

Umbrella Programme to Support NBSAP Update and the 7th National Reports

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11281

Countries

Global (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Congo DR, Cook Islands, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Kiribati, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Marshall Islands, Moldova, Montenegro, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Palau, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Tanzania, Togo, Tonga, T?rkiye, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Zambia, Angola, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Cote d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Micronesia, Namibia, Nauru, Nicaragua, North Macedonia, Qatar, Serbia, Uganda, Zimbabwe, Albania)

Project Name

Umbrella Programme to Support NBSAP Update and the 7th National Reports

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

4/13/2023

Review completed by PM

4/14/2023

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

EA

GEF-8 ENABLING ACTIVITY REVIEW SHEET

Section I - Enabling Activity Summary

Funding elements.

Is the enabling activity aligned with the relevant GEF funding elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF-8 Programming Directions? Is the General Enabling Activity Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

4/14/2023

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Cost Ranges.

If there was a deviation in the cost range, was this explained?

Secretariat's Comments

4/14/2023

No deviation. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Enabling activity summary.

Is the enabling activity summary clear? Are the components in Table B and as described in the enabling activity request sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objectives?

Secretariat's Comments

4/14/2023

Yes, for the most part.

Please clarify how the costing of component three was developed and identified.

Please clarify how the UNEP-led component three relates to the UNDP-led component three for supporting countries in revising their NBSAPs and producing the 7th NR.

5/15/2023

Please provide response in the portal per normal practice.

5/15/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

05/16/2023

A. Clarification on how the costing of component 3 was developed and identified.

The justification for the costing of Component 3, and the process for developing these costs, is as follows:

- a. Length of project: This project will last 42 months, requiring a lengthy period of technical support, as well as project management.
- b. Likely delays: In the past, our experience with the 4th, 5th, and 6th National Reports as well as NBSAP support is that even with clear deadlines set by the CBD, countries often face roadblocks and delays.
- c. Variable timelines: In addition, our experience is that countries will have variable timelines, and variable technical needs at different times of the project cycle, requiring ongoing technical support throughout the project.

d. High variability in capacity needs: Unlike the Early Action Support project, which had a clearly defined set of technical capacity and needs, the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework has a much larger set of potential capacity needs, cross sectoral entity needs (whole of government/whole of society and countries will vary in their technical capacity requirements).

e. Difficulty of some of the new GBF Targets: The Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework has many new elements, many of which will require in-depth technical support and capacity strengthening, such as policy coherence plans.

f. Assumptions: Based on our past experience in supporting Enabling Activities, including NBSAPs and National Reports, we've found that the following expertise is required to fully deliver adequate technical support:

i. Technical experts for key technical areas: The GBF has 23 targets. Although some of them are not new, such as restoration and protection, they will still require technical support. For example, Target 3 is similar to Aichi Target 11, but achieving this target will likely require technical support in identifying opportunities for reaching 30% of lands and waters. Other targets are new, bringing new requirements, expertise, and approaches. Target 14, for example, requires a new level of policy coherence that has been largely absent from both the Aichi Targets, as well as from global discourse. Similarly, the issue of reporting the financial risks, dependencies, and opportunities of nature will require new technical guidance, new case studies, and dedicated, technical support to countries.

ii. Extensive language expertise: UNDP/UNEP supports countries who speak English, Spanish, Portuguese, French, Arabic and Russian, among other languages. All webinars, trainings, guidance documents and communications are in these working languages. The costs of simultaneous interpretations and translations of documents has increased dramatically over the past five years.

iii. Learning and instructional design experts: Our experience is that simply preparing a document and distributing to governments is often insufficient for learning and adoption of new concepts. Instead, we've found a high appetite for facilitated learning methods such as workshops, webinars, training courses that help make learning more interesting, efficient, and effective. Our

learning courses, for example, typically have a satisfaction rate of 95% or higher. This was the case with a recent Restoration Massive Open Online Course, which targeted both general national-level stakeholders (reaching 16,850 learners), and a private version aimed at CBD focal points and their designated learners (reaching more than 150 learners). We have found that transforming guidance documents into interactive sessions, self-paced tutorials as one of the most effective ways to support learning, especially on difficult topics. However, it can also be expensive, and each must be in Six UN Languages .

iv. Web and programming experts: All webinars that we develop are available on a dedicated site within the NBSAP Forum. For just the Early Action Support project, we anticipate at least 100 recorded webinars in multiple languages. Making these widely available for countries after the fact requires dedicated web and programming support, which is ongoing.

v. Coordination for national-level needs and responses: We anticipate that each country will have its own set of national-level needs. As the global technical support program, we aim to be as responsive to these needs as possible. This requires an ongoing set of on-call experts who can help provide data, advice, technical guidance, and support.

B. Clarification of how the UNEP-led component three relates to the UNDP-led component three for supporting countries in revising their NBSAPs and producing the 7th NR.

As with the Early Action Support project, UNDP and UNEP will collaborate closely to ensure seamless technical support to countries, while also maintaining differentiated responsibilities due to institutional mandates and operational processes. We anticipate the following distribution of technical support between our two agencies for providing support on the technical aspects of Component 1:

Primarily UNEP-supported:

1.1.1 Development and implementation of a comprehensive stakeholder engagement plan, to promote an all-of-society approach to the NBSAP.

1.1.3 Building on the results of the Early Action Support grants to accelerate early action on NBSAPs, identify and prioritize essential gaps and inconsistencies between the existing NBSAP, areas for alignments through the EAS and changes needed to achieve the Global Biodiversity Framework.

1.1.5 An assessment of the potential environmental and social impacts and potential risks of the implementation of the updated NBSAP.

1.1.8 An assessment of gaps in capacities and resources available undertaken and on that basis, develop plans or strategies for capacity development and resource mobilization, building on the work undertaken under the early support action project, the umbrella program to support development of biodiversity finance plans, and other initiatives such as BIOFIN.

UNEP primary lead

3.1.1. A suite of e-learning offerings on a range of GBF-related topics on a demand-driven basis including - Integrated Financing Options, Integrating the Two Protocol Issues in INTEGRATING THE TWO PROTOCOL Issues, Synergies, DSI AND related Benefit Sharing issues, Customization and use OF DaRT, SEEA to support NBSAP updates.

3.1.3 Global catalogue of best practices related to NBSAPs across the 23 GBF targets, including documentation of emerging lessons and best practices captured by dedicated knowledge products, technical publications, videos, websites, articles, and podcast episodes.

3.1.7 ? Flagship summary reports on ? Capacity Development through Guidance on ? UN Agencies support at national level, policy coherence, Legal and treaty preparedness, support to regional hubs for technical and scientific cooperation, Data Governance for GBF implementation, Trade and Biodiversity nexus, human rights based approaches, role of non-state actors and reporting on their contributions.

Strengthening the Marine and Coastal elements of the NBSAPs in line with GBF Targets (eg. Targets 3 and 6) by engagement of the various stakeholders including regional seas Secretariat and National Focal points to harmonize indicators for monitoring and reporting

Primarily UNDP-supported

1.1.2 A national gender analysis and action plan developed to ensure gender mainstreaming within consultation processes and within actions to advise the NBSAP updating and revision process.

1.1.4 Building on the results from policy alignment reviews included in the Early Action Support project, develop an NBSAP section that addresses policy alignment and coherence, and biodiversity mainstreaming into key sectors within the NBSAP. UNDP and UNEP Co-lead.

1.1.6 Building on nationally and globally available data, develop a first approximation of spatial priorities for Target 1, and develop a spatialized action plan for other area-based targets, including Targets 2, 3, 8, 9, 11 and 12, within the NBSAP.

1.1.7 Building on the results of the Early Action Support project, identify an action plan for eliminating or phasing out harmful subsidies and incentives within the NBSAP

|

UNDP primary lead

3.1.1. A suite of e-learning offerings on a range of GBF-related topics on a demand-driven basis

3.1.7 Flagship summary reports highlighting key issues, including a Global NBSAP Gender Report, a Global NBSAP Ambition Report, and a Global Spatial Report

Primarily UNEP, with UNDP:

3.1.2. Interactive webinars to highlight best practices.

|

Technical support to National Reports:

We anticipate close collaboration between UNDP, UNEP, and CBD, to develop and provide guidance in alignment with the CBD decisions. We anticipate continuing to work collaboratively across each of the deliverables, we anticipate the following distribution of activities from Component 3.

|

Co-leading in the following areas (UNEP & UNDP)

1.1.2 A national gender analysis and action plan developed to ensure gender mainstreaming within consultation processes and within actions to advise the NBSAP updating and revision process.

1.1.4 Building on the results from policy alignment reviews included in the Early Action Support project, develop an NBSAP section that addresses policy alignment and coherence, and biodiversity mainstreaming into key sectors within the NBSAP [UNEP & UNDP to co-lead]

Technical Support during preparation of National Reports, including harmonization and streamlining reporting with other relevant Conventions and National reporting obligations.

3.1.4. In-country implementation processes supported by dedicated technical advice from global experts including technical review of NBSAPs on a demand-driven basis, and peer to peer exchanges.

3.1.5. Dedicated support to global efforts to raise awareness of the value of biodiversity, and the importance of NBSAPs, at global levels, including through online events that help to mobilize political will and ambition.

3.1.6 Communication and outreach activities to facilitate exchange of experiences and best practices amongst countries and promote international cooperation, including regional and global in-person annual meetings, best practice workshops and CBD side events.

Section 2 - Enabling Activity Supporting Information

Eligibility Criteria.

Is this enabling activity eligible for GEF funding?

Secretariat's Comments

4/14/2023

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Institutional framework.

Are the institutional arrangements for implementation adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

4/14/2023

Yes, for the most part.

Please clarify how the Steering Committee of the UNEP-led NBSAP revision and 7th NR process will communicate with and liaise with the Steering Committee for the UNDP-led NBSAP revision and 7th NR process.

5/15/2023

Please provide response in the portal per normal practice.5/15/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

05/16/2023

The Global Programme Board/Steering Committee will mirror that of the existing GEF EAS. UNEP and UNDP are both listed under the category of 'Development Partners' in the Organization structure of the Steering Committee (SC) included under section C (Institutional Framework) of the proposal. SC meetings will be a key mechanism to facilitate communication between UNDP and UNEP at the highest level. There will be a single Umbrella Steering Committee which will meet virtually. The Text in the Project concept and Figure 1 has been modified accordingly to reflect the structure.

Monitoring and Evaluation.

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?

Secretariat's Comments

4/14/2023

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Section 3. Information Tables

GEF resource availability.

Is the proposed GEF financing in Table F (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/14/2023

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

4/14/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments
4/14/2023

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's Comments
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments
4/14/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments
SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat's Comments
4/14/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments
4/14/2023

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's Comments
Rio Markers.

Are the Rio Markers for CCM ,CCA, BD and LD presented?

Secretariat's Comments

4/14/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Country endorsement.

Has the project been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point at the time of the EA submission and has the name and position been checked against the GEF database? Are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in Portal

Secretariat's Comments

4/14/2023

The following countries have not submitted a Letter of Endorsement: Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Cook Islands, Cote d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Kenya, Mali, Micronesia, Namibia, Nauru, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Qatar, Senegal, Serbia, Solomon Islands, Tanzania, Togo, Tonga, Uganda, Vanuatu and Zimbabwe. Please upload all of the LOEs when the revised submission is presented.

5/15/2023

Please provide response in the portal per normal practice.

5/15/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

05/16/2023

70 LoEs uploaded in the Portal covering all the UNEP supported countries

Response to Comments

Are all the comments adequately responded to? (only as applicable)

Gef Secretariat comments

Secretariat's Comments

4/14/2023

NA

Agency's Comments

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat's Comments

4/14/2023

NA

Agency's Comments

Project Budget Table.

Is the project budget table attached? Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

Secretariat's Comments

5/15/2023

UNEP's budget indeed pays for PMC and M&E out of the \$450,000 per country, yielding \$25,237 less per country for country activities (Components 1 & 2) than should go to each country. Please revise accordingly and as recommended in the email sent on May 15, 2023, to the agency. Please note that in Table B the following lines must be changed: 1) Technical components / country activities (components 1 & 2); 2) PMC; 3) Total project financing.

The total project financing should increase by at least \$1,775,000 (=70*\$25,237). The PMC for the global platform and for all country activities, and the M&E costs, should be reported under "global set-aside" in table F, in addition to the budget for component 3.

Please also note that policy sets the maximum PMC cost at 5%, UNEP is using a figure of 4.8% which is permissible but please be sure that this is an adequate amount for PMC.

Please make the proper revisions and resubmit.

5/15/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

05/16/2023

Budget revised and re-submission made as per the review guidance.

Environmental and Social Safeguards.

**If there are screening documents or other ESS documents available, have these been attached?
(only as applicable)**

Secretariat's Comments

4/14/2023

NA

Agency's Comments

**GEFSEC DECISION
RECOMMENDATION.**

Is CEO clearance/ approval recommended?

Secretariat's Comments

4/14/2023

Please clarify the issues above.

Also, please correct the submission dates for the NBSAP revision to October 2024.

Please correct the submission date for the 7th NR to February 28, 2026.

With regard to this reference on gender: "the GBF is more ambitious, and includes a broader scope of targets, including dedicated gender balanced targets" -- The GBF has gender-responsive targets, not gender-balanced targets. Please revise the text to read gender-responsive targets.

5/15/2023

No. A number of issues were raised above including issues related to LOEs and no responses are provided in the portal.

Please provide responses per normal practice and note how the project revision addressed all of these comments.

Please also correct the budget as presented above and also presented here:

UNEP's budget indeed pays for PMC and M&E out of the \$450,000 per country, yielding \$25,237 less per country for country activities (Components 1 & 2) than should go to each country. Please revise accordingly and as recommended in the email sent on May 15, 2023, to the agency. Please note that in Table B the following lines must be changed: 1) Technical components / country activities (components 1 & 2); 2) PMC; 3) Total project financing.

The total project financing should increase by at least \$1,775,000 ($=70 * \$25,237$). The PMC for the global platform and for all country activities, and the M&E costs, should be reported under "global set-aside" in table F, in addition to the budget for component 3.

Please also note that policy sets the maximum PMC cost at 5%, UNEP is using a figure of 4.8% which is permissible but please be sure that this is an adequate amount for PMC.

Please submit revision on May 16, 2023.

5/16/2023

Project is recommended for clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat's Comments

REVIEW DATE(S)

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/14/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/16/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Review

Agency Response

Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)