



Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.30/5/Add.1
November 28, 2006

GEF Council
June 3-8, 2005

Agenda Item 12

FOCAL AREA STRATEGIES FOR GEF-4 – WORKING DRAFTS AND PROPOSED PROCESS

ADDENDUM

The attached comments received from the Council Member representing the United States of America should be included in Annex I of document GEF/C.30/5.

U.S. Comments on GEF Focal Area Strategies

This paper outlines preliminary U.S. comments on draft GEF focal area strategies (October 2006). It is not intended to be an exclusive or final set of comments, but is provided in the interest of furthering the work on these draft strategies.

General:

The draft strategies are more succinct and clear than the current operational strategies, although it would be helpful if there was some standardization of format. Also, some strategies (especially biodiversity and int'l waters) could be made a little more understandable to policy officials.

In general, we agree that they need more work. For example:

- The overriding strategic consideration should be to maximize global environmental benefits from GEF's scarce resources in all focal areas. This means much greater emphasis on cost-effectiveness, sustainability, replication and selectivity -- concepts that are central to the current operational strategy. In our view, these concepts should drive our strategic priorities, especially in the area of climate change. In this connection, we would like each focal area to have targets on cofinancing, sustainability, replication and cost-effectiveness considered.
- There is no mention of the resource allocation framework, which will be in place for the two largest focal areas for GEF-4 and is to be extended GEF-wide by 2010.
- The document reads too much like a programming paper, with a focus on approval of projects and inadequate attention to how we can ensure results. In general, there should be much greater emphasis on the specific policies that need to be in place for GEF projects to succeed. Each of the focal area strategies should describe the key elements of the policy and regulatory frameworks that should be in place for projects to be sustainable, replicable and cost-effective. Any capacity building should focus on strengthening these frameworks, which in turn will help improve the chances of countries receiving higher allocations in the future. We would suggest that the Secretariat draw upon the components of the performance indicators of the RAF.
- There should be a clearer distinction in the narrative between projects being completed and projects being approved, and the results management framework for GEF-4 should provide targets for projects exiting (being completed) during the GEF-4 as well as targets for projects being approved during this time.
- There is also inadequate attention to how GEF will fit with countries' efforts to reduce poverty. Consistent the GEF-4 agreement, each focal area strategy should emphasize the importance of GEF funded activities being cost-effective in the local context. For example,

we do not want to saddle countries with expensive energy production that they will not be able to sustain or that will come at the expense of poverty reduction efforts. We should not expect countries to pursue global environment benefits at the cost of their own survival.

- The strategies appear to have dropped or downplayed short-term response measures and quick wins. We think this is a mistake. Short-term measures may be the most effective way to build long-term changes.
- We are somewhat concerned that proposed schedule for completing this work would delay the establishment of a results management framework until June of 2007. Under the GEF-3 Replenishment agreement, this framework was to be in place at the outset of each replenishment. There can be no further slippage from June 2007.
- It should be clear in the papers on sound chemical management and forestry that GEF's role is only global environmental benefits, and that these crosscutting objectives will be pursued to the extent that they are consistent with the six focal area strategies. The point is that we do not want the crosscutting issues to have a negative effect on our goals for the six focal areas, especially the reduction of POPs, where there is a limited amount of funding. At the same time we recognize that cross cutting objectives, in particular forest conservation and sustainable management, generate significant global environmental benefits in multiple focal areas.
- We are not prepared to endorse the use of specific instruments (e.g., investment funds in international waters; country partnership programs in land degradation and debt for nature swaps in biodiversity) in these focal area strategies. These are pilot instruments for the GEF and have not yet been independently evaluated. In any event, we believe that decisions on instruments should be separate from these strategies given the important fiduciary considerations.

Climate change:

The overriding concept should be to maximize the sustainable reduction of greenhouse gas emissions with our scarce resources. Therefore, we believe the climate change focal area should have a cost-effectiveness indicator (s). We recognize that this should not be the only way to measure cost-effectiveness, but believe such a metric is a powerful tool to focus countries and Implementing and Executing Agencies on the bottom line. It will also help ensure GEF projects are fully consistent with poverty reduction strategies. That said, we recognize the difficulty of developing a meaningful and objective cost-effectiveness metric across the climate focal area. GHG reductions per dollar may make sense, but we don't want to rule out less tangible activities with big payoffs (sectoral reform, advanced technologies, or activities with high replicability). Therefore, cost effectiveness indicators should be supplemented with expert review of the operational effectiveness of projects.

As indicated above, we do not want to discontinue the short-term response measures. We will likely want to continue to focus on methane and markets transactions. We believe that non-

energy activities such as forest conservation and HFC byproduct emission reduction measures should also be considered under this operational program.

We note that there does not appear to be any avenue for promoting cleaner and more efficient use of fossil fuels for planned (as opposed to existing) power production. Since most significant new power generation capacity in the next several decades will likely involve fossil fuels (especially in rapidly industrializing countries), this means the GEF funding is effectively irrelevant for the lion's share of planned capacity in many countries. This does not make sense.

We note the high priority accorded renewables, which will be competitive under some – but only some – conditions, and will result in at best a relatively marginal increase in renewables capacity – but it will still be marginal. Evaluations highlighted the emphasis on renewables as not constituting a cost-effective use of resources relative to other activities. Has any analysis been done regarding greenhouse gas mitigation costs and potential from achieving greater efficiencies or more advanced technologies in planned fossil fuel plants vs. promoting renewables? What amount is GEF spending on renewables activities relative to other types of activities?

We would like to see an element that relates to terrestrial carbon sequestration in the climate operational program. We note that there is increased interest in tropical forest conservation, and consider that forest conservation activities are attractive both from the standpoint of cost-effectiveness and global environmental benefit.

We don't see why on-grid renewable energy is a higher priority than rehabilitation of power plants and industrial energy efficiency. We agree that GEF needs to be cautious about projects in this area is it that it does not prolong the life of uneconomic, dirty power plants. However, the potential CO2 emissions reduction from investments in these energy efficiency opportunities is quite high and in most cases can be achieved at lower cost than on grid renewable energy. Moreover, its hard to imagine that these are areas that would no longer be needed after GEF-4. Therefore, consistent with the G8 leaders' call in St. Petersburg for the GEF to enhance energy efficiency efforts, and consistent with our comments under the UNFCCC, the *Rehabilitation of Power Plants (OP5)*, now identified as a Medium priority, should become a High priority. In addition, *On-Grid Renewable Energy (OP6)* -- now identified as a High priority should be a Medium priority.

We agree that OP 7 has not worked well and should be a low priority. The track record on these projects has been poor, and as the Secretariat previously indicated, we should not be in the business of picking winners and losers.

GEF adaptation efforts through the climate change focal area, in the absence of results that include greenhouse gas emission cuts, should bring global environmental benefits in other focal areas and they should also enhance adaptive capacity to climate variability. It is premature to indicate that resources should be increased for this area before we have had a chance to examine an evaluation. The mission statement might thus be edited to read (suggested additional language bolded and underlined):

-Adaptation Mission: To assist developing countries in addressing the adverse impacts of climate variability and change by supporting projects that build adaptive capacity, including the capacity to assess vulnerability, and that produce global environmental benefits; to identify and implement suitable adaptation measures; and to increase ecosystem resilience to the adverse impacts of climate variability and change.

While we agree that “market transformation” is an important way to produce CO2 emissions reductions, this term needs to be more clearly defined, using objective indicators, such as energy intensity (as noted in the Martinot/Nichols paper on performance indicators for climate change). We also believe that it is important to maintain CO2 equivalent emissions as the central program indicator. The number of market transformations (125) does not tell much about the size of the market, the energy intensity, or other factors that GEF should consider before deciding to intervene. We would strongly recommend further work on this indicator.

We have reservations regarding the GEF engaging in projects that involve carbon finance. The United States has a policy not to contribute to the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol. To the extent that most carbon finance activities will relate to the Kyoto Protocol, including Clean Development Mechanism capacity building activities, we would need to feel confident that we could differentiate between aspects of projects that depend on carbon-related revenue streams for financial viability and those that are largely dependent on other sources of finance or revenue.

There should be some discussion of the appropriate policies that should be in place for GEF projects to be sustainable and replicable. For example, energy efficiency projects need appropriate energy pricing policies. Rehabilitation of power plants requires adequate tariff structures. These policies should be consistent with the environmental policy indicator of the RAF.

Biodiversity:

As indicated in the introduction, there should be an elaboration of the policies most conducive for success, consistent with the RAF performance indicators. In addition, we did not see any cost effectiveness indicators. Also, we do not want to endorse instruments in the strategy given the important fiduciary implications.

Attached are some additional edits and questions on the draft text.

International waters:

We cannot support the endorsement of investment funds as an instrument for intervening in the sector. These are pilot instruments that have yet to be fully evaluated.

Land degradation:

The strategy should spell out clearly the incremental role the GEF will have in addressing the purely global environmental benefit – for example, cofinancing would focus on sound agricultural and forest management policies, and the GEF increment would focus on bringing

these into a landscape or integrated cross sectional approach. Otherwise, there is a risk that GEF will promote “de-mainstreaming,” with agencies seeking to use GEF resources for activities that agencies would normally fund.

The indicators need much more work. Most are process oriented or outputs, not outcomes. Legal and regulatory frameworks have no impact unless they are enforced.

There needs to be a better discussion of the problem of land and forest degradation, in particular, which areas of the world are most affected by it, so that we can focus our scarce resources where they will have the greatest impact.

We cannot support the strategy’s endorsement of having focal area interventions take the form of a programmatic partnership framework. These are pilot instruments that have not yet been completed or evaluated and raise important fiduciary issues. It is not clear what is meant by a sector or multisector based partnership approach.

There should be some discussion of cost-effectiveness measures – emphasis on prevention, etc. Also, there should be greater focus on governance, especially enforcement of legal and regulatory standards (e.g. combating illegal natural resource production).

Based on the description in the paper, we do not believe that GEF project funds should support the development of a global indicator system for sustainable land management. This strikes us as something that is more appropriately funded through the GEF corporate budget, or through the regular budgets of UNEP, as a core function of this agency, and therefore not eligible for GEF project funds. That being said, we believe that there should be an urgent development of potential environmental benefits indicators for land degradation, financed through the corporate budget, as called for by the GEF-4 Replenishment commitment to extend the RAF GEF wide.

Strategic objective number four (promote cross focal area synergies) is too general for this focal area. This is a broad goal of the GEF across all focal areas. The GEF needs to develop a more specific strategic objective.

Sustainable forest management (SFM) projects, including in the wet tropics, should be given due attention, along with rangelands and drylands projects associated with dry areas (and the CCD). Therefore, we would suggest the following revisions.

(1) para 2, add at end: including sustainable forest management (SFM) practices

(2) para 3, add at the end of sentence 1: as well as to the objectives of the UN Forum on Forests.

- delete 5(b). Promoting “high yielding agricultural” practice seems inappropriate for the GEF.
- add to end of 6(b): including reduced impact logging (RIL), implementation of best management practices (BMPs)

- add to 7 after appropriate technologies: and management tools (technologies is too limited)
- add to 7(a) after soil quality management: and soil and water conservation
- add new 7(c) bis: Promoting forest health and vitality, including insect and disease management, control of invasive species and addressing storm damage
- add 7(c) ter: Monitoring and assessing trends in forest conditions and management using internationally agreed criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management

POPs:

While the paper is generally good, it should be clear that strategic objective (#4) on technology demonstration is a pretty low priority and resources would be used only if the other objectives are met. It is better to focus more of our scarce resources on strategic objectives 2 and 3, which more clearly provide environmental benefits (and have better indicators of success). They are also critical to countries implementing the Convention. Strategic objective #4 has indicators that are weak. The first indicator is just doing a demo – while demos are useful, they are not as important as other actions directly related to implementation and reducing emissions. The second indicator is the number of countries where the practice is introduced – instead, we think the question should be “where is the practice applied cost-effectively and sustainably to produce significant environmental gain?” The indicator should identify the tonnage and cost per ton of reductions.

In anticipation of a GEF-wide RAF, the development of potential environmental benefits indicators (e.g. stockpiles by country) should be undertaken as soon as possible.

Ozone layer depletion:

This seems fairly standard. How much longer will GEF need to be engaged in this focal area?

Would like to see cost-effectiveness indicators for this focal area and comparisons of those indicators with similar projects funded by the Montréal Protocol Fund.

Chemicals crosscutting issues:

The paper is well written. In general, we believe this demonstrates that a new focal area for chemicals is not necessary and the changes that were made to para 3 of the GEF instrument in 2003 are sufficient. However, we do not support the apparent call for chemicals to serve as a screen for all projects or somehow prioritize projects in the pipeline. Therefore, there should be a change in the 6th para, line 8 sentence 4. “It is proposed that from now on, **relevant** project proposals and **relevant** project completion reports should highlight the specific contributions that they are making to sound chemicals management.” Otherwise, the text sounds like GEF would require chemicals to be the criteria in all proposals and reporting, which is neither feasible nor desirable.

The paper could be further improved by a few changes in para 7 but these are not critical suggestions. Line 6 sentence 4 “Agro-forestry practices also reduce the need for synthetic fertilizers.” This is simply wrong – there might be a need for increases in fertilizer in highly managed agro-forestry systems. Also whether fertilizers are synthetic or organic is irrelevant to the pollution load they might produce and their need to be managed. On line 7 sentence 5 delete “prohibit” and replace with “discourage.” Forest certification schemes are diverse and to say that they prohibit types of chemical use is an overstatement.

Sustainable forest management:

We agree that forests cross cut the GEF focal areas on biodiversity, climate change and land degradation. We believe these three focal areas cover a wide range of forest projects for GEF funding, ranging from protected forests under the biodiversity focal area to sustainable harvesting under the land degradation focal area. We also agree with the seven elements of sustainable forest management identified in the paper and believe that projects advancing any one or more of the elements should be considered eligible for GEF funding

However, we oppose inclusion of the outcomes of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA), which were not inter-governmentally sponsored, as a justification for work in these areas. Specifically we are uncomfortable with paragraph 6 and believe it should be deleted. We believe the MEA characterizations of the direct drivers of terrestrial ecosystem degradation is incomplete, ignoring major issues such as unsustainable and illegal natural resource production and believe that the analysis is too simplistic. The paragraph is unnecessary and does not add to the document.

In Section V Future Direction and Challenges, we disagree that with the premise that primary forests provide the greatest global environmental benefits and therefore should be first in line for GEF funding. This is specious. While primary forest projects may be the priority for funding under the biodiversity focal area, this should not be the assumption for all focal areas. For instance in the land degradation focal area a wide variety of forest management projects provide significant global environmental benefits as alternatives to continued deforestation and forest degradation. We believe funding sustainable forest management (SFM) is squarely a role for the GEF under the three focal areas.

III. BIODIVERSITY PRIORITY PROGRAMMING AREAS

Strategic Objective One: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels

3.1. Scope: Protected Areas (PAs)¹ remain the critical foundation of biodiversity conservation worldwide, and as such, they will continue to be supported as a major thrust of GEF-4. Until GEF-3, individual GEF projects had focused on building capacity and improving management effectiveness within the context of individual PAs, with limited attention to the long-term capacity and policy maturity that underpins the sustainability of PA systems. The emphasis during GEF-4 continues the significant shift achieved during GEF-3 towards working at the systems level, and over the long-term. This strategic objective does not preclude support for individual PAs providing that: (i) individual support is justified within country contexts and demonstrates replication effects that contribute towards the maturation of a national-level system of PAs: or (ii) a protected area contains globally important biodiversity [is this determined through use of the IUCN red list? If not, then how? What if the standard to determine that the biodiversity is globally important?] that is critically at risk and in need of immediate attention.

Types of Projects Activities (while distinct they are not mutually exclusive within the context of a project):

4.2. Capacity Building for long-term Sustainability²: Support will be provided to further develop institutional, managerial and financial sustainability from both private and public sources including:

- (a) Systemic capacity building through legislation, policy and enabling activities to improve management effectiveness at the system and/or individual PA level;
- (b) Institutional capacity building to improve all aspects of management;
- (c) Individual capacity building through targeted training.

¹ Protected areas are not limited to formal national parks but will also include indigenous and private reserves whose objective is biodiversity conservation

² Capacity building at the systemic, institutional and individual levels will by necessity entail developing the capacity of the protected area system at all levels to mitigate and respond to threats posed to biodiversity within protected areas including the application of landscape-scale approaches to protected area management that encompasses the production landscape.

5.3. Capacity building in technical fields will include but not be limited to: a) system design; b) prevention, control and management of invasive alien species; c) conflict negotiation/resolution and d) valuation of environmental services provided by PAs.

6.4. Demonstration and Implementation of Innovative Financial Mechanisms at the System Level: GEF will promote comprehensive, system-level financing solutions that makes the best use of a variety of discrete tools and revenue mechanisms, i.e., conservation Trust Funds, systems of payments for environmental services, easements, debt-for-nature swaps and certification processes and other mechanisms. GEF will support policy reform and/or incentives to catalyze engagement of the private sector and other stakeholders to attain improved financial sustainability of PAs.

7.5. Catalyzing Community – Indigenous Initiatives: In recognition of the continuing increase in the number of community and indigenous-owned protected areas, GEF will promote the participation and capacity building of local community and indigenous groups in the design, implementation, management and monitoring of projects to promote biodiversity conservation and sustainable use through established frameworks such as Biosphere Reserves, land-use zoning (e.g. for corridors) and community – indigenous peoples conservation areas.

	Indicators	Targets	Sources of Verification
Outcome: Sustainable protected area systems at the national level achieve their management objectives.	- Protected area systems cover a viable representative sample of ecosystems - Diversification of revenue streams to support protected area management costs - Increased Capacity for protected area management	75% of PA systems	GEF Tracking Tools for biodiversity and independent project evaluations.
	- Percentage of individual protected areas that demonstrate an improvement in management effectiveness	75%	GEF Tracking Tools for biodiversity
Output 1. Protected area systems supported to improve management effectiveness	Number of countries that receive support for strengthening PA systems to ensure their long-term sustainability	At least 40 countries	GEF tracking tools for biodiversity
Output 2. Individual protected areas supported to improve management	Number of protected areas supported	400 PAs supported of which at least 80 PAs should be marine or freshwater	GEF tracking tools for biodiversity

	Indicators	Targets	Sources of Verification
effectiveness as a contribution to a national protected area system	Number of hectares of protected areas supported	80 million hectares	GEF tracking tools for biodiversity

Strategic Objective Two: Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes/ Seascapes and Sectors³

9.6. *Scope*: Mainstreaming occurs at the interaction between biodiversity and economic activity, and therefore the sectoral points of entry are numerous and distinct. Priority sectors for GEF-4 have been identified according to their degree of impact upon globally-important biomes (tropical forests, temperate grasslands, Mediterranean drylands [why is it limited to 'Mediterranean' drylands? What is the purpose of that?], tropical grasslands and savannah, inland water, coastal, marine, and islands) as indicated in the matrix of “Drivers of Change in Biodiversity and Ecosystems” in the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment⁴ [Comment: We oppose inclusion of the outcomes of the millennium ecosystem assessment which was not an inter-governmentally sponsored as a justification for work in these areas. We believe the reference should be deleted. We believe the MEA characterizations of the direct drivers of terrestrial ecosystem degradation is incomplete ignoring major issues such as unsustainable and illegal natural resource production and the analysis is too simplistic. The paragraph is unnecessary and does not add to the document.] Agriculture, forestry, fisheries, tourism, infrastructure and transport; oil, mining and gas; and banking and insurance were identified as the main (but not exclusive) sectors to be addressed that have had either a very high or high impacts on these biomes over the last century through the main drivers of change (habitat change, climate change, invasive species, over-exploitation, and pollution).

Types of Projects Activities (while distinct they are not mutually exclusive within the context of a project⁵):

9.7. Spatial mainstreaming projects will ensure that biodiversity considerations are effectively internalized into the planning and management processes of a particular spatial area.

10.8. Sectoral mainstreaming projects will internalize biodiversity into a particular sector. Sectoral-related activities can include improvement of production practices through demonstration and promotion efforts; strengthening capacity at the systemic level through improving policies (including incorporating management considerations into spatial and sector planning) and legislation, and raising awareness.

³ The approach to mainstreaming in GEF-4 draws on the recommendations provided by the Biodiversity Program Study 2004 as well as a STAP workshop on mainstreaming held in 2004.

⁴ Millennium Ecosystem Assessment 2005, Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Synthesis, Island Press, Washington DC

⁵ In GEF-3, numerous projects in production landscapes, particularly agricultural landscapes, have specific benefit-sharing initiatives and access and benefit sharing components as part of the project intervention strategy. In GEF-4, this type of nested capacity building in access and benefit sharing will continue to receive support and opportunities to engage public and private sector actors and local and indigenous communities in these activities will be pursued as appropriate.

| ~~1.9.~~ Institutional mainstreaming projects will internalize biodiversity considerations into the operations of a particular institution, either public or private, and foster innovative partnerships and approaches to conservation that can be adopted by other companies or public institutions in similar fields.

| ~~2.10.~~ Market mainstreaming projects will actively influence production sectors and systems through the creation of new markets, i.e., Payments for Environmental Services (PES), biodiversity offsets, user fees (for protected areas), and coastal services to reduce vulnerability and marine services for restocking fisheries.

	Indicators	Targets	Sources of Verification
Outcome: Biodiversity conservation and its sustainable use internalized into production systems, supply chains, markets, sectors, development models, policies, plans and programs.	Extent of biodiversity- friendly managed landscapes (some of the land use will be under certified production systems, e.g., Forest Stewardship Council certified,)	75 million hectares [Increase from base?]	GEF Tracking Tools for biodiversity and independent project evaluations
	Incorporation of biodiversity into a) sector policies and plans at national and sub-national levels; b) legislation; c) implementation of regulations and its enforcement, and d) monitoring of enforcement.	75% of projects that are working in explicit sectors improve the policy enabling environment along the indicator trend line from (a) policy to (d) monitoring of enforcement	GEF Tracking Tools for biodiversity
	Cumulative market changes to which GEF projects have contributed	No target set, will reflect intervention strategies	GEF Tracking Tools for biodiversity
	Percentage of individuals that demonstrate improved livelihoods based on sustainable use against the projected targets.	75% of individuals specifically targeted in project interventions	GEF Tracking Tools for biodiversity
	Percentage of projects that mainstream biodiversity into Implementing Agency or Executing Agency development assistance, sector, lending, or technical assistance programs.	75%	GEF Tracking Tools for biodiversity
	Percentage of projects that mainstream biodiversity into public or private institutions.	75%	GEF Tracking Tools for biodiversity
Output 1. Mainstreaming promoted in sectors that exhibit the greatest impact on biodiversity	Number of projects in each production sector (forestry, fisheries, agriculture, and tourism, etc) targeted to mainstreaming biodiversity into the sector	At least 10 projects in each major sector [This is input not output]	GEF tracking tools for biodiversity

Strategic Objective Three: Capacity Building for the Implementation of Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

Overall comments for this section: (1) the “scope” is a good overview of the general ideas to be taken into account. It should be especially constructive to bring a broader range of GEF implementing and executing agencies into activities (to date, the implementation projects on national biosafety frameworks have been done through World Bank, UNDP, and UNEP). (2) the “types of project activities” is extremely vague and provides insufficient information to know what criteria would be used in choosing projects and evaluating their effectiveness. More specific questions and comments are provided in the text of this section.

The authors of this draft have not adequately acknowledged that many countries have already been through stock-taking, etc., and actually made progress in many areas that are identified for improvement in this section. The lack of detail and citation of past project experiences makes this section appear to repeat the rather vague and general approach that was used several years ago when the initial GEF-funded projects were on the drawing board.

11. *Scope.* GEF’s strategy to build capacity to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB) takes into account the guidance from the CPB and lessons and experiences emerging from the GEF biosafety portfolio. As such, GEF’s approach to biosafety capacity building embodies a number of key principles as outlined below:

Regional approaches will be employed when suitable for the participating countries in order to maximize efficient use of human and financial resources and to foster regional coordination and harmonization of biosafety frameworks, where appropriate. Single-country projects will also be supported when most feasible.

Capacity building activities will, to the extent possible, exploit existing Regional Centers of Excellence, ~~to~~ this will help ensure the long-term provision of capacity building support that these Centers will be able to provide post-project.

Project designs and identification of the activities will be informed by a stocktaking analysis that will assess the following aspects of biosafety: national policies regarding biotechnology and biosafety, activity regarding the transfer, handling and use of LMOs, regulatory development in the country, status of biotechnology development, existing technical capacity on biosafety issues including risk assessment and risk management, monitoring and enforcement, public information and public participation, possibility of common approaches and synergies at regional or sub-regional levels, among others.

Special attention will be paid to ensure in-country coordination of roles and responsibilities, and stakeholder involvement in the development and implementation of project activities.

A broader range of GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies will be involved in project implementation, consistent with the respective comparative advantage of each.

Awareness raising, education on biosafety, access to information and public participation on decision making will be supported and complemented to achieve the full participation of countries in the BCH.

Securing long-term sustainability of the capacity built will be paramount. Making capacity building in biosafety sustainable over the long term will be sought through: development of national biosafety strategies that include a capacity-building strategy and action plan, designation of competent authorities and the creation of a national coordination mechanism, recognized in the regulatory framework, to secure institutional sustainability; incorporation of biosafety management costs into the national accounts and budgets to provide financial sustainability for biosafety policy; the development of national regulatory systems that incorporate ~~principles and requirements~~obligations of the CPB into national legislation and national sustainable development policy; regional cooperation and south-south cooperation that will help build a critical mass of scientific and other expertise in each region for the benefit of the region as a whole.

Types of Project Activities:

12. GEF support to the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety will address those areas considered key elements in the *Updated Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the CPB*⁶, agreed at the third Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the CPB (COP/MOP-3), and that have been identified in a country's stock-taking analysis.

These activities will be carried out through regional and subregional CPB implementation projects. Regional approaches will have the flexibility to target specific needs of countries as part of a regional intervention-. [Comment: There is insufficient information given here to know what criteria would be used to decide which activities would be most appropriate for regional or subregional projects.]

13. Single-country approaches will be used when the characteristics of [Comment: Which characteristics? This item #16 is so vague that it is not possible to evaluate which criteria would be used in making decisions about approaches]. the country, assessed in the stock-taking analysis, and the design of existing or planned future regional efforts in the area, recommend a national approach.

14. A thematic approach -can be the best way to effectively support a group of countries lacking competence in a particular field and assist them to build their capacities in that field and these will be supported when appropriate. [shouldn't the focus be on CPB parties — —not countries in general?]

	Indicators	Targets	Sources of Verification
--	------------	---------	-------------------------

⁶ <http://www.biodiv.org/decisions/default.aspx?id=11059&m=MOP-03>

	Indicators	Targets	Sources of Verification
Outcome: Operational national biosafety decision-making systems that contribute to the safe use of biotechnology in conformity with the provisions and decisions of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.	Percentage of participating CPB Parties [countries?] with an effective regulatory and policy framework in place	75%	Project reports, final evaluations
	Percentage of participating countries that have established a National Coordination Mechanism.	75%	Project reports, final evaluations
	Percentage of participating countries with appropriate administrative frameworks in place	75%	Project reports, final evaluations
	Percentage of participating countries with existing risk management strategies for LMOs.	75%	Project reports, final evaluations
	Percentage of participating countries that have carried out risk assessments	75%	Project reports, final evaluations
	Percentage of participating countries with a workable and updated BCH	75%	Project reports, final evaluations
	Percentage of projects promoting regional approaches where regional biosafety frameworks have been adopted	75%	Project reports, final evaluations
	Percentage of projects promoting regional approaches regions where standardized risk assessment/management methodologies have been developed	75%	Project reports, final evaluations
	Percentage of projects promoting regional approaches where a regional BCH has been established.	75%	Project reports, final evaluations
Output 1. Support provided for biosafety implementation to all GEF eligible countries	Number of countries successfully completing CPB implementation projects as a proportion of the participating countries.	75%	Project documents, GEF project database
Output 2. Targeted support to build capacity on thematic issues of importance at the regional level.	Number of countries successfully completing issue-specific regional biosafety projects	75%	Project documents, GEF project database

Strategic Objective Four: Generation, Dissemination, and Uptake of Good⁷ Practices for Addressing Current and Emerging Biodiversity Issues

~~18.15.~~ *Scope:* It is critical that GEF projects apply good practice, innovative approaches and new tools, and that when necessary pilot investments are supported to help countries address emerging technical and social issues in biodiversity conservation. The emphasis under this strategic objective will be on disseminating and facilitating the uptake of good practice information in a timely manner so that this is reflected in improved project design and implementation and improved results on the ground. Regional synthesis will be encouraged when comparative lessons provide additional value-added, or when economies of scale can be achieved. One current and one emerging biodiversity issue, respectively, have been prioritized to be addressed under this strategic objective: invasive alien species and access to genetic resources and benefit sharing.⁸

Types of Projects Activities:

- (a) Gathering and dissemination of information on good practice among Implementing and Executing Agencies, country government agencies and other stakeholders such as NGO and communities, scientific institutions and the private sector.
- (b) Capacity building and knowledge generation via north-south and south-south exchange of information using existing knowledge networks (such as the CHM), or through additional ones.
- (c) Capacity building to assist countries with the implementation of the Action Plan on Capacity-building for Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit-sharing (ABS) in support of the implementation of the Bonn Guidelines.
- (d) Capacity building to improve invasive alien species (IAS) prevention, control, and rapid response and management measures.
- (e) In addition to supporting capacity building in ABS and IAS, additional themes may be prioritized based on identified needs and COP guidance. New areas of support will meet two or more of the following criteria: a) relevance to other GEF strategic objectives; b) priority given by the COP of the CBD; c) engagement on the issue will likely result in a broad and positive impact on biodiversity; d) high potential for replicability and generation of lessons; e) high demonstration value/impact; and f) result in significant increase in capacity for technical and scientific cooperation.

	Indicators	Targets	Sources of Verification
--	-------------------	----------------	--------------------------------

⁷ The term "good practice" is used in preference to "best practice" because the quality of different practices of biodiversity conservation will be context-specific. Something that may be "best" in one situation may be bad, or "worst" in another.

⁸ Support to ABS will continue to be provided through enabling activities and through specific benefit sharing initiatives identified under projects, particularly within Strategic Objective Two.

	Indicators	Targets	Sources of Verification
Outcome One: GEF project design and implementation incorporates good practice	Percentage of projects applying accepted good practice in biodiversity conservation	100%	Portfolio reviews, project evaluations
Outcome Two: Countries possess the organizational and technical capacities to prevent, control, and manage Invasive Alien Species (IAS)	Percentage of countries in GEF-4 demonstrating systemic, institutional, and/or individual capacity to prevent, control, and apply management measures for invasive alien species.	75% of countries that request GEF support demonstrate increased capacity at targeted levels of intervention (system, institutional, and/or individual)	Portfolio reviews, project evaluations
Outcome Three: Countries effectively formulate Access and Benefit Sharing mechanisms that facilitate the implementation of the Bonn Guidelines or equivalent	Percentage of countries in GEF-4 that have developed ABS mechanisms	75% of countries that request GEF support on ABS effectively develop ABS mechanisms	Portfolio reviews, project evaluations