PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF)

PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project
TYPE OF TRUST FUND:NPIF

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title:	Ratification and Implementatio of the Nagoya Protocol in the countries of Pacific.		
Country(ies):	Cook Islands, Fiji, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu. Minus Cooks & Fiji (FSM & RMI)	GEF Project ID:[1]	
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Other Executing Partner(s):	SPREP	Submission Date:	
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration (Months)	24 months
Name of parent program (if applicable): • For SFM/REDD+ ☐ • For SGP ☐ • For PPP ☐		Project Agency Fee ($):	

A. INDICATIVE FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK[2]:

Focal Area Objectives	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount ($)	Indicative Co-financing ($)
(select) BD-5	NPIF	2,000,000	tbc
(select) (select)	(select)		
(select) (select)	(select)		
(select) (select)	(select)		
(select) (select)	(select)		
(select) (select)	(select)		
(select) (select)	(select)		
(select) (select)	(select)		
(select) (select)	(select)		
Total Project Cost		2,000,000	0

B. INDICATIVE PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Project Objective: The ratificatation of the Nagoya Protocol and implementation of key measures to make the protocol operational in the Pacific Island Countries

Project Component	Grant Type[3]	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount ($)	Indicative Cofinancing ($)
1. Ratification of the Nagoya Protocol	TA	National authorities to take informed decisions on the ratification of the protocol and future implementation.	1.1.1.Scoping study of the existing laws and regulation related to ABS	NPIF	100,000	
	(select)		1.1.2. Analysis of the implicaions of	NPIF	150,000	

[1] Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.
[2] Refer to the reference attached on the Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework when completing Table A.
[3] TA includes capacity building, and research and development.

			ratification of the protocol.			
	(select)		1.1.3. Draft document for ratification by the laegislatire or relevant authority	NPIF	50,000	
	(select)		1.1.4. Public awareness among parlamentarians and other decisions mekers	NPIF	150,000	
2. Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol establishing an enabling environment for the implementation of basic provisions of the NP	(select)	An enabling environment is created which will lead to the implementation of the basic provisions of the NP	2.1.1. Stocktaking and assessment of capacities and systems to implement basic provisions of the NP	NPIF	150,000	
	(select)		2.1.3. Building capacity among stakeholders with particular emphasis in the Government agencies in charge of making the protocol operational.	NPIF	300,000	
	(select)		2.1..2. Strategy and action plan for the implementation of ABS measures	NPIF	360,000	
3. Regional coordination, technical support and capacity development	(select)	3.1. Countries share information and gain from the experiences of the other members of the Commision. Countries are capable of meeting basic provisions of the NP 3.2 Effective management and delivery of projects meeting agreed measurable outputs and indicators	3.1.1. Two regional meetings completed at the beginning and end of the project (inception and training in the first meeting for focal points) Second meeting for reviewing progress and planning future activities 3.2.1 Technical support provided to the project including monitoring, evaluation and all reporting including financial	NPIF	200,000 240,000	
	(select)			(select)		
			Subtotal		1,700,000	
			Project Management Cost (PMC)[4]	NPIF	170,000	
			Total Project Cost		1,870,000	0

[4] To be calculated as percent of subtotal.

C. INDICATIVE CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME IF AVAILABLE, ($)

Sources of Cofinancing	Name of Cofinancier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount ($)
National Government	Cook Islands	In kind	10,000
National Government	Fiji	In kind	10,000
National Government	Marshall Islands	In kind	10,000
National Government	Micronesia	In kind	10,000
National Government	Nauru	In kind	10,000
National Government	Niue	In kind	10,000
National Government	Palau	In kind	10,000
National Government	New Guinea	In kind	10,000
National Government	Samoa	In kind	10,000
National Government	Solomon Islands	In kind	10,000
National Government	Tonga	In kind	10,000
National Government	Tuvalu	In kind	10,000
National Government	Vanuatu	In kind	10,000
SPREP		In kind	150,000
Total Cofinancing			280,000

D. INDICATIVE TRUST FUND RESOURCES ($) REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY[1]

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/Global	Grant Amount ($) (a)	Agency Fee ($) (b)[2]	Total ($) c=a+b
UNEP	NPIF	Biodiversity	Global	1,700,000	170,000	1,870,000
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
Total Grant Resources				1,700,000	170,000	1,870,000

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

[2] Indicate fees related to this project.

E. PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG)[5]

Please check on the appropriate box for PPG as needed for the project according to the GEF Project Grant:

	Amount Requested ($)	Agency Fee for PPG ($)[6]
• No PPG required.	-- 0--	--0--
• (upto) $50k for projects up to & including $1 million		
• (upto)$100k for projects up to & including $3 million	100,000	10,000
• (upto)$150k for projects up to & including $6 million		
• (upto)$200k for projects up to & including $10 million		
• (upto)$300k for projects above $10 million		

PPG AMOUNT REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES) FOR MFA AND/OR MTF ROJECT ONLY

[5] On an exceptional basis, PPG amount may differ upon detailed discussion and justification with the GEFSEC.

[6] PPG fee percentage follows the percentage of the GEF Project Grant amount requested.

Trust Fund	GEF Agency	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in $)		
				PPG (a)	**Agency Fee** (b)	**Total** c = a + b
NPIF	UNEP	Biodiversity		100,000	10,000	110,000
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
Total PPG Amount				**100,000**	**10,000**	**110,000**

MFA: Multi-focal area projects; MTF: Multi-Trust Fund projects

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION[7]

Project Overview

A.1. Project Description. Briefly describe the project, including ; 1) the global environmental problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed; 2) the baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects, 3) the proposed alternative scenario, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project, 4) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline , the GEFTF, LDCF/SCCF and co-financing; 5) global environmental benefits (GEFTF, NPIF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF); 6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

1) Global environmental problems, root causes and barriers:
The Pacific Islands region, as defined by the island nations and territories of SPREP, covers 90 million sq km and is ecologically one of the richest on earth, with habitats ranging from mountain forest ecosystems to volcanic islands and low lying coral atolls. Amazingly, land makes up less than 1 percent of this region[8].

The huge expanse of ocean supports the most extensive and diverse coral reefs in the world, the largest tuna fishery, the deepest oceanic trenches and the healthiest and in some cases, largest remaining populations of many globally rare and threatened species including whales, sea turtles, dugongs and saltwater crocodiles.

The Pacific is home to a high proportion of endemic and threatened flora and fauna - some of the highest percentages of endemic species per capita in the world can be found in this region[9]. Many of these endemic and threatened species are of material resource or spiritual and cultural significance to Pacific people.

However, Pacific Island biodiversity is under intense pressure from natural and human-induced disturbance. These threats are interrelated by common causal factors and often having exacerbating combined impacts. The major threats are mostly human-induced and include habitat alteration and loss, invasive alien species, over-harvesting of terrestrial and marine natural resources, land degradation from damaging agricultural techniques, and poor waste management and pollution control. The long-term impacts of global climate change are anticipated to become increasingly significant, potentially amplifying existing vulnerabilities. The Pacific Region also frequently faces direct impacts from extreme natural events such as cyclones, drought, and fire. Furthermore, the small size and isolated nature of our islands makes them extremely vulnerable to these threats.

[7] Part II should not be longer than 5 pages.
[8] Source: Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme.
[9] Ecosystem Profile: Polynesia-Micronesia Biodiversity Hotspot – May 2007 - http://www.sprep.org/attachments/PacificRegion_47.pdf

A number of key barriers have impeded progress on access and benefit sharing in the Pacific. Although all Pacific Island Counties have however, enacted legislation for the protection of their environment and biodiversity, as well as laws governing forestry, land use and protected areas, there is still a lack of efficient institutional and legal arrangements at the national level to protect the environment, ensure sustainable development and provide the basis for the implementation of basic provisions of the Nagoya Protocol. Furthermore, there is lack of capacities (institutional, systemic and individual) within government, local communities and among all key stakeholders on access and benefit sharing. There is also lack of awareness of issues concerning access and benefit sharing which often result in ad hoc actions taken as well as lack of support to implement strategies and priority activities to ensure issues concerning access and benefit sharing are adequately addressed at all levels.

Growing populations lead to over-exploitation of marine resources and increased land clearance for staple crops. External demand for commodities such as coffee, palm oil or exotic timbers likewise leads to large-scale conversion of village lands for agricultural, horticultural or forestry purposes. This utilitarian outlook outpaces biodiversity conservation as the commercial value of this diversity is unknown and there is little demand for it as such. Few countries, perhaps 2 or 3, have policies which support research into and utilisation of genetic resources and consequently there is little or no development or opportunity for growth of this activity in most countries in the region.

2) Baseline scenario: In the Pacific Region there have been several efforts, nationally and regionally, both internally and externally driven, to advance an understanding of the role of customary law and practice and of matters concerning access to genetic resources and benefit sharing. Over the past decade, regional initiatives have been led by the Pacific Island Forum Secretariat (PIFS), the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), the Secretariat for the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), indigenous groups and regional non-governmental organizations such as the World Wide Fund for Nature – South Pacific Programme (WWF-SPP). Due mainly to their size, countries in the region have limited resources for developing effective ABS measures. They do however have a great deal of cultural, social, environmental and economic similarities. Given this, there are significant potential benefits to be gained from sharing experiences and ultimately developing a regional approach to regulating access to and use of their genetic resources and traditional knowledge.

All Pacific island countries are able to ratify the Nagoya Protocol without needing to have legislation or other measures or structures in place and in fact ratifications are routinely carried out in this way
Based on the information compiled during the “Pacific ABS Workshop” held in Nadi, March 2012, and other documents cited below, this is the state of the art in each of the 14 participating countries:

Cook Islands: According to the “Cook Islands Thematic Assestment Report” of 2007 (The National Capacity Self Assestment for Glogal Environemnt Management), “currently, there are no suitable arrangements for the effective management of ABS in the Cook Islands including lack of legislation, policies, institutional structures and management systems such as a system of prior informed consent. Little is known about research activities that access biological resources after they have received their research approval and there is limited capacity to monitor these activities in country. There is no means of enforcement of the requirements of the approval permit, especially once the researchers have left the country. Overall there is a general lack of capacity for the implementation of Access and Benefit Sharing in the Cook Islands”.

Federated States of Micronesia (FSM): Ratified the Nagoya Protocol but do not have specific implementing legislation at either the federal or State level.

Fiji: Has ratified theh Nagoya Protocol. In 1997, Fiji developed an ad-hoc ABS policy which is consistent with the Convention on Biological Diversity. This ad-hoc policy was used to facilitate access to the ICBG to Fiji's genetic resources and it is expected that this policy is be the foundation for a future formal ABS legislation in the country. Fiji has a MSP funded by the NPIF. This project will assist the country advancing the ABS agenda as well as undertraining actual agreements on genetic resources between users and providers.

Kiribati Does not have specific ABS legislation but as with most other Pacific island countries there are provisions in other laws which might be utilised to give effect to some facets of ABS.

Marshall Islands: "The National Capacity Self Assestment" has not been carried out. Human resources (including dedicated staff to address ABS matters) and infrastructure for National Implementation is very limited. Domestic regulatory framework, institutional arrengments and administrative systems need to be developed and implemented. By-in and participation of government stakeholders (including parlamentariats) is limited.

Nauru: "The National Capacity Self Assestment" has not been carried out. Domestic regulatory framework and institutional arrengments need to be developed and implemented. By-in and participation of government stakeholders (including parlamentariats) is limited.

Niue: "The National Capacity Self Assestment" has not been carried out. Domestic regulatory framework, institutional arrengments and administrative systems need to be developed and implemented. By-in and participation of government stakeholders (including parlamentariats) is limited.

Palau: In the "National Capacity Self Assestment" there is reference to ABS: "No legislative policy or administrative measures to facilitate ABS in the use of genetic resources as well as lack of ABS negotiation skills. Lack of national capacity to implement a regulatory regime on ABS". The same assestment suggest to "develop legislative policy or administrative measures to facilitate access and benefit sharing (ABS) in the use of genetic resources as well as lack of ABS negotiation skills", and "Develop national capacity to implement a regulatory regime on ABS". Human resources (including dedicated staff to address ABS matters) and infrastructure for National Implementation is very limited. Domestic regulatory framework, institutional arrengments and administrative systems need to be developed and implemented. By-in and participation of government stakeholders (including parlamentariats) is limited.

Papua New Guinea: "The National Capacity Self Assestment" has not been carried out. Domestic regulatory framework, institutional arrengments and administrative systems need to be developed and implemented. By-in and participation of government stakeholders (including parlamentariats) is limited.
Samoa: Samoa has a draft legislation on ABS. Nevertheless, human resources (including dedicated staff to address ABS matters) and infrastructure for National Implementation is very limited. By-in and participation of government stakeholders (including parlamentariats) is limited.

Solomon Islands: "The National Capacity Self Assestment" has not been carried out. Domestic regulatory framework, institutional arrengments and administrative systems need to be developed and implemented. By-in and participation of government stakeholders (including parlamentariats) is limited.

Tonga: In the draft Action Plan, there is reference to Abs bu t no developments. Domestic regulatory framework, institutional arrengments and administrative systems need to be developed and implemented. By-in and participation of government stakeholders (including parlamentariats) is limited.

Tuvalu: "The National Capacity Self Assestment" has not been carried out. Domestic regulatory framework, institutional arrengments and administrative systems need to be developed and implemented. By-in and participation of government stakeholders (including parlamentariats) is limited.

Vanuatu: "The National Capacity Self Assestment" has not been carried out. Domestic regulatory framework, institutional arrengments and administrative systems need to be developed and implemented. By-in and participation of government stakeholders (including parlamentariats) is limited.

3) Alternative scenario: The overall goal of the project is to support countries ratifying the Nagoya Protocol and take the first steps in implementation. The project will assist in the development of regulatory frameworks for ABS, building capacity for its implementation, and sharing the experiences from these countries to catalyse similar processes in the region. This goal will require developing appropriate capacities and measures for regulating access to genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge, and creating the conditions for equitable sharing of benefits with the communities sourcing the genetic.

This project has the following components:

Component 1: Ratification of the Nagoya Protocol. The objective of this component is that the 14 participating countries ratify the Nagoya Protocol. This protocol will only enter into force when at least 50 countries deposit the instrument of ratification. As of today (3-25-13) only 14 countries have ratified. In order to achieve this objective, each country will need to take the necessary steps for the legislature (or whatever government branch responsible for ratifying international treaties), to ratify the protocol. Some countries would be in position to ratify faster than others, because they do not need to develop the complete legal and regulatory framework in order to present the case to the responsible government institution. Only two countries have ratified the protocol: Fiji (October 24, 2012) and Micronesia (January 30, 2013). Marshall Islands, and Solomon Islands provided letters of endorsement for the Medium Size Project on Ratification, suggesting they could ratify the NP shortly but the advantage of participating in this Regional Project will be explained to them.

Component 2. Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol. The objective of this component is to implement the basic measures of the Nagoya Protocol. These include drafting the policy, legal, and regulatory frameworks governing ABS, appointing the National Focal Point, establishing the Competent National Authority and Institutional agreements and administrative procedures for ABS Agreements with proper Prior Informed Consent [PIC], Mutually Agreed Terms [MAT], and Benefit Sharing, monitoring of use of genetic resources, compliance with legislation and cooperation on trans-boundary issues). Considering the differences in government capacity and needs on ABS, it is expected that countries will achieve different levels of implementation of the protocol. Countries will consider building capacity among stakeholders (including indigenous peoples, local communities) to negotiate ABS agreements, including domestic protocols, model contractual clauses, and minimum requirements to secure the fair and equitable sharing of benefits. Advanced countries may want to invest some of the NPIF resources to strengthen institutional capacity to carry out research and development associated with the valorization of genetic resources (bio-prospecting).

Component 3. Regional coordination. The objective of this component is to bring together the participating countries at least twice during the life of the project. These meeting should allow the Agency and the Executing partners to better coordinate action and use of the human capacity to deliver assistance to the countries and hopefully come together with a united front on ABS related issues. A regional declaration on ABS could be considered. SPREP will provide technical support for the project

plus funds management, monitoring, evaluation and all reporting including financial

4) Incremental reasoning: This project will build on the activities that are currently underway in support of the Nagoya Protocol in the Pacific. These include: i) the existing NPIF project in Fiji where resource are being used to discover nature-based products and build national capacities that facilitate technology transfer on mutually agreed terms, private sector engagement, and investments in the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources, ii) the political will leading to the ratification of the NP by Fiji and Micronesia, iii) the exploratory work by the ABS Capacity Development Initiative to support ABS activities in Micronesia, iii) the lessons learned at "The South Pacific Access and Benefit Sharing Workshop" in Nadi, Fiji, 19-22 March 2012. The Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) hosted the workshop, in partnership with the ABS Capacity Development Initiative (EU/GIZ) and AusAID.

5) Global Environmental Benefits: The full implementation of the measures of the Nagoya protocol will allow the participating countries, to engage "users" of genetic resources suing a different "business model". From this point onwards, the participating countries would be in position to engage with user countries using ABS agreements

6) Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up: Because this is a capacity building project, the issues of innovation and the potential of scaling up are of lesser importance that the issue of sustainability. The participating countries would need to fully engage in building the human and institutional capacity to carry on the work beyond the life of this project. That could be archived by Central Governments to fully develop and put in practice the legal framework, and determine the institutional arrangements and administrative measure to be in position to process requests to access genetic resources under the principles of the Nagoya Protocol. During project preparation , each and all of the participating countries, would provide detailed information on the Government's plans to sustain the efforts initiated with this project.

A.2.Stakeholders. Identify key stakeholders (including civil society organizations, indigenous people, gender groups, and others as relevant) and describe how they will be engaged in project preparation:

COUNTRY	**INSTITUTION**	**ROLE**
SPREP	The Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP). PO Box 3372, Apia, Samoa Ph: +685 21929 Fax: +685 20231 Email: registry@sprep.org	SPREP will be the executing agency. In addition to running the project on the ground, SPREP will be in charge of carrying-out the regional activities as describes in Component 3. SPREP will be accountable to UNEP, the GEF Agency
Cook Island	Mr Vaitoti Tupa Director National Environment Service PO Box 371 RAROTONGA Cook Islands Telephone: (682) 21 256 Fax: (682) 22 256 Email: vaitoti@environment.org.ck Vaitoti@oyster.net.ck	

FSM	Hon. Andrew Yatilman Director & Technical Focal Point Office of Environment and Emergency Management PS-69, Palikir, Pohnpei Federated States of Micronesia 96941 Telephone: (691) 320 8814/8815 Fax: (691) 320 8936 Email: andrewy@mail.fm climate@mail.fm	
Fiji	Mr Jope Davetanivalu Director Department of Environment PO Box 2109 Government Buildings SUVA, Fiji Telephone: (679) 3311 699 Fax: (679) 3312 879 Email: JDavetanivalu@environment.gov.fj JDavetanivalu@govnet.gov.fj Davetanivalu@gmail.com	
Kiribati	Mrs Nenenteiti Teariki Officer in Charge Environment & Conservation Division Ministry of Environment, Lands & Agriculture Development PO Box 234 Bikenibeu, Tarawa Kiribati Telephone: (686) 28211/28507/28647 Fax: (686) 28334 Email: nenenteitir@environment.gov.ki	
Marshall Is	Mr Bruce Kijiner Director Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination (OEPPC) PO Box 975 MAJURO 96960 Republic of the Marshall Islands Telephone: (692) 625 7944/7945 Fax: (692) 625 7918 Email: kijinerb@gmail.com bruce.kijiner@ntamar.net	

Nauru	Mr Russ Kun Permanent Secretary for Commerce, Industry & Environment Department of Commerce, Industry & Environment Republic of Nauru Central Pacific Telephone: (674) 5573042 Email: secretary.cie@naurugov.nr	
Niue	Mr Sauni Tongatule Director for Environment Department of Environment PO Box 80, ALOFI, Niue Telephone: (683) 4021 Fax: (683) 4391 Email: sauni.tongatule@mail.gov.nu	
Papau New Guinea	Mr. Gunther Joku Acting Secretary Department of Environment & Conservation PO Box 6601 BOROKO, NCD, Papua New Guinea Telephone: (675) 325 0180 Fax: (675) 325 0182 Email: guntherjoku@yahoo.com	
Palau	Ms Charlene Mersai National Environmental Planner Office of Environmental Response and Coordination (OERC) Office of the President PO Box 6051, Ngerulmud Capital, PW Republic of Palau 96939 Telephone: (680) 488 4411 Fax: (680) 488 6919 Email: oerc2009@gmail.com meiho42@hotmail.com	
Samoa	Taule'ale'ausumai Laavasa Malua Chief Executive Officer Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment Private Mail Bag, APIA, Samoa Telephone: (685) 25019/23800 Fax: (685) 23176	

	Email: taulealea.malua@mnre.gov.ws	
Solomon Is	Mr Chanel Iroi Acting Permanent Secretary Ministry of Environment Climate Change Disaster Management & Meteorology PO Box 21 HONIARA Solomon Islands Telephone: (677) 27751/ 23031 Fax: (677) 28054 Email: ps@mecm.gov.sb / psmecm@googlemail.com c_iroi@yahoo.com.au c.iroi@hotmail.com	
Tonga	Mr Asipeli Palaki Director Ministry of Environment and Climate Change PO Box 917 Nukualofa, Tonga Telephone: (676) 23611/23210 Fax: (676) 23216 Email:apalaki@gmail.com; a_palaki@yahoo.com	
Tuvalu	Ms Pepetua Latasi Director Department of Environment Private Mail Bag Vaiaku, Funafuti Tuvalu Telephone: (688) 20179 Fax: (688) 20167/ 20836 Email: Pepetua@gmail.com	
Vanuatu	Mr Albert William Director of Environment & Conservation Private Mail Bag 9063 Port Vila Vanuatu Telephone: (678) 25302 Fax: (678) 23565 Email: awilliams@vanuatu.gov.vu; albert.williams52@gmail.com	

A.3 Risk. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design (table format acceptable):

Risk	Degree of risk	Mitigation
1. NP low priority for countries and failing to engage in the project. Local partners failing to deliver on obligations under the project.	H	1. Public education and awareness activities in the countries during the project. Capacity building and training should reinforce the importance of the project. Regional technical support from SPREP (eg via regional meetings and workshops) will raise the ABS/NP profile
2. High staff turnover and loss of important staff	H	2. Hedge risk by designing the implementation of the project so it will not overly rely on individual staff. Using standard modern staff management methodology.
3. Communities may oppose regulations that restrict their activities relevant to ABS	H	3. Thorough community consultation and awareness programmes and wherever possible encourage use the partnership approach with communities
4. lack of communication and coordination between participating agencies in-country	M	4. set up communication procedures customised to each country's situation particularly relevant existing networks and processes (eg NBSAPs
5. Public or politicians not receptive and uninterested in the project	M	5. As for 1 above.
6. Political buy in to NP changes for the worse during the project	M	6. Public awareness to reinforce the country's obligations to the NP.

A.4. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF financed and other initiatives:

i) The "ABS Initiative" a GIZ funded project which together with SPREP and the Government of Australia provides assistance to the region by way of regional meetings (3 were held in 2012) and training. ii) An MSP Pilot Project administered through UNDP. In Fiji resources are being used to discover nature-based products and build national capacities that facilitate technology transfer on mutually agreed terms, private sector engagement, and investments in the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources iii) An MSP Global Support project for Early Ratification of the Nagoya Protocol administered through UNEP.

B.1 Description of the consistency of the project with National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAs, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.:

The proposed project is consistent with national environmental policies and strategies. For example: A review of 10 NBSAPs from Pacific Island Countries was conducted in 2009 which showed 90% of these NBSAPs had access and benefit sharing as one of the priority cross cutting issues. Additionally, a regional synthesis of National Capacity Self Assessments (NCSA) noted the following common problems and vulnerabilities:

- A lack of historical and current evidence of the status and trends of various environmental resources and drivers of environmental change;
- Information management problems, including lack of standardized procedures for collecting and aggregating relevant environmental data; and
- Dissemination problems, with information that is available not always getting into the hands of local scientists, local government officials, or local citizens.
- Limited awareness and concern about environmental problems even where local knowledge of the problem exists among scientists and government officials

The project will respond to some of these priority issues to create an enabling environment to support ratification of the Nagoya Protocol as well as its initial implementation.

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

This project is in line with Objective 4 of the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy for GEF-5: "Build Capacity on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing (ABS)". This project is in also in line with the objective of the NPIF, as stated in the GEF Council Document "Outstanding issues related to the Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund" (GEF/C.40/11/Rev.1 of May 26, 2011). According to this document, "the Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund has been established to facilitate and support effective and efficient implementation of the decisions made at the 10th CoP of the CBD related to the Protocol. The primary objective of the NPIF is to facilitate the early entry into force and create enabling conditions at national and regional levels for implementation of the Protocol".

The creation of the NPIF was approved by the GEF Council on February 18, 2011. Further to the creation of the fund, the GEF Council approved the arrangements proposed for the operation of this new multi donor trust fund in the spring meeting of 2011. The terms of the NPIF are in the document

GEF/C.40/11/Rev.1, *Outstanding Issues Related to the Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund.* Key activity areas to be funded through the NPIF include: a) Support Parties in reviewing their own capacities and needs on ABS and to strengthen the enabling environment with a focus on the provisions of existing national policies, laws, and regulations; b) Support Parties to implement national and regional projects to promote technology transfer on mutually agreed terms, private sector engagement, and projects targeting investments in the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources; c) Support Parties to build capacity as appropriate with the aim of ensuring that traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources held by indigenous and local communities is accessed, d) Support Parties to undertake activities to increase public awareness on needs and opportunities of the Nagoya Protocol, e) Support Parties to further the knowledge and scientific-base for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.

Participating countries could make use of any of the five priority areas of the NPIF with the aim of an accelerated ratification and early entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol and to take the necessary steps for implementation. The way participating countries will use these priorities, will be determined during project preparation.

B.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage for implementing this project:

Support to countries in assessing their opportunities and gaps in addressing issues of Access and Benefit Sharing, as well as adhering to the requirements under the Nagoya Protocol is already an integral part of UNEP's Programme of Work (PoW) 2012-2013 and will play an at least equally important role in the new PoW 2014-2015. UNEP's Division of Environmental Law and Conventions (UNEP DELC), the proposed project executing agency, already assists many national partners and governments through its expertise in environmental law and policy to develop and implement ABS policies and to harmonize national processes for the implementation of CBD provisions on ABS. The UNEP DELC deploys MEA Focal Points who are based in the UNEP Regional Offices IS Asia and the Pacific (ROAP).

UNEP as implementing agency is already involved in various GEF-4 funded ABS-related projects, both at national and at regional scale. The proposed executing agency, UNEP-DELC has at least three officers who specialize in ABS issues, legal and political ramifications, as well as the international processes around CBD and the Nagoya Protocol. Furthermore, UNEP has staff in the Office for Asia and Pacific (ROAP), Regional Office for West Asia (ROWA), Regional Office for Latin America and Caribbean (ROLAC) and within it's GEF Unit in DEPI who work on ABS related topics and projects.

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

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

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE *(MM/dd/yyyy)*

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for project identification and preparation.					
Agency Coordinator, Agency name	**Signature**	**DATE** *(MM/dd/yyyy)*	**Project Contact Person**	**Telephone**	**Email Address**
Director, GEF Coordination Office, UNEP Tel: + 254 20 762 4166			Greg Sherley	+ 685 27473	Greg.Sherley@unep.org