**UN Environment GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2019**

1. July 2018 to 30 June 2019)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Identification**
 | GEF project ID: 5201 | Insert Umoja no.: P1-33GFL-000798 |
| Project Number + Project Title | Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE): Conserving Earth’s Most Irreplaceable Sites for Endangered Biodiversity |
| Duration months | *Planned* | 10 October 2015 – 30 September 2018 (36 months) |
| *Extension(s)* | 31 January 2019 (4 months) | 30 June 2019 (5 months) |
| Division(s) Implementing the project | GEF Biodiversity and Land Degradation Unit, Ecosystems Division |
| Name of co-implementing Agency  | None |
| Executing Agency(ies) | BirdLife International  |
| Names of Other Project Partners | American Bird Conservancy (ABC) (AZE Secretariat)Ministry of Environment (Brazil)Ministerio del Medio Ambiente (Chile)Ministry of Environment, Ecology, Sea and Forests (Madagascar; now Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development)Fundacao Biodiversitas, BrazilAsity Madagascar, MadagascarIUCN |
| Project Type | Medium Size Project |
| Project Scope | Global |
| Region *(delete as appropriate)* | Africa, Latin America and Caribbean |
| Names of Beneficiary Countries | Brazil, Chile, Madagascar |
| Programme of Work | Ecosystem Programme of Work 2014-2017 |
| GEF Focal Area(s) | BD Biodiversity |
| UNDAF linkages  | **Madagascar** (2015-19): PA 1 - Vulnerable populations in the intervention areas gain access to income and employment opportunities, improve their resilience capacities, and contribute to inclusive and equitable growth for sustainable development**Brazil** (2017-21) PA 2: Sustainable management of natural resources for current and future generationsOutcome 2: Participatory governance models for sustainable and effective management of natural resources and ecosystem services, seeking integrated, resilient and inclusive territories**Chile** (2015-18): PA 3 – Environmental sustainability and risk management |
| Link to relevant SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s) | SDG Target 15.1 By 2020, ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreementsIndicator 15.1.2 Proportion of important sites for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity that are covered by protected areas, by ecosystem type SDG Target 15.5 Take urgent and significant action to reduce the degradation of natural habitats, halt the loss of biodiversity and, by 2020, protect and prevent the extinction of threatened speciesIndicator 15.5.1 Red List Index |
| GEF financing amount | USD 1,922,813 |
| Co-financing amount | USD 4,797,171 (pledged) | USD 5,734,177 (achieved) |
| Date of CEO Endorsement | 22 July 2015  |
| Start of Implementation | 10 October 2015 |
| Date of first disbursement | 25 February 2016 |
| Total disbursement as of 30 June | USD 1,692,638  |
| Total expenditure as of 30 June | USD 1,877,813 |
| Expected Mid-Term Date | May 2019 |
| Completion Date | *Planned* | 30 September 2018 |
| *Revised* | 30 June 2019 |
| Expected Terminal Evaluation Date | N/A |
| Expected Financial Closure Date | 31 December 2019 |

1. **OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **UN Environment Subprogramme(s)** The Ecosystem Programme of Work 2014-2017 | **Specify the relevant Expected Accomplishment(s) & Indicator(s)**This project specifically addresses UNEP’s expected accomplishments of “use of the ecosystem approach in countries to maintain ecosystem services and sustainable productivity of terrestrial and aquatic systems is increased” and “services and benefits derived from ecosystems are integrated with development planning and accounting, and the implementation of biodiversity and ecosystem related multilateral agreements” and will specifically contribute to: Output (a) (1) *Methodologies, partnerships and tools to maintain or restore ecosystem services and integrate the ecosystem management approach with the conservation and management of ecosystems;* and Output (c) (5) *Synergies between tools, approaches and multilateral initiatives on biodiversity, ecosystem resilience, climate change adaptation and disaster prevention identified and integrated with development planning, poverty reduction measures, strategic investment partnerships along with the ecosystem approach and national obligations for biodiversity related MEAS*. |
| This project has used an ecosystem approach at local, national and international scales, developing local management plans for protected areas and community conserved areas, supporting the development of national AZE strategies and integration into national conservation and development plans, and at global level influencing the updating of standards and guidance as well as developing tools to ensure development funded by international financial institutions (IFIs) safeguards AZE sites and the wider ecosystems in which they are located. At local level, wherever possible the project has incorporated adaptive management to deal with the dynamic nature of ecosystems and the lack of full understanding of their functioning. In the case of the AZE trigger species for the AZE demonstration site in Brazil, Stresemann’s Bristlefront, climate change and actions by humans in the greater ecosystem presented challenges to the species’ survival. One of the worst droughts in the recorded history of the region combined with small-scale fires set by local ranchers to create a larger fire that destroyed the main area inside the Mata do Passarinho Reserve where the Bristlefront occurred. Already reduced to very low numbers due to habitat loss, these fires pushed the species to the brink of extinction, and it was undetected for over a year. Scaling up efforts and following an adaptive management approach, the project team succeeded in locating the species in 2018, and searches for additional individuals are continuing past the end of the GEF project, using funds leveraged from the project.At the Mehuin AZE sites in Chile, which are not formal protected areas, the project’s approaches integrated single-species conservation programmes and participatory conservation planning to determine and implement strategies to safeguard AZE trigger species at the sites, at the same time as demonstrating the value of the sites for provision of clean freshwater to local people. Strong partnerships were built between local communities, government agencies, such as INDAP, and schools. Local communities used materials donated by INDAP to fence off ravines where the two AZE trigger species, both frogs, occur to prevent disturbances from livestock. Schools educated children about the frogs and had students conduct monitoring to help determine key areas for the frogs. In Madagascar, the conservation approach inside the demonstration site of Tsitongambarika was ecosystem-focused, but with particular actions to track impact on AZE trigger species. The involvement of local people in ecological restoration helped to reduce forest cover loss and to preserve the forest. At national level, AZE conservation has been integrated into both conservation and development policy and planning in all three project countries as well as the national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) of a further 16 countries. In Madagascar, following the integration of the AZE concept into Madagascar’s CBD reports and NBSAP, plans are underway to integrate the concept into all national documents, including Regional Development Plans (PRD) and Communal Development Plans (PCD). Institutions working at the regional level will participate in the development of the PRD and the PCD. In Brazil, the two national AZE ordinances in Brazil now require the recognition of AZE sites in plans developed by the Ministry of Environment. In Chile, the Ministry of the Environment is currently analysing options for incorporating AZE site criteria into its biodiversity conservation policy instruments, including through increased protection via its national protected area network and/or developing a biodiversity protection programme called “Last Refuges for endangered biodiversity”. At global level, the project team has successfully advocated for strengthened IFI safeguards to take into account the need to conserve AZE sites as part of the wider ecosystem, and promoted the use of updated, more user-friendly versions of the IBAT tool and the AZE/KBA websites, to enable IFIs to better avoid cumulative impacts. The project team has also successfully advocated for an increased focus on the protection of KBAs and AZE sites in a key CBD COP14 Decision and in recommendations in the May 2019 IPBES (Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services) Global Assessment and annual SDG Report, both of which include BirdLife staff as co-authors.  |

**For all GEF 6 and later projects:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **GEF Core Indicators** | **Indicative expected Results** |
|  | Indicative expected Results |
| n/a – GEF 5 project |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Planned linkages with UNDAF**  | At the project scale, several advances were made to increase the sustainability of AZE sites. The updated AZE site map provides a blueprint for governments and civil society to focus their conservation goals. A CBD Decision urging Parties to conserve AZE sites provides added encouragement for global-scale conservation of AZE sites, which was also reflected in the inclusion of AZE site conservation in the CBD reports and NBSAPs of over 20 countries.In Brazil, progress was made to promote and increase the sustainable management of natural resources for current and future generations. Sustainability was enhanced at the Serra do Urubu AZE site by constructing an observation tower to provide for economic benefits at the reserve, and a capacity building course was offered for local guides to increase the economic benefits of the reserve and to share those benefits with the local community. At the Oasis Araripe Reserve, the establishment of the Araripe Manakin Wildlife Refuge, a 3,889 hectare refuge adjacent to the reserve will similarly further the sustainable management of natural resources for current and future generations.In Chile, the project supported the UNDAF strategic objective of promoting environmental sustainability and risk management through work on the ground to conserve AZE demonstration sites. Sustainability was increased and risks managed through the full incorporation of local communities in the development and implementation of conservation plans. Biosecurity measures were adopted and local managers trained in their implementation at the AZE site on Mocha Island. Risks were also managed through the inclusion of a variety of sectors in conservation planning, including local schools, local municipalities, and the regional offices of several ministries, including the Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Agriculture, and the Ministry of Public Works. In Madagascar, the Tsitongambarika AZE site, as co-managed by the community organization KOMFITA and the local village associations (COBAs), supported by Asity Madagascar delegated by the Government, has been working successfully, and has led to new reforestation projects in addition to planned GEF project outputs. The focus of the umbrella group KOMFITA is to control deforestation and support sustainable livelihoods locally. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Planned contribution to relevant SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s)** | This project relates most clearly to SDG Target 15.1, to conserve terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, and SDG Target 15.5, to halt the loss of biodiversity and protect and prevent the extinction of threatened species. While the proportion of important sites for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity that are covered by protected areas (SDG Indicator 15.1.2) is increasing year on year, as demonstrated by the annual SDG Report with data provided by BirdLife from the World Database on Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs), the rate of increase in this coverage is actually slowing down, suggesting that as countries strive to protect a greater percentage of their territories, they are losing focus on ensuring that these protected areas are sited in the right place for biodiversity. This is why our advocacy and tools developed through this project have been key to providing this gap analysis for AZE sites and helping to define and formalize AZE sites as KBAs so that we can better support countries to implement Aichi Targets 11 and 12 as well as advocate for stronger, clearer targets and implementation in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. With the rate of biodiversity loss at unprecedented levels and remaining on a downward trajectory, and the rate of extinctions between 100 and 1000 times the baseline rate, there is an urgent need to halt the loss of biodiversity and prevent extinctions. By supporting work on the ground to conserve AZE demonstration sites as well as the development and implementation of wider national policies and practice, alongside public and private sector investor safeguards, this project has helped to better protect AZE sites and therefore the AZE trigger species within, and thus contribute to this target. More specifically, this project has led to (1) the creation or enlargement of protected areas in Madagascar and Brazil and improved management at 10 AZE sites globally; (2) the mapping of AZE sites globally for a wide range of taxonomic groups, providing a blueprint for conservation actions to prevent extinctions; (3) the first-ever national ordinances on AZE sites (in Brazil); and (4) a CBD Decision encouraging all 196 CBD Parties to conserve AZE sites as a way to accelerate progress towards Aichi Targets. All of these results are expected to advance SDG 15.5. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Implementation Status** | FY 2016 | FY 2017 | FY 2018 | FY 2019 | FY 20\_\_ |
| 1st PIR | 2nd PIR | 3rd PIR | 4th PIR (final) | … PIR |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Development Objective Rating FY** | FY 2016 | FY 2017 | FY 2018 | FY 2019 | FY 20\_\_ |
| **S** | **S** | **S** | **S** |  |
| All project results have been completed, largely achieving and in some cases exceeding the planned targets, and in all cases achieving the overall project objective/outcomes.**Outcome 1.1. Creation and improved management effectiveness of protected areas** In **Madagascar**, while the national deforestation rate has increased, the project has succeeded in reducing the deforestation rate inside the Tsitongambarika Protected Area due to effective patrols and surveys and increased community support for the site. The final METT score is evaluated at 78%, above the final target score. This has been due to 1) the strengthened capacity of the KOMFITA (Protected Area Management Body) and the local community, 2) the increase in income generating activities for local people and 3) the success of raising awareness and support for the project/site. In **Brazil**, over 10 ha of cacao have been planted, exceeding the project goal. Seedlings planted earlier in the project are growing well, and the reserve staff are eager to continue advancing the cacao project and eventually harvesting the cacao. All but 4 ha of reforestation have been completed, despite difficult reforestation conditions, including the required removal of a fern that has colonized many previously-burned areas in need of reforestation. The final METT score is 81%, a marked improvement over the baseline score of 69%.In **Chile**, progress has been made both in Isla Mocha and the Mehuin sites in controlling access to sensitive habitats to protect the AZE species, as well as building support from the local communities for conservation and sustainable agriculture. On Isla Mocha, a 4-day long workshop, entitled “Community Leadership Workshop for Mocha Island Sustainability” was held with four local organizations to build community support for conservation initiatives on the island. In Mehuin, fencing has been constructed to restrict access to 8.1 ha of native forest and streams that are habitat of the AZE trigger species. Isla Mocha remains a National Reserve; however, the process to convert it to a National Park is well underway and is expected to be completed by 2020, though the expected transfer of authority over national parks from CONAF to the Ministry of Environment may cause additional delays.Efforts continue to implement improved management at 10 additional AZE sites, as planned, and results from final METT evaluations demonstrate improvements in management at these sites.**Outcome 2.1. Mainstreaming into financial institution policies**AZE sites have been systematically identified, mapped, consulted on, documented and confirmed by the KBA Technical Working Group for the 6 species groups included in the 2010 AZE dataset and for 11 new species groups, thus exceeding the target set, totalling 1,483 AZE trigger species and 843 sites (again exceeding the target). Engagement with IFIs throughout the course of the project has led to notable recognition of AZE sites in safeguard policies and guidance, which we expect to continue after the end of the project as IFI policies continue to be updated. This year, the updated IFC Guidance Note 6 was published in November 2018, now affording AZE sites, along with UNESCO World Heritage sites, the highest level of safeguarding of all types of Critical Habitat, with IFC-funded projects in AZE sites not being acceptable for financing (unless possibly if contributing to their conservation) and consultation required with the organisations that have designated AZE sites, including a reference to the AZE website. Given the influence and broad uptake of IFC Performance Standard 6 amongst other IFIs (not least the 96 financial institutions that are members of the [Equator Principles Association](http://equator-principles.com/members-reporting/), which require members to assess projects against IFC Performance Standards), this offers important new protections for AZE sites. Engagement with other IFIs continues, including via informal discussions with and formal inputs to consultations in the first half of 2019 on safeguard policies of the European Investment Bank (EIB), the European Bank of Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) and the Equator Principles version 4.The AZE information resource factsheet continues to be used to promote AZE considerations to IFIs and is now being promoted to IBAT subscribers through the re-developed portal for the screening tool ([www.ibat-alliance.org](http://www.ibat-alliance.org)). **Outcome 2.2. Mainstreaming into national biodiversity strategies**In Madagascar, the revised [National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan](https://www.cbd.int/doc/world/mg/mg-nbsap-v2-fr.pdf) includes reference to AZE sites. A national mainstreaming plan for AZE conservation was completed following a workshop in September 2018, identifying and mapping 68 AZE sites, including 13 candidate sites, involving the major conservation planning agencies and the two largest private sector mining investments in the country. The Brazilian AZE site map was launched and promoted at CBD COP14 in November 2018. Additionally, all AZE sites in Brazil are now officially recognized by the Brazilian government in the federal PORTARIA Nº 287, which declares that these sites will be used for the implementation of public policies aimed at the conservation and recovery of species threatened with extinction, and should be included on maps published by the Minister of the Environment and considered for the identification of Priority Areas for Conservation, Sustainable Use and Benefit Sharing of Brazilian Biodiversity.A national AZE strategy for Mexico will be finalised in a follow-up workshop that had to be deferred to July 2019, following a development workshop held in Mexico in October 2018, and national AZE conservation was strengthened via mini-workshops in Kenya (October 2018), the Dominican Republic (November 2018), the Philippines (November 2018) and Papua New Guinea (February 2019), in addition to those in Colombia and South Africa previously reported.Globally, 16 non-project countries (nearly double the target of 9) have included AZE sites in their revised NBSAPs and CBD National Reports since the start of the GEF-AZE project: Bahrain, Cape Verde, Eritrea, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Iraq, Panama, Peru, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mexico, Jamaica and Vanuatu. A total of 22 countries now include AZE conservation in such national policies.Awareness of AZE among other CBD Parties was raised through side events, plenary interventions and negotiations in drafting groups by project participants Brazil, Mexico and BirdLife at CBD SBSTTA22 in July 2018 and at COP14 in November 2018, with Decision XIV/1 including the need for urgent progress on AZE conservation. The new AZE map, highlighting that only 43% of AZE sites were protected, was launched to coincide with COP14 and covered in the media. These efforts led to the inclusion of the protection of AZE sites as a means to meet both Aichi Targets 11 and 12 in the final decision on urgent actions needed to meet the Aichi Targets ([CBD/COP/DEC/14/1](https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-14/cop-14-dec-01-en.pdf)).Following engagement with the Global Partnership on Target 11 at a strategy workshop held in April 2019, a call for action to support this Decision and increase efforts to protect and conserve AZE sites, as well as other updates on AZE conservation as a result of this project, was communicated to CBD Focal Points through a [Notification](https://www.cbd.int/doc/notifications/2019/ntf-2019-058-aze-pa-en.pdf) from the CBD Executive Secretary and two webinars on AZE conservation were conducted by the project team for CBD Parties in July 2019, so we expect consideration of AZE conservation to be further included in national conservation efforts pre- and post-2020. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Implementation Progress Rating** | FY 2016 | FY 2017 | FY 2018 | FY 2019 | FY 20\_\_ |
| **S** | **S** | **S** | **S** |  |
| Project implementation proceeded well in this final year, enabling us to largely complete and in several cases exceed project outputs and targets. In terms of site-level AZE conservation, following extensive searches for the AZE trigger species *M. stresemanni* in, adjacent to, and distant from the Mata do Passarinho reserve in southern Bahia, **Brazil**, in December 2018, a female Stresemann’s Bristlefront (*M. stresemanni*) was located just outside of the Reserve in December 2018, and then a second individual (possibly the same) individual in March 2019. This shows that there is hope for the species, which has been in greater decline following drought and fires in the region in recent years, and continued searches in the second half of 2019 have already been funded.As part of actions to promote additional public or private protected areas, data from 264 farms were obtained in an area up to 20 km from the Mata do Passarinho reserve. These properties cover a total of 16,548 hectares, of which 1,098 hectares are Areas of Permanent Preservation (APP), 2,036 hectares are legal reserves, 624 hectares are native vegetation, and 62 are springs. This map will be essential to larger reforestation efforts in this Atlantic Forest region.In **Chile**, progress has been made both in Isla Mocha and the Mehuin sites in controlling access to sensitive habitats to protect the AZE species. On Isla Mocha, a 4-day long workshop, entitled, “Community Leadership Workshop for Mocha Island Sustainability” was held in April 2019 with four local organizations to build community support for conservation initiatives on the island.In Mehuin, Chile, 8.1 ha of native forest and streams that are habitat of the AZE trigger species *E.migueli* have been protected through restricted access from fencing. A participatory Conservation Plan developed with strong community consultation has become an important planning tool for the community, as demonstrated by the commitment to continue implementing the plan beyond the completion of the GEF AZE project. The regional office of the Ministry of the Environment has committed to contributing to the future implementation of the Conservation Plan by coordinating at least two annual meetings with all participating stakeholders, seeking national and international funding for the implementation of the Conservation Plan, and managing resources from the Ministry of the Environment to implement those activities that are under responsibility of the regional office. In addition, INDAP provided training on sustainable agriculture, including livestock grazing, at a community workshop with CONAF.  INDAP also provided funding to a local landowner for materials to fence off AZE trigger species habitat from livestock impacts.In **Madagascar**, the updated Management Plan for Tsitongambarika has been drafted and awaits approval and validation by the Regional (Anosy Region) authorities; AZE site and species conservation is included. Deforestation remains challenging with high rates nationwide (preliminary 3.34% annual rate reported), but at project intervention sites in Tsitongambarika this has been avoided, again showing the value of the approach. A new AZE trigger species, the Critically Endangered millipede *Aphistogoniulus corralipes* has been identified at Tsitongambarika. On the ground, the co-management arrangement through the community organization KOMFITA and the local village associations (COBAs), supported by Asity Madagascar delegated by the Government, has been working successfully, and has led to new reforestation projects additional to GEF project outputs. A powerful [web-story and video of the project in Madagascar](https://www.unenvironment.org/news-and-stories/story/fighting-last-eden-saving-madagascars-unique-species) were produced by the GEF Communication Coordinator at UN Environment. Efforts continued to implement improved management at 10 **additional AZE sites**, and results from final METT evaluations demonstrate improvements in management at these sites.Following the updated identification and **mapping of AZE sites** via two extensive online global consultation exercises, as reported previously, the new global AZE site list and map was launched publicly in November. The updated network currently comprises 853 proposed sites (with the target being 750), which were validated against the new KBA criteria before being confirmed as both AZE sites and KBAs and published on the AZE website. The updated **gap analysis of protected area coverage** of AZEs was conducted at the same time, showing that globally 43% of AZEs lack formal protection. This was the focus of press releases by BirdLife, ABC and IUCN resulting in wider media uptake (e.g. articles by Mongabay and IISD), timed to coincide with the Convention on Biological Diversity’s (CBD) 14th Conference of the Parties (COP14) in November. The importance of protecting AZEs and tools to integrate AZE considerations into **IFI and government policy** were presented and discussed at several key business and policy events: the [Responsible Business Forum](https://www.responsiblebusiness.com/news/africas-news/location-location-location-reduce-bird-collisions/) (Singapore, 11-12 October), the IFC Annual Community of Learning event (Washington DC, 16 October), the Global Business and Biodiversity Forum (Sharm El Sheikh, 14-15 November) and in AZE-focused and other side events at the CBD SBSTTA22 (Montreal, 2 July) and CBD COP14 (Sharm El Sheikh, 25 November). Following publication of the updated IFC Guidance Note 6 in November 2018, now affording AZE sites, along with UNESCO World Heritage sites, the highest level of safeguarding of all types of Critical Habitat, engagement with other IFIs continued, including via informal discussions with and formal inputs in the first half of 2019 to consultations on safeguard policies of the European Investment Bank (EIB), European Bank of Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) and Equator Principles version 4. The AZE information resource factsheet was updated and continues to be used to promote AZE considerations to IFIs, in particular being promoted to IBAT subscribers through the re-developed portal for the screening tool ([www.ibat-alliance.org](http://www.ibat-alliance.org)). At national level, following on from the declaration of the first national ordinance (legislation) on AZE by a country in **Brazil** in July, the Brazilian Ministry of Environment announced a second AZE ordinance in October 2018 to formally recognize the 146 Brazilian AZE sites for 230 target Endangered (EN) and Critically Endangered (CR) Brazilian fauna. A map of Brazilian AZE sites for fauna has been published and was officially launched at the CBD COP-14 in November 2018. A proposal was submitted to Unimed, a Brazilian insurance company, to offer green investments that would provide a continual funding source for Brazilian AZE site conservation. Discussions on this proposal are now in the final phases.At a national level in **Chile**, AZE site data are being used by the Chilean Ministry of the Environment to help identify species that are poorly or not currently represented in the protected area system in order to prioritize conservation actions for these species, which could even result in new protected areas. At the national level in **Madagascar**, the results of the AZE project have been included in the sixth national CBD report (especially on identification of new AZE sites). A workshop was held in Antananarivo in September 2018 in order to establish a mainstreaming plan for Madagascar AZE sites, identifying and mapping 68 AZE sites, including 13 candidate sites. The Alliance Voahary Gasy (of which Asity Madagascar is a member) also sent an open letter urging the newly elected President Andry Rajoelina to take action to prevent species extinction and limit illegal wildlife trade, which both affect AZE sites severely.In **Mexico**, a national AZE strategy workshop in October 2018 yielded positive results. There is strong interest in advancing AZE nationally by the Mexican government’s National Commission for the Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO), which led the workshop, by the National Commission of Natural Protected Areas (CONANP) and by the State Environmental Secretariats of the eight states with the greatest number of AZE sites. Representatives from the Brazilian Ministry of Environment also participated in the workshop to share Brazil’s experiences promoting AZE conservation at a national level, furthering South-South communication and conveying strategies developed in Brazil that might be valuable in Mexico. A follow-up workshop to complete Mexico’s national AZE strategy is being conducted in July 2019.New ‘**mini workshops**’ to promote AZE in national policy and disseminate the new AZE site map were held in Kenya (October), Dominican Republic (November), Philippines (November), and Papua New Guinea (February), bringing the total to six, along with Colombia and South Africa already completed. A total of 16 countries (exceeding the target of 9) now have AZE included in their NBSAPs, CBD national reports or POWPA strategies.Interventions in plenary discussions and negotiations in drafting groups by Brazil, Mexico and BirdLife at both the CBD SBSTTA22 and CBD COP14 meetings led to the inclusion of the protection of AZE sites as a means to meet both Aichi Targets 11 and 12 in the final **CBD Decision** on urgent actions needed to meet the Aichi Targets ([CBD/COP/DEC/14/1](https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-14/cop-14-dec-01-en.pdf)). Strategies to address this were discussed at a meeting of the [Global Partnership on Target 11](https://www.iucn.org/news/protected-areas/201905/enhancing-progress-towards-aichi-target-11) in Vilm, Germany in April 2019, and then communicated to CBD Focal Points through a Notification from the CBD Executive Secretary, with further training and support provided by the project partners through two webinars in July 2019. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Rating** | FY 2016 | FY 2017 | FY 2018 | FY 2019 | FY 20\_\_ |
| **Low** | **Low** | **Low** | **Low** |  |
| Risks have been limited and well-managed and the project has now been successfully completed. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder engagement** | Stakeholder engagement was inclusive and effective. The Pro Doc included a thorough mapping and analysis of stakeholders with explicit details on mandates, roles and interests. The project’s capacity to deliver was enhanced by the participation of a wide range of experienced organizations, nationally and internationally. A varied group of relevant stakeholders and partners were identified during the inception stage and were later were duly involved in the project. During the design phase, government stakeholders were actively involved and a series of workshops also targeted local communities.Despite challenges, substantial progress was made with stakeholder engagement in this project.At all demonstration sites, project teams have worked methodically and successfully to build trust and partnerships with local communities. At Mata do Passarinho in Brazil, both the current and past reserve managers have forged links with local landowners, primarily cattle ranchers, who had long been hesitant to collaborate with the reserve. As a result of the reserve managers’ efforts, they have been invited by local landowners to present to local stakeholders about the importance of conservation and reforestation and to cooperate on local conservation initiatives. The reserve manager was also invited by a leading figure in the community, a rancher, to promote a reforestation project in the region.Stakeholder engagement also led to efforts to create a private reserve near the Mata do Passarinho Reserve in a forest fragment of about 20 hectares that has a small population of Northern Brown Howler Monkeys (*Alouatta guariba guariba*). The species is unique to the Atlantic Forest north of the Jequitinhonha River and is assessed as CR by the IUCN. Although the fragment is extremely small, it is very important for the region, since there are no reports of this subspecies in other places, including the Mata do Passarinho reserve. Fundacion Biodiversitas is now working with the landowner to create an RPPN.In Chile at the Mehuin sites, the GEF AZE project team successfully turned initial community resistance to the project into strong acceptance and willingness to work together to protect the AZE trigger species. Through many meetings and workshops with the local indigenous (Mapuche) community, the AZE project team has fully integrated the community into the development of a regional Conservation Plan, which is viewed as the community’s own project because of their vast input into the Plan. The Conservation Plan was officially launched on 31 May 2018 with the presence of local authorities and stakeholders. The agreement was signed by the regional offices of the Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Public Works, Municipality of Mariquina, Regional Government and local communities to establish an Implementation Committee for the Plan. The Plan has been approved and, due to the strong interest of local communities in continuing the plan, it will continue to be used after the end of the project.At both the Mocha Island and Mehuin sites, an important aspect of stakeholder engagement has focused on environmental education and community outreach. At Isla Mocha, the project team implemented environmental education activities on a regular basis in the island’s school and kindergarten. This was implemented through workshops, painting a mural, guided tours to the reserve, making a board game about amphibians, putting on a play about the fauna of the island, songs, and other activities. Eighty children and their families participated in the programme. At Mehuin, an environmental education programme was developed with a total of 8 rural schools and 87 students between the ages of 7 and 14 participating. The first year of the programme included 5 sessions on the assessment and knowledge of endemic and threatened amphibians of native forests, including lectures, games, crafts and a small research project on amphibians. During the second year of the programme, research projects were developed in each school to monitor the presence of amphibians around the schools. Each school monitored the presence of amphibians during 3 field trips. In September 2018, one class was invited to present their scientific research on *E. migueli* at the XV Regional School Congress of Science and Technology for the Los Ríos Region. Several news articles were published on the students’ research project.In Madagascar, the focus is on community engagement and empowerment and the initiatives to realize these approaches have been elaborated, involving community associations (COBAs) united by a single umbrella body (KOMFITA), empowered to manage the forest under contracts but still thus answerable to the government, all facilitated and with management and other necessary skills/capacity by the NGO (Asity Madagascar). Making this work to control deforestation and support sustainable livelihoods is in itself an achievement, although a challenge to ensure that community benefits are sufficient, and equitably shared. In addition, local stakeholders, seeing the success of these conservation efforts (compared to neighbouring protected areas), decided to reinforce their partnership with Asity Madagascar, and a joint funding proposal was developed by WHH and Asity. Rio Tinto continues to support conservation of the protected area by extending the area of intervention (with the actual fund now covering the entirety of Tsitongambarika rather than just the offset area). |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Gender mainstreaming** | During the MTR, the strong involvement of women and good incorporation of gender aspects in all levels of project implementation were assessed as a strength of the project. Gender was explicitly considered in the Pro Doc and mainstreamed in the project implementation. The promotion of more sustainable livelihoods is at the centre-stage of this project and the needs of local communities (particularly those related to forest resource use) were taken into account, including on a gender-differentiated basis.There were several gender benefits resulting from this project. Women led many different aspects of the project. Women filled key roles in this project, serving as overall BirdLife project manager, ABC lead for the project, the national coordinators of the project in all three project countries, and several of the government officials involved in the project, including the official who spearheaded the successful effort that led to a CBD Decision at COP-14 encouraging all Parties to conserve AZE as a means of accelerating progress towards Aichi Targets. In addition, several of the reserve managers at the additional AZE sites, including Serra do Urubu in Brazil and the Blue & John Crow Mountains in Jamaica, are women. The leads for the Mexican AZE workshop, organized by CONABIO, and the Colombian AZE workshop, organised by the NGO Calidris and ABC, were also women.In addition, this project actively worked to include women in decision-making and implementation of project activities. For example, eight of the 14 teachers who participated in a workshop on environmental education from local schools at Mehuin were women, and girls were active participants in the scientific studies conducted by the students. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Knowledge activities and products** | The overall project strategy was based on providing technological tools and monitoring approaches to enable informed decision making at local, national and international levels. On the ground, it encouraged (a) improved management of existing forest areas and conservation of biodiversity, (b) reforestation/afforestation programmes, (c) improved control of deforestation on the ground and monitoring / protection of carbon stocks and (d) provided the information base for PES schemes. The project conducted knowledge activities tailored to local communities, which are frequently unaware of the global uniqueness and importance of the AZE species in their area, and may have few alternatives to their current land use practices that may threaten AZE species. For example, in the region surrounding the Mata do Passarinho AZE site in Brazil, reserve staff participated in local events, such as the “Dia do campo”, or field day, for rural producers in the municipality of Macarani. At this event, attended by over 300 people, reserve staff gave a presentation on the importance of conserving natural resources and best environmental practices for rural landowners. They also partnered with local cattle ranchers to distribute over 400 native tree seedlings to promote reforestation in the region. Reforestation is a key need for AZE trigger and other species, as over 93% of the Atlantic Forest has been lost.Many knowledge products were made to improve understanding of why and how to conserve AZE sites. For example, to increase knowledge by local community members of the AZE frogs and other amphibians in their region of Chile, an Amphibian Exposition was held at three community centers and six local schools, which included excellent photos of amphibians along with information on their conservation status, distribution and habitat.In Madagascar, children of four local primary schools in the region were engaged in order to show the importance of biodiversity with a particular focus on the endemic species of Tsitongambarika.At global level, a key element of the project was updating the AZE site list and map, consulting widely and greatly increasing the rigour with which AZE sites are identified, according to the new Key Biodiversity Area Standard. They are now managed within the World Database on KBAs, which was developed and improved during the course of and with the support of this project. The WDKBA is a key data layer within the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT), enabling access to spatial AZE data by industry, international financial institutions (IFIs), governments and other stakeholders so that they can screen for the presence of AZE sites and other KBAs and therefore reduce risk of impacts from development projects. The AZE website was also entirely revamped and made much more user-friendly, with an interactive map providing information about each AZE site, sections aimed specifically at governments and IFIs, and case studies, technical support and other resources. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Stories to be shared** | The biggest news story for the project this year was the launch of the AZE site map, where we highlighted the lack of protection and need for greater efforts to protect and conserve AZE sites – this is relevant to the Aichi Targets (11 and 12 in particular) as well as the post-202 global biodiversity framework.<https://www.birdlife.org/worldwide/news/nearly-half-endangered-species-last-refuges-unprotected><https://news.mongabay.com/2018/11/map-pinpoints-last-chance-locations-of-endangered-speciesnearly-half-are-unprotected/>Another new story is on the excellent work by the government of Brazil in promoting AZE both nationally, through the first-ever federal ordinance recognizing AZE sites in the world, and also in proposing and successfully advancing AZE in the CBD process by getting AZE site protection included in a draft recommendation to the COP for options to accelerate progress on Aichi Targets.The rediscovery of the AZE trigger species, *M. stresemanni*, near Mato do Passarinho in Brazil, could also make a good story and is ongoing.Another potential story could be Sierra Cara in Guatemala, which is providing temporary jobs and training for Honduran migrants while also monitoring potential impacts from large increase in migration through the site and local area. Similarly, at this site, a story on the use of carbon credits to finance AZE site conservation could be an interesting approach to report. The work in Madagascar was well-covered by the UNEP communications team this year and could be shared or developed further by GEF?<https://www.unenvironment.org/news-and-stories/story/fighting-last-eden-saving-madagascars-unique-species> |
|  |

1. **RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK**

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

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

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

* 1. **3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project Results(s**)

| **Project objective and Outcomes** | **Indicator** | **Baseline level** | **Mid-Term Target or Milestones[[2]](#footnote-2)**  | **End of Project Target** | **Observations/ justification on rating** | **Progress rating [[3]](#footnote-3)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective[[4]](#footnote-4)**To prevent species extinctions at priority sites identified through the Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE) | AZE is mainstreamed into national biodiversity strategies and action plans and MDB policies | (See the GEF BD2 Tracking Tool (**Appendix 14a).**Two NBSAPs (Brazil and Philippines), and four PoWPA Action Plans (Vietnam, Nauru, Indonesia, Philippines) explicitly mention AZE (i.e., a total of five countries with AZE referenced in at least one of the key documents).UNEP has made contact with countries for which they are providing NBSAP support requesting inclusion of AZE. | (See the GEF BD2 Tracking Tool (**Appendix 14a).**All CBD Focal Points have received from the CBD Secretariat notification requesting information on Protected Areas representativeness including AZE sites.Direct contacts made between AZE staff and responsible parties regarding inclusion of AZE in NBSAPs, CBD National Reports, and/or PoWPA Action Plans for at least 20 countries. | (See the GEF BD2 Tracking Tool (**Appendix 14a).**At least nine countries include AZE in at least one of the following: NBSAPs, CBD National Reports and/or PoWPA Action Plans as direct result of project inputs. | Exceeded (22)AZE staff have worked directly and through the NBSAP Forum to communicate with responsible Parties about inclusion of AZE in CBD documents. Twenty-two countries have now included AZE in their revised NBSAPs, National Reports and/or PoWPA Action Plans: Bahrain, Brazil, Cape Verde, Eritrea, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Madagascar, Nauru, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mexico, Jamaica, Vanuatu and Vietnam. | HS |
| **Outcome 1.1.** Creation and improved management effectiveness of protected areas covering 160,000 ha of AZE sites, and improved conservation status of 17 AZE species at a total of five demonstration sites in Brazil, Chile, and Madagascar, and at an additional 10 sites globally | **Indicator 1.1.1:** Improved management effectiveness of 5 target AZE sites covering a baseline area of 64,102 ha, indicated by the increase in the METT assessment |  |  |  | Note: because of problems contracting a partner in Chile able to serve as a funding administrator, project field activities in **Chile** began late and, were extended by 4 months. This has affected the timing of activities, outcomes and deliverables as referred to below and in section 3.2, though the extension of these components is now in line with the overall project no-cost extension. | S |
| Brazil: Mata do Passarinho | 69% | 75%? | 91% | Mid-term score: 78%. Final score: 81% | S |
| Chile: Isla Mocha National Reserve  | 62% | 65% | 70% | Mid-term score: 64%. Final score: 70%. | S |
| Chile: Mehuin I – Llenehue  | 9% | 12% | 18% | Note: Due to the change in sites at Mehuin, Llenehue and Isaac are no longer involved in the project. These sites have been replaced by Mr. Lienlaf's property. | N/A |
|  | Chile: Mehuin II – Isaac | 23% | 30% | 46% | As above. | N/A |
|  | Chile - Propiedad de Rigoberto Lienlaf (Mehuin) | N/A (added after project start) | N/A (added after project start) | N/A (added after project start) | Mid-term score: 41%. Final score: 64%.This site is within the Mehuin site, and was added following the change in sites noted above.  | S |
|  | Chile - Territorio costero Mariquina (Mehuin) | N/A (added after project start) | N/A (added after project start) | N/A (added after project start) | Mid-term score: 23%. Final score not available yet.This site is within the Mehuin site, and was added following the change in sites noted above.  | S |
|  | Madagascar: Tsitongambarika  | 58% | 65% | 73% | Mid-term score: 65%. Final METT score: 77% | HS |
|  | **Indicator 1.1.2:** Target AZE Site Legal Protection Status:Increased area of 5 target AZE sites under improved legal protection |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Brazil: Mata do Passarinho  | Private Reserve (RPPN) and Rural Environmental Cadaster (CAR) compliant (654 ha) | Private Reserve (RPPN) and CAR compliant (1,041 ha) | Private Reserve (RPPN) and CAR compliant (1,041 ha) | Land purchase in December 2015 increased the RPPN to 951 ha. This is slightly lower than the predicted 1,041 ha due to a lack of agreement in the family selling the land. However, Biodiversitas was able to acquire the most important portions of the property, including most of the intact watershed, leaving behind mostly cattle pasture. | S |
|  | Chile: Isla Mocha  | National Reserve (2,905 ha) | National Reserve (2,905 ha) | National Park (c.2,905 ha) | Isla Mocha remains a National Reserve; however, the process to convert Isla Mocha to a National Park is well underway. Please see the attached document, Isla Mocha Recategorization to National Park. | S |
|  | Chile: Mehuin I & II AZE Site  | Unprotected private areas: 44 ha at two Mehuin sites: Llenehue (2 ha) & Isaac (42 ha)  | Land tenure studies conducted and recommendations implemented to improve protection  | Participatory conservation (management) plan for Mehuin approved and under implementation | Land tenure study component of this project was removed (request approved by GSC), as it is not supported by local actors; resources to be reallocated to expanded participatory conservation planning for Mehuin (Activity M4). The participatory Conservation Plan was officially launched on 31 May 2018 with the presence of local authorities and stakeholders. The agreement was signed by the regional offices of the Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Public Works, Municipality of Mariquina, Regional Government and local communities to establish an Implementation Committee for the Plan. The Plan has been approved and is currently under implementation. Due to the strong interest of local communities in continuing the plan, they will continue to use it beyond the end of the project. | N/A |
|  | Madagascar: Tsitongambarika Forest  | Proposed protected area – temporary protection status (60,509 ha) | Protected Area (60,509 ha) | Protected Area (60,509 ha) | Permanent protection of Tsitongambarika Forest, Madagascar, secured in Year 1 – the site is protected but state resources not available for management, so successful conservation remains dependent on additional inputs (i.e. no change since 2017). | S |
|  | **Indicator 1.1.3:** Measurable progress in addressing key threats at each AZE site |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Brazil: Mata do Passarinho Area of forest habitat restored in and around the reserve | 0 trees planted and 0 ha of habitat restored in and around Mata do Passarinho Reserve [NB: this was inputted incorrectly in previous reports / project document] | 20,000 trees planted and 20 ha of habitat restored in and around Mata do Passarinho Reserve [NB: this was inputted incorrectly in previous reports / project document] | 40,000 trees planted of 27 species and 40 ha of habitat restored in and surrounding Mata do Passarinho Reserve [NB: this was inputted incorrectly in previous reports / project document] | 35,020 trees were planted, restoring 35.91 hectares of habitat. The remaining 4.09 hectares are being prepared to receive the seedlings, which are in the reserve’s nursery and are ready for planting in the reserve nursery. These remaining 4 ha are dominated by *Pteridium* sp. Preparing this land for restoration requires pre-clearing the ground and opening trails in parallel lines to be able to plant the seedlings. We expect this final planting to be finished before the end of 2019. | S |
|  | Chile: Isla Mocha Exclusion zones created for priority AZE amphibian conservation areas where wood harvesting is not permitted | Deforestation and forest degradation ongoing and causing declines in habitat quantity and quality for AZE species | [Key areas for AZE species and wood harvesting identified and mapped] *See ‘level at June 2017’* | Zones established within the protected area for exclusion of wood harvesting activities  | A map showing the overlap of wood harvesting areas in Isla Mocha (based on information provided by CONAF) and the registration points of *E. insularis* (based on information obtained by RECH during the monitoring of amphibians) was developed. The map shows that there is only overlap between the two areas in the northern section of the Reserve. This information was provided to CONAF to be used for permitting for the wood harvesting. | S |
|  | Chile: Mehuin I & II * Restricting access to amphibian habitat at Mehuin [revised indicator following agreed amendment]
 | Deforestation and forest degradation ongoing and causing declines in habitat quantity and quality for AZE species | [no mid-term target following agreed amendment to delay activity] *See ‘level at June 2017’* | Access to amphibian habitat restricted and impact from illegal logging and cattle minimized [revised target following agreed amendment] | Four streams with the presence of *E. migueli* located on the premises of indigenous people were fenced off to prevent access to livestock that disturbs the habitat of amphibians: 1 area of ​​5 hectares (Rigoberto Lienlaf); 1 farm of 1.5 hectares (Indigenous Association Weichafe Lafquen Mapu); 1 area of ​​1 hectare that was also reforested with native trees (Mrs Audolicia Ancacura), and 1 area of ​​0.6 hectares (Mr Javier Nahuelpan), for a total of 8.1 ha of *E. migueli* habitat fenced off to safeguard the species. | S |
|  | Madagascar: Tsitongambarika ForestDeforestation rate as the main threat to, and determinant of conservation status of, AZE species | Estimated rate 2.05% to be verified on project inception | 15% reduction in deforestation rate in project area | 35% reduction in deforestation rate in project area | Exceeded. With new data released recently, across whole of Tsitongambarika deforestation rate 2010-2018 is evaluated at 0.97%, but in target zones for GEF project, benefiting from project activities, no new forest clearance was observed during community monitoring since 2016. This represents a 53% reduction for the entire area compared to the estimated baseline rate, and 100% reduction for the project area. | S |
|  | **Indicator 1.1.4:** Measurable improvements in conservation status achieved for ten additional target AZE sites covering a minimum of 120,000 ha based on METT scores | All potential target sites have significant management problems and threats, impacting on AZE species. Baseline METT scores to be established for target AZE sites by project mid-term | Ten additional AZE sites identified, beyond those initially targeted for project action that are appropriate to focus on for this project element, with interventions and deliverables defined and METT baseline scores established | Measurable improvements in conservation status achieved for ten additional target AZE sites covering a minimum of 40,000 ha based on repeat METT scores | METTs completed at **11 additional AZE sites**: Sierra de Bahoruco National Park, Dominican Republic; Oasis Araripe Reserve, Serra do Urubu Reserve, and Murici, Brazil; Sierra Caral Reserve, Guatemala; Yunguilla and Tapichalaca Reserves, Ecuador; Blue and John Crow Mountains National Park, Jamaica; Osa National Wildlife Refuge, Costa Rica; Abra Patricia Reserve, Peru; Mahavavy-Kinkony Complex, Madagascar. These sites cover over 190,000 ha, far exceeding the minimum goal of 40,000 ha. Key interventions were summarized, based on the key threats and management needs determined by the METTs, and AZE staff are working with reserve staff at the sites to deliver interventions. Follow-up METT evaluations at these sites show management effectiveness improvements. Please see the attached document, *Additional sites METTs*. | HS |
| **Outcome 2.1.** The conservation of threatened species and the protection of AZE sites are mainstreamed into the safeguard policies of key financial institutions such as Equator Principles Financial Institutions and Multilateral Development Banks to minimize the impact of development projects on AZE sites. | **Indicator 2.1.1:** Number of comprehensively assessed taxonomic groups for which AZE sites systematically identified | 6 | 10 | 15 | Exceeded (17). AZE sites have been systematically identified for the 6 species groups included in the 2010 dataset and for 11 new groups, so with 17 groups we have exceeded the target set.  | HS |
|  | **Indicator 2.1.2:** Number of mapped and documented AZE sites | 588 | 700 | 750 | Exceeded (853). AZE sites have been mapped and documented for all 17 of the species groups assessed: following two extensive online consultation exercises in 2017, a total of 853 sites triggered by 1,483 AZE trigger species has been identified. This number of sites is slightly lower than the provisional number previously reported, following verification in July-August 2018 by the KBA Technical Working Group to confirm they meet the KBA standard. The final map was launched at CBD COP14 in November 2018 with a press release and webstory covered by Mongabay and other outlets. | HS |
|  | **Indicator 2.1.3:** Number of visitors to website presenting site factsheets | 500 | 50,000/year | 100,000/year | At least 50,000/year (AZE, KBA and IBAT websites)Given the prolonged period of consultation and data analysis required for the development of the new AZE site list and map, and its delayed launch (with a preliminary list showcased in a side event during the CBD SBSTTA meeting on 2 July, but the final list not being confirmed as KBA sites until the autumn and launched at CBD COP14 in November), promotion of the new AZE website was also delayed and this has impacted visitor numbers as a result, with inadequate time and budget to develop a wider public engagement strategy and social media plan (which were not envisaged as a major focus on this GEF project). We would note that raising the public profile of AZE conservation was in itself not a major focus of this project, and the target of 100,000 visitors per year to the AZE/KBA websites may need re-evaluating if our primary aim is to engage governments, and to a lesser extent IFIs, which we are now directing to the redeveloped IBAT website in the first instance. Since 2016, AZE sites are also being promoted via the KBA website, which was developed during the course of the project, and of course IBAT, as the primary means for formal screening of the KBA/AZE data layers. The current AZE website has had 27,295 hits for the year July 2018-June 2019 (and an estimated 9804 interactions with the AZE map app on top of this – based on 4902 interactions for January-June 2019). The KBA website registered at least ~18,000 hits during this year (more detailed data are not available), and hits are increasing year on year, with an increase of 35% in June 2019 compared to June 2018. Data are not yet available for the IBAT website following the restructuring of the site in January 2019, but extrapolating the number of searches from the July-December 2018 period suggests (conservatively – as visits have increased since the restructure) that users searched for the KBA layer 4374 times over the past year, and the AZE site-specific layer 1462 times. A total of 28 IFI users now regularly access the IBAT website (see indicator 2.1.5). | S |
|  | **Indicator 2.1.4:** Number of MDB and EPFI policies referring specifically to AZE following project guidance and consequent reviews of safeguard policies | 2Two (2) MDBs refer to AZE in their safeguard policy handbook/ guidelines | 5 | 10 | 7 (6 + 96)Included in EIB, IADB, IFC safeguards and World Bank *Environmental and Social Framework* as well as EHS Wind Energy Guidelines and IRMA Standard for Responsible Mining, and by reference to AZEs as Critical Habitat under IFC Performance Standard 6, the policies of all 96 EPFIs. In June 21018 and November 2018 respectively World Bank and IFC guidance published referencing AZE sites/website, with IFC essentially recognising AZE sites as ‘no-go’ – the strongest safeguard yet. In-person and written input has been provided by BirdLife to EIB and EBRD consultations in February/March 2019 and the new Equator Principles 4 consultation in June 2019 and we expect AZE to be included in their new safeguards/guidance as a result. The number of individual policies is below the final target, but all this is contingent upon institutions’ review timelines, and institutions engaged are high-profile and highly influential, with World Bank safeguards likely to be taken up by several other MBDs, and IFC safeguards and guidance by Equator Principles institutions (currently 92). | MS |
|  | **Indicator 2.1.5:** Number of financial institutions engaging and working with AZE member staff to use tools, data and guidance, and/or making this available for borrowers’ due diligence/initial screening processes | 2Some staff in WB, IFC, IDB and EIB (not other MDBs and EPFIs) aware and have access to limited data | 5 | 10 | Exceeded (28)This includes 22 IFIs now using IBAT\* (ADB (Asian Development Bank), AfDB (African Development Bank), AIIB (Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank), Allianz, BNP Paribas, Bpifrance, Credit Suisse, Danish Export Credit Agency (EKF), EIB (European Investment Bank), Finance in Motion, FMO (Netherlands Development Finance Company), IADB (Inter-American Development Bank), IFC, IFU (Danish Development Finance Institution), ING, JPMorgan, KfW, MIGA PWC (German Export Credit Agency), SACE, Standard Chartered, Swedish Export Credit Agency (EKN), UK Export Finance, World Bank), plus engagement with 6 other IFIs through the course of the project (EBRD (European Bank of Reconstruction and Development), the Equator Principles Association, Mizuho Bank, ANZ Bank, DBS and Aviva).Presented AZE guidance document or factsheet in the IFC Community of Learning event in November 2016 with the attendance of 71 Equator Principles Finance Institutions, then engagement with IFIs at November 2017 Business and Nature Forum in Singapore, securing 10 new IBAT subscribers and other engagement, and further session at IFC Community of Learning event in October 2018. \* Not all these institutions have agreed to be listed publicly on the IBAT website so this information should remain confidential. | S |
|  | **Indicator 2.1.6:** Number of AZE sites with conservation enhanced or threats averted by participating IFIs through avoidance, mitigation and/or compensation related to development project impacts  | 0 | 5 | 10 | >8 named sites have had threats averted through specific enquiries to the AZE team, but many more AZE sites will have been avoided or supported through generic and untracked IFI use of IBAT.This very conservative total includes 3 sites (via EKN and Eni Ghana) through IBAT screening and direct request to AZE partner BirdLife, and 5 sites through regular consultations from IFC with AZE staff in countries with specific site issues, including Mexico, Peru, Sri Lanka and Indonesia (likely helped by the direct engagement with 71 IFIs at the first IFC Community of Learning event, and subsequent Singapore forum). Note that it is difficult to keep track of the exact numbers via IBAT as this information on the results of searches is not recorded – just whether AZE sites in general were searched for by IFIs, which is much more frequent than for KBAs in general or other types of KBA). | MS |
| **Outcome 2.2:** AZE site conservation is mainstreamed into national biodiversity strategies, in support of CBD targets | **Indicator 2.2.1:** Number of endorsed and launched pilot national AZE Strategies in project countries (Brazil, Chile, Madagascar) | 0No national AZE strategies exist for Chile, Brazil and Madagascar | 0First draft of National AZE Strategy in Chile, Brazil, and Madagascar | 3National AZE Strategies for Brazil, Chile, and Madagascar endorsed and being implemented | 2.5 (Brazil and Madagascar complete; Chile to be officially endorsed)**Brazil**: On July 12, MMA Ordinance No. 287 was published, which recognizes BAZE, linking it to the National Biodiversity Council through the Technical Chamber of Threatened Species and defining that maps and their updates should be recognized through specific ordinances and included in public conservation strategies (Dropbox). This Decree revoked the recognition of the BAZE of 2006, giving greater definition and opening possibilities for inclusion of the initiative in consolidated policies, such as the definition of Priority Areas for Conservation and National Action Plans. As a consequence, the map of BAZE fauna sites was included in the discussions of the revision of the Priority Areas for the Conservation of the Atlantic Forest. On 31 October 2018, MMA Ordinance no. 413 was published, recognizing the 146 irreplaceable sites for Endangered (EN) and Critically Endangered (CR) Brazilian fauna, or BAZE sites, with 230 target species. The publication was followed by the disclosure of the ordinance and the map on the MMA website (<http://www.mma.gov.br/informma/item/15261-cop-14-minist%C3%A9rio-mapeia-%C3%B3> (See Dropbox). The map was also translated into English and printed in English and Portuguese. The English versions were distributed during the presentation of the project by the MMA technical team at a KBA/AZE side event at the 14th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD COP14) held in Egypt 13-29 November. On 5 December, the methodology and results were presented at the meeting of the Technical Chamber of Endangered Species of the National Council of Biodiversity (CONABIO), to which BAZE became attached after Ordinance 287. The site map was received with great approval, being recognized for the technical quality and relevance for the conservation of the species. In addition, the Brazilian Alliance for Zero Extinction (BAZE) has been re-launched and currently has 17 members, all of which are Brazilian conservation NGOs. See the BAZE website here: <http://www.biodiversitas.org.br/baze2/index.asp>(*Chile and Madagascar progress summarised in separate rows below*)  | S |
|  |  |  |  |  | **Chile**: Following a national AZE site identification workshop conducted with 25 experts at the Ministry for the Environment in August 2017, led by the AZE project coordinator in Chile, a national AZE conservation strategy was developed and published on the AZE website in July 2018 (<http://zeroextinction.org/case-studies/chilean-aze-conservation-strategy/>), which is being used to inform decision-making. At a national level, AZE site data are being used by the Chilean Ministry of the Environment to help identify species that are poorly or not currently represented in the protected area system in order to prioritize conservation actions for these species, which could even result in new protected areas. The results of the national AZE site delimitation consultancy will provide highly useful information for this process, including species distribution information to evaluate protection options for these areas. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | **Madagascar**: a national AZE strategy validation workshop was held inSeptember 2018 in Antananarivo ((SEE DROPBOX), to establish a national mainstreaming plan, involving the major conservation planning agencies and including the two largest private sector investments in the country, mining projects Ambatovy and Rio Tinto QMM, and to propose new Madagascar AZE candidate site. Mainstreaming of AZE is one of many priorities in a highly challenging decade for the environment in Madagascar, with increasing impoverishment, corruption, deforestation and loss of other natural resources. Recognising the need for a fresh start after new presidential elections in December 2018, Asity Madagascar joined the other members of the Alliance Voahary Gasy, an alliance of Malagasy civil society organisations working for the environment, in an open letter to President Andry Rajoelina calling for improvements in various aspects of environmental governance. Although it does not mention AZE (this would not be appropriate to the content and style), the letter is significant as it addresses the drivers of the degradation or loss of AZE sites.  |  |
|  | **Indicator 2.2.2:** Number of project countries (Brazil, Chile, Madagascar) including AZE site protection in NBSAPs/CBD National Reports, and/or PoWPA Action Plans, and other relevant national planning documents | 0*Brazil:* AZE is mentioned in NBSAP, but not the PoWPA Action Plan. *Chile:* NBSAP and PoWPA Action Plans do not mention AZE. *Madagascar:* NBSAP and PoWPA Action Plan do not mention AZE | 0Draft National AZE Strategy developed with strong Government engagement and contains recommendations and timetables for inclusion of AZE in national biodiversity strategies | 3Brazil, Chile, and Madagascar AZE site protection included in key documents, including AZE Species Action Plans (Brazil), Amphibian Conservation Plan (Chile), Species Action Plans (Madagascar)  | 2 (Brazil and Madagascar); Chile to be officially endorsed**Madagascar:** AZE sites were mentioned in the revised NBSAP and latest (6th) CBD national report; no further CBD reports known since then.**Brazil:** Several pages of revised draft Brazilian NBSAP focused on AZE protection. **Chile**: AZE sites not yet mentioned in relevant national documents. However, a national AZE conservation strategy has been developed and detailed boundaries of the Chilean AZE sites will be used as input for national level biodiversity policy instruments and conservation actions. | S |
|  | **Indicator 2.2.3:** Number of countries\* explicitly including AZE sites and species among strategic priorities in at least one of NBSAPs, CBD National Reports, and/or PoWPA Action Plans *\*Excluding Brazil, Chile and Madagascar* | 5 countries with AZE referenced in at least 1 key document * 2 NBSAPs (Brazil and Philippines)
* 4 PoWPA Action Plans (Vietnam, Nauru, Indonesia, and Philippines)

  | 5All CBD Focal Points received from CBD Secretariat notification requesting information on Protected Areas representativeness including AZE sitesDirect contacts made between AZE staff and responsible parties for at least 20 countries. | 9 countries with AZE referenced in at least 1 key document  | 16Sixteen additional non-project countries have included AZE in their revised NBSAPs and National Reports since the project’s initiation: Bahrain, Cape Verde, Eritrea, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Iraq, Panama, Peru, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mexico, Jamaica and Vanuatu. Also new since the project inception is Madagascar, but is not counted as it is a project country. In total, 22 countries have included AZE in their NBSAPs, National Reports and/or PoWPA Action Plans (see objective indicator). Awareness of AZE among CBD Parties was raised through side events at the CBD COP13 meeting in Cancun in December 2016, co-hosted by CONABIO and ABC, the CBD COP14 in Sharm El-Sheikh in November 2018, hosted by BirdLife and the KBA Partnership, at SBSTTA21 in December 2017, hosted by ABC with Brazil, BirdLife, Mexico, the Philippines and GEF, and at SBSTTA22 in July 2018, hosted by BirdLife with IUCN, ABC, Brazil and UNEP-WCMC. Following Decision XIV/1 at COP14 which included AZE, a letter was sent to all CBD Parties urging renewed focus on AZE conservation pre and post-2020 and two webinars were given to CBD Parties and others. The webinar recording is available on the AZE website here: <http://zeroextinction.org/policy/international-financial-institutions/>  | HS |
|  | **Indicator 2.2.4:**Number of countries with national AZE partnerships strengthened through AZE mini-workshops and national strategy development workshops | 0AZE has 93 member NGOs in 35 countries, with national alliances in Brazil, Colombia, India, Mexico, and Peru. 200 member organizations in these countries. | 0Relevant experts are identified and invited to participate in AZE site review processes in 5 countries | 5AZE mini-workshops followed by 2+ national strategy workshops in 4-6 countries, resulting in strengthened national AZE partnerships and draft national AZE strategies | 76 AZE mini-workshops have been conducted in Colombia, Dominican Republic, Kenya, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines and South Africa, and a national strategy development workshop was held in Mexico in October 2018, ahead of a final strategy workshop in July 2019. It was decided to focus on having more mini-workshops in order to scope national interest and commitment to AZE more widely, over holding a second national strategy workshop.  | S |

Overall rating of project progress towards meeting project Result(s) (*To be provided by UNEP GEF Task Manager.)*

| **FY2018 rating**[previous] | **FY2019 rating**[current] | **Justification of the current FY rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods.**  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| S | S | The project’s results have been impressive in over-achieving set targets for recognition and mainstreaming of AZE concepts and sites in national strategies, such as NBSAPs or reporting to the CBD. Most of the project’s outputs are on track and targets have been achieved or exceeded. The project team has progressed in Chile and most delays have been recovered. The overall objective indicator – at least 9 countries include AZE in one of their national reports and/or action plans – was impressively exceeded with 22 countries. Late start for implementation to improve management effectiveness in Chile led to some delays for achieving the set indicators of outcomes 1.1 and 1.2 (4 out of 5 targeted AZE sites), but a no-cost extension will allow to recover the delays toward project end. Outcome 1.1.3 – addressing key threats in each AZE site was fully met, while outcome indicator 1.1.4 – METT scores improved on over 120,000 ha – was exceeded, reaching 190,000 ha. Outcome 2 indicators were either met or exceeded, e.g. indicator 2.1.1 – 17 instead of 15 taxonomic groups comprehensively assessed; or indicator 2.1.2, having mapped 853 instead of 750 AZE sites. The number of MDB and EPFI policies referring to AZE was nearly achieved for indicator 2.1. (7 out of 10), while more than expected financial institutions work with AZE staff and tools (28 instead of the targeted 10 for indicator 2.1.5). Brazil and Madagascar already endorsed their national AZE strategies while Chile is about to complete the official endorsement, thus reaching the targeted 3 AZE strategies as per indicators 2.2.1 and 2.2.2, while indicator 2.2.3 was again exceeded, as 16 and not 9 non-project countries included AZE sites and concepts into their NBSAPs and/or NPs, and 7 instead of the targeted 5 countries held AZE workshops as reported under indicator 2.2.4. |

**Risks to the delivery of results**

The second column should be completed by the Project Manager and the third column should summarize the recommendations that the Project Manager and Task Manager have agreed upon to address the problem/risk. Projects should complete only the relevant sections and are free to add/delete problems/risks. This section should inform the risk rating in section 3.3.

| **Problems/risks identified**  | **Description of the problem/risk** | **Agreed recommended actions**  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| on achieving targets |  |  |
| on stakeholder engagement |  |  |
| on gender actions |  |  |
| on safeguards |  |  |
| on delivering GEF Core Indicators |  |  |
| on delivering of PoW EA |  |  |
| on sustainability of results |  |  |
| others |  |  |

**3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs**

| **Outputs [[5]](#footnote-5)** | **Expected delivery date[[6]](#footnote-6)** | **Implementation status as of 30 June 2018[[7]](#footnote-7)**  | **Implementation status as of 30 June 2019)** | **Progress rating justification**  | **Progress rating[[8]](#footnote-8)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 1.1.1. Habitat conservation for *Merulaxis stresemanni* in Bandeiras, Brazil, strengthened through improved forest protection and restoration with community support to sustain long-term conservation** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity 1. Alternative livelihoods program and reforestation | Mar 2019\* | 63% | 90% | 28,299 tree seedlings of 27 native species have been produced and 30.74 hectares have been reforested. | S |
| Activity 2. Implement Stresemann's Bristlefront conservation activities | Sep 2018 | 100%  | 100%  | In December 2018, following extensive searches, a female Stresemann’s Bristlefront *Merulaxis stresemanni* was found in a forested parcel just outside of the Mata do Passarinho reserve. The individual‘s song was recorded and photos were taken. As a result, additional searches are continuing and focusing on the location of the female. See dropbox for a photo of the discovered individual.Three 15-day searches for *M.* *stressemani* were conducted from February – May, 2019. All the trails of the reserve were covered. On March 8, 2019 an individual of *M. stressemani* was registered just outside the limits of the RPPN Mata do Passarinho. This is good evidence that an individual was found again three months after the rediscovery of the species. This signals that the habitat is suitable for the permanence of the species. Thus, new records are expected at this location and will be used to delimit the entire territory of this individual, enabling the monitoring of their activities.A new search project, funded by MbZ, has been approved for the second half of 2019. | S |
| Activity 3. Draft and implement a Reserve Business Plan  | Mar 2016 | 100% | 100% | This activity is complete. From our previous PIR: The Reserve Business Plan has been developed, focusing on cacao production and tourism, and is being implemented. Received support from SEBRAE (a Brazilian institution that promotes the development of small businesses) to assess, update and apply the Reserve Business Plan. The goal is to integrate properties surrounding the Reserve in improved land management.  | S |
| Activity 4. Produce cacao on Mata do Passarinho Reserve | Mar 2019\* | 40% | 100% | 10.07 ha have been planted with cacao seedlings planted in six areas. In addition, about 4,000 more cocoa seeds were planted to generate new seedlings and continue the expansion of the productive area. The seeds come from the Quilombo Marobá dos Teixeiras, Almenara-MG. These quilombolas are active in cocoa production and this was one of the first actions of a partnership signed last year. | S |
| Activity 5. Improve tourism at Mato do Passarinho Reserve | Jun 2019\* | 50% | 100% | The status of tourism at the reserve has remained the same since the previous PIR: In relation to birdwatching tourism, as previously reported, the Mata do Passarinho Reserve has temporarily interrupted the reception of birdwatchers. The decision was made after the release of the worrying results of the population monitoring of the Bristlefront. Considering that this tourism may have negative impacts, mainly due to the use of the playback technique, a decision was made to suspend the activity until a better understanding of its consequences on the species was made. The decision whether or not to resume the activity should be made only after evaluation of the results of the next monitoring and under the guidance of experts. Since bird tourism has been temporarily halted, the Reserve has focused on other types of tourism. An interpretive trail and observation tower have been developed, and school groups and local ecotourism tourists have visited. New signs and trail maps have been created & installed. | S |
| Activity 6. Formulate protected area scenarios to propose public or private protected areas | Mar 2017 | 100% | 100% | As reported in the previous PIR: A document "Socio-environmental assessment of the *Merulaxis stresemanni* distribution area" was developed and includes the following information:A. Identification and analysis of the points of distribution of *Merulaxis stresemanni* (current and past);B. An analysis of socio-environmental aspects of the region of occurrence of *Merulaxis stresemanni*;C. An analysis of parameters and indicators related to the social, economic, conservation (fauna and flora) aspects, threats, stakeholders, development; programs and policies of the municipalities near the Mata do Passarinho Reserve D. The formulation of scenarios for the conservation of the area covered by the Reserve, aiming at proposing the creation of public protected areas.As part of efforts to propose new protected areas, we are working to help create a private reserve near the Mata do Passarinho Reserve. This area is a fragment of forest of about 20 hectares that has a small population of Northern Brown Howler Monkeys (*Alouatta guariba guariba*). The species is unique to the Atlantic Forest north of the Jequitinhonha River and is assessed as CR by the IUCN. Although the fragment is extremely small, it is very important for the region, since there are no reports of this subspecies in other places, including the Mata do Passarinho reserve. Therefore, a dialogue has begun with the owner of the area for the creation of an RPPN in that fragment. So far, there is interest by the owner, in part because there is financial support to obtain the documents required to create the private reserve (RPPN) with the relevant environmental agency. We will continue efforts to advance the creation of this protected area. | S |
| Activity 7. Create a site conservation map and platform for information sharing | Mar 2017 | 100% | 100% | As reported in the previous PIR: Four (4) maps have been created showing land use and land tenure in areas surrounding the reserve. A portal was developed in conjunction with ICMBio and the MMA to create an online database with information and data about the site.Update: The GIS database is being developed at the RPPN Mata do Passarinho site within the Biodiversitas Foundation website. The database was created on Google MyMaps' free platform and attached to the reserve’s website.At <http://www.biodiversitas.org.br/matadopassarinho/site/index.html>, tab "Projects and Activities," in the item "SIG BAZE Bandeira Site," is a map that includes the boundaries of the Mata do Passarinho Reserve, the boundaries of the neighbouring municipalities and states where the reserve is located, the registration data of the *Merulaxis stresemanni* available in the National Biodiversity Portal, and data from the Rural Environmental Registry (CAR). The CAR includes data on the areas of the registered properties, as well as the Areas of Permanent Preservation - APP, Legal Reserves, native vegetation and springs that were declared at the reserve.The map is interactive, allowing users to select needed data and assemble the map that suits their needs. | S |
| Activity 8. Strengthen stakeholder awareness regarding benefits of protecting habitat and environmental laws | Jan 2019\* | 60% | 100% | Three meetings with local stakeholders were reported in the previous PIRs.  | S |
| Activity 9. Assist interested landowners to comply with Forest Code and create private reserves (RPPN) | Mar 2019\* | 45% | 90% | The Rural Environmental Registry (CAR) is a very important tool to guide the process of environmental regularization of rural properties and possessions. It is based on the collection of georeferenced information of the property, with the separation of the areas of the property in several categories, such as the Permanent Protection Areas (APP), Legal Reserve (RL), remnants of native vegetation, areas of consolidated use, areas of social interest and public interest, and springs. An instrument used in rural property planning and the recovery of degraded areas, CAR encourages the linkage of preserved areas through ecological corridors and the conservation of other natural resources, contributing to the improvement of environmental quality.Data from 264 farms were obtained in an area up to 20 km from the Mata do Passarinho reserve. These properties cover a total of 16,548 hectares, of which 1,098 hectares were declared with Areas of Permanent Preservation (APP), 2,036 hectares of legal reserve, 624 hectares of native vegetation, and 62 springs. See dropbox for this map.The various CAR categories, in which property areas can be declared, have different levels of protection in relation to fauna and flora. The two main ones related to the environment are the APP and the Legal Reserve. APPs are natural areas that must be protected from any kind of human action. Its water, soil, and fauna and flora characteristics must be preserved and cared for to ensure the constitutional right of an "environmentally balanced environment, well used by the people and essential to a healthy quality of life." The size of the APP area of ​​each property depends on a number of factors such as slope and altitude of the terrain, presence of rivers, lakes, and springs. While the Legal Reserve is much more flexible in relation to the activities that can be developed, generally associated with sustainable land uses, it can be exploited through the collection of non-timber forest products and sustainable forest management. The total area of ​​the Legal Reserve of each property depends on the biome in which it is inserted, being in the case of the Atlantic Forest 20% of the entire area of ​​the property.Knowing the size of the areas with some kind of legal environmental protection around the RPPN is extremely important for the planning of our future actions, to know where these areas are concentrated and to emphasize the actions in those places to avoid that they degrade and continue in the process of regeneration.In 2019, the reserve manager has met and is working with the president of the local farmers association to advance the establishment of a new RPPN in the region. | S |
| **Output 1.1.2. In Chile, at Isla Mocha Reserve in Chile, for Eupsophus insularis and at Mehuin 1 and Mehuin 2 for Eupsophus migueli and Insuetophrynus acarpicus respectively, habitat conservation enhanced through strengthened protection status and implementation of newly created or existing (Isla Mocha) management plans**  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Isla Mocha (IM)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| IM1. Design and implement a species monitoring program for *Eupsophus insularis* | Jan 2019\* | 80% | 100% | In November 2018 the monitoring of 43 sites was completed, after 5 site visits. The final results show the presence of *E. insularis* in 19 of the 43 plots between 24 and 205 masl. The physicochemical characterization of the streams where the species is present shows streams with average levels of conductivity and total dissolved solids, temperatures between 10 and 15ºC and slightly alkaline pH. In terms of biometry, the species present in Mocha Island correspond to amphibians of small size and mass. In two sites, a tagging and recapture study was carried out with nanochips, which allows a more reliable estimation of the population sizes that would be between 15 and 60 individuals per hectare. The diet study shows that isopods were the most important food for amphibians in autumn (2017 and 2018) and Lumbricidae in the spring. In the study plots, we qualitatively detected the presence of at least five types of impacts, with a predominance of the category "without apparent impact" and "trails", as well as impacts by cattle and vegetation felling. The results obtained to date (spring and autumn campaign samples) of the chytrid fungus analysis show 55% (23 positive individuals / 43 individuals total) of prevalence of the fungus on the skin. | S |
| IM2. Install fencing or develop other solutions, such as signage or trail modification, to reduce the impact of public use and/or cattle near trails within the Isla Mocha Reserve [wording modified as agreed with UNEP Task Manager, June 2017)] | Jun 2018\* | 100% | 100% | Seven (7) wooden fences have been built to prevent unauthorized people accessing certain sectors of the reserves, as reported in a previous PIR. Eight (8) interpretative panels to educate visitors about the importance of the forest and water of the Mocha Island Reserve as habitat of *E. migueli* were installed in the reserve. | S |
| IM3. Upgrade status of Isla Mocha Reserve to National Park | Jun 2019\* | 65% | 70% | Isla Mocha remains a National Reserve; however, the process to convert Isla Mocha to a National Park is well underway. Please see the attached document, Isla Mocha Recategorization to National Park. The procedure is expected to be completed by 2020. However, the expected transfer of authority over national parks from CONAF to the Ministry of Environment may cause additional delays.  | MS |
| IM4. Implement environmental awareness and education campaign  | Jan 2019\* | 80% | 100% | During 2017 and 2018 the Ministry’s GEF AZE project team worked together with the NGO Oikonos to implement environmental education activities on a regular basis in the island’s school and kindergarten. This was implemented through workshops, painting a mural, guided tours to the reserve, making a board game about amphibians, putting on a play about the fauna of the island, songs, and other activities. Eighty (80) children and their families participated in the program. The Ministry of the Environment and the NGO Oikonos will continue the environmental education program in the school and kindergarten during 2019. | S |
| IM5. Update and begin implementation of socio-environmental strategy  | Mar 2019\* | 30% | 100% | During April 2019 a 4-day Community Leadership Workshop for Mocha Island Sustainability was held with four local organizations. | S |
| IM6. Promote responsible pet ownership and implement a pet spay/neuter program  | Mar 2018 | 100% | 100% | From the previous PIR: In the March 2018 sterilization campaign, 20 pets, including 14 dogs and 6 cats, were spayed or neutered. To date, 66% of the female dogs and 14.4% of the males have been sterilized, 63.6% of the female cats and 44.9% of the males have been sterilized. Two brochures on responsible pet ownership were handed out to the community: "Let's avoid the impact of our pets on the wildlife of Isla Mocha" and "Dogs and Cats: our pets and their impact on wildlife".Update: A pamphlet on responsible pet ownership, including spaying and neutering, was distributed to 130 people on the island. | S |
| IM7. Implement biosecurity measures | Jan 2019\* | 50% | 100% | During all five amphibian monitoring campaigns, biosecurity measures have been implemented according to the "Protocol for the control of infectious diseases in Amphibians during field studies" by Lobos et al (2013). See protocol in the Dropbox. In May 2018, RECH trained the Mocha Island National Reserve guardians in biosecurity and amphibian monitoring measures. | S |
| IM8. Determine impact of invasive vertebrate species, particularly rodents and cats, on amphibian populations | Mar 2019\* | 50% | 100% | During the two rodent samplings, three species were captured: the invasive *Rattus rattus*, the native and dominant *Abrothrix longipilis*, and *Abrothrix olivaceus*. The isotopic analyzes show that *A. olivaceus* and *R. rattus* share the same trophic position according to the food consumed. | S |
| IM9. Analyze viability of fuelwood alternatives | Mar 2019\* | 5% | 10% | There have been initial conversations between CONAF and the Ministry of Energy to analyze energy alternatives for Isla Mocha. During 2019, CONAF Biobío and the regional secretary of energy are developing a plan to evaluate alternative energy supply options for Mocha Island. However, political will to move this activity forward has been limited. | MU |
| IM10. Create amphibian conservation area and wood harvesting maps to create wood harvest exclusion zone | Mar 2018\* | 100% | 100% | A map of overlap of the wood extraction areas in Isla Mocha (based on information provided by CONAF) and the registration points of *E. insularis* (based on information obtained by RECH during the monitoring of amphibians) was developed. It is observed that there is no greater overlap between the two areas, except for in the northern sections of the Reserve. This information was given to CONAF to be considered for future permits for the extraction of firewood on the Island, and CONAF agreed to use this information in determining whether to grant future firewood extraction requests. CONAF now requires the local community to apply for and obtain fuelwood extraction permits, and this map can determine no-go areas for harvesting. | S |
| IM11. Seek funding from the Fondo Nacional de Desarrollo Regional | Jun 2019\* | 0% | 10% | There had been little will to achieve this activity. However, CONAF Biobío has now put as a top priority for 2019 the preparation of a project to apply for funding the environmental information center on the island. | MU |
| **Mehuin (Me)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Me1. Conduct land tenure study  |   |  |  | [Activity deleted with Global Steering Committee approval, but numbering not changed for easier reference to ProDoc] | N/A |
| Me2. Reduce impacts from illegal logging and cattle on amphibian habitat in ravines, through fencing, revegetation and other onsite solutions [wording modified as agreed with UNEP Task Manager, June 2017)]  | Jan 2019\* | 50% | 100% | Four streams with the presence of *E. migueli* located on the premises of indigenous people were fenced off to prevent access to livestock that disturbs the habitat of amphibians: 1 area of ​​5 hectares (Rigoberto Lienlaf); 1 farm of 1.5 hectares (Indigenous Association Weichafe Lafquen Mapu); 1 area of ​​1 hectare that was also reforested with native trees (Mrs. Audolicia Ancacura), and 1 area of ​​0.6 hectares (Mr. Javier Nahuelpan), for a total of 8.1 ha of *E.migueli* habitat fenced off to safeguard the species.In two of these properties, educational trails will be developed through the native forest to increase the value of these streams and provide education opportunities about this species and threatened amphibian habitat. | S |
| Me3. Conduct baseline amphibian survey, and develop and implement monitoring methodology | Jan 2019\* | 80% | 100% | Amphibian monitoring included 3 sites for *I. acarpicus* and another 3 for *E. migueli* for the tag-recapture and diet study. There are also 19 sites that are monitored only to register presence / absence of *E. migueli*, which recorded presence in 11 of the 19. Physicochemical parameters were monitored in 7 streams with the presence of these threatened amphibians, finding values ​​of conductivity and total dissolved solids that indicate soft waters and pH values ​​that fluctuate between acidic and slightly alkaline. To estimate the population size, a labeling and recapture study with nanochips was carried out, estimating a population of between 4 and 50 individuals per 600m2 at each site monitored for *I. acarpicus* and between 1 and 18 individuals per 600 m2 for *E. migueli*. The diet study shows that *I. acarpicus* consumes invertebrates of the Plecoptera order, Haplotaxida (family Lumbricidae) and Hemiptera mainly, while *E. migueli* consumes mainly insects of the families Tabanidae and Lumbricidae.A paper on the results of these amphibian surveys has been written for submission to a peer-reviewed journal. | S |
| Me4. Develop and initiate implementation of new conservation plan  | Jan 2019\* | 80% | 100% | The participatory design of the Conservation Plan was completed in May 2018. During its official launch, the Plan's Follow-up and Implementation Committee was set up, which met for the first time in July 2018. During 2018, the Conservation Plan has been implemented mainly in the areas of training of local communities, waste management and environmental education.Four local communities (Villa Nahuel, Piutril, Alepue, Pichicuyin) have participated in and been beneficiaries of the conservation plan through loom workshops, native plant generation, and through the protection of streams that are habitat for endemic amphibians.The Regional Secretariat of the Ministry of the Environment in the Los Ríos Region is promoting the continuation of the implementation of the Conservation Plan beyond the life of the GEF AZE project by coordinating at least two annual meetings with all participating stakeholders, seeking national and international funding for the implementation of the Conservation Plan, and manage resources from the Ministry of the Environment to implement those activities that are under the responsibility of the regional office.  | S |
| Me5. Design and implement environmental education program | Jan 2019\* | 80% | 100% | During 2017 and 2018, an environmental education program was developed with a total of 8 rural schools and 87 students between the ages of 7 and 14 participating. The first year of the program included 5 sessions on the assessment and knowledge of endemic and threatened amphibians of native forests, including lectures, games, crafts and a small research project on amphibians. During the second year of the program, research projects were developed in each school to monitor the presence of amphibians around the schools. Each school monitored the presence of amphibians during 3 field trips in which they had to answer a research question, for example, *In which environment are there more amphibians, in the forest or along the road?* In September 2018, one class was invited to present their scientific research on *E. migueli* at the XV Regional School Congress of Science and Technology for the Los Ríos Region. Several news articles were published on the students’ research project, including this one: <http://www.lavozdevaldivia.cl/?p=24939>. Additionally, during 2018, a photographic exhibition was exhibited on temperate forest amphibians called "Land of Frogs" in the Municipality of Mariquina, Chanchan Health Center, Villa Nahuel indigenous community headquarters and in 6 schools. | S |
| Me6. Training to improve agriculture and cattle ranching practices  | Jan 2019\* | 10% | 100% | INDAP participated in a community workshop with CONAF and provided training on cattle ranching to participants. In addition, INDAP provided funding to local landowner for materials to fence off AZE trigger species habitat from livestock impacts. | S |
| Me7. Workshops and consultancy to recommend improved timber harvesting practices in critical amphibian habitat | Jan 2019\* | 50% | 100% | Between May and November 2018, a training program on the protection, management and conservation of native forest developed in conjunction with CONAF was implemented in the Pichicuyin sector. This training program sought to highlight the importance of good management and conservation of the native forest, not only as a source of products, but also as a habitat for threatened amphibians. Six workshops were held on the following topics: a) general concepts on native forest, CONAF functions and forest sector regulations; b) forest inspection; c) management and forestry of native forest in the field; d) non-timber forest products with a visit to a hazelnut processing plant; e) watershed management for water supply; f) control of forest fires.Fifteen (15) Pichicuyin community members are now trained in the good management and conservation of the native forests.The Regional Secretary of the Ministry of Environment may seek future alliances with CONAF to develop similar training programs with other local communities. | S |
| Me8. Baseline study to investigate fish and invertebrate populations  | Mar 2016 | 100% | 100% | Complete. Products include a book of aquatic fauna with photographs and short descriptions of each species and a report on the baseline results of aquatic fauna (macro-crustaceans, fish and herpetofauna) monitoring on 11 tributaries of the Lower Lingue River (5 from the northern slope and 6 from the southern slope). Key results:• Aquatic habitat is diverse in the estuaries surveyed in terms of bottom type, flow and riparian vegetation• The condition of riparian vegetation varies from tributaries that exclusively present herbaceous vegetation to native vegetation in the three strata. All estuaries have at least some type of shore vegetation.• Human disturbance was detected in all the estuaries, with greater intensity in the lower parts of the basins.• 5 species of macro-crustaceans, 4 species of fish (3 native, 1 introduced), 5 amphibians, and 3 reptiles were found. | S |
| **Output 1.1.3 At Tsitongambarika, Madagascar, habitat of two plant and 11 newly-discovered frog and reptile species is enhanced through a co-managed protected area and the implementation of a management and financing plan with a private sector partner** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity 1. Conducting ecological research on AZE species | Jun 2017 | 100% | 100% | Since 2017, ecological research on target species has been conducted and completed, but several efforts have been continued using other resources, in light of ongoing new discoveries and numbers of AZE trigger species. Presence of another AZE trigger species has been revealed. One of them is the Critically Endangered millipede *Aphistogoniulus corallipes* (Pachybolidae), known only from a small part of Tsitongambarika, and information on the status of this species has been collected. Also, *Microcebus tanosi,* only known from Tsitongambarika is recently assessed as endangered but the result need to be published in the UICN. In addition research has been initiated to resolve the status of the sportive lemur *Lepilemur* is still continuing. | S |
| Activity 2. Delineate habitats of AZE species | Jun 2018 | 100% | 100% | As for Activity 1, this activity was already treated as complete since 2018. New information on additional confirmed or candidate AZE trigger species not recognized in the ProDoc has been collected in order to delineate their habitat. Map of confirmed localities of *Microcebus tanosi* is attached to this document. | S |
| Activity 3. Develop a conservation strategy for AZE species | Mar 2017 | 90% | 95% | Conservation strategy of amphibian of TGK has been drafted since 2017 and updated on 2018. This plan has been utilized during the update of the management plan of the whole protected area (see activity 4). The validation of this plan will be done with the management plan during a planned regional and national workshop. | S |
| Activity 4. Update Protected Area Management Plan by incorporating the concept of AZE | Mar 2018 | 80% | 95% | As mentioned in activity 3, the update of the Management Plan has been completed as planned; implementation is rated at 90%, not 100%, as the plan awaits validation by the regional authorities. Specific topics on Tsitongambarika as an AZE site, promotion of the research station and tourism development have been included in this plan. The validation workshop will be planned on late 2019. | S |
| Activity 5. Evaluate the COBA and develop new management contract | Dec 2016 | 90% | 90% | Largely complete as described in previous reports, with final outcomes dependent on Government approvals of contracts and ToRs for COBAs; necessary activities at field level all completed. Four management plan have been approved [(Tanitsara (2018), Antsotso (2018), Iabokoho(2019), Enakogny (2019)], so 8/53 COBA have legal ToR and contract. | S |
| Activity 6. Strengthen the capacity of 53 CoBas for management of forest resources | Sep 2017 | 100% | 100% | Already rated as complete in terms of GEF project expectations. However, capacity building of the COBAs on specific topic depending to the in-field situation has been done each year. It includes management plan survey, monitoring, financial management and reporting to the Government and Asity.  | S |
| Activity 7. Carry out forest restoration and establish forest plantations | Mar 2018 | 100% | 100% | Already rated as complete in terms of GEF project expectations. Further update: as mentioned in the latest report, the program to plant 20,000 rosewood and ebony (*Dalbergia* spp and *Diospyros* spp) is on the way. More than 5000 plant are now available at the nursery established Ampasy Research Station at the edge of Tsitongambarika Forest. This initiative has been taken in response to the disastrous levels of logging of these precious hardwoods in the last 10 years. In addition, a corridor plantation of more than 5km relying the southern part of TGK (habitat of the trigger specie *Aphistogoniulus corallipes*) to the medium part is starting this year (2019) | S |
| Activity 8. Develop income generating actitivies for the most vulnerable populations | Sep 2018 | 90% | 100% | More than 6,300 households have been supported around Tsitongambarika Protected Area. Income generating activities envisaged through GEF project completed, reaching over 1,600 households with recent advances in vegetable and coffee cultivation and honey production in new areas. This year (2019), 10 poultry farming demonstration sites have been launched. In addition, as requested by local people, 150 new hives have newly been confectioned and distributed. | S |
| Activity 9. Support KOMFITA management platform in the development and implementation of its annual work plan | Sep 2018 | 100% | 100% | Linked to Activity 6 (also completed in relation to expectations of GEF project. Update on KOMFITA: it continues to carry out its role, and now has its own (simple) office, improving its functioning and profile while also emphasizing its independence. As reported on the latest report, regional meeting have been held in the four zone (Ambato, Ambolo, Atsinanana,and Avaratra) in which all Members of COBAs have been invited. The resolution of these regional meeting will be discussed and validated during the annual meeting which was reported to august 8th 2019. New members of the KOMFITA per zone have been elected. These elected members will constitute members of the KOMFITA but the president will be elected during the annual meeting.  | S |
| Activity 10. Carry out socio-economic and ecological monitoring | Jun 2018 | 100% | 100% | Socio-economic evaluation carried out as planned, and already rated as complete in terms of GEF project expectations. Collected informations have been utilized to update the management plan. | S |
| Activity 11. Support forest managers in their inspections | Sep 2018 | 100% | 100% | As mentioned on the past reports, this training programs planned under this project completed already. However, forest managers continue their inspections. The results of these inspections have been useful to avoid deforestation and fire.  | S |
| Activity 12. Support CoBas in achieving their terms of reference | Sep 2018 | 90% | 100% | Ongoing support continued as planned from the project team in Asity Madagascar, though now rated as complete in terms of GEF project plans, as confirmed in visit by BirdLife project manager in September 2018. KOMFITA office (see Activity 9) in Laboakoho (capital of commune) also provides a hub for community training and information sharing among COBAs. COBAs continue to report to the forestry administration and Asity.  | S |
| **Output 1.1.4. An additional 10 AZE sites covering a minimum of 40,000 ha will gain enhanced protection through additional projects, informed by progress at the three demonstration projects**  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity 1. Confirmation of site selection | Dec 2015 | 100% | 100% | Site selection is complete. | S |
| Activity 2. METT baseline and target setting | Sep 2017 | 100% | 100% | METT baseline completed for 11 sites: Sierra de Bahoruco National Park in the Dominican Republic; Oasis Araripe Reserve, Serra do Urubu Reserve, and Murici in Brazil; Sierra Caral Reserve in Guatemala; Yunguilla and Tapichalaca Reserves in Ecuador; Blue and John Crow Mountains National Park in Jamaica; Osa National Wildlife Refuge in Costa Rica; Abra Patricia Reserve in Peru; Mahavavy-Kinkony Complex, Madagascar.  | S |
| Activity 3. Development of site intervention goals, workplans and deliverables | Sep 2017 | 100% | 100% | Site intervention goals have been determined for all 11 sites. To determine these goals, the high threats and the key management issues with low scores (of 0 or 1) were highlighted, and actions to address these concerns were determined. Workplans and deliverables have been developed with reserve managers. | S |
| Activity 4. Supervision of implementation | Mar 2019\* | 50% | 100% | Meetings have been held with reserve managers to continue discussions on actions to improve management at the additional AZE sites.  | S |
| Activity 5. Final METT and reporting | Mar 2019\* | 0% | 100% | Final METTs have been completed. Please see the attached document, *Additional sites METTs* for more information. | S |
| **Output 2.1.1. Improved awareness of, and accessibility to, AZE data online for relevant decision-makers to facilitate mainstreaming, including updated global AZE site list and global site status assessment**  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity 1. Develop WBDB (World Biodiversity Data Base) | Jun 2019\* | 50% | 100% | The workflow for KBA validation has been drafted and completed as far as funds and scope under the project envisaged. Work with external software developer and internal IT staff has incorporated into the World Bird/Biodiversity Database (WBDB): (i) new fields and tables to store KBA/AZE criteria and other required KBA documentation; (ii) update of species backbone to match latest IUCN Red List assessment; (iii) enhanced reporting interface; (iv) enhanced Dashboard; (v) spatial/mapping extension for viewing/downloading KBA polygon. |  |
| Activity 2. Update AZE assessments for comprehensively assessed groups in current AZE dataset | Sep 2018\* | 95% | 100% | AZE trigger species and sites have been identified for mammals, corals, selected reptiles, conifers, amphibians and birds. The tabular data were posted online for expert consultation during summer 2017 (<http://www.birdlife.org/globally-threatened-bird-forums/2017/07/aze-consultation/>). The spatial boundaries were made available online via a dedicated map viewer in autumn 2017, collating feedback via a Survey Monkey questionnaire (<http://birdlife.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=15991d1ca7f34ec3a734efa496f644d4>). Both tabular and spatial data sets were revised accordingly during winter/spring 2018, in the light of relevant expert feedback received. The final set of proposed sites was checked by the KBA Technical Working Group in summer 2018, to confirm which sites meet the KBA standard.Summary of results for number (existing and new) of trigger species and AZE sites:* Mammals – 217 species, 178 sites
* Corals – 2 species, 2 sites
* Selected reptiles – 25 species, 22 sites
* Conifers – 33 species, 32 sites
* Amphibians – 610 species, 355 sites

Birds – 191 species, 133 sites | S |
| Activity 3. Identify and document AZE sites for species groups that have been comprehensively assessed for the IUCN Red List but are not included in the current AZE dataset | Sep 2018\* | 95% | 100% | AZE trigger species (1483) and sites (853) have been identified for chameleons, freshwater crabs, freshwater crayfish, freshwater shrimps, cacti, cycads, cone snails, sharks and rays, selected marine fish families (Groupers, Pufferfish, Blennies and Wrasses), and selected birches. Mangrove ecosystem plants were also examined but no AZE trigger species or sites were identified. The tabular data were posted online for expert consultation during summer 2017 (<http://www.birdlife.org/globally-threatened-bird-forums/2017/07/aze-consultation/>). The spatial boundaries were made available online via a dedicated map viewer in autumn 2017, collating feedback via a Survey Monkey questionnaire (<http://birdlife.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=15991d1ca7f34ec3a734efa496f644d4>). Both tabular and spatial data sets were revised accordingly during winter/spring 2018, in the light of relevant expert feedback received. The final set of proposed sites was checked by the KBA Technical Working Group in summer 2018, to confirm which sites meet the KBA standard.Summary of results for number of new trigger species and AZE sites:* Chameleons – 28 species, 20 sites
* Mangrove plants – 0 species, 0 sites
* Freshwater crabs – 60 species, 47 sites
* Freshwater crayfish – 49 species, 41 sites
* Freshwater shrimps – 43 species, 34 sites
* Cacti – 140 species, 121 sites
* Cycads – 55 species, 50 sites
* Cone snails – 11 species, 5 sites
* Sharks and rays – 2 species, 2 sites
* Selected marine fish (Groupers, Pufferfish, Blennies and Wrasses) – 8 species, 8 sites

Selected birches – 9 species, 9 sites | S |
| Activity 4. Facilitate AZE site identification for species groups that have not yet been comprehensively assessed for the IUCN Red List | Jan 2019\* | 50% | 100% | An interim mechanism for the proposal of new AZE sites is fully incorporated on the AZE website and is functioning. ABC (as the AZE Secretariat) has already received input through this mechanism. A prominent notice has been placed on the new AZE website where people can register interest to propose a new AZE for any Red Listed species (<http://zeroextinction.org/get-involved/submit-a-site/>). A detailed KBA proposal form has been developed in Excel which can then be distributed to the AZE proposer for filling in and submission to the KBA Secretariat for checking and validation of the proposed AZE site/KBA. Development of a system with fully supportive infrastructure is ongoing, concurrent to the progress of KBA data curation, currently working towards a beta release date of November 2019.Data on a number of freshwater KBAs (most of which are likely KBAs) is currently being captured from existing work by the IUCN Freshwater Biodiversity Unit.  To date five sites in Lake Malawi, three in Indonesia and one in the Lower Mekong region have been identified and will be published to the KBA website and IBAT during 2019. | S |
| Activity 5. Develop AZE website | Dec 2017 | 100% | 100% | Following a soft launch in June 2018, the revamped AZE website ([www.zeroextinction.org](http://www.zeroextinction.org)) was formally launched in November 2018 (behind the original schedule due to delays to the finalisation of the new AZE site list). The website includes AZE stories about specific sites and the conservation work conducted at them by AZE partners, information on AZE and financial institutions, the connection between AZE sites and KBAs, information on AZE site criteria and identification, selected AZE resources, including peer-reviewed articles on AZE, options to join AZE and submit new or modified AZE sites, the project country case studies, and interactive map of all 853 currently recognised AZE sites. The site is now available in over 100 languages through auto-translation, making it and the information on it more accessible to the global community. The AZE website is being and will continue to be regularly updated with new information on AZE sites, multilateral environmental agreements related to AZE site conservation, and other site-, national-, and policy-level updates. 2019 update: Site level data and GIS boundaries will be updated as appropriate and up to twice a year (in coordination with IBAT and the KBA website).  In due course these updates will cease to become manual and data will be accessed directly from the KBA database via an API or equivalent mechanism. | S |
| **Output 2.1.2 Technical guidance documents based on 2.1.1, to inform and support the incorporation of AZE species and site considerations into EIA and safeguard policies**  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity 1. Produce comprehensive and tailored targeted guidance material  | Jun 2016 | 100% | 100% | Guidance for Equator Principles Financial Institutions, on global datasets and tools for screening critical habitat, legally protected areas and internationally recognised areas, including KBAs and AZEs, has been completed.  | S |
| Activity 2. Make guidance available on AZE website and IBAT | Sep 2016 | 100% | 100% | Guidance is available on both the IBAT and new AZE websites. Additional materials are added to the AZE site as they become available - the policy section has been updated with the new IFC Guidance Note 6 mentioning AZEs as the most critical of Critical Habitats (November 2018; see below). | S |
| Activity 3. Produce scoping document identifying advocacy targets and review opportunities | Sep 2016 | 100% | 100% | Final scoping document has been completed.  | S |
| Activity 4. AZE member organisations undertake targeted advocacy | Jun 2019\* | 50% | 100% | AZE was invited to speak at the 12th Annual International Finance Corporation (IFC)’s Community of Learning, held in Washington DC in October 2018. ABC presented on AZE and its role in international financial institution safeguards, flagging that AZE sites, along with UNESCO World Heritage sites, are now the only sites recognized as the *most critical* of Critical Habitat by the IFC, as per the new IFC Guidance Note 6 detailed below. Further discussions, including targeted one-on-one interviews, have been held by BirdLife with two key personnel in the biodiversity team at IFC on improved engagement of civil society conservation organisations in their safeguards development and implementation process and IFC will participate in a proposed session on AZE conservation at the IUCN World Conservation Congress in Marseille in June 2020, led by BirdLife and ABC, as well as two other sessions on engagement of civil society in standards and safeguards and spatial planning processes for renewable energy development led by IUCN with BirdLife as a partner.In December 2018 ABC and BirdLife discussed the AZE concept with the head of the Equator Principles Association ahead of the public phase of the current Equator Principles 4 consultation process in 2019. In order to support raised awareness and build understanding of AZE sites within Equator Principles Financial Institutions (EPFIs), the EPA invited AZE to conduct a webinar in spring 2019 for all EPFIs, as well as promote the current EPFI factsheet, but this has been delayed by EPA while they roll out the new guidance for IFC Performance Standard 6 and will now take place following the end of the GEF project. | S |
| Activity 5. AZE member organisations work with development banks to ensure guidance contributes to reviews of safeguard policies  | Jun 2019\* | 60% | 100% | The IFC Guidance Note 6 was published in November 2018 (and updated in June 2019), flagging AZE sites along with UNESCO World Heritage sites as the most critical of Critical Habitats, stating that AZE sites “will not be acceptable for financing with the possible exception of projects specifically designed to contribute to the conservation of the area. Consultation with the relevant national and international organizations that designate these areas is required.” and including a reference to the AZE website. This was also uploaded to the [policy section](http://zeroextinction.org/policy/international-financial-institutions/) of the AZE website. Work continues to ensure key data layers such as AZEs, and tools such as IBAT, remain a requirement for candidate projects to use in IFI environmental screening and due diligence. Input has been provided to the consultations on the Equator Principles revision (EP4), EIB and EBRD which are currently underway, and internal discussions with EPA and EBRD outside of the public consultations have taken place (see activity 7 below). | S |
| Activity 6. AZE member organisations work with development banks to ensure guidance utilised by MDBs and EPBs to strengthen compliance with and implementation of existing safeguards  | Jun 2019\* | 50% | 100% | The AZE information resource factsheet continues to be used to promote AZE considerations to IFIs and is now being promoted to IBAT subscribers through the re-developed web portal for the screening tool ([www.ibat-alliance.org](http://www.ibat-alliance.org)). Presentations and promotion of the importance of AZEs and tools to integrate AZE considerations into IFI and government policy were presented and discussed at the Responsible Business Forum (Singapore, 11-12 October), the IFC Annual Community of Learning event (Washington DC, 16 October), the Global Business and Biodiversity Forum (Sharm El Sheikh, 14-15 November) and AZE side events at CBD SBSTTA22 (Montreal, 2 July) and CBD COP14 (Sharm El Sheikh, 25 November). A webstory by BirdLife on the need to ensure wind energy developments need to be sited appropriately, including to avoid AZE sites through the use of IBAT for pre-screening, was published by the Responsible Business Forum ( <https://www.responsiblebusiness.com/news/africas-news/location-location-location-reduce-bird-collisions/>). In these events IFIs and private lenders were provided with an overview of the AZE concept and their status as priority Key Biodiversity Areas, and IBAT as a key screening tool. The webinar mentioned above is also now available on the AZE and IBAT websites for IFIs to view and will be adapted to give to Equator Principles Financial Institutions when the EPA is ready to facilitate this. | S |
| Activity 7. AZE member comments on safeguard policies posted online | Jun 2019\* | 50% | 100% | Where relevant, AZE member responses to open public consultations have been posted online (e.g. World Bank in 2015 and 2016 from BirdLife and others: <https://consultations.worldbank.org/content/comments-birdlife-international-fauna-and-flora-international-royal-society-protection-birds>), though not all are or will be available online (e.g. recent IFC Guidance Note 6 comments). Consultations during 2019 on the Equator Principles (EP4), EBRD Environmental and Social Policy and EIB Energy Lending Policy are underway and ongoing, with BirdLife inputting via in-person consultations for the EIB on 27 February in London and EBRD on 5 March in Brussels and via written responses to the EBRD in March, to the EIB in April and the EPA in June 2019.  | S |
| **Output 2.1.3 Capacity of AZE members to partner with lending institutions strengthened and national AZE networks enhanced through outreach and training programs**  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity 1. Scope capacity development needs and produce capacity development programme document  | Sep 2016 | 100% | 100% | A consultation with AZE project leads has been undertaken to inform the capacity development approach. | S |
| Activity 2. Organise and deliver workshops to train staff from AZE member organisations  | Sep 2018\* | 70% | 100% | A session on AZEs, their relationship to KBAs/IBAs and relevance to IFI safeguards and national conservation policy took place with around 50 BirdLife Partners during the BirdLife Global Partnership Meeting in Belgium at end of September.  | S |
| Activity 3. Develop webinars for AZE member organisations in safeguard policies and guidance | Jun 2019\* | 60% | 100% | An updated webinar was conducted with BirdLife Partners in May 2019 (following the format of the webinar given the BirdLife Partners in 2017, but expanding on KBAs and AZE policies and practice), conducted by BirdLife and ABC, and two webinars were conducted with CBD Parties and AZE members in July 2019, conducted by BirdLife, the KBA Secretariat and ABC, introducing KBAs and AZE sites as the most irreplaceable subset, AZE conservation in policy and practice, and integrating AZEs into IFI safeguards, followed by discussion on what Parties can do to better conserve AZE sites up to and post-2020. The CBD focal point webinar is available on the AZE website at <http://zeroextinction.org/policy/international-financial-institutions/> and in the dropbox. | S |
| Activity 4. Work with AZE member organisation staff to reach out to key financial institution staff at national, regional and global levels through meetings | Jun 2019\* | 40% | 100% | BirdLife, IUCN and ABC have engaged with financial institutions at global level, as well as on a regional level, specifically in Asia and Latin America including financial institutions that currently do not have clear safeguard policies in place. The work is continuing following the latest webinars on how to engage IFIs conducted in May-July 2019. | S |
| Activity 5. Ensure regular engagement of AZE staff with lending institutions in the 3 focal countries | Jun 2019\* | 20% | 100% | AZE staff in the project countries were included in the webinars mentioned above and some also attended in person or remotely a project team meeting in June 2019 in Washington DC where further training and discussion took place. Engagement with the focal countries is also being done on a regular basis. For example, the Brazilian Alliance for Zero Extinction is in discussions with Unimed, a Health Care company, on a proposal to create green investment bonds that investors can purchase as a retirement fund. These will provide funding for BAZE site conservation throughout Brazil. | S |
| **Output 2.1.4 Staff in private financial institutions trained in use of AZE tools and data** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity 1. Produce targeted plan outreaching to private financial institutions.  | Sep 2016 | 100% | 100% | Internal scoping paper and outreach plan completed.  | S |
| Activity 2. Develop AZE member staff relationships with key staff in financial institutions | Jan 2019\* | 40% | 100% | Relationships on AZE work developed, including through boundary consultation, involvement in Cambridge Group of business and biodiversity practitioners, presentations/networking at international meetings as per Output 2.1.2 and follow-up meetings/calls, with World Bank, IFC, IADB, ADB, EBRD, the Equator Principles Association, the Danish Export Credit agency (EKF), Swedish Export Credit agency (EKN), Mizuho Bank, ANZ Bank, DBS, and Aviva. | S |
| Activity 3. Scope needs of staff in private financial institutions to use tools, data and guidance to be integrated in their risk assessment frameworks and environmental policies | Sep 2016 | 100% | 100% | Internal scoping paper and outreach plan completed. | S |
| Activity 4. Deliver webinar and seminars for bank staff  | Mar 2017 | 100% | 100% | Delivered presentation and Q&A session for IFC and EPFIs on AZE and use of IBAT at end of 2016. Session held for IFIs on AZEs and other data layers in Singapore at the Business and Nature Forum, November 2017. A webinar for EPFIs and potentially the ADB is being planned for 2019. | S |
| Activity 5. Deliver targeted support from AZE member staff to financial institutions  | Jun 2019\* | 60% | 100% | Ongoing support is provided to IFIs on AZEs via IBAT and through direct enquiries to the AZE website and those coming through the IFC as a requirement of Performance Standard 6. New training for the Equator Principles Financial Institutions (beyond that already supplied in 2017, to update them on the new IFC guidance and issues for EP4 consultation) and potentially also to the ABD has been delayed due to issues at the recipients’ end, but is being planned for later in 2019 as mentioned above. | S |
| **Output 2.1.5 Synergies identified and AZE site conservation opportunities mainstreamed with existing and planned donor/agency and private sector financing programs**  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity 1. Review lessons learned where private sector financing programs reflect AZEs  | Sep 2016 | 100% | 100% | Incorporated in the guidance document as part of the section positive.  | S |
| Activity 2. Scope opportunities through UNEP’s Finance Initiative  | Sep 2016 | 100% | 100% | Internal scoping paper and outreach plan completed. | S |
| Activity 3. Develop strategy for future actions  | Mar 2017 | 100% | 100% | Internal scoping paper and outreach plan completed. | S |
| Activity 4. Support the IBAT Director to renew subscriptions/secure new subscription to IBAT | Sep 2018 | 100% | 100% | As reported previously, following direct support (given BirdLife’s role on the IBAT Steering Committee and in the absence of an IBAT ‘Director’), BirdLife provided direct support to IBAT in securing a number of new subscriptions, enabling the release of national factsheets through the IBAT tool – increasing government uptake of its use, and then providing the new IBAT Manager with a list of target IFIs to further engage through this project. These include MDBs, EPFIs and private banks that are not EPFI members. | S |
| Activity 5. Support/provide advice to IFIs in use of AZE data as screening and scoping tool for to enhance site conservation | Jun 2019\* | 60% | 100% | An overview of support available on AZEs and IBAT was provided to IFIs at the IFC Community of Learning events mentioned above. Technical training on IBAT is provided on demand by the IBAT manager and ABC (as the AZE Secretariat) answers enquiries and technical questions that are made by IFIs through emails (often directed through IFC) or through the website. The webinar recorded in July 2019 (see above), alongside other training and policy support materials, is available on the AZE and IBAT websites. | S |
| **Output 2.2.1. Development and implementation of at least three pilot National AZE Strategies (Brazil, Chile, and Madagascar) mainstreamed into NBSAPs and PoWPA Action Plans, and plans developed and adopted for long-term financing and sustainability.** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity 1. Expert workshops | Sep 2016 | 100% | 100% | **Madagascar**: Third national workshop held in September 2018, agreeing the approach to mainstream AZE into existing site and species conservation strategies in Madagascar, rather than developing a ‘standalone’ AZE national strategy.  | S |
| Activity 2. Publication of maps and analyses | Jun 2019\* | 70% | 100% | **Brazil:** The Brazilian Alliance for Zero Extinction (BAZE) map of fauna sites was published through an Ordinance of the Ministry of Environment. Brochures were printed with details of the sites in Portuguese and English, and results and the map in PDF format are available on the Ministry of Environment’s website. See dropbox. A completed gap analysis of AZE protection, made using a database of Protected Areas updated in September 2018, will be published as part of the guide of fauna sites, currently in production, and on the BAZE website. The Brazilian Alliance for Zero Extinction (BAZE) map of flora sites is near completion. Delimitation of the sites is in the final stages, and is being prepared for consultation and validation by specialists.In addition, the BAZE website has an interactive map of Brazilian AZE sites, published online with free access to users. <http://www.biodiversitas.org.br/baze2/index.asp>**Chile:** In August 2017, a national AZE site identification workshop was conducted with 25 national experts. Work was developed on 4 taxa: plants, fish, amphibians, and insects. AZE sites that complied with national and global (IUCN) CN and EN criteria were identified and their boundaries were proposed. 68 national AZE sites were identified, 18 of which are also globally listed as CR or EN. Of these, 35 national AZE sites were prioritized to have GIS-based boundaries defined through a consultancy that is currently being developed. Detailed boundaries of these 35 prioritized national AZE sites will be used as input for national level biodiversity policy instruments and conservation actions. Detailed information on Chile’s AZE identification process can be found under Case Studies on the AZE website.**Madagascar**: The map of Madagascar AZE sites has been revised, including 13 newly proposed additional sites to be integrated as AZE sites. The document includes a table showing site management, conservation status of each site. 13 orphan sites are currently unmanaged. | S |
| Activity 3. Initial mainstreaming of National AZE Strategies into PoWPA Action Plans and NBSAPs using present dataset | Sep 2016 | 100% | 100% | ‘Initial mainstreaming’ complete as indicated in previous reports: AZE included in Madagascar NBSAP but no revision of PoWPA Action Plans at present. Biodiversitas proposed modifications (at the government’s invitation) to first draft of revised Brazil [NBSAP](https://www.cbd.int/doc/world/mg/mg-nbsap-v2-fr.pdf), resulting in a draft including reference to AZE sites and their importance.  | S |
| Activity 4. Mainstreaming of National AZE Strategies into PoWPA Action Plans and NBSAPs | Jun 2019\* | 50% | 80% | **Brazil**: In the second half of 2018 there were significant advances in the institutionalization of BAZE and its inclusion in public conservation policies and strategies. On July 12, MMA Ordinance No. 287 was published, which recognizes BAZE, linking it to the National Biodiversity Council through the Technical Chamber of Threatened Species and defining that maps and their updates should be recognized through specific ordinances and included in public conservation strategies (Dropbox). This Decree revoked the recognition of the BAZE of 2006, giving greater definition and opening possibilities for inclusion of the initiative in consolidated policies, such as the definition of Priority Areas for Conservation and National Action Plans. As a consequence, the map of BAZE fauna sites was included in the discussions of the revision of the Priority Areas for the Conservation of the Atlantic Forest.On 31 October 2018, MMA Ordinance no. 413 was published, recognizing the 146 irreplaceable sites for Endangered (EN) and Critically Endangered (CR) Brazilian fauna, or BAZE sites, with 230 target species. The publication was followed by the disclosure of the ordinance and the map on the MMA website (http://www.mma.gov.br/informma/item/15261-cop-14-minist%C3%A9rio-mapeia-%C3%B3 (See Dropbox).The map was also translated into English and printed in English and Portuguese. The English versions were distributed during the presentation of the project by the MMA technical team at a KBA/AZE side event at the 14th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD COP14) held in Egypt 13-29 November. On 5 December, the methodology and results were presented at the meeting of the Technical Chamber of Endangered Species of the National Council of Biodiversity (CONABIO), to which BAZE became attached after Ordinance 287. The site map was received with great approval, being recognized for the technical quality and relevance for the conservation of the species. During the meeting, the MMA also shared the analyses made on the conservation strategies present for BAZE sites and species, based on the outcome of the GEF Pro-Species Project. These analyses should be included in the species sheets in the guide under preparation.**Chile**: At a national level, AZE site data are being used by the Chilean Ministry of the Environment to help identify species that are poorly or not currently represented in the protected area system in order to prioritize conservation actions for these species, which could even result in new protected areas. The results of the national AZE site delimitation consultancy will provide highly useful information for this process, including species distribution information to evaluate protection options for these areas.In **Madagascar**, the NPSAP already recognises AZE sites. AZE, specifically the results of this AZE project in Madagascar, have been provided for the next (sixth) CBD national report, particularly noting the identification of many new AZE sites in the 2018 global site update. All major conservation planning agencies were again present at the September 2018 national workshop, working towards the agreed development of a national plan to integrate AZE into existing policy (and this includes the two largest private sector investments in the country, mining projects Ambatovy and Rio Tinto QMM) by the end of the project.It was decided during the validation workshop on 7 September 2018 in Antananarivo that a working group inside the SAPM (Madagascar Protected Area System) will have periodic meetings in order to share and communicate information about AZE in Madagascar. This working group includes all NGO managers of AZE sites in Madagascar. The AZE concept should be mainstreamed into all National Plans in which members of the working group are participating.  | S |
| **Output 2.2.2 Technical guidance documents (based on the strategies developed under 2.2.1) inform and support incorporation of AZE priorities in the development of further NBSAPs and PoWPA Action Plans globally** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity 1. Completion of case studies | Sep 2017 | 66% | 100% | Brazilian, Chilean and Madagascar case studies completed and available online on the AZE website. | S |
| Activity 2. Website updates (framework, not the data itself) | Jan 2019\* | 0% | 100% | The AZE website has been updated and is currently live. It includes an interactive map of the updated AZE sites, which is searchable by taxonomic group and by country, and provides both spatial and tabular data on the AZE sites and associated trigger species.  | S |
| Activity 3. Completion of data tools and communication materials | Jan 2019\* | 0% | 100% | There has been great interest in the updated AZE dataset, published in November, and it has been provided to IUCN and academic researchers.A fact sheet on the updated AZE dataset has been produced in English and Spanish as a communication tool for users. See Dropbox for both versions.A joint press release and webstories on the new AZE site map were published on the [BirdLife](https://www.birdlife.org/worldwide/news/nearly-half-endangered-species-last-refuges-unprotected), [IUCN](https://www.iucn.org/news/species/201811/last-refuges-endangered-species-mapped-showing-nearly-half-lack-protection) and [ABC](https://abcbirds.org/article/refuges-of-endangered-species-mapped-providing-opportunity-to-prevent-global-species-extinctions/) websites, and widely disseminated by social media, to coincide with the CBD COP14 in November. This was publicised by international media, such as an article in Mongabay: <https://news.mongabay.com/2018/11/map-pinpoints-last-chance-locations-of-endangered-speciesnearly-half-are-unprotected/>. UN Environment also published a webstory and video in November 2018 of the work on AZEs in Madagascar which has been well-received and widely viewed: <https://www.unenvironment.org/news-and-stories/story/fighting-last-eden-saving-madagascars-unique-species>. It has also been re-published on the AZE website: http://zeroextinction.org/news/fighting-for-the-last-eden-saving-madagascars-unique-species/. | S |
| **Output 2.2.3: Consolidated and strengthened national AZE partnerships use project outputs to support NBSAP and PoWPA processes, national CBD reporting and enhanced AZE site conservation through targeted capacity development and outreach programs** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity 1. CBD letter sent to 81 countries re NBSAPs including AZE | Dec 2015 | 100% | 100% | CBD letters, accompanied by tailored information dossiers with IBA and AZE sites, were sent to all 196 CBD Parties at the start of the project. A new letter has now been sent to update all CBD focal points on AZE conservation needs at national level, including the national-level protected area gap analysis, as outlined in Activity 4 below. | S |
| Activity 2. Alliances and staff contact and liaise with plan authors | Sep 2016 | 100% | 100% | ABC has continued to provide AZE information for NBSAPs tailored to countries to the NBSAP Forum Moderator to include in the forum’s peer review of draft NBSAPs. To date, 15 countries have included AZE protection in their NBSAPs and other CBD reports, in addition to the 5 countries that included AZE in their CBD reports prior to the GEF-AZE project’s initiation. | S |
| Activity 3. Mini-workshops and AZE strategy workshops held | Jun 2019\* | 35% | 100% | AZE mini-workshops have now been conducted in Colombia, the Dominican Republic, South Africa, Kenya (October 2018), the Philippines (November 2018) and Papua New Guinea (February 2019). In Kenya AZE sites were discussed in the context of the government’s preparations for the upcoming CBD COP14, and in the Philippines the protected area coverage of AZE sites was reviewed with regard to development of the government’s new protected area masterplan to be rolled out in early 2019. See the reports in the dropbox.In October, a national AZE workshop was held in Mexico. Mexico was invited to host this workshop because of the strong interest in AZE site conservation by the Mexican government’s National Commission for the Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO), which has worked to identify and delineate AZE sites nationally. Additionally, Mexico has the most AZE sites in the world. Led by CONABIO, the workshop was attended by representatives of the National Commission of Natural Protected Areas (CONANP), the Institute of Biology at UNAM, and representatives of the State Environmental Secretariats of eight states: Oaxaca, Guerrero, Quintana Roo, Veracruz, Michoacán, Coahuila, Mexico and Jalisco, which were invited because those states have the greatest number of AZE sites. In addition to the Mexican participants, two representatives from the Brazilian Ministry of Environment were invited to speak about Brazil’s experiences advancing AZE at a national level, and ABC was invited to speak about AZE from a global perspective.All of the representatives of the states were interested in participating and implementing an AZE initiative. In addition, an invitation will be made to other states to join the initiative.Each state will work independently, making use of the resources available to them. The possibility of establishing collaboration agreements between ABC, CONABIO and the state governments will be explored in order to prioritize the initiative in the environmental agendas of each state. Finally, workshop participants discussed opening several projects on the Naturalista platform to compile rapid information on the presence of the species at the sites and to directly involve civil society.As an update, in December 2018, the Wildlife Technical Committee of the Government of the State of Michoacan met to discuss AZE site conservation strategies. See the attached document, Guerrero Workshop by the Wildlife Technical Committee. Since then, the state has included AZE site conservation in their environmental planning.See the report for Mexican AZE workshop in the dropbox. | S |
| Activity 4. Gap analysis and data revisions communicated to country focal points when data update (2.1.1) complete | Jun 2019\* | 0% | 100% | The gap analysis of protected area coverage of AZEs was conducted alongside the update of the AZE site list and boundary demarcation, showing that globally 43% of AZEs lack formal protection. A preliminary gap analysis was presented by BirdLife at a seminal international symposium on ‘Safeguarding space for nature, securing our future: developing a post-2020 strategy’ held at the Zoological Society of London in February 2018, co-hosted by BirdLife and attended by a number of key governments, flagging the need for new protected and conserved area targets to include AZE sites. See the dropbox.This was highlighted and discussed at a very well attended (~120 people) side event at CBD COP14 (Sharm El Sheikh, 25 November) as well as through interventions in plenary discussions and negotiations in drafting groups at both the CBD SBSTTA22 and CBD COP14 meetings by Brazil, Mexico and BirdLife, in support of the mention of protection of AZE sites as a means to meet both Aichi Targets 11 and 12 in the draft decision on urgent actions needed to meet the Aichi Targets. Following these interventions this mention of AZEs was included in the final decision CBD/COP/DEC/14/1 (available at <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-14/cop-14-dec-01-en.pdf> and in the dropbox).The gap analysis for AZE sites as well as KBAs in general was included by BirdLife in the annual SDG Report in January 2019, and reported by project manager Noelle Kumpel at a workshop to review progress towards the Global Partnership on Target 11 in Vilm, Germany in March 2019, before holding a strategic discussion with CBD Parties and other members of the Partnership on how to increase coverage of AZE sites by protected and conserved areas. See the dropbox for presentation and SDG Report.Following this, a follow-up letter including information on the new AZE site list as well as the global and a national gap analysis and new CBD decision was finalised for the Secretariat of the CBD in June 2019 and sent to CBD focal points on 11 July 2019 as Notification SCBD/SSSF/SBG/PG/88220 (<https://www.cbd.int/doc/notifications/2019/ntf-2019-058-aze-pa-en.pdf>), urging Parties to consider this while revising their NBSAPs (likely after the post-2020 framework is agreed) and in considering priorities for the new post-2020 global biodiversity framework. See the dropbox for the letter and accompanying information note (available at <https://www.cbd.int/doc/aze-en.pdf>) with the gap analysis. The letter also offered advice and support on AZE conservation via the AZE website and two webinars which were held by BirdLife with the KBA Secretariat and ABC in July 2019. The webinars were attended by a total of 29 participants and a recording has been uploaded to the AZE website and is in the dropbox. | S |
| Activity 5. Funding and protected area proposals developed | Jun 2019\* | 33% | 100% | 1. The funding proposal, ‘Sampling of the avifauna and searches for individuals of Stresemann’s Bristlefront (*Merulaxis stresemanni*) in the RPPN Mata do Passarinho and adjacent areas’ that was developed and successfully funded at USD$11,725 was directly responsible for the discovery of a female individual just outside of the reserve. A second follow-up proposal is currently in process to continue searches for additional Stresemann’s Bristlefront individuals.2. A protected area proposal by Brazilian NGO Aquasis and American Bird Conservancy for the Oasis Araripe Reserve was successful in securing more than 170 acres of habitat in 2018 for the critically endangered Araripe Manakin, doubling the size of the existing reserve, an AZE site, and connecting it to the much larger Araripe National Forest. This AZE site is one of the 10 additional sites in this GEF project (Output 1.1.4). 3. A new AZE trigger species, Bahama Nuthatch, was rediscovered by research teams searching the island of Grand Bahama in 2018 following the devastation of Hurricane Matthew in 2016. In December 2018, ABC and Bahamas National Trust submitted a $350,000 proposal focused on safeguarding this and other species in the Bahamas.4. To improve management at the Blue and John Crow Mountains AZE site, a $136,000 project proposal was submitted and successfully funded in 2018 to conduct reforestation, hire two new guards, and develop a maroon ecotourism project. This AZE site is one of the 10 additional sites in this GEF project (Output 1.1.4).5. A $300,000 proposal was successfully funded through BirdLife International to improve management at Serra do Urubu. This AZE site is one of the 10 additional sites in this GEF project (Output 1.1.4).6. The proposal between Asity Madagascar and an international development organization, working in partnership with the Government, for large-scale conservation and development activities in and around Tsitongambarika is still pending. Additional donation from Rio Tinto has been attributed to Asity Madagascar as recompense for conservation success to the conservation programme of Tsitongambarika. Two Key Asity Madagascar staff received training in sustainable financing for forest conservation with BirdLife in March 2019. 7. A collaborative project of the Cambridge Conservation Initiative, co-coordinated by BirdLife, to build the capacity of conservation organisations and produce guidelines for CSOs to engage with IFIs and certification bodies on safeguards and standards, started in September (original award £12,216 plus £1500)..8. A Mohamed bin Zayed Species Conservation Fund proposal to continue searches for the Stresemann’s bristlefront in the second half of 2019 for US$6,000 was awarded. 9. A USFWS Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act (NMBCA) award for US$200,000 was granted to ABC. This project, “Bird-friendly Communities in Northern Peru” includes reforestation work surrounding the Abra Patricia AZE site. | S |

Overall project implementation progress [[9]](#footnote-9) *(To be completed by UNEP GEF Task Manager.):*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FY2018 rating**[previous] | **FY2019 rating**[current] | **Justification of the current rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods.** |
| S | S | Nearly all activities have been completed and the project was able to catch up on activities that were lagging behind in the previous reporting period. |

**Risks in implementation**

This section should be completed by the Project Manager and summarize implementation risks (e.g. procurement delays, reputational risks etc).

The first column should be completed by the Project Manager and the second column should summarize the recommendations that the Project Manager and Task Manager have agreed upon to address the problem/risk. This section should inform the risk rating in section 3.3.

| **Problems/risks identified** | **Agreed recommended actions** | **By whom** | **When** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ACTIVITY LEVEL |  |  |  |
| **Output 1.1.1. Habitat conservation for *Merulaxis stresemanni* in Bandeiras, Brazil, strengthened through improved forest protection and restoration with community support to sustain long-term conservation**Activity 4. Produce cacao on Mata do Passarinho Reserve40% (MS) | The Brazilian GEF AZE team worked diligently to make progress on this activity. As of June 2019, 10.07 ha have been planted with cacao seedlings planted in six areas. In addition, about 4,000 more cocoa seeds were planted to generate new seedlings and continue the expansion of the productive area. The seeds come from the quilombo Marobá dos Teixeiras, Almenara-MG. These quilombolas are active in cocoa production and this was one of the first actions of a partnership signed last year. | Staff at the Mata do Passarinho Reserve | June 2019 |
| Activity 5. Improve tourism at Mato do Passarinho Reserve Comments: In relation to birdwatching tourism, as previously reported, the Mata do Passarinho Reserve has temporarily interrupted the reception of birdwatchers. The decision was made after the release of the worrying results of the population monitoring of the Bristlefront. Considering that this tourism may incur negative impacts, mainly due to the use of the playback technique, a decision was made to suspend the activity until a better understanding of its consequences on the species was made. The decision whether or not to resume the activity should be made only after evaluation of the results of the next monitoring and under the guidance of experts.Since bird tourism has been temporarily halted, the Reserve has focused on other types of tourism. An interpretive trail and observation tower have been developed, and school groups and local ecotourism tourists have visited. New signs and trail maps have been created & installed. | The Brazilian GEF AZE partner, Fundação Biodiversitas, has been reluctant to re-open the Mata do Passarinho Reserve to birdwatching tourists due to the extremely precarious condition of Stresemann’s Bristlefront. However, following his visit to the reserve in November 2018, the MTR consultant decided to recommend the re-opening of the reserve to this type of tourism. The GEF AZE reviewed his comments, and additional tourism has taken place at the reserve. However, this tourism focuses on ecotourism in general, as a decision was made to not use playback to attract the Bristlefront for tourism purposes. | ABC, BirdLife and the Brazil partners | June 2019 |
| **Output 1.1.2. In Chile, at Isla Mocha Reserve in Chile, for Eupsophus insularis and at Mehuin 1 and Mehuin 2 for Eupsophus migueli and Insuetophrynus acarpicus respectively, habitat conservation enhanced through strengthened protection status and implementation of newly created or existing (Isla Mocha) management plans**Activity (Isla Mocha) IM5. Update and begin implementation of socio-environmental strategy30% (MS)Comments: A consultant was selected from the four proposals submitted and the strategy is in the design stage. Between February and May, 2018, the consulting team visited the island three times to collect information about the inhabitants of Isla Mocha and their environmental interests and needs. The consultants are also preparing a small community and school project to improve waste management.Despite years of conservation initiatives aimed at improving awareness of the importance of protecting Pink-footed shearwaters on the island, in May 2018 there was a massacre of 300 Pink-footed shearwaters (*Ardenna creatopus*) by the local community. This is a protected bird in Chile and is endangered. This massacre generated some problems with the local community and its relationship with organizations that promote conservation projects and actions on the island. Some of the perpetrators have been arrested, and we are hoping that this is the work of a small group of islanders. In August 2018, a workshop will be held with relevant actors from Isla Mocha to define the strategic objectives and main activities of the socio-environmental strategy, after which strategic activities will be implemented. | Between August and November 2018, five meetings with local stakeholders were conducted and formed the basis for finalizing the socio-environmental strategy. In December 2018, the consultants delivered the final report of the socio-environmental strategy (see Dropbox). During April 2019 a 4-day Community Leadership Workshop for Mocha Island Sustainability was held with four local organizations. | ABC with the Chile partners | April 2019 |
| Activity (Isla Mocha) IM7. Implement biosecurity measures50% (MS)Comments: During the amphibian monitoring held in 2017, biosafety protocols for emerging diseases were applied. In addition, RECH provided training for rangers at the Mocha Island National Reserve to apply biosafety measures in the field.In May 2018, RECH conducted training for the guards of the Mocha Island National Reserve on biosecurity measures and amphibian monitoring. During all amphibian monitoring campaigns, biosecurity measures are implemented. | During all five amphibian monitoring campaigns, biosecurity measures have been implemented according to the "Protocol for the control of infectious diseases in Amphibians during field studies" by Lobos et al (2013). See protocol in the Dropbox. In May 2018, RECH trained the Mocha Island National Reserve guardians in biosecurity and amphibian monitoring measures. | ABC with the Chile partners | January 2019 |
| Activity (Isla Mocha) IM9. Analyze viability of fuelwood alternatives5% (MU)Comments: Initial recommendations and alternatives have been determined. However, there is very scarce political will from local authorities to effectively consider alternative heat sources to substitute fuelwood. An effective change of heat sources requires large public investment which at the moment is not possible. For these reasons, alternatives have not been discussed with the local community. | There have been initial conversations between CONAF and the Ministry of Energy to analyze energy alternatives for Isla Mocha. During 2019, CONAF Biobío and the regional secretary of energy are working on developing a plan to evaluate alternative energy supply options for Mocha Island. However, political will to move this activity forward has been scarce. | ABC with the Chile partners | June 2019 |
| Activity (Isla Mocha) IM11. Seek funding from the Fondo Nacional de Desarrollo Regional0% (MU)Comments: There is very scarce political will for this activity. | We are pleased to report that while there had been little will to achieve this activity over the course of the project, the Chilean GEF AZE team has continued to pursue this activity. As a result of their efforts, CONAF Biobío has now put as a top priority for 2019 the preparation of a project to apply for funding the environmental information center on the island. | ABC with the Chile partners | January 2019 |
| Activity (Mehuin)Me6. Training to improve agriculture and cattle ranching practices10% (MS)Comments: No trainings have been held due to an initial lack of interest and involvement by INDAP. However, during this period of performance an agreement was signed with CONAF to deliver a set of 10 talks and workshops to local and indigenous communities during 2018 through the implementation of the Conservation Plan | INDAP participated in a community workshop with CONAF and provided training on cattle ranching to participants. In addition, INDAP also provided funding to local landowner for materials to fence off AZE trigger species habitat from livestock impacts. | ABC with the Chile partners | May 2019 |
| **Output 1.1.4. An additional 10 AZE sites covering a minimum of 40,000 ha will gain enhanced protection through additional projects, informed by progress at the three demonstration projects**Activity 4. Supervision of implementation50% (MS)Comments: Implementation has begun. As an example, at the Sierra Caral AZE site in Guatemala, actions have focused on several management issues that received low scores on the METT:Management issue: The borders of the protected area are known to the managing authority but not to local residents. Action: Partner NGO Fundaeco has been working with local communities to inform them of the site’s boundaries and the activities permitted at the site.Management issue: The available budget is insufficient for basic management needs and constitutes a serious obstacle to the management capacity. Action: Partner NGO Fundaeco is developing sustainable production activities in the La Firmeza Biocenter, which is expected to generate income for the area.At Yunguilla in Ecuador, the overall METT score improved due to significantly improved legal status (from no gazettement to the gazettement in progress), improved budget status (from no secured budget to some secured budget), equipment maintenance (from little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities to basic maintenance of equipment and facilities), and cooperation with landowners (from no contact between managers and neighboring official or corporate land and water users to contact between managers and neighboring official or corporate land and water users but little or no cooperation). However, some threats also increased (residential and commercial development within a protected area, mining and quarrying, edge effects, and erosion), pointing to the importance of focusing not only on existing high threats and poor management issues, but also the need to ensure that low and medium threats do not worsen.Similarly, at Tapichalaca in Ecuador, many management improvements were made, including improving inadequacies in protected area design so that they no longer significantly constrain the achievement of objectives. As the assessor explains, "we are in the process of slowly enlarging Tapichalaca reserve to increase connectivity to neighboring protected areas." In addition, the results of monitoring, research and evaluation are now (as of 2018) routinely incorporated into planning, which they were not when the previous METT (2016) was completed. Improvements also included improved budget status (from no secured budget to some secured budget). Programs to enhance community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, were being partly implemented in 2016, but the assessor writes that these programs are now being more fully implemented, since "with ABC we now have an active programme" to enhance community welfare. Finally, specific management programs are now being implemented to address threats to biodiversity, ecological and cultural values, which was not the case in 2016.Some threats at Tapichalaca have also decreased (non-timber crop cultivation in the reserve decreased from a high to a medium threat, and gathering terrestrial plants or plant products (non-timber) decreased from a medium to a low threat). However, others increased (wood and pulp plantations increased from a low to a medium threat, and avalanches and landslides increased from a medium to a high threat). | The final METT evaluations show management improvements at 9 additional sites. See Additional Sites METTs for more detail. | ABC and partners | June 2019 |

**3.3. Risk Rating***.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Mitigation at CEO approval** | **Mitigation at implementation** | **Rank** |
| Weak coordination among ministerial bodies and lack of support from national governments at the national and local level to support the conservation of AZE sites.  | Building on the lessons of other GEF projects it will be critical to foster government ownership from the onset. Practical measures to pre-empt this risk will be to establish coordination mechanisms comprised of both civil society and government personnel. Government staff will also be involved on relevant local Steering Committees and governance structures. To ensure sustainability, measures will be taken to facilitate government support for conservation activities in partnership with the AZE members and partners, after the project cycle has ended. Effective inter-ministerial bodies such as Madagascar’s SAPM Commission will help to mitigate this risk. | The mitigation strategies outlined at CEO approval successfully pre-empted this risk. There was substantial coordination and collaboration between governmental and NGO project partners. For example, in both Brazil and Chile, the ABC project coordinator worked closely with Ministry staff on many project activities, including site-level management in the Chilean example and AZE integration into the CBD in the case of Brazil. Government staff were included on the project’s Steering Committee. Government officials and NGO project team staff continue to be in contact following the end of the project. In Madagascar, however, government capacity continues to be an issue. This project has enabled Asity as an NGO to support the updating of management plans by local-based communities, both technically and financially, while the government lacks resources to do this; without GEF support this would not have been possible. On the ground, while NGOs and local communities detect illegal loggers and report them to the forestry administration. They are unable to act on this information due to a lack of personnel, materials and supplies (e.g. transportation and per diems). | CEO: **M** |
| TM: M |
| PM: M |
| Government turnover leading to changes in political direction. This risk appears to be strongest in Madagascar, in view of the 2009-2013 political crisis, but has been reduced by the recent election, and by the long-term involvement of key government officials in conservation efforts. Conservation policy directions including the new Protected Areas initiative have been largely maintained (albeit sometimes interrupted) through several changes of government including the recent crisis. | To counter this risk it is essential foster a sense of Return on Investment and demonstrate how the conservation of AZE sites benefits national interests. Particular attention needs to be devoted to sustaining government engagement through a combination of high level, public, and working level meetings to leverage maximum political commitment. All major agreements should be clearly documented and signed off by relevant government agencies. This risk can be minimized by ensuring that staff at a variety of levels are engaged in national AZE discussions. The present government has committed to place the conservation of natural capital, always with the participation of local communities, at the heart of the national strategy for sustainable development, and similar policies have been maintained through several earlier changes of Government, and so are considered likely to be maintained. | A significant governmental change in Brazil in 2018 led to changes in political direction that affected the project. The primary Ministry of Environment official involved in the project left the Ministry, and governmental collaboration with national NGOs declined following the elections. To reduce impacts to the project, the ABC project led strengthened partnerships with other Ministry of Environment officials on project activities.During the course of the project, Madagascar has changed a key member of the forestry administration, the regional director; the current government has advocated for improved governance. | CEO: **M** |
| TM: M |
| PM: M |
| Opportunities to influence IFI policies fail to occur during lifespan of project | Success does not depend on all IFI policies being open for complete review. The number of IFIs is large and, although policies of each one are rarely reviewed, it is expected that some will be during the period. The project will engage on the basis of international best-practice approaches that IFIs have committed to in their environmental policies; this can be done through a case-by-case approach by forming close relationships with IFI environmental specialists to influence the decision-making and requirements on EIAs/SEAs. The project will also collect evidence of how weak policies affect the outcome of a project and revive the information when reviews are underway. | The project team successfully worked to influence IFI policies, some of which are highly influential (e.g. World Bank and IFC). Some policies are still open to consultation following the end of the project (e.g. Equator Principles), but the project team continues to advocate for AZE sites as a key type of KBA through ongoing policy work (e.g. by providing comment and being in touch with the Equator Principles prior to and following the end of project to hopefully ensure strong safeguards for AZE sites in Equator Principles updates) as well as via an ongoing project to improve civil society capacity to engage with standards and safeguards and provide guidance for standardised advocacy points. | CEO: **M** |
| TM: L |
| PM: L |
| Communities resident in areas surrounding target AZE sites may not be supportive of conservation plans. This may arise from lack of awareness of the significance of such sites, as well as the potential for government restrictions on land uses and access to natural resources in order to ensure habitat and species protection. | A comprehensive community outreach plan for each target AZE site will be developed and implemented. At the Madagascar site, this, and consequent actions, will be based on the existing Social and Environmental Safeguards Plan based on comprehensive community consultation with and approval by local communities. The generation of socio-economic benefits will be emphasized as part of the establishment and management of target AZE sites. Where applicable, priority in job creation and capacity building will be given to the disadvantaged social groups, including women’s groups, within the surrounding community. | This risk did indeed turn out to be a concern, in Mehuin, Chile and the Chilean project team did an exceptional job reversing initial community resistance to the project. The Mapuche indigenous communities surrounding the AZE sites were reluctant to support the AZE project, in part due to reluctance to have governmental involvement on their land. To reverse this initial scepticism, the project team held community workshops, with adults, school teachers, including many women, and students, to raise awareness of the AZE trigger species on their land. Over time, the project team built up trust with the communities, to the point where the communities were interested in participating in the development of a Conservation Plan for the region. The project team also worked with one landowner initially to fence off part of his land to protect the ravines where the AZE trigger species occur. The involvement of this individual in the project led to increased interest of others to protect the AZE trigger species. The project team has been so successful that the communities were eager to continue the project activities past the end of the project. They successfully involved local government to fund continued conservation actions at the Mehuin sites following the close of the GEF project.In Brazil, the project team collaborated with local ranchers to put together land management workshops and stress the importance of reforestation, not only for the long-term persistence of the AZE trigger species but also to benefit the landowners themselves. In Madagascar, coordination and support from local communities has been good, following a nationally-established model.  | CEO: **M** |
| TM: L |
| PM: L |
| **Overall Risk Rating****Project Manager** | L/M |
| Overall Risk RatingTask Manager | L-M |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FY2018 rating**[previous] | **FY2019 rating**[current] | **Justification of the current risk rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods.** |
| L | L | The project did not encounter significant internal risks. External risks pertaining to government turnover and weak ministerial coordination were considered as medium and have affected timely delivery of some results. However, the project was overall successful in mitigating these risks and in delivering on the expected results. |

**High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
**Substantial Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.
**Modest 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.

 **Annexes and/or Links:**

* **Project Steering Committee Minutes of the year reported**
* **Risk Factor Table form previous template**

**Risks Factor Table**

*There are two tables to assess and address risk: the first “risk factor table” to describe and rate risk factors; the second “top risk mitigation plan” should indicate what measures/action will be taken with respect to risks rated* ***Substantial*** *or* ***High*** *and who is responsible to for it.*

**High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
**Substantial Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.
**Modest 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.

|  |
| --- |
| **RISK FACTOR TABLE** |
| ***Project Managers*** *will use this table to summarize risks identified in the* ***Project Document*** *and reflect also* ***any new risks*** *identified in the course of project implementation. The Notes column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project,* ***as relevant****. The “Notes” column has one section for the Project Manager (****PM)*** *and one for the UNEP Task Manager (****TM)****. If the generic risk factors and indicators in the table are not relevant to the project rows should be added. The* ***UNEP Task Manager*** *should provide ratings in the right hand column reflecting his/her own assessment of project risks.* |

|  |  |  |  | **Project Manager Rating** | **Notes** | **Task Manager Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Factor** | **Indicator of Low Risk** | **Indicator of Medium Risk** | **Indicator of High Risk** | Low | Medium | **Substantial** | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |  | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |
| **INTERNAL RISK** |
| **Project management** |
| Management structure[Roles and responsibilities] | Stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood | Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others | Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Management Team established with clear responsibilities and lines of accountability. The original Project Coordinator, Pepe Clarke, left BirdLife in March 2017, with management responsibilities for interim period determined while recruiting his replacement, Dr Noelle Kumpel, who started in September 2017. Noelle has chaired Project Management Team meetings, reported as required and supported the policy work in particular, including engagement with CBD. The Mid-term Review was delayed by the change/gap in Project Manager, but took place in Q4 2018 to Q2 2019 and was used to inform a final project team meeting held at project partner ABC’s offices in Washington DC in June 2019. | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: agree |
| Governance structure[oversight] | Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet periodically and provide effective direction/inputs | Body(ies) meets periodically but guidance/input provided to project is inadequate. TOR unclear | Members lack commitment Committee/body does not fulfil its TOR |  | x |  |  |  |  | PM: Management Team meets regularly and is functioning effectively. Frequent and constructive contact between project manager at BirdLife and project coordinator at ABC, and by BirdLife/ABC with respective country teams. Global Steering Committee has met less frequently than planned, facing considerable logistical challenges (e.g. budget, geographical spread and language); an extremely valuable in-person meeting was held in Washington DC in June 2019 with repurposed project travel budget to discuss the final project outputs and the recommendations of the mid-term review.  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| TM: agree |
| Internal com­munications | Fluid and cordial | Communication process deficient although relationships between team members are good  | Lack of adequate communication between team members leading to deterioration of relationships and resentment | x |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Internal communication fluid, cordial and productive.  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: agree |
| Work flowBudget | Project progressing according to work plan | Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall timetable | Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation | x |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Some delays to the project work plan have occurred as a result of the lengthier-than-expected AZE site consultation and review process, and some site-level delays, including a late start to Chile and ongoing tree planting etc in Brazil, and a gap in the lead for the safeguards component. Two short no-cost extensions were therefore granted which have enabled all project activities to be completed by the new completion date of 30 June 2019.The budget has been fully spent up essentially as planned (with minor changes to the Brazil and Chile subcontract budgets checked with the project manager and agreed); with some savings on project travel repurposed to allow for an end of project team/project review meeting and some additional GIS element to the AZE data support work. | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: agree |
| Co-financing | Co-financing is secured and payments are received on time | Is secured but payments are slow and bureaucratic | A substantial part of pledged co-financing may not materialize | x |  |  |  |  |  | PM: wide range of sources of cofinancing have been confirmed, with all partners contributing largely as expected and the total co-finance commitment exceeded. | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: agree |
| Budget | Activities are progressing within planned budget | Minor budget reallocation needed | Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Activities have progressed within budget, with only minor budget reallocations ((e.g. minor changes to the Brazil and Chile subcontract budgets, and some savings on project travel repurposed to allow for an end of project team/project review meeting and some additional GIS element to the AZE data support work) which have been set out and agreed with the PM/TM. | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: agree |
| Financial management | Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for | Financial reporting slow or deficient | Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds | x |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Funds managed correctly and financial reports submitted. | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: agree |
| Reporting | Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues | Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues | Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of project reporting | x |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Reports submitted on time or with agreed extension; feedback welcomed | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: agree |
| Stakeholder engagement | Stakeholder analysis done and positive feedback from critical stakeholders and partners | Consultation and participation process seems strong but misses some groups or relevant partners | Symptoms of conflict with critical stakeholders or evidence of apathy and lack of interest from partners or other stakeholders | x |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Stakeholder engagement processes has engaged key national stakeholders, CBD Parties and IFIs. | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: agree |
| External com­munications | Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public understand project and are regularly updated on progress | Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is successfully transmitted | Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners or misunderstand­ings concerning objectives and activities evident | x |  |  |  |  |  | PM: External communications have ensured that key messages are communicated to highest priority audiences. | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: agree |
| Short term/long term balance | Project is addressing short term needs and achieving results with a long term perspective, particularly sustainability and replicability | Project is interested in the short term with little understanding of or interest in the long term | Longer term issues are deliberately ignored or neglected | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Long term issues are explicitly built into the program design and reflected in implementation to date. Ongoing effort required to ensure appropriate balance between short term delivery and long term impact, especially for site-based outcomes, though integration of AZE definition and advocacy into KBA/IBAT process will help ensure long-term, sustained outcomes. | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: agree |
| Science and technological issues | Project based on sound science and well established technologies | Project testing approaches, methods or technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks | Many scientific and /or technological uncertainties | x |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Site selection based on well-established methodology. Field interventions based on proven conservation measures. Policy components (especially financial institution engagement) have a higher level of uncertainty but by linking to IBAT provides established implementation system and additional funding secured to work with others in Cambridge Conservation Initiative to better engage with standards and safeguards. | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: agree |
| Political influences | Project decisions and choices are not particularly politically driven | Signs that some project decisions are politically motivated | Project is subject to a variety of political influences that may jeopardize project objectives | x |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Decisions not motivated by political considerations. | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: agree |
| Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |

|  |  |  |  | **Project Manager Rating** | **Notes** | **Task Manager Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Factor** | **Indicator of Low Risk** | **Indicator of Medium Risk** | **Indicator of High Risk** | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |  | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |
| **EXTERNAL RISK** |
| **Project context** |
| Political stability | Political context is stable and safe | Political context is unstable but predictable and not a threat to project implementation | Very disruptive and volatile |  | X |  |  |  |  | PM: Political developments in Brazil (in year 4) and Madagascar (from earlier in the project) have presented challenges for national level policy component, but have not affected delivery of field activities.  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| TM: agree, and some delays in mainstreaming due to fluctuating commitments in Brazil and Madagascar  |
| Environmental conditions | Project area is not affected by severe weather events or major environmental stress factors | Project area is subject to more or less predictable disasters or changes | Project area has very harsh environmental conditions |  | X |  |  |  |  | PM: AZE sites and species are uniquely vulnerable to severe weather events and disasters (e.g. El Niňo related forest fires in Brazil). This should be a focus of follow-up work. |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| TM: agree, information baseline on CC effects on AZE sites should be improved |
| Social, cultural and economic factors | There are no evident social, cultural and/or economic issues that may affect project performance and results | Social or economic issues or changes pose challenges to project implementation but mitigation strategies have been developed | Project is highly sensitive to economic fluctuations, to social issues or cultural barriers |  | X |  |  |  |  | PM: Social and economic factors pose challenges for implementation, but mitigation strategies have been developed. |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| TM: TM: agree. Incentivizing conservation work at local level could be strengthened in an eventual follow-up |
| Capacity issues | Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners  | Weaknesses exist but have been identified and actions is taken to build the necessary capacity | Capacity is very low at all levels and partners require constant support and technical assistance |  | x |  |  |  |  | PM: Capacity building activities have been built into the work plan, with a focus on effective engagement in policy processes; national NGO partners (the smallest organisations in the project) delivering well at technical and management levels. |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| TM: agree |
| Others, please specify |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*If there is a significant (over 50% of risk factors) discrepancy between Project Manager and Task Manager rating, an explanation by the Task Manager should be provided below*

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **TOP RISK MITIGATION PLAN** |
| Rank – importance of riskRisk Statement – potential problem (condition and consequence)Action to take – action planned/taken to handle the riskWho – person(s) responsible for the actionDate – date by which action needs to be or was completed  |

| **Rank** | **Risk Statement[[10]](#footnote-10)** | **Action to Take** | **Who** | **Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Condition** | **Consequence** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High) (*Please include PIR risk ratings for all prior periods, add columns as necessary*):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FY2018 rating** | **FY2019 rating** | **Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period** |
| L | L | The project did not encounter significant internal risks. External risks pertaining to government turnover and weak ministerial coordination were considered as medium and have affected timely delivery of some results. However, the project was overall successful in mitigating these risks and in delivering on the expected results. |
|  | **If a risk mitigation plan had been presented for a previous period or as a result of the Mid-Term Review/Evaluation please report on progress or results of its implementation** |
|  |

1. For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Some projects are adopting/planning to adopt milestones for tracking the achievement of outcomes. Add the corresponding milestones in this column when applicable to inform the rating. Milestones are optional and may substitute for Mid-Term Target. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (**HS**), Satisfactory (**S**), Marginally Satisfactory (**MS**), Marginally Unsatisfactory (**MU**), Unsatisfactory (**U**), and Highly Unsatisfactory (**HU**). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Add rows if your objective has more than 3 outcome indicators. Same applies for the number of outcomes. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. As per latest workplan (latest project revision) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Implementation may be assessed by qualitative assessments, percentage of delivery, and/or budget expenditure (planned and actually spent). The 2018 assessment should be copied from previous PIR. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Only for Substantial to High risk. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)