GEF - PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR)

Document Generated by: GEF Coordination Office CO

At: 2024-09-12 09:26:20

Table of contents

1 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

1.1 Project Details

GEF ID: 4623	**Umoja WBS:**SB-015083.01,SB-000760.02.45,SB-000760.02.29,SB-000760.02.76,SB-000760.02.70,SB-000760.02.21,SB-000760.02.89,SB-000760.02.36,SB-000760.02.73,SB-000760.02.79,SB-000760.02.16,SB-000760.02.58,SB-000760.02.72,SB-000760.02.77,SB-000760.02.15,SB-000760.02.51,SB-000760.02.64,SB-000760.02.74,SB-000760.02.11,SB-000760.02.68,SB-000760.02.39,SB-000760.02.12,SB-000760.02.47,SB-000760.02.26,SB-000760.02.63,SB-000760.02.67,SB-000760.02.23
SMA IPMR ID:22157	**Grant ID:**S1-32GFL-00367,P1-33GFL-000250, P1-33GFL-000312, P1-33GFL-000610, P1-33GFL-000314, P1-33GFL-000244, P1-33GFL-000295, P1-33GFL-000322, P1-33GFL-000310, P1-33GFL-000306, P1-33GFL-000604, P1-33GFL-00023, P1-33GFL-000611, P1-33GFL-000315, P1-33GFL-000280, P1-33GFL-000252, P1-33GFL-000308, P1-33GFL-000299, P1-33GFL-000231, P1-33GFL-000318, P1-33GFL-000291, P1-33GFL-000287, P1-33GFL-000271, P1-33GFL-000268, P1-33GFL-000242, P1-33GFL-000330, 2000002875
Project Short Title: NBSAP NR5/Phase 2	
Project Title: Support to GEF Eligible Parties (LDCs & SIDs) for the Revision of the NBSAPs and Development of Fifth National Report to the CBD - Phase II	
Duration months planned:	36
Duration months age:	156
Project Type:	Full Sized Project (FSP)
Parent Programme if child project:	
Project Scope:	Global
Region:	
Countries:	Afghanistan,Angola,Antigua and Barbuda,Barbados,Burkina Faso,Burundi,Chad,Comoros,Dominican Republic,East Timor,Ethiopia,Guinea-Bissau,Haiti,Kiribati,Lesotho,Mali,Marshall Islands,Mozambique,Myanmar,Nauru,Niger,Saint Lucia,Samoa,Sao Tome and Principe,Senegal,Sierra Leone,Tanzania
GEF Focal Area(s):	Biodiversity
GEF financing amount:	$ 6,118,200.00

Co-financing amount:	$ 5,513,640.00
Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval:	2012-01-19
UNEP Project Approval Date:	2012-01-19
Start of Implementation (PCA entering into force):	2012-04-04
Date of Inception Workshop, if available:	
Date of First Disbursement:	2012-04-04
Total disbursement as of 30 June 2024:	$ 5,611,031.00
Total expenditure as of 30 June:	$ 4,897,348.00
Midterm undertaken?:	No
Actual Mid-Term Date, if taken:	
Expected Mid-Term Date, if not taken:	
Completion Date Planned - Original PCA:	2016-12-31
Completion Date Revised - Current PCA:	2026-12-31
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date:	2026-06-30
Expected Financial Closure Date:	2027-12-31

1.2 Project Description

This project responded to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets adopted by the 10th Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) (Decision X), which was a commitment to promote effective implementation of the Convention through a strategic approach, comprising a shared vision, a mission, and strategic goals and targets (the Aichi Biodiversity Targets), that would inspire broad-based action by all Parties and stakeholders. Specifically, the project would: -

(a) Enable GEF eligible Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing Countries (SIDs) to undertake revision of the National Biodiversity Strategies and Plans (NBSAPs);

(b) Develop the 5th National Report to the CBD. In accordance with Article 26 of the Convention and Decision X/10 of the 10th Conference of the Parties, Parties were required to submit their Fifth National Report by 31 March 2014. National reports were essential tools in allowing the COP to keep the implementation of the Convention under review, inter alia, by providing material for the preparation of the Global Biodiversity Outlook. The Fifth National Report provided a key source of information for a mid-term review of the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, which would be undertaken at the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Unlike previous enabling activities, this project would also serve as the basis for the development of communication tools capable of attracting the attention of and engaging stakeholders, thereby facilitating the mainstreaming of biodiversity into broader national and global agendas. In addition, the project would respond to the request from COP 10 Decision X/6 on Integration of biodiversity into poverty eradication and development.

This umbrella program was set up to cover 27 LDCs and SIDs in this second Phase, and would provide an expedited mechanism for the development, submission and approval of countries' proposals (individual funding requests of up to $220,000) for their revision of the NBSAPs and development of the 5th National Report to the CBD, providing the GEF and UNEP an opportunity for managing the biodiversity Enabling Activities more strategically in partnership with the CBD and other key global actors. Activities at country level would include (1) Stocktaking and Assessment;(2) Setting national targets, principles, & priorities of the strategy; (3) Strategy and Action Plan development; (4) Development of Implementation plans and related activities; and (5) Institutional, monitoring, reporting and exchange. In addition, this project would integrate issues pertaining to the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization (the 'Nagoya Protocol'). This "integrated approach" would allow for creating synergies and support mainstreaming of ABS issues into the different policy areas that were relevant for the mutually supportive implementation of the three objectives of the CBD.

UNEP was the GEF implementation Agency supporting this program and its roles included: (1)Responding to countries on guidance and frequently asked Questions (FAQs); (2)Assisting the countries to navigate the 5th National Report Portal; (3)Approval of country requests; (5) Issuance of the Project Cooperation Agreements (PCAs) or Small Scale Funding Agreements (SSFA) to countries; (6) Payment of funds directly to the countries; (7) Review and analysis of selected draft countries' Fifth National Reports either upon request from countries or during arranged regional consultations (8) Financial reporting to the GEF Secretariat; and (9) Project evaluation.

The main objective of this project was to enable countries to revise their NBSAP and to develop the Fifth National Reports to the CBD. The project supported integrating the obligations of these countries under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) into their national development and sectoral planning frameworks through a renewed and participative 'biodiversity planning' and strategizing process, in a manner that was in line with the global guidance contained in the CBD's Strategic Plan for 2011-2020.

COMPONENT 1:
Stocktaking and Assessment:
It entailed rapid stocktaking and review of relevant plans, policies and reports, Identification of stakeholders and raising awareness and rapid assessment of the causes and consequences of biodiversity loss highlighting the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services and their contribution to Human well-being. The methods of execution included the National consultants engaged to do rapid stock taking of relevant plans, policies and reports including those that pertained to the Nagoya Protocol on ABS, National consultants engaged undertook a gap analysis of the initial NBSAP report, National consultative meetings that undertook rapid assessment of causes and consequences of biodiversity loss

COMPONENT 2:
National Targets, Principles, & Priorities of the Strategy.
Before the NBSAP was developed, the country determined its targets and priorities first, using the 2020 targets, and taking into account the guiding results from Component 1. This component was further guided by the instructions given by the CBD COP, and assisted by an international consultant (where it was necessary) based on the many emerging issues which were updated in the NBSAPs and which added different dimensions to the consultations. These emerging issues included the recently adopted Strategic Plan for Biodiversity (2011-2020) and its associated goals, Integration of biodiversity into poverty eradication and development, human Rights and Indigenous, gender considerations and social and environmental safeguards, issues of BD conservation and poverty alleviation, Marine and coastal Biodiversity needs, Issues on Nagoya protocol on ABS.

COMPONENT 3:
Strategy and action plan development:
This entailed developing the strategy and actions to implement the agreed targets through national consultations. In addition, mainstreaming biodiversity into development policies, plans and practices and into sectoral plans and strategies were done. This meant internalization of biodiversity conservation goals into economic and development sectors, policies and programs, such that they became an integral part of their functioning of these sectors. Focus was made in such sectors as Agriculture, Forestry, Hunting, Livestock, Tourism, Trade, Travel and Transport, Energy, Fishery, Development Planning & Finance, Water, housing, and mining.

COMPONENT 4:
Development of Implementation Plans:

Once there was a revised draft NBSAP – further work was required to address supporting systems. Component 4 addressed these supporting systems for the NBSAP process. Activities included development of a plan for capacity development for NBSAP implementation; Assessing and strengthening capacity needs, technology needs assessment, development of a communication and outreach strategy for the NBSAP. National consultants, development of a plan for resource mobilization for NBSAP implementation.

COMPONENT 5:
Institutional, monitoring, reporting and exchange.
This component addressed establishment and or strengthening of national coordination structures. Countries chose the activities that were most relevant to them. The activities included support to the existing national coordination structures and strengthening of Biodiversity Units, especially in development of how to monitor progress (indicators) of the implementation of the NBSAP in the future, strengthening of the CHM development, development of the Fifth National Report to the CBD: The National Report addressed 3 areas; Part I - An update on biodiversity status, trends, and threats and implications for human well-being; Part II - The NBSAP, its implementation, and the mainstreaming of biodiversity; Part III - Progress towards the 2015 and 2020 Aichi Biodiversity Targets and contributions to the relevant 2015 Targets of the Millennium Development Goals.

1.3 Project Contacts

Division(s) Implementing the project	Ecosystems Division
Name of co-implementing Agency	
Executing Agency (ies)	National Government Ministries of Environment
names of Other Project Partners	Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD Secretariat), UNEP-WCMC
UNEP Portfolio Manager(s)	Johan Robinson
UNEP Task Manager(s)	Jane Nimpamya
UNEP Budget/Finance Officer	Paul Vrontamitis
UNEP Support Assistants	Sophia Mwangi
Manager/Representative	Ruth Igamba
Project Manager	Ruth Igamba
Finance Manager	George Saddimbah
Communications Lead, if relevant	NA

2 Overview of Project Status

2.1 UNEP PoW & UN

UNEP Current Subprogramme(s):	Thematic: Nature action subprogramme
UNEP previous Subprogramme(s):	Subprogramme 3: Healthy and productive ecosystems, Sub-programme 4: Environmental Governance
PoW Indicator(s):	• Nature: (i) Number of national or subnational entities that, with UNEP support, adopt integrated approaches to address environmental and social issues and/or tools for valuing, monitoring and sustainably managing biodiversity.
UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages	Sustainable and inclusive growth – Emphasis on biodiversity management for development.
Link to relevant SDG Goals	• Goal 15: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss
Link to relevant SDG Targets:	• 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 agreements • 15.2 By 2020, promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally • 15.4 By 2030, ensure the conservation of mountain ecosystems, including their biodiversity, in order to enhance their capacity to provide benefits that are essential for sustainable development

2.2. GEF Core and Sub Indicators

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

	Targets - Expected Value			
Indicators	**Mid-term**	**End-of-project**	**Total Target**	**Materialized to date**
	(NULL)			

2.3. Implementation Status and Risks

	PIR#	Rating towards outcomes (section 3.1)	Rating towards outputs (section 3.2)	Risk rating (section 4.2)
FY 2024	10th PIR	S	S	L
FY 2023	9th PIR	S	S	L
FY 2022	8th PIR	S	S	L
FY 2021	7th PIR	S	S	L
FY 2020	6th PIR	S	S	L
FY 2019	5th PIR	S	S	L
FY 2018	4th PIR	HS	HS	L
FY 2017	3rd PIR	S	S	L
FY 2016	2nd PIR	S	S	L
FY 2015	1st PIR	S	S	L

Summary of status

Project started in all the 27 countries. 25 countries (92.6%) have submitted their NBSAPs namely, Afghanistan, Angola, Antigua& Barbados, Barbuda, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chad, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, Kiribati, Mali, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Niger, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome & Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, Timor-Leste.

2 countries have not yet submitted their NBSAPs but are in advanced stages in the development process. These are Lesotho and Marshall Islands.

26 out of 27 (96.3%) countries have submitted their 5NRs except Lesotho

Rating towards outcomes: The rating is Satistfactory because 26 out of 27 (96.3%) countries have submitted their 5th National reports and 25 out of 27 (92.6%) of the countries have submitted the NBSAPs to the CBD

Rating towards outputs is Satisfactory

Overall risk rating is low (L)

This is the last PIR for this project, but financial closure might take longer because of the difficulty with getting final financial reports from the countries.

UNEP is persistently following up on this to ensure that those countries that have completed submit all their final financial reports to enable closure of their sub-projects.

2.4 Co Finance

Planned Co-finance:	$ 5,513,637
Actual to date:	4,110,000
Progress	**Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges:** Planned is $5,513,637 while realized is $4,110,000 (75%) as of June 2021

2.5. Stakeholder

Date of project steering committee meeting	
Stakeholder engagement (will be uploaded to GEF Portal)	At national/ executing agency level, there was extensive stakeholders' engagements with government establishments, NGOs, CBOs and the private sector enhanced knowledge management At national/ executing agency level, there was extensive stakeholders' engagements with government establishments, NGOs, CBOs and the private sector enhanced knowledge management. National Stakeholders: Government Ministries (multi sectoral), local authorities, local communities, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) local NGOs and Universities - all of which have been active in consultations and working teams. (b) Private sector entities have been active in providing inputs on their role in Biodiversity conservation and how it can be improved (c) local communities and indigenous groups have been consulted and represented in the consultations so that indigenous methods of conservation are included, and the needs of indigenous communities which live close to nature are taken care of. (d) International NGOs related to Biodiversity conservation and which operate at country level participated in the consultations. They were also active in checking final documents before they are submitted to the SCBD (e) Multi laterals such as FAO, UNDP, World Bank and others were invited to attend the consultations.

2.6. Gender

Does the project have a gender action plan?	Yes
Gender mainstreaming (will be uploaded to GEF Portal):	Gender considerations and social and environmental safeguards: -the initial NBSAPs had ignored mainstreaming of gender perspectives into the implementation of the Convention and promote gender equality in achieving its three objectives. This aspect has now been included to ensure that views on how various social groups utilize biodiversity, how lack of conservation might affect both genders and how the needs of indigenous groups, forest communities and other local communities should be taken care of in BD conservation. While gender mainstreaming has been well considered in the stakeholders' consultation level, there has been emphasis on how social groups utilize biodiversity, how both genders can equally ensure conservation of biodiversity, the specific needs of indigenous groups. Papua New Guinea, Mexico and Venezuela has produced a final draft NBSAP which as clearly linked poverty alleviation and both gender and how their contributions are key towards

2.7. ESSM

Moderate/High risk projects (in terms of Environmental and social safeguards)	**Was the project classified as moderate/high risk CEO Endorsement/Approval Stage?** No **If yes, what specific safeguard risks were identified in the SRIF/ESERN?** No
New social and/or environmental risks	**Have any new social and/or environmental risks been identified during the reporting period?** No **If yes, describe the new risks or changes?**
Complaints and grievances related to social and/or environmental impacts	**Has the project received complaints related to social and/or environmental impacts (actual or potential) during the reporting period?** No **If yes, please describe the complaint(s) or grievance(s) in detail, including the status, significance, who was involved and what actions were taken?**
Environmental and social safeguards management	This project has taken into consideration the requirements of Environmental and Social Safeguards during it execution. Project executing agencies ensured diversity in stakeholders' consultations leaving no one behind. In principle, the following Environmental and Social Safeguards were considered;• Minimum standards 1: Environmental and Social Assessment, Management and Monitoring – this was utilized in data collection and analysis processes as a key activity in the project execution. • Minimum standards 2: Accountability,

	Grievance and Conflict Resolution – to ensure delicate resources are well accounted for and indigenous communities made aware of conservation plans.• Minimum standards 3: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources – to ascertain the importance of sustainably living with nature.• Minimum Standard 4: Restriction on land use and Involuntary Resettlement - this component was key in advancing processes of exploiting nature while caring for it.• Minimum Standard 5: Indigenous people – was a key stakeholder in consultation processes as they interact more closely with nature for sustenance.• Minimum Standard 6: Cultural Heritage – as a measure of cultural value, the project also took stock of natural resources that have cultural importance and underscored the need to protect them• Minimum Standard 7: Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention – Ultimately, the NBSAPs and 5NR outlined how parties enshrined sustainable utilization of natural resources into policy

2.8. KM/Learning

Knowledge activities and products	The project team and the stakeholders utilized the NBSAP Forum Web portal and the CHM website. Webinars for training were developed by WCMC. NBSAPs and 5th National Reports publications were publicized at national level and are also now posted on the UNCBD website and the country websites including the CHM websites. https://www.cbd.int/reports/
Main learning during the period	The establishment of the NBSAP forum was a very good initiative. The NBSAP Forum is a global partnership aiming to support countries in implementing the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and its strategic plans, including global biodiversity targets. This online community of practice connects a wide range of stakeholders who need access to timely information regarding the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and its targets. Members can also share expertise, knowledge, technical support, and resources. Under this project countries got a lot of support through this forum. https://www.learningfornature.org/en/nbsap-forum/

2.9. Stories

Stories to be shared	NA

3 Performance

3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
Objective: With the overarching goal of integrating CBD obligations into national planning processes through enabling activities, the main objective of this project is to enable GEF eligible LDCs and SIDs to revise the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and to develop the 5th National Report to the CBD	"By year 3 of the project the following will have been done: 2. Development and sectoral planning frameworks at country level integrate measurable biodiversity conservation and sustainable use targets"	"In the past the GEF eligible countries have been supported to conduct country planning for BD conservation including initial NBSAPs, four rounds of national reports for biodiversity. This planning has been useful in guiding the countries and the COPs in BD	"Improvement on the existing baseline data compiled with new data collected in-country. 27 assessment reports emanating from review of Biodiversity loss 100% of all Identified Stakeholders registered in a comprehensive stakeholder inventory. 16 compilation report of country specific targets and principles "	"By end of project: The CBD COP is using the report from the LDCs and SIDS and the revised NBSAPs for planning processes. 27 compilation report of country specific targets and principles"	92.6%	Project started in all the 27 countries. 25 out of 27 (92.6%) countries have submitted their NBSAPs namely, Afghanistan, Angola, Antigua& Barbados, Barbuda, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chad, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, Kiribati, Mali, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Niger, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome & Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, Timor-Leste. 2 countries have not yet submitted their NBSAPs but are in advanced stages in the development process. These are Lesotho and Marshall Islands. 26 out of 27 (96.3%) countries have submitted their 5NRs except Lesotho	S

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
		conservation. zero compilation report of country specific targets and principles"					
	3. The 27 countries are enabled and informed for better decision making in BD conservation	zero countries are enabled and informed for better decision making in BD conservation	Informed professional entities (and the general public are better able to lobby for or improve BD Conservation. The CBD Conference of the Parties (COP) uses results of the project for decision making to improve BD conservation actions	100% of completed NBSAP approved by country Biodiversity Committee, parliament or responsible approval body and uploaded to the SCBD CHM. (NB: This benchmark applies barring any force majeure) At least 50% of the NBSAP recommendations are integrated into	92.6%	25 out of 27 (92.6%) countries have submitted their NBSAPs namely, Afghanistan, Angola, Antigua& Barbados, Barbuda, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chad, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, Kiribati, Mali, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Niger, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome & Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, Timor-Leste. 2 countries have not yet submitted their NBSAPs but are in advanced stages in the development process. These are Lesotho and Marshall Islands. 26 out of 27 (96.3%) countries have submitted their 5NRs except Lesotho	S

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
				national/sectoral country plans			
Outcome 1:Better decision making enabled on Biodiversity (BD) conservation in Government Ministries resulting from knowing the current stocks and baseline	"Indicators By year 3 of the project a) Comprehensive stakeholder inventories and elaboration of best consultation modalitiesb) Completed reports from reviews on national plans & policies on Biodiversity conservationc) Reports emanating from review of causes and consequences of BD loss, and value of BD to human well being"	The last stock taking and inventory on biodiversity was done in 1998/1999 in most countries when the first NBSAPs were commissioned	National implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) is improved and enhanced as status of biodiversity, and measurable targets for conservation and sustainable use are operationalized in participating countries at national and sub national levels, and mainstreamed into sectors and development plans	"BY End TERM The revised inventories and assessments in NBSAPs ready for use by countries for planning processes. "	96.3%	A list of National Biodiversity stakeholders developed through a comprehensive stakeholder assessment and analysis process for engagement and consultation has been developed by all countries. This stocktaking exercise informed the development of the 5th NR. 26 out of 27 (96.3%) countries have submitted their 5NRs except Lesotho	S
Outcome 2: National implementation of the	"Specific Targets, principles, and priorities of BD	In GEF 4 the participating	"Improved and more realistic	"BY End TERM All 27 countries have	92.6%	92.6% work on identification of targets, principles and priorities of	S

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) is improved and enhanced as status of biodiversity, and measurable targets for conservation and sustainable use are operationalised in countries at national and sub national levels, and mainstreamed into sectors and development plans	conservation compiled by Year 3 by each country. The fifth national report develped before March 2014"	countries attempted to develop 2010 targets but need to build on this process for 2020 targets.	decision making on biodiversity conservation in 80% of the country Government ministries resulting from knowing the current baseline Identification of stakeholders; consultations and awareness"	domesticated and elaborated on the 2020 AICHI targets including Nagoya Protocol issues for ABS"		biodiversity conservation in line with 2020 AICHI targets achieved and reported all of them have prioritized Nagoya Protocol issues for ABS.26 out of 27 (96.3%) countries have submitted their 5NRs except Lesotho	
Outcome 3: The governments, CBD COP, development partners and other stakeholders start using the new NBSAP	Completed NBSAPs in place by the end of 2014 from all 30 countries and 0ver 60% of them commissioned by the Ministries concerned	Initial NBSAPs completed in the countries between 1998- 2007 and need updating	"Relevant Stakeholders capacity improved and is engaged in NBSAP implementation. Number of active communication outlets and modes engaged in providing information about the	"BY End TERM The COP and all stakeholders have access to completed revised NBSAPs from participating countries and 5th national reports in this project"	92.6%	25 out of 27 (92.6%) countries have submitted their NBSAPs to the CBD Sec26 out of 27 (96.3%) countries have submitted their 5th national reports to the CBD and accessible through CBD website. https://www.cbd.int/reports/	S

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
			NBSAP Reflection of NBSAP and or biodiversity into country budget"				
Outcome 4: BD Country budgets adjusted as a result of knowing costs of capacities required , technology, and conservation gaps	"By year 3 of the project the following will have been done: a) Capacity Development Plan For NBSAP Implementation.b)Technology Needs Assessment Reports.c)Communication Strategies are completed d)Resource Mobilisation Plan for NBSAP implementation"	Most of the countries in this project conducted the capacity and technical needs assessment starting in 2002- but now need to repeat to update according to emerging scenarios	"Relevant Stakeholders capacity improved and is engaged in NBSAP implementation. Number of active communication outlets and modes engaged in providing information about the NBSAP Reflection of NBSAP and or biodiversity into country budget"	By end of project the countries are ready to roll out with implementation of new NBSAPs.	92.6%	Over 97% work achieved with regards to development of NBSAPs implementation capacity plans, technology needs assessment and resource mobilization plans.25 out of 27 (92.6%) countries have submitted their NBSAPs to the CBD Sec26 out of 27 (96.3%) countries have submitted their 5th national reports to the CBD and accessible through CBD website. https://www.cbd.int/reports/	S
Outcome 5: Informed professional entitites (and the general public are better equipped and able to improve	By end of project a) National BD Coordination Structures more strengthened and Operatinal (b) National CHM	"The current national BD structures require	"Operational National biodiversity conservation	"BY End of project -Stronger BD conservation institutions with	92.6%	Capacity gaps of biodiversity conservation institutions identified, and recommendations integrated in the NBSAPs. 25 out of 27 (92.6%) countries	S

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
BD Conservation.b) The CBD Conference of the Parties (COP) uses results of the project for decion making to improve BD conservation guidance.	Operationalc)Fifth National Reports submitted to the SCBD by the recommended COP 10 deadline	strengthening. All the participating countries have submitted their 4th national report to the CBD"	coordination structures. An updated CHM The 5th National Report completed and feeds into COP decisions "	operational CHMs compared to baseline -General public and stakeholders better informed about BD conservation and country specific targets -A monitoring system in place for following progress of NBSAP implementation "		(Majority) of implementing countries have submitted their NBSAPs. Enhanced BD information access through CHM development has been achieved. 26 out of 27 (96.3%) of implementing countries have submitted Fifth National Reports to SCBD	

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

Component	Output/Activity	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%)	Implementation status as of current reporting period (%)	Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress Rating
Component 1 - Output 1: Stocktaking and Assessment	Output 1: Stocktaking and Assessment	2020-12-01	100%	100%	Partners heavily engage with project stakeholders to ensure sufficiency and efficiency in data collection. This data is supporting the stocktaking and assessment processes	HS
Component 2 - Output 2: Setting National Targets, Principles & Main priorities of the strategy	Output 2: Setting National Targets, Principles & Main priorities of the strategy	2024-12-31	97%	97%	97% of the countries have set targets based on individual country priorities which have little variance considering that the countries are indifferent Geographic locations with diverse biodiversity concerns	S
Component 3 - Output 3: Strategy and action plan development	Output 3: Strategy and action plan development	2024-12-31	92.6%	92.6%	Approximately 92.6% of participating countries have developed strategies and action plans, a continued outcome of output 2 above	S
Component 4 - Development of a plan for capacity development for NBSAP implementation	Output 4: Development of a plan for capacity development for NBSAP implementation	2024-12-31	92.6%	92.6%	NBSAPs approvals by respective governments and sectoral integration of BD issues is enhancing funding opportunities for NBSAP implementation. This is been achieved through sectoral integration and mainstreaming of biodiversity issues into national development plans. 25 out of 27 (92.6%) countries have submitted their NBSAPs to the CBD Sec	S
Component 5 -	Output 5: Institutional, monitoring, reporting and exchange	2024-12-31	92.6%	92.6%	Most countries have updated their	S

Component	Output/Activity	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%)	Implementation status as of current reporting period (%)	Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress Rating
Output 5: Institutional, monitoring, reporting and exchange					Biodiversity CHMs at both national level and CBD level. 25 out of 27 (92.6%) of the countries have developed and produced their NBSAPs. 26 out of 27 (96.3%) have produced their Fifth National Reports to the CBD.	

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

4 Risks

4.1 Table A. Project management Risk

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

Risk Factor	EA Rating	TM Rating
1 Management structure - Roles and responsibilities	Low	Low
2 Governance structure - Oversight	Low	Low
3 Implementation schedule	Low	Low
4 Budget	Low	Low
5 Financial Management	Low	Low
6 Reporting	Moderate	Moderate
7 Capacity to deliver	Low	Low

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

4.2 Table B. Risk-log

Implementation Status (Current PIR)

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

Risks	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Current PIR	Δ	Justification
Risk 1: Experience from past Umbrella programs (for 3rd and 4th national reports to the CBD) showed that many countries have been slow in preparing and remitting country requests to the GEF implementing agency. Often requests were incomplete or	Outcome 1-5	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	=	

Risks	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Current PIR	Δ	Justification
contained inconsistent text.										
Risk 2: The review of several reports also showed that many countries missed the opportunity to truly involve civil society in consultations.	Outcome 1-5	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	=	
Risk 3: The CBD may reject submissions beyond the original deadline of 30 March 2014 for 5NR.	Outcome 1-5	M	M	M	L	L	L	L	=	
Risk 4: Lack of capacity: Experience from the Fourth National Report Umbrella Projects (both UNDP's and UNEP's) showed that many countries do not have adequate capacity for the preparation of the reports to the CBD. In addition. this project includes revision of the NBSAPs- which requires a different type of training	Outcome 1-5	M	L	L	L	L	L	L	=	
reporting of financial reports to UNEP	Outcome 1-5	L	L	L	L	L	L	M	↑	Only 2 countries (Lesotho and Marshall islands) have not technically completed the project. This is partially attributed to poor compliance of reporting to UNEP. especially regarding financial reports. We are working around the clock to sort this out.
	Outcome 1-5	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	=	

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

Additional mitigation measures for the next periods

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	What	When	By Whom
reporting of financial reports to UNEP	N/a	N/A	This is the last PIR for this project. but financial closure might take longer because of the difficulty with getting final financial reports from the countries.UNEP is persistently following up on this to ensure that those countries that have completed submit all their final financial reports to enable closure of their sub-projects (country level projects).	30 June 2025	Jane Nimpamya

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

5 Amendment - GeoSpatial

Project Minor Amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines.Please tick each category for which a change occurred in the fiscal year of reporting and provide a description of the change that occurred in the textbox. You may attach supporting document as appropriate

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

Minor Amendments	Changes
Results Framework:	No
Components and Cost:	No
Institutional and implementation arrangements:	No
Financial Management:	No
Implementation Schedule:	
Executing Entity:	No
Executing Entity Category:	No
Minor project objective change:	No
Safeguards:	No
Risk analysis:	No
Increase of GEF financing up to 5%:	No
Location of project activity:	No
Other:	No

Minor amendments

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

Version	Type	Signed/Approved by UNEP	Entry Into Force (last signature Date)	Agreement Expiry Date	Main changes introduced in this revision
Extensions					None. extension of duration of the project implementation

GEO Location Information:

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as OpenStreetMap or GeoNames use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: https://coordinates-converter.com Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking here

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	GEO Name ID	Location Description	Activity Description
Nairobi/Global Project	-1.27467	36.81178		Nairobi/Global Project	Coordination of 27 countries for NBSAP/NR5 development

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

This is a global project of 27 countries and so we cannot have a map. In addition, it is an enabling acvitity project.

[Annex any linked geospatial file]