



UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2023

1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

1- Identification

1.1 Project details

GEF ID	4623	SMA IPMR ID	22157
Project Short Title	NBSAP NR5/Phase 2	Grant ID	S1-32GFL-000367
		Umoja WBS	SB-000760
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)		
Project Type	▼ Full Sized Project (FSP)	Duration months	Planned 36
Parent Programme if child project			Age
GEF Focal Area(s)	Biodiversity	Completion Date	Planned -original PCA
Project Scope	▼ Global		Revised - Current PCA
Region	▼	Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval	19th January 2012
Countries	Afghanistan, Angola, Antigua& Barbuda, Barbados, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chad, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, Kiribati, Lesotho, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Niger, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome & Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, Timor-Leste	UNEP Project Approval Date (on Decision Sheet)	19th January 2012
GEF financing amount	USD 6,118,200	Start of Implementation (PCA entering into force)	04th April 2012
Co-financing amount	USD 5,513,640	Date of First Disbursement	04th April 2012
		Date of Inception Workshop, if available	
Total disbursement as of 30 June	US\$ 5,611,031	Midterm undertaken?	▼ No
Total expenditure as of 30 June	US\$ 4,897,348	Actual Mid-term Date, if taken	
		Expected Mid-Term Date, if not taken	

Expected Terminal Evaluation Date

1-Dec-24

Expected Financial Closure Date

1-Dec-24

1.2 EA: 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:

1.3 Project Contact

Division(s) Implementing the project	Ecosystems Division, Biodiversity & Ecosystems Services Branch (BESB), GEF BDLD unit UN Environment Programme Ecosystems Division GEF Biodiversity and Land Degradation Unit Biodiversity and Land Branch	Executing Agency(ies)	National Government Ministries of Environment
Name of co-implementing Agency	none	Names of Other Project Partners	Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD Secretariat), UNEP-WCMC
TM: UNEP Portfolio Manager(s)	Ersin Esen	EA: Manager/Representative	Jane Nimpamya
TM: UNEP Task Manager(s)	Jane Nimpamya	EA: Project Manager	Ruth Igamba
TM: UNEP Budget/Finance Officer	George Saddimbah	EA: Finance Manager	George Saddimbah
TM: UNEP Support/Assistant	Ruth Igamba	EA: Communications lead, if relevant	N/A

2- OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

TM: UNEP Current Subprogramme(s)

TM: PoW Indicator(s)

EA: UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages

Insert the Subprogramme(s) and biennia of the PoW to which the project contributes

POW 2018 – 2019
 Subprogramme 3: Healthy and productive ecosystems
 Biennia for the PoW under result “The health and productivity of marine, freshwater and terrestrial ecosystems are institutionalized in education, monitoring and cross-sectoral and transboundary collaboration frameworks at the national and international levels” :

1. Technical assistance and partnerships to establish indicators for biodiversity and ecosystem functioning and monitoring of key issues that have an impact on ecosystem functioning and ecosystem productivity
2. Technical assistance and partnerships on effective conservation measures and monitoring thereof (ecosystem management, ecological representativeness and connectivity)

Biennia for the PoW under result “Policymakers in the public and private sectors test and consider the inclusion of the health and productivity of ecosystems in

TM: UNEP previous Subprogramme(s)

Insert the Subprogramme(s) and biennia of the PoW to which the project contributes

POW 2018 – 2019
 Subprogramme 3: Healthy and productive ecosystems
 Biennia for the PoW under result “The health and productivity of marine, freshwater and terrestrial ecosystems are institutionalized in education, monitoring and cross-sectoral and transboundary collaboration frameworks at the national and international levels” :

1. Technical assistance and partnerships to establish indicators for biodiversity and ecosystem functioning and monitoring of key issues that have an impact on ecosystem functioning and ecosystem productivity
2. Technical assistance and partnerships on effective conservation measures and monitoring thereof (ecosystem management, ecological representativeness and connectivity)

Biennia for the PoW under result “Policymakers in the public and private sectors test and consider the inclusion of the health and productivity of ecosystems in economic decision-making”:

1. Development and dissemination of tools and methodologies to incorporate ecosystem health and resource availability in economic decision-making

Sustainable and inclusive growth – Emphasis on biodiversity management for development.

Implementation Status

2023

2.3 Implementation status & Risk

FY 2023
 FY 2022
 FY 2021
 FY 2020
 FY 2019
 FY 2018
 FY 2017
 FY 2016
 FY 2015

PIR #	Rating towards outcomes (DO) (section 3.1)	Rating towards outputs (IP) (section 3.2)	Risk rating (section 4.2)
	S	S	L
	S	S	L
9th PIR	S	S	L
8th PIR	S	S	L
7th PIR	S	S	L
6th PIR	HS	HS	L
5th PIR	S	S	L
4th PIR	S	S	L
3rd PIR	S	S	L

Projects started in all the 27 countries. 23 countries (85%) have submitted their NBSAPs namely; Antigua& Barbuda, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chad, Comoros, Ethiopia, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, Kiribati, Lesotho, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Niger, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome & Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, Timor-Leste.

4 countries have not yet submitted their NBSAPs but are in advanced stages in the development process. These are Afghanistan, Angola, Barbados and Dominican Republic. Their agreements are still active and projects ongoing.

All the 27 countries have submitted their 5NRs

There have been challenges in project execution at country level. These challenges emanate from change in political regimes which affected constitution of project Management teams in several countries. Additionally, with COVID – 19 outbreak, some countries noted delays in project activities and project reporting.

Rating towards outcomes: The rating is S because all countries have submitted their 5th National reports and 97% of the countries have submitted the NBSAPs to the CBD

Rating towards outputs: same as for outcomes

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

2.4 Co-finance

EA: Planned Co-finance

EA: Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges.

\$5,513,637

EA: Actual to date:

\$4,110,000 (75%) as of June 2022

2.5. Stakehc

EA: Date of project steering committee meeting

EA: 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

TM: Does the project have a gender action plan?



Yes

2.6. Gender

EA: 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

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

▼ No

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

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

▼ No

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

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

▼ No

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

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

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;

2.8. KM/Learning

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

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/>

Please attach a copy of any products

EA: Main learning during the period

NA

2.9. Storie

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

NA

3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	EA: Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	TM: Progress rating
<p>Objective</p> <p>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</p>	<p>By year 3 of the project the following will have been done:</p> <p>2. Development and sectoral planning frameworks at country level integrate measurable biodiversity conservation and sustainable use targets</p>	<p>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 conservation. zero compilation report of country specific targets and principles</p>	<p>Improvement on the existing baseline data compiled with new data collected in-country.</p> <p>27 assessment reports emanating from review of Biodiversity loss</p> <p>100% of all Identified Stakeholders registered in a comprehensive stakeholder inventory.</p> <p>16 compilation report of country specific targets and principles</p>	<p>By end of project: The CBD COP is using the report from the LDCs and SIDS and the revised NBSAPs for planning processes.</p> <p>27 compilation report of country specific targets and principles</p>	<p>85%</p>	<p>All 27 countries have started their NBSAP projects. Projects started in all the 27 countries. 23 countries (85%) have submitted their NBSAPs namely: Antigua & Barbuda, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chad, Comoros, Ethiopia, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, Kiribati, Lesotho, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Niger, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome & Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, Timor-Leste.</p> <p>4 countries have not submitted their NBSAPs but are in advanced stages in the development process. These are Afghanistan, Angola, Barbados and Dominican Republic. Their agreements are still active and projects ongoing.</p> <p>All (100%) of participating countries having submitted their fifth national reports to the CBD. The 5th NRs were used for production of the Global Biodiversity outlook (GBO4)</p> <p>Through consultative and participatory processes, approximately 98% work on development of targets, principles & main priorities of national biodiversity conservation strategy has been achieved and included in the draft NBSAPs.</p> <p>Mainstreaming of Biodiversity issues in sectoral and national planning has been achieved at 95%.</p>	<p>S</p>

	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 national/sectoral country plans		100%, of the countries have reported their biodiversity status through the fifth national reports submitted to CBD. 23 out of 27 countries (85%) have submitted their NBSAPs to the CBD Sec Angola, Barbados, Dominican Republic and Afghanistan are in the final stages of developing their NBSAPs, thereby enhancing access to biodiversity related information for better decision making All countries that have submitted their NBSAPs have also finalized their CHMs namely; Antigua& Barbuda, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chad, Comoros, Ethiopia, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, Kiribati, Lesotho, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Niger, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome & Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tanzania and Timor-Leste.	S
--	--	---	---	---	--	---	---

Outcome 1

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 modalities b) Completed reports from reviews on national plans & policies on Biodiversity conservation c) 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.		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. National Progress reports highlighting reviews on national plans & policies on Biodiversity conservation developed and submitted to UNEP National reports on stocktaking and review of relevant plans, policies developed and submitted to UNEP National reports on review of causes and consequences of BD loss, and value of BD to human well being developed	S
--	--	---	---	---	--	--	---

Outcome 2

<p>Outcome 2: 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 operationalised in countries at national and sub national levels, and mainstreamed into sectors and development plans</p>	<p>Specific Targets, principles, and priorities of BD conservation compiled by Year 3 by each country.</p> <p>The fifth national report developed before March 2014</p>	<p>In GEF 4 the participating countries attempted to develop 2010 targets but need to build on this process for 2020 targets.</p>	<p>Improved and more realistic decision making on biodiversity conservation in 80% of the country Government ministries resulting from knowing the current baseline</p> <p>Identification of stakeholders; consultations and awareness</p>	<p>BY End TERM All 27 countries have domesticated and elaborated on the 2020 AICHI targets including Nagoya Protocol issues for ABS</p>	<p>90%</p>	<p>90% work on identification of targets, principles and priorities of biodiversity conservation in line with 2020 AICHI targets achieved and reported all of them have prioritized Nagoya Protocol issues for ABS.</p> <p>All countries have developed their Fifth National Report and submitted to UNEP and CBD</p>	<p>S</p>
Outcome 3							
<p>Outcome 3: The governments, CBD COP, development partners and other stakeholders start using the new NBSAP</p>	<p>Completed NBSAPs in place by the end of 2014 from all 30 countries and Over 60% of them commissioned by the Ministries concerned</p>	<p>Initial NBSAPs completed in the countries between 1998- 2007 and need updating</p>	<p>Relevant Stakeholders capacity improved and is engaged in NBSAP implementation.</p> <p>Number of active communication outlets and modes engaged in providing information about the NBSAP</p> <p>Reflection of NBSAP and or biodiversity into country budget</p>	<p>BY End TERM The COP and all stakeholders have access to completed revised NBSAPs from participating countries and 5th national reports in this project</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>23 out of 27 countries (85%) have submitted their NBSAPs to the CBD Sec</p> <p>A number of countries already have their revised NBSAPs commissioned by respective governments and final versions of the revised NBSAPs submitted to CBD</p> <p>100% of participating 27 countries have submitted their 5th national reports to the CBD and accessible through CBD website. https://www.cbd.int/reports/</p>	<p>S</p>
Outcome 4							
<p>Outcome 4: BD Country budgets adjusted as a result of knowing costs of capacities required , technology, and conservation gaps</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>a) Capacity Development Plan For NBSAP Implementation. b)Technology Needs Assessment Reports. c)Communication Strategy d)Resource Mobilisation Plan for NBSAP implementation</p>	<p>By end of project the countries are ready to roll out with implementation of new NBSAPs.</p>	<p>90%</p>	<p>Over 90% work achieved with regards to development of NBSAPs implementation capacity plans, technology needs assessment and resource mobilization plans</p>	<p>S</p>

	<p>Outcome 5: Informed professional entities (and the general public) are better equipped and able to improve Biodiversity Conservation. b) The CBD Conference of the Parties (COP) uses results of the project for decision making to improve Biodiversity Conservation guidance.</p> <p>By end of project a) National Biodiversity Coordination Structures more strengthened and Operational (b) National CHM Operational c) Fifth National Reports submitted to the SCBD by the recommended COP 10 deadline</p>	<p>The current national Biodiversity Conservation structures require strengthening. All the participating countries have submitted their 4th national report to the CBD</p>	<p>Operational National Biodiversity Conservation coordination structures. An updated CHM</p> <p>The 5th National Report completed and feeds into COP decisions</p>	<p>By End of project -Stronger Biodiversity Conservation institutions with operational CHMs compared to baseline -General public and stakeholders better informed about Biodiversity Conservation and country specific targets -A monitoring system in place for following progress of NBSAP implementation</p>	100%	<p>Capacity gaps of biodiversity conservation institutions identified, and recommendations integrated in the NBSAPs.</p> <p>23 out of 27 (Majority) of implementing countries have submitted their NBSAPs. These are Antigua & Barbuda, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chad, Comoros, Ethiopia, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, Kiribati, Lesotho, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Niger, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome & Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, Timor-Leste. Afghanistan, Angola, Barbados and Dominican Republic are yet to finalize/ update their NBSAPs.</p> <p>Enhanced Biodiversity Conservation information access through CHM development. 100% of implementing countries have submitted Fifth National Reports to SCBD</p>	S
--	--	---	--	---	------	--	---

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

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

Output	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2022 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2023 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	EA: Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	TM: Progress rating
Under Comp 1					
Output 1: Stocktaking and Assessment	Dec-20	100%	100%	Partners heavily engage with project stakeholders to ensure sufficiency and efficiency in	HS
Activity 1: Rapid stocktaking and review of relevant plans, policies and reports.	Dec-20	100%	100%		S
Activity 2: Identification of stakeholders; consultations and awareness	Dec-20	100%	100%		S
Activity 3: 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	Dec-20	100%	100%		S
Under Comp 2					
Output 2: Setting National Targets, Principles & Main priorities of the strategy	Dec-20	100%	100%	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
Activity 4: Setting National Targets, principles & Main priorities of the strategy through national consultation	Dec-20	100%	100%		S
		97%	100%		Approximately 93% of participating countries have developed strategies and action plans,
					S

Under Comp 3

Output 3: Strategy and action plan development	12/1/2020	97%	97%	Approximately 93% of participating countries have developed strategies and action plans, a continued outcome of output 2 above	S
Activity 7: Developing the strategy and actions to implement the agreed targets through national consultations	Dec-20	99%	97%		S
Activity 8: Application of the NBSAP to sub-national entities through sub-national and local consultations	Dec-20	99%	97%		S
Activity 9: Sectoral integration including mainstreaming into development, poverty reduction and climate change plans through sectoral consultations	Dec-20	85%	85%		S

Under Comp 4

Activity 10: Development of a plan for capacity development for NBSAP implementation	Dec-20	85%	85%		
Activity 11: Technology needs assessment	Dec-20	85%	85%	NBSAPs approvals by respective governments and sectoral integration of BD issues is enhancing funding opportunities for NBSAP implementation	S
Activity 12: Development of a communication and outreach strategy for the NBSAP		85%	85%		S
Activity 13: Development of a plan for resource mobilization for NBSAP implementation	Dec-20	85%	85%		S

Under Comp 5

Output 5: Institutional, monitoring, reporting and exchange	Dec-20	85%	85%	Variance due to different project commence date. Most countries previously had CHMs which required updating and hence why this activity	S
Activity 14: Establishment / strengthening of national Coordination structures	Dec-20	85%	85%		S
Activity 15: CHM Development	Dec-20	85%	85%		S
Activity 16: Development of indicators and monitoring approach	Dec-20	85%	85%		S
Activity 17: fifth National Reports	Dec-20	85%	85%		S

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

4 Risk Rating

4.1 Table A. Project management Risk

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

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

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)

0

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

Risk	Risk affecting:								Variation respect to last rating	
	Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	PIR 6	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 contained inconsistent text.	Outcome 1-5	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	=	Nothing changed
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	=	Nothing changed
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	=	Nothing changed
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	=	Nothing changed

Consolidated project risk

L L L L L L L L

This section focuses on the variation. The overall rating is discussed in section 2.3.

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

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

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIR-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	Additional mitigation measures for the next periods		
			What	When	By whom

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

Project Minor Amendments

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

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

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

Minor amendments
None

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

Version	Type	Signed/Approved by UNEP
Original Legal Instrument		
Amendment 1	Revision	
Extension 1	Extension	

Entry Into Force (last signature Date)	Agreement Expiry Date	Main changes introduced in this revision

GEO Location Information:

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as OpenStreetMap (<https://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=4/21.84/82.79>) or GeoNames(<http://www.geonames.org/>) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking here(<https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx>)

Location Name <small>Required field</small>	Latitude <small>Required field</small>	Longitude <small>Required field</small>	Geo Name ID <small>Required field if the location is not an exact site</small>	Location Description <small>Optional text field</small>	Activity Description <small>Optional text field</small>
Nairobi/Global Project	-1.27467	36.81178	Nairobi	Nairobi/Global Project	Coordination of 27 countries for NBSAP/NRS development

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

This is a global project in 30 countries and so we cannot have a map. In addition, it is an enabling activity project.

[Annex any linked geospatial file]