

## **PROJECT BRIEF**

### **1. Identifiers**

<b>Project Number:</b>	<i>[Implementing Agency Project Number not yet assigned]</i>
<b>Project Title:</b>	Building capacity for effective participation in the Biosafety Clearing House of the Cartagena Protocol
<b>Duration:</b>	36 months
<b>Implementing Agency:</b>	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
<b>Executing Agency:</b>	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in co-operation with the Secretariat of the CBD
<b>Requesting Countries:</b>	Global
<b>Eligibility:</b>	Only those countries that are eligible for GEF funding and have ratified or acceded to the Cartagena Protocol by the first meeting of the Conference of the Parties, serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol (COP-MOP), and are not beneficiary of a GEF project to support implementation of their NBFs may apply for assistance. Eligible countries will be required to demonstrate their need for funding and summarize their current situation with respect to use and access of the BCH. Ways and means will be devised to assist those countries that become Parties after the first Meeting of Parties.
<b>GEF Focal Areas:</b>	Biodiversity/Biosafety
<b>GEF Programming Framework:</b>	The project falls within the activities contained in the GEF Initial Strategy on Biosafety adopted by GEF Council in November 2000. The project also addresses the emerging priorities outlined by the GEF for Phase III under the pillar on “Capacity Building for the Implementation of the UN Convention on Biological Diversity Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety”. Biosafety is a crosscutting issue to OPs1-4 and OP13. As an enabling activity, this project is eligible for full financing.

### **2. Summary:**

The goal of this project falls under the global aim to support the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. It is proposed as an add-on project to the current UNEP-GEF Project on Development of National Biosafety Frameworks. The objective is complementary to that project’s aims, but more specifically will develop core human resources and establish an appropriate BCH infrastructure so as to enable eligible countries to

fully participate and benefit from the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH), as established under Article 20 of the Biosafety Protocol. This targeted intervention will facilitate the ability of the eligible countries to readily access scientific, technical, environmental and legal information on LMOs, and thereby assist with implementation of the Protocol in ensuring an adequate level of protection for biodiversity in the field of safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs. This activity will also complement the other past and existing projects aiming at the implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks.

### **3. Costs and Financing (Million US \$)**

<b>GEF:</b>	Project	:	US\$ 4,615,000
	<b>Subtotal GEF</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>US\$ 4,615,000</b>
	Governments :	:	
	in kind	:	US\$ 350,000
	<b>Subtotal Co-financing</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>US\$ 350,000</b>
<hr/>			
	<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>US\$ 4,965,000</b>
<hr/>			

**4. IA Contact:** Mr Ahmed Djoghlaif, Director Division Global Environment Facility, UNEP/GEF Co-ordination Office, UNEP, Nairobi, Tel:254-2-624166; Fax:254-2-624041; Email:Ahmed.Djoghlaif@unep.org

## **FULL PROJECT PROPOSAL TABLE OF CONTENTS**

PROJECT BRIEF	PAGE	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS		iii
LIST OF ACRONYMS		iv
 <b>1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>		
1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT		1
2. RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES (GEF ALTERNATIVE STRATEGY)		4
3. PROJECT COMPONENTS		6
4. EXPECTED RESULTS		10
5. RISKS AND SUSTAINABILITY		12
6. STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS		14
7. INCREMENTAL COSTS AND PROJECT FINANCING (BUDGET)		16
8. MONITORING AND EVALUATION		19
 <b>2. ANNEXES</b>		
<b><u>REQUIRED ANNEXES</u></b>		
ANNEX A. INCREMENTAL COSTS ANALYSIS		21
ANNEX B. PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX		26
ANNEX C. WORK PLAN AND TIME TABLE		32
ANNEX D. MONITORING & EVALUATION		36
ANNEX E. STAP REVIEW		45
ANNEX E. UNEP RESPONSE TO THE STAP REVIEW		50

## LIST OF ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS

AIA	Advance Informed Agreement
BCH	Biosafety Clearing House
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CHM	Clearing House Mechanism
COP	Conference of Parties
CPB	Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographic Information System
GMO	Genetically Modified Organism
ICCP	Intergovernmental Committee on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety
ICGEB	International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology
IRRO	International Research on the Release of Organisms into the Environment
ISNAR	International Service for National Agricultural Research
IUCN	IUCN The World Conservation Union
LMO	Living Modified Organism
MSDN	Microbial Strain Data Network
NBF	National Biosafety Framework
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NEA	National Executing Agency
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
ONT	Organism with Novel Traits
R & D	Research and Development
STAP	Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
WHO	World Health Organization

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### 1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

- 1.1 The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety was adopted by the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in January 2000. Its objective is “to contribute to ensuring an adequate level of protection in the field of the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms resulting from modern biotechnology that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health, and specifically focusing on transboundary movements.
- 1.2 The Republic of Palau became the 50th State to ratify the Protocol on 13 June 2003. Therefore, the Protocol will enter into force on 11 September 2003, on the 90th day after the date of deposit of the fiftieth instrument of ratification or accession. Entry into force of the Protocol means that it will become legally binding in the international legal system and in the legal systems of States that have given consent to be bound by it; and henceforth States must comply with, and implement, all the provisions of the Protocol.
- 1.3 The BCH is established by Article 20 - Information Sharing and the Biosafety Clearing-House - of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in order to

*Facilitate the exchange of scientific, technical, environmental and legal information on, and experience with, living modified organisms; and*

*Assist Parties to implement the Protocol, taking into account the special needs of developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and small island developing States among them, and countries with economies in transition as well as countries that are centres of origin and centres of genetic diversity.*

- 1.4 At its first meeting, held in Montpellier, France, from 11 to 15 December 2000, the Intergovernmental Committee for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (ICCP) recommended the development of a pilot phase of the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH) established by Article 20 of the Protocol. The ICCP identified a number of elements and steps to guide the development of this pilot phase whose objectives were defined as follows: i) to build experience and provide feedback for the development of a functional and accessible internet based BCH, and to identify alternatives to the electronic system; ii) to identify and address capacity needs of countries with respect to the BCH (UNEP/CBD/ICCP/1/9, annex 1).
- 1.5 Elements identified as required to implement the pilot phase were: (i) A central portal; (ii) central database(s)<sup>1</sup>; (iii) Linkage of central portal to national, regional and

---

<sup>1</sup> The central database(s) will contain(s) at a minimum: a. Information from countries without a national database (e.g. information in accordance with Article 20, paragraph 3 (a), of the Protocol); b. Information sent from countries without an electronic infrastructure (e.g. information in accordance with Article 10, paragraph 3, and Article 20, paragraphs (c) and (d) of the Protocol); c. Information required to implement Article 11, paragraph 1; d. Searchable indexes of information to facilitate decision-making, including that required under the Advance Informed Agreement procedure.

international databases/nodes; and (iv) Common formats for information, which can incorporate linked information through appropriate search engines;

- 1.6 At its second meeting, the ICCP welcomed the progress on the pilot phase of the Biosafety Clearing-House and urged Governments to nominate national BCH focal points and to participate actively in the pilot phase. The Executive Secretary was requested to develop CD-ROMs of the pilot phase for distribution to Governments, along with templates and guidance to facilitate the creation of national BCHs. Recommendations for the further development of the Pilot Phase were made on technical issues associated with the implementation of the Pilot Phase of the Biosafety Clearing-House (UNEP/CBD/ICCP/2/15, recommendations 2/8).
- 1.7 In its third meeting, the ICCP recognized “the importance of developing a fully functioning Biosafety Clearing-House by the time of entry into force of the Protocol, and of meeting the capacity needs of all countries with respect to implementation and use of the Biosafety Clearing-House” (UNEP/CBD/ICCP/3/10, recommendations 3/3).
- 1.8 In addition, the COP-6 and ICCP Bureaux have recommended that GEF funding be explored in order to address the urgent need of Parties with respect to the timely implementation of the BCH. The Bureaux identified national BCH components as essential for enabling Parties to provide information to the BCH in accordance with their obligations under the Protocol and to access the information available through the BCH for decision-making.
- 1.9 The GEF Initial Strategy included the possibility of GEF providing additional funds for assistance to countries to participate in the BCH in time to ensure access to the BCH by the time of entry into force of the CPB. This project is designed in that specific context.
- 1.10 The GEF “Initial Strategy for assisting countries to prepare for the entry into force of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety” provides clear guidelines on how it will a) assist countries in the establishment of national biosafety frameworks, b) promote information sharing and collaboration, especially at the regional and sub-regional level, and c) promote collaboration with other organizations to assist capacity-building for the Protocol. The initial strategy indicates as well that the GEF would support activities for "countries to participate in the biosafety clearing-house, once the terms of reference of the clearing-house are agreed upon by the Parties”.
- 1.11 Within the emerging directions of the GEF for the next planning period, specific support for Biosafety is mentioned as Priority III under Biodiversity since “There is recognition of the potential risks posed by modified living organisms and therefore biosafety constitutes a high priority for recipient countries. This priority also responds to the guidance from the CBD and it is consistent with the decisions of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Cartagena Protocol.” The GEF will consider under this strategy the development of systemic and institutional capacity building for biosafety as follows:

*“Provision of support to countries for the development and implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks including the Biosafety Clearing House [...] with the participation of relevant government sectors such as agriculture, fisheries, forestry,*

*industry, environment, education, manufacturing, trade and health as well as community and private sector stakeholders.”*

- 1.12 The needs identified by countries with respect to capacity-building for implementation of the pilot phase of the BCH were synthesized for ICCP-3 (document UNEP/CBD/ICCP/3/5/Add.3). In addition, a questionnaire was launched by UNEP-GEF in February 2003, in close collaboration with the CBD Secretariat, in order to determine the state of current access and use of the Biosafety Clearing House in each country, and to further understanding of their urgent needs. This proposal responds to the urgent needs identified by countries.
- 1.13 The project will complement other UNEP-GEF projects on biosafety, which are carried out in line with the GEF Initial Strategy on Biosafety that was approved in November 2000. More specifically, the project will build upon the achievements of the UNEP/GEF Development of National Biosafety Frameworks, currently being implemented with the participation of 117 countries. Under the original project, some financial support is being provided to participating countries to purchase equipment, software etc. that may, among other functions, be used to access the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH). However, those funds could not be expected to fulfill all requirements for equipment and services related to establishment of national BCH components and the training of national personnel to use and access the BCH, as this was not considered within the project design.
- 1.14 This project will also complement the work of the 12 demonstration projects on Implementation of National Biosafety Framework being run by UNEP, UNDP and the World Bank. Under these demonstration projects, the national requirements of the participating countries with respect to the Biosafety Clearing House will be taken into account. Activities that are being supported, and are related to the BCH, include implementing the national components of the BCH within the various institutional structures, and the development of appropriate technology and training of personnel to use the BCH, according to the requirements of their National Biosafety Frameworks. These activities, carried out in collaboration with the CBD, will also take advantage of any training materials to be developed at the Convention Secretariat for this proposed project.

## **2. RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES (GEF ALTERNATIVE STRATEGY)**

- 2.1. More than 100 countries signed the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB) while it was open for signing, and as of June 11th 2003, 49 have already ratified. The Protocol will be likely to enter into force soon, three months after the fiftieth ratification. Once the Protocol enters into force, all Parties to the Protocol must be able to use the Biosafety Clearing-House to fulfill various obligations under the Protocol. In this context, many Parties during the meetings of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Cartagena Protocol (ICCP) have expressed concern over the urgent need to build national capacities to use and provide information to the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH).
- 2.2. The CBD Secretariat, following the recommendations of the ICCP, has developed a pilot phase of the BCH. The pilot phase was first launched in March 2001, and a revised version was made available in February 2003. The BCH is comprised of a central portal and a distributed network of external components. The focus of the work at the CBD Secretariat has been on development of the central portal. Now the focus is to develop the national BCH components and the capacities of countries to access and use the BCH.
- 2.3. The CBD-COP-6 has also specifically requested the GEF to provide for national capacity-building in biosafety, in particular for enabling effective participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House (Decision VI/17.10b). The Intergovernmental Committee for Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (ICCP) has recognized the interconnection between national capacities, effective use of the Biosafety Clearing-House and successful implementation of the Biosafety Protocol, and urged donors to provide financial support and technical assistance to enable developing countries to access and use the pilot phase of the Biosafety Clearing-House (see recommendations 1/4.1, 2/8 and 3/3).
- 2.4. It is therefore imperative that all countries have the necessary capacity to access and use the BCH effectively. With the entry into force of the Protocol on the 11 September 2003, countries will be required to enter and manage their own data in the Biosafety Clearing-House. They will need essential equipment, tools and training, to be able to fulfil these obligations and to take advantage of the benefits provided by the BCH
- 2.5. The 12 demonstration projects on Implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks, presently being run by UNEP, UNDP and the World Bank, already have specific budget provisions on setting up national components of the BCH and will therefore not be eligible to directly receive funds under this project. However, these 'implementing' countries may wish to coordinate their training and other capacity building activities with the participating countries of the BCH project. This collaboration, while offering to these countries a larger amount of resources in terms of training material and opportunities, could also contribute to the development of useful synergies, increase the exchange of information and further facilitate the harmonization of routines and procedures for the BCH.

- 2.6. It is also intended that this project will synergize with the larger global effort at capacity building in support of implementation of the Protocol. For example, the BCH will assist in making legislative and regulatory frameworks more widely accessible to the world. This is important for lesson learning and information sharing as a number of such frameworks are being developed through the UNEP/GEF global biosafety frameworks project. In addition, infrastructure and expertise gained through this project may be applied to other areas of information-exchange, such as upgrading and maintaining an online biodiversity presence through the Clearing-House Mechanism of the Convention.
- 2.7. The overall objective of this project is to assist eligible countries in building and strengthening the national capacity needed to enable access and use of the BCH in order to implement their obligations under the Protocol once it enters into force. This will also ensure that the Biosafety Clearing-House is operational upon entry into force of the Protocol.

The estimated number of potential beneficiary countries is 50 by the time of the first Meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol. Only those countries that are eligible for GEF funding and have ratified or acceded to the Cartagena Protocol by the first meeting of the Conference of the Parties, serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol (COP-MOP), and are not beneficiary of a GEF project to support implementation of their NBFs may apply for assistance. Eligible countries will be required to demonstrate their need for funding and summarize their current situation with respect to use and access of the BCH. Ways and means will be devised to assist those countries that become Parties after the first Meeting of Parties.

The overall objective will be achieved through the following specific objectives:

- a) To strengthen capacity in eligible Parties through support for capacity building including training activities for key stakeholders. The training programmes will cover (i) data management; (ii) identification and access to information required for decision-making under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and (iii) access to, and registration of information in the BCH.
- b) To create an enabling environment for Parties to meet the obligations for implementation of the Protocol by providing participating countries with appropriate computer hardware and software, as well as appropriate software for the storage and exchange of data with the BCH through Internet connectivity or other means.
- c) To support further capacity building activities through the development and dissemination of an interactive computer-based training package including the BCH toolkit. This training package will be developed at the global level and used for training as well distributed in participating countries.

### **3. PROJECT COMPONENTS**

- 3.2. In response to the needs of Parties to the Protocol identified by meetings of the ICCP, regional meetings on the BCH, recommendations of the COP-6 and ICCP Bureaux, and the 2003 BCH questionnaire, physical and technological conditions need to be created for the national level components of the BCH, for Parties to operate in an enabling environment and meet the obligations for implementation of the Protocol. This will be achieved by providing participating Parties with appropriate training, computer software and hardware, as well as a means of access to the BCH through improved Internet connectivity or other means.

#### **A. Training Components**

##### *Training and networking*

- 3.3. A series of training workshops on access, use and input of relevant data through BCH will be organized and held in addition and, wherever possible, in conjunction, with the activities organized in the context of the UNEP-GEF Development of National Biosafety Frameworks. In particular,
- A roster of qualified consultants will be compiled by the UNEP-GEF team, in close collaboration with CBD Secretariat, including up to a maximum of five consultants from each region. Consultants will qualify based on their expertise relevant to Information Technology, training experience and the BCH. National governments will then select a consultant of their choice from the roster to complement the national experts.
  - A series of orientations/training workshops will be held in order to ensure that all of the consultants on the roster, and up to 3 national experts including the BCH focal points, as indicated by participating countries, are fully prepared and able to deliver the national training workshops. These meetings will also serve to help improve the network of BCH expertise.
  - A series of national level training workshops on the use of the BCH will be held in each participating country. Each workshop will train approximately 20 participants (country needs will vary), comprising mostly representatives from relevant government agencies and departments that will have a key role in either (1) making policy decisions about the national BCH, (2) using and administering the BCH to fulfill national obligations (e.g., certain members of the National Coordinating Committees formed under the National Biosafety Framework project).
- 3.4. The training workshops will cover the following:
- Database design and data management;
  - Searching BCH for information;
  - Access and use of BCH information

- Identification of relevant BCH information for decision makers
  - Registration of information on the BCH:
- 3.5. Such training sessions will be also complemented by the content of any other events organized by the UNEP-GEF Development Project at national or regional levels. In addition, and separately from this project, training sessions may be organized in consultation with the Secretariat of the CBD, at the margins of major biosafety international events, including the COP-MOP.
- 3.6. In order to encourage the exchange of peer-to-peer experience, lessons learned and best practice as well as facilitating the collaboration between the participating countries and developed countries, a campaign will be run to set up a supportive network among BCH operatives with similar challenges to face so that they can learn with and from each other as well as from external professionals. This process will be assisted by the presence of a dedicated list-server<sup>2</sup> that the CBD Secretariat will run. In this way the learning-by-doing approach will be enormously facilitated by the continuous exchange of information on resolution of day-by-day problems by the users themselves as well as by a faster identification of general problems in the global system by the central portal manager/s.
- 3.7. In conjunction with forthcoming sub-regional workshops of the NBF Development Project in late 2003 and early 2004, a specific training session will be dedicated to the central BCH structure, functioning, management, use and interaction with the Parties. It will provide training to key national government representatives responsible for decision making, who will steer the BCH activities in their respective countries.
- 3.8. Each session will be split in two parts:
- Requirements coming from the Protocol, the need for informed decisions, the crucial role of the BCH for the Biosafety Clearing House Focal Points, Biosafety Protocol Focal Points, and representative(s) of the National Competent Authorities on access and use of databases and BCH searching capability
  - Technical sessions on understanding access, use, search and entry of data to BCH database.

### ***Development of supporting training material***

- 3.9. For the purpose of these training workshops specific training materials and start-up kits will be developed and stored in CD-ROMs to be widely disseminated:
- A full training package including background documents, BCH toolkit and a user-friendly computer-based training manual,
  - An interactive tutorial to assist beginners in BCH operations
  - A Biosafety Clearing-House database template that could be used with existing software programs (e.g. Microsoft Access) to store data at national level in Biosafety Clearing-House common formats; the same database will also

---

<sup>2</sup> A list-server is a program that distributes new messages, newsletters, or other postings from the list's members to the entire list of subscribers as they occur or are scheduled.

provide functions to export this data to the Biosafety Clearing-House through the use of Internet or data-storage media (e.g. CD-ROM).

- 3.10. All such material will be made available in relevant UN languages for participating countries.

## **B. Equipment component**

- 3.11. In order to create an enabling environment for Parties to meet the obligations for implementation of the Protocol, appropriate computer hardware and software, as well as means of access to the BCH through Internet connectivity or other means, will be provided.
- 3.12. Participating countries will be asked to set up a BCH Task Force to look the needs and requirements for equipment and staffing in order to decide on the structure and parameters for the national components of the BCH.
- 3.13. The setting up of any particular model for BCH national components will be undertaken in accordance with country needs, but will require countries to commit to standard operating procedures with corresponding levels of resource commitment. Countries will also need to establish strategies to ensure continuity and sustainability of fulfillment of obligations related to the Biosafety Clearing-House.
- 3.14. Some outcomes of the recent meeting of the liaison group of technical experts on the biosafety clearing-house may assist eligible countries in developing their national components of the BCH (UNEP/CBD/BCH/LG-MTE/1/2). Their views about the possible range of options to be considered in setting up a system within a particular country were as follows:

*The following options can be considered as the basis for national components depending on suitability for meeting country needs and circumstances:*

(a) Option 1. National database and central portal:

*(i) National database to store data, but no local Biosafety Clearing-House website;*

*(ii) Export data from these databases to the Biosafety Clearing-House (and, in cases of poor Internet connectivity, information could be accessed by, for example, CD-ROM);*

*(iii) Use central portal at the Biosafety Clearing-House to store all data on central Biosafety Clearing-House databases (use of Management Centre);*

(b) Option 2. National biosafety clearing-house website and central portal:

*(i) Maintain a local biosafety clearing-house website;*

*(ii) Use central portal at the Biosafety Clearing-House to enter and store metadata centrally, link to records on national site;*

(c) Option 3. National biosafety clearing-house website crawled by central Biosafety

*Clearing-House:*

*(i) Maintain a local Biosafety Clearing-House website;*

*(ii) Make website metadata accessible to the Biosafety Clearing-House (i.e. provide information in XML format so it can be harvested by the Biosafety Clearing-House) – “pull technology”;*

(d) Option 4. National interoperable biosafety clearing-house database:

*(i) Develop and maintain interoperable database according to Biosafety Clearing-*

*House interoperability protocols and meet minimum standards (national database/XML) – “push technology”.*

3.15. The CBD Secretariat will also prepare guidelines for national governments to evaluate the various options available for developing national components of the BCH. In this context, participating countries will be encouraged to choose an option that is appropriate to country needs and their ability to meet the corresponding commitments. There are differing resource requirements for each option in terms of Internet connectivity, personnel costs, security, maintenance costs, hardware and software. Correspondingly, the commitment required from countries to implement and maintain each option will vary. National interoperable databases, for example, require a large commitment of resources from a country in the long-term.

#### **4. Expected results**

- 4.1. The proposed GEF project has been designed as a key activity in the context of those addressing biosafety issues under the GEF Initial Strategy. The overall objective is to build or enhance the capacity of Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on all relevant issues related to the BCH activities.
- 4.2. The capacity of the beneficiary countries to access and use the Biosafety Clearing-House will be improved through developing core human resources and establishing appropriate BCH infrastructure.
- 4.3. Capacity will be built in order to facilitate the exchange of scientific, technical, environmental and legal information on, and experience with, LMOs; and therefore facilitate the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol.
- 4.4. In particular, the project will lead to a realization of the following outcomes in the participating countries:

***Outcome One: Strengthened capacities of potential users of BCH in relevant ministries and other institutions on how to use and access the BCH***

- Beneficiary countries in a better position to make timely and informed decisions on LMO transboundary movements and to report on those decisions as required by the Protocol.
- A core group of relevant stakeholders, including the officially designated BCH focal points, with increased skills and competence to develop and run BCH national components
- Key decision-makers in each participating country able to understand how to use and access BCH strategically and deploy it in decision-making
- National level data on decisions entered on BCH and made available on the national database and accessible via Internet.

***Outcome Two:***

***Strengthened national infrastructure in order to be able to actively use and access the BCH***

- Beneficiary countries able to effectively access, use and register information through the BCH in order to fulfil their obligations under the Protocol and meet national needs.
- A core group of relevant stakeholders trained to maintain national databases.
- Participating countries have the necessary physical requirements needed (computers, software etc) for the national BCH to be operational

***Outcome Three:***

***Strengthened and enhanced exchange of experience within and between participating countries in terms of information flow and exchange of experience on use of BCH***

- Increased and more effective exchange of relevant information and decision-making regarding LMOs in place among participating countries.
  - An increased exchange of experience and knowledge between personnel involved in Biosafety in different countries
  - Informal network of peer-to-peer support set up among countries to assist each other in BCH related matters
  - Sustainability of the project and participation increased by the broadening of the user base for the BCH and from the development and dissemination of tutorial material.
- 4.5. By the end of the project, capacity to use and manage the BCH will be improved, and more information will then be available to help assess and manage risks associated with the transboundary movement of LMOs. Consolidated capacities in these areas will also help to detect and fill eventual gaps in the functioning of the biosafety management system at national and global level.
- 4.6. Thus, in line with the GEF's emerging strategic directions, this project will build management capacity to address and mainstream biosafety issues throughout participating countries through effective participation in the biosafety-clearing house. In line with GEF policy, aimed at achieving measurable targets at the completion of the project, it will demonstrate how the participating countries are using the biosafety clearing-house in actual national planning and decision making thus resulting in concrete change

## 5. RISKS AND SUSTAINABILITY

Project risks that could affect the sustainability of the benefits gained through this project include:

- 5.1. **National BCH Development.** Once the Cartagena Protocol enters into force, countries are obliged to enter/ register the data on the BCH. However, there is a risk that factors external to the project, such as national government processes may prevent the national level components of the BCH from being developed efficiently and effectively. The project will address this risk by ensuring that eligible countries prove their political support and need for the project by written justification and their governmental commitment to the process by setting up Biosafety Task Force and coordinating activities and choosing appropriate staff for training.
- 5.2. **Project workshop quality** Each training session relies on an in-depth planning process that brings the relevant mix of stakeholders who are directly involved in the issue of BCH in a particular country to an appropriate setting where they will feel free to learn and experiment. Each training session will need to be focused on both providing the Parties with new technical and scientific information on a topic and teaching them how to use their knowledge and practical experience at the national level. Training will not be effective if there is not a comprehensive strategy and planning process that enables practical situations to be discussed and represents an interactive “two-way” information exchange process rather than a “one-way” information dissemination process that does not interact fully and freely with the audience.
- 5.3. **Information uptake by participants.** In the case of passing information to the audience there could be a risk of participants not gaining sufficient technical and practical experience from the training session and the countries could then find it difficult to implement the required tasks when faced with the day-to-day activity. The monitoring and evaluation plan will be designed to assure a feedback from the audience that should benefit and improve with each training session so as to see whether the training sessions need to be modified according to the results of those plans. In addition, the monitoring and evaluation plan will help to monitor and address the task performance and quality.
- 5.4. **The issue of financial sustainability could pose a risk to the project.** Once the project is completed, the participating countries must be able to maintain Internet connectivity and an access to the BCH must be fast enough to ensure that costs and timing are at an acceptable level when browsing through the BCH. Once the project is completed, a country must also ensure that there is an efficient Internet service on the BCH and the costs of it are kept at a minimum level. This issue was raised in section 3.12 in the context of the importance of governments assuming responsibilities and obligation as Parties to the Protocol. Indeed, the requirements for building in financial sustainability extend far beyond the BCH requirements and are also covered under the UNEP-GEF Global Development Project. Political support and internalization of the need for a fully functioning BCH and of the obligations on Parties will most adequately address this risk.

**5.5. Loss of experienced staff.** It is generally well understood that the area of IT and computing are growth industries in most countries and so any training provided to competent stakeholders can lead them to re-evaluate their positions and seek other opportunities that take them away from working on the BCH. It is therefore imperative that the interactive training programmes are done by a large number of stakeholders and that the active support system should be there to help countries cope with high turn over in the 3 years so that countries can continue to manage the BCH despite predicted turnover. After such an initial period, countries will be able to set up coping mechanisms that are sustainable, but some disturbance is likely in the early years.

## **6. STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

### **Stakeholder identification, participation, and consultation**

- 6.1. One of the central purposes of building capacity to utilize the BCH by developing countries is to broaden stakeholder involvement in the use and access to the information. A prior exercise to identify the main users and solicit input from a broader range of stakeholders to identify their needs, as users will be needed before the training sessions in country will commence. After identification, such stakeholders will be likely to be involved only in the first stage of the training course. The persons benefiting from the workshops will include relevant stakeholders identified by the relevant National Authorities in different sectors representing health, agriculture, natural resources, food production, forestry, finance, national planning and development sectors and those responsible for control of import/export to a country, consumers, non-governmental bodies, scientific bodies and the private sector. However, this list is not exhaustive and will require local verification, which is a process that is an integral part of the UNEP-GEF Development project process.
- 6.2. The structure of the UNEP-GEF NBF Development Project and its current activities will ensure that continuous and effective consultation with a broad range of stakeholders is being conducted, through the following:
  - Meetings of the UNEP-GEF Development Project Steering Committee;
  - Planning processes for training sessions;
  - Selection of workshop organizers and workshop presenters;
  - Selection of participants for the training sessions
  - Trainees who will attend training sessions;
  - Preparation of background documents (including peer review) for training sessions;
  - Outreach activities such as dissemination of updates, bulletins, reports, etc.)
  - Involvement of participants in self-evaluation of each training session (according to the M&E plan).

### **Project implementation and management**

- 6.3. This project is to be run as an add-on to the active UNEP-GEF global project on development of National Biosafety Frameworks. Therefore, the existing institutional structures (e.g., National Coordinating Committee, National Executing Agency and National Project Coordinator, etc.) will be used to help deliver the project and exploit the synergies between the projects. The existence of the UNEP-GEF global project means that the systems for managing relations with almost all of the eligible countries are already well established and formalized. The relevant Regional Coordinator, who is already supported by the global project, will, on approval, contact eligible countries and negotiate the terms and conditions for equipment and training and support to be provided under this project and additional budget line/s will be added to their National Project Document. Expenditure on this BCH budget line will be reported upon in the same context and operating system as the original

project. Reports will also be produced for the Global Project Steering Committee.

- 6.4. For eligible Parties to the CPB that do not have a current project with the global GEF-UNEP Project, slightly different arrangements will need to be made. An MOU with that country (currently only 3) will need to be negotiated by the relevant Regional Coordinator and a similar system of reporting and disbursement will then be established as for the other 117 country projects.
- 6.5. The total duration of the project will be for three years and the project will start on 1st October 2003. A number of project activities will be concentrated in the first two years, but a focus on learning from lessons and from review and an intensive and continuing support to stakeholders will be necessary to ensure that the number of confident and active BCH users participants and trainers is maintained at acceptable levels in the country. Thus, it can be said that the final year will involve technical assistance to all participants who have benefited from the training workshops to ensure that they do indeed utilize the knowledge gained in their day-to-day planning and decision making related to biosafety. The continuing support will also be critical in maintaining an adequate number of trained users, considering the perceived risk of losing trained staff in the short and medium term.
- 6.6. As this project responds to one of the major requirements to ensure the successful implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, the active participation of the Secretariat of the CBD is essential. Accordingly this project will be implemented by UNEP in close cooperation with the Secretariat of the CBD. A combined UNEP & CBD project management team will also be established to ensure full and smooth communications and concerted synergistic action to achieve outputs and impact.
- 6.7. In order to oversee the original NBF Development Project and facilitate inter-agency collaboration, a Steering Committee<sup>3</sup> for the UNEP-GEF National Biosafety Framework Development projects was initially set up in June 2001 and this is now functioning with regular exchanges of information and annual meetings. This same steering committee will take on the functions of oversight of this add-on project. The Steering Committee is co-chaired by UNEP and the GEF and has, as its members, representatives of the CBD Secretariat, the other Implementing/Executing Agencies and the GEF Secretariat. It also includes a representative of STAP and the Chairman of the ICCP (after the 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the Parties of the Protocol, this will be substituted by the Chairman of the COP-MOP of the CPB). The Steering Committee meets at least once a year to review the status of implementation of the global NBF development project and will then also review relevant activities in this add-on project and provide guidance to the task managers.
- 6.8. A technical advisory group may be established at the discretion of the Project steering committee. The advisory group will provide guidance on scientific and technical issues arising from the implementation of these activities
- 6.9. A project manager and adequate administrative assistance will be recruited for the implementation of this project.

---

<sup>3</sup> Steering Committee Membership includes representatives GEF Secretariat (Co-Chair), UNEP(Co-Chair), CBD Secretariat, UNDP, World Bank, UNIDO, ICGEB, STAP and the ICCP Chairman

## **7. INCREMENTAL COSTS AND PROJECT FINANCING**

- 7.1. GEF resources will be used to build/strengthen national capacity needed to enable countries to access and use the BCH so as to implement their obligations under the Protocol once it enters into force.
- 7.2. Eligible countries have had very limited financial means to fulfil the national needs with respect to the BCH. In fact, when resources have been available at national level, priority has been given to other elements of the National Biosafety framework, i.e. biosafety regulatory issues and public awareness/participation.
- 7.3. Only through the support of international partners, countries have been able to start activities related to the BCH. In particular, this project adds on to the ongoing UNEP/GEF Project for the Development of National Biosafety Frameworks, which is carried out in line with the GEF Initial Strategy on Biosafety, as approved in November 2000. Under the Global NBF Development project, support has been provided to participating countries to carry out surveys and inventories, to begin setting up a national database and to purchase equipment, etc. to access the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH). An average level of financial support of around 14,000USD per country has been provided for computer equipment and software. However, this support is directed at the development of the national biosafety framework rather than the aim of connectivity to the BCH nor did the project design include training of national personnel to use and access the BCH. Therefore, the funds from the proposed project are expected to fulfill all requirements for equipment and services related to establishment of national BCH components.
- 7.4. This project will also complement the work of the 12 demonstration projects on Implementation of National Biosafety Framework being run by UNEP, UNDP and the World Bank. Under these demonstration projects, the national requirements of the participating countries with respect to the Biosafety Clearing House are taken into account. These demonstration projects, which are not eligible for funding and are already carried out in collaboration with the CBD, will also be encouraged to take advantage of any global inputs provided under this project with respect to training and database set up.
- 7.5. An expanded programme, which generates global benefits, will be implemented under the GEF alternative. The activities include the development of core human resources and establishment of appropriate BCH so as to support the decision making process related to the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs. Countries will be able to readily access scientific, technical, environmental and legal information on LMOs, thereby assisting with the implementation of the Protocol and ensuring an adequate level of protection for biodiversity.
- 7.6. An incremental cost of US\$4,965,000 is required to achieve the project's global environmental objectives. This project is eligible for full financing as enabling activity. Nevertheless, around 7% percentage of mentioned cost will come from countries as in kind contributions, mainly as space for meetings and administrative support for training activities. The remaining 93%, equal to US\$4,615,000 , is

requested for GEF support.

7.7. Table Four provides a summary of baseline and incremental costs by output/component and Table Five provides information on Component Financing and Co-funding. Details of incremental costs, an incremental cost analysis, and global and domestic benefits are presented in Annex A. Overall, the total baseline costs for the 50 potential participating countries can only be associated to available equipment (hardware/software) for a limited global amount of US\$25,000 in total, based on an estimated amount of 500 US\$ for each country. Project management and coordination activities, already set up under the Global Project for the Development of National Biosafety Frameworks, are not included in the baseline, which refers only to activities other than the GEF sponsored ones.

7.8. Table Five presents the project budget and component financing. The total cost of the project is US\$ 4,965,000 of which US\$ 350,000 are the costs for the participating governments in kind. The remaining amount, US\$ 4,615,000, is being requested from the GEF.

<b>TABLE FOUR. BASELINE AND INCREMENTAL COSTS IN US\$</b>			
<b>Component</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Alternative (USD)</b>	<b>Increment (USD)</b>
<i>Component A: Training</i>	-	2,807,000	2,807,000
<i>Component B: Equipment</i>	25,000	1,275,000	1,250,000
Project Management and Co-ordination	-	808,000	808,000
<b>Total</b>	25,000	4,890,000	4,865,000

<b>TABLE FIVE. COMPONENT FINANCING IN US\$</b>			
<b>Component</b>	<b>Increment (USD)</b>	<b>GEF</b>	<b>Co-financing (in-kind)</b>
<i>Component A: Training</i>	2,807,000	2,557,000	250,000
<i>Component B: Equipment</i>	1,250,000	1,250,000	-
Project Management and Co-ordination	908,000	808,000	100,000
<b>Total</b>	4,965,000	4,615,000	350,000

## BUDGET

UNEP BUDGET LINE/OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE	US\$ ( GEF YEAR 1)	US\$ ( GEF YEAR 2)	US\$ (GEF YEAR 3)	US\$ (TOTAL GEF FUNDING)	Equipment and related support	Training activities and related support	Project management costs
<b>10 PROJECT PERSONNEL COMPONENT</b>							
<b>1100 Project Personnel</b>							
1101 Project Manager	140,000	146,000	152,000	438,000			438,000
<b>1199 Subtotal</b>	<b>140,000</b>	<b>146,000</b>	<b>152,000</b>	<b>438,000</b>			
<b>1300 Administrative Support</b>							
1301 Administrative Assistant	80,000	88,000	95,000	263,000			263,000
<b>1399 Subtotal</b>	<b>80,000</b>	<b>88,000</b>	<b>95,000</b>	<b>263,000</b>			
<b>1999 Component Sub-Total</b>	<b>220,000</b>	<b>234,000</b>	<b>247,000</b>	<b>701,000</b>			
<b>20 SUB-CONTRACT COMPONENT</b>							
<b>2300 Sub-contracts for commercial purposes</b>							
2301 Subcontract to private firms for development of supporting training materials	400,000	100,000	-	500,000		500,000	
<b>2399 Subtotal</b>	<b>400,000</b>	<b>100,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>500,000</b>			
<b>2999 Component Sub-Total</b>	<b>400,000</b>	<b>100,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>500,000</b>			
<b>30 TRAINING COMPONENT</b>							
<b>3200 Group training</b>							
3201 Training / Orientation Sessions (average 20 participants x 50 countries x \$29,000 per country +20 regional experts) plus trainers and programme support	970,000	962,000	115,000	2,047,000		2,047,000	
<b>3299 Subtotal</b>	<b>970,000</b>	<b>962,000</b>	<b>115,000</b>	<b>2,047,000</b>			
<b>3300 Technical Meetings</b>							
3302 Project Steering Committee	-	-	-	-			
<b>3399 Subtotal</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>			

<b>3999 Component Sub-Total</b>	<b>970,000</b>	<b>962,000</b>	<b>115,000</b>	<b>2,047,000</b>			
<b>40 EQUIPMENT COMPONENT</b>							
<b>4100 Expendable equipment</b>							<b>10,000</b>
4101 Office supplies	5,000	5,000		10,000			
<b>4199 Subtotal</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>5,000</b>	-	<b>10,000</b>			
<b>4200 Non- Expendable equipment</b>							
4201 Computer hardware and software for 50 countries x 25,000 US \$ each	400,000	850,000		1,250,000	<b>1,250,000</b>		
4202 Office equipment / furniture	15,000			15,000			<b>15,000</b>
4203 Office rental and maintenance	15,000	15,000	15,000	45,000			<b>45,000</b>
<b>4299 Subtotal</b>	<b>430,000</b>	<b>865,000</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>1,310,000</b>			
<b>4999 Component Sub- Total</b>	<b>435,000</b>	<b>870,000</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>1,320,000</b>			
<b>50 MISCELLANEOUS COMPONENT</b>							
<b>5200 Reporting costs</b>							<b>10,000</b>
5201 Publication of relevant documents and reports	6,000	4,000		10,000			
<b>5299 Subtotal</b>	<b>6,000</b>	<b>4,000</b>	-	<b>10,000</b>			
<b>5300 Sundry</b>							
5301 Communication and mailing costs	15,000	12,000	10,000	37,000			<b>37,000</b>
<b>5399 Subtotal</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>12,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>37,000</b>	<b>1,250,000</b>	<b>2,557,000</b>	<b>808,000</b>
<b>5999 Component Sub-Total</b>	<b>21,000</b>	<b>16,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>47,000</b>			
<b>GRAND TOTAL GEF FINANCING</b>	<b>2,046,000</b>	<b>2,182,000</b>	<b>387,000</b>	<b>4,615,000</b>			

1. Year 1 will begin in October 2003

2. Note that the project will be implemented from October 2003 to October 2005, a total of three years. While all activities will be completed in the first and second year, the final year will be utilized to support countries and ensure that delivery of technical assistance to the participants who benefited from the project was successful and to ensure that knowledge gained through the workshop is utilized in actual planning and decision-making.

## **8. MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

- 8.1. As an add-on project to the global UNEP-GEF Project on Development of National Biosafety Frameworks, the monitoring of the progress of all activities will be undertaken within the monitoring schedules of the global project, in accordance with UNEP's internal guidelines for project monitoring and evaluation. This process will include a mid-term assessment (desk review) and end-of-project assessment undertaken by external review teams arranged by UNEP. As a part of this monitoring process, GEF/UNEP's requirements of quarterly and half-yearly reports on substantive and financial matters will be provided. Deliverables will be identified on a timetable agreed between UNEP and each participating country, and country-specific final reports will be prepared at the end of the activities foreseen by this project.
- 8.2. Project performance and impact will be measured according to the indicators developed in the project log frame, and using the specific Monitoring and Evaluation Plan as per Annex D.
- 8.3. The UNEP-GEF NBF Development Steering Committee will monitor progress (annually and bi-annually) and will advise the project manager on any necessary adjustment to the work plan and timetable. A final evaluation of the project will be undertaken and in accordance with UNEP approved Monitoring and Evaluation procedures.
- 8.4. Dissemination of results will take place, where possible together with those of the UNEP-GEF NBF Development Project, via their sub-regional meetings, periodic meetings between the project management team and the government departments in each country, via the newsletter and other publications as well as via the public media.
- 8.5. The enabled access and the effective use of the BCH by participating countries will represent the most important tangible output of the project and will be the main target for evaluation of the success of the project.

## ANNEXES

### REQUIRED ANNEXES

ANNEX A. INCREMENTAL COSTS ANALYSIS	PAGE	21
ANNEX B. PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX		26
ANNEX C. WORK PLAN AND TIME TABLE		32
ANNEX D. MONITORING & EVALUATION		36
ANNEX E. STAP REVIEW		45
ANNEX E. UNEP RESPONSE TO THE STAP REVIEW		50

## ANNEX A-INCREMENTAL COSTS ANALYSIS

### BROAD DEVELOPMENT GOALS

1. GEF resources will be used to build/strengthen national capacity needed to enable access and use of the BCH to implement their obligations under the Protocol once it enters into force, and now that the Biosafety Clearing-House is operational.
2. The countries that participate in this project will be those that have ratified the Biosafety Protocol but are not currently receiving GEF support for projects for the implementation of their national biosafety frameworks.
3. The Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH) is an essential tool by which they must fulfill certain obligations with respect to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety on information sharing about the safe transfer, handling and use of Living Modified Organisms (LMOs).
4. During regional consultations on capacity-building needs for working with the Biosafety Clearing-House, countries identified four main categories of capacity needs, namely: developing human resources and technical expertise; building and maintaining infrastructure; developing institutional synergies; and continued development of a non-web, non-Internet based system to access the Biosafety Clearing-House. A fifth, crosscutting, need for sustainable financial resources was also identified. Small Island Developing States also noted that unreliable telecommunications systems and high cost of access to the Internet were of particular concern for those countries.
5. Most of the countries involved have already highlighted biosafety as an important issue that needs to be addressed within their Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans, in accordance with Article 6 of the CBD.

### BASELINE

6. All eligible countries have had very limited financial means to fulfil their national needs with respect to the BCH. In fact, when resources have been available at national level, priority has been given to other elements of the National Biosafety Framework, biosafety regulatory issues, information gathering and public awareness/participation.
7. Only through the support of international partners countries have been able to start activities related to the setting up of the BCH or been able to attend global or regional workshops and assist in training activities aimed at the creation of the capacity needed for the BCH to be operational. In this respect, as far as GEF is concerned, this project will complement other UNEP-GEF projects on biosafety.
8. In particular, 117 GEF eligible countries are currently participating in the UNEP/GEF Global Project for the Development of National Biosafety Frameworks. Under this Project a modest financial support of around 14,000 US\$ per country is being provided to participating countries to purchase computer equipment, software, etc. However, this equipment was actually intended to support national framework development and only incidentally would any of these resources be used for access to the Biosafety Clearing

House (BCH). As importantly, the training of personnel to use and access the BCH is not being addressed within this project. In summary, adequate equipment and appropriate training to access and use the BCH is critical for these countries to complete their obligations under the Protocol.

9. In addition, UNEP is assisting in the demonstration projects on implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks in Bulgaria, Cameroon, China, Cuba, Kenya, Namibia, Poland and Uganda. UNDP is assisting Mexico and Malaysia while the World Bank is assisting Colombia and India. As a part of these projects and their own internal processes, national governments are collating the information that needs to be registered on the BCH, and are determining institutions and personnel to undertake the functions required by the BCH National Focal Point and relating to the BCH appropriately.
10. Under these demonstration projects, the national requirements of the participating countries with respect to the Biosafety Clearing House will also be taken into account. Activities that are being supported, and are related to the BCH, include implementing the national components of the BCH within the various institutional structures, and the development of appropriate technology and training of personnel to use the BCH, according to the requirements of their National Biosafety Frameworks. These projects, carried out in collaboration with the CBD, will also take advantage of any training materials to be developed for this proposed project.
11. In this respect and in collaboration with the CBD, a questionnaire has been sent out in February 2003 by UNEP to all Parties to the CBD on their use of the BCH in order to provide baseline information for designing this project and providing key data on use of the BCH.
12. As result, and in line with the advice of the CBD/ICCP Bureaux on national components of the BCH, adequate equipment and appropriate training to access and use the online BCH are now critical for these countries to complete their obligations under the Protocol.
13. Other donors are supporting or have intentions to support countries in the implementation of their BCH (Belgium, Canada, etc.) through exchange programmes.
14. Overall, the total baseline costs for the 50 potential participating countries can only be associated to available equipment (hardware/software) for a limited amount of US\$25,000 in total (for an estimated amount of 500USD/each). Project management and coordination activities, set up under the Global Project for the Development of National Biosafety Frameworks, are not included in the baseline of this add-on project. Baseline refers only to activities other than the GEF sponsored ones.

#### **GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL OBJECTIVES**

15. The global community benefits greatly from an operational BCH, by being able to make informed decision on the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms. The biosafety clearing-house will ensure good feedback mechanisms and networking capabilities, allowing the users ready access to the data directory and enable them to make direct contact with the sources of information. Without additional

resources, global benefits will be hindered by a limited capacity in BCH management as well as by a limited user base.

#### **ALTERNATIVE**

16. The Biosafety Clearing House is 'owned' by the participants. This is important because it places the onus of quality, timeliness, maintenance, access and other issues squarely where it belongs – on the initial producer or provider.
17. It is therefore imperative that all countries have the necessary capacity to access and use the BCH effectively. Once the Protocol enters into force, countries will be required to enter and manage their own data in the Biosafety Clearing-House.
18. The activities planned by the project will therefore support the development of core human capacities and the provision of essential equipment so as to enable countries to fulfill their obligations under the Protocol. Countries will also take advantage of the benefits provided by the BCH in terms of aid in timely, informed decision-making through readily access to scientific, technical, environmental and legal information on LMOs. This will facilitate the ability of these countries to readily access relevant information on LMOs, and thereby assist with implementation of the Protocol and ensuring an adequate level of protection for biodiversity in the field of safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs.
19. Under the GEF alternative, an expanded programme will be implemented, focusing on those activities that generate global benefits. These include the development of core human resources and establishment of appropriate BCH infrastructure so as to improve the capacity of the beneficiary countries to access and use the Biosafety Clearing-House.
20. The incremental costs of these components are estimated as follows:

Training: US\$ 2,807,000, of which US\$ 250,000 of co-funding in kind by countries. GEF support is requested for US\$2,557,000

Equipment: US\$ 1,250,000. GEF support is requested for the full amount.

As far as project management and coordination is concerned, out of 908,000US\$ of increment, 100,000US\$ are made available as in-kind contribution by countries. This includes administrative support and workshop rooms. GEF is requested to contribute 808,000US\$.

#### **COSTS IN TOTAL**

21. Baseline expenditure amounts to US\$ 25,000. The alternative has been costed at US\$4,890,000.
22. The incremental cost analysis shows that an amount of US\$4,965,000 is required to achieve the project's global environmental objectives. As an enabling activity, this project is eligible for full financing. Nevertheless countries will cover around the 7% of the cost of the alternative as in-kind contribution, mainly as space for meetings and

administrative support for training activities. US\$ 4,615,000 corresponding to the remaining 93 % of the total cost of implementing the alternative is requested for GEF support.

## INCREMENTAL COST MATRIX

Cost/Benefit	Baseline (B)	Alternative (A)	Increment (A-B)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of knowledge of the beneficiary countries of the role of the BCH</li> <li>• Lack of knowledge of the beneficiary countries on the access, use and registration of information on the BCH</li> <li>• Absence of a systematic approach in handling request and carrying out risk assessment associated with LMOs transboundary movements as needed for making timely and informed decisions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central Portal and National BCH play a key role as foreseen by the Protocol</li> <li>• BCH contains all necessary information by countries as requested by the Protocol</li> <li>• Adoption of a systematic approach in handling requests</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity of the beneficiary countries to access, use and register information in the Biosafety Clearing-House improved through developing core human resources and establishing appropriate BCH infrastructure</li> <li>• Enhanced use of technical and scientific information for making informed decisions</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Obligations on BCH under the Protocol are not matched because of lack of human resources and appropriate BCH infrastructure</li> <li>• Limited opportunities for exchange of knowledge and experience, feedback and networking</li> <li>• Inadequate participation due to a very limited user base of BCH</li> <li>• Inadequate participation due to a lack of tutorial material</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Obligations on the BCH under the Protocol are met</li> <li>• BCH becomes a crucial tool for making informed decision on the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BCH provides good feedback mechanisms and networking capabilities</li> <li>• Sustainability of the project and informed public participation increased by the broadening of the user base for the BCH and from the development and dissemination of tutorial material</li> </ul>

<b>Cost/Benefit</b>	<b>Baseline (B)</b>	<b>Alternative (A)</b>	<b>Increment (A-B)</b>
<b>Component A Training</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited knowledge of the Protocol requirements with respect to the BCH</li> <li>Limited capacity in database design and data management in relation to the BCH</li> <li>Limited capacity to search for information on the BCH</li> <li>Limited capacity to access and use BCH information</li> <li>Limited capacity in identifying relevant BCH information for decision makers</li> <li>Limited capacity in registering information on the BCH</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of the Protocol requirements with respect to the BCH improved</li> <li>Enhanced capacity in database design and data management in relation to the BCH</li> <li>Enhanced capacity to search for information on the BCH</li> <li>Enhanced capacity to access and use BCH information</li> <li>Enhanced capacity in identifying relevant BCH information for decision makers</li> <li>Enhanced capacity in registering information on the BCH</li> </ul>	Increment: 2,807,000US\$ GEF: 2,557,000US\$ Co-financing by countries: 250,000US\$
	Baseline: 0	Alternative: 2,807,000	
<b>Component B Equipment (Hardware &amp; software)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate infrastructure for BCH functioning</li> </ul> Baseline: 25,000US\$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate hardware and software for BCH functioning set up in each country</li> </ul> Alternative: 1,275,000US\$	Increment: 1,250,000US\$ GEF: 1,250,000 Co-financing by countries: 0
<b>Project management and coordination</b>	Baseline :0	Alternative: 908,000\$	Increment: 908,000\$ GEF: 808,000\$ Co-financing by countries: 100,000\$

## ANNEX B PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX

*Additional indicators have been elaborated in the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan( in Annex D), to be fine-tuned during the execution of the project.*

Narrative Summary (Intervention Logic)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions & Risks
<b><i>Development Goal</i></b>			
Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol with respect to Article 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity of participating countries to address biosafety issues increased through effective participation in the biosafety clearing house by:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased exchange of information through the BCH</li> <li>- Increased capacity of participating countries to implement the CPB.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• % of participating countries that comply with the requirements of the CP with respect to information required for the BCH</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Logs of use and access of the BCH</li> <li>• Increase of information usage through case studies and BCH logs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parties maintain interest in utilizing the BCH</li> <li>• The issue of financial sustainability could pose a risk to the project</li> <li>• Political and economic stability in the countries involved</li> </ul>
<b><i>Project Purpose/Immediate Objective</i></b>			
Support the creation and/or strengthening of national capacity in order to enable the participating countries to fully take part and benefit from the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH), as established under Article 20 of the Biosafety Protocol	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of decisions by all countries on transboundary movement of LMOs that are based on information from the BCH</li> <li>• % of participating countries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BCH logs and records on identity and frequency of user searches</li> <li>• CPB obligated Data of eligible Parties available on BCH within specified time frame</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholders continue to need to use BCH</li> <li>• Quality of the project workshops and support               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Central node of the BCH is adapted in line with the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Narrative Summary (Intervention Logic)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions & Risks
	<p>that use the BCH for making all their decisions on the use of LMOs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of participating countries that routinely (ie for all decisions on LMOs) input and access information on the BCH</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Response from officials to training material measured in workshop evaluations and follow up studies</li> </ul>	<p>needs of countries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Political and economical stability in the countries involved</li> </ul>
<p><b>Outcome One:</b></p> <p><b>Strengthened capacities of potential users of BCH in relevant ministries and other institutions on how to use and access the BCH</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of trained resource people who carry out training programmes in their countries</li> <li>• Minimum of 20 people trained in each participating country to be able to use and access BCH</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of training reports and evaluations</li> <li>• Quarterly reports to UNEP</li> <li>• Pattern and nature of queries to support group after training</li> <li>• Logs of follow up with trainees/trainers on use/access of BCH</li> <li>• BCH logs of use by persons to check on trainee usage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of quality of the project workshops</li> <li>• Drain of qualified personnel out of Biosafety as a result of training</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of participating countries from each region that are able to use training materials from the global project for their national training programmes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports to UNEP on official users and training activities</li> <li>• Logging usage by new trainees of BCH</li> <li>• Surveys of stakeholders on user friendliness and utility of training materials and manuals</li> <li>• Follow up questionnaires prior to project end</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trainers able to use package for national BCH training workshops</li> <li>• Quality of the project workshops</li> <li>• Quality of personnel acting as trainers</li> <li>• Quality of manual and training material to be used by trainers to train new personnel in isolation</li> </ul>

Narrative Summary (Intervention Logic)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions & Risks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of those trained in national training programmes who are able to input and access data on the BCH</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of training reports and evaluations               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly reports to UNEP</li> <li>• Pattern and nature of queries to support group after training</li> <li>• BCH logs on use by trainees to check on usage</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of quality of the project workshops</li> <li>• Drain of qualified personnel out of Biosafety as a result of training</li> <li>• National capability to sustain sufficient capacity of potential trainees and trainers</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of national stakeholder groups in each participating countries able to input and access information on the BCH</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Solicited feedback from key decision makers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Country continues to dedicate resources to Biosafety and follows obligations of CPB</li> <li>• Political support and capital for Biosafety in country builds up on early interest in Biosafety.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of national decisions made by participating countries that are based on information gathered from the BCH</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly Reports of UNEP-GEF NBF Development Project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuity of Political support for informed decision making</li> <li>• Country continues to dedicate resources to Biosafety and follows obligations of CPB</li> </ul>

Narrative Summary (Intervention Logic)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions & Risks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of participating countries that are able to input and access information on the BCH</li> <li>• % of participating countries with operational national BCH that is compatible with the global BCH</li> <li>• % of participating countries that set up national databases that are accessible at the national level and are compatible with the BCH</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNEP Quarterly reports detailing results from National BCH Task Force Teams formation and activity reports</li> <li>• Inventories of appropriate hardware purchased and installed in each country involved</li> <li>• Questionnaires on software filled in by national teams</li> <li>• Records of country problems and solutions in project support team</li> <li>• Necessary data available on BCH with regular updates</li> <li>• BCH records on use of software export facility for storage of data</li> <li>• Specific country survey of users on comfort and acceptability of BCH system</li> <li>• Software usage level in countries tested</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient capability to use and access the BCH created through the capacity building and training courses and follow up support</li> <li>• Guidance on appropriate systems for use of BCH provided</li> <li>• Access to the BCH fast enough to ensure that costs and time spent are at an acceptable level for national use of the BCH.</li> <li>• Alternative systems set up for Parties without adequate Internet access</li> <li>• CBD software allows for recording and monitoring of style and frequency of data entry and use by countries</li> <li>• Confidentiality issues addressed adequately on access to information</li> </ul>

Narrative Summary (Intervention Logic)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions & Risks
<p><b>Outcome Two:</b></p> <p><b>Strengthened national infrastructure in order to be able to actively use and access the BCH</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Numbers of countries that set-up their own BCH under the auspices of the global BCH</li> <li>• % of decisions on transboundary movement of LMOs in each sub-region on which information is available on the BCH</li> <li>• % of countries in each sub region that input and access data on the BCH</li> <li>• % of national information on the BCH that is regularly utilized by other countries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly Reports of the project and workshops</li> <li>• Reports at national level and in external communications</li> <li>• Reports of the workshops and evaluation reports</li> <li>• Solicited feedback from users and information from BCH support group</li> <li>• Records of list server from CBD</li> <li>• Countries logging decisions taken with respect to the introduction of LMOs into the environment onto BCH</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constituencies maintain interest in utilizing the BCH and exchanging information</li> <li>• Number of users stable or increasing despite natural leakage into different sectors</li> <li>• Continued interest in sharing information and networking</li> <li>• Sufficient capability to use the BCH created through the national and sub-regional training courses to make an informed decision</li> </ul>

Narrative Summary (Intervention Logic)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions & Risks
<p><b>Outcome Three:</b></p> <p><b>Strengthened and enhanced exchange of experience within and between participating countries in terms of information flow and exchange of experience on use of BCH</b></p>	<p>National level data on decisions entered on BCH and made available on the national database and accessible via internet.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of quoted use of material from BCH in decisions published in BCH</li> <li>• National BCH portals visible on Internet on 24/7 basis</li> <li>• National data accessible and up to date on BCH via internet</li> <li>• Reports back to UNEP on information collected by country reflected on the national BCH or in global BCH</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to create the national BCH portals improved through training workshops</li> <li>• Confidentiality of data respected</li> <li>• Suitable qualified personnel available to develop, test and use the system</li> <li>• Understanding of the crucial role of BCH and active role of each participating country addressed during training activities</li> <li>• Public is informed of reasons and nature for data in BCH</li> </ul>
	<p>Participating countries make use of BCH by inputting data and accessing information</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey of the information collated by countries on the database</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient capability to use the BCH created through the training courses</li> </ul>
	<p>Increase in the number of BCH users entering data on BCH and other stakeholders using BCH.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BCH logs users and levels of usage</li> <li>• Gross number of hits on BCH through internet</li> <li>• Volume of data entered to BCH</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitable qualified personnel available to develop, test and use the system</li> <li>• System on BCH available to monitor users and usage to levels required</li> </ul>









## ANNEX D- MONITORING & EVALUATION

1. The Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for this FSP has three major goals. The goals are:

***1.1. To capture the lessons learned from the organization of each training session/workshop to continually improve the usefulness of future sessions.***

The organization of each training session/workshop both builds on the experience of previous sessions and poses its own unique set of issues. Monitoring and evaluation of each training session/workshop provides the mechanism for systematically capturing the learning from each event in order to provide the basis for continual improvement in the organization of future training sessions for the next country in the process.

***1.2. To ensure that the use by countries of the BCH is contributing to actual action on the ground, thus having significant impact.***

The project runs the risk of becoming solely a series of training events without its integration into actual on-the-ground impacts. Thus, the M&E plan has been worked out below to monitor the impact the training sessions and use of the BCH have in further follow up of concrete activities that will help address the needs of countries to meet the Cartagena Protocol.

***1.3. To ensure that the choice made by countries on the development of their system and relevant equipment to meet current needs is carried out in a structured way and with appropriate support to that decision-making***

The countries need to set up a system to analyze their current system of IT in relation to use and access of the BCH and then develop an appropriate physical and human network that will allow the required usage of the national BCH and the central portal of the BCH.

2. Some of the baseline data for monitoring against “indicators” has been collected and is already available as result of the questionnaire launched by UNEP-GEF in February 2003, in close collaboration with the CBD Secretariat, in order to 1) determine the state of current access and use of the Biosafety Clearing House in each country, and 2) to further understanding of their urgent needs. Within the Global NBF project and in the BCH project, survey activities are being done in order to establish the baseline for further activity and NBF development. These will be complemented by the status report that each country will provide as part of its justification for project eligibility. Further investigation will be carried out in each individual country when evaluating the options for setting up the national BCH in terms of equipment and the national BCH Task Force will provide hardware and an equipment baseline
3. The components of the proposed M and E plan (key questions, indicators, data sources and frequency of data collection) are detailed in Exhibit 2, while
4. Exhibit 1 shows the code referred to in Exhibit 2 that relate the indicators to the data sources and collection methods. The responsibility for implementing the monitoring and evaluation plan is that of the project management team at UNEP and the responsibility for ensuring that it is implemented rests with the NBF Development Project Steering Committee.

**Exhibit 1** Proposed data sources & data collection methods (in no order of priority) code referred to in Exhibit 2

<b>Code</b>	<b>Data Source</b>	<b>Data Collection Method</b>
1	Project Management Team	Post-Session self-assessment
2	Steering Committee of UNEP-GEF NBF Development Project	Minutes from each annual meeting or intermediary meetings
3	Training Session Participants	Training session self - evaluation questionnaire
4	COP/MOP1 (or other meetings related to the Cartagena Protocol) reports	Document review
5	National focal points, Representatives of Government ministries, agencies, NGOs, Private Sector Associations & CBD Convention Secretariat, Project Management Team & Steering Committee	Questionnaire/selected in-depth interviews
6	Project Management Team quarterly reports to UNEP (and the NBF Project Steering Committee)	Document review
7	BCH Task Force Reports	Document Review
8	Official Inventories of equipment	Document Review

**Exhibit 2** Proposed M & E plan

<b>Key Question</b>	<b>Sub question</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Data Source/ Collection method</b>	<b>Frequency of Collection</b>	
<b>Component A</b>					
<b>Issue: Accountability; Are the training processes and training session objectives being achieved?</b>					
1. Are the individual Sessions contributing to the project process objectives?	1.1 To what degree did each training session assist policymaking & implementation at all levels (International & National)?	1.1.1 # of people involved in policy making or implementation at each level who attended each training session	3	Each Training Session	
		1.1.2 # of participants (1.1) reporting learning new information/view-points from the Training Session	3	Each Training Session	
		1.1.3 # of intended follow-up activities from Training Session reported by participants (1.1 & 1.2)	3	Each Training Session	
		1.1.4 # & type of references to recommendations on BCH Training in MOP reports (or in reports of other meetings related to the BCH)	4	On availability of report	
		1.1.5 # & type of reported uses of BCH outputs (written reports, participant input on return etc.) contributing to policy making & implementation by: National Focal Points, Government ministries/departments, NGOs, Private Sector Associations, & other Convention Secretariats etc.	5	Once (last 6 months of project)	
	1.2. To what degree did the Training Sessions promote complementarity among the sectoral processes relevant to Biodiversity and Biosafety?		1.2.1 # of people attending Sessions from sectors whose primary responsibility is something other than Biosafety related policy-making or implementation of the CPB	3	Each Training Session
			1.2.2 # by categories of planned activities by participants (2.1) for follow-up from Training	3	Each Training Session

Key Question	Sub question	Indicator	Data Source/ Collection method	Frequency of Collection
		Session		
		1.2.3 # & type of reported uses of BCH outputs (written reports, participant input on return etc.) contributing to the promotion of complementarity among sectoral processes relevant to Biodiversity by: National focal points, Government ministries/departments, NGOs, Private Sector Associations, involved in sectors whose primary responsibility is something other than the implementation of the CPB	5	Once (last 6 months of project)
	1.3. To what degree did each Training Session facilitate partnerships within &/or between sectors of society?	1.3.1 # of different institutions engaged as local hosts in Training Sessions	1	End of each series of training sessions
		1.3.2 # of different institutions/organizations from which Workshop trainers were drawn for each Training Session	1	End of each series of training sessions
		1.3.3 # (by categories) of reported partnership intended follow-up action from the Training Sessions cross-tabulated with sector for which participant is associated.	3	Each Training Session
		1.3.4 # & type of reported uses of BCH outputs (written reports, participant input on return etc.) contributing to the promotion of partnerships either within or across sectors by: National focal points, Government ministries/departments, NGOs, Private Sector Associations, other Convention Secretariats involved in sectors whose primary responsibility is something other than the	5	Once (in last 6 months of project)

<b>Key Question</b>	<b>Sub question</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Data Source/ Collection method</b>	<b>Frequency of Collection</b>
		implementation of the CBD		
	1.4. To what degree did each Training Session raise awareness & promote the effective participation of stakeholders in relevant processes?	1.4.1 # of participants at each Session reporting receiving new information/view points	3	Each Training Session
		1.4.2 # of Session participants attending a training session on biosafety for the first time	3	Each Training Session
		1.4.3 # & type of reported use of BCH outputs (written reports, participant input on return etc.) for obtaining new information or promoting participation in relevant processes by: National focal points, Government ministries/departments, NGOs, Private Sector Associations & Convention Secretariats etc.	5	Once (in last 6 months of project)
		1.4.4 # (by categories) of reported intentions of Session participants to participate in relevant processes as a follow-up to a Training Session	3	Each Training Session
2. Were specific objectives for each Training Session clearly defined and to what degree were they achieved for each Training Session?	2.1. Were specific objectives for the Training Session clearly defined and indicators developed for them?	2.1.1 Session objectives and indicators clearly defined by the Project Management Team.	6	End of each series of training sessions
	2.2. To what degree were the specific objectives for each Training Session achieved?	2.2.1 Degree to which Training Session participants report that specific objectives were achieved	3	Each Training Session
		2.2.2 Degree to which the Project Management Team report that specific objectives were	1	End of each series of training sessions

Key Question	Sub question	Indicator	Data Source/ Collection method	Frequency of Collection
		achieved		
		2.2.3 Additional indicators generated specifically for the Training Session objectives		End of each series of training sessions

### Component A

#### **Issue: Improving the Training process & Sessions by monitoring for lessons learned**

3. How can the selection process of the Training session themes & workshops be improved?	3.1 Is the consultation process for the identification of Training Session themes sufficiently broad & selection requirements understood by those consulted?	3.1.1 Project Management Team is receiving more suggestions for Session themes that meet established selection criteria <sup>4</sup> than can be addressed within current resources	3	Evaluation at conclusion of each meeting
	3.2 Do Training Session selection criteria support the Training process mission & objectives?	3.2.1. Confirmation from Project Management Team's regular review of selection criteria to ensure that they support the mission & objectives of the training process of this project	3	Evaluation at conclusion of each meeting
	3.3 Do the selected Session themes meet the established Steering Committee selection criteria?	3.3.1 Sufficient time & information is available for the Steering Committee to make an adequate analysis if recommended Session themes noted in proposal need to be modified to meet participants' needs.	1	Each series of training selection session and at conclusion of meetings
	3.4 Are selected Session themes perceived as relevant by a broad constituency of stakeholders at the national levels and whose work relates to biosafety either directly or indirectly	3.4.1 Comments from # of participants attending the Training Sessions	3	Each Training session
		3.4.2 Training Session attracts participants from	3	Each Training Session

<sup>4</sup> The project proposal lists the themes that the BCH is comprised of, and the themes that subsequently be covered by each training session. However, these may need to be modified or adapted based on the lessons learned from each prior training session held. As such, the M&E plan here refers to selection criteria which will be developed and used if and when the training workshops are found to be inadequate in one or another aspect that has to be added to the subsequent training sessions.

<b>Key Question</b>	<b>Sub question</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Data Source/ Collection method</b>	<b>Frequency of Collection</b>
		broad range of sectors		
		3.4.3 Training Session outputs are used by broad range of individuals & organizations to assist them in policy making & implementation work	3, 4	Each Training Session
4. How can the organizational/planning processes of the Training process & Sessions be improved?	4.1. Are the roles & responsibilities of the Steering Committee, Project Management Team clearly defined & communicated to those who take on the roles	4.1.1 Degree of clarity on roles & responsibilities reported by those taking on the roles	1, 2	Each series of training selection session and at conclusion of each meeting
		4.1.2 Roles & responsibilities are satisfactorily carried out	1,2	Each series of training selection session and at conclusion of each meeting
		4.1.3 Project Management Team reviews adequacy of criteria in light of experience of each Training Session & recommends revisions to Steering Committee where necessary	1, 2	Each Training Session
5. How can improvements be made to the types, quality & distribution of Training Session outputs?	5.1. Are the workshop reports useful to the Training Session participants?	5.1.1 Degree of usefulness of workshop reports reported by participants, workshop trainers, Steering Committee and Project Management Team.	3	Each Training Session
	5.2. Can the workshop outputs be improved?	5.2.1 Evaluative comments from Workshop leaders, participants & other report users	1, 3	Each Training Session
	5.3. Should the Training Session report distribution list be revised (added to or deleted)?	5.3.1 Recommendations from Training Session participants, Workshop leaders, Steering Committee and Project Management Team	1, 2, 3,	Each Training Session
	5.4. What other type(s) of Session outputs would support the Training process objectives?	5.4.1 Recommendations from Training Session participants, Workshop leaders Steering Committee and Project Management Team	1, 3, 4	Each Training Session

Key Question	Sub question	Indicator	Data Source/ Collection method	Frequency of Collection
<b>Component B</b>				
<b>Issue: Ensuring that the choices made on the development of their system is carried out in a structured way and with appropriate support</b>				
6. How can the selection process of the choice of equipment be carried out efficiently?	6.1 Is the consultation process for the identification of different option sufficiently broad & selection requirements understood by those consulted?	6.1.1 Biosafety Task Force prepares reports on decision making process and responds to the suggestions made that meet established selection criteria than can be addressed within current resources	6, 7	Evaluation by Biosafety Task Force and oversight by Project Management Team each quarter
	6.2 Were objective selection criteria, such as from CBD and other sources, used to support the choice of BCH equipment needs & objectives?	6.2.1. Confirmation from Project Management Team's review of BCH Task Force Team reports to ensure that they support the needs & objectives of the individual country circumstances.	6,7	Evaluation by BCH Task Force and oversight by Project Management Team each quarter
	6.3 Is the equipment purchased and inventoried in line with the plans produced and agreed?	6.3.1 Inventories provided of all equipment purchased and cross-referenced to reports of Biosafety Task Force	6,7	Oversight by Project Management Team each quarter
	6.4 Is selected equipment appropriate to needs after purchase?	6.4.1 Comments from BCH users and BCH task Force team members in meeting and in usage	5, 6, 7	Inputs from Questionnaire and reports will help to set up best practice for replicability



**ANNEX E –STAP REVIEW**  
**OF UNEP-GEF PROPOSAL ON BUILDING CAPACITY FOR EFFECTIVE PARTICIPATION IN**  
**THE BIOSAFETY CLEARING HOUSE (BCH) OF THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL**

**1 Introduction**

- 1.1 Considerable resources and effort has already been put into fulfilling the objectives of the GEF's initial strategy to assist countries in the development of their national biosafety framework (NBF) in accordance with their needs taking into consideration regional and sub-regional capabilities. Within the NBF framework further work is needed to establish a structure to access and utilise the biosafety clearing house (BCH) mechanism. This work would involve the evaluation of the needs of the participating countries in order to assist them through training so that they can get maximum benefit from the BCH mechanism. The current proposal is aimed at achieving that objective and follows on from the information gained as a result of the UNEP-GEF questionnaire on BCH launched in February 2003.

In the following, comments are provided as necessary on relevant areas.

**2 Comments**

***2.1 Project design and approach***

- 2.1.1 The project design and approach is appropriate considering that the BCH is an important component of the information sharing aspect of the Cartagena Protocol. The living modified organism (LMO) technology is recent and complex and its understanding requires a certain amount of technical know-how. The national set up in many countries that are not producers of LMOs is likely to have a limited resource in the area of accessing information through the BCH mechanism and would require assistance that this project would initiate.

***2.2 Project's operational strategy and programme priority***

- 2.2.1 The timing of the project is opportune considering the progress on ratification of the Protocol. Now that 50 countries have ratified the Protocol the Protocol will come into force three months later on 11 September 2003. Some of the countries that have ratified the Protocol would benefit considerably from the implementation of this project by gaining a better understanding of the BCH mechanism and more importantly by hands on involvement.

***2.3 The project and its relationship with the GEF, CBD, Cartagena Protocol, COP, and the ICCP***

- 2.3.1 The project fits in well with the overall strategy of capacity building. Timely

access to information on LMOs is crucial to informed decision making and access to information through the BCH will be integral part of that process. In accordance with GEF's initial strategy and the positive response from COP and the ICCP Bureaux the project would assist countries with limited resources to become familiar with the BCH mechanism in order to fulfil their obligation under the Protocol.

#### ***2.4 Assessment of scientific and technical soundness of the project***

2.4.1 The proposed project's inclusion of the capacity building, development of training material, and the provision of support with the computing necessities is soundly based. The project and the proposed workshops will no doubt assist in particular those countries with small economies such as the small island developing states (SIDS) who have very limited technical and human resources. Here a point has to be made with respect to small economies and that is the continuation of the programme established under the proposed project. The project would establish technical ability and human capital through training but there is a danger that at the completion of the project national implications may hinder its sustainability.

#### ***2.5 Assessment of potential improvements to be made for regional and sub-regional cooperation***

2.5.1 So far as I am aware there has been an important consideration of the benefits to be gained from regional and sub-regional cooperation under the UNEP-GEF involvement with the NBF. It is expected that a similar strategy will be used for the proposed BCH training exercises and this would build on the understanding of the participating countries for the benefits to be gained from regional and sub-regional cooperation in respect of the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol. This understanding may also be helpful in other areas of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), such as the effect on biodiversity of alien invasive species.

#### ***2.6 Evaluation of sustainability of the project***

2.6.1 I understand that the risks and sustainability of the project have been identified and recognised. I would like to draw particular attention to the need (already recognised in the project) of retention of capability gained as a result of the involvement with the project. In small economies there may be a temptation to use the people and equipment elsewhere once the obligation under the project is over. On the other hand, people with experience may be tempted by more lucrative conditions and move on. There are no easy answers or remedies for this but it is useful to make the participants aware of this issue so that they can take appropriate measures to ensure continuity according to their own circumstances.

2.6.2 In terms of the equipment to be used in respect of this project it would be worthwhile to consider the compatibility with existing equipment/systems that is available and in use.

2.6.3 The importance of evaluation of the workshops is recognised in the project and this

is important to build on the experience gained from the first exercise so that the following exercises can benefit from the experience.

## ***2.7 Assessment of the efficacy of capacity-building aspects***

2.7.1 The proposed programme for capacity building on the BCH mechanism will be effective taking into account the recognition of involving experienced resource people on a consistent basis. There is no substitute for experience and therefore retention of experienced people within the national framework as also noted above cannot be over emphasised.

## ***2.8 Assessment of the efficacy of the monitoring mechanisms***

2.8.1 I am aware that the current proposed project is an addition to the global project on the development of NBF. Monitoring and evaluation of any activity requires careful thinking and commitment. The project is likely to benefit from instituting a process by which reports on a pre-established parameters are submitted by participants on an agreed timeframe, on a quarterly or half-yearly basis. The project has addressed this issue and can be implemented on a case-by-case basis. An important consideration is that any issues arising are addressed in a timely manner.

## ***2.9 Evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of the project***

2.9.1 Cost effectiveness of the project needs to be looked at in the global context of information sharing under the BCH umbrella. Ineffective mechanism of information sharing is likely to contribute to confusion in the developing countries with limited means of obtaining the relevant information on transboundary movement of LMOs. The BCH would be a reliable source of information for all concerned as the same information will be available to all. This is likely to contribute to common understanding globally. For this reason the proposed cost of the project from the perspective of countries with small economies seems worthwhile.

## ***2.10 Usefulness of the project outputs***

2.10.1 The overall NBF system with the added BCH component is likely to add to realising global benefits arising from an informed and adequately equipped framework for the implementation of the objectives of the Cartagena Protocol. No drawbacks as a result of the proposed project are recognised.

## ***2.11 Advise on the ways and means to enhance the scientific and technical capacity of the participating countries in terms of improving BCH usage***

2.11.1 Retention of adequately trained and knowledgeable staff and the maintenance of physical resources are seen as important components of ensuring continuity of BCH usage to maximum benefit. In this regard regional and sub-regional cooperation and linkages could play an important role and these should be encouraged and

supported.

- 2.11.2 There is a need for monitoring and reporting on the retention and continuation of the experience and expertise gained through the project after it has completed so that the benefits gained can be continued and enhanced.

### **3 Additional comments**

- 3.1 There is inconsistency of 1% in percentages mentioned in section 7.6 of the "Project Description" and in paragraph 25 of the heading "Costs in total".
- 3.2 In the section on "Additional cost matrix" on page 27, second column, third bullet point in first row, it is to be recognised that for some developing countries risk assessment of LMOs will be difficult. Consequently, they may have to rely on the information provided, as well as information through the BCH and through regional and sub-regional linkages. The same matrix on page 30 notes that a body of 20 to 25 people will be trained in each participating country to be able to use and access BCH. It is to be recognised that each and every participating country may not have an adequate pool of people and therefore the actual numbers intended may be low, not because of the desire but because of limitation of available human resource. In such an event the proportion of the population that can be trained is likely to have a proportionally better involvement.
- 3.3 In "Exhibit 2 Proposed M&E plan", page 17, second column, item 1.2, please consider adding the words "and biosafety" after the word "Biodiversity"

### **4 Conclusion**

- 4.1 In Summary, the project would build on the other complementary projects already underway with respect to building NBF. Continuity of the framework after this project expires is to be considered. There are two main elements to this, equipment and human resource. Maintenance of equipment and its continued operation would require technical support whereas maintenance of persons familiar with the technical components of the BCH will be essential. This technical aspect does not end at computing technology but also extends to genetic technology where familiarity with the technological terms and processes will be required to understand information about a particular LMO. This information at times can have subtle differences in terms of host, donor, vector, and marker systems used in a particular line/event of an LMO.
- 4.2 The overall objective of the project is achievable provided participating countries show commitment to gain, improve, and maintain physical and human resources.
- 4.3 To conclude, the proposed project would contribute to the development of a

framework that will assist in accessing scientific and technical information in a timely manner through the BCH mechanism. The project would have global benefits and no identifiable drawbacks and it would contribute to the development of the overall NBF. Involvement with the BCH mechanism is likely to contribute to the regional and sub-regional cooperation and thereby adding to global benefits and sustainability of the project as well as the effective implementation of the Cartagena Protocol.

Abdul Moeed  
Wellington, New Zealand  
16 June 2003

## ANNEX F - UNEP RESPONSE TO THE STAP REVIEW

1. The STAP Technical Review considered that:
  - a) *The project design and approach is appropriate considering that the BCH is an important component of the information sharing aspect of the Cartagena Protocol*
  - b) *The timing of the project is opportune considering the progress on ratification of the Protocol*
  - c) *The project fits in well with the overall strategy of capacity building. Timely access to information on LMOs is crucial to informed decision making and access to information through the BCH will be an integral part of that process*
  - d) *The project's design of capacity building, development of training material, and the provision of support of hardware and equipment is soundly based*
  
2. The STAP concerns relate mainly to the future and sustainability of the project activities. UNEP appreciates the constructive nature of the suggestions for clarification, refinement and improvement. Comments have all been noted and are addressed here below. They will be fully taken into account during the development of the project and have been incorporated in the revised version of the project.

### STAP Reviewer's comments on specific issues

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>
<p><i>2.4 Assessment of scientific and technical soundness of the project</i></p> <p><b>Here a point has to be made with respect to small economies and that is the continuation of the programme established under the proposed project. The project would establish technical ability and human capital through training but there is a danger that at the completion of the project national implications may hinder its sustainability</b></p>	<p>This important issue is addressed at page 12, para 5.4 of the project proposal, where it is mentioned that “once the project is completed, a country must also ensure that there is an efficient Internet service on the BCH and that the costs of it are kept at a minimum level”. This issue was also raised in para 3.14 in the context of the importance of governments assuming responsibilities and obligation as Parties to the Protocol. In fact, the requirements for building in financial sustainability extend far beyond the BCH requirements and are also covered under the UNEP-GEF Global Development Project. When the Protocol comes into effect, political support and internalization of the need for a fully functioning BCH and of the obligations on Parties will attempt to address this risk adequately.</p>

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>
<p data-bbox="233 300 800 359"><i>2.5 Assessment of potential improvements to be made for regional and sub-regional cooperation</i></p> <p data-bbox="233 392 800 695"><b>2.5.1 There has been an important consideration of the benefits to be gained from regional and sub-regional cooperation under the UNEP-GEF involvement with the NBF. It is expected that a similar strategy will be used for the proposed BCH training exercises and this would build on the understanding of the participating countries for the benefits to be gained from regional and sub-regional cooperation in respect of the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol.</b></p> <p data-bbox="233 753 800 812">See also the UNEP response in light of reviewer's comments in section 2.11</p> <p data-bbox="233 846 800 1089"><b>2.11.1 Retention of adequately trained and knowledgeable staff and the maintenance of physical resources are seen as important components of ensuring continuity of BCH usage to maximum benefit. In this regard regional and sub-regional cooperation and linkages could play an important role and these should be encouraged and supported.</b></p>	<p data-bbox="821 392 1388 602">UNEP fully agrees with the STAP review on promoting regional and sub-regional cooperation. This request is also in line with priorities identified by the National Governments during the development phase. In this respect, the proposal has indeed foreseen to carry out a similar strategy through the following activities (page 11):</p> <ul data-bbox="837 636 1388 1459" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="837 636 1388 846">• Orientation/training workshops (see para 3.2) to train the Governmental nominees and regional experts to carry out training at national level will also support the cause of regional and sub-regional cooperation, which UNEP agrees is essential for full implementation of the Protocol in developing countries.</li> <li data-bbox="837 852 1388 1213">• We see the need to encourage the exchange of peer-to-peer experience, lessons learned and best practice as well as facilitating the collaboration between the participating countries and developed countries. (See para 3.5) A campaign will be run to set up a supportive network among BCH operatives with similar challenges to face so that they can learn with and from each other as well as from external professionals. This process will be assisted by the presence of a dedicated list-server that the CBD Secretariat will run.</li> <li data-bbox="837 1220 1388 1459">• In conjunction with forthcoming sub-regional workshops of the NBF Development Project in late 2003 and early 2004, a specific training session will be dedicated to the central BCH structure, functioning, management, use and interaction with the Parties. This will support the same cause of cooperation at an appropriate sub-regional level.</li> </ul>

<p><b>2.6 Evaluation of sustainability of the project</b></p> <p><b>2.6.1 I understand that the risks and sustainability of the project have been identified and recognised. I would like to draw particular attention to the need (already recognised in the project) of retention of capability gained as a result of the involvement with the project. In small economies there may be a temptation to use the people and equipment elsewhere once the obligation under the project is over. On the other hand, people with experience may be tempted by more lucrative conditions and move on. There are no easy answers or remedies for this but it is useful to make the participants aware of this issue so that they can take appropriate measures to ensure continuity according to their own circumstances.</b></p> <p><b>2.6.2 In terms of the equipment to be used in respect of this project it would be worthwhile to consider the compatibility with existing equipment/systems that is available and in use.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This issue is addressed under Section 5 Sustainability and Risks, para 5.5 on Loss of experienced staff. It is generally well understood that the area of IT and computing are growth industries in most countries and so any training provided to competent stakeholders can lead them to re-evaluate their positions and seek other opportunities that take them away from working on the BCH. It would therefore be very useful that the active support system should be there to help countries cope with high turn over in the 3 years so that countries can continue to manage the BCH despite predicted turnover. After such an initial period, countries should be able to set up coping mechanisms that are sustainable, but some disturbance is likely in the early years.</li> <li>• The monitoring and evaluation plan allows for a review of the number of trained personnel in post and opens up the possibility of the government taking preventive measures if the drain is excessive, while the training materials should allow for new recruits to take up the BCH duties easily.</li> <li>• In this respect, a questionnaire was sent out in February 2003 by UNEP to all Parties to the CBD on their use of the BCH in order to provide baseline information for designing this project and providing key data on use of the BCH This can provide limited information on existing equipment for responding countries</li> <li>• The compatibility of the equipment needs to be investigated as part of the mandate of the BCH Task Force and results factored into the choice of the national BCH that is actually developed</li> <li>• Within the Global NBF project and in the BCH project, survey activities need to be done in order to establish the baseline for further activity and NBF development. These will be complemented by the status report that each country will provide as part of its justification for project eligibility.</li> <li>• Further investigation will be carried out by BCH task Force in each individual country when evaluating the options for setting up the national BCH in terms of equipment. Such investigation will provide hardware and equipment baseline.</li> </ul>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p><b>2.6.3 The importance of evaluation of the workshops is recognised in the project and this is important to build on the experience gained from the first exercise so that the following exercises can benefit from the experience.</b></p>	<p>See Goal 1, particularly, of Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Plan in Annex D and related activities.</p>
<p><i>2.7 Assessment of the efficacy of capacity-building aspects</i></p> <p><b>2.7.1 The proposed programme for capacity building on the BCH mechanism will be effective taking into account the recognition of involving experienced resource people on a consistent basis. There is no substitute for experience and therefore retention of experienced people within the national framework as also noted above cannot be over emphasised.</b></p>	<p>See answer to reviewer's point <b>2.6 on Evaluation of sustainability of the project.</b></p>

<p><i>2.8 Assessment of the efficacy of the monitoring mechanisms</i></p> <p><b>2.8.1 I am aware that the current proposed project is an addition to the global project on the development of NBF. Monitoring and evaluation of any activity requires careful thinking and commitment. The project is likely to benefit from instituting a process by which reports on a pre-established parameters are submitted by participants on an agreed timeframe, on a quarterly or half-yearly basis. The project has addressed this issue and can be implemented on a case-by-case basis. An important consideration is that any issues arising are addressed in a timely manner.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In order to address any new issue arising during the development of the project in a timely fashion, a specific monitoring and evaluation plan, additional to the one already in place for the UNEP/GEF Global Project for the Development of National Biosafety Frameworks, has been annexed to the project proposal.</li> </ul>
<p><i>2.11 Advise on the ways and means to enhance the scientific and technical capacity of the participating countries in terms of improving BCH usage</i></p> <p><b>2.11.1 Retention of adequately trained and knowledgeable staff and the maintenance of physical resources are seen as important components of ensuring continuity of BCH usage to maximum benefit. In this regard regional and sub-regional cooperation and linkages could play an important role and these should be encouraged and supported.</b></p> <p><b>2.11.2 There is a need for monitoring and reporting on the retention and continuation of the experience and expertise gained through the project after it has completed so that the benefits gained can be continued and enhanced.</b></p>	<p>Please see combined response on issues relating to regional and sub-regional cooperation performed under section 2.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A questionnaire under the M&amp;E plan in the final six months is planned in order to address this issue. Most project activities are completed within first two years and final year is to be used for review, monitoring and assistance to trainees.</li> <li>• Furthermore, at page 14, under Project Implementation and Management, it is mentioned that ‘a number of project activities will be concentrated in the first two years, but a focus on learning from lessons and from review and an intensive and continuing support to stakeholders will be necessary to ensure that the number of confident and active BCH users participants and trainers is maintained at acceptable levels in the country. Thus, it can be said that the final year will involve technical assistance to all participants who have benefited from the training workshops to ensure that they do indeed utilize the knowledge gained in their day-to-</li> </ul>

	<p>day planning and decision making related to biosafety. The continuing support will also be critical in maintaining an adequate number of trained users, considering the perceived risk of losing trained staff in the short and medium term'.</p>
<p><b>3. Additional comments</b></p> <p><b>3.1 There is inconsistency of 1% in percentages mentioned in section 7.6 of the "Project Description" and in paragraph 25 of the heading "Costs in total".</b></p> <p><b>3.2 In the section on "Additional cost matrix" on page 27, second column, third bullet point in first row, it is to be recognised that for some developing countries risk assessment of LMOs will be difficult. Consequently, they may have to rely on the information provided, as well as information through the BCH and through regional and sub-regional linkages. The same matrix on page 30 notes that a body of 20 to 25 people will be trained in each participating country to be able to use and access BCH. It is to be recognised that each and every participating country may not have an adequate pool of people and therefore the actual numbers intended may be low, not because of the desire but because of limitation of available human resource. In such an event the proportion of the population that can be trained is likely to have a proportionally better involvement.</b></p> <p><b>3.3 "Exhibit 2 Proposed M&amp;E plan", page 17, second column, item 1.2, please consider adding the words "and biosafety" after the word "Biodiversity"</b></p>	<p>The inconsistency has been rectified and the percentage in section 7.6. is reported in line with para 21 of the Incremental Cost Analysis.</p> <p>It is understood that some countries will have fewer resources and fewer people than others and so the figures provided represent target figures across the countries as a basis of calculation. However, decisions will have to be taken on a country-by-country basis in close collaboration with the national BCH task force.</p> <p>Biosafety has been added as suggested.</p>