**UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2021**

Reporting from 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021

# INSTRUCTIONS TO COMPLETE THIS PIR

1. Instructions in blue are directed to Task Managers / Administrative Officers
2. Instructions in red are directed to Project Managers and Executing Agencies
3. When filling up the respective cells, use the Normal style from the template. The text will look like this.

# 1. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

# 1.1. Project details

This entire table is to be prepared by Task Managers

1. IDENTIFICATION

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Identification Table | | | GEF ID.:4087 | Umoja no.:N/A | |
| Project Title | | | Implementation of National Biosafety Framework for Syrian Arab Republic | | |
| Duration months | Planned | | 48 months | | |
| Extension(s) | | N/A | |  |
| Division(s) Implementing the project | | | UN Environment Programme  Ecosystems Division  GEF Biodiversity and Land Degradation Unit  Biodiversity and Land Branch | | |
| Name of co-implementing Agency | | | N/A | | |
| Executing Agency(ies) | | | Ministry of State for Environment Affairs, Syria | | |
| Names of Other Project Partners | | | N/A | | |
| Project Type | | | Medium Size Project | | |
| Project Scope | | | National | | |
| Region | | | West Asia | | |
| Countries | | | Syria Arab republic | | |
| Programme of Work | | | Programme of Work for the Biennium 2020‒2021  Subprogramme 3 – Healthy and productive ecosystems  Subprogramme 4 – Environmental governance | | |
| GEF Focal Area(s) | | | Biodiversity | | |
| UNSDCF / UNDAF linkages | | | N/A | | |
| Link to relevant SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s) | | | Goal 2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture Target: 2.5 - By 2020, maintain the genetic diversity of seeds, cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and their related wild species, including through soundly managed and diversified seed and plant banks at the national, regional and international levels [BIOSAFETY], and promote access to and fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge, as internationally agreed Indicator - 2.5.1: Number of plant and animal genetic resources for food and agriculture secured in either medium or long term conservation facilities Indicator - 2.5.2: Proportion of local breeds, classified as being at risk, not-at-risk or unknown level of risk of extinction | | |
| GEF financing amount | | | US$875,000.00 | | |
| Co-financing amount | | | US$953,000.00 | | |
| Date of CEO Endorsement | | | 29 October 2010 | | |
| Start of Implementation | | | 14 April 2011 | | |
| Date of first disbursement | | | N/A | | |
| Total disbursement as of 30 June 2021 | | | N/A | | |
| Total expenditure as of 30 June 2021 | | | N/A | | |
| Expected Mid-Term Review Date | | | N/A | | |
| Completion Date | | Planned | February 2016 | | |
| Revised | N/A | | |
| Expected Terminal Evaluation Date | | | N/A | | |
| Expected Financial Closure Date | | | N/A | | |

1.2. Project description

|  |
| --- |
| Present a brief project description, stating objective, components, executing agency and main government/other partners involved. Summarize each component in one short paragraph:  The objective of Syrian implementation of National Biosafety Framework project is that by the end of this project, Syria has in place a comprehensive, workable and transparent national biosafety framework, in line with its national needs and priorities as well as its international obligations.  **COMPONENT 1:** Finalize, adopt and implement a fully functional and responsive regulatory regime in line with new developments, national needs and priorities and other international obligations  ***Expected Results***   * Fully functional biosafety legislative system in place and working by 2015 * Application and enforcement of regulatory regime   **COMPONENT 2:** Establish an effective national mechanism for handling requests, carrying out risk assessment, and decision making for GMOs and their products  ***Expected Results***   * Fully functional, effective and integrated system for Risk Assessment, Risk Management and Decision making on LMOs and their products in place * Fully functional and integrated system in place for handling requests on LMOs and their products   **COMPONENT 3**: Set up a workable and fully functional system for monitoring, enforcement and emergency measures.  ***Expected Results***   * Establishment of roles, responsibilities and procedures for monitoring, enforcement and emergency measures * Technical means for monitoring and inspections are in place * Emergency measures established and made operational by MoE, and relevant Governmental & Non-Governmental Organisations.   **COMPONENT 4**: a fully functional improved system for public information, education and participation in decision making process  ***Expected Results***   * Access to information for the public ensured * Public awareness of information sources and possibilities to influence the authorization process enhanced |

1.3. History of project revisions

To be completed by Task Managers – N/A

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Version | Date | Main changes introduced in this revision |
| Rev0 (CEO ED) |  |  |
| : |  |  |
| : |  |  |
| RevN (latest version at the time of this PIF) |  |  |

2. OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

To be completed by UNEP Task Manager

2.1. UNEP Subprogramme(s)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Programme of Work for the Biennium 2020‒2021)  **Subprogramme 3 – Healthy and productive**  **ecosystems**  **Subprogramme 4 – Environmental governance** | | Specify the relevant Expected Accomplishment(s) & Indicator(s) Insert the Subprogramme’s Expected Accomplishment(s) and Indicator(s) to which the project contributes | |
| Describe any progress made towards delivering the stated PoW Expected Accomplishments and Indicators. State key changes since previous reporting period. (maximum one paragraph)  Not applicable – Project never started  [Section to be shared with relevant Regional and Global SubProgramme Coordinators] | | | |
| Expected Accomplishment | Indicator | | Progress |
| Add rows as needed |  | |  |

2.2. GEF Core Indicators (for all GEF 6 and later projects): N/A

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| GEF Core Indicators | Indicative expected Results |
| Discuss GEF core indicators targeted by the project, as well as expected results. (maximum one paragraph)  N/A | |

2.3. Implementation status and risk – N/A

[complete the fiscal year and select: 1st PIR; 2nd PIR; …. Final PIR; select HS; S; MS; MU; U; HU; unknown; not rated to rate the progress towards outcomes and outputs in third and fourth lines; select H; S; M; L; to rate risks for the fiscal year you are reporting in the fifth line. Add more columns if needed]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | FY 20\_\_ | FY 20\_\_ | FY 20\_\_ | FY 20\_\_ | FY 20\_\_ |
| PIR # | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | …. |
| Rating towards outcomes (section 3.1) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rating towards **outputs** (section 3.2) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Risk** rating (section 3.3) |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Summary of status. Please structure as follows, highlighting progress, challenges and main achievements, as needed: N/A  Rating towards outcomes: The rating is X because this, this, and this. This should be aligned with progress reported on section 3.1.  Rating towards outputs: Aligned with progress reported on section 3.2.  Overall risk rating: justify consolidated project risk given on Table A in section 3.3.  [section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal] |

* 1. 2.4. Co-financing

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Planned Co-finance**  **Total:**  (total only)    **Actual to date:** Complete (in $ and %. State the date for which this value is valid) | Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges.  N/A  (maximum one paragraph) |

* 1. 2.5. Stakeholder engagement (N/A)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder engagement** | Describe progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO endorsement). For older projects that did not have a Stakeholder Engagement Plan in the CEO Endorsement Document, simply mention any kind of stakeholder engagement activities undertaken during the reporting period.  (maximum two paragraphs)  [section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal] |

* 1. 2.6. Gender

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Gender mainstreaming** | Describe progress, challenges and outcomes related to the gender-responsive measures documented at CEO Endorsement/ Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent. Older projects that were designed before gender mainstreaming should proactively report any possible gender benefits, as appropriate.  [section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal] |

* 1. 2.7. Environmental and social safeguards management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Environmental and social safeguards management** | Describe progress, challenges and outcomes related to the environmental and social safeguard-responsive measures documented at CEO Endorsement/ Approval in social safeguard action plan or equivalent. Older projects that were designed before environmental and social safeguard mainstreaming should proactively report any possible social safeguard benefits, as appropriate.  [section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal] |

* 1. 2.8. Knowledge management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Knowledge activities and products** | Provide a narrative of knowledge activities/ products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement/ Approval  [section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal] |

* 1. 2.9. Stories to be shared

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Stories to be shared** | Optional for mature projects: Provide a brief summary of any especially interesting and impactful project results that are worth sharing with a larger audience, and/or investing communications time in, if any.  [section to be shared with communication division/ GEF communication] |
|  | |

# 3. PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK

*Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the* ***UNEP Task Manager****[[1]](#footnote-2) will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:*

1. *Progress towards achieving the project Results(s)- see section 3.1*
2. *Implementation progress – see section 3.2*

*Section 3.3 on Risk should be first completed by the Project Manager. The UNEP Task Manager will subsequently enter his/her own ratings in the appropriate column.*

* 1. 3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes (N/A)

[copy and paste the CEO Endorsement (or latest formal Revision) approved Results Framework, adding/deleting outcome rows, as appropriate]

**(Ensure that each entered indicator has a baseline, end of project and current period value)**

| **Project objective and Outcomes** | **Indicator**  **(One indicator per row)** | **Baseline level** | **Mid-term target** | **End-of-project target** | **Progress as of current period**  **(numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)** | **Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2021** | **Progress rating[[2]](#footnote-3)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective:** | Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | *Fill* | *Fill* | *Fill* |
| **Outcome 1.1:** | Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | *Fill* | *Fill* | *Fill* |
| Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | *Fill* | *Fill* | *Fill* |
| Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | *Fill* | *Fill* | *Fill* |
| **Outcome 1.2:** | Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | *Fill* | *Fill* | *Fill* |
| Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | *Fill* | *Fill* | *Fill* |
| Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | *Fill* | *Fill* | *Fill* |

* 1. 3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs (N/A)

| **Outputs/Activities[[3]](#footnote-4)** | **Start Date**  **(dd/mm/yyyy)** | **Expected completion date[[4]](#footnote-5)**  **(dd/mm/yyyy)** | **Implementation status as of 30 June 2020 (%)** | **Implementation status as of 30 June 2021 (%)** | **Progress rating justification[[5]](#footnote-6), description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay** | **Progress rating[[6]](#footnote-7)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **COMPONENT 1:** | | | | | | |
| **Output 1.1:** Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill |
| **Activity 1.1.1** | Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill |
| **Activity 1.1.2** | Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill |
| **:** | Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill |
| **Output 1.2:** Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill |
| **Output 1.3:** Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill | Fill |
| Add rows as needed to reflect the project structure |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* 1. 3.3. Risk Rating *(N/A)*

Please choose the most relevant risk (choose only 1 risk)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Check (X) | Risk |
|  | Delayed funding e.g. disbursement or allotment |
|  | Implementing partners e.g. delays or lack of capacity |
|  | Insufficient funding |
|  | Stability of the countries involved e.g. political, soci-economic, natural disasters |
|  | UNEP administrative processes e.g. delays due to legal, HR, procurement |
|  | Problems with project design e.g. changes to logframe, activities |
|  | Recipient country/organization/institution e.g. lack of ownership, capacity, e.t.c. |
|  | Covid 19 |
|  | No implementation challenge for this period |

**Table A.** Risk-log (N/A)

Insert ALL the risks identified either at CEO endorsement (inc. safeguards screening), previous/current PIRs, and MTRs. Use the last line to propose a suggested consolidated rating.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Risk affecting:** | **Risk Rating** | | | | | | | **Variation respect to last rating** | |
| Outcome / outputs | **CEO ED** | **PIR 1** | **PIR 2** | **MTR** | **PIR 3 (this PIR)** | **PIR 4** | **PIR 5** | **Δ** | **Justification** |
| Risk 1 | Outcomes 1-3 | L | L | L | L | L |  |  | = | This explanation should focus on what changed respect to the previous rating. |
| Risk 2 | All outcomes & outputs | M | M | M | M | L |  |  | ↓ |  |
| Risk 3 | Output 2.3 | M | M | M | M | L |  |  | = |  |
| : |  |  | M | L | L | L |  |  | = |  |
| : |  |  |  |  | H | M |  |  | ↓ |  |
| : |  |  |  |  | M | L |  |  | ↓ |  |
| Risk *k* |  |  |  |  |  | M |  |  | ↑ |  |
| Consolidated project risk |  | n.a | M | M | M | L |  |  | ↓ | This section focuses on the variation. The overall rating is discussed in section 2.3. |

**Table B.** Outstanding medium & high risks (N/A)

List here **only risks from Table A above that have a risk rating of M or worse** in the **current** PIR

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)** | **Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period** | **Additional mitigation measures for the next periods** | | |
| What | When | By whom |
| Risk |  |  |  |  |  |
| Risk |  |  |  |  |  |
| Risk |  |  |  |  |  |
| : |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Add rows as needed to reflect additional risks |  |  |  |  |  |

**High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.   
**Significant Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.   
**Medium Risk (M):** There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.   
**Low Risk (L):** There is a probability of up to 25% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.

1. For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Outputs and activities (or deliverables) as described in the project logframe (and workplan) or in any updated project revision. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. The completion dates should be as per latest workplan (latest project revision). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. As much as possible, describe in terms of immediate gains to target groups, e.g. access to project deliverables, participation in receiving services; gains in knowledge, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager [↑](#footnote-ref-7)