

UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2023

Reporting from 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

**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*

Identification Table		GEF ID.: 5634	Umoja no.: GFL-11207-14AC0003-SB-006480
Project Title		Ratification and Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in the countries of the Pacific Region	
Duration months	36 months	36 months	
	Extensions	12 months x 2 ext. + 6 months = 30 in total	1 <sup>st</sup> : 1 Jan - 31 Dec 2021 2 <sup>nd</sup> : 1 Jan - 30 Jun 2022 3 <sup>rd</sup> : 30 Jun - 31 Dec 2022
Division(s) Implementing the project		United Nations Environment Programme	
Name of co-implementing Agency		N/A	
Executing Agency(ies)		Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme.	
Names of Other Project Partners		ABS Initiative Medium-	
Project Type		Medium-Sized Project	
Project Scope		Regional	
Region		Pacific Region	
Countries		Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu	
Programme of Work		SP4: Environmental Governance	
GEF Focal Area(s)		Biodiversity	
UNSDCF / UNDAF linkages		1) Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management. 2) Governance, Rule of Law and Institutional Capacity Development	
Link to relevant SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s)		SDG 2 “Zero Hunger” and SDG 15 on “Life on Land”	
GEF financing amount		USD 1,762,557	
Co-financing amount		USD 1,234,000	

Date of CEO Endorsement	12 May 2016	
Start of Implementation	16 September 2016	
Date of first disbursement	29 December 2016	
Total disbursement as of 30 June 2022	USD 1,244,245.18	
Total expenditure as of 30 June 2022	USD 1,309,121.09	
Expected Mid-Term Review Date	August 2021 (Waived)	
Completion Date	<i>Planned</i>	31 December 2020
	<i>Revised</i>	31 December 2022
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date	31 January 2023	
Expected Financial Closure Date	31 Dec 2023	

## 1.2. Project description

The ABS Regional Project is being implemented by UN Environment (UNEP) and executed by SPREP in 14 PICs. These countries are Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. The main objective of the project is to help countries from the Pacific region in the ratification of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing, build legal and technical capacity to implement and operationalize the Protocol domestically and to improve awareness, communication and education on access and benefit sharing issues in the Pacific. The project execution officially began following the Project Inception held in July 2017 in Apia, Samoa. The closing date for the project as per official project document was at 31<sup>st</sup> December, 2020, which has been extended till 31<sup>st</sup> December 2022.

The four components of the project are as follows:

**Component 1:** baseline analysis to identify common assets (particularly relating to traditional knowledge), issues and needs between countries

**Component 2:** assist countries to ratify the Protocol through supporting national authorities. It includes scoping studies to identify any gaps in existing laws and regulations at national level, analyses of implications of ratification, public awareness of the Protocol and consultation with policy makers

**Component 3:** establish an enabling environment for the implementation of basic provisions of the Protocol. It includes stocktaking and assessment of capacities and systems currently in place, development or review of strategy and action plans for the implementation of ABS measures and building capacity among stakeholders; and

**Component 4:** *addresses regional coordination and technical support.*

## 1.3. History of project revisions

*To be completed by Task Managers*

Version	Date	Main changes introduced in this revision
Rev0 (CEO ED)	31 Aug 2016	N/A

:		
:		
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)

<p>Insert the Subprogramme(s) and biennia of the PoW to which the project contributes</p> <p><b>SP4: Environmental Governance</b></p>	<p><b>Specify the relevant Expected Accomplishment(s) &amp; Indicator(s)</b></p> <p><b>SP4 EA (a):</b> The international community increasingly converges on common and integrated approaches to achieve environmental objectives and implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development</p> <p><b>Indicator (ii):</b> Uptake of approaches for the coherent implementation of multilateral environmental agreements or other multilateral institutional mechanisms as a result of UNEP support</p> <p><b>SP4 EA (b):</b> Institutional capacities and policy and/or legal frameworks enhanced to achieve internationally agreed environmental goals, including the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the SDGs</p> <p><b>Indicator (i):</b> The number of countries that have enhanced institutional capacity and legal frameworks to fully implement the multilateral environmental agreements and to achieve internationally agreed environmental goals, including the SDGs as a result of UNEP support</p>
<p><i>Describe any progress made towards delivering the stated PoW Expected Accomplishments and Indicators. State key changes since previous reporting period. (maximum one paragraph)</i></p> <p>The project supports common for the coherent implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity is an international agreement which aims at sharing the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources in a fair and equitable way.</p> <p>To date, through support provided by the project, ten out of fourteen countries in the Pacific have ratified the Nagoya Protocol, one country has completed the domestic process for ratification and awaiting deposition of the instrument of accession and the other remaining three have completed national capacity building and are currently conducting internal</p>	

consultations for ratification in near future. [ Please note the previous PIR had counted PNG has having ratified however it has been now confirmed that their deposition of instrument of accession hasn't been done till date. Developing capacity of countries in the Pacific region to fully implement the Nagoya Protocol is one of the main outcomes of the project.

Expected Accomplishment	Indicator	Progress
<b>SP4 EA (a):</b> The international community increasingly converges on common and integrated approaches to achieve environmental objectives and implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development	<b>(ii):</b> Uptake of approaches for the coherent implementation of multilateral environmental agreements or other multilateral institutional mechanisms as a result of UNEP support	Ongoing: This project supports common for the coherent implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity is an international agreement.
<b>SP4 EA (b):</b> Institutional capacities and policy and/or legal frameworks enhanced to achieve internationally agreed environmental goals, including the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the SDGs	<b>(i):</b> The number of countries that have enhanced institutional capacity and legal frameworks to fully implement the multilateral environmental agreements and to achieve internationally agreed environmental goals, including the SDGs as a result of UNEP support	Ongoing: To date, through support provided by the project, ten out of fourteen countries in the Pacific have ratified and one country having completed all domestic requirements for ratification and awaiting deposition of instruments of accession to the Nagoya Protocol.

[Section to be shared with relevant Regional and Global SubProgramme Coordinators]

**2.2. GEF Core Indicators (for all GEF 6 and later projects): This is GEF-5 project**

GEF Core Indicators	Indicative expected Results	
<i>Discuss GEF core indicators targeted by the project, as well as expected results. (maximum one paragraph)</i>		
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Expected values at</i>	
	<i>Mid-term</i>	<i>End-of-project</i>

**2.3. Implementation status and risk**

*[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 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
PIR #	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	5 <sup>th</sup>
Rating towards <b>outcomes</b> (section 3.1)	S	S	S	S	S
Rating towards <b>outputs</b> (section 3.2)	S	S	S	S	S
<b>Risk</b> rating (section 3.3)	L	L	L	L	L

*Summary of status. Please structure as follows, highlighting progress, challenges and main achievements, as needed:*

The project has made significant progress since the last reporting period. Despite most of 2021 remained under lock down and state of emergency continue to be in place in many Pacific Island countries (due to COVID 19), it was apparent that there would be further delays in getting business to normal and therefore the Project must make serious plans to deliver project outputs virtually. This wasn't so difficult because the project had already anticipated this and was prepared to deal with the situation unlike in the previous year. Country workshops and regional webinars were held virtually to support capacity building measures and to provide technical assistance in the implementation of Nagoya Protocol. Microsoft Teams, Skype, emails, zoom and telephonic conversations led to success of the virtual workshops which were largely held on the zoom platform. A hybrid nature of these workshops was carried out in countries with in-person workshop at a local meeting venue (with national partners attending in line with national COVID safe measures) and the Project Technical Team and experts joining remotely. A local government official identified to coordinate in the conference room worked closely with the experts that were available full time online during the course of the workshop.

The progress of the ABS Regional Project was provided at the monthly staff meeting of the Islands Oceans and Ecosystems Department. On a weekly basis the Project Manager held meetings every Monday with the Project Team on the progress of the activities and any specific issue of concern. By end of the current reporting period all major activities for the project had been completed.

The major achievements are the regional conference on Traditional Knowledge and ABS, launching of the regional access and benefit sharing guidelines for the Pacific and ABS Lessons Learned Technical Report from the Pacific. The major challenges were related to COVID 19. Since the project was closing in June 2022 and many countries were still under state of emergencies and with international borders closed, implementing some of the activities were very difficult.

***Rating towards outcomes:*** The rating is “S” because all major outputs had been delivered in this period. These are national capacity building workshops, regional conference on the associated traditional knowledge and benefit sharing, launching of the access and benefit sharing regional guidelines and ABS lessons learnt technical report from the Pacific. Although no additional countries have ratified since last reporting period, it must be noted that to date the project has

got 10 of the 14 countries having ratified already. Of the remaining 4 countries, Papua New Guinea is already in the process and the other three have indicated they needed more time for consultation.

***Rating towards outputs:*** The rating is “S” with all major outputs having been achieved.

***Overall risk rating: justify consolidated project risk given on Table A in section 3.3.***

The overall risk is rated to be “L” because despite all challenges, the experiences and lessons learnt from the previous year (as per the last PIR), the project had well prepared and planned for the similar situation and thus no significant impact on delivery of outcomes were noted.

[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]

#### 2.4. Co-financing

<b>Planned Co-finance Total:</b> <i>(total only)</i>	The overall project budget for the project is
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost to the GEF Trust Fund      \$1,762,557.00      51%</li> <li>• Co-financing Total                      \$1,234,000.00      49%</li> </ul>
<b>Actual to date:</b> <i>Complete (in \$ and %.                  State the date for which                  this value is valid)</i>	The total expenditure as of March 2022.      \$1,244,245.66
	The end date for project implementation period is on the 31 <sup>st</sup> December 2022.

#### 2.5. Stakeholder engagement

<b>Stakeholder engagement</b>	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p>The Project has established a large stakeholder base in the Pacific Region. Some stakeholders have been working on access and benefit sharing in the region for many years while others have been added to the list more recently from project collaborations. By providing technical support and facilitating country workshops, the project has been able to build inroads in adding more national ABS stakeholders especially in countries that have many ABS players such as Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands. The Project provided support, guidance and technical assistance to all these partners in the ABS National workshops that were organized by National ABS Focal Points and during the workshop networking also happened between SPREP and these stakeholders. The associated traditional knowledge and biodiversity conservation for sustainable development goals conference brought together a broad range of stakeholders represented by over 200 individuals from different organizations.</p>
-------------------------------	--

	<p>These were from scientific and technical organizations, academia, research organizations, private sector, government and non-government, faith groups, community resource owners and youths. The engagement of stakeholders has been carefully planned and in line with project communication guidelines. As the project draws to the conclusion in few months, the stakeholder list is most robust, wide and inclusive ever. This huge stakeholder list will be used as part of ongoing collaborations in the future.</p> <p>The stakeholders have been engaged in the following ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Validating country consultations</li> <li>2) Providing opinions/ comments in technical discussions</li> <li>3) Sharing lessons learnt, experiences and examples of their work related to ABS</li> <li>4) Identification of priorities for ABS issues in the Pacific</li> <li>5) Providing comments to draft documents / reports</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]</i></p>
--	---

**2.6. Gender**

<p><b>Gender mainstreaming</b></p>	<p>Gender consideration has featured prominently in the implementation of the project. SPREP has a Gender Policy and the Project is required to follow the Gender &amp; Social Inclusion (GESI): Guiding Document in activities dealing with the project, particularly national / regional workshops. The guiding document is available at <a href="https://www.sprep.org/publications/gender-social-inclusion-gesi-guiding-document">https://www.sprep.org/publications/gender-social-inclusion-gesi-guiding-document</a></p> <p>Careful thinking and planning are done to ensure gender balance in the panel of speakers (experts) for conferences and for all participants that are invited to attend ABS workshops, conferences and meetings. A gender report is prepared and shared internally to ensure that the meeting followed the internal guideline on gender considerations. A email with a copy of the guideline is also shared to all presenters to ensure that they comply with the SPREP’s gender policy.</p> <p>Efforts has also been made to ensure that equal opportunity is given to both men and women for all project related activities.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]</i></p>
------------------------------------	---

**2.7. Environmental and social safeguards management**

<p><b>Environmental and social safeguards management</b></p>	<p><i>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.</i></p>
--	---

	<p>The activities of the project are to support the implementation of the third objective of the Convention of Biological Diversity. Despite this, the Executing Agency, SPREP has stringent policies in place to avoid, prevent, minimize, mitigate, manage and to compensate adverse impacts that Regional ABS Project may have on people or the environment throughout the project or program cycle, thereby enhancing the environmental and social outcomes.</p> <p>SPREP in itself is a regional organization that supports environmental governance, climate change, waste management, biodiversity conservation and progress towards sustainable development in general. This project addresses the importance of biodiversity conservation and fulfilling the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity through its facilitation of the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol. As a cross-cutting issue it also supports the conservation of globally significant biodiversity and sustainable use of the components of globally significant biodiversity in small island nations. The project has significantly moved forward towards achieving positive environmental and social impacts by integrating ABS implementation mechanisms within government policies and plans, and no unintended negative impacts to people and the environment are foreseen from the implementation of proposed project activities.</p> <p>Using communication tools and awareness materials the project has been reaching out to all key stakeholders so that the participation of local communities in the PIC processes and in the negotiation of ABS agreements to ensure fair and equitable sharing of benefits deriving from the use of genetic resources and traditional knowledge, and thus the accrual of economic and social benefits at the local level are ensured.</p> <p>[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]</p>
--	--

**2.8. Knowledge management**

<p><b>Knowledge activities and products</b></p>	<p><i>Provide a narrative of knowledge activities/ products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement/ Approval</i></p> <p>The Regional ABS Project has reproduced communication materials that were developed in the early implementation period for countries to use. These materials were requested by countries for communication and awareness during national consultations / workshops. All these materials also shared on the ABS Webpage of the Project at <a href="http://www.sprep.org/abs">www.sprep.org/abs</a> and shared via ABS Clearing House. These materials are also available on the ABS CH at the following link <a href="https://absch.cbd.int/en/database/ORG/ABSCH-ORG-SCBD-206945/1">https://absch.cbd.int/en/database/ORG/ABSCH-ORG-SCBD-206945/1</a></p>
---	---



	<p>Other materials provided by the Project are soft copies of technical reports and documents in USB drive for countries, Promotional materials to increase visibility in the Pacific have also been produced such as water bottles, facemasks, hand sanitizers, key tags and reusable tote bags. These materials were distributed during the regional traditional knowledge forum held in Suva, Fiji. The objective of the meeting was to have an open dialogue to share experiences, and challenges and explore opportunities in addressing biodiversity conservation goals in the Pacific with a focus on linkages to traditional knowledge and sustainable development goals.</p> <p>The conference was the first-ever “Dialogue Forum” on Traditional Knowledge for Biodiversity and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in the Pacific 30 May – 1st of June 2022 at the Grand Pacific Hotel, Suva. The meeting was held face to face but was accessible virtually for countries and participants) that were unable to attend in person.</p> <p>The meeting brought together officials from the government, non-government and civil society groups, research organizations and academia, the private sector, development partners, and community representatives to discuss how traditional knowledge associated with biodiversity can be protected and used for achieving sustainable developments goals of the Pacific.</p> <p>A desk calendar highlighting project activities, photos and quotes from Nagoya Protocol has also been produced by the project and shared with key stakeholders.</p> <p>[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]</p>
--	---

**2.9. Stories to be shared**

<p><b>Stories to be shared</b></p>	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><b>1. Pacific Regional Guidelines for effective implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.</b></p> <p>SPREP has developed the Regional Guidelines to help countries implement compliance measures and various challenges. These challenges were highlighted during country consultations, meetings, workshops and with requests made for technical assistance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ There are gaps and challenges in establishing compliance mechanisms in countries. These are due to lack of awareness and technical capacity to implement key provisions of the protocol.</li> </ul>
------------------------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Furthermore, many relevant institutions are not (entirely) operational, and authorities lack the confidence to engage in Access actively and Benefit Sharing issues, including being non-responsive to questions from researchers and users of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge.</li> <li>➤ The goal of the SPREP through the ABS Regional Project is to create a “Research and Development” friendly Pacific on rich flora and fauna in the Pacific, particularly in relation to Biodiscoveries with necessary safeguards, protection and best practices for access and benefit sharing. This also ties with the objective of the conference on Traditional Knowledge, Biodiversity and Sustainable Development.</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Lessons Learned Report</b></p> <p>SPREP also launched the ABS Lessons Learned Report, a documentation of examples, experiences and shared challenges in the pacific Island countries. The ABS Regional project began execution of activities in the region in 2017. Since then, numerous country consultations, meetings, capacity building sessions have been held in these countries. This report captures key issues that have emerged in the Pacific in implementation of the Nagoya Protocol</p> <p>[section to be shared with communication division/ GEF communication]</p>
--	---

### 3. PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK

Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the **UNEP Task Manager**<sup>1</sup> will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:

- (i) Progress towards achieving the project Results(s)- see section 3.1
- (ii) 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.

#### 3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes

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

---

<sup>1</sup> For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2023		Progress rating <sup>2</sup>
<p><b>Outcome 1.1</b></p> <p><i>Countries have a common understanding of shared assets/values, issues and needs on which to base collective policy for use nationally and at convention or a</i></p>	<p>1. Number of countries for which human (e.g., cultural, institutional), biophysical (e.g., biodiversity) and TK assets have been highlighted.</p>	<p>0 systematic analysis has been undertaken , but several countries have initiated</p>	<p>Survey of shared assets/values , issues and needs is undertaken within the first six months of the project,</p>	<p>14 countries have completed analysis.</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>Analysis on all 14 PIC has been completed that has culminated into 2 technical reports (i) ABS Regional Guidelines to address gaps and challenges identified in the analysis and (ii) ABS Lessons Learned Technical Report identifying all</p>	<p>HS</p>

<sup>2</sup> 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).

<p><i>regional instrument level.</i></p>		<p>national stocktaking activities (that may be incomplete ).</p> <p>0 formal common understanding on ABS, although regional meetings have identified some common issues and needs, and partner organizations, such as the ABS Capacity Initiative, have also prepared various relevant analyses of common issues.</p>	<p>including input from at least 3 stakeholder groups per country.</p>			<p>critical issues and experiences.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

	<p>2. Number of Pacific countries that support a regional position on shared assets/values, issues and needs.</p>		<p>Analysis is delivered and discussed at regional workshops within the first year of the project (and beyond as opportunity allows).</p>	<p>14 countries support a common understanding of shared assets/values, issues and needs is achieved within the region, as demonstrated, for example, through endorsement of a regional statement</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>The Regional Guidelines for effective implementation of the Nagoya Protocol has been completed and was launched during the Traditional Knowledge Forum in Suva, Fiji. The guidelines are attached at <a href="https://library.sprep.org/content/pacific-access-and-benefit-sharing-abs-implementation-guidelines">https://library.sprep.org/content/pacific-access-and-benefit-sharing-abs-implementation-guidelines</a></p>	<p>HS</p>
	<p>3. Number of countries/meetings that make use of regional position to support international negotiations.</p>		<p>Draft common understanding (e.g. statement, regional strategy or action plan) submitted to governments for endorsement during second year of the project.</p>	<p>Common understanding is used by countries to support international negotiations, as appropriate.</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>The Project has provided ongoing support to ALL PIC's on the development, preparation and coordination of regional position on the access and benefit sharing, post 2020 global biodiversity framework negotiation, open ended working groups of the CBD negotiation (in relation to new targets / goals) and emerging issues such as DSI.</p>	<p>HS</p>

<p>Outcome 1.2: Future directions of policy development for the region are identified</p>	<p>Number of countries that support draft regional position on future policy development.</p>	<p>7 Policies or draft policies have been developed (Cook Is, FSM, Fiji, PNG, Samoa, Solomon Is and Vanuatu) but they need to be updated for compliance with NP.</p>	<p>Methods are in place to regularly monitor and identify emerging initiatives to implement the Nagoya Protocol within first six months of the project</p>		<p>90%</p>	<p>Papua New Guinea (PNG) and Tuvalu have been greatly assisted to develop compliance measures. PNG has been provided technical supports and at least 3 country workshops to consult and develop National ABS legislation while Tuvalu has benefitted through country workshop and ongoing support towards a national consultant to develop ABS policy. This is added to the work previously done and reported as follows in the last PIR “there are seven countries that have made significant progress in development of ABS related policies. Palau has a standalone ABS legislation and currently developing ABS Regulations. Cook Islands, Fiji, FSM and Samoa have draft ABS policies that has the potential to be developed into specific ABS legislation while RMI has developed an ABS Policy. Tuvalu and Tonga are currently in the stage of Policy Development on ABS. The other remaining countries are finalizing details with the Project in terms of</p>	<p>S</p>
---	---	--	--	--	------------	---	----------

						developing ABS policy as a way forward by 2021.	
Outcome 1.3 Countries understand their national assets/values and requirements in a regional context	Number of experts in regional technical roster, number of countries represented, and percentage of relevant areas of expertise covered.	There is no regional understanding of assets, and no central repository of technical expertise available in the region	A communication mechanism or process is established and operational by the second year of the project, including a roster of technical expertise.	A register of regional technical expertise and initiatives to support implementation of the Protocol is established, with at least one expert from each country represented.	100%	The Project has reviewed its guidance policy on the registration and use of Roster of Experts and regional technical cooperation. The Roster now has 10 experts from around the region. Three more experts have been added in the reporting period. This activity has been completed. The Roster is available on the ABS Webpage.	S



<p>Outcome 2:</p>	<p>Number of countries with intra-regional coordination mechanisms identified (e.g. in ABS National Work Plans, participating in expert roster)</p>		<p>By end of second year, at least 5 countries show regional leadership through actively coordinating between national and regional institutions, as appropriate.</p>	<p>All participating countries are actively coordinating between national and regional institutions, as appropriate, including through participation in expert roster.</p> <p>Country understanding of national assets in a regional context is increased and evident through endorsement of common understanding (linked to output 1.1). Support</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>The ABS Roster of Experts has facilitated the identification of key experts on ABS for the Traditional knowledge and Biodiversity for Sustainable Development Goals in the Pacific Conference held in Suva, Fiji.</p> <p>The conference had over 200 participants from government, NGO, academia, research agencies, Traditional Knowledge holders, resource owners, faith-based groups, private sector and youths. Participants joined from across the Pacific both physically and virtually.</p> <p>The outcomes of the conference will be used as an input in the CBD negotiation on traditional knowledge and sustainable development.</p> <p>The outcomes provide expert opinion, range of ideas, experiences and Pacific position on key issues relating to traditional knowledge, biodiversity and conservation linkages.</p>	<p>HS</p>
-------------------	---	--	---	---	-------------	---	-----------

<p>Outcome 2.1 National authorities take informed decisions on the ratification of the protocol and future</p>	<p>Number of countries that have ratified the Protocol.</p>	<p>Some awareness raised through NBSAP process in all countries; but limited or no analyses of implications undertaken in all countries.</p>	<p>National scoping studies (or updating) of the existing laws and regulations related to ABS to be initiated in every country during the first year of the project.</p>	<p>Analysis of ABS frameworks is completed for 14 countries.</p>	<p>80%</p>	<p>10 countries have ratified. In the last PIR it was reported to be 11, PNG was counted to have ratified as it had completed domestic processes however no formal deposition of the instrument of accession has taken place till date. To note that PNG is very well placed to ratify in few months (at least before the end of the Project period)</p> <p>Other countries that are being convinced to ratify are Cook Islands, Niue and Nauru.</p>	<p>S</p>

	<p>Number of national scoping studies and national frameworks reviewed to identify gaps, overlaps and implications for ratification.</p>	<p>ABS implementation plan is advanced in Cook Is and Fiji, partially prepared but incomplete and/or out of date in Niue, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Is and Vanuatu, and no plan exists in remaining countries.</p>	<p>Analysis of the implications of ratification of the Nagoya Protocol completed within the first six months of the project for countries that have ratified, or within six months of ratification if it occurs after the start of the project, or at the latest within the first two years of the project if country has not yet ratified.</p>	<p>Public awareness of Parliamentarians and other decision makers sufficient to ensure support for ratification.</p>	<p>90%</p>	<p>All countries have been provided necessary support as per requests made.</p> <p>All 10 parties from the Pacific have been assisted with scoping studies for development of compliance mechanisms.</p> <p>A policy or legal framework has been facilitated in all 10 countries that are Parties to the Nagoya Protocol. This support has been delivered through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Drafting instructions</li> <li>(ii) Regional Guidelines</li> <li>(iii) ABS lesson Learned Report</li> </ul>	<p>HS</p>
--	--	--	---	--	------------	--	-----------

	<p>Number of workshops held to raise public awareness.</p>			<p>All Competent National Authorities and National Focal Points designated at national level.</p>	<p>75%</p>	<p>National awareness workshops have been held for Samoa, Papua New Guinea ( 3 workshops in PNG) , Solomon Islands, and Tuvalu in the current reporting period. Furthermore, all PIC's National Focal Points have been provided with communication materials and invitations to attend regional webinars and conferences.</p>	<p>S</p>
	<p>Number of participants reached through public awareness activities</p>				<p>95%</p>	<p>The project has completed all major activities in terms of conducting public awareness on access and benefit sharing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A) 400 page views on the traditional knowledge forum</li> <li>B) 100 participants from across 5 Pics' during national ABS awareness workshops</li> <li>C) At least 500 page views from around the region on social media posts (Facebook &amp; Twitter) on access and benefit sharing issues</li> </ul>	<p>S</p>

	<p>Number of national ABS law/regulation/ policy proposals in place or submitted for approval to competent authorities.</p>				<p>95%</p>	<p>Tuvalu – procuring a local consultant to develop ABS Policy</p> <p>Solomon Islands – ABS consultation on the draft policies / protected area legislation and associated TK legislation</p> <p>Papua New Guinea – provided technical assistance in development of ABS Policy / legislative framework</p> <p>Otherwise, the Regional ABS Guidelines are now available for all countries to use. This is cost effective, practical steps in implementation with easy-to-follow guide.</p>	<p>S</p>
--	---	--	--	--	------------	---	----------

<p>Outcome 3.1 An enabling environment is created which will lead to the implementation on of the basic provisions of the NP</p>	<p>Number of awareness raising activities and mechanisms used to target stakeholders.</p>	<p>Minimal stocktaking undertaken , most countries have initial strategies for implementation of ABS measures through NBSAPs, limited capacity among stakeholders, no mechanism to support decisionmakers, no frameworks to protect TK.</p>	<p>Stocktaking to be completed within the first two years of the project.</p>	<p>Stocktaking analysis completed for 14 countries, including existence of national expertise; legal aspects; traditional knowledge, national/regional research institutions ; government institutions (research councils); private sector activities; differences between sectoral approaches ; ex situ collections at national scale; IT needs; specialist laboratories;</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>The Lessons Learned Report from the Pacific with assessment of capacities of the PIC's in implementing the Nagoya Protocol has been completed. The report is available at the following link</p> <p>This report is based on the stocktaking analysis that the project conducted in the early part of its implementation.</p> <p>The report highlights key gaps and challenge in the region in implementation of the Protocol. Subsequently an enabling environment through development of basic provisions of the Protocol through the Regional Guidelines is provided to all PIC's.</p> <p>There were 4 national workshop and one regional conference. The awareness raising activities included the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A) Conference abstracts (25 speakers)</li> <li>B) Social media snippets (about 10)</li> </ul>	<p>HS</p>
--	---	---	---	--	-------------	---	-----------

				compliance ; bilateral communication; etc.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>C) Press release</li> <li>D) Website article through (at least 4) through SPREP Communication Department</li> <li>E) Information dissemination through ABS-CH (all material produced so far)</li> <li>F) Funding support for reproduction of communication materials designed for the project (<i>in 5 countries</i>)</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

	<p>Number of stakeholders reached by awareness raising activities and mechanisms.</p>	<p>No regional technical support mechanism for implementing the Nagoya Protocol (SPREP provides ad hoc support in some instances), however information exchange has taken place at regional workshops under the ABS Initiative, and other mechanisms exist at SPREP to facilitate information dissemination and sharing including MEA CHM,</p>	<p>Key NGOs and community representatives identified in year 1.</p>	<p>14 national strategy and action plans for implementation of ABS are consistent with the Nagoya Protocol.</p> <p>14 institutional frameworks fully respect and protect traditional knowledge</p> <p>ABS capacities of key national CNAs are sufficient to implement the Protocol.</p> <p>All bio-prospecting applications are covered by</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p><i>See above (responses are similar)</i></p>	<p>S</p>
--	---	--	---	--	-------------	---	----------



		PIPAP and PEIN27		national laws and regulations.			
	Number of women stakeholders reached.		Initial list of information, training materials, and organisations to assist local and indigenous communities to negotiate ABS agreements identified in year 1. Stocktaking Two regional meetings completed at the beginning and end of the project	Country capacity to implement the Nagoya Protocol improved through intraregional learning potential opportunities for bio discovery/c ommerciali sation identified in 14 countries. Political support for protecting traditional knowledge, innovations and practices and customary uses of biological and genetic resources is increased	95%	<p>With the new SPREP Gender mainstreaming guidelines, the representation of women has not only improved but achieved necessary objectives.</p> <p>Women and men are equally participating in workshops as participants and presenters, an equal opportunity exists for consultations and meetings in communities for both.</p> <p>In the current reporting period around 150 women across the Pacific has been reached out.</p>	S

	<p>Number of traditional knowledge stakeholders reached.</p>		<p>Capacity-building and legal training conducted at sub regional capacity building workshops [see 4.1.3] and national workshops [see 2.1.3] in years 1 and 2.</p>	<p>Institutions and stakeholder s trained how to use different tools available to access technical support</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>Pacific's first-ever Dialogue Forum on Traditional Knowledge for Biodiversity and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) was successfully held in Suva on the 30<sup>th</sup> May – 1<sup>st</sup> June.</p> <p>The focus and objective of th conference was to have an open dialogue to share experiences and challenges and explore opportunities to address biodiversity conservation goals in the Pacific, focusing on linkages to traditional knowledge and sustainable development goals.</p> <p>This meeting allowed participants to focus on how traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources can be better protected and accessed with prior informed consent from the holders of TK and that there is a fair and equitable way of providing benefits for access and use.</p>	<p>HS</p>
--	--	--	--	--	-------------	--	-----------

						<p>The meeting also discussed the links between Biodiversity, particularly Article 8(j) under the Convention on Biological Diversity, Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing, and our collective responsibility to achieve sustainable development goals.</p> <p>A total of 235 people had registered for this conference, approximately 60% attending in person and the rest virtually.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

	<p>Number of operational guidelines (including national strategy and action plans, policies and legal frameworks) developed for implementing ABS policies</p>		<p>Potential research capabilities necessary to add value to genetic resources and associated TK in the region identified in years 2 and 3.</p>		<p>80%</p>	<p>In reference to the last PIR comment (see below) , all that was planned has been achieved. Supporting policies for PNG, Tuvalu, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Samoa had been undertaken.</p> <p>PIR 2021 Policies for Fiji, Marshall Islands, Samoa, Cook Islands and FSM has been reviewed and shared with the countries – final draft.</p> <p>The issue of traditional knowledge has been prominently addressed in these frameworks developed in 2019.</p> <p>A special TK forum was held May 2022.</p>	<p>S</p>
--	---	--	---	--	------------	---	----------

<p>4.1 Countries share information and gain from the experiences of other members of the Pacific Community</p>	<p>Number of regional and sub-regional meetings held.</p> <p>Number of focal points, and national/regional institutions represented at the regional meetings.</p> <p>Number of provisional measures identified to support countries in situations where national legal framework is not in place post ratification.</p>	<p>No provisional measures in place for interim implementation.</p> <p>No regional technical support mechanism for implementing the Nagoya Protocol (SPREP provides ad hoc support in some instances), however information exchange has taken place at regional workshops under the ABS Initiative, and other mechanisms exist at SPREP to facilitate</p>	<p>Two regional meetings completed at the beginning and end of the project</p> <p>Countries that have ratified but are not in compliance with the protocol identified in first year.</p> <p>Provisional measures identified to support countries in situations where national legal framework is not in place post ratification within six months of ratification process.</p>	<p>All countries in compliance with the Nagoya Protocol</p> <p>Country capacity to implement the Nagoya Protocol improved through intraregional learning</p> <p>Key information and technical support are produced and shared with stakeholders</p> <p>Institutions and stakeholders trained how to use different tools available to access technical support</p>	<p>80%</p>	<p>Due to COVID-19 lockdowns and borders still remaining closed during most months of the year until early May 2022, only one regional conference (see above) has been held.</p> <p>Although other sub regional and regional workshops had to be cancelled, the Project has provided webinar and online virtual engagements with the countries especially during CBD COP negotiations.</p> <p>Country workshops were done virtually.</p>	<p>S</p>
--	---	---	--	---	------------	--	----------

		informatio n disseminati on and sharing including MEA CHM, PIPAP and PEIN						
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>Number of country representatives involved in sharing lessons learned and best practices</p> <p>Number of joint ABS activities/ collaborations undertaken by key stakeholders in the region</p> <p>Number of countries using the ABS</p>				<p>100%</p>	<p>All PIC have now access to best practice and lessons learned report available at SPREP virtual library.</p> <p>Samoa, Palau, Fiji, Tuvalu, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Cook Islands have all shared lessons learned at various meetings, workshops, trainings and webinars.</p> <p>Collaborations have increased with ABS Partners. Experts from University of Technology Sydney, Massey University, University of Canterbury, and University of New South Wales were invited as guest speakers, facilitators and moderators at the TK conference. Furthermore, CROP agencies such as SPC, PIFS and PIDF have also been engaged in a similar way. NGO partners such as WWF, IUCN, CI and Birdlife International also collaborated with SPREP during the TK dialogue form.</p> <p>We have increased case studies that are being shared across the region.</p>	<p>HS</p>
--	---	--	--	--	-------------	---	-----------

	<p>Clearing-House as an information exchange and monitoring mechanisms</p>					<p>All countries in the pacific have been provided information on the use of ABS Clearing House and 12 countries have been specially trained (Tonga, Samoa, Cook Islands, Tuvalu, Nauru, Fiji, FSM, Kiribati, Nauru, RMI PNG, Vanuatu)</p>	
	<p>Number of intraregional visits (including south-south country expert exchanges)</p> <p>Participation of SIDS and regional experts at sub regional meeting</p>				<p>75%</p>	<p>Unfortunately, this had to be incorporated into the budget of a regional TK dialogue forum due to COVID not many workshops were able to be organized.</p> <p>Information exchange was done through speakers from various countries such as Samoa, PNG, Australia, NZ, Solomon Islands and Tuvalu.</p>	<p>MS</p>



<p>4.2 Effective management and delivery of projects meeting agreed measurable outputs and indicators.</p>	<p>Number of project coordination and oversight meetings held.</p> <p>Number of recommendations for improved project delivery generated during M&amp;E activities</p> <p>Percentage of project beneficiaries that express satisfaction with project results, management and technical assistance.</p> <p>Percentage of women involved in implementation, e.g. number of staff, consultants.</p> <p>Ratings received during project reviews and evaluations.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>At least one coordination and oversight meeting (virtual or physical) held by project midterm, to reach agreements and provide inputs to project implementation within first year</p>	<p>At least three coordination and oversight meetings held by project mid-term, to reach agreements and provide inputs to project implementation within first year. At least 70% of project participants express satisfaction with the project results, management and technical assistance. The terminal evaluation shows project obtained satisfactory</p>	<p>80%</p>	<p>The project has been able to secure project extension till December 2022.</p> <p>Project Steering Committee meeting maybe held in view of terminal reporting towards the last quarter of the 2022.</p> <p>The project has prepared Executive Board papers for SPREP to consider endorsement of Regional Guidelines and support for its implementation.</p> <p>Overall, the Project has received positive feedback from Project partners / stakeholders.</p> <p>The project has a manager and 2 full time staff. The manager is a female and the other two are males. They are collectively responsible for implementation of the project.</p>	<p>S</p>
--	---	----------	--	--	------------	--	----------

				results and completed at least 80% of planned activities.			
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs

Outputs/Activities <sup>3</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>4</sup>	Implementation status as of 30 June 2021 (%)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2023 (%)	Progress rating justification <sup>5</sup> , description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress rating <sup>6</sup>
Output 1.2.1 New policy directions for individual countries and the region identified and communicated via existing means (e.g. during the execution of the project and future SPREP/UNEP support mechanisms).	June 2018	95%	100%	ABS Regional Guidelines have been developed and shared with all countries. Furthermore, Technical report highlighting lessons learned and case studies / best practices has also been completed and shared via ABS-CH.	HS
Output 2.1.3 National ABS law/regulation/policy proposals drafted and submitted for approval to competent authorities and draft documentation for ratification prepared and submitted to the appropriate authorities		80%	95%	Fiji, Samoa, Palau, Vanuatu, RMI, Solomon Islands, Cook Islands have draft / completed development of a legal framework to address ABS issue sin respective countries.  PNG, Tuvalu & Tonga are currently developing their legal framework through Project funded technical assistance.  Nauru, Niue, FSM and Kiribati are encouraged to use the ABS Regional Guidelines for development of ABS policies.	S
Output: 3.1.2 Strategies and action plans for the implementation of ABS measures are	December 2020	70%	100%	Capacity stocktaking analysis has been completed for 14 countries including existence of national expertise, legal aspects, traditional knowledge, research institutions, governments, and private sector. A detailed report on the capacity building in	S

<sup>3</sup> Outputs and activities (or deliverables) as described in the project logframe (and workplan) or in any updated project revision.

<sup>4</sup> The completion dates should be as per latest workplan (latest project revision).

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager

<p>developed or reviewed, as appropriate.</p>				<p>close collaboration with ABS Initiative has been drafted and shared by the next quarter.</p> <p>Capacity-building sessions have been held for 3 countries (Samoa, Tonga &amp; Tuvalu) through national workshop and for the Pacific region through webinars.</p>	
<p>Output: 3.1.3 Enabling environment is created, including: (i) capacity among stakeholders with particular emphasis in the Government agencies in charge of making the Protocol operational; (ii) supportive groundwork for countries to take advantage of bio discovery and commercialisation opportunities under the Protocol; and (iii) supportive institutional framework developed for protecting traditional knowledge, innovations and practices and customary uses of</p>	<p>December 2019</p>	<p>90%</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>There have been country specific capacity building sessions for PNG, Tonga, Tuvalu, Solomon Islands, and Samoa. These are the list of those countries that had requested during the reporting period. Otherwise, the Project has provided necessary capacity building support at national level since inception.</p> <p>A capacity building assessment report, lessons learned and good practices / case studies is highlighted in the technical report that was launched during the TK dialogue Forum in May.</p> <p>The project has widened the range of stakeholders involved in building capacity, knowledge sharing and providing best practices or examples.</p> <p>A special regional conference on traditional knowledge was also held in Suva. Key technical agencies were given opportunity to make high level remarks and stakeholders were involved by way of dialogue. The outcomes of the conference feeds into Pacific voice negotiating at CBD Post 2020 global Biodiversity Framework.</p>	<p>HS</p>

biological and genetic resources					
Output 4.1.3 Information and experience exchange on development and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol takes place, especially mutual learning between Pacific countries.	December 2020	60%	100%	A regional conference on traditional knowledge gave opportunity for regional information exchange.	HS
Output 4.2.1 Technical support provided to the project, including monitoring, evaluation and all reporting including financial	December 2020	95%	100%	The project has met all reporting and monitoring requirements. The only last bit left is the terminal reporting which has already begun.	HS

### 3.3. Risk Rating

**Table A.** Risk-log

*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	PIR 4	PIR 5 (this PIR)	Δ	Justification
COVID-19	Outcomes 1-3	L	L	L	N/A	L	M	M	=	The project felt that if borders remain close and countries continued to enforce strict COVID protocols sch as social distancing then physical workshop would be impossible. This will also lead to unutilized funds.

Post Ratificación of NP	All outcomes & outputs	M	M	M	N/A	L	M	M	=	Countries not fully participating on the ABS Clearing House.
Consolidated project risk		n.a	M	M	N/A	L	L	L	=	<i>This section focuses on the variation. The overall rating is discussed in section 2.3.</i>

**Table B.** Outstanding medium & high risks

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 (PIR <sub>t-1</sub> , MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	Additional mitigation measures for the next periods		
			What	When	By whom
COVID-19	Project Planning to have a contingency plan in view of COVID 19 impacts and discuss at the Steering Committee Level	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue was discussed at the Project Steering Committee</li> <li>SPREP Project Planning (IOE) discussed the issue and developed a systematic approach to ensure funds are fully utilised and there was a Plan B in case borders remained closed. Virtual Meeting and Hybrid workshops were seen as one of the strategies.</li> </ol>	Review dates, Budget and the mode of regional workshops and meetings every month in case there is no clear indication of when the borders will open and travel is restored in the larger Pacific island countries.	Every Month from January until June.	Rahul and James
Post Ratification of NP	Raise the issue at a Pacific Meeting and also send important reminders to countries, provide capacity building support where needed.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity building sessions for countries were done during national ABS workshops</li> <li>Issue has been identified to be discussed during Pacific preparatory meeting for CBD COP.</li> </ol>	Countries will be shared with online tools, information and support for compliance.	July – Dec	Rahul
:					

<i>Add rows as needed to reflect additional risks</i>					

**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.

**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.

- Results framework
- Components and cost
- Institutional and implementation arrangements
- Financial management
- Implementation schedule
- 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

[\[Annex document linked to reported minor amendment\]](#)

<p><b>Minor amendments</b></p>	<p>The request for extension as noted by the Project Steering Committee was made in view of the fact that an additional six months will provide sufficient time to compensate for the loss of time encountered due to COVID-19 impacts. The situation was projected to normalize in the Pacific with vaccination numbers increasing, COVID safe measures becoming prominent, and a travel bubble within the region being discussed and SPREP will be able to conduct business by physically attending some of the most prioritized issues in the region. given significant delays and challenges, there remains an essential unspent budget. The ABS Project Team was vigilant not to spend money or revise the budget without prior approval or consent by the Steering Committee. This included project savings accrued because of collaboration with other donors, termination of some activities due to its relevance, unspent budgetary allocations on activities that couldn't happen, such as physical workshops and travel.</p>
--------------------------------	---

**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://openstreetmap.org/) or [GeoNames](https://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](#)

Location Name Required field	Latitude Required field	Longitude Required field	Geo Name ID Required field <i>if</i> the location is not an exact site	Location Description Optional text field	Activity Description Optional text field
Apia, Samoa	-13.83333	-171.76666	4035413	Samoa is based in the Pacific Region. The project is being housed at SPREP, a regional environmental organisation in Apia. The project is being implemented in 14 Pacific Island countries.	The project supports ratification of Nagoya Protocol, capacity building, development of compliance measures and general awareness raising on access and benefit sharing in th Pacific.

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate. \*  
 [Annex any linked geospatial file]



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

