



# REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

**PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project**

**TYPE OF TRUST FUND: NPIF**

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Ratification and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in the countries of the Pacific			
Country(ies):	Cook Islands <sup>1</sup> , Federated States of Micronesia <sup>2</sup> , Fiji <sup>3</sup> , Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa <sup>4</sup> , Solomon Islands <sup>5</sup> , Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu	GEF Project ID: <sup>6</sup>	5634
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	01208
Other Executing Partner(s):	The Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)	Submission Date:	
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration (Months)	36 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	N/A	Project Agency Fee (\$):	167,443

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>7</sup>

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
BD-4 (Build capacity on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing)	Outcome 4.1: Legal and regulatory frameworks, and administrative procedures established that enable access to genetic resources and benefit sharing in accordance with the CBD provisions and the Nagoya Protocol	Output 4.1. Access and benefit sharing agreements (number) that recognize the core ABS principles of Prior Informed Consent (PIC) and Mutually Agreed Terms (MAT) including the fair and equitable sharing of benefits.	NPIF	1,762,557	1,234,000
<b>Total project costs</b>				1,762,557	1,234,000

### B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

**Project Objective:** To support ratification of the Nagoya Protocol and implementation of key measures to make the Protocol operational in Pacific Island countries.

<sup>1</sup> The project will work closely with two country-based projects also funded by the NPIF (Fiji and Cook Islands), as well as two countries participating in a global project on strengthening resources, frameworks and capacities to implement the Protocol (Micronesia and Samoa), as elaborated in the project document.

<sup>2</sup> See above.

<sup>3</sup> See above.

<sup>4</sup> See above.

<sup>5</sup> Solomon Islands have endorsed the project at the PIF stage. However, a Letter of Co-financing commitment is still pending. Reconfirmation of Solomon Islands participation in the project will be revisited at the inception meeting and hopefully a letter of co-financing would be made available then.

<sup>6</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

<sup>7</sup> Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

<b>Project Component</b>	<b>Grant Type</b>	<b>Expected Outcomes</b>	<b>Expected Outputs</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>Grant Amount (\$)</b>	<b>Co-Financing (\$)</b>
1. Baseline analysis to identify common assets (particularly relating to traditional knowledge), issues and needs between countries.	TA	<p>1.1 Countries have a common understanding of shared assets/values, issues and needs on which to base collective policy for use nationally and at convention or regional instrument level.</p> <p>1.2 Future directions of policy development for the region are identified.</p> <p>1.3 Countries understand their national assets/values and requirements in a regional context.</p>	<p>1.1.1 Systematic analysis of common assets/values, issues and needs between countries is undertaken and reported to regional workshops and beyond as opportunity allows.</p> <p>1.2.1 New policy directions for individual countries and the region identified and communicated via existing means (e.g. during the execution of the project and future SPREP/UNEP support mechanisms).</p> <p>1.3.1 Roster of regional technical expertise is developed and initiatives with potential to support implementation of the Protocol are identified.</p>	NPIF	55,000	100,000
2. Ratification of the Nagoya Protocol	TA	2.1 National authorities to take informed decisions on the ratification of the protocol and future implementation	<p>2.1.1 National scoping studies of the existing laws and regulations related to ABS undertaken or updated, as appropriate.</p> <p>2.1.2 National analyses of the implications of ratification of the Nagoya Protocol completed</p> <p>2.1.3 Public awareness workshops targeting parliamentarians and other decision-makers of the Protocol, as well as understanding of the importance of genetic resources as a source of innovation/driver for benefit-sharing in the national economy</p> <p>2.1.4 National ABS</p>	NPIF	410,000	250,000

<b>Project Component</b>	<b>Grant Type</b>	<b>Expected Outcomes</b>	<b>Expected Outputs</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>Grant Amount (\$)</b>	<b>Co-Financing (\$)</b>
			<p>law/regulation/ policy proposals drafted and submitted for approval to competent authorities</p> <p>2.1.5 Draft documentation for ratification prepared and submitted to the appropriate authorities</p> <p>2.1.6 All countries have developed policies and regulation frameworks that meet the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol by the end of the project.</p>			
3. Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol establishing an enabling environment for the implementation of basic provisions of the NP	TA	3.1 An enabling environment is created which will lead to the implementation of the basic provisions of the NP	<p>3.1.1 Stocktaking and assessment of capacities and systems to implement basic provisions of the NP is completed</p> <p>3.1.2 Strategy and action plan for the implementation of ABS measures are developed or reviewed, as appropriate</p> <p>3.1.3 Building capacity among stakeholders with particular emphasis in the Government agencies in charge of making the Protocol operational</p> <p>3.1.4 Supportive groundwork laid for countries to take advantage of biodiscovery and commercialisation opportunities under the Protocol</p> <p>3.1.5 Supportive institutional framework developed for protecting traditional knowledge, innovations and practices and customary uses of biological and genetic resources</p>	NPIF	601,000	484,000

<b>Project Component</b>	<b>Grant Type</b>	<b>Expected Outcomes</b>	<b>Expected Outputs</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>Grant Amount (\$)</b>	<b>Co-Financing (\$)</b>
4. Regional coordination , technical support	TA	4.1 Countries share information and gain from the experiences of other members of the Pacific Community	<p>4.1.1 Two regional meetings completed at the beginning and end of the project (inception and training in the first meeting for focal points; second meeting for reviewing progress and planning future activities)</p> <p>4.1.2 Provisional measures in place to ensure interim implementation of the Nagoya Protocol post ratification in situations where national legal framework is not yet in place.</p> <p>4.1.3 Information and experience exchange on development and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol takes place, especially mutual learning between Pacific countries.</p> <p>4.1.4 Regional communication and technical support mechanism established to support national decision-makers in Pacific Island countries on issues related to implementation of the Nagoya Protocol</p> <p>4.1.5 All participating countries have policies and regulation frameworks that meet the basic provisions of the Nagoya Protocol by the end of the project.</p>	NPIF	304,000	250,000
		4.2 Effective management and delivery of projects meeting agreed measurable outputs	4.2.1 Technical support provided to the project including monitoring, evaluation and all reporting including financial	NPIF	232,325	

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-Financing (\$)
		and indicators				
Subtotal					1,602,325	1,084,000
Project Management Cost (PMC)				NPIF	160,232	150,000
<b>Total project costs</b>					<b>1,762,557</b>	<b>1,234,000</b>

### C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming co-financing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	Republic of Marshall Islands	In-kind	100,000
National Government	Nauru	In-kind	100,000
National Government	Niue	In-kind	100,000
National Government	Palau	In-kind	100,000
National Government	Samoa	In-kind	100,000
National Government	Tonga	In-kind	100,000
National Government	Tuvalu	In-kind	100,000
National Government	Vanuatu	In-kind	100,000
National Government	Kiribati	In-kind	100,000
National Government	Papua New Guinea	In-kind	100,000
Regional Organization	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)	In-kind	150,000
Other Multilateral Agency	Multi-donor funded ABS Capacity Development Initiative	In-kind	34,000
GEF Implementing Agency	UNEP-DELIC	In-kind	50,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>1,234,000</b>

### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
UNEP	NPIF	Biodiversity	Pacific Islands	1,762,557	167,443	1,930,000
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				<b>1,762,557</b>	<b>167,443</b>	<b>1,930,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

<sup>2</sup> Indicate fees related to this project.

### F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

<b>Component</b>	<b>Grant Amount (\$)</b>	<b>Cofinancing (\$)</b>	<b>Project Total (\$)</b>
International Consultants	48,000	33,000 <sup>8</sup>	81,000
National/Local Consultants	866,000		866,000

**G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT?** No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

**PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

**A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>9</sup>**

**A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.**

No change.

**A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.**

GEF Focal Area changed from BD-5 (Integrate CBD obligations into national planning processes through enabling activities) to BD-4 (Build capacity on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing) to more accurately reflect focus of proposal on implementation of Nagoya Protocol.

**A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:**

UNEP’s comparative advantage stems from its mandate to promote the development and implementation of international environmental law, to foster transboundary collaboration and catalyze action on the management of shared resources; and to coordinate actions of the UN on common environmental priorities to improve coherence of the UN system, in this case the ABS system under the Nagoya Protocol. A key strategy of UNEP’s Programme of Work 2014-2017 is to promote coherence in the UN system in addressing environmental matters and to ensure a coordinated approach across the UN system to reduce fragmentation and increase efficiency and effectiveness. Sub-programme 3 of the PoW provides that special attention will also be given to equity issues including, but not limited to, access and benefit-sharing and how vulnerable and disadvantaged communities could be compensated or rewarded for their ecosystem stewardship.

UNEP’s Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (UNEP DEPI), the proposed project executing agency, already assists many national partners and governments through its expertise in environmental law and policy to develop and implement ABS policies and to harmonize national processes for the implementation of CBD provisions on ABS. UNEP deploys MEA Focal Points who are based in the UNEP Regional Offices in Asia and the Pacific (ROAP). The sub-regional UNEP Office for the Pacific is based in Apia, Samoa. The Pacific office is being hosted by SPREP, the other executing partner, which will facilitate extensive leverage of both partners’ experience, expertise and networks.

UNEP as implementing agency is also already involved in various GEF-funded ABS-related projects, both at national and at regional scale. The proposed executing agency has at least three officers who specialize in ABS issues, legal and political ramifications, as well as the international processes around CBD and the Nagoya Protocol. Furthermore, UNEP has staff in the Office for Asia and Pacific (ROAP), Regional Office for West Asia (ROWA), Regional Office for Latin America and Caribbean (ROLAC) and within its GEF Unit in DEPI who work on ABS related topics and projects.

**A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:**

No substantive change has been made to the baseline project and the problem it seeks to address.

<sup>8</sup> International consultants will be funded through in-kind co-financing contributions from partner organisations.

<sup>9</sup> For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

However, the root causes, proposed solution and baseline scenario have been updated to more completely elaborate the problems as well as reflect developments that have occurred in the past 12 months.

*Global Environmental problems, root causes and barriers*

Section A.1.2 of the UNEP-SPREP Project Document now elaborates the problems under the following headings:

- Limited legal, policy and institutional capacity to develop and implement national ABS frameworks
- Limited awareness of key stakeholders about role of ABS in sustainable development
- Need for regional co-ordination

*Proposed solution*

The specific problem that this project addresses is the lack of functioning national legal, policy and institutional frameworks in the Pacific that are needed to enable the equitable sharing of benefits from the use of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge between national governments, commercial interests, and the owners and custodians of these resources and traditional knowledge.

The solution proposed is to undertake a systematic analysis of the resources available at regional level, to support the establishment of functional ABS frameworks at national level, to establish an enabling environment for the implementation of basic provisions of the Nagoya Protocol, and to ensure mechanisms for regional and bilateral cooperation, coordination, technical support and capacity development are developed and supported in a way that will extend beyond the life of the project.

*Baseline scenario*

Detailed baselines in each participating country are provided in section A.1.2 of the UNEP-SPREP Project Document. The table below summarises the changes made to the baseline description outlined in the PIF.

Country	Summary of changes in baseline scenario
Cook Islands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Traditional Knowledge Act (2013)</i> adopted, which established a register of traditional knowledge administered by the Ministry of Cultural Development</li> <li>- <i>National Research Policy</i> clearly outlines the National Research Committee and the research permit process, however the national administrative processes for issuing ABS licenses, negotiating and enforcing agreements have not been fully clarified and key stakeholders remain unaware of their roles in promoting ABS.</li> <li>- Since 2012 the ABS Capacity Development Initiative has been working with the NES for the development and clarification of policies, processes and roles necessary for the design of an effective ABS system.</li> <li>- The Cook Islands is currently implementing the UNDP-GEF MSP <i>Strengthening the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing in the Cook Islands</i></li> </ul>
Federated States of Micronesia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Has initiated a national process for the development of a regulatory ABS framework (ratified the Nagoya Protocol on 30 January 2013). However, there is currently no specific implementing legislation at national level.</li> <li>- Two national ABS workshops organized with the support of the ABS Initiative undertook stocktaking of relevant existing legislation (5-7 August 2013, Pohnpei) and elaborated a draft ABS policy (19-21 November 2013, Chuuk).</li> <li>- A GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) project for raising awareness of ABS at the local level was approved in 2013.</li> <li>- FSM has applied to participate in the UNDP-GEF global project <i>Strengthening human resources, legal frameworks and institutional</i></li> </ul>

	<i>capacities to implement the Nagoya Protocol.</i>
Fiji	<p>- Has initiated a national process for the development of a regulatory ABS framework (ratified the Nagoya Protocol on 30 January 2013). However, there is currently no specific implementing legislation at national level.</p> <p>- The current <i>ad hoc</i> agreement with the Fiji government is that any income from bioprospecting is shared between the prospector and the country in a 50:50 ratio and the 50% Fiji's share is deposited into the Locally Managed Marine Area Network Trust Fund, where the bio-prospecting is done from marine areas.</p> <p>- Fiji is currently implementing the UNDP-GEF MSP <i>Discovering nature-based products and building capacities for the application of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing in Fiji</i></p>
Kiribati	No substantive change (existing patchwork of national laws further elaborated)
Marshall Islands	Acceded to the Nagoya Protocol on 10 October 2014.
Nauru	No substantive change (existing patchwork of national laws further elaborated)
Niue	No substantive change (existing patchwork of national laws further elaborated)
Palau	<p>- Recommendations for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol developed and submitted to the ABS National Focal Point 2012 under the ABS Capacity Development Initiative</p> <p>- Draft ABS Framework developed</p>
Papua New Guinea	No substantive change (existing patchwork of national laws further elaborated)
Samoa	<p>- Ratified the Nagoya Protocol on 20 May 2014.</p> <p>- Has initiated a national process for the development of a regulatory ABS framework. However, there is currently no specific implementing legislation at national level.</p> <p>- Samoa has applied to participate in the UNDP-GEF global project <i>Strengthening human resources, legal frameworks and institutional capacities to implement the Nagoya Protocol.</i></p>
Solomon Islands	No substantive change (existing patchwork of national laws further elaborated)
Tonga	No substantive change (existing patchwork of national laws further elaborated)
Vanuatu	<p>- Ratified the Nagoya Protocol on 1 July 2014.</p> <p>- Has initiated a national process for the development of a regulatory ABS framework. However, there is currently no specific implementing legislation at national level.</p> <p>- Vanuatu NGO Network prepared a proposal to the GEF SGP for ABS awareness raising at the community level which was approved in mid-2013.</p>
Regional capacity-building activities	<p>Additional regional capacity-building activities undertaken in the past 12 months have included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training: Mutually Agreed Terms: Contracts to Make ABS Functional, 5-8 August 2014, Nadi, Fiji</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pacific Regional Project Inception Workshop, 9 August 2014, Nadi, Fiji</li> <li>• Access and Benefit Sharing Forum on Marine Bioprospecting, 2 September 2014, Apia, Samoa</li> <li>• 5th Pacific Sub-regional Workshop on Access and Benefit-Sharing, 10–13 November 2014, Sydney, Australia</li> </ul>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**A.5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:**

PART II, Section A (‘Project Justification’) of the UNEP-SPREP Project Document more fully details the complete suite of project outcomes, outputs and activities. The table below summarises the changes made to the components and outputs in the PIF, and provides the rationale for these changes.

	<b>PIF</b>	<b>GEF CEO ER</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
<b>Components</b>	1. Baseline analysis to identify common assets (particularly relating to traditional knowledge), issues and needs between countries	<i>No change</i>	
	2. Ratification of the Nagoya Protocol	<i>No change</i>	
	3. Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol establishing an enabling environment for the implementation of basic provisions of the NP	<i>No change</i>	
	4. Regional coordination, technical support and capacity development	<i>No change</i>	
<b>Outcomes</b>	1.1 Countries have a common understanding of shared assets/values, issues and needs on which to base collective policy for use nationally and at convention or regional instrument level.	<i>No change</i>	
	1.2 Future directions of policy development for the region are identified	<i>No change</i>	
	1.3 Countries understand their national assets/values and requirements in a regional context.	<i>No change</i>	
	2.1 National authorities to take informed decisions on the ratification of the Protocol and future implementation	<i>No change</i>	
	3.1 An enabling environment is created which will lead to the implementation of the basic provisions of the NP	<i>No change</i>	
	4.1 Countries share information and gain from the experiences	<i>No change</i>	

	<b>PIF</b>	<b>GEF CEO ER</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
	of the other members of the Commission. Countries are capable of meeting basic provisions of the NP		
	4.2 Effective management and delivery of projects meeting agreed measurable outputs and indicators	<i>No change</i>	
<b>Outputs</b>	1.1.1 Systematic analysis of common assets/values, issues and needs between countries is undertaken and reported to regional workshops and beyond as opportunity allows	<i>No change</i>	
	1.2.1 New policy directions for individual countries and the region identified and communicated via existing means (e.g. during the execution of the project and future SPREP/UNEP support mechanisms)	<i>No change</i>	
	1.3.1 Communication mechanisms are established which provide the means for technical support on an ongoing basis	1.3.1 Roster of regional technical expertise is developed and initiatives with potential to support implementation of the Protocol are identified.	Communication mechanisms for technical support now included as part of regional support mechanism in 4.1. Regional roster will support national understanding in regional context.
	2.1.1 Scoping study of the existing laws and regulations related to ABS	2.1.1 National scoping studies of the existing laws and regulations related to ABS, including identification of any gaps, undertaken or updated, as appropriate.	As several participating countries have initiated the process of scoping national laws and regulations over the past 12 months, this output has been updated accordingly.
	2.1.2 Analysis of the implications of ratification of the Protocol	<i>No change</i>	
	2.1.3 Draft document for ratification by the relevant authority	2.1.4 National ABS law/regulation/ policy proposals drafted and submitted for approval to competent authorities. 2.1.5 Draft documentation for ratification prepared and submitted to the appropriate authorities 2.1.6 All participating countries have policies and regulation frameworks that meet the basic provisions	Output expanded to ensure that both documentation required at a national level, as well as deposit of the instrument of ratification/acceptance/ approval with the official Depository are addressed; and also to be explicit that all countries will have

	<b>PIF</b>	<b>GEF CEO ER</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
		of the Nagoya Protocol by the end of the project.	frameworks that meet basic provisions of the Nagoya Protocol.
	2.1.4 Public awareness among parliamentarians and other decision makers	2.1.3 Public awareness workshops targeting parliamentarians and other decision-makers of the Protocol, as well as increasing understanding of the importance of genetic resources as a source of innovation/driver for benefit-sharing in the national economy	Awareness of the need to ratify the Protocol has been raised in several of the participating countries during the past 12 months through the NBSAP priority-setting process. This output has therefore expanded to include raising awareness of the role of genetic resources as a source of innovation/driver for benefit-sharing in order to strengthen opportunities for fair and equitable sharing of benefits from their use, and to create incentives to conserve biological diversity.
	3.1.1 Stocktaking and assessment of capacities and systems to implement basic provisions of the NP	<i>No change</i>	
	3.1.2 Strategy and action plan for the implementation of ABS measures	3.1.2 Strategy and action plan for the implementation of ABS measures are developed or reviewed, as appropriate	As several participating countries have initiated the process of developing a strategy and/or action plan over the past 12 months, this output has been updated accordingly.
	3.1.3 Building capacity among stakeholders with particular emphasis on the Government agencies in charge of making the Protocol operational	<i>No change</i>	
		3.1.4 Supportive groundwork laid for countries to take advantage of biodiscovery and commercialisation opportunities under the Protocol	New output to support implementation of Protocol in more advanced countries through preparing them to enter into biodiscovery agreements or take advantage of commercialisation opportunities under the Protocol.

	<b>PIF</b>	<b>GEF CEO ER</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
		3.1.5 Supportive institutional framework developed for protecting traditional knowledge, innovations and practices and customary uses of biological and genetic resources	New output to support traditional knowledge holders, ensure Indigenous and local community stakeholders are engaged in the policy development process, and to initiate an increase in the capacity of indigenous and local communities to negotiate ABS agreements.
	4.1.1 Two regional meetings completed at the beginning and end of the project (inception and training in the first meeting for focal points). Second meeting for reviewing progress and planning future activities	<i>No change</i>	
		4.1.2 Provisional measures in place to ensure implementation of the Nagoya Protocol post ratification in situations where national legal framework is not yet in place	New output to ensure that those countries that have ratified the Protocol without the necessary legal framework are in compliance with their obligations.
		4.1.3 Information and experience exchange on development and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol takes place, especially mutual learning between Pacific countries	New output to promote 'South-South' learning, as well as to support interaction between national MSPs in Fiji and Cook Islands and Pacific regional project
		4.1.4 Regional communication and technical support mechanism established to support national decision-makers in Pacific Island countries on issues related to implementation of the Nagoya Protocol	New output to support implementation of Protocol through regional support mechanisms, including a regional register of regional and external technical expertise, identifying initiatives that support implementation of the Protocol with potential to advantage Pacific SIDS, and a mechanism for identification of future developments to ensure long term sustainability of the project.
		4.1.5 All participating countries have policies and regulation frameworks that meet the basic provisions of	New output to clarify how countries will meet basic provisions of the Protocol.

	PIF	GEF CEO ER	Rationale
		the Nagoya Protocol by the end of the project.	
	4.2.1 Technical support provided to the project including monitoring, evaluation and all reporting including financial		
<b>Co-financing</b>		National Government funding increased from \$50k to \$100k per country  ABS Initiative co-financing reduced from \$50k to \$34k	Co-financing increased per GEF recommendation on PIF  C-financing commitment formalised – support anticipated to increase when ABS Initiative funding is confirmed.

**Budget note:** Note that the initial PIF budget contained \$100,000 that, despite being approved in the total project funds required, had not been allocated against a project component. These funds have been allocated as elaborated elsewhere in the project budget, i.e to component 2.1 to cover national workshops, to component 3.1 to increased communication services and to component 4.1 to increase participation in the inception workshop from one to two representatives per country.

#### **A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:**

The following risk and mitigation strategy was identified in addition to those identified in the PIF:

Risk	Level	Mitigation Measure
Lack of political support	Low	Political will has already been expressed by countries participating in the project; however there is a risk that governments (and related priorities) will change throughout the duration of the project. Awareness raising activities for parliamentarians are included as part of the project and could be repeated if the key personnel involved change.
Unrealistic expectations	Medium	A common vision for the outcomes of the project will be achieved by all participating countries, and proportionality will be applied to ensure the burdens of implementation will not be excessive.

#### **A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives:**

Coordination strategies for the MSP projects administered through UNDP in Fiji and Cook Islands have been expanded, including sharing ‘lessons learned’ regular meetings between UNEP and UNDP (and other agencies) during the course of UN Country Team activities and tasks such as the UNDAF and UN SIDS meetings. The project will also collaborate with the UNDP-GEF global project *Strengthening human resources, legal frameworks and institutional capacities to implement the Nagoya Protocol* as Micronesia and Samoa have applied to participate in this project.

#### **B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:**

## **B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.**

The stakeholder involvement element is embedded in the description of several activities within this proposal which will have a consultative and participatory character. Specific stakeholder engagement strategies are elaborated further below:

### International and regional institutions

#### *Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)*

SPREP is the regional focal institution for the Nagoya Protocol, working closely with relevant national, regional and international agencies and organizations. SPREP will be the executing agency of the project. In addition to running the project on the ground, SPREP will be in charge of carrying-out the regional activities as described in Component 4. SPREP will be accountable to UNEP, the GEF Implementing Agency, responsible for implementation of the project.

#### *Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)*

SPC is involved in capacity-building activities in the Pacific region that are relevant to ABS, and is the regional focal point for the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture through Ministries of Agriculture. SPC will be invited to provide expertise during project training and assist in coordinating between agricultural focal points and ABS focal points in implementing the International Treaty and the Nagoya Protocol at national level. SPC provides technical, advisory, statistical and information support, and also has a mandate to support policy making and analysis relating to culture and gender equality.

The SPC-EU Deep Sea Minerals Project has potential to collaborate in the development of joint documentation relating to the commercial exploitation of marine resource. Staffs have indicated that they could share expertise in assisting the negotiation of agreements between States and commercial entities for marine resource exploration activities; legal expertise in legislative drafting on marine resources; delivery of regional capacity-building training workshops and internship programs; and knowledge of commercial and scientific marine research/exploration processes.

#### *University of the South Pacific (USP) Center of Drug Discovery and Conservation*

USP is managing the GEF-5 MSP National Project for Fiji and is also working in Solomon Islands. USP has the capacity to advise on ABS issues that affect the region and in particular, USP has indicated it would be available to share expertise on accessibility, research processes and biodiversity data.

#### *Convention on Biological Diversity Secretariat (SCBD)*

The CBD Secretariat has carried out a number of awareness-raising and capacity-building activities in previous years to support the expeditious entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol. This has also included generic outreach material on ABS that includes a systematic review of the provision of the Nagoya Protocol and the implications for Governments, as well as the development of a rationale to support ratification that is available for adaptation to the Pacific environment (e.g. factsheets on the Nagoya Protocol, the ABS information kit, and policy briefs on the Nagoya Protocol).

#### *GIZ (German International Aid) / ABS Capacity Building Initiative*

The multi-donor ABS Capacity Development Initiative is hosted by the German Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), funded by several governments and international organizations, and managed by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ). It engages members of the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group of States, and within this global context, it is implementing a regional project to support ABS development in the Pacific Islands. Project conveners will work together closely to ensure projects continue to be complementary and do not overlap.

The ABS Initiative has committed €30,000 of in-kind support to the project, by providing in-house expertise to the capacity-building and legal training workshops that will be held during the project. It is anticipated that support will increase when ABS Initiative funding is confirmed.

#### *IUCN Oceania*

IUCN Oceania comprises Australia, New Zealand and 22 Pacific Island countries. IUCN Oceania will be invited to

provide technical support to the project.

#### *Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS)*

PIFS's goals are to stimulate economic growth and enhance political governance and security for the region, through the provision of policy advice; and to strengthen regional cooperation and integration through coordinating, monitoring and evaluating implementation of Leaders' decisions. Thus the roles include: provide policy advice and guidance in implementing the decisions of the Leader; coordinate and assist in the implementation of Leaders' decisions; provide support to the Leaders' meetings, ministerial meetings, and associated committees and working groups.

Relevant activities include the Regional Framework for the Protection of Traditional Knowledge and Expressions of Culture and the Traditional Knowledge Action Plan executed by PICFS and SPC in collaboration with WIPO. In addition, The Pacific Ocean Commissioner will facilitate a Pacific Ocean Alliance, which was launched at the 3<sup>rd</sup> International Conference for Small Islands Developing States in Samoa in September 2014, and is currently under development. This mechanism will provide effective, integrated ocean policy coordination and implementation, facilitate regional cooperation and collaboration, including for the high seas, as well as support for national ocean governance and policy processes when required.

#### *International Development Law Organisation (IDLO)*

IDLO's Legal Preparedness Initiative is working with the CBD Secretariat to develop country and regional support programs to build up capacity and support to build legal frameworks for implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and Strategic Plan (on mainstreaming, incentives, rights-based issues).

Under this Initiative, IDLO assistance will be available for undertaking assessments of existing frameworks, needs, barriers and opportunities. Some legal preparedness program activities provided by IDLO may be eligible for additional funding through GEF-6 STAR funding, and these will be closely coordinated to ensure no overlap with the Project.

#### *UNCLOS*

While there is currently no global regulatory framework for comprehensive management of areas beyond national jurisdiction, United Nations Resolution 69/245 adopted on 29 December 2014 has commenced the process to establish a legal instrument to create such a framework. It is expected however, that this will not be concluded during the life of the Project. SPREP will undertake to monitor the development of elements of the emerging framework to ensure work undertaken through the project will be mutually supportive to the concluded treaty. In the meantime, the International Seabed Authority (ISA) has been established through UNCLOS to manage the seabed mineral resources of the seabed beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. In this arena, the continuing points of interest in relation to ABS for Pacific Island countries are the broader adoption of an ecosystem management approach, contiguous Protected Areas, migratory or drifting genetic organisms, and the adoption of benefit sharing terms that do not create a perverse incentive to obtain genetic resources in ABNJ over those within national EEZs.

#### *Other stakeholders*

Other organisations that are conducting ABS projects and/or research in the Pacific region will also be invited to contribute the project, as indicated in the relevant project activities. These may include, for example, Pacific Heritage Hub, UNESCO Pacific Regional Office, FAO, Micronesia Challenge, UNEP-SGP, UNU-TKI, WHO (Pandemics & Pathogens network), LMMA Network, International Coral Reef Centre, and Melanesia Spearhead Group.

#### National institutions

##### *Nagoya Protocol National Focal Points & CBD National Focal Points*

National Focal Points will be instrumental in gathering information necessary during initial stages of the project, and in identifying national experts and key stakeholders as the project progresses.

##### *ABS Competent National Authorities*

ABS Competent National Authorities will aid in structuring the most effective and cost-efficient institutional

arrangements needed to implement the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol.

*National policy makers, national biodiversity committees, indigenous and local community representatives and private sector organisations*

At national level, policy makers will be engaged to ensure understanding of the implications of ratification of the Protocol, as well as the benefits from the ABS regime to ensure it is a priority for implementation. Indigenous and local communities as well as the private sector will be engaged to provide input into development of national frameworks.

#### National and international institutions and organizations involved in ABS research

Institutions that have been actively involved in ABS research in the Pacific region will be invited to provide input on user experiences with ABS regulatory systems in the region. Discussions on modalities of cooperation are already underway with several of these, including:

- Institut de Recherche pour le Developpement (IRD), New Caledonia and French Polynesia
- University of Papua New Guinea (UPNG)
- Scientific Research Organisation of Samoa (SROS)
- CIM-TECH, Cook Islands

#### **B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):**

This project addresses the importance of biodiversity conservation and fulfilling the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity through its facilitation of the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol. As a cross-cutting issue it also supports the conservation of globally significant biodiversity and sustainable use of the components of globally significant biodiversity in small island nations.

Proposed activities will support reviews of capacities on ABS that focus on existing policies, laws and regulations; as well as undertaking initial scoping assessments, outreach and public awareness activities leading to accession to the Protocol. In countries that have already made more advanced progress towards implementation of the Protocol, in its later stages the project will also support pilot projects leading to ABS agreements between users and providers of genetic resources, technology transfer and public sector engagement.

The objective of the Nagoya Protocol is to set an international, legally binding framework to promote a transparent and effective implementation of the ABS concept at the regional, national and local level in the future. Effective implementation of the measures of the Nagoya protocol will allow participating countries to engage users of genetic resources through negotiating ABS agreements. Since the Nagoya Protocol is intended to create legal and administrative systems to stimulate the engagements of users and producers of genetic resources, these systems need to provide legal certainty and clarity to the parties to engage in fair and equitable sharing of benefits. Monetary and non-monetary benefits would be accrued in various sectors that depend on biological resources, including pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, food & drinks and seeds, among others, and these forms of benefit-sharing may make important contributions to local communities, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. The establishment of value chains for the supply of biological products from within provider countries (e.g. up-scaling sample extracts from plant or animal species to commercial production) may also result in sustained benefits for providers and provider countries, such as employment and income streams and employment as well as incentives for the conservation of biological resources.

Specifically, the project will contribute to the objectives of the CBD and to reduce loss of biodiversity by:

- a. deriving greater economic benefits from genetic resources, thereby providing incentives for biodiversity conservation;
- b. providing communities that are holders of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge with livelihood options that result in economic benefits and reduce pressures for conversion of ecosystems;



- c. contributing to national development strategies and economic growth, thereby reducing poverty and poverty-associated threats to ecosystem integrity
- d. supporting access to non-monetary benefits including scientific information relevant to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, which in turn contributes to the maintenance of global ecosystem services.

Gender and diversity dimensions will be considered during the engagement of consultants and when determining participants in stakeholder discussion fora and training workshops.

### **B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:**

Due mainly to their size, countries in the Pacific region have limited resources for developing effective ABS measures and in some instances very limited resources. They do however have a great deal of cultural, social, environmental and economic similarities. All participating countries have customary law, and all have English or American legal systems (Vanuatu has a combination of English and French).

This project takes advantage of these similarities to increase cost-effectiveness by working at regional level to share experiences and ultimately develop a regional approach to regulating access to and use of their genetic resources and traditional knowledge.

### **C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:**

The project will follow standard United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and Global Environment Facility (GEF) minimum requirements for project monitoring, reporting and evaluation processes and procedures. This is discussed in Section 6 of the Project Document and is presented in detail in Appendix 7 – Costed Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.

The Project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan is consistent with the GEF M&E policy. The Project Results Framework (Appendix X) and M&E plan (Appendix Y) include SMART indicators for each expected outcome as well as mid-term and end-of-project targets. The M&E plan will be reviewed and revised as necessary at project inception and a project supervision plan will also be developed at this stage. The main emphasis will be on outcome monitoring, but financial and implementation monitoring will also occur.

The main assessment method will be through the annual Project Implementation Review systems, and mid-term and terminal evaluations that will make use of the GEF IAS SP 7 tracking tool. The project PSU and TAG will participate in the mid-term evaluation and the terminal evaluation which will be managed by the Evaluation and Oversight Unit (EOU) of UNEP.

Details of M&E activities are provided in the table below.

<b>M&amp;E Activity</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Budget</b>
Inception workshop/meeting	Project coordinator, national coordinators, SPREP, UNEP and collaborating partners	Within 6 months of project approval	US \$100,000.00 (includes 2 attendees from each country)
Project steering committee meetings (virtual)	Executing agencies, Project coordinator	At start of project After first six months At start of second year After first 18 months At start of third year At end of project	US \$3,000.00 (\$1000 pa for telephone and internet meeting costs)
Project steering committee reports	Project coordinator with input from partners	At start of project At start of second year At start of third year At end of project	US \$1,500.00 (\$500 pa for printing and distribution of reports)
Annual audits	Executing agency	At end of first year At end of second year At end of third year	US \$15,000 (\$5000 pa)
Mid-term review (3	PMU	During second year	US \$20,000 (review)

<b>M&amp;E Activity</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Budget</b>
weeks FTE) + Project monitoring (visit 3 countries)			plus US \$20,000.00 (3 country visits)
Operational reports to UNEP	Executing agencies	Half-yearly progress reports; Project Implementation Reviews (annual); Project Review (as and if required) Quarterly financial reports	From co-financing
UNEP terminal evaluation	UNEP evaluation office and UNEP task manager	3 months prior to end of project	US \$40,000.00
Project final report	Project coordinator, executing agencies	Within 3 months of project completion	From co-financing

**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

**A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)). -


Operational Focal Point Endorsement Letter attached.

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE
Mr. Vaitoti Tupa	GEF OFP & Director	National Environment Service, Cook Island	15 August 2013
Hon. Andrew Yatilman	GEF OFP & Director	Office of Environment and Emergency Management, Federated States of Micronesia	27 December 2012
Mr. Jope Davetanivalu	GEF OFP & Director	Department of Environment, Suva, Fiji	15 August 2013
Mr. Bruce Kijiner	GEF OFP & Director	Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination (OEPPC), Rep. of Marshall Islands	20 February 2013
Mrs Nenenteiti Teariki-Ruatu	GEF OFP & Ag Director	Ministry of Environment, Lands Agriculture, Development, Kiribati	12 August 2013
Mr. Russ Kun	GEF OFP & Permanent Secretary	Department of Commerce, Industry & Environment, Republic of Nauru	25 July 2013
Mr. Sauni Tongatule	GEF OFP & Director	Department of Environment, Niue	25 July 2013
Ms Charlene Mersai	GEF OFP	Office of Environmental Response and Coordination (OERC), Republic of Palau	28 July 2013
Taule'ale'ausumai Laavasa Malua	GEF OFP & CEO	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Apia, Samoa	1 August 2013
Mr. Joe Horokou	GEF OFP & Ag Permanent Secretary	Ministry of Environment Climate Change Disaster Management & Meteorology, Solomon Islands	11 February 2013
Mr. Asipeli Palaki	GEF OFP & Director	Ministry of Environment and Climate Change, Tonga	19 August 2013
Ms. Pepetua Latasi	GEF OFP & Director	Department of Environment, Tuvalu	8 August 2013

Mr. Jotham	GEF OFP & Director	Dept. of Environmental Protection and Conservation, Vanuatu	18 July 2013
Mr. Gunther Joku	GEF OFP & Acting Secretary	Department of Environment and Conservation, PNG	11 September 2013

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

<b>Agency Coordinator, Agency Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date (Month, day, year)</b>	<b>Project Contact Person</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
Brennan Van Dyke, Director,  UNEP/GEF Coordination		April 19. 2016	Greg Sherley	+ 685 21929	<a href="mailto:Greg.Sherley@unep.org">Greg.Sherley@unep.org</a>

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK** (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Project Component	Desired Outcome	Expected Outputs	Indicators	Baseline <sup>10</sup>	Mid-Term Targets	End Project Targets	Verification Method	Assumptions
1. Baseline analysis to identify common assets (particularly relating to traditional knowledge), issues and needs between countries	1.1 Countries have a common understanding of shared assets/values, issues and needs on which to base collective policy for use nationally and at convention or regional instrument level.	1.1.1 Systematic analysis (including stocktaking and comparison) of common assets/values, issues and needs (including biological resources and applications of traditional knowledge) between countries is undertaken and reported through regional workshops.  1.1.2 Regional position is prepared and used to support international negotiations.	Number of countries for which human (e.g. cultural, institutional), biophysical (e.g. biodiversity) and TK assets have been highlighted.  Number of Pacific countries that support a regional position on shared assets/values, issues and needs.  Number of countries/meetings that make use of regional position to support international negotiations.	0 systematic analysis has been undertaken, but several countries have initiated national stocktaking activities (that may be incomplete).  0 formal common understanding on ABS, although regional meetings have identified some common issues and needs, and partner organizations, such as the ABS Capacity Initiative, have also prepared various relevant analyses of common issues.	Survey of shared assets/values, issues and needs is undertaken within the first six months of the project, including input from at least 3 stakeholder groups per country.  Analysis is delivered and discussed at regional workshops within the first year of the project (and beyond as opportunity allows).  Draft common understanding (e.g. statement, regional strategy or action plan) submitted to governments for endorsement during second year of the	Analysis completed for 14 countries.  14 countries support a common understanding of shared assets/values, issues and needs is achieved within the region, as demonstrated, for example, through endorsement of a regional statement.  Common understanding is used by countries to support international negotiations, as appropriate.	Documentation on analysis methodology (e.g. national records, interviews and/or surveys used to prepare analysis, feedback from countries on analysis).  Correspondence and reports from regional workshops and other meetings considering the analysis.  Countries' endorsement of common understanding Documentation of common understanding on which to base collective policy (e.g. regional statement)	Participating countries are able to reach internal agreement on policy direction.  Participating countries are able to agree on a common regional policy direction.

<sup>10</sup> See stakeholder analysis for details of baseline.

Project Component	Desired Outcome	Expected Outputs	Indicators	Baseline <sup>10</sup>	Mid-Term Targets	End Project Targets	Verification Method	Assumptions
					project.			
	1.2 Future directions of policy development for the region are identified	1.2.1 New policy directions for individual countries and the region identified and communicated via existing means (e.g. during the execution of the project and future SPREP/UNEP support mechanisms).  1.2.2 National ABS policies reflect a common vision for the region.	Number of countries that support draft regional position on future policy development.  Number of countries with intra-regional coordination mechanisms identified (e.g. in ABS National Work Plans,	ABS Initiative emails are currently sent to SPREP, but no monitoring and communication specific to Pacific SIDs is undertaken.  7 Policies or draft policies have been developed ( Cook Is, FSM, Fiji, PNG, Samoa, Solomon Is and Vanuatu) but they need to be updated for compliance with NP.	A review of existing initiatives that support implementation of the Protocol with potential to advantage small island states is completed within the first year.  Methods are in place to regularly monitor and identify emerging initiatives to implement the Nagoya Protocol within first six months of the project.	14 countries support policies for future direction that reflect common values and are consistent with the Nagoya Protocol.	Documentation on monitoring of future policy developments.  Analysis of national policies and regional position prepared in 1.1.1.	
	1.3 Countries understand their national assets/values and requirements in a regional context.	1.3.1 Regional mechanisms are established which provide the means for regional understanding and technical support on an ongoing basis.	Number of experts in regional technical roster, number of countries represented, and percentage of relevant areas of expertise covered.  Number of countries with intra-regional coordination mechanisms identified (e.g. in ABS National Work Plans,	There is no regional understanding of assets, and no central repository of technical expertise available in the region.	A communication mechanism or process is established and operational by the second year of the project, including a roster of technical expertise.  By end of second year, at least 5	A register of regional technical expertise and initiatives to support implementation of the Protocol is established, with at least one expert from each country represented.	Expert roster is established, contains key expertise, and is functioning effectively (documentation, stakeholder feedback) Support for institutions and other stakeholders in	Technical experts in the region are willing to join a register of experts.  Access to regional roster of expertise will improve country understanding

Project Component	Desired Outcome	Expected Outputs	Indicators	Baseline <sup>10</sup>	Mid-Term Targets	End Project Targets	Verification Method	Assumptions
			participating in expert roster)		countries show regional leadership through actively coordinating between national and regional institutions, as appropriate.	All participating countries are actively coordinating between national and regional institutions, as appropriate, including through participation in expert roster.  Country understanding of national assets in a regional context is increased and evident through endorsement of common understanding (linked to output 1.1).	making use of the roster to support implementation of the Protocol (documentation, stakeholder feedback)  Documentation showing inter-institutional coordination (correspondence, minutes, agreements, etc)	of national assets.
2. Ratification of the Nagoya Protocol	2.1 National authorities take informed decisions on the ratification of the protocol and future implementation	2.1.1 National scoping studies of the existing laws and regulations related to ABS, including identification of any gaps, undertaken or updated, as appropriate and analysis of the implications of	Number of countries that have ratified the Protocol.  Number of national scoping studies and national frameworks reviewed to identify gaps, overlaps and implications for ratification.  Number of Parties to the	Some awareness raised through NBSAP process in all countries; but limited or no analyses of implications undertaken in all countries.  ABS implementation plan is advanced in Cook Is and Fiji,	National scoping studies (or updating) of the existing laws and regulations related to ABS to be initiated in every country during the first year of the project.  Analysis of the implications of ratification of the Nagoya Protocol	Analysis of ABS frameworks is completed for 14 countries.  Public awareness of Parliamentarians and other decision-makers sufficient to ensure support for ratification.  14 countries are compliant Parties	Reports of scoping studies of existing laws and regulations undertaken or reviewed in participating countries. Analyses of the implications of ratification undertaken in participating countries. Reports and public	Political support exists to give priority to ratification of the Protocol.  Raising public awareness among decision-makers will lead to ratification of the Protocol

Project Component	Desired Outcome	Expected Outputs	Indicators	Baseline <sup>10</sup>	Mid-Term Targets	End Project Targets	Verification Method	Assumptions
		<p>ratification of the Nagoya Protocol is prepared.</p> <p>2.1.2 Public awareness workshops are held targeting parliamentarians and other decision-makers of the Protocol, as well as increasing understanding of the importance of genetic resources as a source of innovation/driver for benefit-sharing in the national economy</p> <p>2.1.3 National ABS law/regulation/policy proposals</p>	<p>Protocol that have frameworks that are compliant with the Protocol.</p> <p>Number of NFPs and CNAs established and communicated to CBD</p> <p>Number of workshops held to raise public awareness.</p> <p>Number of participants reached through public awareness activities.</p> <p>Number of national ABS law/regulation/ policy proposals in place or submitted for approval to competent authorities.</p>	<p>partially prepared but incomplete and/or out-of-date in Niue, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Is and Vanuatu, and no plan exists in remaining countries.</p> <p>5 participating countries have ratified the Protocol: FSM, Fiji, Marshall Is, Samoa and Vanuatu.</p>	<p>completed within the first six months of the project for countries that have ratified, or within six months of ratification if it occurs after the start of the project, or at the latest within the first two years of the project if country has not yet ratified.</p> <p>Key decision-makers identified in each country (at least 3 per country) within first year of the project.</p>	<p>to the Protocol.</p> <p>All National policies/regulation frameworks are all consistent with the Nagoya Protocol</p> <p>All Competent National Authorities and National Focal Points designated at national level.</p> <p>All exit/entry points for checking ABS information/permits identified.</p>	<p>awareness materials targeting parliamentarians distributed through workshops and other means. Documentation on proposals/ratification/ national cost-benefit analyses/Cabinet templates Ratification of the Protocol and registration of CNAs/NFPs with the CBD Database</p>	



Project Component	Desired Outcome	Expected Outputs	Indicators	Baseline <sup>10</sup>	Mid-Term Targets	End Project Targets	Verification Method	Assumptions
		drafted and submitted for approval to competent authorities and draft documentation for ratification prepared and submitted to the appropriate authorities						
3. Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol establishing an enabling environment for the implementation of basic provisions of the NP	3.1 An enabling environment is created which will lead to the implementation of the basic provisions of the NP	3.1.1 Stocktaking and assessment of capacities and systems to implement basic provisions of the NP  3.1.2 Strategies and action plans for the implementation of ABS measures are developed or reviewed, as appropriate	Number of awareness-raising activities and mechanisms used to target stakeholders.  Number of stakeholders reached by awareness-raising activities and mechanisms.  Number of women stakeholders reached.  Number of traditional knowledge stakeholders reached.  Number of operational guidelines (including national strategy and action plans, policies and	Minimal stocktaking undertaken, most countries have initial strategies for implementation of ABS measures through NBSAPs, limited capacity among stakeholders, no mechanism to support decision-makers, no frameworks to protect TK.	Stocktaking to be completed within the first two years of the project.  Key NGOs and community representatives identified in year 1.  Initial list of information, training materials, and organisations to assist local and indigenous communities to negotiate ABS agreements	Stocktaking analysis completed for 14 countries, including existence of national expertise; legal aspects; traditional knowledge, national/regional research institutions; government institutions (research councils); private sector activities; differences between sectoral approaches; ex	Stocktaking document to address all relevant topics (number of countries; percentage of topics addressed). List of common stakeholders National strategy and action plans, policies and legal frameworks.. Strategies and action plans meet the requirements of the NP	Government agencies responsible for the Protocol are stable throughout the project (if not, some activities will need to be updated during the life of the project). Initiatives to support implementation have potential to advantage small island

Project Component	Desired Outcome	Expected Outputs	Indicators	Baseline <sup>10</sup>	Mid-Term Targets	End Project Targets	Verification Method	Assumptions
		3.1.3 Enabling environment is created, including: (i) capacity among stakeholders, with particular emphasis in the Government agencies in charge of making the Protocol operational; (ii) supportive groundwork for countries to take advantage of biodiscovery and commercialisation opportunities under the Protocol; and (iii) supportive institutional framework developed for protecting traditional knowledge,	<p>legal frameworks) developed for implementing ABS policies at national level with clearly identified institutional roles and responsibilities</p> <p>Number of countries with elaborated steps for ABS under their NBSAPs or similar policy commitments.</p> <p>Number of institutional frameworks that fully respect and protect traditional knowledge, innovations and practices and customary uses of biological and genetic resources</p> <p>Percentage of local communities covered by protocols for PIC and MAT</p> <p>Percentage of bioprospecting activities undertaken in the Pacific</p>		<p>identified in year 1.</p> <p>Capacity-building and legal training conducted at sub-regional capacity-building workshops [see 4.1.3] and national workshops [see 2.1.3] in years 1 and 2.</p> <p>Potential research capabilities necessary to add value to genetic resources and associated TK in the region identified in years 2 and 3.</p>	<p><i>situ</i> collections at national scale; IT needs; specialist laboratories; compliance; bilateral communication; etc.</p> <p>14 national strategy and action plans for implementation of ABS are consistent with the Nagoya Protocol.</p> <p>14 institutional frameworks fully respect and protect traditional knowledge</p> <p>ABS capacities of key national CNAs is sufficient to implement the Protocol.</p> <p>All bioprospecting applications are covered by national laws and regulations.</p> <p>Research</p>	<p>(percentage of requirements). ABS Tracking Tool (if available). Documentation on initiatives identified to implement Protocol with potential to advantage SIDS Documentation identifying key NGOs and community representative organisations</p> <p>Documentation on stakeholder consultations</p>	states

Project Component	Desired Outcome	Expected Outputs	Indicators	Baseline <sup>10</sup>	Mid-Term Targets	End Project Targets	Verification Method	Assumptions
		innovations and practices and customary uses of biological and genetic resources	region covered by national laws and regulations  Number of initiatives identified to implement Protocol with potential to advantage SIDS			capabilities and potential opportunities for biodiscovery/commercialisation identified in 14 countries.  Political support for protecting traditional knowledge, innovations and practices and customary uses of biological and genetic resources is increased		
4. Regional coordination , technical support and capacity development	4.1 Countries share information and gain from the experiences of other members of the Pacific Community	4.1.1 Two regional meetings completed at the beginning and end of the project (inception and training in the first meeting for focal points; second meeting for reviewing progress and planning future activities)	Number of regional and sub-regional meetings held.  Number of focal points, and national/regional institutions represented at the regional meetings.  Number of provisional measures identified to support countries in situations where national legal framework is not in place post ratification.	No provisional measures in place for interim implementation .  No regional technical support mechanism for implementing the Nagoya Protocol (SPREP provides <i>ad hoc</i> support in some instances), however information exchange has taken place at regional	Two regional meetings completed at the beginning and end of the project  Countries that have ratified but are not in compliance with the protocol identified in first year.  Provisional measures identified to support countries in situations where national legal framework	All countries in compliance with the Nagoya Protocol Country capacity to implement the Nagoya Protocol improved through intraregional learning Key information and technical support are produced and shared with stakeholders Institutions and stakeholders trained how to use different	Documentation of 2 regional meetings, including agenda and reports, etc Documentation of 3 sub-regional workshops Documentation and feedback on communication platform	Regional cooperation will continue during the life of the project. Participating countries are willing and able to access mechanisms for technical support.

Project Component	Desired Outcome	Expected Outputs	Indicators	Baseline <sup>10</sup>	Mid-Term Targets	End Project Targets	Verification Method	Assumptions
		<p>4.1.2 Provisional measures in place to ensure interim implementation of the Nagoya Protocol post ratification in situations where national legal framework is not yet in place</p> <p>4.1.3 Information and experience exchange on development and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol takes place, especially mutual learning between Pacific countries.</p>	<p>Number of country representatives involved in sharing lessons learned and best practices</p> <p>Number of joint ABS activities/ collaborations undertaken by key stakeholders in the region</p> <p>Number of countries using the ABS Clearing-House as an information exchange and monitoring mechanisms</p> <p>Number of intraregional visits (including south-south country expert exchanges)</p> <p>Participation of SIDS and regional experts at sub-regional meeting</p>	workshops under the ABS Initiative, and other mechanisms exist at SPREP to facilitate information dissemination and sharing including MEA CHM, PIPAP and PEIN <sup>11</sup> )	is not in place post ratification within six months of ratification process.	tools available to access technical support		

<sup>11</sup> Pacific Environment Information Network holds information from countries and other sources (<https://www.sprep.org/pacific-environment-information-network/pein>)  
GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

Project Component	Desired Outcome	Expected Outputs	Indicators	Baseline <sup>10</sup>	Mid-Term Targets	End Project Targets	Verification Method	Assumptions
	4.2 Effective management and delivery of projects meeting agreed measurable outputs and indicators.	4.2.1 Technical support provided to the project, including monitoring, evaluation and all reporting including financial	<p>Number of project coordination and oversight meetings held.</p> <p>Number of recommendations for improved project delivery generated during M&amp;E activities.</p> <p>Percentage of project beneficiaries that express satisfaction with project results, management and technical assistance.</p> <p>Percentage of women involved in implementation, e.g. number of staff, consultants.</p> <p>Ratings received during project reviews and evaluations.</p>	0	At least one coordination and oversight meeting (virtual or physical) held by project mid-term, to reach agreements and provide inputs to project implementation within first year	<p>At least three coordination and oversight meetings held by project mid-term, to reach agreements and provide inputs to project implementation within first year</p> <p>At least 70% of project participants express satisfaction with the project results, management and technical assistance. The terminal evaluation shows project obtained satisfactory results and completed at least 80% of planned activities.</p>	Mid-term and terminal evaluation reports Documentation of stakeholder engagement. Feedback from parallel project partners and participating countries.	Regional cooperation will continue during the life of the project.

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

*Responses to PIF Review, 20 November 2013*

Q10. Communities have been engaged during project preparation through input provided at regional meetings, and inclusion of local communities has been expanded.

Q16. Governments increased co-financing contributions from \$50k to \$100k as requested. Two countries have their own individual country ABS projects (Cook Islands and Fiji) and another one (Federated States of Micronesia) is part of a global ABS project. Co-financing contributions from these three projects are not counted under this ABS project although they will be consulted closely during implementation to ensure project activities complement each other.

Q17. Governments and other participating entities increased their contributions to reach a 49:51 ratio as requested.

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>12</sup>**

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Consultant	28,000.00	28,000.00	
Travel	18,986.00	18,986.00	
Workshop, communication, supplies	16,941.00	16,941.00	
<b>Total</b>	<b>63,927.00</b>	<b>63,927.00</b>	

<sup>12</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A