



**Applying the GEF Tracking Tools in GEF-4**

**Objective:** To measure progress in achieving the impacts and outcomes established at the portfolio level under the biodiversity focal area. The following targets and indicators are being tracked for all GEF-4 projects submitted under Strategic Objective Three and the associated Strategic Programs.

**Outcome Indicators for Strategic Objective Three and Associated Strategic Programs**

Strategic Objective	Expected Long-Term Impacts	Indicators
To safeguard biodiversity	<p>Potential risks posed to biodiversity from living modified organisms are avoided or mitigated</p> <p>Potential risks posed to biodiversity from invasive alien species are avoided or mitigated</p>	<p><u>Biosafety:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each request for intentional transboundary movement or domestic use is processed through a regulatory and administrative framework aligned with the CPB</li> <li>• For each request for intentional transboundary movement or domestic use risk assessments carried out in accordance with the CPB</li> <li>• For each request for intentional transboundary movement or domestic use, measures and strategies to manage risks established</li> </ul> <p><u>Invasive Alien Species:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of point-of-entry detections</li> <li>• Number of early eradications</li> <li>• Number of successful prevention and control programs</li> </ul>
Strategic Programs for GEF-4	Expected Outcomes	Indicators
6. Building capacity for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operational national biosafety decision-making systems that contribute to the safe use of biotechnology in conformity with the provisions and decisions of the CPB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentage of participating countries with regulatory and policy framework in place</li> <li>• Percentage of participating countries that have established a National Coordination Mechanism</li> <li>• Percentage of participating countries with administrative frameworks in place</li> <li>• Percentage of participating countries with risk assessment and risk management strategies for the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms (LMOs), specifically focused on transboundary movements</li> <li>• Percentage of participating countries that have carried out risk assessments</li> <li>• Percentage of participating countries that fully participate and share information on the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH)</li> </ul>

GEF-4 Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Objective Three:  
Safeguarding Biodiversity

<b>Strategic Programs for GEF-4</b>	<b>Expected Outcomes</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
7. Prevention, control, and management of invasive alien species (IAS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operational IAS management frameworks that mitigate impact of IAS on biodiversity and ecosystem services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National coordination mechanisms to assist with the design and implementation of national strategies for IAS</li> <li>• National strategies that inform policies, legislation, regulations, and management</li> <li>• Regulatory and policy frameworks for IAS in place</li> <li>• Point of detection mechanisms in place</li> <li>• Incorporation of environmental considerations with regards to IAS into existing risk assessment procedures</li> <li>• Identification and management of priority pathways for invasions</li> </ul>

**Rationale:** Project data from the GEF-4 project cohort will be aggregated for analysis of directional trends and patterns at a portfolio-wide level to inform the development of future GEF strategies and to report to GEF Council on portfolio-level performance in the biodiversity focal area.

**Structure of Tracking Tool:** Each tracking tool requests background and coverage information on the project and specific information required to track the indicator sets listed above.

**Guidance in Applying GEF Tracking Tools:** GEF tracking tools are applied three times: at CEO endorsement<sup>1</sup>, at project mid-term, and at project completion.

In GEF-4, we expect that projects will be fully aligned with specific Strategic Objectives and support Strategic Programs under each Strategic Objective hence only one tracking tool will need to be completed.

On *very rare occasions*, projects make substantive contributions to more than one strategic objective. In these instances, the tracking tools for the relevant strategic objectives should be applied. It is important to keep in mind that the objective is to capture the full range of a project’s contributions to delivering on the targets set for each of the strategic priorities. The GEF Implementing Agency/Executing Agency will guide the project teams in the choice of the tracking tools. Please submit all information on a single project as one package (even where more than one tracking tool is applied).

Multi-country projects may face unique circumstances in applying the tracking tools. The GEF requests that multi-country projects complete one tracking tool per country involved in the project, based on the project circumstances and activities in each respective country. The completed forms for each country should then be submitted as one package to the GEF. Global projects which do not have a country focus, but for which the tracking tool is applicable, should complete the tracking tool as comprehensively as possible.

*The tracking tool does not substitute or replace project level M&E processes, or GEF Implementing Agencies’/Executing Agencies’ own monitoring processes.* Project managers, consultants and project evaluators will likely be the most appropriate individuals to complete the Tracking Tool, in collaboration with other members of the project team, since they would be most knowledgeable about the project.

<sup>1</sup> For Medium Sized Projects when they are submitted for CEO approval.

GEF-4 Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Objective Three:  
Safeguarding Biodiversity

**Submission:** The finalized tracking tool will be cleared by the GEF Implementing Agencies and Executing Agencies before submission. The tracking tool is to be submitted to the GEF Secretariat at three points:

- 1.) With the project document at CEO endorsement<sup>2</sup>;
- 2.) Within 3 months of completion of the project's mid-term evaluation or report; and
- 3.) With the project's terminal evaluation or final completion report, and no later than 6 months after project closure.

---

<sup>2</sup> For Medium Sized Projects when they are submitted for CEO approval.

GEF-4 Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Objective Three:  
Safeguarding Biodiversity

**I. Project General Information**

1. Project Name: Development of mechanisms to strengthen the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol in Guatemala
2. Project Type (MSP or FSP): MSP
3. Project ID (GEF): 3630
4. Project ID (IA):
5. Implementing Agency: UNEP
6. Country(ies): Guatemala

Name of reviewers completing tracking tool and completion dates:

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Agency/Institution</b>
<b>At CEO Approval</b>	Dr. Mónica Stein	Project prep consultant	In representation of CONAP
<b>Project Mid-term</b>			
<b>Final Evaluation/project completion</b>			

7. Project duration: *Planned*   4   years *Actual*            years

8. Lead Project Executing Agency (ies): CONAP

9. GEF Strategic Program:

- Building capacity for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (SP 6)
- Prevention, control, and management of invasive alien species (IAS) (SP 7)

## **Strategic Program 6: Building capacity for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety Tracking Tool Guidance Note**

### **Purpose of the Tracking Tool**

The Biosafety Tracking Tool has been developed to help track and monitor progress in the achievement of the primary outcome of Strategic Program Six of the GEF-4 Biodiversity Strategy: “Operational national biosafety decision-making systems that contribute to the safe use of modern biotechnology in conformity with the provisions and decisions of the CPB.” This outcome will be achieved by building capacity to implement the CPB and takes into account the guidance from the CPB and lessons and experiences emerging from the GEF biosafety portfolio. Priority is given to activities for the implementation of the CPB that are specified in the COP guidance to the GEF with respect to biosafety, in particular the key elements in the *Updated Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the CPB*, agreed to at the third COP serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the CPB (COP-MOP-3), and identified in a country’s stock-taking analysis. The complete list of activities to be supported under this strategic objective can be found in the biosafety strategy document at: [http://gefweb.org/Documents/Council\\_Documents/GEF\\_30/documents/C.30.8.Rev.1StrategyforFinancingBiosafety.pdf](http://gefweb.org/Documents/Council_Documents/GEF_30/documents/C.30.8.Rev.1StrategyforFinancingBiosafety.pdf)

### **Guidance on Applying the Biosafety Tracking Tool**

The Tracking Tool contains a set of questions that have been designed to be easily answered by project staff and project evaluators. It depicts a best-case scenario of the required components of a fully operational biosafety framework, and, within each component, a continuum of progress towards a biosafety framework that is fully effective.

As with the other tracking tools applied in the GEF biodiversity portfolio, the application of the tool is meant to facilitate an iterative process whereby the project staff and project evaluators carefully discuss each question about the biosafety framework to arrive at a carefully considered assessment, and in doing so, identify concrete steps forward for improvement. In most cases, a group of project staff, GEF agency staff, (and the project evaluators in the case of the application of the tool at the mid-term and final evaluation) should be involved in answering the questions in the Tracking Tool.

When the assessment is undertaken at the mid-term and the final evaluation, we recommend that some of the same team members who undertook previous assessments be involved to provide continuity of analysis. Where this is not possible the information provided by previous assessors in the comments section of the Tracking Tool will be particularly valuable in guiding the assessment and ensuring consistency in the evaluation being made.

### **Structure and content of the Tracking Tool**

The Tracking Tool addresses eight main issues in one assessment form:

- 1) Biosafety Policy;
- 2) Biosafety Regulatory Regime;
- 3) Administrative System;
- 4) Risk Assessment and Decision-making;
- 5) Follow-up and Monitoring;
- 6) Public awareness;
- 7) Education; and

8) Participation

**Assessment Form:** The assessment is structured around eight (8) questions presented in table format which includes three columns for recording details of the assessment, **all of which should be completed.**

**Questions and scores:**

The assessment is made by assigning a simple score ranging between 0 (poor) to 4 (excellent) in response to a series of eight questions that measure progress in the eight main issues listed above: 1) Biosafety Policy; 2) Biosafety Regulatory Regime; 3) Administrative System; 4) Risk Assessment and Decision-making; 5) Follow-up and Monitoring; 6) Public awareness; 7) Education; and 8) Participation.

Five alternative answers are provided for each question to help assessors to make judgments as to the level of score given. This is, inevitably, an approximate process and there will be situations in which none of the five alternative answers appear to fit the project conditions very precisely. We ask that you choose the one answer that is nearest and use the comment/explanation section to elaborate. The maximum score from the eight main questions is 32. A final total of the score from completing the assessment form can be calculated as a percentage of 32.

The whole concept of “scoring” progress is however fraught with difficulties and possibilities for distortion. The current system assumes, for example, that all the questions cover issues of equal weight, whereas this may not necessarily be the case. Scores will therefore provide a better assessment of effectiveness if calculated as a percentage for each of the elements of a biosafety framework.

Most importantly, the assessment, when applied over time in the context of one project, allows us to gauge progress in achieving the strategic program’s expected outcome. GEF will use this information and subsequent analysis in assessing and better understanding the design of biosafety projects, the strategic program itself, and the tracking tool as a means to measure progress.

**Comment/explanation:**

The **comment/explanation** box next to each question score allows for *qualitative judgments to be explained* in more detail. This could range from local staff knowledge (in many cases, staff knowledge will be the most informed and reliable source of knowledge), a reference document, monitoring results or external studies and assessments – the point being to give anyone reading the report an idea of why the assessment was made.

It is **very important** that this box be completed – it can provide greater confidence in the results of the assessment by making the basis of decision-making more transparent. More importantly, it provides a reference point and information for local staff in the future. This column also allows for *comments*, such as why a particular question was not answered when completing the questionnaire.

**Next Steps:**

For each question respondents are also asked to identify any intended actions that will improve performance of the biosafety framework.

GEF-4 Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Objective Three:  
Safeguarding Biodiversity

**Strategic Program 6: Building capacity for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety Tracking Tool**

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Scoring Criteria</b>	<b>Score: Tick only one box per question</b>	<b>Comment/Explanation</b>	<b>Next Steps</b>
<b>Biosafety Policy</b>	A stand alone biosafety policy does not exist	0		This area of work is contemplated in the project
<i>1) Has a biosafety policy been developed and is it being fully implemented?</i>	A stand alone biosafety policy has been produced	1		
	A stand alone biosafety policy has been produced and has been formally adopted by the government	2		
	A legally approved biosafety strategy has been incorporated into broader sectoral policies (e.g. agriculture, biotechnology, science and technology, health, etc) and is being enforced	3		
	A biosafety policy is implemented through a multi-year Action Plan that involves more than one sector of Government or society.	4		
<b>Biosafety Regulatory Regime</b>	A regulatory regime has not been developed	0		
<i>2) Has a regulatory regime been developed and does it have full legal force?</i>	Interim measures for biosafety decision making, including some modification of existing regulations, have been put in place.	1	Only one NCA has put in place interim measures (internal regulations)	This area of work is contemplated in the project
	A regulatory regime has been developed and adopted but does not yet have full legal force	2		

GEF-4 Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Objective Three:  
Safeguarding Biodiversity

Issue	Scoring Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question	Comment/Explanation	Next Steps
	The regulatory regime has full legal force, is operational and linked to the administrative system -i.e. used for decisions	3		
	The regulatory regime covers all the types of LMOs and transboundary movements referred to in the Cartagena Protocol, including agreements with Non-Parties	4		
<b>Administrative System</b>	Focal Points and National Competent Authorities not appointed nor available via BCH	0		
<i>3) Is an administrative system in place and fully operational?</i>	All Focal Points and National Competent Authorities appointed, and roles & responsibilities stated and available on BCH	1		
	Procedures for handling requests have been designed, legally adopted, and made available to the public.	2	For one NCA only, but are not in operation	This area of work is contemplated in the project
	Requests have been received, processed, and decisions communicated to the BCH. Appeal procedures designed and operational.	3		
	Administrative system fully supported by national budget allocation or alternative (non-donor) system of revenue generation	4		
<b>Risk Assessment and Decision-making</b>	No risk assessment is applied to LMOs	0		

GEF-4 Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Objective Three:  
Safeguarding Biodiversity

Issue	Scoring Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question	Comment/Explanation	Next Steps
4) <i>Are risk assessment procedures employed and contributing to decision-making?</i>	Sectoral risk assessment dossiers are required to accompany LMO requests	1	Ministry of agriculture requires and shares dossiers	
	Risk assessment/risk management system involves case-by-case analyses by scientific experts that provide recommendations to decision-making bodies. Composition and responsibilities of the decision-making bodies clearly stated and publicized.	2	Risk assessment exists in one NCA but Guatemalan legal structure prevents NCA unilateral regulation or decision making.	
	Decisions on LMOs are integrated across sectors (e.g. take into account risks to human health)	3		This area of work is contemplated in the project
	Decision-making system allows for socio-economic considerations and for review of decisions based on new evidence	4		
<b>Follow-up and Monitoring</b>	No system for follow-up and monitoring exists	0	As no LMOs have been approved, this has not been necessary so far	
5) <i>Does an operational follow-up and monitoring system exist?</i>	Institutional and human capacity in place to follow-up and monitor, including Risk Management for field-trials and post-release	1		This area of work is contemplated in the project
	Compliance mechanisms for Risk Management established	2		
	Liability and redress mechanisms in place	3		
	Decisions, risk management plans, and reports on compliance and liability have	4		

GEF-4 Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Objective Three:  
Safeguarding Biodiversity

Issue	Scoring Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question	Comment/Explanation	Next Steps
	been posted to the BCH			
<b>Public awareness, education and participation</b>	Little or no official information on LMOs available to the general public	0		
<b>Awareness</b> <i>6) Is information on LMOs made available to public?</i>	Information on LMOs generally available in at least one national language	1	Lack of approvals results in little or no information to report.	
	Information on LMOs generally available in at least one national language and is kept updated	2		This area of work is contemplated in the project
	Information on LMOs is used for awareness-raising campaigns	3		
	Survey results on levels of public awareness available	4		
<b>Education</b> <i>7) Has coursework and training on biosafety been integrated into higher education?</i>	No modern biotechnology and biosafety available in the formal (i.e. technical, academic, extramural) education system.	0		
	Basic modern biotechnology and biosafety information included in the curricula at technical and college levels.	1	Dependent on the interests and initiatives of local universities	
	Dedicated short-term courses on biosafety available for government staff at technical schools and higher education institutions.	2		This area of work is contemplated in the project
	National association for biosafety established	3		
	Undergraduate and graduate degree programs offering concentrations and/or	4		

GEF-4 Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Objective Three:  
Safeguarding Biodiversity

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Scoring Criteria</b>	<b>Score: Tick only one box per question</b>	<b>Comment/Explanation</b>	<b>Next Steps</b>
	degree programs on modern biotechnology, including biosafety			
<b>Participation</b>	Little or no direct involvement of public in LMO decision-making	0	Lack of approvals so far means this has not yet been necessary	
<i>8) Has the public been engaged in LMO decision-making?</i>	Access to information includes other mechanisms in addition to the BCH (i.e. radio and television programs, newspapers columns, blogs, etc.).	1		This area of work is contemplated in the project
	Mechanism for public involvement in LMO decision-making established	2		
	Evidence of level of public involvement in LMO decision-making available via BCH or other means	3		
	Regular open consultation meetings held on biosafety	4		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>Score at time of CEO Approval request</b>	
<b>TOTAL POSSIBLE</b>		<b>32</b>		