



## UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2023

1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

### 1- Identification

#### 1.1 Project details

GEF ID	9884	SMA IPMR ID	36747
Project Short Title	BRS Toolkit	Grant ID	S1-32GFL-000632 / P1-33GFL-000
		Umoja WBS	SB-009494.01
Project Title	Integrated SC toolkit to improve the transmission of information under Articles 07 and 15		
Project Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full Sized Project (FSP)	Duration months	36
Parent Programme if child project			68.1 months
GEF Focal Area(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Chemicals and Waste	Completion Date	31-Jul-21
Project Scope	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Global		30-Jun-23
Region	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval	9-Nov-17
Countries	Cambodia, Honduras, Kenya, Madagascar, Republic of Moldova, Papua New Guinea, Saint Lucia, Ukraine	UNEP Project Approval Date (on Decision Sheet)	16-Nov-17
GEF financing amount	USD 2,000,000	Start of Implementation (PCA entering into force)	9-Feb-18
Co-financing amount	USD 7,232,340	Date of First Disbursement	10-Feb-18
Total disbursement as of 30 June	USD 1,965,150	Date of Inception Workshop, if available	25-26 Oct 2018
Total expenditure as of 30 June	USD 1,538,441	Midterm undertaken?	No
		Actual Mid-term Date, if taken	
		Expected Mid-Term Date, if not taken	(Not required)
		Expected Terminal Evaluation Date	30-Jun-24
		Expected Financial Closure Date	30-Dec-24

\* As per Legal Agreement signed with the EA, project effectiveness is defined as "the date of receipt of first disbursement or sub-allotment".

#### 1.2 EA: Project description

The **objective of the project** is to facilitate the development, transmission, access and use of data contained in National Implementation Plans (NIP, Article 7) and National Reports (Article 15). The project comprises of only **one component** on the "Development and demonstration of an integrated Articles 7 and 15 electronic toolkit". Such toolkit compiling the data contained in National Implementation Plans (NIP, Article 7) and National Reports (Article 15) helps countries to take informed decisions with regard to the reduction of POPs and apply POPs mitigation plans, and thus protect human health and the environment from its adverse effects. Also, availability of such data at the national level contributes to the periodical effectiveness evaluation process conducted under the Stockholm Convention on POPs.

The **project outcome** is to enhance compliance with the Stockholm Convention through improved transmission, accessibility and use of data contained in NIPs (Article 7) and National Reports (Article 15). Five outputs are defined under the project, namely: Output 1.1. Gap analysis and consultations with Parties to the SC and implementing agencies developed, taking into account gender aspects; Output 1.2. Integrated articles 7 and 15 electronic toolkit designed taking into account the recommendation on gender, tested and endorsed by the project Steering Committee; Output 1.3. Demonstration of the integrated electronic toolkit taking into account gender aspects; Output 1.4. Development of Replication Strategy; Output 1.5. Monitoring and Evaluation.

**Organizations involved:** Secretariat of Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, Stockholm and Basel Convention regional centres, National governments of the project countries, Global Environment Facility, UNEP etc.

### 1.3 Project Contact

Division(s) Implementing the project	Industry and Economy Division, GEF Chemicals and Waste Unit	Executing Agency(ies)	UNEP Knowledge & Risk Unit
Name of co-implementing Agency		Names of Other Project Partners	Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions Secretariat; Basel and Stockholm Conventions Regional Centre for English speaking countries in Africa; Basel and Stockholm Convention Regional Centre in Uruguay; Basel and Stockholm Convention Regional Centre for the Asia and the Pacific Region in China
<b>TM:</b> UNEP Portfolio Manager(s)	Ludovic Bernaudat	<b>EA:</b> Manager/Representative	Sandra Averous-Monnery
<b>TM:</b> UNEP Task Manager(s)	Jitendra Sharma	<b>EA:</b> Project Manager	Mihaela Claudia Paun
<b>TM:</b> UNEP Budget/Finance Officer	Anuradha Shenoy	<b>EA:</b> Finance Manager	Gricha Zurita
<b>TM:</b> UNEP Support/Assistant		<b>EA:</b> Communications lead, if relevant	

## 2- OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

<b>TM:</b> UNEP Current Subprogramme(s)	Chemicals Pollution and Action	<b>TM:</b> UNEP previous Subprogramme(s)	n/a
<b>TM:</b> PoW Indicator(s)	PoW Outcomes: 3A PoW Outcome Indicators: i and iv Direct outcomes to which project contributes: 3.5, 3.11, 3.13		

EA: UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages

The **project document** makes no direct reference to the UNDAF strategic objectives of the project countries. Still, this report includes a selection of the relevant project countries UNDAF strategic objectives the project could contribute to. The integrated electronic toolkit to be developed contributes to supporting and drawing upon national strategic planning processes, as well as to strengthen the monitoring and evaluating systems to track progress towards the SDGs.

**Kenya (Kenya's UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2018-2022)**

Strategic priority II: A social and cohesive society enjoying equitable social development in a clean and secure environment: "By 2022, people in Kenya, particularly the most vulnerable, are educated, healthy, well nourished, have clean water and sanitation, are protected, empowered and live in decent homes within resilient communities"

**Madagascar (Plan-cadre des Nation Unies pour l'aide au développement 2015-2019 )**

None identified.

**Republic of Moldova (Cadrul de Parteneriat ONU - Republica Moldova pentru Dezvoltare Durabilă 2018-2022)**

Pillar 3: Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management

Outcome 3.1: Improved environmental management in increased compliance with international and regional standards

**Ukraine (Draft UNDAF Result Matrix for Ukraine 8 May 2017)**

Thematic Pillar 4: Sustainable economic growth, environment and employment - Outcome 4.1. By 2022, all women and men, especially young people, equally benefit from an enabling environment that includes labour market, access to decent jobs and economic opportunities

**Honduras (Marco de Asistencia de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo en Honduras 2017 - 2021)**

Strategic Area 3. A productive Honduras, generating opportunities and decent employment, which takes advantage of its resources in a sustainable manner and reduces environmental vulnerability. Effect 5: The poor and vulnerable to food insecurity of prioritized municipalities has increased their production and productivity, access to productive employment and decent work, income and sustainable consumption, taking into account climate change.

**Saint Lucia** (United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Barbados and the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) 2012 to 2016) - Outcome 1: Environment, energy, climate change and disaster risk reduction

**Cambodia (United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2016-2018)**

Outcome 1: Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development - By 2018, people living in Cambodia, in particular youth, women and vulnerable groups, are enabled to actively participate in and benefit equitably from growth and development that is sustainable and does not compromise the well-being, natural and cultural resources of future generations.

**Papua New Guinea (United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2018-2022)**

Outcome 3: By 2022, Papua New Guinea demonstrates improved performance in managing environmental resources and risks emanating from climate change and disasters. Sub-Outcome 3.1: By 2022, PNG has strengthened legislative and policy frameworks with institutional support for natural resources management including climate change mitigation, adaptation and disaster risk reduction

EA: Link to relevant SDG Goals

Goal 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages

Goal 6: Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all

Goal 12: Responsible consumption and production

EA: Link to relevant SDG Targets

Target: 3.9 – "By 2030, substantially reduce the number of deaths and illnesses from hazardous chemicals and air, water and soil pollution and contamination".

Target: 6.3 – "By 2030, improve water quality by reducing pollution, eliminating dumping and minimizing release of hazardous chemicals and materials, halving the proportion of untreated wastewater and substantially increasing recycling and safe reuse globally".

Target: 12.4.1 - "Number of Parties to MEAs that meet their commitments and obligations in transmitting information as required by each agreement".

TM: GEF core or sub indicators targeted by the project as defined at CEO Endorsement/Approval, as well as results

or Sub Indicators

Indicators

Targets - Expected value		
Mid-term	End-of-project	Total Target

Materialised to date
N/A

2.2. GEF Core


Implementation Status 2023 Final PIR

2.3 Implementation status & Risk

	PIR #	Rating towards outcomes (DO) (section 3.1)	Rating towards outputs (IP) (section 3.2)	Risk rating 4.2 (section 4.2)
FY 2023	Final PIR	S	S	L
FY 2022	3rd PIR	S	S	L
FY 2021	2nd PIR	MS	MS	L
FY 2020	1st PIR	MS	MS	L
FY 2019				
FY 2018				
FY 2017				
FY 2016				
FY 2015				

**EA:** Summary of status  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

This is the final PIR of the project. The project aims to support the parties to the Stockholm Convention to submit their national implementation plans in a harmonized manner with the national reporting under Article 15 of the Convention. During the reporting period, the electronic toolkit has been developed and shared with all other Parties to the Stockholm Convention for testing and providing comments. Following the feedback from Stockholm Convention Parties, the electronic toolkit has been updated and deployed with the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions Secretariat. The toolkit was presented during dedicated side event organized at the BRS COP 2023. The deliverables of the project were fully completed and endorsed by all project countries/steering committee members, BRS Secretariat during the final steering committee meeting on 25th May 2023 in Geneva. The project steering committee identified the need to continue to improve and pilot test the toolkit.

The toolkit was presented to the Stockholm COP 11 in a side event and was referenced in the COP decision (SC11-7) which urged Parties to continue to test the toolkit. The promotion and testing of toolkit should be planned in future NIP update projects.

The output wise progress provided below:

Output 1.1: Generic gap analysis and 8 individual preliminary gap analysis were developed and consultations with the project countries and partners conducted (100%).

Output 1.2: The development of the integrated Articles 7 and 15 electronic toolkit is finalized and deployed on Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions Secretariat Server (100%).

Output 1.4: The Replication Strategy has been finalized (100%).

Output 1.5: 7 half-yearly progress reports, 5 quarterly progress and expenditures reports and 6 annual Project Implementation Reports (2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2023) were prepared. 22 quarterly progress and financial reports for 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023 were prepared (100%).

Overall, the project has completed all the planned activities successfully and were endorsed by the project countries. On the financial progress, the project has reported an expenditure of ~\$1.5 million against the total allocation of \$1.95 million. However, the EA has noted that some of the agreements with local partners are being closed and the expenditure will be recorded and should be close to the project budget, the balance will be returned to GEF. The management led terminal review will be conducted in consultation with UNEP evaluation office.

2.4 Co-finance

<b>EA:</b> Planned Co-finance	USD 7,232,340	<b>EA:</b> Actual to date:	USD 8,316,201
<b>EA:</b> Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges.	US\$ 1,083,861 leveraged beyond the cofinance resources committed at time of approval.		

2.5. Stakeholder

**EA:** Date of project steering committee meeting

25-May-23

**EA:** Stakeholder engagement  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

Demonstration countries - Cambodia, Honduras, Kenya, Madagascar, Republic of Moldova, Papua New Guinea and Saint Lucia – conducted in-country activities to prepare and conduct the testing of the integrated electronic toolkit. (note that Ukraine did not join the project activities even after repeated follow up).

Basel and Stockholm Conventions Regional Centre for English speaking countries in Africa, Basel and Stockholm Convention Regional Centre for the Asia and the Pacific Region in China and Basel and Stockholm Convention Regional Centre in Uruguay - supported the dissemination of the project outputs and promotion of the integrated electronic toolkit and its use among the Parties served in Africa, Asia and Pacific and Latin America and Caribbean regions. In case of the Basel and Stockholm Convention Regional Centre in Uruguay, this has supported three of the demonstration countries (Honduras, Republic of Moldova and Saint Lucia) in delivering their in-country activities.

Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions Secretariat – provided technical support in the selection of the IT consultant responsible for the development of the integrated electronic toolkit; provided guidance on navigating within the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions Secretariat server which hosts the toolkit; when needed, provided guidance on the alpha and beta versions of the toolkit and shared their demos to be tested by the Parties to the Stockholm Convention; checked the final version of the toolkit upon its deployment on the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions Secretariat server and provided recommendations.

2.6. Gender

**TM:** Does the project have a gender action plan?

No

**EA:** Gender mainstreaming  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

A Guidance on Incorporating Gender Dimensions into National Strategy Setting in Chemicals Management for Stockholm Convention National Implementation Plans was developed and disseminated to the project demonstration countries and Parties to the Stockholm Convention in Africa, Asia-Pacific, Central and Eastern Europe, and Latin America and Caribbean regions during the project life-time. Also, balanced gender representation was considered when organizing the meetings, workshops and in-country activities organized within the framework of the project. The issue of gender disaggregated data collection was considered when developing the integrated electronic toolkit and during the in-country activities implementation.

2.7. ESSM

**TM:** Was the project classified as moderate/high risk at CEO Endorsement/Approval Stage?

No

**TM:** Have any new social and/or environmental risks been identified during the reporting period?

No

**TM:** If yes, what specific safeguard risks were identified in the SRIF/ESERN?

**TM:** If yes, please describe the new risks, or changes

**TM & EA:** Has the project received complaints related to social and/or environmental impacts (actual or potential) during the reporting period?

No

**TM & EA:** If yes, please describe the complaint(s) or grievance(s) in detail

**EA:** Environmental and social safeguards management  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

As a global project which developed an integrated reporting toolkit and building national capacity, there were no direct actions on the ground and therefore no safeguard risks were identified at outset, and did not materialize during implementation.

2.8. KM/Learning

**EA:** Knowledge activities and products  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

Generic gap analysis was developed. The analysis identified and presents the generic overlaps and gaps between data and information requested under the reporting pursuant Article 15 and other reporting obligations under the Stockholm Convention and the data and information generated during the NIP development and/or update process, as well as conclusions and recommendations on modalities to correlate the processes of reporting under Article 15 and other reporting obligations under the Stockholm Convention with the process of developing and updating the NIPs. The analysis represents the baseline for development of an electronic toolkit that will be used to enhance compliance with the Stockholm Convention through improved transmission, accessibility and use of data contained in NIPs (Article 7) and National Reports (Article 15). A Guidance on Incorporating Gender Dimensions into National Strategy Setting in Chemicals Management for Stockholm Convention National Implementation Plans was also developed to: a) provide the background and context for incorporating gender dimensions into policy formulation for chemicals management, i.e. POPs and gender focused facts and figures as well as the key issues that should be considered; b) provide process-oriented recommendations on incorporating gender dimensions throughout the process of National Implementation Plans development, including accompanying tools with more detailed recommendations; c) provide content-oriented recommendations on incorporating gender dimensions into the development of content in the NIPs, including accompanying tools with more detailed recommendations.

To support the execution of the in-countries activities, the UN Environment Programme developed the following support materials:

- Correspondence table between NIP chapters and Art. 15 reporting;
- Correspondence table among the source categories, activity rates and potential sources of information for POPs, mercury and greenhouse gases releases estimates;
- Summary of relevant information for POPs data collection process out of the POPs inventories guidance documents;
- Excel sheet compiling information on existent specific exemptions/acceptable purposes;
- Excel sheet compiling Harmonized System (HS) codes per POPs/articles containing POPs (where available);
- Excel sheet compiling the Basel Convention waste codes per POPs.

A dedicated project webpage was developed and kept permanently updated on the UN Environment Programme website available at the following link: <https://www.unenvironment.org/explore-topics/chemicals-waste/what-we-do/persistent-organic-pollutants/national-implementation-1>.

*Please attach a copy of any products*

**EA:** Main learning during the period

- National Implementation Plan was acknowledged as main information and data source for fulfilling the reporting obligations under the Stockholm Convention.
- The early involvement of all the relevant stakeholders on the project implementation ensured the ownership over the solutions proposed for integrated electronic toolkit development.
- A structured NIP transmission template, harmonized with the reporting under Article 15, prevents Parties in wasting time and other resources in compiling information with less relevance.
- Understanding the relationship between NIPs and National Reports enhanced the collection and sharing of information between the two mechanisms at national levels.
- The structure of the new toolkit supports the direct inventory planning, helping countries prioritize and plan field work to support desk studies necessary for NIP updates.
- Integration and mainstreaming of gender dimensions into the NIP development and update process, as well as action plans development and NIP implementation was strengthened via using designated generic tools for chemicals management and specific tools for NIPs.

2.9. Storie

**EA:** Stories to be shared  
(section to be shared with communication division/  
GEF communication)

N/A

### 3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE

#### 3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes (Development Objectives)

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	EA: Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	TM: Progress rating
<b>Objective</b>							
Facilitate the development, transmission, access and use of data contained in National Implementation Plans (NIP, Article 7) and National Reports (Article 15)	N/A						
<b>Outcome 1</b>							
Enhanced compliance with the Stockholm Convention (SC) through improved transmission, accessibility and use of data (article 16) contained in National Implementation Plans (NIP, Article 7) and National Reports (Article 15)	Number of countries that meet their obligations in transmitting information as required by Articles 7 and 15 of the Stockholm Convention (SDG 12.4.1)	0 demonstration countries have submitted the updated NIPs addressing COP 6 amendments.  0 countries have reported in the 4th round deadline for national reports	NA	06 demonstration Countries  06 demonstration Countries	100%	6 demonstration countries have their NIPs under development: Cambodia, Honduras, Kenya, Madagascar, Republic of Moldova and Ukraine. 2 countries officially submitted their NIPs to BRS Secretariat: Saint Lucia and Papua New Guinea (not yet posted on the website). 7 demonstration countries submitted their national report at 4th and 5th cycles: Cambodia (4th and 5th reports); Honduras (4th and 5th reports); Kenya (5th report); Madagascar (5th report); Republic of Moldova (4th and 5th reports), Saint Lucia (4th and 5th reports); Ukraine (4th and 5th reports). 1 demonstration country has its national report under development: Papua New Guinea (5th report).	S
	Increased percentage of data from NIPs is used to report under Article 15 and used in Article 16	To be determined in the gap analysis that will be done in the project component 1	NA	TBD	100%	All demonstration countries used the data from NIPs to report under Article 15. All other Parties to the Stockholm Convention in Africa, Asia-Pacific and Latin America and Caribbean regions were trained in understanding the interlinkages between NIPs and Article 15 reporting and interchangeable use of data.	S

For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.

#### 3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs (Implementation Progress)

Output	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2022 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2023 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	EA: Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	TM: Progress rating
<b>Under Comp 1</b>					
1.1 Gap analysis and consultations with Parties to the SC and implementing agencies developed, taking into account gender aspects.	Saturday, September 1, 2018	100%	100%	Output indicator target: 1 report Progress: Completed One gap analysis report available Additional: 8 individual preliminary gap analysis available Generic gap analysis was developed and consultations with the demonstration countries and partners were conducted in September 2018 for its finalization.	S
1.2 Integrated articles 7 and 15 electronic toolkit designed taking into account the recommendation on gender, tested and endorsed by the project Steering Committee	Friday, June 30, 2023	85%	100%	Output indicator target: 1 integrated electronic toolkit Progress: Completed  1 integrated electronic toolkit taking into account gender aspects designed, tested and endorsed. The integrated electronic toolkit, comprising of four modules (NIP Submission Module, POPs Inventory Module, Guidance Module and Queries Module) was developed, tested by the demonstration countries and other Parties to the Stockholm Convention, endorsed by the Project Steering Committee at its final meeting held on 25 May 2023 and deployed on Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Convention Secretariat server.  100% quantitative data in existing NIPs of demonstration countries imported into the new integrated electronic toolkit. The NIPs uploaded were those of the demonstration countries and the other invited/willing countries identified during the promotion of the toolkit use. The upload was initiated together with the NIP Submission Module testing exercise of the alpha version and continued for the beta version.	S

1.3 Demonstration of the integrated electronic toolkit taking into account gender aspects	Friday, June 30, 2023	85%	100%	<p>Output indicator target: 6 demonstration countries</p> <p>Progress: Completed</p> <p>7 demonstration countries assisted in fully entering new NIP and national report data into the integrated electronic toolkit. All 7 demonstration countries have conducted POPs data collection, which was used to test the integrated electronic toolkit. Further support has been provided beyond the project framework, through further testing by the Stockholm Convention Parties (following a COP decision) and the dissemination activities conducted by regional centres within the context of the project outcomes and outputs replication.</p> <p>7 countries taking into account gender aspects in the NIP Action Plan. Practical guidelines to incorporating gender considerations into the NIP action plans development and NIP implementation were developed and disseminated among demonstration countries and beyond to the Parties served by the three regional centres in Africa, Asia and Pacific and Latin America and Caribbean regions. 7 countries entering gender disaggregated data in the integrated electronic toolkit when relevant. When available, the 7 demonstration countries collected, compiled, and entered gender disaggregated data into the integrated electronic toolkit.</p>	S
1.4 Development of Replication Strategy	Friday, June 30, 2023	95%	100%	<p>Output indicator target: 1 replication strategy</p> <p>Progress: Completed</p> <p>1 replication strategy developed and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.</p>	S
1.5 Monitoring and Evaluation	Friday, June 30, 2023	90%	100%	<p>7 half-yearly progress reports, 5 quarterly progress and expenditures reports and 6 annual Project Implementation Reports (2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2023) were prepared.</p> <p>22 quarterly progress and financial reports for 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023 were prepared.</p> <p>The first Project Steering Committee Meeting was held on 22 October 2018 in Montevideo, Uruguay (face-to-face).</p> <p>The second Project Steering Committee Meeting took place on 1st of December 2021 (online).</p> <p>The third Project Steering Committee Meeting took place on 25th May 2023 in Geneva, Switzerland (face-to-face).</p>	S

The Task Manager will decide on the relevant level of disaggregation (i.e. either at the output or activity level).

#### 4 Risk Rating

##### 4.1 Table A. Project management Risk

Please refer to the Risk Help Sheet for more details on rating

Risk Factor	EA's Rating	TM's Rating
1 Management structure - Roles and responsibilities	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
2 Governance structure - Oversight	Low : Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet at least once a year and Active membership and participation in decision-making processes. SC provides direction/inputs. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
3 Implementation schedule	Moderate: Project progressing according to work plan and Adaptive management and regular monitoring. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Moderate: Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
4 Budget	Low : Activities are progressing within planned budget and Balanced budget utilisation including PMC. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
5 Financial Management	Low : Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for and Audit reports provided regularly and confirm correct use of funds. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
6 Reporting	Low : Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and Reports are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
7 Capacity to deliver	Low : Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners and Capacity gaps were addressed before implementation or during early stages. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.

If any of the risk factors is rated a Moderate or higher, please include it in Table B below

##### 4.2 Table B. Risk-log

Implementation Status (Current PIR)

Final PIR

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:							Variation respect to last rating	
	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	PIR 6	Δ	Justification
The Executing Agency selected for this project does not have enough human resources to deliver the project outputs timely	L	M	M	L	L			=	

The project time frame is too tight and therefore a project extension is needed	Outputs 1.1 to 1.5	M	M	S	M	M			=	Due to the delays registered in Umoja disbursement process to project partners, as well as the late joining of Kenya into the project, the execution of the activities was allowed until June 2023. This enabled the finalization of the pending activities at the partners level and execution of project budget.
The BRS Secretariat does not have the necessary IT resources allocated to continue supporting countries with the integrated electronic toolkit	Outputs 1.1 to 1.5	M	L	L	L	L			=	
Demonstration countries have different levels of capacity and supporting needs and they progress in the project implementation at a different pace	Outputs 1.1 to 1.5	M	M	L	L	L			=	
Delays are caused for political / administrative reasons even if the NIP and National Reports are technically completed in time	Outputs 1.1 to 1.5	M	M	M	M	L			↓	
Internet access in some countries does not permit the use of the integrated electronic toolkit	Outputs 1.1 to 1.5	H	M	L	L	L			=	
Need to balance diverse needs and expectations from the NIP and national reports	Outputs 1.1 to 1.5	M	M	L	L	L			=	
Different working cultures result in Parties preferring other knowledge management mechanisms and reporting strategies;	Outputs 1.1 to 1.5	M	M	L	L	L			=	
Changes in national priorities lead to lack of support to the project implementation	Outputs 1.1 to 1.5	L	L	L	L	L			=	
		-	L	L	L	L			=	

<b>Consolidated project risk</b>		M	M	L	L	L			=	This section focuses on the variation. The overall rating is discussed in section 2.3.
----------------------------------	--	---	---	---	---	---	--	--	---	--

### 4.3 Table C. Outstanding Moderate, Significant, and High risks

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

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIR-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	Additional mitigation measures for the next periods		
			What	When	By whom
The project time frame is too tight and therefore a project extension is needed	Extension of the implementation end date of the project by December 2022.	Extension of the implementation end date of the project by June 2023.	A project workplan and budget revision was prepared and submitted for approval by TM/GEF.	Nov-22	UNEP/Knowledge and Risk Unit

**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.

**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 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.

## Project Minor Amendments

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% as described in Annex 9 of the Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines. Please tick each category for which a change occurred in the fiscal year of reporting and provide a description of the change that occurred in the textbox. You may attach supporting document as appropriate.

### 5.1 Table A: Listing of all Minor Amendment (TM)

Minor amendments	Changes	Minor amendments
Results framework		
Components and cost		
Institutional and implementation arrangements		
Financial management		
Implementation schedule	Explain in table B	
Executing Entity		
Executing Entity Category		
Minor project objective change		
Safeguards		
Risk analysis		
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%		
Co-financing		
Location of project activity		
Other		

### 5.2 Table B: History of project revisions and/or extensions (TM)

Version	Type	Signed/ Approved by UNEP	Entry Into Force (last signature Date)	Agreement Expiry Date	Main changes introduced in this revision
Original Legal Instrument		9-Feb-18	9-Feb-18	31-Jul-21	Internal Agreement with UNEP Knowledge and Risk Unit
New Internal Agreement (Amend. 1)		20-Oct-21	20-Oct-21	31-Dec-22	Internal Agreement with UNEP Knowledge and Risk Unit
Extension (Amend 2)	Extension	14-Nov-22	14-Nov-22	30-Jun-23	Extension at no additional cost

## 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 (<https://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=4/21.84/82.79>) or GeoNames(<http://www.geonames.org/>) 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\(https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx\)](https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx)

Location Name Required field	Latitude Required field	Longitude Required field	Geo Name ID Required field if the location is not an exact site	Location Description Optional text field	Activity Description Optional text field
Montevideo	-34.9059	-56.191357	Montevideo		
Beijing	39.916668	116.383331	Beijing		
Pretoria	-25.73134	28.21837	Pretoria		
Geneva	46.201756	6.146601	Geneva		
Tegucigalpa	14.077386	-87.195419	Tegucigalpa		
Castries	13.952589	-60.987824	Castries		
Nairobi	-1.292066	36.821946	Nairobi		
Antananarivo	-18.910012	47.525581	Antananarivo		
Kiev	50.450107	30.52405	Kiev		
Chisinau	47.024471	28.832253	Chisinau		
Port Moresby	-9.47433	147.15995	Port Moresby		
Phnom Penh	11.568271	104.922443	Phnom Penh		

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

[Annex any linked geospatial file]