

**INPUT TO THE REPORT OF THE HIGH-
LEVEL PANEL ON GLOBAL ASSESSMENT
OF RESOURCES FOR IMPLEMENTING
THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR
BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020**

(UNEP/CBD/COP/11/INF/20)

**CLUSTER REPORT ON RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS**

TARGET 16: ENABLING ACTIVITIES

**AUTHORS: RAVI SHARMA, MARKUS LEHMANN, VALERIE
NORMAND, JOHN SCOTT, DAVID DUTHIE, EDJIGAYEHU
SEYOUM-EDJIGU, BEATRIZ GOMEZ AND DAVID COOPER (CBD
SECRETARIAT)**

2012

ASSESSING THE FINANCIAL RESOURCES NEEDED TO IMPLEMENT THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020 AND ACHIEVE THE AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS:

TARGET 16

Target 16 relates to a cluster of Aichi Targets grouped under *Enabling Activities* for the purpose of the present assessment. Under this cluster are found five targets: Aichi Target 16 to Target 20. As defined by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) enabling activities are defined as '*activities that prepare the foundation to design and implement effective response measures to achieve Convention objectives*'. Following the definition, some of the Aichi Targets of this cluster do not involve recurrent costs for achieving them since recurrent costs arise once implementation starts e.g. Target 16. Furthermore, the resource needs of the targets in this particular cluster are estimated separately for each Target in question.

1. INTRODUCTION TO TARGET 16

By 2015, the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization is in force and operational, consistent with national legislation.

Definition and interpretation

The Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing is a supplementary agreement to the Convention adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its tenth meeting on 29 October 2010 in Nagoya, Japan. It provides a transparent legal framework for the effective implementation of one of the three objectives of the CBD and sets the scene for the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources. The objective of the Protocol repeats the third objective of the CBD, but also adds that ABS shall contribute to the conservation of biological diversity and the sustainable use of its components, explicitly linking ABS to the CBD's other two objectives. The Protocol build on the provisions of the Convention, namely on Article 15 which set out principles and obligations of Parties related to access to genetic resources and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources, on the basis of prior informed consent and mutually agreed terms. The Protocol covers genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources, as well as the benefits arising from their utilization by setting out core obligations for its contracting Parties to take measures in relation to access, benefit-sharing and compliance. Genetic resources are used for a variety of purposes ranging from basic research to development of products. The Nagoya Protocol is expected to create a win-win situation through the:

- a) Provision of greater legal certainty and clarity to both users and providers of genetic resources; as well as provision of fair and non-arbitrary rules and procedures;
- b) Promotion of the advancement of research on genetic resources by creating incentives for both users and providers of such resources to work together including consideration of the importance of genetic resources for food and agriculture for food security;
- c) Strengthening of the ability of indigenous and local communities to benefit from the use of their knowledge; and
- d) Creation of incentives to conserve and sustainably use genetic resources.

These and more details about the Protocol are provided at <http://www.cbd.int/abs/about/>. Users of genetic resources may include research institutes, universities and private companies operating in various sectors such as pharmaceuticals, agriculture, horticulture, cosmetics and biotechnology among other.¹

Target 16 addresses two main issues:

- 1) *Entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol by 2015*: The Protocol will enter into force 90 days after the date of deposit of the fiftieth instrument of ratification (Article 33)². As such for this target to be met 50 countries must ratify the Protocol by October 2015 at the latest.
- 2) *The Nagoya Protocol is operational, consistent with national legislation by 2015*. The extent of the scope of this part of the target can be interpreted in a broader or in a more restrictive way depending on the level of ambition.
 - (a) *At the minimum level of ambition*, having a Nagoya Protocol that is operational, consistent with national legislation by 2015 could be interpreted as requiring Parties that have ratified the Protocol to have domestic legislative, administrative or policy measures and institutional structures in place in order to be in compliance with the Protocol.
 - (b) *At the higher level of ambition*, however, in order to reach to the level of *full implementation of the Protocol*, in addition to those two requirements, Parties would also need to have the capacity and means to effectively start to implement it.

Assumptions

Given that this Protocol is new international treaty, the target aims, at this stage, for its entry into force and operability by 2015³. In accordance to Article 32, the Protocol was opened for signature from 2 February 2011 to 1 February 2012 at the United Nations Headquarters in New York by Parties to the Convention⁴. As of 28 August 92 Parties have signed and 5 Parties have ratified the Protocol. Even after entry in force when the requirement is fulfilled, Parties are expected to continue ratifying and undertaking activities to make it operational. It can be assumed or expected that by 2020 all or most Parties to the CBD would have ratified the Protocol and have taken actions to prepare and get ready for the implementation of the Protocol or some may have already started implementation. However, the assessment below does not include costs of implementation and associated recurrent costs, where any, since these are beyond the scope of Target 16.

Challenges

The main challenges regarding resources needed to meet this target relate to paucity of information and particularly cost related data for the different activities that are necessary to a) to get to the point of ratification; and b) operationalize the Protocol. Although, ABS issues have been raised since COP II, the Nagoya Protocol is new and at the very early stage of ratification. Hence, the real costs to fulfil Target 16 can only be approximated at best.

Links to the CBD and COP Decisions

Numerous COP Decisions have addressed the issue of access to genetic resources and benefit sharing. These include Decision II/11 and 12 (access to genetic resources and intellectual property rights respectively); Decisions III/15, IV/8, V/26, VI/24, VII/19, VIII/4, and IX/12, all on ABS also following Article 15⁵. The Convention in its Article 15, set out principles and obligations of Parties related to access to genetic resources and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of the utilisation of genetic resources on the basis of prior informed

¹ (<http://www.cbd.int/sp/targets/rationale/target-16/>)

² <http://www.cbd.int/abs/nagoya-protocol/signatories/>

³ <http://www.cbd.int/sp/targets/rationale/target-16/>

⁴ <http://www.cbd.int/abs/nagoya-protocol/signatories/>

⁵ <http://www.cbd.int/abs/decisions.shtml>

consent and mutually-agreed terms⁶. Even though ABS has been in COP agenda since COP-2, Target 16 is directly linked to COP-10 decision X/1. This decision included adoption of the Nagoya Protocol and the establishment of an Intergovernmental Committee for the Nagoya Protocol and its work plan.

Links to other Targets

The accomplishment of this target will contribute to and benefit from the achievement of Target 18 that has to do with traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and their customary use of biological resources; Target 19, about knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss being improved, widely shared and transferred, and applied; and Target 20 on the strategy for resource mobilization. Target 17, about development, adoption of a policy instrument and implementation of an effective participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan will not be complete without Target 16 (ABS). The success of Target 16 would also benefit from timely mainstreaming of biodiversity at all levels (Target 1), and can contribute to and benefit from Target 4 (sustainable production and consumption) among other targets. However, at this initial stage of the Nagoya Protocol, there will not be overlap in estimation or double counting of costs when identifying activities and costing this target since full implementation of the Protocol will start after Target 16 is met (i.e. after the foundations for that are put in place).

2. ACTIONS

The following section identifies and suggests actions to be carried out by countries and possible supporting activities with a view to meet the target according to the two levels of ambition identified in the previous section.

a) Minimum Level of Ambition

In order to meet the target, *at the minimum level of ambition*, countries would need to:

- Deposit the instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession of the Nagoya Protocol as soon as possible to ensure that the Protocol enters into force by 2015.
- Have legislative, administrative or policy measures and institutional structures in place for implementing the Nagoya Protocol by 2015. In accordance with their national circumstances, Parties having ratified the Protocol would need to:
 - Revise legislative, administrative or policy measures already in place or develop new measures in order to meet the obligations set out under the Protocol; and
 - Put in place the institutional structures required for implementing the Protocol, including:
 - A national focal point,
 - One or more competent national authorities,
 - One or more check points, and
 - Enabling conditions to actively participate in the ABS Clearing-House.

The following suggests *supporting activities* with a view to assist countries in meeting the target.

- Awareness-raising and capacity-building, and development initiatives with a view to promoting ratification of the Protocol by countries;
- Building the capacity of Parties to develop, implement and enforce domestic legislative, administrative or policy measures on access and benefit-sharing, thereby contributing to the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components, including through:

⁶ <http://www.cbd.int/sp/targets/rationale/target-16/>

- Identification of relevant actors and existing legal and institutional expertise for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol;
- Taking stock of domestic measures relevant to ABS in light of the obligations of the Nagoya Protocol;
- Development and/or amendment of access and benefit-sharing legislative, administrative or policy measures with a view to implementing their obligations under the Nagoya Protocol as users and providers of genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources; and
- Establishment of ways to address transboundary issues.
- Establishment of institutional arrangements and administrative systems to provide access to genetic resources, ensure benefit-sharing, support compliance with prior informed consent and mutually agreed terms and monitor the utilization of genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources, including support for the establishment of check points, and
- Enabling Parties to actively participate in the ABS Clearing-House⁷.

b) Higher Level of Ambition

In addition to the actions and activities identified above, *at a higher level of ambition*, in order to fully implement the Protocol, countries would also need to have the capacity and means to effectively implement it.

With a view to assist Parties to effectively implement the Protocol the following *supporting activities* are suggested based on the priority activities identified by the Intergovernmental Committee for the Nagoya Protocol in relation to the GEF sixth replenishment period 2014-2018:⁸

- Building the capacity of Parties to negotiate mutually agreed terms to promote equity and fairness in negotiations in the development and implementation of ABS agreements;
- Building the capacity of Parties to develop their endogenous research capabilities to add value to their own genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources;
- Addressing the capacity needs and priorities of indigenous and local communities and relevant stakeholders, in particular projects that would:
 - Encourage their participation in legal, policy and decision-making processes; and
 - Assisting in building their capacity related to genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources, such as through the development of community protocols, model contractual clauses and minimum requirements for mutually agreed terms.
- Supporting Parties in raising awareness to the importance of genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources

The supporting activities listed in this section could serve as basis for the assessment of resource requirements to meet the target according to the two different levels of ambition.

⁷ Priority activities identified by the Intergovernmental Committee for the Nagoya Protocol in relation to the GEF sixth replenishment period 2014-2018 (Recommendation 2/1 of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Nagoya Protocol, Annex II, paragraph 1 (a) and (e)).

⁸ Recommendation 2/1 of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Nagoya Protocol, Annex II, paragraph 1(b) (c) (d) and (f).

3. METHOD OF ASSESSMENT

The Nagoya Protocol is a new international treaty adopted in October 2010, and as a new instrument there is limited information available on assessment of resources needed with a view to make it operational.

In addition, the amount of resources required to meet the target will greatly vary from country to country depending on:

- The degree of complexity of the ratification procedures;
- The degree of development of the ABS national frameworks;
- The existing level of capacity on ABS; and
- The variety and complexity of national circumstances that are to be taken into account for making the Protocol operational (e.g. number of indigenous and local communities, number of administrative structures involved in the process, conflicting legislation, etc).

Taking into account (a) the limited information available and (b) the enormous variety in country needs and circumstances for making the Protocol operational at the national level, the next section provides a preliminary assessment of resource needs per country to meet Target 16.

The assessment of resource needs is mainly based on SCBD in-house expertise, using the following sources of information as references during the assessment:

- In the GEF project on “*Development of National Biosafety Frameworks*”⁹ of 2001, the required amount for preparing a national biosafety framework was estimated to be 320,000 USD per country. This amount could serve as a guidance to estimate the cost of developing ABS legislative, administrative or policy measures, but accounting for inflation to bring the amount up to the level of 2012. Hence, the amount becomes 415,000 USD per country per country approximately.
- In the “Full assessment of the amount of funds needed for the implementation of the Convention for the sixth replenishment period of the trust fund of the GEF” developed by an expert group for its consideration by COP-11, the cost for ABS capacity-building activities in relation to Target 16 was initially estimated to range between 300,000 and 600,000 USD per country for the GEF eligible countries for the period 2014-2018. However, due to the existence of the Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund (NPIF)¹⁰, there was no estimate provided in the assessment. According to GEF Progress report on the NPIF (GEF/C.42/Inf.07)¹¹ of May, 2012, 14.83 million USD has been made available for the ratification of the Protocol through the generous contributions of the Governments of Japan, Norway, Switzerland, and United Kingdom. The amount of fund currently awaiting Council approval is 12.76 million USD. However, this fund is implementation fund and might not be necessarily for the types of activities proposed in the present assessment. GEF-6 financial needs assessment is based on priority activities, in only GEF eligible countries (developing countries and countries with economies in transition and for the period 2014-2018. This assessment also uses an incremental reasoning approach to estimate the amount of fund needed for the period 2014-2018s although it also estimates total costs before such reasoning. Hence, there are differences between the present assessment and the GEF-6 assessment.
- Expert consultation and opinion; and
- Other sources of references and information consulted include the following GEF projects on ABS:
 - Capacity-building for the early entry into force of the Protocol on ABS;
 - Strengthening the implementation of access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing regimes in Latin America and the Caribbean;
 - Capacity building for access and benefit-sharing and Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants in Ethiopia; and

⁹ For more information see the project brief at:

http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/gef_prj_docs/GEFProjectDocuments/Biodiversity/Global%20-%20Development%20of%20National%20Biosafety%20Frameworks/Project%20Document%20for%20WP.pdf

¹⁰ For more information see UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/10

¹¹ http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.42_Inf.07_Progress%20Report%20on%20the%20NPIF.pdf

- Strengthening the implementation of the Biological Diversity Act and Rules with focus on its ABS provisions in India

4. ASSESSMENT OF RESOURCE NEEDS

The following tables provide a preliminary assessment of the resource needs per country to meet Target 16 according to two levels of ambition as set out in section 2 above. The estimated costs provided do not include recurrent costs for implementing the Protocol. The two scenarios represent ranges of values of the different activities. The tables can serve as basis for discussion by the panel.

Table 0.1-A gives the breakdown of estimated resource needs per country. The activities and amounts are related to what is needed to ratify and prepare the administrative, legislative, institutional environment in order to enable implementation. Actions and supporting activities required to meet Target 16 at minimum level of ambition may range between 280,000 USD and 590,000 USD per country.

Table 0.1-A Breakdown of estimated resource needs per country (minimum level of ambition)

ACTIONS AND SUPPORTING ACTIVITIES REQUIRED TO MEET TARGET 16 AT A MINIMUM LEVEL OF AMBITION	Estimated costs per country		Recurrent Annual Expenditure		Recurrent Total (2013-2020)	
	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 1	Scenario 2
	(in US \$)					
Action: Deposit the instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession of the Nagoya	20,000	50,000	na	na	na	na
<i>Supporting activity</i> : Awareness-raising and capacity-building and development initiatives with a view to promoting ratification of the Protocol by countries	20,000	20,000	na	na	na	na
Subtotal:	40,000	70,000	na	na	na	na
Action: Revise legislative, administrative or policy measures already in place or develop new measures in order to meet the obligations set out under the Protocol	50,000	150,000	na	na	na	na
<i>Supporting activity</i> : Building the capacity of Parties to develop, implement and enforce domestic legislative, administrative or policy measures on access and benefit-sharing, thereby contributing to the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components	100,000	200,000	na	na	na	na
<i>Supporting activity</i> : Identification of relevant actors and existing legal and institutional expertise for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol	10,000	10,000	na	na	na	na
<i>Supporting activity</i> : Taking stock of domestic measures relevant to ABS in light of the obligations of the Nagoya Protocol	10,000	10,000	na	na	na	na
<i>Supporting activity</i> : Establishment of ways to address transboundary issues	20,000	20,000	na	na	na	na
Subtotal:	190,000	390,000	na	na	na	na
Action: Put in place the institutional structures required for implementing the Protocol, including a national focal point, one or more competent national authorities and one or more check points	20,000	100,000	na	na	na	na
<i>Supporting activity</i> : Enabling Parties to actively participate in the ABS Clearing-House	30,000	30,000	na	na	na	na
Subtotal	50,000	130,000	na	na	na	na
TOTAL AMOUNT NEEDED PER COUNTRY	280,000	590,000	na	na	na	na

Note: 'na' refers to non applicable. Countries may start ratify and lay the foundation for the implementation of the Protocol at different time during the current decade. The activities listed above do not imply recurrent costs at this initial stage (i.e. for ratification and preparing for implementation). Recurrent costs may appear once implementation starts.

Table 0.1-B gives the breakdown of estimated resource needs per country to facilitate implementation once the Protocol is ratified. These include enabling and capacity building activity to prepare for implementation of the Protocol. These additional actions and supporting activities are also required to meet Target 16 at a higher level of ambition and may cost between 400,000 USD and 1,000,000 USD per country. Hence, at a higher level of ambition the total amount that would be required ranges between 680,000 USD and 1,590,000 USD – i.e. the total amounts in Table 0.1-A plus the additional amounts from Table 0.1-B under Scenario 1 and 2 that again represent ranges of values. This is presented in Table 0.2-A under the results section.

Table 0.1-B Breakdown of additional estimated resource needs per country (higher level of ambition)

ADDITIONAL ACTIONS AND SUPPORTING ACTIVITIES REQUIRED TO MEET TARGET 16 AT A HIGHER LEVEL OF AMBITION	Estimated costs per country		Recurrent Annual Expenditure		Recurrent Total (2013-2020)	
	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 1	Scenario 2
<i>Action: Building the capacity and providing the means for effective implementation of the Protocol</i>						
	(in US \$)					
<i>Supporting activity:</i> Building the capacity of Parties to negotiate mutually agreed terms to promote equity and fairness in negotiations in the development and implementation of ABS agreements.	100,000	300,000	na	na	na	na
<i>Supporting activity:</i> Build the capacity of Parties to develop their endogenous research capabilities to add value to their own genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources.	100,000	300,000	na	na	na	na
<i>Supporting activity:</i> Addressing the capacity needs and priorities of indigenous and local communities and relevant stakeholders, in particular projects that would: a) Encourage their participation in legal, policy and decision-making processes; and b) Assisting in building their capacity related to genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources, such as through the development of community protocols, model contractual clauses and minimum requirements for mutually agreed terms.	100,000	300,000	na	na	na	na
<i>Supporting activity:</i> Supporting Parties in raising awareness to the importance of genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources	100,000	100,000	na	na	na	na
Subtotal Amount needed per country	400,000	1,000,000	na	na	na	na

Note: na refers to non applicable. The above activities are additional enabling and capacity building activities to lay the foundation for implementation of the Protocol. It is important to note that the amounts needed are not for implementation but rather to get to the point of implementation. Once again, countries may undertake these activities at different point in time during the decade but the activities do not involve recurrent costs. Recurrent costs will start when implementation starts.

5. RESULTS

Tables 0.2-A summarizes the estimated resources required per country for meeting Target 16 according to the two levels of ambition in relation to the interpretation of the target as explained in section 2. The scenarios refer to the estimated range of costs for activities as observed in Tables 0.1-A and B. At the minimum level of ambition the amount needed will range between 280,000 USD and 590,000 USD. At higher level of ambition additional amounts of 400,000 to 1,000,000 will be needed to meet the target, thereby raising the amount needed at higher level of ambition to between 680,000 USD and 1,590,000 USD per country.

In order to meet the target, at a minimum level, 50 countries would need to ratify the Protocol and make it operational at the national level before 2015. The following table contains an estimate of overall resources required based on the results of the assessment as per table above, while providing for different scenarios regarding the number of countries meeting target 16. **Table 0.2-B** shows the results at minimum level of ambition and higher level of ambition for the case of 50 countries, 100 countries and 197 countries (for global level estimation). While it would cost between 14 million and 79.5 million USD for 50 countries to ratify the protocol and prepare for implementation, there will be a need for 55.1 million to 313 million USD at the global level and about 6.9 million USD to 39.1 million USD per year on average for the next eight year (i.e. 2013-2020).

Table 0.2-A Summary of total resource needs per country

Summary of activities	Total amount per country (2013-2020)		Average annual per country (2013-2020)	
	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 1	Scenario 2
	(in US \$)			
Estimated resources required at <i>minimum level of ambition</i> per country	280,000	590,000	35,000	73,750
Additional amount required to reach the higher level of ambition per country	400,000	1,000,000	50,000	125,000
Total amount required <i>at higher level of ambition</i>	680,000	1,590,000	85,000	198,750

Note: 2013-2020 inclusive i.e. 8 years considered.

Table 0.2-B Summary of total resource need for 50, 100, and 197 countries

Summary of activities	Total amount (2013-2020)		Average annual (2013-2020)	
	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 1	Scenario 2
50 countries				
	(in US \$)			
Estimated resources required at <i>minimum level of ambition</i> per country	14,000,000	29,500,000	1,750,000	3,687,500
Total amount required <i>at higher level of ambition</i>	34,000,000	79,500,000	4,250,000	9,937,500
100 countries				
Estimated resources required at <i>minimum level of ambition</i> per country	28,000,000	59,000,000	3,500,000	7,375,000
Total amount required <i>at higher level of ambition</i>	68,000,000	159,000,000	8,500,000	19,875,000
Global (197 countries)				
Estimated resources required at <i>minimum level of ambition</i> per country	55,060,000	115,980,000	6,882,500	14,497,500
Total amount required <i>at higher level of ambition</i>	133,860,000	312,980,000	16,732,500	39,122,500

Note: the amounts for depositing the instrument for ratification the five countries that have already ratified (20,000 USD in Scenario 1 and 50,000 in Scenario 2) have been removed from the global amounts.

6. DISCUSSION

The above required amounts to achieve the targets are not indefinite. Once, implementation starts costs structure will change and benefits start arising from the implementation activities. The required amounts are needed to be able to get to the implementation stage. Recurrent costs will also start showing up after implementation and amounts of those will be hard to determine at this stage since these may be affected by a number of factors.

Although there could be differences in resource needs from country to country, there is a higher level of confidence in the estimated amounts that are presented for activities at the minimum level of ambition than at higher level of ambition that could depend more on the various circumstances in different countries. Since the estimation partly drew lessons from the Cartagena Protocol, the total amounts are expected to be representative of costs per country on average. Hence, these amounts are also used to estimate the global amounts.

Estimates are not expected to be sensitive to changes at the minimum level of ambition (activities related to the point of ratification). Estimates related to the additional activities related to the higher level of ambition may slightly be sensitive to various factors and socio-economic and political situations in different countries, awareness, amount and types of resources in a country among other.

Table 1.1 Gap Analysis for Target 16

Target 16	
Evidence on costs	Strength of evidence (low) – A combination of sources used in this case Extent to which further research is required (considerable)
Evidence on current levels of expenditure	Strength of evidence (low) – A combination of sources used in this case Extent to which further research is required (considerable)
Other Targets	
Links to other Targets	Both within the overall cluster and with other Targets – Link with numerous targets mostly after starting implementation
Evidence on potential co-benefits	Both within the overall cluster and between Targets (possible) Strength of evidence (low) if related to the Target - (high on genetic resources) Extent to which further research is required (considerable for ABS)
Other policy areas	
Related policy areas outside of biodiversity	e. g. climate change, rural development, health, agriculture, etc. The target deals with genetic resources, it touches on all these areas and more such as climate change, rural development, health (pharmaceutical, traditional medicines), R&D, agriculture, biotechnology, private companies (e.g. cosmetics industry), universities...
Evidence on potential benefits to other policy areas	Extent of potential benefits (very high) Extent to which further research is required (considerable) – there are yet a lot of genetic resources properties to discover around the world – ABS could be the way to make the best of these resources)

Benefits of delivering the target

The fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources is one of the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The Nagoya Protocol is based on the fundamental principles of access and benefit-sharing enshrined in the CBD. It supports the implementation of the third objective of the Convention by providing greater legal certainty and transparency for both providers and users of genetic resources. It helps to ensure benefit-sharing, in particular when genetic resources leave the country providing the genetic resources, and it establishes more predictable conditions for access to genetic resources.

By enhancing legal certainty and promoting benefit-sharing, the Nagoya Protocol encourages the advancement of research on genetic resources which could lead to new discoveries for the benefit of all. The Nagoya Protocol also creates incentives to conserve and sustainably use genetic resources, and thereby enhances the contribution of biodiversity to development and human well-being.

In addition, by setting-out clear provisions on access to traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources, the Nagoya Protocol will assist in strengthening the ability of indigenous and local communities to benefit from the use of their knowledge, innovations and practices. The Nagoya Protocol will also provide incentives for the promotion and protection of traditional knowledge by encouraging the development of community protocols, minimum requirements for mutually agreed terms and model contractual clauses related to access and benefit-sharing of traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources.

As far as funding opportunities are concerned, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) is one source of funding. Considering the advantages (and comparative advantages) and benefits that countries could have by meeting the Target, countries may decide to invest in ABS activities. The GEF has also been catalyst for leveraging large amounts of funds for projects with global environmental benefits of which ABS could be one. So far the funding evidences that are readily available are those from the GEF. Overall, the Target could potentially benefit from internal and external funding sources.

It is important to note that the amount of fund that is available through NPIF (12.8 million USD) is not accounted in this assessment. This is because the fund so far has been used for an implementation project (GEF Project 4897-Panama) it is not clearly know what the rest of the amount is going to be used. *'The Fund supports existing opportunities leading to development and implementation of concrete ABS agreements with involvement of the private sectors. The projects funded under the NPIF encourage the engagement with private sector entities interested in exploring the economic potential of genetic resources and facilitate the transfer of appropriate technologies. Through the implementation of this type of projects, countries should be generating additional information that can help to understand their capacities and needs on ABS, with focus on the provisions from existing policies, laws, and regulations affecting genetic resources'*¹². There is no other available information on the current levels of investment and expenditure. The results presented in the present assessment include the estimate of resources required from donor support and national contributions.

ICF GHK/ WCMC, First draft, 27.8.12

¹² http://www.thegef.org/gef/trust_funds