

# GEF - PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR)

2025-08-25 09:36:21

---

## Table of contents

1 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION .....	3
1.1 Project Details .....	3
1.2 Project Description.....	4
1.3 Project Contacts .....	4
2 Overview of Project Status.....	6
2.1 UNEP PoW & UN .....	6
2.2. GEF Core and Sub Indicators .....	6
2.3. Implementation Status and Risks.....	7
2.4 Co Finance .....	9
2.5. Stakeholder .....	9
2.6. Gender.....	13
2.7. ESSM.....	14
2.8. KM/Learning.....	14
Reflows.....	16
2.9. Stories.....	16
3 Performance.....	18
3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes .....	18
3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs (Implementation Progress) .....	21
4 Risks.....	34
4.1 Table A. Project management Risk .....	34
4.2 Table B. Risk-log .....	34
4.3 Table C. Outstanding Moderate, Significant, and High risks.....	38
5 Amendment - GeoSpatial.....	39
5.1 Table A: Listing of all Minor Amendment (TM).....	39
5.2 Table B: History of project revisions and/or extensions (TM) .....	40

**UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2025**  
Reporting from 1 July 2024 to 30 June 2025

## 1 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

### 1.1 Project Details

<b>GEF ID:</b> 10920	<b>Umoja WBS:</b> SB-023665
<b>SMA IPMR ID:</b> 161618	<b>Grant ID:</b> S1-32GFL-000867-SB-023665
<b>Project Short Title:</b> Policy Coherence	
<b>Project Title:</b> Policy Coherence for Global Environmental Benefits	
<b>Duration months planned:</b>	24
<b>Duration months age:</b>	25
<b>Project Type:</b>	Medium Sized Project (MSP)
<b>Parent Programme if child project:</b>	
<b>Project Scope:</b>	Global
<b>Region:</b>	Global
<b>Countries:</b>	Colombia,Mongolia,Zambia
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Biodiversity
<b>GEF financing amount:</b>	\$ 2,000,000.00
<b>Co-financing amount:</b>	\$ 2,215,000.00
<b>Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval:</b>	2023-05-08
<b>UNEP Project Approval Date:</b>	2023-08-02
<b>Start of Implementation (PCA entering into force):</b>	2023-08-04
<b>Date of Inception Workshop, if available:</b>	2023-09-13
<b>Date of First Disbursement:</b>	2023-09-27
<b>Total disbursement as of 30 June 2025:</b>	\$ 1,027,999.00
<b>Total expenditure as of 30 June:</b>	\$ 770,366.00

<b>Midterm undertaken?:</b>	n/a
<b>Actual Mid-Term Date, if taken:</b>	
<b>Expected Mid-Term Date, if not taken:</b>	
<b>Completion Date Planned - Original PCA:</b>	2026-08-31
<b>Completion Date Revised - Current PCA:</b>	2027-12-31
<b>Expected Terminal Evaluation Date:</b>	2027-12-31
<b>Expected Financial Closure Date:</b>	2028-06-30

## 1.2 Project Description

The project “Policy Coherence for Global Environmental Benefits”, was approved by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Chief Executive Officer (CEO), on 8 May 2023, and aims to identify approaches and promote mutually reinforcing legal frameworks and alignment of financial resources for global biodiversity benefits.

This global project, executed in Colombia, Mongolia, and Zambia, is the first GEF-funded project that deals with the issue of policy incoherences affecting the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. The initiative is organized into three interrelated components:

1. Identify approaches and opportunities for policy coherence to deliver nature positive results in general and global biodiversity benefits in particular,
2. Country pilots to increase policy coherence through technical review and legislative processes, and
3. Knowledge management and communication.

Agreements among the GEF Implementing Agency, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and the Executing Agency, the Conservation Council of Nations (CCN/ICCF Group), regarding the terms and conditions for the execution of the project were concluded and came into effect as of 4 August 2023.

## 1.3 Project Contacts

<b>Division(s) Implementing the project</b>	Ecosystems Division
<b>Name of co-implementing Agency</b>	
<b>Executing Agency (ies)</b>	Conservation Council of Nations (1) The Conservation Council of Nations (CCN) was established when ICCF

	expanded its operations outside the US, where ICCF was originally founded to support Congress. CCN is now doing business as the ICCF Group and both terms are being used interchangeably.
<b>names of Other Project Partners</b>	
<b>UNEP Portfolio Manager(s)</b>	Johan Robinson
<b>UNEP Task Manager(s)</b>	Robert Erath
<b>UNEP Budget/Finance Officer</b>	Arshad Hussain
<b>UNEP Support Assistants</b>	Gloritzel Frangakis Cano
<b>Manager/Representative</b>	Jaime Cavelier
<b>Project Manager</b>	Edmilce Ugarte
<b>Finance Manager</b>	Katherine Brantley
<b>Communications Lead, if relevant</b>	

## 2 Overview of Project Status

### 2.1 UNEP PoW & UN

<b>UNEP Current Subprogramme(s):</b>	Thematic: Nature action subprogramme
<b>UNEP previous Subprogramme(s):</b>	N/A
<b>PoW Indicator(s):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nature: (iii) Number of countries and national, regional and subnational authorities and entities that incorporate, with UNEP support, biodiversity and ecosystem-based approaches into development and sectoral plans, policies and processes for the sustainable management and/or restoration of terrestrial, freshwater and marine areas</li> </ul>
<b>UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages</b>	<p><b>Colombia:</b> The project’s objective and expected outcomes are aligned with Priority Axis 4, “<i>Environment, Climate Action, and a Clean and Just Energy Transition,</i>” of the UNSDCF 2024–2027. This priority seeks to advance adaptation and mitigation efforts in response to the triple planetary crisis of biodiversity loss, climate change, and pollution.</p> <p><b>Mongolia:</b> The project’s objective and expected outcomes are aligned with Strategic Priority 2, “<i>Green, Inclusive, and Sustainable Growth,</i>” of the UNSDCF 2023–2027. It will contribute to building more resilient communities and ecosystems, with enhanced capacity for evidence-informed and gender-responsive sustainable natural resource and environmental management, as well as disaster risk reduction.</p> <p><b>Zambia:</b> The project’s objective and expected outcomes are aligned with Outcome 4 of the UNSDCF 2023–2027: “<i>Ecosystems are healthier, and all people,... are more resilient and contribute to and benefit from the sustainable management and use of natural resources and environmental services, and more effective responses to climate change, shocks, and stresses...</i>” Specifically, it will contribute to Output 4.1: “<i>Strengthened laws, policies, and programmes for the sustainable management of natural resources...</i>”.</p>
<b>Link to relevant SDG Goals</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> <li>Goal 17: Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development</li> </ul>
<b>Link to relevant SDG Targets:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>17.14 Enhance policy coherence for sustainable development</li> </ul>

### 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

Indicators	Targets - Expected Value			Materialized to date
	Mid-term	End-of-project	Total Target	
11- People benefitting from GEF-financed		532 (266 male/ 266	532	Total = 348Male: 191 (55%);

Indicators	Targets - Expected Value			Materialized to date
	Mid-term	End-of-project	Total Target	
investments		female)		Female: 157 (45%)
11.1- Male		266	266	191
11.2- Female		266	266	157

Implementation Status 2025: 1st PIR

### 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 2025	1st PIR	S	S	L
FY 2024				
FY 2023				
FY 2022				
FY 2021				
FY 2020				
FY 2019				
FY 2018				
FY 2017				
FY 2016				
FY 2015				

#### Progress: Information on progress outcomes of project implementation activities

Component 1: This component focuses on identifying opportunities, approaches, and tools to improve coherence between environmental policies and sectoral policies, especially those that impact biodiversity. The activities under this component concentrated on gathering information to identify the main methodologies and tools used to analyze, measure, evaluate, and enhance policy coherence. It is important to note that, while there is a wealth of information available on policy coherence—such as research reports, recommendations, and guidelines—this information is scattered across various sources. Through this project, we have compiled an interesting repository of documents on policy coherence, which can be shared with interested stakeholders. Additionally, most available information relates to Policy Coherence for Development and Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development. However, literature specifically addressing policy coherence in environmental or biodiversity conservation topics is still limited, with only a few case studies available. The main output of this component will be a “Guidebook on Policy Coherence”. This guide will be based on the compiled

---

information but will primarily draw from practices, experiences, and lessons learned during the project's implementation, especially under Component 2 in the pilot countries. For the development of the Guide, the project's technical team has discussed its focus and scope, agreeing that it will primarily offer practical recommendations for improving policy coherence for biodiversity conservation, as well as guidance for designing and implementing projects with policy coherence components. Component 2: This component aims to improve policy coherence in each pilot country through technical reviews and legislative processes. Progress in each country is detailed below:

**Colombia:** During the project's inception workshop, sectors were prioritized for analyzing policy coherence between biodiversity conservation and productive sectors such as agriculture, livestock, and mining. Subsequently, data collection and analysis were carried out using both primary sources (interviews) and secondary sources to understand the national policy context, identify existing sectoral policies, key stakeholders, and institutional mechanisms that might support policy coherence. The findings were compiled into a baseline document, which was presented to the Project Steering Committee for review and validation. The Committee recommended focusing the policy coherence analysis on a practical case, prioritizing the Páramos ecosystem. Currently, with technical support from the Humboldt Institute of Colombia, a study is underway to assess coherence between agricultural development policies and Páramos conservation policies.

**Zambia:** The project's approach in Zambia has been similar to Colombia's. During the inception workshop, sectors were prioritized for policy coherence analysis, followed by data collection and analysis of the national context. The baseline study results were presented to both the Technical Committee and the Project Steering Committee. Based on the Committees' recommendations, specific analyses of the policies and legal frameworks governing wildlife protected areas, agriculture, mining, and tourism will be conducted in the third quarter of 2025. These analyses will adopt a participatory approach involving sectoral consultations with key stakeholders. The results will be presented at a national consultation, aiming to develop a long-term National Action Plan to improve coherence among the mentioned policies.

**Mongolia:** Project implementation in Mongolia has taken a unique approach compared to Zambia and Colombia. In Mongolia, the Conservation Caucus requested support from CCN/ICCF to review a package of current environmental laws and propose amendments to improve natural resource management. The review was conducted by Mongolian lawyers and U.S. experts from the Conservation Corps. During this review, the project identified an opportunity to conduct a basic analysis to detect potential incoherences between laws and identify opportunities for synergy. The legal and technical team reviewed around 18 laws, provided recommendations, and drafted proposed amendments. This initial exercise resulted in a report highlighting policy coherence aspects identified during the legal review, focusing on:

- Internal coherence: gaps, conflicts, and ambiguities within the laws themselves;
- External coherence: known conflicts between sectors;
- Coherence with best practices: standards, procedures, or methods.

This preliminary work will be complemented by a more systematic effort to incorporate tools that can help improve coherence during the law-making process. This is possible because Mongolia has a "Law on Legislation," which aims to establish a unified, coherent, and transparent legal system by regulating the development, adoption, implementation, and review of laws. Currently, as part of this process, the policy coherence project is supporting the review of draft laws on protected areas, forests, and environmental protection.

**Component 3:** Component 3 is dedicated to knowledge management and communication. Its main objective is to disseminate project experiences and lessons learned, and to promote the adoption of practices to improve policy coherence. Key achievements include:

- Development of a communication strategy;
- Creation of the project website (Policy Coherence for Global Environmental Benefits);
- Participation in international conferences to share project experiences (e.g., Latin America and Caribbean Environmental Funds Network Congress, GEF International Waters Conference, OECS Blue Economy Conference);
- Organization of events to promote discussion on policy coherence, such as the Forum "Parliamentarians for Socioeconomic Transitions for the Conservation, Protection, and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity: and Target 18: Creating the Right Incentives for a Nature-Positive Future";
- Participation in the Global Policy Coherence Network (GPCN): ICCF/CCN has formally joined the GPCN and participated in its meetings and events. Led by UNEP, as the custodian agency for SDG Target 17.14 and Indicator 17.14.1 on Policy Coherence, the Network aims to facilitate the sharing of best practices and challenges among countries to achieve policy coherence for sustainable development at the national level.

### Challenges: Information on challenges of project implementation activities

The implementation of this global policy coherence project has reaffirmed that there is no “one-size-fits-all” approach. Each country has its own political context, interests, and priorities, so the project methodology and implementation approach must be adapted accordingly. Changes in key actors, such as GEF focal points, and political timing—like parliamentary elections—have impacted the project’s implementation schedule. The idiosyncrasies of each country are another important factor. For example, some authorities do not initially accept the involvement of civil society or international cooperation in project activities. Therefore, care must be taken to avoid uncomfortable situations or misunderstandings. Project governance must be tailored to the conditions of each country. For instance, in Zambia, in addition to the Project Steering Committee, a Technical Committee was also established. Accessing information on specific policies and legislation has been a challenge, as in many cases the information is scattered or not publicly available. Regarding Component 1, one of the main challenges has been the difficulty in identifying the impact of policy coherence on improving financial flows for biodiversity

### 2.4 Co Finance

<b>Planned Co-finance:</b>	\$ 2,215,000
<b>Actual to date:</b>	567,314
<b>Progress</b>	<b>Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges:</b>  The co-financing received is adequate. It is expected that co-financing levels will increase as the project progresses and specific activities are carried out in each country.

### 2.5. Stakeholder

<b>Date of project steering committee meeting</b>	2024-12-16
<b>Stakeholder engagement (will be uploaded to GEF Portal)</b>	<b>Project Steering Committee</b>  The Global Project Steering Committee (GPSC) for the GEF 10920 “Policy Coherence for Global Environmental Benefits” project met virtually on December 16, 2024, to review progress made in 2024, identify challenges, and discuss the 2025 work plan. Key discussions focused on advancing Component 1, including the development of a

---

	<p>guidebook based on best practices and lessons learned, and Component 3, which promotes knowledge sharing through communication strategies, a project website, and participation in international forums.</p> <p>Challenges identified included the dispersed nature of policy coherence information, limited case studies on aligning financial resources for biodiversity, and the need to adapt SDG-focused methodologies to better address Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs).</p> <p>Country-level updates (Component 2) showed progress in Colombia, Mongolia, and Zambia. Colombia developed a methodology to analyze policy coherence and identified key issues for further study. Mongolia completed legal assessments and produced policy recommendations presented to parliamentarians. Zambia completed a rapid study and engaged stakeholders across ministries.</p> <p>The 2025 work plan emphasizes completing the guidebook, deepening country-level analyses to identify and address incoherences, improving knowledge dissemination tools, and tackling challenges related to aligning financial flows. Coordination across components will be critical to ensure the integration of field experiences and policy recommendations into actionable outputs.</p> <p>In addition to the GPSC meeting, the following virtual and in-person meetings were held to review project progress and discuss technical approaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>September 12, 2024 (virtual):</b> Participants: TM, PTA, and PMU coordinator. Topics: Review of the Project Implementation Report (PIR); summary of lessons learned to be presented at the GEF International Waters Biennial Conference in Uruguay, RedLAC Assembly in Saint Lucia, and the GEF Secretariat in Washington.</li><li>• <b>November 28, 2024 (in person):</b> Participants: TM, PMU coordinator. Topics: Project implementation</li></ul>
--	--

	<p>progress; establishment of National Project Steering Committees; agenda for the Global Steering Committee; ideas regarding the content of the Guidelines to be developed under Component 1; global meeting to systematize lessons learned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>March 5, 2025 (hybrid):</b> Participants: GEF Secretariat, ICCF, UNEP. Topics: Project progress update; discussion on lessons learned during project implementation; scope of the guidebook on policy coherence.</li> <li>• <b>April 17, 2025 (virtual):</b> Participants: TM, ICCF/PMU. Topics: Project progress update; justification and requirements for the no-cost project extension request.</li> </ul> <p><b>Stakeholder Involvement</b></p> <p>The involvement of relevant stakeholders is key to the project’s success and is one of the essential pillars for improving policy coherence.</p> <p>Main activities undertaken to promote participation include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of key stakeholders in each pilot country.</li> <li>• Bilateral meetings with key stakeholders to present the project and its objectives.</li> <li>• Establishment of National Project Steering Committees in each participating country.</li> <li>• Conducting interviews with key informants to deepen coherence analysis.</li> <li>• Briefings to update members of the Conservation Caucuses on project progress.</li> </ul> <p><b>National Project Steering Committees</b></p> <p>The establishment of National Project Steering Committees has proven essential not only for ensuring project governance but also for securing the participation of representatives from key sectors.</p>
--	--

---

	<p>Considering that one of the barriers to policy coherence is the siloed approach to policy-making, the formation of multisectoral committees fosters dialogue and understanding of intersectoral priorities and challenges. This is crucial for building more coherent and synergistic policy and regulatory frameworks.</p> <p>In Zambia, the National Project Steering Committee (NPSC) and its Technical Committee bring together representatives from the Ministry of Green Economy and Environment, Finance, Mining, Land Use, Agriculture, the National Cabinet, and the National Assembly. In Colombia, the NPSC convenes representatives from the Ministry of Environment, the National Congress, the Ocean Commission, research organizations (Humboldt Institute), and civil society (Global Compact Colombia)</p>
--	--

## 2.6. Gender

Does the project have a gender action plan?	Yes
Gender mainstreaming (will be uploaded to GEF Portal):	<p>The project is committed to promoting gender mainstreaming and women’s empowerment throughout its implementation, contributing to gender equality by improving women’s participation and decision-making.</p> <p>In line with this commitment, the Project Management Unit is composed predominantly of women (7 out of 11), who occupy key leadership positions, including the global and country coordinators.</p> <p>Regarding the participation of women and men in activities carried out during the reported period, the main figures are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Zambia’s National Project Steering Committee meeting (09/18/2024):</b> Number of attendees: 15; Women: 5 (33%); Men: 10 (67%)</li> <li>• <b>Mongolia's National Project Steering Committee meeting (11/20/2024):</b> Number of attendees: 13; Women: 4 (31%); Men: 9 (69%)</li> <li>• <b>Forum: Parliamentarians for Socioeconomic Transitions for the Conservation, Protection, and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity (side event during CBD’s COP 16 in Cali, Colombia, 10/23/2024):</b> Number of attendees: 165; Women: 67 (41%); Men: 98 (59%)</li> <li>• <b>Colombia’s National Project Steering Committee meeting (01/23/2025):</b> Number of attendees: 18; Women: 11 (61%); Men: 7 (39%)</li> </ul> <p><b>Zambia’s National Project Steering Committee meeting (06/06/2025):</b> Number of attendees: 18; Women: 8 (44%); Men: 10 (56%)</p>

## 2.7. ESSM

<b>Moderate/High risk projects (in terms of Environmental and social safeguards)</b>	<b>Was the project classified as moderate/high risk CEO Endorsement/Approval Stage?</b> No <b>If yes, what specific safeguard risks were identified in the SRIF/ESERN?</b>
<b>New social and/or environmental risks</b>	<b>Have any new social and/or environmental risks been identified during the reporting period?</b> No <b>If yes, describe the new risks or changes?</b>
<b>Complaints and grievances related to social and/or environmental impacts</b>	<b>Has the project received complaints related to social and/or environmental impacts (actual or potential) during the reporting period?</b> No <b>If yes, please describe the complaint(s) or grievance(s) in detail, including the status, significance, who was involved and what actions were taken?</b>
<b>Environmental and social safeguards management</b>	According to the UNEP/GEF Environmental and Social Safeguards Checklist (Annex S of the CEO Endorsement), the probability of Risk and Significance of Risk for all the safeguard standards were in the lowest values, 1 for probability and L for significance. The assessment has not changed over this reporting period.

## 2.8. KM/Learning

<b>Knowledge activities and products</b>	<p>The project includes a component dedicated to knowledge management and communication that seeks to promote the adoption of the tools and assessment methods of Policy Coherence by other countries, with particular emphasis on those where CCN's Conservation Caucuses have been established.</p> <p>Some of the activities implemented during this reporting period are detailed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development of the project's website content</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Compilation of publications on policy coherence aiming at the creation of an online repository</li> <li>- Collection and systematization of lessons learned.</li> <li>- Dissemination of lessons learned in global events (RedLAC Congress, GEF International Water Conference, OECS Blue Economy Conference)</li> <li>- Events to raise awareness about policy coherence and its role for biodiversity conservation (Conference on Target 18 – Right incentives for a nature-positive future; Forum of Parliamentarians for Socioeconomic Transitions for the Conservation, Protection, and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity)</li> </ul>
<b>Main learning during the period</b>	<p>One of the first lessons learned is the importance of having clear definitions for key terms such as <i>policy</i>, <i>policy framework</i>, <i>legal framework</i>, <i>regulatory framework</i>, <i>policy instruments/tools</i>, and <i>legal instruments</i>, among others. These terms can have different meanings depending on the country context.</p> <p>It is equally important to define the types of policy instruments that will be considered in the intersectoral coherence analysis—such as policies, laws, and decrees. For example, in Colombia, judicial rulings are influential in policymaking and are considered part of the national policy framework.</p> <p>Another key lesson is the need to clearly define the scope of the policy coherence analysis by prioritizing sectors (e.g., agriculture, mining, protected areas) and identifying the types of policy instruments to be analyzed. In this regard, consultations held during the inception workshops were particularly useful for identifying the most relevant sectors.</p> <p>A recurring challenge in conducting coherence analyses is the accessibility and availability of information, which is often scattered across different sources. To address this, the project is currently identifying strategic partners that manage relevant databases to support the identification, collection, systematization, and analysis of sectoral policy instruments.</p>

	<p>The review of existing methodologies and practices revealed that information on policy coherence—both globally and nationally—is fragmented. This highlights a significant opportunity to develop open-access online platforms to centralize information, especially regarding national studies and research.</p> <p>Finally, there is no one-size-fits-all approach to implementing projects aimed at improving policy coherence. The most effective strategies depend on each country’s specific context, priorities, and needs.</p>
--	---

## Reflows

Reflows (for NGIs only)	
-------------------------	--

## 2.9. Stories

Stories to be shared	<p><b>Strengthening Cross-Sector Dialogue for Policy Coherence in Zambia</b></p> <p>During the baseline review and interviews conducted in Zambia, it was found that the country has several formal mechanisms in place to promote coordination across sectors and support policy coherence. These include the Policy Analysis and Coordination Division, the national development planning process, and the budgeting cycle, among others.</p> <p>However, despite these frameworks, direct dialogue between the productive sectors—such as agriculture and mining—and the conservation sectors—such as forestry, protected areas, and land management—is not taking place in practice. This gap limits opportunities for integrated decision-making and balanced development.</p> <p>Recognizing this challenge, the Project Steering Committee—led by the Ministry of Green Economy and Environment (MGEE) and the Parliamentary Conservation Caucus—plays a crucial role in promoting cross-sector dialogue. As a first step, the Committee brings together representatives from productive, conservation, economic, and policy institutions—including Parliament and the Cabinet—to foster collaboration and strengthen coherence between environmental and development goals.</p> <p><b>Mining and Conservation Policy in Zambia</b> During the recent Project Steering Committee meeting, the team shared and discussed the main findings from</p>
----------------------	---

---

	<p>the first phase of project research. One key issue that emerged was the complex relationship between mining activities and conservation policies in Zambia. The discussion highlighted that mining is not only carried out by large companies with legal permits in protected areas, but also by many small-scale, informal (artisanal) miners. It became clear that artisanal mining is a major and growing challenge. Unlike big companies, artisanal miners often work without regulation and tend to avoid contact with authorities or researchers, making it very difficult to engage with them or understand their needs. This situation was not fully recognized in previous reports or conversations, and it adds urgency and complexity to the project's goals. The committee noted that the Zambian government, especially the Ministry of Mines, is beginning to recognize the importance of addressing artisanal mining. Although efforts are just starting, there is now an opportunity to work together on this issue. This learning highlights the need to expand understanding of mining stakeholders also as including artisanal miners and not only major companies. This has a concrete impact in considering artisanal miners when promote dialogue between the conservation and productive sectors to create more coherent public policies.</p>
--	---

### 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
1.1 Increased understanding of opportunities, approaches and tools for Policy Coherence	Guidebook on best practices and tools for policy coherence with potential impacts on the flow of public financial flows.	no guidebook available and no understanding of the opportunities, approaches and tools on policy coherence for legislators.	A draft guidebook on policy coherence and increased understanding on policy coherence and how to make use of it when addressing conflicting pieces of legislation on environmental issues. Activities conducive to the drafting the guidebook (briefings, dialogues, workshops, other), will take into	A final gender-sensitive Guidebook and full understanding on the opportunities offered by the Policy Coherence to generate consistent and durable legislation on environmental issues delivering tangible and measurable GEBs. Activities conducive to the drafting the Guidebook (briefings,	0 (no guidebook available). 30% of progress achieved.	Information on approaches and tools for policy coherence has been compiled. Additionally, experiences and lessons learned are being collected and will continue to be gathered throughout the project implementation in each pilot country. The Guidebook is expected to be delivered at the end project's implementation.	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
			account equal participation of women and men - 50%. Guidebook will be gender sensitive.	dialogues, workshops, (other) will take into account equal participation of women – 50%. Guidebook will be gender sensitive			
2.1: Increased Policy Coherence in pilot countries for achievement of Global Environmental Benefits.	Number of countries adopting guidelines, approaches and enhance policy coherence of sustainable development. Target 17.14 of the SDGs.	Colombia is developing a searchable database BIObserve to capture information on policies and laws. It has also developed a tool “Regulatory Impact Analysis” to assess proposals and/or modifications of technical	At least 1 target country holds discussions on the guidelines, approaches to enhance policy coherence of sustainable development Discussions will take into account equal participation of women and men – 50%)	At least 2 of the 3 pilot countries consider using guidelines, approaches and enhance policy coherence of sustainable development Discussions will take into account equal participation of women and men – 50%)	0 (no country has adopted practices and approaches on PC)	The adoption of guidelines and approaches to improve policy coherence by other countries depends on the experiences and progress made by the pilot countries. Specific activities to identify and address incoherences are being developed in the target countries, and these experiences will be documented and systematized to inform the development of the project's Guidebook on Policy Coherence"	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
		<p>regulations. Mongolia has developed a methodology to ensure policy coherence but there is limited capacity to use it in practice. The Ministry of Environment has the intention to analyze for inconsistencies a package law of circa 35 laws on the environment. Zambia has adopted integrated planning but still faces challenges to achieve coherence</p>					
3.1: Adoption of the tools and	Number of CCN Conservation	0	At least 1 CCN	At least 2 CCN	0 (no CCN)	The achievement of this target is	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
assessment methods of Policy Coherence and experiences gained in pilot countries and sectors by other countries with active CCN's Conservation Caucuses.	Councils in other countries adopting practices on Policy Coherence		Conservation Council in another country is adopting practices on Policy Coherence (Dissemination events will take into account equal participation of women and men – 50%)	Conservation Councils in other countries adopting practices on Policy Coherence (Dissemination events will take into account equal participation of women and men – 50%)	conservation caucus in other countries has adopted the practices on PC)	subject to the completion of outcomes 1.1 and 2.1. However, some activities to disseminate information on policy coherence are already in progress under component 3 of the project	

### 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
1 Identify approaches and opportunities for policy coherence to deliver nature positive results in general and	1.1.1 Guidance and best practices for legislators to assess policy coherence. 1.1.2 Review of the impacts of policy coherence on the alignment of financial resources and institutional structure to deliver Global Environmental Benefits.	2026-12-31	0	58	Compilation of information on approaches and methodologies for policy coherence has been carried out and the practical experiences arising from project implementation is being collected. Impacts of policy coherence on the alignment of financial flows and institutional structure	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
Global Biodiversity Benefits in particular						
1 Identify approaches and opportunities for policy coherence to deliver nature positive results in general and Global Biodiversity Benefits in particular	1.1.1 Guidance and best practices for legislators to assess policy coherence.	2026-12-31	40	60	Activities under this output are being implemented in a timely manner.	S
1 Identify approaches and opportunities for policy coherence to deliver nature positive results in general and Global Biodiversity Benefits in particular	1.1.1.1 Compilation of domestic and international practices on policy coherence for legislators	2024-06-30	90	100	Activities under this output are being implemented in a timely manner.	S
1 Identify approaches and	1.1.1.2 Review and selection of best practices to address policy incoherence limiting the delivery of GEBs	2024-09-30	90	100	Activities under this output are being implemented in a timely manner.	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
opportunities for policy coherence to deliver nature positive results in general and Global Biodiversity Benefits in particular						
1 Identify approaches and opportunities for policy coherence to deliver nature positive results in general and Global Biodiversity Benefits in particular	1.1.1.3 Consultations (forums, discussions) with domestic and international experts, practitioners and National Conservation Caucuses on most cost-effective practices	2026-06-30	50	70	Consultations with experts and practitioners at the national level were carried out as part of the baseline setting for each country. Also, as part of the learning process, CCN/ICCF joined the Global Policy Coherence Network.	S
1 Identify approaches and opportunities for policy coherence to deliver nature positive results in general and	1.1.1.4 Draft guidelines and best practices on policy coherence	2026-09-30	30	50	The guidebook's scope, content, and structure have been preliminarily defined by the PMU.	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
Global Biodiversity Benefits in particular						
1 Identify approaches and opportunities for policy coherence to deliver nature positive results in general and Global Biodiversity Benefits in particular	1.1.1.5 Guidebook on best practices and tools for policy coherence	2026-12-31	0	0	The guidebook will be delivered by the end of the project.	S
1 Identify approaches and opportunities for policy coherence to deliver nature positive results in general and Global Biodiversity Benefits in particular	1.1.2 Review of the impacts of policy coherence on the alignment of financial resources and institutional structure to deliver Global Environmental Benefits (GEB).	2026-12-31	70	80	Information related to the alignment of financial flows for biodiversity has been compiled, and practical examples have been identified. However, it has been difficult to find cases that clearly demonstrate the impact of policy coherence on the alignment of financial flows for biodiversity. The cases that were identified mainly relate to efforts to reform harmful subsidies.	S
1 Identify approaches and	1.1.2.1 Assess cost and externalities resulting from policies that negatively affect GEBs. Find areas where policy coherence can most	2025-12-31	70	80	Information on costs and externalities caused by environmentally harmful	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
opportunities for policy coherence to deliver nature positive results in general and Global Biodiversity Benefits in particular	readily eliminate or abate the above cost.				incentives and subsidies has been compiled.	
1 Identify approaches and opportunities for policy coherence to deliver nature positive results in general and Global Biodiversity Benefits in particular	1.1.2.2 Compilation of cases in the legislature on successful policy coherence impacting the use of financial resources and institutional organizations linked to delivery of GEBs.	2025-12-31	70	80	Cases related to the removal or reform of environmentally harmful incentives and subsidies have been identified.	S
1 Identify approaches and opportunities for policy coherence to deliver nature positive results in general and	1.1.2.3 Selection of cases and lessons learned on how redirecting financial resources and modifying the structure and function of the institutions resulted in positive GEBs	2025-12-31	70	80	Cases of environmentally harmful incentives and subsidies reforms have been identified.	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
Global Biodiversity Benefits in particular						
1 Identify approaches and opportunities for policy coherence to deliver nature positive results in general and Global Biodiversity Benefits in particular	1.1.2.4 Recommend policy/law changes that can most quickly and effectively deliver benefits.	2026-09-30	0	0	Through the implementation of the country pilots, policy and legal changes will be identified.	S
1 Identify approaches and opportunities for policy coherence to deliver nature positive results in general and Global Biodiversity Benefits in particular	1.1.2.5 Briefing with parliamentarians to present cases and recommendations and how to replicate them.	2026-12-31	0	0	Briefings with parliamentarians depend on the findings and conclusions of the pilot countries' studies.	S
2 Country pilots to increase	2.1.1 Review and analysis of policy frameworks and the associated financial flows in relevant sectors (i.e., agriculture, forestry, tourism,	2026-09-30	40	60	A review and analysis of sectoral policy frameworks is being conducted in each	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
policy coherence through technical reviews and legislative processes.	infrastructure) for the delivery of Global Environmental Benefits in Target Countries.				pilot country.	
2 Country pilots to increase policy coherence through technical reviews and legislative processes.	2.1.1.1 Assess policy environments, financial flows, and reward systems. Compilation of the policies and financial flows in selected sectors following on the results of outcome 1.1	2026-06-30	40	80	The compilation of information related to the selected sectors is well advanced in each country. Baseline country reports have been elaborated for Colombia and Zambia.	S
2 Country pilots to increase policy coherence through technical reviews and legislative processes.	2.1.1.2 Critical analysis of cases by selected productive sectors. Identify measures and incentives with the most pronounce negative effects on GEBs.	2026-06-30	30	50	Specific sectoral analyses are currently being developed. In Colombia, the analysis will focus on agricultural development policies and páramo conservation policies. In Mongolia, draft laws on forests, protected areas, and environmental protection are being reviewed. In Zambia, policies and the legal framework related to protected areas, mining, agriculture, and tourism will be analyzed.	S
2 Country pilots to increase policy coherence through technical reviews and legislative processes.	2.1.1.3 Best practices on adequate policy frameworks resulting in proper financial flows for the delivery of GEBs and recommendations.	2026-09-30	0	0	This activity will be conducted in later stages of the project.	

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
coherence through technical reviews and legislative processes.						
2 Country pilots to increase policy coherence through technical reviews and legislative processes.	2.1.1.4 Briefing and working sessions to discuss and learn from the review and analysis	2026-09-30	0	0	The activity will be conducted once activities 2.1.1.1, 2.1.1.2 and 2.1.1.3 are completed.	S
2 Country pilots to increase policy coherence through technical reviews and legislative processes.	2.1.2 Identification of the policies, laws and regulations that are working across purposes (i.e., undermining each other) with special attention to those that limit or impede the alignment of public investments aiming at delivering GEBs.	2025-09-30	30	50	Policy and legal framework analyses are being undertaken in the pilot countries	S
2 Country pilots to increase policy coherence through technical	2.1.2.1 Identification of the policies, laws and regulations in selected sectors working against each other and impeding the delivery of GEBs, including budgetary investments in economic, environmental, and social goals.	2025-09-30	30	50	Policy and legal framework analyses are being undertaken in the pilot countries	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
reviews and legislative processes.						
2 Country pilots to increase policy coherence through technical reviews and legislative processes.	2.1.2.2 Consultations with policymakers on their experiences leading to policy incoherence and how issues were resulted.	2025-12-31	30	30	Consultations with policymakers will take place once the results of the policy analysis are available	S
2 Country pilots to increase policy coherence through technical reviews and legislative processes.	2.1.2.3 Make recommendations on harmonizing rules and reducing contradictions or inconsistencies that affect GEBs.	2026-12-31	0	0	This activity is subject to the conclusion of the policy and legal framework analysis	S
2 Country pilots to increase policy coherence through technical reviews and legislative processes.	2.1.3. Policy makers convened and engaged in the discussion and drafting of policies to address the policy incoherencies identified in the project in collaboration with the Executive to facilitate the implementation of the policy reforms and allocation of financial resources to deliver GEBs.	2026-12-31	0	0	This activity is subject to the conclusion of the policy and legal framework analysis	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
2 Country pilots to increase policy coherence through technical reviews and legislative processes.	2.1.3.1 One-on-one meetings with each sector to identify their priorities and interests in environmental issues and disseminating knowledge on policy coherence.	2026-12-31	0	0	This activity is subject to the conclusion of the policy and legal framework analysis	S
2 Country pilots to increase policy coherence through technical reviews and legislative processes.	2.1.3.2 Multi sectoral meetings to address the issues identified and disseminating knowledge on coherence.	2026-12-31	0	0	This activity is subject to the conclusion of the policy and legal framework analysis	S
2 Country pilots to increase policy coherence through technical reviews and legislative processes.	2.1.3.3 Compile the agreements reached and establish a roadmap.	2026-12-31	0	0	This activity is subject to the conclusion of the policy and legal framework analysis	S
2 Country pilots to increase policy coherence through technical reviews and legislative processes.	2.1.3.4 Share the roadmap and recommendations for its implementation with the sectors involved.	2026-12-31	0	0	This activity is subject to the conclusion of the policy and legal framework analysis	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
	coherence through technical reviews and legislative processes.					
3 Knowledge Management and communications	3.1.1 Printed and digital documents on the tools, assessment methods and lessons learned on Policy Coherence in the pilot countries.	2026-12-31	40	70	Information for the development of printed and digital materials on PC approaches and tools has been compiled and reviewed. A summary report will be prepared and made available for those interested in the topic.	S
3 Knowledge Management and communications	3.1.1.1 Define audience for PC information and develop a communication strategy	2024-06-30	100	100	The Communication Strategy has been elaborated. The strategy is envisaged as a "living" document, to be continuously revised and updated, to ensure it remains relevant and effective.	HS
3 Knowledge Management and communications	3.1.1.2 Design communications materials that will best reach the target audiences, at various levels of authority and experience.	2026-12-31	40	60	The information on methods, approaches, and tools for policy coherence, as well as the experiences and lessons learned, will be used to design communication materials.	S
3 Knowledge Management and communications	3.1.1.3 Disseminate materials and evaluate their effectiveness in reaching the audience.	2026-12-31	0	0	The execution of this activity is subject to the conclusion of activity 3.1.1.2	S
3 Knowledge Management and	3.1.2 In-person and virtual events to disseminate lessons learned in the target countries.	2026-12-31	0	50	Lessons learned has been disseminated in global events such as the RedLAC Congress (Saint Lucia, October, 2024),	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
communications					the GEF International Water Conference (Uruguay, September, 2024), and the OECS Blue Economy Conference (Saint Lucia, October, 2024)	
3 Knowledge Management and communications	3.1.2.1 Assess types of events that will best reach the audience defined above.	2024-12-31	100	100	Key audiences and suggested types of events were identified as part of the elaboration of the Communication Strategy (3.1.1.1). Specific selections will be made on a case-by-case basis according to the circumstances in each pilot country.	HS
3 Knowledge Management and communications	3.1.2.2 Hold different types of events according to the target audiences, assessing the effectiveness of each format.	2026-12-31	0	40	Two events were held to raise awareness and discuss the role of policy coherence in biodiversity conservation: 1. The Conference on Target 18 – Right Incentives for a Nature-Positive Future (a Biodiversity COP 16 side event led by the GEF Secretariat); 2. The Forum 'Parliamentarians for Socioeconomic Transitions for the Conservation, Protection, and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity' (a Biodiversity COP 16 side event co-organized by the Colombian Congress, the Ministry of Environment of Colombia, and CCN/ICCF).	S
3 Knowledge Management and communications	3.1.2.3 Prepare reports systematizing the events and disseminate them through the website, e-mails and other means.	2026-12-31	0	40	Reports on the events held have been prepared.	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
3 Knowledge Management and communications	3.1.3 Design and implementation of a website to disseminate lessons learned.	2025-06-30	50	80	Project website has been develop. <a href="https://internationalconservation.org/partners/the-gef/policy-coherence">https://internationalconservation.org/partners/the-gef/policy-coherence</a>	S
3 Knowledge Management and communications	3.1.3.1 Using information above on audience/behaviour/content, create a website that delivers PC information effectively. Publicize website's existence to desired audience.	2024-09-30	30	80	Website has been developed. <a href="https://internationalconservation.org/partners/the-gef/policy-coherence">https://internationalconservation.org/partners/the-gef/policy-coherence</a>	
3 Knowledge Management and communications	3.1.3.2 Establish partnerships with local partners linking their websites to the project website for dissemination of PC information.	2025-12-31	0	0		S
3 Knowledge Management and communications	3.1.3.3 Periodic updating of the website	2026-12-30	0	50	The website is regularly updated with information related to project activities.	S

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	Low	Low
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
Not being able to create sufficient Political Commitment on the part of the Parliamentarians to engage in the discussion on Policy Coherence and Political	2.1.3. Policy makers convened and engaged in the discussion and drafting of policies to address the policy incoherencies	M	L						↓	This risk has not materialized. Policymakers, including parliamentarians, are aware of the project's importance and have

Risks	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Current PIR	Δ	Justification
Coherence.Lack of interest of Legislators to address conflicting pieces of legislation that may be difficult to handle politically	identified in the project in collaboration with the Executive to facilitate the implementation of the policy reforms and allocation of financial resources to deliver GEBs.									expressed their support for engaging in discussions on policy and political coherence
Disturbance of public order	2.1.3. Policy makers convened and engaged in the discussion and drafting of policies to address the policy incoherencies identified in the project in collaboration with the Executive to facilitate the implementation of the policy reforms and allocation of financial resources to deliver GEBs. 3.1.2 In-person and virtual events to disseminate lessons learned in the target countries.	M	L						↓	This risk has not materialized. The political and social environment in the pilot countries has remained stable, with no events disrupting project implementation.
Not being able to create the political will for parliamentarians to request the leadership of the project drafting guidance and policies to address incoherencies in the legal framework.Political dynamics hinder the ability of enact new policies and laws within the project timeframe	2.1.3. Policy makers convened and engaged in the discussion and drafting of policies to address the policy incoherencies identified in the project in collaboration with the Executive to facilitate the implementation of the policy reforms and allocation of financial resources to deliver GEBs.	L	L						=	This risk has not materialized. Parliamentarians have demonstrated commitment and interest in the project's objectives.

Risks	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Current PIR	Δ	Justification
Not being able to identify all the relevant policies, laws and regulations of the productive sectors that may affect the adequate funding related to the GEBs in the target countries. Policies, laws, norms and directives that relate to the delivery of GEBs as well as those governing productive sectors are not readily available for the project	2.1.1 Review and analysis of policy frameworks and the associated financial flows in relevant sectors (i.e., agriculture, forestry, tourism, infrastructure) for the delivery of Global Environmental Benefits in Target Countries 2.1.2 Identification of the policies, laws and regulations that are working across purposes (i.e., undermining each other) with special attention to those that limit or impede the alignment of public investments aiming at delivering GEBs. 2.1.3. Policy makers convened and engaged in the discussion and drafting of policies to address the policy incoherencies identified in the project in collaboration with the Executive to facilitate the implementation of the policy reforms and allocation of financial resources to deliver GEBs.	L	L						=	This risk remains low. The project has been able to access the necessary policies, laws, norms, and directives to conduct the policy coherence analysis in the target countries.
The implementation of the enacted and amended policy and legal frameworks in the target countries may be slowed down due to the time necessary for the new set of	Output 2.1.3. Policy makers convened and engaged in the discussion and drafting of policies to address the policy	M	M						=	Representatives of the Executive, including Ministers of the Environment and other relevant agencies, have been actively involved

Risks	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Current PIR	Δ	Justification
coherent laws and regulations to be passed and executed by the Executive (Ministers of the Environment) and other Agencies	incoherencies identified in the project in collaboration with the Executive to facilitate the implementation of the policy reforms and allocation of financial resources to deliver GEBs.									in the project from an early stage, helping to facilitate timely implementation and reduce potential delays.
The project timeframe is not sufficient to work with the Legislature of additional countries and get traction on the subject.	Outcome 3.1: Adoption of the tools and assessment methods of Policy Coherence and experiences gained in pilot countries and sectors by other countries with active CCN's Conservation Caucuses	M	L						↓	Parliamentary caucuses in additional countries have been informed about the project and its importance. Furthermore, the project timeframe has been extended to ensure that activities can be fully implemented.
Difficulties by the project countries in providing the needed cofinancing for the project	Outcome 2.1: Increased Policy Coherence in pilot countries for achievement of Global Environmental Benefits	M	L						↓	The committed cofinancing is being executed
New restrictions due to COVID-19 pandemic or other	Outcome 2.1: Increased Policy Coherence in pilot countries for achievement of Global Environmental Benefits	L	L						=	This risk remains low. No pandemics or related public health restrictions have affected project implementation
Natural disasters may hinder participation of stakeholders in project activities	Outcome 2.1: Increased Policy Coherence in pilot countries for achievement of Global Environmental Benefits	L	L						=	This risk remains low. No natural disasters has been reported.
	All outcomes and outputs.	L	L						=	No variation. Risk remains low.

### 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
The implementation of the enacted and amended policy and legal frameworks in the target countries may be slowed down due to the time necessary for the new set of coherent laws and regulations to be passed and executed by the Executive (Ministers of the Environment) and other Agencies	The Executive and Government Agencies will be invited to participate in the project as early as possible to ensure they engage in preparing information, participating in project activities (briefings, dialogues, etc.) and disseminating the information within the different levels in each institution (managerial, technical, operational, etc.).	Relevant ministries and government agencies were invited to participate in the national project steering committee.	Provide technical assistance to government agencies during the drafting and execution phases to resolve bottlenecks quickly.	July 2025-December 2026	PMU - National Project Coordinator

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

To ensure the comprehensive execution of all project activities and the achievement of the intended outcomes and deliverables, the project was granted a No Cost Extension of its workplan until December 2026, with the validity of the amendment lasting until December 2027 as reflected in Table B below. The justification for the extension is based on this being a pilot initiative with a steep learning curve; its global nature demanding tailored approaches in three countries on different continents; its execution being influenced by the political cycles of each country, such as elections and parliamentary recess; and the additional time required to

deliver the systematization of experiences and lessons learned from the three pilot countries to generate the Guidebook on Policy Coherence.

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

Version	Type	Signed/Approved by UNEP	Entry Into Force (last signature Date)	Agreement Expiry Date	Main changes introduced in this revision
Original		2023-08-02	2023-08-04	2026-08-31	Original Project Cooperation Agreement
NCE	Extension	2025-05-29	2025-05-29	2027-12-31	No cost extension of the workplan

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
Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development of Colombia	4.625970	-74.070503			Colombia's GEF Operational Focal Point
Ministry of Environment and Climate Change of Mongolia	47.9184676	106.9177016			Mongolia's GEF Operational Focal Point
Ministry of Green Economy and Environment of Zambia	-15.4347	28.3206			Zambia's GEF Operational Focal Point

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

The project "Policy Coherence for Global Environmental Benefits" is a global initiative executed in three countries: Colombia (Latin America), Zambia (Africa) and Mongolia (Asia). The scope of the activities extends to the national level.

[Annex any linked geospatial file]

**Additional Supporting Documents:**

Filename	File Uploaded By	File Uploaded At	
Meetings Registry-Policy Coherence.pdf	BDLD TM	2025-08-01 17:53:17	<a href="#"><u>Download</u></a>
Zambia Steering Committee Meeting Notes - 06.06.25.pdf	Executing Agency	2025-07-09 19:53:30	<a href="#"><u>Download</u></a>
Mongolia Steering Committee Meeting Notes_11.20.2024.pdf	Executing Agency	2025-07-09 19:51:46	<a href="#"><u>Download</u></a>
Publication_Event Forum Parliamentarians_Oct 2024.pdf	Executing Agency	2025-07-09 19:51:31	<a href="#"><u>Download</u></a>
Global Steering Committee Meeting Notes_12.16.2024.pdf	Executing Agency	2025-07-09 19:50:38	<a href="#"><u>Download</u></a>
Dissemination_Policy Coherence Brochure.pdf	Executing Agency	2025-07-09 19:50:17	<a href="#"><u>Download</u></a>
Colombia Steering Committee Meeting notes - 23.01.25.docx.pdf	Executing Agency	2025-07-09 19:49:53	<a href="#"><u>Download</u></a>