

UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2023 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

1- Identification

roject details						
GEF ID		9347	SMA IPMR ID			22157
Project Short Title		NBSAP NR5 Phase 3	Grant ID			S1-32GFL-000367
			Umoja WBS			SB-000760
Project Title		the Revision of		Eligible Parties (LDCs & SIDs elopment of Fifth National Rep	,	BD (PHASE III)
Project Type	\mathbf{A}	Full Sized Project (FSP)	Duration months	Planned		36
Parent Programme if child project				Age		86.6 months
GEF Focal Area(s)		Biodiversity	Completion Date	Planned -original PCA		1-Jun-21
Project Scope	¥			Revised - Current PCA	-	1-Dec-24
					L	
Region	\checkmark		Date of CEO Endors	ement/Approval		3-Dec-15
Countries	E	Bahamas, Mexico, Papua New Guinea and Venezuela,	UNEP Project Appro	val Date (on Decision Sheet)		
GEF financing amount		USD 968,000	Start of Implementat	ion (PCA entering into force)		2-Aug-16
Co-financing amount		USD 830,000	Date of First Disburs	ement		2-Aug-16
			Date of Inception We	orkshop, if available		
Total disbursement as of 30 June		USD 364,340	Midterm undertaken	?	A	
Total expenditure as of 30 June		\$US\$ 289,768	Actual Mid-term Da	te, if taken		
			Expected Mid-Term	Date, if not taken		N/A
			Expected Terminal E	Evaluation Date		1-Dec-24

1.2 EA: Project description

There were 196 parties to the CBD including Palestine. Of those 196 countries, only 184 countries were in the process of or had revised/developed their NBSAPs and produced their 5th National report. About 12 countries had not yet started. Of the 184 countries, UNEP assisted 79 countries to access GEF funds through two umbrella projects code named phase 1 and Phase 2. Phase I had 30 countries and phase II had 27 countries while 22 countries were assisted as standalone projects. This phase III project involved 8 countries namely Bahamas, DPR Korea, Libya, Mexico, Palestine, Papua New Guinea, Syria and Venezuela 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/2), 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 actions by all Parties and stakeholders. This project also responded to decision X/10 of the Conference of the Parties of the CBD, which requested all the Parties to submit their fifth national reports by 31 March, 2014.

Specifically, the project tried to: -

(a) Enable GEF eligible Countries to undertake revision or updating 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 meetings of the Conference of the Parties until 2020, including the twelfth meeting held in October 2014 in the Republic of Korea.

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 phase 3 umbrella program was set up to support 8 developing countries including LDCs and SIDs, 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 included (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.

Project activities started in all the 4 countries namely Venezuela, Mexico, Bahamas and Papua New Guinea. 3 of the 4 countries, Papua New Guinea, Mexico and Venezuela already produced the final draft NBSAP. Bahamas managed to start their project in May 2019 and was expected to finalize by December 2020. Bahamas started late due to country challenges which were resolved.

1.3 Project Contact

Division(s) Implementing the project	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	N/A	Names of Other Project Partners	Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD Secretariat), UNEP-WCMC
TM: UNEP Portfolio Manager(s)	Jane Nimpamya	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	Sophia Mwagi	EA: Communications lead, if relevant	N/A

2- OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

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

TM: UNEP previous Subprogramme(s)

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

Subprogramme(s) St gc

POW 2018 – 2019 Subprogramme 4 - Environmental governance

TM: UNEP Current Subprogramme(s)

	Sustainable and inclusive growth – Emphasis on biodiversity management for development	t
PoW Indicator(s)	implement the 2030 Agenda for	
	environmental objectives and	
	approaches to achieve	
	common and integrated	
	increasingly converges on	
	The international community	
	Expected Accomplishment: (a)	
	Environmental governance	
	Subprogramme 4:	
	Subprogramme(s)	
	UN Environment	
	Goals	
	Sustainable Development	
	Development and the	
	the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable	
	environmental goals, including	
	internationally agreed	
	enhanced to achieve	
	policy and/or legal frameworks	
	(b) Institutional capacities and	
	Sustainable Development	
	implement the 2030 Agenda for	
	environmental objectives and	
	approaches to achieve	
	common and integrated	
	(a) The international community increasingly converges on	
	(a) The international community	
	project contributes	
	and Indicator(s) to which the	
	Expected Accomplishment(s)	
	Insert the Subprogramme's	
	Indicator(s)	
	Accomplishment(s) &	

2.1 UNEP PoW & UN

TM: Po

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

EA: UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages

A: Link to relevant SDG Goals	Where appropriate, insert the	EA: Link to relevant SDG Targets	Where appropriate, insert the most
	most relevant SDG target(s) and		relevant SDG target(s) and indicator(s) to
	indicator(s) to which the project		which the project contributes Indicators
	contributes Indicators Indicator		Indicator 2.4.1: Proportion of agricultural
	2.4.1: Proportion of agricultural		area under productive and sustainable
	area under productive and		agriculture
	sustainable agriculture		
			Indicator 2.5.1: Number of plant and
	Indicator 2.5.1: Number of plant		animal genetic resources for food and
	and animal genetic resources for		agriculture secured in either medium or
	food and agriculture secured in		long-term conservation facilities
	either medium or long-term		Indicator 3.9.2: Mortality rate attributed to
	conservation facilities		unsafe water, unsafe sanitation and lack
	Indicator 3.9.2: Mortality rate		of hygiene (exposure to unsafe Water,
	attributed to unsafe water,		Sanitation and Hygiene for All (WASH)
	unsafe sanitation and lack of		services)
	hygiene (exposure to unsafe		Indicator 6.4.2: Level of water stress:
	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene		freshwater withdrawal as a proportion of
	for All (WASH) services)		available freshwater resources
	Indicator 6.4.2: Level of water		Indicator 6.5.1: Degree of integrated
	stress: freshwater withdrawal as		water resources management
	a proportion of available		implementation (0-100)
	freshwater resources		Indicator 6.6.1: Change in the extent of
	Indicator 6.5.1: Degree of		water-related ecosystems over time
	integrated water resources		Indicator 11.3.2: Proportion of cities with
	management implementation (0-		a direct participation structure of civil
	100)		society in urban planning and
	Indicator 6.6.1: Change in the		management that operate regularly and
	extent of water-related		democratically
	ecosystems over time		Indicator 13.2.1: Number of countries that
	Indicator 11.3.2: Proportion of		have communicated the establishment or
	cities with a direct participation		operationalization of an integrated
	structure of civil society in urban		policy/strategy/plan which increases their
	planning and management that		ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of
	operate regularly and		climate change, and foster climate
	democratically		u
	Indicator 13.2.1: Number of		resilience and low greenhouse gas
	countries that have		emissions development in a manner that
	communicated the		does not threaten food production
	communicated the		(including a national adaptation plan.

t i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	o , 1	,	11 /			
dica	Indicators	Targ	ets - Expected value			Materialised to date
<u> </u>		Mid-term	End-of-project	Total Target		Waterhalised to date
	1: People benefitting from GEF-financed investment	47 (40% women)	100 (40%) women)	Not recorded yet.		
or S					Ī	
e A						
<u> </u>					L	

V C			
A GEF			
N N			
8			

Implementation Status

2023

	PIR #	Rating towards outcomes (DO) (section 3.1)	Rating towards outputs (IP) (section 3.2)	Risk rating (section 4.2)
FY 2023			S	L
FY 2022	8th PIR	S	S	L
FY 2021	7th PIR	S	S	L
FY 2020	6th PIR	S	S	L
FY 2019	5th PIR	S	S	L
FY 2018	4th PIR	HS	HS	L
FY 2017	3rd PIR	S	S	L
FY 2016	2nd PIR	S	S	L
FY 2015	1st PIR	S	S	L
FY 2019 FY 2018 FY 2017 FY 2016 FY 2015 EA: Summary of status (will be uploaded to GEF Portal)		Guinea, Mexico and Venezuela have already	untries namely Venezuela, Mexico, Bahamas and Papua N produced the final draft NBSAP. Bahamas managed to start 20. Bahamas started late due to country challenges which l	t their project in May 2019 and is expected to
EA: Planned Co-finance		\$860,000	EA: Actual to date:	\$600,000 (70%) as of June 2021
EA: Planned Co-finance EA: Justify progress in term of materialization of expecte co-finance. State any relevant challenges.				

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

2.6. Gender TM: Does the project have a gender action plan? EA: Gender mainstreaming (will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

V

Yes

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. Panua New Guinea. Mexico and Venezuela has produced a final draft NBSAP which as clearly linked poverty alleviation and both

	TM: Was the project classified as moderate/high risk at CEO Endorsement/Approval Stage? 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? Image: Tm: If yes, please describe the new risks, or changes
2.7. ESSM	TM & EA: Has the project received complaints related to social and/or environmental impacts (actual or potential) during the reporting period? 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) EA: Main learning during the period	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 <i>Please attach a copy of any products</i>
2.9. Storie	EA: Stories to be shared (section to be shared with communication division/ GEF communication)	N/A



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: Progres rating
jective		1					1
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	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	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 guideng the countries and the COPs in BD conservation.	data compiled with new data collected in-country. 30 assessment reports emanating from review of Biodiversity loss	By end of project: The CBD COP is using the report from the LDCs and SIDS and the revised NBSAPs for planning processes.		Under this phase 1 umbrella project, 3 out of 4 countries (75%) have developed their draft NBSAPs All countries have submitted its fifth national report to the CBD.	S
	 Development and sectoral planning frameworks at country level integrate measurable biodiversity conservation and sustainable use targets 	specific targets and	report of country specific targets and	27 compilation report of country specific targets and principles		Through consultative and participatory processes, approximately 80% work on development of targets, principles & main priorities of national biodiversity conservation strategy has been achieved and included in the draft NBSAPs. Mainstreaming of Biodiversity issues in sectoral and national planning has been achieved at 80%.	S

	3. The 4 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 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	NBSAP approved by country Biodiversity Committee, parliament or responsible	50%, of the countries have reported their biodiversity status through the fifth national reports submitted to CBD. 3 3 out of 4 countries (75%) have developed their draft NBSAPs 75% of participating countries have also developed their CHM, thereby enhancing access to biodiversity related information for better decision making	
utcome 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	

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	Specific Targets, principles, and priorities of BD conservation compiled by Year 3 by each country. The fifth national report develped before March 2014	In GEF 4 the participating countries attempted to develop 2010 targets but need to build on this process for 2020 targets.		BY End TERM All 4 countries have domesticated and elaborated on the 2020 AICHI targets including Nagoya Protocol issues for ABS	80%	80% 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. All the 4 countries have developed their Fifth National Report and submitted to UNEP and CBD	S
utcome 3						1	
	Completed NBSAPs in place by the end of 2014 from all 30 countries and Over 60% of them commissioned by the Ministries concerned	Initial NBSAPS completed in the countries between 1998- 2007 and need updating	Relevant Stakeholders capacity improved and is engaged in NBSAP implementation. Number of active communication outlets and modes engaged in providing information about the NBSAP Reflection of NBSAP and or biodiversity into country budget	BY End TERM The COP and all stakeholders have access to completed revised NBSAPs from participating countries and 5th national reports in this project	75%	3 out of 4 countries (75%) have developed their draft NBSAPs 25% of participating countries have submitted their 5th national reports to the CBD and accessible through CBD website. https://www.cbd.int/reports/	S
utcome 4							
BD Country budgets adjusted as a result of knowing costs of capacities required , technology, and conservation gaps	By year 3 of the project the following will have been done: a) Capacity Development Plan For NBSAP Implementation. b)Technology Needs Assessment Reports. c)Communication Strategies are completed d)Resource Mobilisation Plan for NBSAP implementation	Most of the countries in this project conducted the capacity and technical needs assessment starting in 2002- but now need to repeat to update according to emerging scenarios			80%	Over 80% work achieved with regards to development of NBSAPs implementation capacity plans, technology needs assessment and resource mobilization plans	S

Outcome 5: Th	he current national	Operational National	BY End of project	Capacity gaps of biodiversity conservat
Informed professional entitites (and the general public are better BE	D structures	biodiversity		institutions identified and
equipped and able to improve BD Conservation. re	equire	conservation	-Stronger BD	recommendations integrated in the
b) The CBD Conference of the Parties (COP) uses results of the str	trengthening.	coordination	conservation	NBSAPs.
project for decion making to improve BD conservation guidance. Al	Il the participating	structures.	institutions with	
co	ountries have		operational	75% of implementing countries have fu
By end of project su	ubmitted their 4th	An updated CHM	CHMs compared	developed CHM with links to CBD netw
a) National BD Coordination Structures more strengthened and na	ational report to		to baseline	http://www.cbd.int/chm/network/
Operatinal (b) National CHM Operational th	he CBD	The 5th National		
c)Fifth National Reports submitted to the SCBD by the		Report completed	-General public	Enhanced BD information access throu
recommended COP 10 deadline		and feeds into COP	and stakeholders	CHM development.
		decisions	better informed	
			about BD	100% of implementing countries have
			conservation and	submitted Fifth National Reports to SC
			country specific	
			targets	
			-A monitoring	
			system in place	
			for following	
			progress of	
			NBSAP	
			implementation	

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				1	
Output 1: Stocktaking and Assessment	Dec-20	95%	95%	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	95%	95%		S
Activity 2: Identification of stakeholders; consultations and awareness	Dec-20	95%	95%		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	95%	95%		s
					S
Under Comp 2					
Output 2: Setting National Targets, Principles & Main priorities of the strategy	Dec-20	90%	90%	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	90%	90%		S
					S
					S
					S
der Comp 3					
Output 3: Strategy and action plan development	Dec-20	93%	95%	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	93%	93%		S
Activity 8: Application of the NBSAP to sub- national entities through sub-national and local consultations	Dec-20	93%	95%		S
Activity 9: Sectoral integration including mainstreaming into development, poverty reduction and climate change plans through sectoral consultations	Dec-20	95%	95%		S
					S
der Comp 4					
				NBSAPs approvals by respective governments and sectoral integration of BD issues is	
Output 4: Development of Implementation plans and Related activities	Dec-20	95%	95%	enhancing funding opportunities for NBSAP implementation	S
Activity 10: Development of a plan for capacity development for NBSAP implementation	Dec-20	95%	95%		S
Activity 11: Technology needs assessment	Dec-20	95%	95%		S
Activity 12: Development of a communication and outreach strategy for the NBSAP	Dec-20	75%	75%		S
Activity 13: Development of a plan for resource mobilization for NBSAP implementation	Dec-20	75%	75%		S
der Comp 5					
Output 5: Institutional, monitoring, reporting and exchange	Dec-20	75%	75%	Variance due to different project commence date. Most countries previously had CHMs which required updating and hence why this	S
Activity 14: Establishment / strengthening of national Coordination structures	Dec-20	75%	75%		S
Activity 15: CHM Development	Dec-20	75%	75%		
Activity 16: Development of indicators and monitoring approach	Dec-20	75%	75%		S
Activity 17: fifth National Reports	Dec-20	100%	100%		s

UN () environment programme													
Risk Rating													
	oject management Risk												
			Please refer to the Risk Help	Sheet for	more det	ails on rati	ng						
Risk Factor				EA's Ra	ting]			т	M's Rating	
1 Managemen	t structure - Roles and responsibilities	A	Low : Well develope Roles/responsibilities are cl potential negativ	early defin	ed/unders	tood. Low I	ikelihood of	A					
2 Governance	structure - Oversight	A	Low : Steering Committee once a yearand Active m making processes. SC p potential negativ	embership ovides dire	o and parti ection/inpu	cipation in its. Low like	decision- elihood of	A		hip an	d participation in decisio	project bodies meet at least once a yearand Active n-making processes. SC provides direction/inputs. negative impact on the project delivery.	
3 Implementat	ion schedule	A	Low : Project progressing a management is practiced potential negativ	and regula	ar monitori	ng. Low lik	elihood of	A					
4 Budget		A	Low : Activities are progre budget utilisation including impact	PMC. Lov		d of potenti		A				planned budgetand Balanced budget utilisation tential negative impact on the project delivery.	
5 Financial Ma	nagement	A	Moderate: ⊢unds are corre forand Audit reports prov funds. Moderate likelihood	ded regula	arly and co al negative	onfirm corre	ect use of	¥			arly and confirm correct	and transparently accounted forand Audit reports use of funds. Low likelihood of potential negative the project delivery.	
6 Reporting		A	Low : Substantive report Reports are complete and progress and implement negative im	l accurate ation issue	with a goo es. Low lik	od analysis elihood of	of project	A		ate witl	h a good analysis of pro	I in a timely manner and Reports are complete and oject progress and implementation issues. Low gative impact on the project delivery.	
7 Capacity to	leliver	A	Low : Sound technical and in project partners and 0 implementation or during negative im	apacity ga early stag	aps were a jes. Low lik	ddressed I kelihood of	pefore	¥		bacity g	gaps were addressed b	I capacity of institutions and other project partners efore implementation or during early stages. Low gative impact on the project delivery.	
If any of the r	sk factors is rated a Moderate or higher, pl	ease ii	nclude it in Table B below										
4.2 Table B. Ri	sk-log												
Implementat	ion Status (Current PIR)		0										
Insert Al I the	risks identified either at CEO endorsement (inc so	afeauards screenina) previo	is/current	PIRs and	MTRs 114	e the last lin	e to nron	nse a suaaes	sted co	onsolidated rating		
insert ALL the	risks identified entiter de CEO endorsement (Risk affecting:	is, cuirent	i ins, ullu		sk Rating		se a sayyes	neu ll	-	ation respect to last rating	
	Risk		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 sountries have been slow in preparing and remitting country requests to the GEF implementing gency. Often equests were incomplete or contained inconsistent text.	Outcome 1-5	м	L	L	L	L	L	=	Nothing changed
Risk 2: The review of several reports also showed that nany countries missed the opportunity to truly involve civil ociety in consultations	Outcome 1-5	M	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	L	L	L	L	L	=	Nothing changed
Lack of capacity: Experience from the Fourth National Report Umbrella Projects (both UNDP's and UNEP's) howed that many countries do not have adequate capacity or 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	М	L	L	L	L	L	=	Nothing changed
Risk 4: Data collection risk, in terms of non-validated eports or other data that could be incorrect or misstated.	Outcomes 1-5	м	L	L	L	L	L	=	Nothing changed
Partners, having made implementation commitments and let goals, back away from or abandon their goals as leadlines approach.	Outcomes 1-5	М	L	L	L	L	L	=	Nothing changed
Experience from past Umbrella programs (for 3rd and 4th tational 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 accomplete or contained inconsistent text		М	L	L	L	L	L	=	Nothing changed
Consolidated project risk		Not Applicat	ы м	м					This section focuses on the variation. The overall

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			Additional mitigation measures for the next periods					
	instance (PIR-1, MTR, etc.)		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.

Bit proper taking a type proper taking a type proper taking a type of taking a type proper taking a type of tak	t Minor Amendments	ne project design o	r implementation that do not be	we significant impact on the p	rolect objectives or scope, or an	n increase of the GEE project financ	ing un to 5% as described in Anney 9 of the Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines	
Note assednments Change Note assednments results framments Change Image: Assed as assed assed assed assed as assed assed assed as assed assed as assed assed assed assed as assed as assed assed assed assed as assed as assed assed assed assed as assed as assed as assed assed assed ass								
More amendments Changes Results framments Changes Results framments Changes Results framments Explain in table B Results framments Explain in table B <								
More amendments Changes Results framments Changes Results framments Changes Results framments Explain in table B Results framments Explain in table B <								
Result framework Image: Section of Se	5.1 Table A: Listing of all Min	nor Amendmer	nt (TM)					
Results framwork Image Groupporters and or opporters and o								
Components and coel Image: Components Components File coefficients schedule Explain in table B Decoring Endy Explain in table B Steparts Explain in table B Stepar		nts	Changes				Minor amendments	
Initial and independention rangement Implementation schedule Implementatio				None				
Financial management Explain in table B Exocuting Entity Exocuting Entity Exocuting Entity Exocuting		<u>.</u>						
Implementation scholde Explain in table B Brouting Entity Category Implementation scholde Implem		rangements						
Security Entry Interview Interview Security Entry Calegory - Min ropect clogebre change - Striggards - Risk analysis - Increase of CEP roject francing up to 5% - Cochrancing - <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	-							
Eventing Entity Category Image: Stategords			Explain in table B					
Nince project dijective change Image: Status in the case of GEP project financing up to 5%. Status in the case of GEP project financing up to 5%. Co-financing Co-financing <								
Stefgurds Image:								
Rek analysis Increase of GEF project financing up to 5% Increase of GE								
Increase of GEE project financing up to 5% Image: Contraining contraini contraining contraining contraining contrain	-							
Co-financing Image: Co-financing Location of project activity Image: Co-financing Other Image: Co-financing S.7 Table B: History of project revisions and/revensions (TM) Version Type Signed/Approved by UNEP Original leage instrument Image: Co-financing Amendment 1 Revision Extension 1 Extension Solution 1 Extension Solution 1 Extension 1 Solution 1 Extension 2 Solution 1 Extension 2 Solution 1 Extension 2 Solution 1 Extension 2 Solution 1 Extension 2	,							
Location of project activity Image: Introduced in this revision Other Image: Introduced in this revision 52 Table B: History of project revisions and/or extensions (TM) Original Legal instrument Image: Introduced in this revision Amendment 1 Revision Amendment 1 Revision Extension 1 Duration extensions: A few countries have not yet submitted ther NBSAPs to the CBD, countries not able to submit all the required reports on time. Image: Introduced are required fields insfar as an Agency chooses to etter 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 Reduced are required fields insfar as an Agency chooses to etter 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 Review approxization generation of 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 Review approxization as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as Opposed State as an Opposed State 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 Opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The location Name The location Name Lattude Longitude	., .	up to 5%						
Other Image: Control of Control	•							
S.2 Table B: History of project revisions and/or extensions (TM) S.2 Table B: History of project revisions and/or extensions (TM) Original legal instrument Main changes introduced in this revision Original legal instrument Main changes introduced in this revision Agreement Expiry Date Main changes introduced in this revision Agreement Expiry Date Main changes introduced in this revision Agreement Expiry Date Main changes introduced in this revision Agreement Expiry Date Main changes introduced in this revision Agreement Expiry Date Main changes introduced in this revision Agreement Expiry Date Main colspan="2">Main changes introduced in this revision Agreement Expiry Date Main colspan="2">Main colspan="2">Main colspan="2">Main colspan="2">Main colspan="2" Colspan="2" Colspan= Colspan="2" Main colspan="2" Colspan= Colspan=2 Main colspan= Colspan=2 Main colspan="2" Colspan= Colspan= Colspan=2 Colspan=Colspan=Colspan=Colspan=Colspan=Colspan=Colspan=Colspan=Colspan=Colspan=Colspan=Colspan=Colspan=								
Version Type Signed/Approved by UNEP Original Legal Instrument Image: Instrument i image: Instrument i image: Instrument i image: Instrument i image: I	Other							
Version Type Signed/Approved by UNEP Original Legal Instrument Image: Imag	E 2 Table D: History of proje	ot routoiono on	d/or oxtonoione (TM)					
Version Type Signed/Approved by UNEP signiture Date Agreement Expiry Date Main Changes introduced in this revision Original legal instrument i	5.2 Table B. History of proje	st revisions an	u/or extensions (TW)			1		
Amendment 1 Revision Image: Construction of the construction of t	Version	Туре	Signed/Approved by UNEP		Agreement Expiry Date		Main changes introduced in this revision	
Instant	Original Legal Instrument							
cocation 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 OrgenstreetMap Orgen	Amendment 1	Revision				Duration extension: A few countries	ave not yet submitted their NBSAPs to the CBD. countries not able to submit all the required reports on time.	
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 WG584 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 GeoName(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://geportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx)	Extension 1	Extension						
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 foliow 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/Imap=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://geportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx) Location Name Latitude Longitude Geo Name ID Location Description Required field Required field Geo Name ID Location Description Optional text field								
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 foliow 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/Imap=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://geportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx) Location Name Latitude Longitude Geo Name ID Location Description Required field Required field Geo Name ID Location Description Optional text field								
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 foliow 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/Imap=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://geportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx) Location Name Latitude Longitude Geo Name ID Location Description Required field Required field Geo Name ID Location Description Optional text field								
Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS&4 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://geportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.doc	ocation Information:							
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://geportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx) Location Name Latitude Congitude Geo Name ID Required field if the location is not an exact site Location Description Optional text field	The Location Name, Latitude and Lon	gitude are required	d fields insofar as an Agency cho	oses to enter a project locatio	n under the set format. The Ge	o 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	
here(https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx/								
Location Name Required field Latitude Required field Longitude Required field Geo Name ID Required field if the location is not an exact site Location Description Optional text field Activity Description Optional text field					use this format. Consider using	a conversion tool as needed, such	as: https://coordinates-converter.com Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking	
Location Name Lattude Longtude Required field Required field the location is not an exact site Optional text field Optional text field	nere(https://getportal.worldbank.org	/App/assets/gener	al/Geocoding%20User%20Guid	e.docx)				
Location Name Lattude Longtude Required field Required field the location is not an exact site Optional text field Optional text field								
Required field Required field Required field Required field the location is not an exact site Optional text field Optional text field	Location Name		Latitude	Longitudo	Geo Name ID	Location Description	Activity Description	
notanexact ste								
Nairobi/Global Project 1.27467 36.81178 Nairobi Nairobi/Global Project Coordination of 4 countries for NBSAP/NRS development					not an exact site			
			-1.27467	36.81178	Nairobi	Nairobi/Global Project	Coordination of 4 countries for NBSAP/NR5 development	
	Nairobi/Global Project							
	Nairobi/Global Project							

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]