



Project Implementation Report

(1 January 2021– 30 June 2023)

Project Title:	<i>Using systemic approaches and simulation to scale Nature Based Infrastructure for climate adaptation</i>
GEF ID:	10632
UNIDO ID:	200172
GEF Replenishment Cycle:	GEF-7
Country(ies):	Global
Region:	Global
GEF Focal Area:	Climate Change Mitigation (CCM)
Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP) Programs ¹ :	N/A
Stand-alone / Child Project:	Stand-alone
Implementing Department/Division:	ENV / IRE
Co-Implementing Agency:	
Executing Agency(ies):	International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD)
Project Type:	Medium-Sized Project (MSP)
Project Duration:	60
Extension(s):	n.a.
GEF Project Financing:	2,190,000
Agency Fee:	190,000
Co-financing Amount:	3,822,486
Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval:	4/20/2021
UNIDO Approval Date:	6/4/2021
Actual Implementation Start:	7/13/2021
Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June 2023:	641,497.32
Mid-term Review (MTR) Date:	1/1/2024

¹ Only for GEF-6 projects, if applicable

Original Project Completion Date:	3/31/2026
Project Completion Date as reported in FY22:	7/13/2026
Current SAP Completion Date:	7/13/2026
Expected Project Completion Date:	11/22/2026
Expected Terminal Evaluation (TE) Date:	9/15/2026
Expected Financial Closure Date:	5/22/2027
UNIDO Project Manager ² :	Christian Susan

I. Brief description of project and status overview

Project Objective
<i>To enhance adaptation to climate change by establishing the business case, building capacities, and enabling increased investment in Nature Based Infrastructure</i>

Baseline
<p><i>There are two ways of defining the baseline scenario against which the project can be evaluated. On the one hand, the degradation of ecosystem services is on the rise, due to the lack of appreciation for the services it provides. This results in additional challenges, such as rural to urban migration and lack of access to resources and services. The restoration of ecosystems is required to support a variety of beneficiaries realize new opportunities. On the other hand, there is lack of knowledge on the performance of NBI, of measurement frameworks, of methods for quantification, and of approaches to involve multiple stakeholders. Lack of knowledge in turns prevents and pre-empt the appreciation of the value of NBI.</i></p> <p><i>Against this baseline the project has performed satisfactory; knowledge on the performance of NBI and the appreciation of the value of NBI have been enhanced.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore the project has contributed to halting the degradation of ecosystem services by strengthening awareness and appreciation for the services ecosystems and NBI provide.</i></p>

Please refer to the explanatory note at the end of the document and select corresponding ratings for the current reporting period, i.e. FY23. Please also provide a short justification for the selected ratings for FY23.

In view of the GEF Secretariat's intent to start following the ability of projects to adopt the concept of adaptive management³, Agencies are expected to closely monitor changes that occur from year to year and

² Person responsible for report content

³ Adaptive management in the context of an intentional approach to decision-making and adjustments in response to new available information, evidence gathered from monitoring, evaluation or research, and experience acquired from implementation, to ensure that the goals of the activity are being reached efficiently

demonstrate that they are not simply implementing plans but modifying them in response to developments and circumstances or understanding. In order to facilitate with this assessment, please introduce the ratings as reported in the previous reporting cycle, i.e. FY22, in the last column.

Overall Ratings ⁴	FY23	FY22	
Global Environmental Objectives (GEOs) / Development Objectives (DOs) Rating	Satisfactory (S)	Unknown	
<p><i>This project was designed to generate evidence, knowledge and skills to increase the use of NBI as an adaptation strategy. While 2,340 NBI stakeholders will be trained, the project will reach a total of 115,000 direct beneficiaries. The project will support valuation of NBI in 10 adaptation projects every year, with only 6 valuations planned for the first year, thereby enhancing their adaptation outcomes for vulnerable communities and ecosystems in terms of enhanced resilience to flooding, droughts and increased temperatures. It is expected that some 15 policies/development plans will be influenced to mainstream NBI in climate change adaptation. In addition to direct adaptation benefits, the project will contribute to provide climate change mitigation benefits and contribute to sustainable development goals (SDGs) on some 21,425 ha of land that will be managed for climate resilience. These co-benefits include carbon sequestration, nutrient removal, water storage, increasing biodiversity, prevention of erosion, protection of soil, contributing to sustainable land management, providing for harvesting and livelihoods, provision of 'cultural services' such as tourism and leisure and much more. The SCCF funding will provide resources for valuations in developing countries only. The project valuations in developed countries will be financed through the co-financing of the MAVA Foundation. The lessons from valuations of developed country projects will help for cross-learning and dissemination in developing countries.</i></p> <p><i>The project is on track to deliver the pledged global environmental benefits.</i></p>			
Implementation Progress (IP) Rating	Satisfactory (S)	Unknown	
		Project target	Achieved since project launch
Core Indicator 1	Total no. of direct beneficiaries	115,000	2,778,366
	Male	57,500	1,375,290
	Female	57,500	1,403,076
Core Indicator 2	Area of land managed for climate resilience (ha)	21,425ha	76,336
Core Indicator 3	Total no. of policies/plans that will mainstream climate resilience	15	6
Core Indicator 4	Total no. of people trained	2,340	3,450
	Male	1,170	1,650
	Female	1,170	1,800

⁴ Please refer to the explanatory note at the end of the document and assure that the indicated ratings correspond to the narrative of the report

.		
Overall Risk Rating	Moderate Risk (M)	Choose an item.
<p><i>The project was designed with measures to mitigate stakeholder, climate change, Covid-19 and environmental and social safeguards related risks. The mitigation measures proposed at CEO endorsement stage have been consequently implemented and have allowed to keep the overall risk level at the same niveau as predicted at CEO endorsement stage.</i></p>		

II. Targeted results and progress to-date

Please describe the progress made in achieving the outputs against key performance indicator's targets in the project's **M&E Plan/Log-Frame at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval**. Please expand the table as needed.

Please fill in the below table or make a reference to any supporting documents that may be submitted as annexes to this report.

Project Strategy	KPIs/Indicators	Baseline	Target level	Progress in FY23 (since project launch)
Component 1 – Valuation of Nature Based Infrastructure (NBI)				
Outcome 1.1: Improving the predictability and knowledge on the economic efficiency of NBI for climate adaptation and the provision of other infrastructure services through more comparable and credible evidence on capital and operating costs and benefits of NBI and how they preform compared to grey infrastructure alternatives.				
Output 1.1.1: Tools to identify, select, value, record and communicate NBI solutions	No of tools developed (TCO 3 Number of toolkits and guidelines produced)	0	1	1
Outcome 1.2: Increased confidence of all market participants in developing countries in the use and performance on NBI. Market participants include project developers, design and engineering firms, cities, national governments, public and private investors				
Output 1.2.1: Customized valuations on NBI. Target: 46 valuations	No of valuations carried out (PAO 2 Number of analytical and statistical publications produced)	0	46	11
Component 2 – Data Management and Dissemination				
Outcome 2.1: Decision makers and infrastructure planners in developing countries have access to data on the performance and costs of NBI.				
Output 2.1.1: Interactive online database with downloadable excel spreadsheets	No of database developed (TCO 3 Number of toolkits and guidelines produced)	0	1	1
Output 2.1.2: Bi-annual updates of the database	No of biannual updates (PAO 2 Number of analytical and statistical publications produced)	0	8	3
Outcome 2.2: Decision makers in developing countries are able to use the database to compare performance and costs of NBI with conventional grey infrastructure.				

Output 2.2.1:: Records on user engagement and number of downloads:	TCO 1 number of capacity building activities provided	0	54	36
	KASA 1 number of actors gaining awareness (how many trainees have been reached and are gaining awareness)	0	660	3450 (due to high demand more actors were trained)
	KASA 2 number of actors gaining skills (how many are engaged and able to use the database/tools)	0	528	2760 (due to high demand more actors were trained)
	REACT 1 percentage of trainees satisfied with interventions/trainings	0	80%	80%
	REA 1 Number of actors reached	0	1500	1946 (due to high demand more actors were trained)
	REA 2 Number of actors engaged	0	660	3450 (due to high demand more actors were trained)

Outcome 2.3: Uncertainties related to the use of NBI begins to decrease. Market participants in developing countries begin to trust NBI as a sound and predictable adaptation solution

Component 3 – Capacity Building and Knowledge Management

Outcome 3.1: Decision makers in developing countries have more knowledge and less uncertainties on the performance of NBI

Output 3.1.1: Web-based massive online open course (MOOC)	TCO 1 No of capacity building activities provided	0	54	36
Output 3.1.2: Records on registration and user feedback	REA 1 Number of actors reached	0	1500	1946
	REA 2 Number of actors engaged	0	660	3450 (due to high demand more actors were trained)
	REACT 1 percentage of trainees satisfied with interventions/trainings	0	80%	80%
Output 3.1.3: Annual update of teaching materials based on user feedback	No of annual updates (TCO 3 Number of toolkits and guidelines produced)	0	4	2

Outcome 3.2: Improved capacities of decision makers in developing countries to compare the performance and cost of NBI with grey infrastructure

Component 4 – Outreach and Partnerships

Outcome 4.1: NBI becomes a systematic consideration when planning adaptation and infrastructure

Output 4.1.1: Nature Based Infrastructure Resource Centre established at IISD as a project execution	CPO 5 Number of interventions in partnership with non-UN institutions	0	1	1
Output 4.1.2: Communication and outreach strategy to sustain the NBI Resource Centre beyond the project	CPO 1 No of global fora, workshops	0	5	7 (due to the high demand from stakeholders additional workshops were organized)
	KASA 1 number of actors gaining awareness (how	0	660	3450 (due to high demand more actors were trained)

	many trainees have been reached and are gaining awareness)			
	KASA.2: Number of actors gaining skills	0	528	2760 (due to high demand more actors were trained)
	REA.1: Number of actors reached	0	1500	1946 (due to high demand more actors were trained)
	REA.2: Number of actors engaged	0	660	3450 (due to high demand more actors were trained)
	REACT.1: Percentage of actors satisfied with interventions	0	80%	80%
Outcome 4.2: NBI becomes the preferred option and even maybe the default option for adaptation.				
Output 4.2.1: Annual impact report of the NBI Resource Centre	GOV.1: Number of institutions established or strengthened	0	13	5
	TEC 1 Number of new technologies adopted	0	7	5
	TEC 2 Number of countries showing the adoption of new technologies	0	5	5
	POL.3: Number of guidelines adopted by relevant actors	0	15	6
	INV.3: Value (US\$) of investments leveraged	0	320 mio	425 mio (some high investment value projects could be leveraged)
Component 5 – Monitoring and Evaluation				
Outcome 5.1. Project implementation informed by results from midterm review and up-scaling informed by the results of an independent terminal evaluation				
Output 5.1.1: Mid term review and independent terminal evaluation	No of MTR and TE implemented	0	2	0

III. Project Risk Management

1. Please indicate the overall project-level risks and the related risk management measures: (i) as identified in the CEO Endorsement document, and (ii) progress to-date. Please expand the table as needed.

	(i) Risks at CEO stage	(i) Risk level FY 22	(i) Risk level FY 23	(i) Mitigation measures	(ii) Progress to-date	New defined risk ⁵
1	Stakeholder risks: Insufficient outreach and communication	n.a.	L	The project implements a dedicated component on outreach and communication. A communication and outreach strategy has been developed	The stakeholder risks remain low as significant outreach and communication has taken place during the reporting period. The project is successfully engaging the	<input type="checkbox"/>

⁵ New risk added in reporting period. Check only if applicable.

	<p>The global development community are not developing the NBI skills fast enough.</p> <p>Delays in interacting with project stakeholders to design the analysis and obtaining minimum level of project specific-data to provide a credible valuation.</p>		<p>during the Inception Phase of the project.</p> <p>Components 2 (data management and dissemination) and components 3 (capacity building) of this proposal were implemented with focus on mitigating this risk.</p> <p>The Project Section Matrix includes a criterion that evaluates the data availability, as well as the capacity of a project stakeholder to engage in the NBI valuation workflow. The online database, developed under component 2 of the project, serves to develop proxies/assumptions to fill data gaps.</p>	<p>identified stakeholder groups in the NBI valuations, workshops, online discussions, training courses, and communications activities, including through the project website, social media, direct mailing, webinars, and print materials.</p>		
2	<p>Climate Change risks and opportunities:</p> <p>The impact of climate change becomes more and more evident. The costs and damages caused by climate change induced extreme weather events are steadily increasing as extreme weather events become more frequent and more intense. Humanity is becoming increasingly aware that we will have to adapt to climate change. While climate change has a negative impact on the global economy, climate change does also negatively impact ecosystems and their ability to provide valuable eco-system services</p>	n.a.	M	<p>The economic impacts of climate change on the economy constitute a risk. Countries are not be able to invest in the necessary adaptation measures; particularly if their mindset is limited to making investments in grey infrastructure. Therefore, it becomes increasingly important that alternative and more cost-effective adaptation measures, beyond investments in grey infrastructure will be mainstreamed. The project also managed to turn climate change induced loss of ecosystem services into an opportunity. It has contributed to mankind starting to attribute a higher economic value (i.e., the willingness to pay for an ecosystem service or not to lose it) to these ecosystem services once they are becoming scarce and when it becomes evident how much the loss of regulating ecosystem services costs individuals and societies. This momentum has been used by the project to demonstrate that nature-based infrastructure can be a less costly adaption option than investments in conventional grey infrastructure. Furthermore, the</p>	<p>Climate scenarios and Copernicus climate data have been used in the NBI valuations in year 1 and this will continue throughout the duration of the project.</p> <p>We are also increasingly (in almost all NBI valuations) making use of maps generated through the InVEST models to provide more accurate and location specific results for the assessments.</p> <p>Since UNFCCC COP26 momentum on climate adaptation has increased. We have also seen bilateral commitments, such as from the Canadian government, scaling up efforts on climate adaptation and in particular on NbS. The Biodiversity COP15 in Montreal and the outcome document has given the NbS agenda further visibility and momentum</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>

				project has contributed to humanity starting to allocate a higher scarcity value to the positive externalities nature-based infrastructure solution do provide, when we see them endangered and disappearing. Thus, as the impact of climate change become more visible, the higher the demand for cost effective alternatives to grey infrastructure adaptation measures has become and the higher the economic (scarcity) value of the positive externalities and additional ecosystem services provided by NBI is perceived. Here the project contributed to the awareness of the financial and economic benefits of ecosystem services as it is required for a mainstreaming of NBI as a cost effective and economically beneficial solutions for the unavoidable investments that will have to be made in climate change adaptation at a global scale. Finally, existing risks to nature-based solutions were taken into account during project selection scrutiny. For more information on Project Selection Protocol please refer to Annex 2.of the CEO endorsement document		
3 COVID-19 risks and opportunities The outbreak of the global COVID-19 pandemics will have multiple repercussions on the implementation/execution of this project: The impacts of COVID-19 make international travel for project execution and outreach difficult. The COVID-19 global economic downturn will diminish momentum on climate adaptation. Delays in the sourcing of NBI projects for valuation	n.a.	M	<p>This was mitigated by working virtually. IISD routinely worked electronically with partners and NBI proponents, using teleconference platforms and on-line tools to engage stakeholders, discuss priorities, co-design NBI valuations, share results and explore next steps.</p> <p>The project will demonstrated that adapting to extreme weather using cost-effective NBI is a pre-requisite for economic resilience and economic recovery. As NBI do require lower capital expenditure, it become an even more attractive option</p>	IISD has successfully carried out project operations in a fully virtual environment with no major disruptions or negative project impacts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	<p>due to the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the COVID-19 crisis can also provide opportunities: The post- COVID-19 recovery stimulus will increase public spending on infrastructure and climate change adaptation.</p>			<p>during times of public budget stress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A first list with projects for valuation in year 1 has been compiled and shared with the GEF Secretariat. • Continued outreach has taken place after the PIF approval and NBI project proponents have reached out and expressed interest in a valuation during year 1 of the project. • A project selection protocol (annex 2) has been developed. • Engagement through the GEF, GCA, UNIDO, MAVA Foundation, IISD NAP Global Network has happened on a continued basis to identify potential projects. • The NBI Resource Center provides the possibility for any NBI project proponent to submit a request for a valuation online. 	<p>IISD has successfully submitted 31 projects to the project steering committee. This solid project pipeline was the result of wide outreach and bilateral engagements with a diverse group of stakeholders, including multilateral and regional development banks, governments, civil society organizations and networks, and project developers.</p>	
4	Environmental and social safeguard-related risks	n.a.	L	<p>Environmental and social safeguard-related risks have proven not to be relevant in the context of this project as it is not an investment. In line with the UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policy and Procedures (ESSPP), the project has proven to have minimal or no adverse social and/or environmental impacts. No further specific environmental and/or social assessment were required during project implementation</p>	<p>No environmental and social safeguard-related risks have arisen during the reporting period.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. If the project received a sub-optimal risk rating (H, S) in the previous reporting period, please state the actions taken since then to mitigate the relevant risks and improve the related risk rating. Please also elaborate

on reasons that may have impeded any of the sub-optimal risk ratings from improving in the current reporting cycle; please indicate actions planned for the next reporting cycle to remediate this.

N/A

3. Please indicate any implication of the **COVID-19** pandemic on the progress of the project.

The project was already designed taking the COVID-19 related challenges into due consideration. All interaction with stakeholders is virtually or through electronic communication channels. Thus COVID-19 had no impact on the implementation of this project.

4. Please clarify if the project is facing delays and is expected to request an **extension**.

At this point in time the project is still on track. Yet, it has to be seen whether the total of 46 evaluations can be delivered within the designated project implementation period

5. Please provide the **main findings and recommendations of completed MTR**, and elaborate on any actions taken towards the recommendations included in the report.

MTR will only be done in end 2023

IV. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

1. As part of the requirements for **projects from GEF-6 onwards**, and based on the screening as per the UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures (ESSPP), which category is the project?

☐ Category A project

☐ Category B project

☒ Category C project

(By selecting Category C, I confirm that the E&S risks of the project have not escalated to Category A or B).

Please expand the table as needed.

	E&S risk	Mitigation measures undertaken during the reporting period	Monitoring methods and procedures used in the reporting period
(I) Risks identified in ESMP at time of CEO Endorsement	Environmental and social safeguard-related risks are not likely to be relevant in the context of this project as it is not an investment. According to the UNIDO Environmental and Social	No procurements were undertaken	Reports on project activities

	<p>Safeguards Policy and Procedures (ESSPP), the proposed project is likely to have minimal or no adverse social and/or environmental impacts. No further specific environmental and/or social assessment were required during Project Formulation, although those with procurement components may still have potential environmental and social sustainability considerations. These will be addressed through UNIDO's and IISD procurement processes, as applicable.</p>		
(ii) New risks identified during project implementation (if not applicable, please insert 'NA' in each box)	NA	NA	NA

V. Stakeholder Engagement

1. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please provide information on **progress, challenges and outcomes** regarding engagement of stakeholders in the project (based on the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent document submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval).

The project is successfully implementing the Stakeholder Engagement Plan by actively engaging the identified stakeholder groups in the NBI valuations, workshops, online discussions, training courses, and communications activities, including through the project website, social media, direct mailing, webinars, and print materials. In addition, three Project Steering Committee meetings have been convened and two Technical Advisory Committee meetings have been convened during the reporting period.

2. Please provide any feedback submitted by national counterparts, GEF OFP, co-financiers, and other partners/stakeholders of the project (e.g. private sector, CSOs, NGOs, etc.).

The project has engaged successfully with a wide group of stakeholders. For example, the NBI training and

selected workshop activities have seen a high overall satisfaction rate. More than 85% of survey respondents indicate enhanced capacities and skills to value NBI projects and report an increased understanding of the importance of NBI for climate adaptation and infrastructure development. Representation is diverse in terms of sectors. For example, in the live online training program in October 2022 we had the following sector representation : 18% of government rep. 28% non-profit, 22% private sector, 19% research & academia, and 13% other. Participants came from more than 100 different countries.

Some of the feedback captured by the stakeholders of the project is available here: <https://nbi.iisd.org/impact/>

3. Please provide any relevant stakeholder consultation documents.

Project Steering Committee meeting May 2023 (attachment 1)
NBI live online training agenda (attachment 2)

VI. Gender Mainstreaming

1. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please report on the progress achieved on implementing gender-responsive measures and using gender-sensitive indicators, as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval (in the project results framework, gender action plan or equivalent),.

Pursuant to the Gender Analysis as attached to the CEO Endorsement letter, the project is actively implementing specific measures to ensure women's meaningful participation and representation in the project. The project has fostered women as drivers of change by targeting women in government and other stakeholder groups in trainings and workshops. As a result, over 50% of the participants are women in the NBI Centre's three online training activities. This focus on ensuring women's voice and representation has not only included the training participants but also those leading these activities, including trainers, moderators, and facilitators. The project has also focused on including women's experience and knowledge in the NBI valuations and to increase the in-house capacities on gender equality and women's empowerment.

VII. Knowledge Management

1. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please elaborate on any knowledge management activities / products, as documented at CEO Endorsement / Approval.

The project is delivering a range of knowledge management activities and has published numerous knowledge products during the reporting period. The knowledge management activities include the establishment of a project website (<https://nbi.iisd.org/>) and the establishment of a knowledge sharing platform on the Green Forum (<https://www.thegreenforum.org/group/278/about>). In addition, 2 flagship reports have been published and 9 NBI valuation studies have been released. An NBI Centre flyer has also been published and a promotional video has been produced and made available on the homepage of the NBI Centre website.

2. Please list any **relevant knowledge management mechanisms / tools** that the project has generated.

The following knowledge products were published during the reporting period:

On the NBI assessments:

- [Forest restoration/water management in Indonesia](#)
- [Tree planting in Bhutan](#)
- [Tree planting in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia](#)
- [Land restoration in Ethiopia](#)
- [Wastewater treatment infrastructure in Mossel Bay, South Africa](#)
- [Sand dunes reconstruction in the Netherlands](#)
- [Wetland restoration in Colombia](#)
- [River restoration in Greece](#)
- [Mangrove restoration in Colombia](#)

Flagship reports:

- [The value of incorporating NBI in urban infrastructure planning](#)
- [How can investment in nature close the infrastructure gap?](#)

Capacity building and self-paced training materials:

- [Self-paced E-course](#)
- [5 – week live online training program](#)

Database with user-guide: <https://nbi.iisd.org/database/>

Other outreach material and stories: <https://nbi.iisd.org/resources/>

VIII. Implementation progress

1. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please provide information on **progress, challenges and outcomes achieved/observed** with regards to project implementation.

In 2021, the focus was on the set up of the [NBI Centre](#), its governance, committees, a comprehensive communication and outreach strategy and internal working processes as well as on advancing the knowledge through the customized valuations. In terms of working processes for the NBI Centre, IISD completed TORs for the project steering committee, composition and TOR of the technical advisory committee, selection protocols and templates to increase efficiency of the sourcing of projects, as well as the SAVi workflow in terms of research and publication of outputs. In 2021, the first 6 valuations were identified and through the assessments, and in dissemination of results and knowledge on the NBI valuations and the valuation methods we engaged with more than 1070 stakeholders in 2021.

The launch of the NBI Centre and [the flagship report “How can Investment in Nature close the Infrastructure Gap?”](#) generated a lot of media attention as well as increased visibility for the NBI

Centre, and raised significant awareness on NBI and the need for more systemic valuations of infrastructure projects and nature. This was also highlighted at the COP 26 in Glasgow where the NBI Centre was featured as a flagship initiative at the GEF-GCF Pavilion.

In 2022, the online training was launched. Participants were able to choose the self-paced option or participate in the live program, which runs twice per year. The first live program took place in March/April 2022. Overall, 857 participants (54% Women and 45% Men) signed up for the Online Training Course About Nature-Based Infrastructure. 428 of these participants chose to join the 5-week live program held from March 28 to April 28, 2022. The second 5-week live program took place in autumn 2022. In total, 2074 people from 159 countries signed up for the training. A total of 481 of these participants joined the live program from September 19 to October 20, 2022 with the other registrants following the course at their own pace.

In 2022, IISD also published the first technical reports on [constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment in South Africa](#), [land restoration in Ethiopia](#), [tree planting in Bhutan](#), and [tree planting in Addis Ababa \(Ethiopia\)](#). Other projects for the valuations were identified and engagement with project stakeholders to complete on-going assessments continued. At the Biodiversity COP15 in December 2022 another [flagship report](#) about the value of incorporating nature in urban infrastructure planning was launched, and the NBI Centre also organized two side events.

In 2022 and the first half of 2023, the project ramped up its efforts to secure further projects for assessments and in total there are now 31 projects approved by the steering committee. These include projects with the WRI, C40 CFF, World Bank, EIB, and NDC Partnership among others. 11 assessments are completed, and 10 assessments are on-going. In 2023, continued training has taken place, among others through 3 deep dive trainings on the valuation methods, and 5 other online capacity building engagements, bringing the total number of trained people by the project up to 3450. The database of the project has also regularly been updated with the latest information and findings of the assessments.

2. Please briefly elaborate on any **minor amendments**⁶ to the approved project that may have been introduced during the implementation period or indicate as not applicable (NA).

Please tick each category for which a change has occurred and provide a description of the change in the related textbox. You may attach supporting documentation, as appropriate.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Results Framework	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Components and Cost	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Institutional and Implementation Arrangements	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Financial Management	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Implementation Schedule	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Executing Entity	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Executing Entity Category	NA

⁶ As described in Annex 9 of the *GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines*, **minor amendments** are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5%.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Minor Project Objective Change	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Safeguards	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Risk Analysis	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Increase of GEF Project Financing Up to 5%	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Co-Financing	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Location of Project Activities	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Others	NA

3. Please provide progress related to the **financial implementation** of the project.

No project disbursements have yet been made for activities during the reporting period. In conjunction with the reporting to be provided on August 31st a disbursement request will be made for WP 4 (5 valuations on nature-based infrastructure (including a webinar with the proponents of the NBI solution) carried out in the first half of 2023).

As agreed with the GEF Secretariat, first two years of the project was funded by the MAVA Foundation. With the exception of work conducted under WP 16 (Services provided by the NBI Resource Centre as a project execution unit in 2021) and WP 20 (Communication and Outreach activities 2021). All other project activities were covered by funding provided by the MAVA Foundation until the 31st of October 2022. Activities taking place after 31st of October 2022 are developed with the support of the UNIDO/GEF SCCF funds.

IX. Work Plan and Budget

1. Please provide **an updated project work plan and budget** for the remaining duration of the project, as per last approved project extension. Please expand/modify the table as needed.

Please fill in the below table or make a reference to a file, in case it is submitted as an annex to the report.

Please see the attachment 3 annex for a detailed breakdown of the remaining project budget.

X. Synergies

1. **Synergies** achieved:

A SAVI valuation was carried out by the EA (IISD) during the PPG phase of the GEF LD Project Maintaining and Enhancing Water Yield Through Land and Forest Rehabilitation (MEWLAFOR, GEF Project ID 10575)". The valuation revealed that the project is economically viable for investors and generates net benefits for society when considering a) material economic impacts, including the carbon benefits yield with an Internal Rate of Return (IRR) of 22.5%, or b) all material impacts and externalities yields an IRR above 62%. This information was instrumental to obtain GEF funding for this project applying NBI and hybrid solutions to overcome LD induced water scarcity.

3. Stories to be shared (Optional)

<https://nbi.iisd.org/impact/>

XI. GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate.

Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap](#) or [GeoNames](#) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com>

Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#)

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location and Activity Description
<i>Global</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

1. **Timing & duration:** Each report covers a twelve-month period, i.e. 1 July 2022 – 30 June 2023.
2. **Responsibility:** The responsibility for preparing the report lies with the project manager in consultation with the Division Chief and Director.
3. **Evaluation:** For the report to be used effectively as a tool for annual self-evaluation, project counterparts need to be fully involved. The (main) counterpart can provide any additional information considered essential, including a simple rating of project progress.
4. **Results-based management:** The annual project/programme progress reports are required by the RBM programme component focal points to obtain information on outcomes observed.

Global Environmental Objectives (GEOs) / Development Objectives (DOs) ratings	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed <u>all</u> its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as "good practice".
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to <u>achieve most</u> of its <u>major</u> global environmental objectives, and yields satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to <u>achieve most</u> of its major <u>relevant</u> objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modes overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environmental benefits.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve <u>some</u> of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to <u>achieve only some</u> of its major global environmental objectives.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected <u>not</u> to achieve <u>most</u> of its major global environmental objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, <u>any</u> of its major global environmental objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

Implementation Progress (IP)	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of <u>all</u> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as "good practice".
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of <u>most</u> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of <u>some</u> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of <u>some</u> components is <u>not</u> in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of <u>most</u> components in <u>not</u> in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of <u>none</u> of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Risk ratings	
Risk ratings will assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:	
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.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks.
Moderate 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 moderate risk.
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 low risks.