



REQUEST FOR MSP APPROVAL (1-STEP PROCEDURE)

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title:	Support to GEF Eligible Countries for achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 Through a Globally Guided NBSAPs Update Process		
Country(ies):	Global	GEF Project ID:	t.b.d.
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP, UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	UNDP PIMS: 5283 UNEP ADDIS No. 01160
Other Executing Partner(s):	UNDP-GEF, UNEP-DEPI/GEF and UNEP-WCMC	Submission Date:	September 27, 2013
		Re-submission Date:	October 24, 2013
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration (Months)	30
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	n/a	Project Agency Fee (\$):	161,500

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD5 Integrate CBD Obligations into National Planning Processes through Enabling Activities	5.1: Development and sectoral planning frameworks at country level integrate measurable biodiversity conservation and sustainable use targets.	At least 50% of countries implementing BD EA with GEF support have successfully included measurable and Aichi-inspired biodiversity conservation and sustainable use targets into their national development and sectoral planning frameworks	GEF TF	1,700,000	2,000,000
Total project costs			GEF TF	1,700,000	2,000,000

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: As an overall contribution to the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 at the global level, to provide technical support to all eligible countries accessing GEF Biodiversity Enabling Activities funding, with a view to improving the quality benchmark and policy relevance of the next generation of NBSAPs, while also enhancing public participation in the NBSAP preparation process.

Project Component	Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
1) Global learning and technical content development	TA	<p><i>New and innovative knowledge management tools enhance global learning on biodiversity planning and support GEF-financed NBSAP development processes, so that NBSAPs become more relevant policy instruments, integrated into sectoral national plans strategies and policies, thereby making a significant contribution to achieving Aichi Target 17. Evidenced by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technical quality benchmarks for GEF financed NBSAPs are established and adopted in self-assessment and peer-review mechanisms delivered through 	<p>1.1 User-friendly, customizable tools, e-learning, voluntary templates, guidance material and assessment methodologies and checklists for technical quality benchmarking of NBSAP products before submission, are developed and widely applied in GEF-financed NBSAP development processes. They are primarily disseminated through the 'NBSAP Forum (e-based community of practice dedicated to NBSAPs).</p> <p>1.2 Online spatial planning tools for key thematic areas and cross-cutting issues are made available to countries to facilitate biodiversity</p>	GEFTF	891,500	1,000,000

Project Component	Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
		<p>Component 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least 50% of NBSAPs fully address, at a minimum, Targets 2,3,5,11,12,13,14, 15 and 20. - NBSAP Forum become a key medium for facilitation and learning with respect to GEF financed NBSAPs and make tools fully available to countries in multiple languages. - Best practices in NBSAP development are compiled and disseminated. 	<p>status assessments.</p> <p>1.3 The NBSAP Forum Web Portal is functional and well maintained: (i) fully operational by end 2013; (ii) further developed to fulfill evolving clients' needs throughout the project's duration; (iii) hosting and maintenance are taken over by CBD for sustainability.</p> <p>1.4 A partnership framework for collaboration among all agencies and entities involved in NBSAP process emerges with a view to supporting client countries and developing best practices.</p>			
2) Direct technical support delivery	TA	<p><i>Targeted, timely and high quality technical support to countries enables the adoption of best practices, guidelines and other materials, and corroborate the long-term goal of developing countries' capacity of countries to carry out effective biodiversity planning. Evidenced by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Various statistics kept on direct technical support illustrate the scope of the project's outreach, e.g. number and types of "NBSAP architects"¹ that benefit from direct technical support delivery, length and intensity of support through the NBSAP Forum and training. - Results from anonymous client satisfaction surveys the quality of peer-review and expert review, online webinars, e-learning, spatial planning tools and other tools. - More than half of client countries has had access to a technical support person. 	<p>2.1 Peer and expert review technical support is provided to countries on a 'demand-driven' and 'match-making' basis for each phase of NBSAP development process, including (i) preparation and stocktaking; (ii) national targets setting (iii) preparation and validation of the NBSAPs; (iv) action, implementation and resource mobilization planning; and (v) monitoring and reporting (in close collaboration with the CBD Secretariat).</p> <p>2.2 Online webinars and both virtual and in person workshops are facilitated guiding NBSAP processes through critical steps and to the benefit of client countries.</p> <p>2.4 A framework for monitoring client satisfaction and for creating a feedback loop for technical support delivery is effective by end 2013.</p>	GEFTF	658,500	800,000
Subtotal					1,550,000	1,800,000
Project Management Cost (PMC)				GEFTF	150,000	200,000
Total Project Cost					1,700,000	2,000,000

¹ "NBSAP architects" may be the BD EA coordinator, core consultants, the CBD National Focal Point and other CBD Focal Points (see [Link](#)), focal points for other relevant conventions involved in the process, including both the biodiversity-related conventions (CITES, CMS, Plant Treaty, Ramsar, WHS – see [Link](#)) and the other Rio Conventions (see [Link](#)), leaders and focal points within entities involved in the NBSAP process.

C. CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME IF AVAILABLE, (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Cofinancing	Name of Cofinancier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	UNDP	Cash	1,000,000
GEF Agency	UNEP	Cash	1,000,000
Total Cofinancing			2,000,000

Note: Refer to Annex D for letters.

D. GEF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/Global	Grant Amount(\$) (a)	Agency Fee (\$) (b) ²	Total (\$) c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Global	850,000	80,750	930,750
UNEP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Global	850,000	80,750	930,750
Total Grant Resources				1,700,000	161,500	1,861,500

¹In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table.

PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	952,000	700,000	1,652,000
National/Local Consultants	0	0	0

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

Contents

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION	1
A. Focal Area Strategy Framework	1
C. Co-financing for the project by source and by name if available, (\$)	3
D. GEF Resources Requested by Agency, Focal Area and Country	3
E. Consultants working for technical assistance components:	3
F. Does the project include a “non-grant” instrument?	3
PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION	6
A. Project Overview	6
A.1. Project Description.....	6
1) <i>The global environmental problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed</i>	6
2) <i>The baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects</i>	7
3) <i>The proposed alternative scenario, with a thorough description of project components</i>	12
4) <i>Incremental cost reasoning</i>	18
6) <i>Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up</i>	19
A.2. Stakeholders	21
A.3. Socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions considerations	22
A.4. Risks.....	23
A.5. Cost-effectiveness reflected in project design	24
A.6. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives.....	24
A.7 Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation.....	25
B. Description of the consistency of the project with:	25
B.1. National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions	25
B.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities	25
C. Budgeted M & E plan	27
PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)	29
A. Record of Endorsement of GEF Operational Focal Point(s) on Behalf of the Government(s)	29
B. GEF agency(ies) certification	29
ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK	30
ANNEX B: BUDGET	34
ANNEX C: TERMS OF REFERENCE	37
Activity Coordination	37
Site Moderation	37
Knowledge Management	37
Expert Review Support	38
ANNEX D: CO-FINANCING LETTERS	39

Acronyms

BD EA	Biodiversity Enabling Activities
BIOFIN	UNDP's Biodiversity Finance Initiative
BIOPAMA	IUCN's Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management
BIP	Biodiversity Indicators Partnership
CBD	Convention of Biological Diversity
CHM	Clearing House Mechanism
CI	Conservation International
CMS	Convention on Migratory Species
COP	Conference of the Parties
DEFRA	Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
DELC	UNEP's Division of Environmental Law and Conventions
DEPI	UNEP's Division of Environmental Policy Implementation.
FAO	UN's Food and Agriculture Organisation
GIZ	German International Cooperation Agency
GLOBE	The Global Legislators Organisation
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
IUCN PACO	IUCN's West and Central Africa Programme
JRC	EU's Joint Research Centre
LDC	Least Developed Country
MIKE	Monitoring of Illegal Killings of Elephants
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans
PoWPA	CBD's Program of Work on Protected Areas
ROPME	UNEP's Regional (Red Sea) Organization for the Protection of the Marine Environment
SANBI	South Africa Biodiversity Institute
SIDS	Small Island Development State
SPREP	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme
TEEB	The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization
WAVES	World Bank Wealth Accounting through the Valuation of Ecosystem Services Project
WCMC	UNEP's World Conservation Monitoring Centre
WCPA	World Consortium on Protected Areas
WHS	World Heritage Site
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. PROJECT OVERVIEW

A.1. Project Description

1. **Summary.** By mid 2013, some 130+ countries have accessed the GEF's Biodiversity Enabling Activities (BD EA) with the aim of updating their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) to incorporate the Aichi Targets and fulfilling other related obligations before the Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD). However, these countries count on uneven levels of technical support for the task, in spite of current and growing demand for it. Most countries receive only basic technical and operational support while others no support at all—even though experience shows that this support is vital for a successful outcome of policy-oriented projects. This global project will address this issue and make a key contribution to the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 at the global level, which predicates the development, adoption and initial implementation of NBSAPs as effective policy instruments (for biodiversity mainstreaming). Through close collaboration between UNDP and UNEP, the two main GEF agencies for BD EA, this project will cement the 'NBSAP global partnership', together with the CBD Secretariat, a key partner in the equation, and provide quality and focused technical support to all countries that have accessed—or will access—GEF resources for BD EA. This will be achieved through a two-pronged approach. First, it will support the development of a suite of guidance tools (using primarily electronic media and innovative learning methods). The project will also avail spatial planning tools that can be easily be adopted in NBSAP-relevant biodiversity assessments. Technical quality benchmarks will be established and countries encouraged to apply them. The project will also co-support the sustainable maintenance of the NBSAP Forum Web Portal, which will function as a the main mechanism for availing guidance and bringing together multiple partners, government entities, regions and individuals to support the NBSAP process globally. The Forum will also serve to and track progress and report on the NBSAP processes. Second, the project will directly deliver technical support to all eligible countries accessing GEF BD EA funding. This will imply the operationalisation of mechanisms such as peer review and expert review, webinars and the participation of project experts in CBD organized workshops as resource persons. Overall, the project aims to improve the quality benchmark and policy relevance of the new generation of NBSAPs, while also enhancing public participation in the NBSAP preparation process.

1) The global environmental problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed

2. **Context and Issues.** In 2010, the Tenth Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD COP-10) agreed on an ambitious Strategic Plan for 2011-2020, including a set of global "Aichi Targets." The Targets represent the global response to challenges pertaining to biodiversity loss and degradation of ecosystem services, which were thoroughly analyzed in the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005) and in the Third Global Biodiversity Outlook (2010). The rationale for the new plan is that biological diversity underpins ecosystem functioning and the provision of ecosystem services essential for human well-being. Biodiversity provides for food security, human health, the provision of clean air and water; it contributes to local livelihoods and economic development, and, is essential for the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals, including for poverty reduction goals.

3. Included in the Aichi Targets are: i) a call to Parties to update their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and ii) ensure that they become effective policy instruments. This is the essence of Aichi Target 17, which recognises the importance of sound national policies in contributing to the overall implementation of the Strategic Plan 2011-2020 (refer to COP 10 Decision X/2). The Plan has set a challenging and ambitious vision that "*biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystem*

services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people.” (ibid.) The Strategic Plan’s mission further stresses that “adequate financial resources are provided, capacities are enhanced, biodiversity issues and values mainstreamed, appropriate policies are effectively implemented, and decision-making is based on sound science and the precautionary approach.” (ibid.)

4. The revised NBSAPs have the potential to be the main conduit to achieving these goals at the country level. This is confirmed in Paragraph 14 of the Strategic Plan on ‘Means of Implementation’: *“National biodiversity strategies and action plans are key instruments for translating the Strategic Plan to national circumstances, including through the national targets, and for integrating biodiversity across all sectors of government and society. The participation of all relevant stakeholders should be promoted and facilitated at all levels of implementation. Initiatives and activities of indigenous and local communities, contributing to the implementation of the Strategic Plan at the local level, should be supported and encouraged. The means for implementation may vary from country to country, according to national needs and circumstances. Nonetheless, countries should learn from each other when determining appropriate means for implementation.[...]”*

2) The baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects

5. A review of all NBSAPs produced by 2010, and discussed during the COP10 and in other arenas, highlighted several major weaknesses in the previous generation of strategies and action plans.² The most striking conclusions from this evaluative report are: (1) Not all of the NBSAPs have placed biodiversity into a broader development policy context. Only a few countries have attempted to put strong emphasis on development in their NBSAPs, but the reverse was not true – i.e. development planning in those countries had no focus on biodiversity. (2) Most NBSAPs analyzed highlighted the need to value and create economic incentives for biodiversity, but only a few effectively moved beyond general statements and established policies that reflected this. (3) Only very few countries included time bound and measurable targets. The inclusion of targets was in fact only observed for the newer NBSAPs produced around 2009/2010. The same applied to the inclusion of mechanisms for monitoring and review progress at country level. (4) A fourth important conclusion was that there is a wide gap between the planning contained in NBSAPs and their implementation. The review goes on to state that, because reports typically did not make clear linkages between biodiversity, ecosystem services and human wellbeing, political will in support of implementation was chronically low, and implementation of the plans highly uneven, with the majority of plans not implemented.

6. It is notable that the majority of plans are today outdated (9-10 years old, on average), which means that they do not incorporate the CBD Programmes of Work, the important decisions from COP6 onwards, nor the newly revised CBD Strategic Plan. This also means that the majority of NBSAPs do not adequately address several key issues that have emerged over the past decade, including the importance of ecosystem services in alleviating poverty, the importance of mainstreaming biodiversity into diverse sectors, and the importance of ecosystem-based approaches to climate resilience, adaptation and mitigation. In hindsight, we can also conclude today that, because NBSAP from the first generation rarely included financial mechanisms, most strategies did not leverage sufficient finance and, as a result, did not get effectively implemented. Furthermore, UNDP’s and UNEP’s own experience with supporting various NBSAP processes from the previous generation served to identify several other weaknesses, including:

- Limited access to (or knowledge of) essential and publicly available data for assessing the status of biodiversity and ecosystems;

² Prip, C. and T. Gross. 2010. Biodiversity Planning: An Assessment of National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans. Tokyo: UNU-IAS. 273 pages.

- Limited analytical capacity among NBSAP authors/framers to present key issues in biodiversity management and formulate a strategic response;
- Limited stakeholder consultation and insufficient disclosure of key documentation;
- Narrow scope of participation in NBSAP development and validation exercises;
- Limited experience with biodiversity mainstreaming analysis;
- Poor financial planning for the implementation of NBSAPs, often building on incorrect assumptions and unrealistic projections with respect to required financial resources; and
- Lack of political support for NBSAP implementation, linked primarily to pervasive lack of awareness on biodiversity values and ecosystem services in most societies.

7. Many of these issues have today a good basis for being addressed. In fact, paragraph 6 of the CBD's Strategic Plan 2011-2020 recognizes the following weaknesses with respect to CBD implementation in general: "*Most Parties identify a lack of financial, human and technical resources as limiting their implementation of the Convention. Technology transfer under the Convention has been very limited. Insufficient scientific information for policy and decision making is a further obstacle for the implementation of the Convention. [...]*" Clearly, NBSAPs are a key vehicle for a country to plan how CBD implementation issues can be addressed and how biodiversity management can gain political traction within society.

8. The GEF confirmed its support to the process of updating NBSAPs by prioritizing BD EA in its GEF-5 Strategy and setting aside funds for the purpose. GEF funds have been made available to all eligible countries, either directly or through a process facilitated by a GEF agency of their choice. UNEP and UNDP are the primary agencies for BD EA, assisting more than 130 countries throughout the globe. FAO is assisting one country, while a handful of countries have made use of the new window of direct access to GEF resources for EA introduced in GEF-5. To date, the vast majority of all GEF eligible countries have accessed GEF BD EA. Implementation of these BD EA projects is progressing, though at unequal pace, given the different and varied national circumstances. Most importantly, the support that countries receive on technical and operational issues is also uneven. The support received by BD EA projects supported by GEF Agencies is consistent with the role that these agencies play is the management of GEF funds, but it generally very basic, while 'direct access countries' receive no support at all.

9. **Baseline Programmes.** Currently, there are a number of projects, programmes and initiatives that co-support the NBSAP process globally that are being rolled out. They constitute the financial baseline for this project and relate to it in different ways, as it will be presented. The following can be mentioned:

- *Japan funding to the CBD Secretariat for regional workshops and technical backstopping:* Since 2011, the CBD Secretariat has benefitted from specific funding from Japan for conducting multiple workshops aimed at building countries' capacity for biodiversity planning, implementation and reporting. With a budget of \$8M per year, the project benefits primarily CBD national focal points and CBD Program of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA) focal points. These have included workshops on protected areas; valuation and mainstreaming; NBSAP development; target setting; and national reporting. For the purpose of baseline calculation (considering amounts that are directly relevant to NBSAP-related activities), the Japan Biodiversity Fund contributes to this project's baseline finance with approximately \$3M for its duration.³
- *Multi-partner UNDP Biodiversity Finance Initiative:* Since the CBD COP11, UNDP has launched the global initiative BIOFIN, supported by the European Commission and the Governments of Germany and

³ The CBD Secretariat is a key partner in this project and the activities of the Japan Biodiversity Fund essential to co-support the project's objective. It could be an obvious co-financier, but the Secretariat is barred from co-financing GEF projects for legal reasons. Therefore, the funding is herein presented as baseline finance.

Switzerland. It aims at developing methodologies for quantifying the biodiversity finance gap at national level, and for reducing the cost of biodiversity management through an effective mainstreaming of biodiversity into national development and sectoral planning. BIOFIN is also undertaking a broad level Public Expenditure Review in selected countries. A total of \$8.8M has been between mobilized under the BIOFIN. For the purpose of calculations, \$4M represents the baseline for this project, half of which – i.e. \$2.0M – will co-finance it.

- *NBSAP Two-Point-Zero Project*: UNEP and the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) are jointly implementing the “NBSAP 2.0” Project, in partnership with UNDP, and with funding from the UK Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA). The project focuses on mainstreaming of biodiversity in poverty and development planning, looking at an in-depth process in seven countries in Africa, and is planning to disseminate lessons learned through the NBSAP Forum in early 2014. The project’s amount which counts against the baseline represents \$0.5M and serves as part of UNEP’s co-financing to this project.
- *Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)*: UNDP is working with partners UNEP-WCMC and the Government of Norway to respond to calls for IPBES to include an effective capacity building programme in the science-policy interface. More specifically, UNDP is currently developing web-based capacity building tools for scientists, policy-makers and local implementers of the three Rio Conventions and other multilateral agreements relating to biodiversity and ecosystem services. This demand-based initiative can potentially contribute to NBSAP processes in various countries. The baseline amount of the IPBES collaboration represents to date \$50K.
- *WAVES and TEEB*: Two global programmes of significant scope are also part of the financial baseline for this project and are relevant to NBSAP’s policy-making elements in different ways: the World Bank Wealth Accounting through the Valuation of Ecosystem Services (WAVES) project and The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB). Valuation and methods such as the TEEB are relevant theme to the NBSAP. Both UNDP-GEF and UNEP-DEPI are exploring the scope for a closer collaboration with the TEEB Secretariat. The relevance of the funding attached to these two initiatives was assessed at approximately \$1M for the duration of the project.

10. **The total financial baseline for this project amounts to \$6.5 million.**

11. In addition, UNDP, UNEP-WCMC and the CBD Secretariat decided in 2012 to work together to address the issue of limited technical support to NBSAP countries, by forming the *NBSAP Forum*. The NBSAP Forum has been launched during COP11 in Hyderabad and received wide and high-level support from COP participants. The Forum is a global community of practice that develops capacity, shares learning and offers countries support in updating and implementing their NBSAPs. As a partnership between the CBD Secretariat, UNDP and UNEP, the Forum proposes to coalesce and coordinate support from numerous initiatives that can contribute to ‘transformative NBSAPs’ – e.g. facilitating access to biodiversity data, dissemination of knowledge, methodologies, analysis and mapping tools.⁴

12. ***The Long Term Solution.*** In order for NBSAPs to go beyond the baseline and become effective national conduits for fulfilling the goals of the CBD Strategic Plan, a number of basic conditions will need to be met, including but not limited to:

- A commitment to fully integrating biodiversity and ecosystem services into sectoral, poverty alleviation and development plans;

⁴ To date, the Forum has only counted with seed funds (<\$150K) from UNDP and UNEP; This has hence with no impact on the financial baseline.

- Ensuring that the basic conditions for participatory NBSAP development are in place and that consultations are held with a wide range of sectors, groups and segments of society (including traditionally marginalized populations, business and industry, finance organizations, and more);
- An emphasis on protected areas as a primary, efficient and cost-effective vehicle for achieving many of the Aichi Targets;
- An understanding of the fundamental need to fully incorporate climate change resilience principles into all aspects of biodiversity conservation, including an understanding of key thresholds, tipping points for regime shifts, and the natural limits of ecosystems;
- Recognition that a range of finance policies and mechanisms will be needed to secure the resources required to implement NBSAPs, coupled with an understanding that biodiversity mainstreaming is the tool by which countries can identify and unlock many potential financial mechanisms; and
- The need to look beyond each Aichi Target and NBSAP component to develop integrated, holistic strategies that tackle the many inter-related of biodiversity management challenges.

13. The long term solution implies the new generation of NBSAPs fully embracing the Aichi Targets in national development planning and finance frameworks. They become the key conduit at the national level. for achieving all of the Aichi Targets and implementing the CBD's Strategic Plan. In an ideal world, the large majority of GEF supported NBSAPs will contain feasible action, implementation and financing plans, which will be implemented. As a result, national capacity for biodiversity planning, implementation and reporting is incrementally enhanced.

14. **Barriers.** There are two overarching barriers that stand in the way of advancing the preferred long-term solution:

Barrier #1: Available instructive content on NBSAPs has gaps, including in terms of the uptake of the available information, and it is not conducive to the emergence of widespread participation into NBSAP development processes, to higher quality NBSAPs, nor to improvements in national capacity for biodiversity planning and management.

15. While there is no shortage of guidance documents available to governments on biodiversity planning, much of it focuses on process and is scattered around many websites and publications. There is limited guidance that is related to the current challenges facing biodiversity planning, in particular on establishing national Aichi-inspired targets and addressing biodiversity management issues through mainstreaming. Both the reviews of strategies and action plans from the first generation of NBSAPs and recent stock-taking exercises on existing guidance and delivery methods⁵ point out to gaps. There is a clear absence of instructive and utilitarian guidance that is readily available, easily consumable and, more importantly, guidance that effectively helps build the national capacity for biodiversity planning in the medium and long term. How can guidance and innovation help expand the “NBSAP community” beyond the environmental sector? This is a challenge worth a response. What we also observe in many countries is that key NBSAP players lack a “convening mandate” for effective mainstreaming. This, too, is linked to capacity – namely to systemic capacity. In this light, form, language availability and the logic organization of content that could be highly useful in the revision of NBSAPs all show weaknesses that constitute a major barrier to ‘policy effective’ and ‘Aichi-ready’ NBSAPs.

16. Generally, existing guidance that can be rapidly applied to a particular NBSAP context is neither pragmatic nor logically organized. Information and data on biodiversity exists and are theoretically accessible. However, applying it directly is challenging and not always strait forward. This creates a barrier to effectively

⁵ See e.g. Herkenrath (2012): *Preliminary stocktake of existing National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs) support initiatives and capacity needs assessment for the revision and implementation of new generation NBSAPs: Prepared by UNEP-WCMC on behalf of NBSAP Forum.* UNEP, UNDP, CBD.

contributing to advancement of the biodiversity policy agenda and limits national awareness on biodiversity. Open access to useful mapping tools are another major constraint for spatially assessing biodiversity challenges. Few countries are in a position to readily use mapping tools and reach meaningful conclusions on biodiversity management challenges. In terms of the language accessibility of current guidance and tools, there is a large and unmet demand for services and materials in languages other than English, in particular in French and Spanish.

17. Furthermore, biodiversity planning has evolved. Several CBD Parties have experienced difficulties with respect to setting national targets vis-à-vis the '2010 Global Target'. This is amply discussed in the foreword to the illustrated in the Third Global Biodiversity Outlook from 2010.⁶ In spite of early materials produced in the aftermath of COP10, there is still today (two years down the line) gaps in prescriptive materials. There is virtually no systematic guidance on how to develop an NBSAP that meets the Aichi Targets or on the significance of this to national policies and practices. In particular, UNDP and UNEP are experiencing an unfulfilled demand for guidance on the following themes: i) assessing and integrating ecosystem services through economic valuation; ii) mainstreaming biodiversity into development policies, plans and practices and into sectoral plans and strategies with clear targets and monitoring indicators; iii) incorporating climate change issues into NBSAPs; iv) assessing financial elements of the integration of NBSAPs into national development processes; and v) ensuring that issues from biodiversity related conventions also are addressed in the NBSAPs.

18. Another key gap pertains to limitations that certain countries may have in terms of accessing data and sharing information. Also, in many countries, sharing information is not part of the prevailing culture. Even though new technology is now challenging this, the process is not yet straight forward and not enough for supporting a fully inclusive and participatory NBSAP process in-country. There are many ways of communicating and networking, but the NBSAP Forum is the only one tailored to the needs of the NBSAP development process. The launching of the NBSAP Forum Website is planned for November 2013 and it is expected to create an immediate and intense demand for specialised technical, operational and moderated networking services. Currently, the embedded technical capacity of the host partners for meeting the expected peak demand is stretched very thin. This includes the ability to provide: (1) a fully operational help desk and technical support service to NBSAP Forum members beyond the end of 2013, including for the planned peer and expert review mechanisms; (2) the production of specific materials such as e-learning modules, analytical and spatially-based tools, and scorecards, in particular as they relate to mainstreaming and finance for NBSAPs. The plans for developing a multi-language streams under the NBSAP Forum would remain unrealised without additional support. As countries experiment, implement, and learn from different approaches, there will also a need to capture, synthesize and summarize lessons learned, and to ensure that this information is widely disseminated and easily accessible. Without additional support, this need will remain unfulfilled.

Barrier #2: Technical support services are currently insufficient.

19. The demand for technical support services, tailored to the needs of NBSAP 'architects' is currently in limited supply and it is generally insufficient to raise the bar of quality of the new generation of NBSAPs. There are regional teams in place both in UNDP and UNEP that are tasked with providing support within the realm of what is expected from these agencies vis-à-vis GEF project cycle support services. In practice, this support is only basic. It is often limited to operational guidance and some technical support in terms of consultant's referral and review of TOR. There are no efforts in terms assisting countries with more complex issues, such as how to apply methodologies, how to analyse policies or how to structure NBSAPs for policy effectiveness. This support is also constrained by competing demands imposed on the regional teams within GEF agencies, as they also need to serve other and often larger GEF projects. Countries that accessed GEF funding directly have, in turn, no access to technical support. At the global scale, this is not conducive to higher quality NBSAPs that can overcome the

⁶ See e.g. the Third Global Biodiversity Outlook, CBD Secretariat (2010) *Global Biodiversity Outlook 3*. Montréal, 94 pages ([Link](#)).

constraints of the previous generation of strategies, given the, nuanced, multifaceted and technical nature of NBSAPs. Regardless of how countries choose to fulfill their obligations vis-a-vis the CBD, it is clear that there is not yet a structured, cost-effective and targeted way of delivering technical assistance to countries.

20. There is evidence that technical assistance makes a difference in the overall outcome of projects; e.g. only about a dozen GEF-eligible countries have managed to update their NBSAP without outside assistance. Experience from two other global umbrella projects confirms that technical assistance actually makes a substantial difference, both with respect to the timing and quality of products. For example, under the UNDP-UNEP-GEF global project that supported the preparation of the Fourth National Report to the CBD (4NR), Parties that benefitted from the it had a 38% higher chance of submitting their report on time to the CBD than other CBD Parties. The other example is the PoWPA Early Action Grant project. The availability of tools and methodologies on the PoWPA has been essential for the structure and quality of reports prepared by countries to the CBD. This is attested by the project's evaluation. The process of developing NBSAPs does not count on technical assistance anywhere near the level that had been available to both the 4NR and PoWPA GEF-financed projects.

21. Also, because the NBSAPs are not a one-size-fits-all exercise, tailored outreach and targeted extension services, including in terms of language and country knowledge, have been requested by governments in various areas. These needs are not yet being fulfilled. They include biodiversity mainstreaming into poverty alleviation plans and key productive sectors, valuation, incentives, protected areas, ecosystem restoration, spacial planning, resource mobilization, and resilience and adaptation to climate change. Governments are also specifically requesting proactive technical support for applying new guidance in their particular context. Within the current setting, the various NBSAP development are not likely to get these services, or available services will only reach a few individuals who participate in CBD organised workshop. The lack of a wider reach-out to countries to meet those needs remains a gap.

3) The proposed alternative scenario, with a thorough description of project components

22. To overcome existing gaps and barriers, emphasis will be placed on content and services that are easy to access, easy to apply on the development of the NBSAP Forum portal, and on direct delivery. The following are the project's objectives and Components:

The overarching development goal of the project is to enhance implementation of the CBD's Strategic Plan 2011-2020 and support the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity-building.

The project's objective is to provide technical support to all eligible countries accessing GEF Biodiversity Enabling Activities funding, with a view to improving the quality benchmark and policy relevance of the next generation of NBSAPs, while also enhancing public participation in the NBSAP preparation process.

Component 1. Global learning and technical content development

23. To meet calls from governments for guidance, best practices and technical materials that can be effectively adapted to a national context, the project will focus on content generation and knowledge consolidation. More specifically, the project will produce new and innovative NBSAP-related content. It will facilitate access and refer to existing and emerging content and tools from other NBSAP-related initiatives, projects and programmes. Another key focus under this Component is the NBSAP Forum, a multi-function web portal that brings together multiple partners to support NBSAP processes. As a result from activities, new and innovative knowledge management tools will enhance global learning on biodiversity planning and support GEF-financed NBSAP development processes. The project will also significantly contribute to consolidating the

NBSAP Forum community of practice. Content generation for the site will be demand-driven, outcome-oriented, and responsive to the respective knowledge and capacity needs and capabilities of each country and each participating member in the NBSAP Forum. Given that the work of generating and managing knowledge requires close coordination, the project will also co-support the partnership that underpins it. Four outputs are foreseen, with the following planned activities:

Output 1.1 *User-friendly, customizable tools and assessment methodologies, e-learning, voluntary templates and other guidance material, including for benchmarking the technical quality of NBSAP products before submission, are developed and widely applied in GEF-financed NBSAP development processes. They are primarily disseminated through the NBSAP Forum.*

This output will be jointly implemented by UNDP (and UNEP-WCMC for target setting) and in consultation and close collaboration with UNEP and the CBD Secretariat. Two key activities are involved.

1.1.1 Guidance materials, voluntary templates and assessment methodologies: The project will support the development of guidelines, the dissemination of case studies and the production of voluntary templates with suggested reporting formats. The preferred medium will be electronic. At this current stage, the technical collaboration among the CBD Secretariat, UNDP and UNEP-WCMC has already yielded the outlining on the “Nine NBSAP Steps”. These are the standard steps that every NBSAP should undergo to ensure quality. Specific and user-friendly guidance will to be prepared and translated for the following key products:

- *Assessment methodologies.* As one of the first activities, the project will develop a guiding checklist for assessing the quality benchmark for NBSAPs. It will focus on minimal standards for a NBSAP and mostly on thoroughness – e.g. through 'yes' or 'no' answers on the fulfilment of a set of minimal condition for a quality NBSAP. These may be the completion of the "Nine NBSAP Steps", or whether or not NBSAPs have established national Aichi-inspired targets, etc.
- *Voluntary templates* have proven to be very useful in the context of PoWPA reporting. The approach is replicable to the context of NBSAPs.⁷ The fact that the template is voluntary will provide flexibility.
- *Peer review framework:* In order to ensure professional, consistent, thorough peer review of NBSAPs, and to enable a wide range of reviewers to easily and quickly provide peer review, a concise guide to peer reviewing, including a checklist of questions and best practices, will be developed and made available in multiple languages.
- *Financing planning and resource mobilisation tools.* A key customisable tool will be availed for supporting simplified finance assessments. It will be based on the BIOFIN methodology. For preparing a NBSAP financing plan, the tool will be based on a voluntary template. Financing plans are essential for the development of effective and feasible NBSAPs implementation plans, of which resource mobilisation plans will be part of.
- *Other tools* may cover: capacity development needs, technology assessments, policy screening, fifth national reports, the clearing house mechanism (CHM) and linkages with biodiversity related conventions.

1.1.2 E-learning, quick guides, Wiki pages and training packages: Quick guides for all Aichi Targets and e-learning modules on mainstreaming and protected areas already exist, the latter in multiple

⁷ The PoWPA reporting framework provides evidence on the usefulness of voluntary templates. A partnership between CBD Secretariat and UNDP resulted in the both the creation of an online reporting format, the collection of data from more than 100 countries, and a CoP decision in 2010 to adopt the reporting framework; as well as the creation of a clearinghouse mechanism with more than 1300 protected area documents.

languages. E-learning modules will be developed for a range of Aichi Biodiversity Targets to complement the existing one. The latter will build on existing quick guides, which will be made more interactive and complemented by Wiki pages. The project will support the translation of the e-learning modules, guides and training packages into French and Spanish. Additional languages will be explored through low-cost options, including automatic translations and DuoLingo⁸, as well as moderate cost options working directly with countries – an approach that has successfully been used in the past to translate modules. Because of the scope of countries involved in NBSAPs, Russian and Arabic will be prioritized as additional languages. E-learning modules will be self-paced, electronic learning tutorials that can be accessed on-line or off, providing exercises and additional resources, and they will be housed in an online course room that allows for regional discussion and dialogue. Because some countries have difficulty accessing the internet reliably, all tools and materials, including e-learning modules, will be able to be downloaded during off-peak hours, and CDs will be made available to anyone on request. This option has already proven to be useful during CBD workshops, where protected area modules have been launched – several countries requested CD versions so that they can easily ensure that all of their colleagues have full access to the full set of modules⁹. Training packages will be similar to the self-paced e-learning modules, but will be adapted to classroom/workshop contexts, with built-in assessment points and suggestions for group discussion topics. In terms of modules and toolkits, products will include:

- *E-learning*. Drafting effective communication plans (Target 1), valuation and mainstreaming (Target 2), incentives (Target 3), sustainable production and consumption (Target 4), direct pressures on biodiversity (Targets 5-10), ecosystem services (Target 14), climate resilience (Target 15), mobilization of financial resources (Target 20), and, cross-cutting issues such as targets and indicators and spatial data and mapping.
- *Training toolkits*: A series of train-the-trainer toolkits will be developed on drafting effective communication plans (Target 1), ecosystem services (Target 14), climate resilience (Target 15), valuation and mainstreaming (Target 2), incentives (Target 3), sustainable production and consumption (Target 4), direct pressures on biodiversity (Targets 5-10), mobilization of financial resources (Target 20), and national target setting.
- *Quick Guides*. These will present the materials in a much more summarized fashion, online and through interactive links for “learning more”. They will also function as guidance documents to methodologies, which are essential and are in demand.

Output 1.2 *Online spatial planning tools for key thematic areas and cross-cutting issues are made available to countries to facilitate biodiversity status assessments.*

Under this output, the project will co-support UNEP-WCMC to carry the necessary activities aimed at availing spatial planning tools that can be used by countries to underpin different types of biodiversity assessments in their NBSAPs. The Centre will appoint an activity coordinator to lead implementation. Key activities are as follows:

- 1.2.1 **Scoping the NBSAP Spatial Planning Tools**: This implies defining the key parameters that are necessary to conceive the product and obtain the agreement of key data holders of how data can be shared, including any legal agreements that may be needed. It also includes the preparation of data protocols and disclaimers that will be necessary for availing the tool. To the degree possible,

⁸ DuoLingo (www.duolingo.com) is a new platform that pairs language learners and language expert reviewers with those who need inexpensive translations. Although untested, this technology could present a very low-cost option to translation of materials into multiple languages.

⁹ All modules for protected areas are available for download at www.conservationtraining.org, or are available by CD or flashdrive from the CBD Secretariat.

the NBSAP Spatial Planning Tools will be based on existing, open source and freely available mapping infrastructures. The final NBSAP Spatial Planning Tools will be the combined set of freely downloadable geo-based layers for protected areas, together with other useful biodiversity data that can be aggregated, depending on the possibilities that will be scoped, negotiated and consolidated through this activity.

- 1.2.2 Development of country packages: The project will support the preparation of minimum pre-set 'country packages' for all NBSAP countries, and of customized packages to be prepared according to direct pre-ordered and specific demand.
- 1.2.3 Guidance on NBSAP Spatial Planning Tools: The project will support the preparation of a short video in English French and Spanish on how to use the tools. (It may be disseminated through You-Tube.) A Quick Tutorial Guide in presentation form will also be developed.
- 1.2.4 NBSAP Online -Tools for Guidance to countries (in particular LDCs and SIDs globally) on legal/policy preparedness of the "new generation NBSAPs": This aspect will be lead by UNEP's Division of Environmental Law and Conventions (DELIC). Through this activity, the project will also establish links to a closely related project, the *Legal Preparedness for Achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets*. The mentioned project will establish a knowledge sharing and learning platform on innovative legal solutions that support the global efforts to achieving the Aichi Targets. It was launched in 2012 as a partnership between the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the International Development Law Organization (IDLO), with support from the Japan Biodiversity Fund.¹⁰

Output 1.3 *The NBSAP Forum Web Portal is functional and well maintained: (i) fully operational by end 2013; (ii) further developed to fulfill evolving clients' needs throughout the project's duration; (iii) hosting and maintenance are taken over by CBD for sustainability.*

The Forum will empower NBSAP architects to connect with peers, experts and other countries, identify best practices, find technical materials, share experiences, upload and download key documents, seek feedback at various stages of NBSAP development and learn about various planning processes. Activities under this output will be managed by UNDP (noting though that website content development is carried out through a small technical team from CBD Secretariat, UNDP and UNEP-WCMC). The following activities are proposed:

- 1.3.1 Phase III development of NBSAP Forum Web Portal project: GEF will co-support the maintenance and further development NBSAP Forum Web Portal from end 2013 till project end. Within two months of the launch of the NBSAP Forum site (scheduled for November 2013), it is expected that there will be a clear picture of the needs for further development. Around end October 2013, the procurement process for selecting an adequate service provider will be carried out and the winning company engaged. Phases I and II are currently financed and involve the development of a minimally functional website with respectively "first priority" and "second priority" pages. Phase III will involve the refinement of all existing pages and the expansion of the site to include various features and links to tools, publications and guides that will be developed through this project.
- 1.3.2 Hand-over of NBSAP Forum Portal to the CBD Website: By project end, it will be necessary to secure the sustainability of the NBSAP Forum functionality. From the onset of the NBSAP Forum

¹⁰ See project info-page [\[Link\]](#) and news on it [\[Link\]](#).

project, it has been decided that the CBD Secretariat would take over the maintenance of the NBSAP Forum site once the NBSAP development process supported by GEF agencies has been completed for most countries (expected by end 2015 or slightly later). Whether the NBSAP Forum will evolve to be a community of practice to support NBSAP implementation or not, the sustainability of the site's maintenance is to be ensured beyond the end of this project. The proposal of the CBD Secretariat taking over seems like the best solution at hand at this stage. Site hand-over costs (in terms of securing the back-end support and migration only if needed) will be engineered through this project. UNDP will either select a company to ensure this or build the tasks into TOR for the procurement for Phase III website development.

Output 1.4 *A partnership framework for collaboration among all agencies and entities involved in NBSAP process emerges with a view to supporting client countries and developing best practices.*

This last output under Component 1 will ensure the smooth collaboration among entities supporting NBSAPs through a partnership approach. This implies creating the space for defining priorities, planning in a concerted manner and monitoring progress with respect to content production under this Component. This component is guided by lessons learned from previous collaborative efforts aimed at strengthening capacity, including both the Biodiversity Support Program¹¹ (a partnership between WRI, WWF and The Nature Conservancy) and the Friends of PoWPA Support Consortium (a loose collaboration of more than a dozen organizations supporting the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas) including the following lessons: a) commitment to a shared set of priorities between organizations, with clearly defined objectives; b) clarity on roles and responsibilities, including clear delegation of leadership to organizations with expertise in a particular area; c) effective and regular communication channels between partners; c) collaborative, adaptive learning; d) shared decision making; and e) the need to develop long-term learning platforms, beyond a single product, event or workshop.

This output will be jointly implemented by UNDP and UNEP, including UNEP-WCMC in close collaboration with the CBD Secretariat (a core and obvious partner), as well as other partners who can and are willing to contribute in different ways to the NBSAP 'process'. Together with Output 2.4, it is a key part of the project's overall M&E Framework. Key activities will include:

- 1.4.1 Adaptive feedback and global collaboration on content development: This activity will create the space for the partnership that primarily involves the core partners supporting NBSAP processes (CBD Secretariat, UNDP and UNEP¹²) to remain active and functional throughout the project. It will enable the technical capabilities embedded in the entities to cross fertilize each other through feedback and internal peer review. It will also allow concerted planning and implementation. While constant remote contact can be sufficient for most tasks, face-to-face events are necessary at critical points. A first planning meeting involving the core technical happened in December 2012. A second one is planned for November 2013 (piggy-backing on a global NBSAP workshop) and third one in late 2014, when the project is also expected to be externally reviewed. The GEF will co-support future meetings through this activity.
- 1.4.2 Best practices compilation: A key result of this activity will be the compilation by the core team (and collaborators as applicable) of a 'best practices' publication with selected case studies to be launched at COP12.

¹¹ See for example <http://rmportal.net/library/content/tools/biodiversity-support-program>

¹² The GEF can be considered within this group, but as a financier its role is different and should be separated from project implementation support.

- 1.4.3 **M&E:** Project monitoring and evaluation is supported with donor reports submitted in a timely manner with due technical quality. In addition to normal M&E activities typically foreseen in a GEF project, this project will use the networking power of the NBSAP Forum to apply periodic surveys aimed at assessing user satisfaction, experience and requirements of project beneficiaries. This will enhance the adaptive feedback foreseen under Activity 1.4.1 and improve project performance during implementation.

Component 2. Direct technical support delivery

24. To meet calls from governments for more proactive outreach and the provision of easy-uptake technical guidance, the project will provide a menu of extension and support services that will be, to the greatest extent possible, tailored to the needs of individual countries and regions. Technical support services will be demand-driven, outcome-oriented, and responsive to the respective capacity needs of each country. Three outputs are planned:

Output 2.1 *Peer and expert review technical support is provided to countries on a ‘demand-driven’ and ‘match-making’ basis for each phase of NBSAP development process*

The work under this output will involve the provision of support during the following critical steps of NBSAP development: (i) preparation and stocktaking; (ii) national targets setting; (iii) preparation and validation of the NBSAPs; (iv) action, implementation and resource mobilization planning; and (v) monitoring and reporting (in close collaboration with the CBD Secretariat). Activities will be implemented by both UNDP and UNEP WCMC. There are two main modalities of support, both of which will be articulated through the NBSAP Forum:

- 2.1.1 **Expertise on demand:** The project will create a roster of qualified consultants with technical expertise that will be shared with NBSAP architects in each government/country. The intention is to provide a rolling matchmaking service to address hurdles and barriers to an effective NBSAP development process. This implies more direct, one-on-one trouble shooting and support to strategic planning. Retained consultants will have technical expertise in a range of topics and will be deployed on a case-by-case, as-needed basis.
- 2.1.2 **Peer and expert review:** The project will develop mechanisms that will enable peer-to-peer feedback of initial NBSAP products (i.e. government-to-government), as well as expert review by leading thematic experts. The intention of offering this suite of peer and expert review services – which – is to accelerate learning, facilitate adaptive management, and create a feedback loop that sets a high bar both in terms of vision, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. Peer review in particular will include regional review of targets by peers and the organization of regional workshops, where possible through webinars. The roll-out will be on a demand-driven basis. Expert review complements peer review and will be facilitated on a needs’ basis, due to the relatively elevated costs. The NBSAP Forum website will enable countries to find willing peer reviewers (the existing database of pre-registered members already includes more than 100 individuals willing to volunteer in peer reviews).

Output 2.2 *Online webinars and both virtual and in person workshops are facilitated guiding NBSAP processes through critical steps and to the benefit of client countries.*

- 2.2.1 Workshops and webinars: The project will support: i) workshops and virtual webinars to strengthen overall NBSAP capacity building at regional and sub-regional levels, including continued support to CBD Secretariat capacity development workshops on NBSAPs and related issues, such as CHM and national reporting; and ii) workshops to identify and synthesize best practices on a variety of issues. At least two regional webinars may be conducted in 2013. Others will be planned for the remainder of the duration of the project.
- 2.2.2 Workshop facilitation: Technical assistance will be provided by UNDP and UNEP-WCMC during CBD regional workshops for addressing key thematic areas and cross-cutting issues. This will be another extension of direct technical support to countries and an opportunity to obtain direct feedback, trouble-shoot and enhance collective learning.

Output 2.3 *A framework for monitoring client satisfaction and for creating a feedback loop for technical support delivery is effective by end 2013.*

Given that this project focuses on enhancing the content and mechanisms of technical assistance support, a key measure of success is client satisfaction. This output is concerned with generating and analyzing the data for measuring satisfaction levels. It will be jointly implemented by UNDP and UNEP, but an independent consultant will be engaged to assist with developing surveys and analyzing results. The feedback loop will also involve the constant monitoring and adaptive improvement of the NBSAP Forum site. Key activities will include:

- 2.3.1 Developing and applying surveys: Quick multiple-choice surveys will be designed and applied to provide immediate feedback on certain products and processes (e.g. e-learning, workshops, tools, publications, website user experience), while more qualitative surveys will be applied to other, more outcome-oriented, types of products and processes (e.g. peer and expert review, use of the spatial planning tool). Electronic surveys will be applied wherever applicable.
- 2.3.2 Website moderation: The project will engage a part-time staff consultant with a biodiversity-technical profile to function as the primary focal point for website moderation. This person will also function as the UNDP activity coordinator with respect to project management tasks (under the UNDP component) for a small portion of his/her time.
- 2.3.3 Analyzing survey data and adapting: The same consultant who will prepare the surveys under Activity 2.3.1 will also compile the data and present it through analytical reports for presenting it to technical teams and management in UNDP, UNEP and the CBD Secretariat. They will be a key input into the project's M&E system.

25. Anticipated outcomes associated with Components 1 and 2 of the project include: i) governments/countries internalize the goals of biodiversity conservation and the sustainable use of biological resources into societal sectors and development models, policies and programs; ii) ecosystem goods and services are valued appropriately; iii) biodiversity and ecosystems are effectively mainstreamed into key productive sectors, economic plans, and poverty reduction strategies; iv) the challenges and opportunities linked to ecosystem-based adaptation and resilience are effectively incorporated into NBSAPs and across sectors and planning; v) governments/countries establish national Aichi-inspired targets and indicators to monitor progress; vi) spatial planning considerations are integrated; and vi) governments/countries establish feasible implementation plans for their NBSAPs, including (and in particular) resource mobilization plans.

4) Incremental cost reasoning

26. The project seeks to develop a demand-driven platform that offers instructive guidance and a suite of responsive technical support services for enhancing the quality of NBSAPs and catalyzing their transformative role as effective policy instruments, and thereby contributing to achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Target 17.

<u>Current Baseline</u>	<u>Alternative</u>	<u>Global Biodiversity benefits</u>
<p>In the baseline scenario, countries will complete the next generation of NBSAPs, some earlier than others. Without the project, however, new NBSAPs will lack the sufficient technical stringency and analytical depth that will be required for significantly raising the bar of biodiversity planning. Business as usual strategy preparation will not achieve the necessary levels of policy traction to contribute to achieving the goals of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. The Aichi Targets will remain aspirational and will find no expression at the country level.</p> <p>Without the project, the next generation of NBSAPs will be developed with insufficient or inaccurate data on the status of biodiversity and ecosystems, NBSAP architects will continue to lack analytical and technical capacity, there will be limited stakeholder consultation in NBSAP development, biodiversity will be insufficiently mainstreamed into key productive sectors and development plans, countries will continue to create financial planning for NBSAP implementation based on incorrect assumptions and unrealistic projections, and NBSAPs will quite likely lack sufficient policy traction at the national level and simply get shelved.</p>	<p>In the alternative, governments/countries will develop robust and policy ambitious NBSAPs, which will be drafted in a participatory manner, based on sound assessments of the status of biodiversity and ecosystems, as well as sharp analysis of the underlying causes of biodiversity loss; attach due value to biodiversity and ecosystem services for a country's development; provide policy guidance on the mainstreaming of biodiversity into key sectoral and development plans, policies and practices; take climate change and resilience into consideration; include a sound a prioritized plan for addressing direct pressures on biodiversity; include national biodiversity targets and appropriate indicators for monitoring progress; integrate spatial planning considerations; identify issues requiring capacity development and urgent action; include a feasible resource mobilization plan; and have been adopted with the inclusion of Aichi-inspired national targets.</p> <p>The GEF's co-support to the development and maintenance of the NBSAP Forum will be essential for fostering the development of a community of practice dedicated to NBSAP, which currently counts on 750 pre-registered participants. The project has been designed to establish and maintain an innovative knowledge, communication and country outreach support framework for achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 and making significant advances on national biodiversity policy-making. Innovation will permeate all aspects of the project, both through online and in-person content and services delivery.</p>	<p>More specifically, the following global biodiversity benefits will be produced by the project:</p> <p>Successful mainstreaming of biodiversity into national development planning frameworks and sector planning processes.</p> <p>Increased understanding about the role intact habitat and biodiversity play to help humans adapt to climate change and advances in ecosystem service valuation provide an opportunity to incorporate this knowledge into the revision of NBSAPs.</p> <p>At the level of individual NBSAPs, the project's specific benefits will be: i) the valuing of ecosystem goods and services; ii) biodiversity mainstreaming; iii) the incorporation of challenges and opportunities linked to ecosystem-based adaptation and resilience; iv) the establishment of national Aichi-inspired targets and development of biodiversity indicators for monitoring implementation; v) the integration of spatial planning considerations; and vi) the inclusion of feasible NBSAP implementation plans, including and in particular resource mobilization plans for biodiversity.</p>

6) Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up

27. **Innovation.** The face of capacity building activities is rapidly changing. Practitioners interface with each other and with resources and services differently than they have in the past. Many practitioners complain of information overload, e.g. the availability of endless amounts of information with too little direction on accessing

and deploying the information that will be most useful for their particular context or challenge. Similarly, while one-off workshops were once considered sufficient for knowledge transfer and capacity building, more and more practitioners are demanding targeted and responsive guidance. In terms of innovation, the methods and knowledge management means applied and facilitated by this project respond exactly to those challenges.

28. Learning and knowledge exchange will primarily take place on-line. The NBSAP Forum will be a 100% virtual community of practice. Not only is this more cost-effective, but it also opens up to a wealth of interactive possibilities for sharing and multiplying knowledge, and for reaching out to very large audiences. More importantly, it will build on and share the knowledge that is embedded in the community itself – what is today termed “crowd sourcing”. The key motto of the of the web facility is “The NBSAP Forum is what you make of it”, encouraging users to give and take in the act of sharing.

29. E-learning is innovative, but content is still more important than the medium. Innovation will also permeate the content produced by the project in many different ways. One of the keys to successful NBSAPs and the achievement of Aichi Target 17 is a critical understanding of the role of mainstreaming and protection in achieving all of Aichi Targets. The content that will be produced by the project through e-learning and trainers’ training under Output 1.1 will be critical in this respect. It will present to NBSAP ‘architects’ to a perspective of biodiversity management that will allow them to fully grasp the implications of translating Aichi Targets to the national reality.

30. **Sustainability and Replicability.** Project design is a direct response to needs identified in an assessment carried out by WCMC in 2012 with respect to NBSAPs.¹³ On the one hand, sustainability emanates from the fact that project responds to those needs (see Table 1 below for evidence); on the other, from the fact that by project end, project support will be evaluated and may evolve to provide support, in the future, to NBSAP implementation, e.g. through a new follow-on project. The latter point underpins the idea that biodiversity planning is a cyclical and incremental process of capacity building.¹⁴

31. In terms of the project’s potential to be replicated, the most immediate potential related to other GEF supported enabling activities – on the methods, modes of support delivery and innovation elements. Else, the project’s is already drawing interesting lessons on the importance of inter-agency collaboration and on the need to involve the Convention in partnerships.

Table 1. Project response vis-a-vis the support prioritised by 2011 NBSAP workshops participants ^[a]

NBSAP stage	Support required	Addressed through Outputs
Bringing stakeholders together	Publicize and improve accessibility of CBD guidance on how to prepare and update NBSAPs	1.1
	Prepare good practice guidance on inception and engaging stakeholders in NBSAPs updating	1.1 and 1.4
	Workshops to support the identification of main stakeholders	2.1
	Establish NBSAP Support Desk, online discussion forums and listservs/ email discussions to support the NBSAP revision process	2.1
Biodiversity assessment	Template on the structure of stock-take of existing plans, policies and practices report	1.1
	Workshops to support stock-take of existing plans, policies and practices, and of the root causes of biodiversity loss	2.1

¹³ Herkenrath (2012) .

¹⁴ See e.g. Miller & Lanou (1995) *National Biodiversity Planning: Guidelines Based on Early Experiences Around the World*. WRI/UNEP/IUCN, for a definition of biodiversity planning.

NBSAP stage	Support required	Addressed through Outputs
	Guidance document and check list on rapid assessment of national biodiversity and its links with human well-being	1.1 and 1.2
	NBSAP Support Desk, online discussion forums and listservs/ email discussions to support the NBSAP revision process	1.3 and 2.1
	Facilitate exchange visits between countries	not addressed ^[b]
	Synthesizing existing land cover maps and data to identify the most threatened habitats, the drivers of habitat loss, and the policies that directly or indirectly encourage the continued loss of natural habitats	1.2
	Assessment of the status of national wetlands	1.2
	Identifying those wetlands of highest conservation value based on biodiversity and human use values	1.1 and 1.2
	Guidelines and best practices for national biodiversity information systems including effective Clearing-house Mechanisms	1.1, 1.2, 1.3
Developing a strategy	Support development of NBSAPs communication strategies	1.3 and 2.1
	Support south –south exchanges on best practices on conservation and sustainable use of genetic diversity	not addressed ^[b]
	Tools and guidelines for mainstreaming genetic diversity in NBSAP and national development plans	1.1 and 1.2
Developing an action plan	Support preparation for national sustainable production and consumption (SCP) action plans	1.1 and 1.2
	Spatial data needed to underpin planning and priority-setting: decision-maker support tools (IBAT-like) integrated into the NBSAP	1.2
	Review of action plans for protected areas	1.1 ^[c]
	Identification of best practices	1.3 and 1.4
	Voluntary template for NBSAP chapter/section on protected areas	1.1
	Guidance on the links between protected areas and poverty	1.1
	Ecosystem-based climate resilience, adaptation and mitigation guidance	1.1
	Guidelines and best practices for national biodiversity information systems including effective Clearing-house Mechanisms	1.1
	Guidelines and best practices for identifying, accessing, combining and sequencing multiple sources of finance, including national budgets, for meeting countries' biodiversity management needs	1.1

Notes:

[a] Based on survey and other sources; adapted from table 3 in Herkenrath (2012): *Preliminary stocktake of existing National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs) support initiatives and capacity needs assessment for the revision and implementation of new generation NBSAPs: Prepared by UNEP-WCMC on behalf of NBSAP Forum.* UNEP, UNDP, CBD.

[b] Beyond the budgetary scope of this project.

[c] Indirectly addressed through training for Target 11, whose modular e-learning tool is in fact available.

A.2. Stakeholders

32. There is an existing body of guidance explaining how those responsible for biodiversity planning can approach the task of identifying stakeholders. Much of it is specific to the organization of NBSAPs and preparation of national reports. In its guidance, it is repeatedly stressed that, if the necessary transition from biodiversity planning to biodiversity implementation is to be made, then everyone with a stake in the outcome of the NBSAP needs to be engaged. The stakeholder engagement process should start with the CBD national focal points, the NBSAP responsible authority or whoever has responsibility for NBSAP coordination, the preparation of CBD national reports; and thereafter it should expand to include a much broader range of national actors.

33. At the country level, UNDP and UNEP generally recommend that a national steering committees be proposed for accompanying the process of developing national targets and updating the NBSAPs. As far as possible, the steering committee should include representatives of all sectors. These could include line ministries, research and academic bodies, business and industry, indigenous and local community organizations, bodies representing the agricultural, forestry, fishing or other sectors, environmental management bodies, non-governmental organizations, women's organizations, bodies and agencies addressing sustainable development and poverty eradication, educators, the media, and others. Each country's list will be different, but comprehensive. The NBSAP Forum will be key to ensuring disclosure, participation and inclusiveness, in particular through the availability of country pages. In other words, this project will create the means for ensuring that, at the country level, the development of a NBSAP will be a widely inclusive and participatory process.

34. The project will also draw on the guidance and engagement of a number of regional partners that work together with UNDP, UNEP and the CBD Secretariat in different ways (the list is not exhaustive). From Mesoamerica and South America: REDPARQUES, CATIE, IUCN WCPA regional vice chairs, WWF, TNC, Birdlife International, GIZ regional offices, Government of Brazil. From the Caribbean: IUCN regional office implementing BIOPAMA, TNC, and UNEP-CEM/CaCMP. From Africa (Southern & Eastern): SANBI, IUCN regional office for Southern and Eastern Africa which is implementing BIOPAMA, WWF, CI, Birdlife, IUCN TILCEPA. From central Africa: IUCN PACO, TNC, and AWF. From West Africa: WWF, PMRC (supported by a consortium of NGOs and donors), Birdlife international, IUCN PAPACO and MIKE Programmes. From Northern Africa and West Asia: IUCN regional offices for West Asia and Mediterranean, ROPME, LAS. Ramsar regional coordinator, CMS Abu Dabi office, and the Government of Egypt and UAE. From the Pacific: SPREP, TNC, WWF, WCS, Birdlife International, IUCN Oceania, and Rare. From South Asia: ICIMOD and Wildlife Institute of India, IUCN - WCPA regional vice chair and Rare. From South and East Asia: Government of Korea, ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity, IUCN regional office in Vietnam supported by WCS, WWF and Birdlife International. From CEE and Central Asia: WWF, Bfn (German nature academy), TNC, and WCS. All of these partners and many individuals are being encouraged to pre-register into the NBSAP Forum site. In this sense, they will automatically become participating partners.

35. The NBSAP Forum host partners (the CBD Secretariat, UNDP, UNEP-WCMC and are also reaching out to several partners at the global level, such as IUCN (HQ), IDLO (with respect to Activity 1.2.4) and various UN agencies, the latter primarily through the UN Environment Management Group.

36. In terms of resource mobilization and needs assessment partners, the project will work with Defra, World Bank, Conservation Finance Alliance, and GIZ. Biodiversity data partners will be enlisted from: GLOBE, NASA, JRC, WCMC, TNC, IUCN, EOL/BioSynthesis Group, GBIF, BirdLife, UNESCO, CI, Ramsar, UNESCO, FAO, among others.

A.3. Socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions considerations

37. The project will place particular emphasis on several key topics, including mainstreaming biodiversity into poverty alleviation efforts, and into sectoral plans and policies. This will build off of existing efforts of a partnership with IIED, UNEP-WCMC, UNDP, and UNDP's Poverty Environment Initiative (PEI), that explores in detail how biodiversity can be mainstreamed into poverty alleviation efforts e.g. through the NBSAP 2.0 project.¹⁵ Special emphasis will be placed on sustainable livelihoods, and on mainstreaming biodiversity to achieve national sustainable development goals.

¹⁵ See [Link](#) for more details.

38. Gender mainstreaming is an important aspect of CBD implementation and it is enshrined not just in the Strategic Plan 2011-2020 itself (refer to COP 10 Decision X/2, article 8), but also in a number of other COP decisions. Quoting the mentioned article: “*Recalls decision IX/8, which called for gender mainstreaming in national biodiversity strategies and action plans, and decision IX/24, in which the Conference of the Parties approved the gender plan of action for the Convention, which, among other things, requests Parties to mainstream a gender perspective into the implementation of the Convention and promote gender equality in achieving its three objectives, and requests Parties to mainstream gender considerations, where appropriate, in the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its associated goals, the Aichi Targets, and indicators.*” The project will be a vehicle for implementing these decisions and data will be gender-disaggregated where applicable. It will help track gender marking scores in UNDP-GEF BD EA projects.¹⁶ Both UNDP’s and UNEP’s projects are subject to gender considerations and social and environmental safeguards. Socio-economic studies that highlight women’s role in conservation/sustainable use and the need for a more gender-equitable sharing of its benefits will be made available through the NBSAP Forum.

A.4. Risks

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND CATEGORY	RATING	MITIGATION MEASURES
<p><u>STRATEGIC</u> Demand for technical support services will exceed the delivery capacity of technical consultants.</p>	Medium	<p>The project has been designed to fit its budgetary envelope. GEF support is but a contribution and the collaboration with related initiatives a staple. Potentially costly activities, such as South-South cooperation through country exchange visits, were deliberately left out (countries may finance this themselves, if they so wish, and the NBSAP Forum platform be used to facilitate the process). Also the project will not organize and carry out in person workshops independently, but will rather participate in CBD-organized events. UNDP and UNEP will ensure that technical assistance capacity can be provided through cost-effective ongoing service in Spanish, English, French and Russian by engaging with multiple consultants on a part-time basis. The expert review services is designed to be financed by requesting countries themselves – the project will but support the match-making mechanism. Project consultants will be trained to ensure cost-effectiveness in their services. The e-learning and training of trainers approach is designed to reach out to large audiences.</p>
<p><u>STRATEGIC</u> Interagency collaboration meets operational challenges.</p>	Low	<p>There has been a constant and on-going dialogue prior to the design of the project, through which the partnership of the ‘NBSAP Forum’ has built (here the Forum is more than the website, but the partnership itself). An exchange of letters of intent among directorate level officials in the CBD Secretariat, UNDP and UNEP ensures that a framework is in place and that roles and responsibilities are well defined.</p>
<p><u>POLITICAL</u> Some governments may not subscribe to wide information-sharing platforms, and thereby engage ineffectively in accessing technical resources.</p>	Low	<p>The project will focus on providing services on a demand-based fashion, providing guidance and technical support based on inputs and requests from each country. It will establish a peer-review facility, as well as self-assessment checklists and easy to use guidance documents and templates, ensuring that technical guidance comes in a form that is politically viable. The project will also cultivate national country-level ‘champions’ for key issues, to help promote best practices and develop case studies for their countries.</p>

¹⁶ Gender marking requires that each project in UNDP’s ATLAS system be rated for gender relevance. This will for example include a brief analysis of how the project plans to achieve its environmental objective by addressing the differences in the roles and needs of women and men.

A.5. Cost-effectiveness reflected in project design

39. The proposed project will ensure that the investments already placed in NBSAPs, including GEF funding, UNDP and UNEP co-financing, and government co-financing, will achieve the intended result of having high-quality NBSAPs that help to transform the biodiversity, finance and development trajectories, achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and provide a pathway toward sustainable development and the CBD goals.

40. The project will ensure that other existing initiatives, such as WAVES, TEEB and BIOFIN are co-supportive of the NBSAP process. This will avoid duplication of efforts wherever possible and foster cross-fertilisation and collaboration. The focus on user-defined needs (see Table 1, e.g.), on generic tools that can be tailored to individual country circumstances, and on targeted, individual technical support, ensures that investments will benefit countries in a cost-effective manner.

41. By collaborating through the NBSAP Forum and through its ongoing partnership with the CBD Secretariat, UNEP and UNDP, along with other agencies, this project will ensure that all tools developed will be accessible to every GEF-eligible country. An emphasis on webinars and digital learning and communication tools helps promote a low-carbon approach to distillation and dissemination of lessons, and provides a platform for further expanding learning within countries.

42. Other options have been considered in delivering technical support (e.g., expand staffing of implementing agencies, hold multiple thematic workshops). These would not cover the breadth of needs that countries have identified. It would neither be conducive to the sustainability of results. The options outlined in this proposal are the most cost-effective and sustainable in achieving the desired outcomes.

A.6. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

43. This project will coordinate on activities, collaborate with and learn lessons from the following GEF-financed initiatives:

- All of the GEF-financed NBSAPs, including those countries supported by UNDP, UNEP or FAO through national projects, through the umbrella projects with UNEP, or directly by GEF. This project adds direct value to this substantial portfolio of BD EA projects by ensuring consistently and high quality.
- Other Global Biodiversity Enabling Activities: This pertains to past initiative, but are worth mentioning because this project drew on the full range of national and global experience to develop and provide information, tools, training, and communication needed to develop and implement NBSAPs, and to ensure a smooth transition between the development and implementation stages. (1) *Biodiversity Planning Support Programme*: Activities included the development of information services, preparation of technical and advisory materials, training, and enhancing horizontal exchange and co-operation among Parties. Information exchange mechanisms established will foreshadow, and be maintained in the long term by, the activities of the Clearing House Mechanism (CHM). This project, if funded, will ensure that the best of these materials continue to be available and are updated. (2) *National Reporting to the CBD (3NR and 4NR umbrellas)*: Virtually all of the GEF eligible countries have benefitted from at least one of the six umbrella MSPs (they were approved in phases). A key lesson pertains to the UNDP-UNEP-CBD collaboration and the breadth of country outreach, but also to the importance of technical assistance in quality assurance.
- PoWPA Early Action Grant: Lessons learning and collaboration will be ensured through the e-learning modules and the strategy for stakeholder engagement, which were highly successful in the PoWPA EAG project.

A.7 Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation

44. The project will be implemented over a period of two years. UNDP and UNEP are the GEF agencies for this project and will implement it directly (through UNDP-GEF and UNEP-DEPI/GEF units), being thereby accountable to the GEF for the use of funds. UNEP will engage UNEP-WCMC in implementing Output 2.1 and co-implementing several other outputs of the project. An internal agreement will be drawn for this purpose.

45. UNDP and UNEP-WCMC will each engage an ‘activity coordinator’, who will be the lead focal point in each of the agencies for the project. Due to the project’s global character, key activities and the work of the two activity coordinators will be closely monitored by senior technical staff within each of the agencies. A small technical group already exists and is supporting the NBSAP Forum website development. This arrangement will continue and may be expanded, as consultants to be engaged in direct technical support join the team. From an administrative point of view, staff members within UNDP-GEF, UNEP-DEPI/GEF/WCMC¹⁷ will be assigned with the part-time responsibility of providing support to the project in terms of procurement, recruitment, financial control and legal matters on a needs’ basis.

46. UNDP and UNEP will form a Project Steering Committee (PSC) and invite other global partners to be part of it for providing oversight and policy guidance to project implementation.

47. All project consultants will be hired by using standard recruitment procedures of either UNDP, UNEP or UNEP-WCMC. UNDP and UNEP will otherwise be responsible for: (i) providing financial and audit services to the project; (ii) recruitment of specialized consultants and service provider; (iii) overseeing financial expenditures against project budgets approved by PSC; (iv) appointment of independent financial auditors; and (iv) ensuring that all activities, including procurement and financial services, are carried out in strict compliance with UNDP, UNEP and GEF procedures.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:

B.1. National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions

48. This project is consistent with the development of national strategies and plans, included in the Convention itself as an obligation of countries. It is also consistent with the global CBD strategic plan, as articulated by the Aichi Targets.

B.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities

49. This project will contribute to the GEF’s Focal Area Objective BD5, which focuses on the integration of CBD obligations into national planning processes through BD EA. This is a global project, bringing to bear the resources and technical capabilities of both UNDP and UNEP to support all of the GEF countries that have accessed the “BD5” funding window. More specifically, it will contribute to Outcome 5.1. on the development

¹⁷ DEPI is UNEP’s Division of Environmental Policy Implementation.

and sectoral planning frameworks at country level integrate measurable biodiversity conservation and sustainable use targets.

50. The GEF has prioritized in GEF5 continued support to BD EA, playing an important role in assisting national government institutions to meet their immediate obligations under the CBD, in particular through the development and revision of National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs), but also national reporting, and clearing house information functions.

51. This project will support a global effort to incentivize countries to make substantive changes in the state of biodiversity at the national level through participation in global, regional or multi-country projects. It fits with the following criteria:

- The project is clearly relevant to the objectives of GEF's biodiversity strategy, and emphasizes key areas of GEF's interests, including protected areas and biodiversity mainstreaming, among others;
- This project clearly supports priorities identified by the Conference of Parties of the CBD, including the development and revision of NBSAPs that fully reflect the Aichi Targets
- There is high likelihood that the project will have a broad and positive impact on biodiversity; potential for replication;
- This proposal represents an innovative approach to learning that is faster, more nimble, more lasting and has a lower carbon footprint than previous efforts. To the extent that this project shows new and more cost-effective ways to strengthen capacity globally, it will provide enormous demonstration value for other conventions; and
- This project will contribute to global conservation knowledge through formal experimental or quasi-experimental designs that test and evaluate the hypotheses embedded in project interventions.

B.3. The GEF Agencies' Programmes and respective comparative advantage

52. UNDP and UNEP have historically been the main GEF Agencies in terms of assisting countries in implementing BD EA projects. These projects helped countries prepare their original Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans, prepare their reports to the CBD COP, from the first to the fourth, and assess capacity needs in a number of countries.

53. Both UNDP-GEF, UNEP-DEPI (GEF) are well equipped to directly implement the project. UNDP-GEF has one senior full-time global staff directly responsible for BD and LD EA, plus 10 regional UNDP-GEF advisors that also support BD EA projects, lead by the Principle Technical Adviser for Ecosystems and Biodiversity. UNEP has one senior Task Manager, one Task Manager and one Programme Assistant who will be involved in direct implementation of the project.

54. In addition, UNDP and UNEP-WCMC share complementary expertise. UNDP has a strong history of supporting protected areas, incentives, biodiversity finance, and a growing portfolio in climate resilience and restoration. UNDP pioneered several biodiversity mainstreaming projects in relevant themes. Through its nationally-anchored projects, UNDP seeks to harness the positive opportunities provided by biodiversity and natural ecosystems, as a catalyst for sustainable development. It recognizes the real value of biodiversity and ecosystems to society—in relation to secure livelihoods, food, water and health, enhanced resilience, conservation of threatened species and their habitats, and increased carbon storage and sequestration—and calls for innovation, drawing on the potential of nature, to achieve multiple development dividends. UNEP, including UNEP-WCMC has a strong background in spatial planning, and the development of targets and indicators. UNEP WCMC is the custodian of the World Database on Protected Areas and holds strategic alliances with several other data holders, putting it in a unique position to assist beneficiary countries. In addition, UNEP-WCMC has extensive

background in providing thematic support for NBSAP revision and implementation. UNEP-WCMC has considerable experience in supporting countries in integrating spatial mapping considerations, incorporating biodiversity and ecosystem service values and building NBSAPs that influence development decisions and improve outcomes for biodiversity and poverty. UNEP-WCMC also hosts the Secretariat of the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP), the principal vehicle for coordinating indicators at global, regional and national scales for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. A large component of the BIP's work focuses on building capacity and supporting Parties to develop indicators for their NBSAP revision and implementation. These capacities will be brought to bear in project implementation.

55. The UNEP/DELC MEA support mechanisms have continuously provided opportunities to effectively enhance synergies not only between UNEP and various multilateral environmental agreements, but also through support to countries to meet their obligations under these MEAs, in areas of common interests to avoid duplication, ensure quality and eventually strengthen the international architecture of international environmental governance as a whole.

56. The global Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Targets coupled with the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) applies to all biodiversity-related MEAs and National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs) are the primary means of its implementation. Currently, most countries worldwide have reviewed or are reviewing their NBSAPs, in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and it is, therefore, an opportunity for enhancing synergies with other biodiversity-related Conventions, a process that has been continuously supported by UNEP/DELC MEA support Team (including regional support mechanisms) and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers. It is pertinent that the “new generation NBSAPs” are well refined for quality assurance to facilitate their effective implementation by policy and decision-makers’ and integration into appropriate policies, institutional processes as well as responses into national sectoral action plans.

C. BUDGETED M & E PLAN

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Technical Coordinator ▪ UNDP-GEF and UNEP-DEPI GEF, WCMC 	Indicative cost: 36,000	By Nov 2013, piggy-backing on CBD organized workshop.
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Technical Coordinator ▪ UNDP-GEF and UNEP- DEPI GEF, WCMC ▪ External consultant for data-handling 	Approx. \$4,400	Annually.
Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Technical Coordinator and team ▪ UNDP-GEF and UNEP-DEPI GEF, WCMC 	None, except printing costs	ARR/PIR: Annually Periodic status review / progress reports: Quarterly

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Periodic user surveys and user feedback ¹⁸	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Technical Coordinator and team 	None	Periodically, but at least twice a year
Terminal Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Technical Coordinator, UNDP-GEF, UNEP-DEPI GEF, WCMC ▪ UNDP and UNEP Evaluation Offices 	Indicative cost : 50,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Technical Coordinator and team 	None, except printing costs	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP- GEF Directorate for the UNDP Component 	Indicative costs: 3,200 per year (\$9,600 in total)	Yearly
TOTAL indicative COST <i>Excluding project team staff time and UNDP and UNEP staff expenses</i>		\$100,900	

¹⁸ User surveys, employing simple survey tools such as SurveyMonkey, will be used to identify user satisfaction with knowledge management products, the NBSAP Forum web portal, and capacity strengthening efforts. These surveys will also elicit ongoing user needs for additional support.



PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S)

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
n/a			

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, UNDP/ GEF Officer- in-Charge and Deputy Executive Coordinator		October 24, 2013	Fabiana Issler Regional Technical Advisor, Ecosystems & Biodiversity, Africa, UNDP-GEF	+27-12- 3548128	fabiana.issler@undp.org
Maryam Niamir- Fuller Director, GEF Coordination Office		October 24, 2013	Mohamed F. Sessay Chief , GEF Biodiversity/Land Degradation/Biosafety Unit & Portfolio Manager DEPI-GEF Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (DEPI)	+254 20 7624294	Mohamed.sessay@unep.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

(Either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Table 2. Project Strategic Results Framework (SRF)

		Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective As an overall contribution to the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 at the global level, to provide technical support to all eligible countries accessing GEF Biodiversity Enabling Activities funding, with a view to improving the quality benchmark and policy relevance of the next generation of NBSAPs, while also enhancing public participation in the NBSAP preparation process	1	NBSAPs fully address the Aichi Biodiversity Target, as evidenced by high scores on the NBSAP peer review template	NBSAPS do not address the Aichi Biodiversity Targets – all but a small handful were developed prior to 2010	At least 50% of NBSAPs fully address, at a minimum, Targets 2,3,5,11,12,13,14, 15 and 20	NBSAPs as submitted to the CBD Secretariat	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – That technical guidance in the form of e-learning, guides, best practices will be sufficient to enable countries to achieve this objective. – That there is sufficient political will and stakeholder participation within countries to obtain these results.
	2	Number and diversity of stakeholders included in GEF-supported NBSAPs, and the description of participation in NBSAP documents	Previous NBSAPs focused on biodiversity stakeholders, rather than broad stakeholder engagement.	At least 50% of NBSAPs include diverse stakeholders from a range of civil society, as well as from key sectors, focusing on the sectors that drive biodiversity loss	NBSAP section on stakeholder participation (as per minimum benchmark checklist for stakeholder participation to be developed)	Risks: That governments will not utilize the tools and materials provided
	3	NBSAPs target the key sectoral drivers of biodiversity loss, and include specific strategies and actions on mainstreaming biodiversity into sectors, poverty alleviation plans and national development plans.	In previous NBSAPs, there was only scant attention paid to sectoral drivers of biodiversity loss, and mainstreaming strategies were identified as one of the primary weaknesses. An initial review of recent NBSAPs submitted after CoP-10 indicates that countries have not fully internalized Target 2.	At least 50% of NBSAPs have clear and compelling analysis of the drivers of biodiversity loss (e.g., have completed a root cause analysis or some other form of sectoral analysis), and have robust mainstreaming strategies as determined by peer reviews	NBSAP sections on mainstreaming and sectoral drivers of biodiversity loss, and peer review feedback	That major sectoral pressures from powerful lobby interests will prevent NBSAPs from being transformative
Outcome 1 <i>New and innovative knowledge management tools enhance global learning on biodiversity</i>	4	Tools are fully available to enable countries to access information regarding key themes, and in multiple languages.	The current status of learning tools is highly variable, and quality is not uniform. Tools are not generally translated into multiple languages, and are not targeted to the specific needs of users.	At least 12 new tools are developed focusing on critical themes, and they provide practical guidance to countries to achieve the overall project objective, and each are available in English, Spanish, French, Russian and Arabic	12 tools are developed and available on the NBSAP Forum in multiple languages	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – That the countries will avail of the technical guidance materials – That the materials can be developed in a timely manner, and translated into

		Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<i>management and support the NBSAP development processes throughout the world, so that NBSAPs become more relevant policy instruments, integrated into and other sectoral national plans strategies and policies</i>	5	NBSAPs include realistic, appropriate, prioritized and sequenced resource mobilization plans to achieve the NBSAPs	<p>The last round of NBSAPs included neither a realistic costing of strategies and actions, nor a strategy for mobilizing resources</p> <p>Concrete tools for resource mobilization do not currently exist for NBSAPs</p>	<p>At least 50% of NBSAPs have realistic, appropriate, prioritized and sequenced resource mobilization plans as part of their NBSAPs</p> <p>An e-learning module and support materials is developed on resource mobilization, and available in multiple languages, and accessed by at least 70% of GEF-eligible countries</p>	<p>NBSAPs, as submitted to CBD Secretariat, including resource mobilization plans</p> <p>E-learning module on resource mobilization and support materials hosted on the NBSAP Forum</p>	<p>languages quickly enough to be utilized by countries</p> <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – That materials are developed too late in the process to be useful – That materials are not utilized fully by countries for political or other reasons
	6	NBSAPs include and fully utilize the latest scientific and spatial data on biodiversity, conservation and threats.	<p>The vast majority of NBSAPs have only limited spatial data.</p> <p>Several of the most recent NBSAPs as submitted to CBD do not have spatial data</p>	<p>At least 50% of NBSAPs incorporate recent spatial data</p>	<p>NBSAPs, as submitted to CBD Secretariat</p>	
Outcome 2 Targeted, technical and timely support to countries enables the adoption of best practices, guidelines and other materials, and ensures the long-term capacity of countries to fully incorporate the essence of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets	7	Direct technical support is provided in a variety of languages to meet national needs on key themes	<p>Technical support to countries is very limited, with major language gaps (e.g., Spanish, Russian, French, Arabic)</p>	<p>At least 65 countries receive direct technical support</p> <p>>60% across the board are satisfied with the quality of services</p>	<p>Reports from technical experts, consultants on services provided</p> <p>Anonymous client satisfaction surveys on peer-review and expert review</p>	<p>Assumptions:</p> <p>That the countries will avail of the technical support opportunities, and will fully participate in learning forums.</p> <p>Risks:</p> <p>That demand for technical capacity will exceed the ability to service this demand.</p>
	8	Trainings, webinars, e-learning and toolkits help to expand learning to a broader constituency within countries	<p>Training on NBSAPs is currently limited to 1-2 CBD workshops per year, aimed at a single person within a country</p>	<p>At least 70% of countries will participate in some form of webinar or training</p> <p>E-learning materials are accessed by at least 1000 people, with at least 5 per country</p> <p>>60% across the board are satisfied with the quality of materials</p>	<p>Training, webinar records of participation</p> <p>E-learning participation as recorded on host site</p> <p>Anonymous client satisfaction surveys on online webinars, e-learning, spatial planning tools and other tools</p>	

		Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	9	Key services are enabled through the NBSAP Forum and targeted support for peer reviews and best practices	There is no current facility for exchange or peer review	At least 50% of NBSAPs are peer reviewed by at least 5 expert reviewers At least 100 best practices are exchanged	Participation within the NBSAP Forum through the peer review and best practices exchange facility	

Table 3. Overview of Management Arrangements per Output

<i>Components, Outputs and Activities</i>		<i>Implementation</i>
Component 1. Global learning and technical content development		
Output 1.1	<p><i>User-friendly, customizable tools and assessment methodologies, e-learning, voluntary templates and other guidance material, including for benchmarking the technical quality of NBSAP products before submission, are developed and widely applied in GEF-financed NBSAP development processes. They are primarily disseminated through the NBSAP Forum.</i></p> <p>1.1.1 Guidance materials, voluntary templates and assessment methodologies 1.1.2 E-learning, quick guides, Wiki pages and training packages</p>	UNDP
Output 1.2	<p><i>Online spatial planning tools for key thematic areas and cross-cutting issues are made available to countries to facilitate biodiversity status assessments.</i></p> <p>1.2.1 Scoping the NBSAP Spatial Planning Tools 1.2.2 Development of country packages 1.2.3 Guidance on NBSAP Spatial Planning Tools 1.2.4 Online -Tools for Guidance to countries (in particular LDCs and SIDS globally) on legal/policy preparedness of the “new generation NBSAPs”. (UNEP DELC)</p>	UNEP-WCMC and UNEP DELC
Output 1.3	<p><i>The NBSAP Forum Web Portal is functional and well maintained: (i) fully operational by end 2013; (ii) further developed to fulfil evolving clients’ needs throughout the project’s duration; (iii) hosting and maintenance are taken over by CBD for sustainability.</i></p> <p>1.3.1 Phase III development of NBSAP Forum Web Portal project 1.3.2 Hand-over of NBSAP Forum Portal to the CBD Website</p>	UNDP
Output 1.4	<p><i>A partnership framework for collaboration among all agencies and entities involved in NBSAP process emerges with a view to supporting client countries and developing best practices.</i></p> <p>1.4.1 Adaptive feedback and global collaboration on content 1.4.2 Best practices compilation 1.4.3 M&E</p>	UNDP and UNEP-WCMC
Component 2. Direct technical support delivery		
Output 2.1	<p><i>Peer and expert review technical support is provided to countries on a ‘demand-driven’ and ‘match-making’ basis for each phase of NBSAP development process.</i></p> <p>2.1.1 Expertise on demand 2.1.2 Peer and expert review 2.1.3 Expert advice on legal/policy preparedness of the “new generation NBSAPs (by UNEP DELC)</p>	UNDP and UNEP WCMC and UNEP DELC
Output 2.2	<p><i>Online webinars and both virtual and in person workshops are facilitated guiding NBSAP processes through critical steps and to the benefit of client countries.</i></p> <p>2.2.1 Workshops and webinars 2.2.2 Workshop facilitation</p>	UNDP and UNEP, including UNEP-WCMC, & UNEP DELC
Output 2.3	<p><i>A framework for monitoring client satisfaction and for creating a feedback loop for technical support delivery is effective by end 2013.</i></p> <p>2.3.1 Developing and applying surveys 2.3.2 Website moderation</p>	UNDP and UNEP, including UNEP-WCMC

ANNEX B: BUDGET

Table 4. Detailed UNDP Total Budget and Work Plan (\$)

Component	Fund ID and Donor Name	Implementation	Atlas Budget Codes and Description	Total Amount	Amount 2013	Amount 2014	Amount 2015	Note
Component 1. Global learning and technical content development	62000 - GEF	UNDP	71400 Contractual Services - Individ	100,000	0	100,000	0	1
	62000 - GEF	UNDP	71400 Contractual Services - Individ	56,000	0	56,000	0	2
	62000 - GEF	UNDP	71400 Contractual Services - Individ	20,000	0	10,000	10,000	3
	62000 - GEF	UNDP	72100 Contractual Services-Companies	40,000	20,000	20,000	0	4
	62000 - GEF	UNDP	72100 Contractual Services-Companies	100,000	0	100,000	0	5
	62000 - GEF	UNDP	72400 Communic & Audio Visual Equip	15,000	3,000	8,000	4,000	6
	62000 - GEF	UNDP	72800 Information Technology Equipmt	8,000	8,000	0	0	7
	62000 - GEF	UNDP	74100 Professional Services	70,000	20,000	50,000	0	8
TOTAL Component 1				409,000	51,000	344,000	14,000	
Component 2. Direct technical support delivery	62000 - GEF	UNDP	71400 Contractual Services - Individ	26,000	0	26,000	0	2
	62000 - GEF	UNDP	71400 Contractual Services - Individ	100,000	0	100,000	0	1
	62000 - GEF	UNDP	71200 International Consultants	130,000	60,000	50,000	20,000	9
	62000 - GEF	UNDP	71200 International Consultants	25,000	0	0	25,000	10
	62000 - GEF	UNDP	71600 Travel	85,000	10,000	60,000	15,000	11
TOTAL Component 2				366,000	70,000	236,000	60,000	
Project Management	62000 - GEF	UNDP	74100 Professional Services	64,000	20,000	24,000	20,000	12
	62000 - GEF	UNDP	74500 Miscellaneous Expenses	11,000	3,000	5,000	3,000	13
TOTAL Proj Mgt				75,000	23,000	29,000	23,000	
GRAND TOTAL				850,000	144,000	609,000	97,000	

UNDP Budget Notes	
1	Long-term project consultant: UNDP activity coordinator and site moderator (Outputs 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 2.2 and 2.3) (\$200K for 2 years part-time; see ToR).
2	Senior Knowledge Management consultant, part-time (critical inputs to outputs 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1 and 2.2) (\$82K part-time retainer over 3 years, approx. 27 weeks of service; see ToR).
3	Senior agency technical staff support to knowledge management and partnership building (Output 1.4).
4	Knowledge management products: preparing e-learning modules and webinars, conceiving and organizing the peer and expert review framework, inputs to guidance materials, publications, entering data into systems, etc. (Output 1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3).
5	Engagement of web development services development, regular maintenance, hand-over and migration, if needed (Output 1.3).
6	Communication costs (primarily Output 1.4, but also 2.2 in connection with webinars).
7	Package of IT equipment and software for project consultants. (Output 1.4).
8	Translation (FR + ES) + editorial services and typesetting for: e-learning modules, quick guides, toolkits, voluntary templates and reporting formats (primarily Output 1.1).
9	Retainer technical support consultant – EN, SP, RU engaged by UNDP (\$130K); EN, FR engaged by UNEP (refer to UNEP budget lines 1200's further down) (principally Output 2.1, but also 1.1, 2.2 and 2.3).
10	Evaluation (50% UNDP, 50% UNEP - refer to UNEP budget further down) (Output 2.3).
11	Participation of project staff/consultants in CBD workshop plus direct support to countries where needed (Output 2.2).
12	Agency administrative costs and audit costs. (The former includes procurement, legal, HR plus local business unit admin staff time).
13	Bank charges, insurance, currency fluctuation and other miscellaneous changes.

Quick Reference to Outputs:
Output 1.1 Tools, methodologies, e-learning & guidance
Output 1.2 Spatial Planning
Output 1.3 NBSAP Forum
Output 1.4 Partnerships & adaptive management
Output 2.1 Peer & expert review
Output 2.2 Workshops
Output 2.3 Site moderation, adaptive feedback & evaluation

Table 5. Detailed UNEP Budget (\$)

Project No: 1160

Project Name: Support to GEF Eligible Countries for achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 through a globally guided NBSAPs update process

UNEP BUDGET LINE/OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE	EXPENDITURE BY PROJECT COMPONENT/ACTIVITY *				EXPENDITURE BY YEAR			
	1	2	PMC	Total	2013	2014	2015	Total
	US\$	US\$	US\$	US\$	US\$	US\$	US\$	US\$
10 PROJECT PERSONNEL COMPONENT								
1100 Project Personnel w/m (Show title/grade)								
1101 Project Management UNEP-WCMC			75,000	75,000	15,625	37,500	21,875	75,000
1199 Total	0	0	75,000	75,000	15,625	37,500	21,875	75,000
1200 Consultants w/m (Give description of activity/service)								
1201 UNEP WCMC Consultants/Experts for Targets and Indicators	42,500			42,500		30,000	12,500	42,500
1202 UNEP WCMC Consultants/Experts Spatial mapping and data	61,750			61,750		40,250	21,500	61,750
1203 UNEP WCMC Support/deskHelp Desk(s)		110,000		110,000	30,000	60,000	20,000	110,000
1204 UNEP DELC Regional MEA Consultant(s)		95,000		95,000	10,000	55,000	30,000	95,000
1205 UNEP DEPI Technical NBSAP Progress Consultant	290,750			290,750	60,000	140,000	90,750	290,750
1299 Total	395,000	205,000	0	600,000	100,000	325,250	174,750	600,000
1601 DEPI Travel on official business	20,000	20,000		40,000	20,000	20,000		40,000
1602 WCMC Travel on official business	20,000	20,000		40,000	20,000	20,000		40,000
1603 DELC Travel on official business	20,000	20,000		40,000	20,000	20,000		40,000
1699 Total	60,000	60,000	0	120,000	60,000	60,000	0	120,000
1999 Component Total	455,000	265,000	75,000	795,000	175,625	422,750	196,625	795,000
3999 Component Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5199 Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5200 Reporting costs (publications, maps, newsletters, printing, etc)								
5201 Output Reports UNEP WCMC	15,000			15,000		10,000	5,000	15,000
5202 Output Reports UNEP DELC		15,000		15,000		10,000	5,000	15,000
5299 Total	15,000	15,000	0	30,000	0	20,000	10,000	30,000
5500 Evaluation (consultants fees/travel/ DSA, admin support, etc. internal projects)								
5501 Terminal Evaluation	12,500	12,500		25,000			25,000	25,000
5502				0				0
5503				0				0
5599 Total	12,500	12,500	0	25,000	0	0	25,000	25,000
5999 Component Total	27,500	27,500	0	55,000	0	20,000	35,000	55,000
TOTAL	482,500	292,500	75,000	850,000	175,625	442,750	231,625	850,000

ANNEX C: TERMS OF REFERENCE

(To be adapted and completed by UNDP and UNEP as applicable)

ACTIVITY COORDINATION

Coordination

- Prepare annual and quarterly work-plans and establish monitoring milestones.
- Together with the Agency's admin staff ensure the smooth implementation of all processes pertaining to procurement, recruitments and contractual engagement of service providers.
- Ensure the timely adherence to work-plans and the cost effective use of project funds.
- Monitor implementation of all project activities and budgets, including progress towards project indicators.
- Report on implementation and progress towards results through appropriate means (Inception Report, APR/PIR, progress reports – noting that some of these reports will be joint UNDP-UNEP).
- Support the evaluation of the project and the organization of project steering committee meetings.

Partnerships

- Create and strengthen key partnerships, primarily with activity coordinator in counterpart in Agency, and with the CBD Secretariat to ensure cohesion in the joint UNDP-UNEP implementation, but also with other partners with whom the project is expected to collaborate and create synergies with.
- Attend selected CBD organized NBSAP workshops.
- Maintain senior management in Agency informed of key issues to be addressed at the appropriate level.

SITE MODERATION

Communication management

- Serve as the key point of correspondence addressed to Agency though the NBSAP Forum site, responding and directing it as needed.
- Source resources and materials for distribution and referral
- Create and populate content to the NBSAP Forum site, but also other sites (e.g. wiki pages, the Agency's own website pertaining to NBSAPs, NBSAP Forum's accounts in different social network sites etc.)
- Create linkages with existing expert discussion groups for key topics

Match-making for NBSAP Review

- Organise the Peer and Expert review platform through match-making (identifying needs, sourcing an expert or peer, creating linkages, supporting the actual match-making), working closely with the technical adviser in the Agency responsible for the project (or directly for direct GEF access countries).

KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

Technical support

- Coordinate the implementation of Outputs 1.1 and 2.1 for what content is concerned, planning in detail the production and organisation of knowledge products, and supporting technical review of service providers engaging in implementing specific activities and tasks under the Output.
- Engage with in-house experts within UNDP, UNEP, CBD Secretariat and partners agencies for supporting the knowledge management and production process pertaining to NBSAP Support.
- Provide critical technical and knowledge support to activities under: Output 1.3 (NBSAP Forum), Output 1.4 (Partnerships & adaptive management), Output 2.2 (Workshops).

NBSAP Forum knowledge and relationship management

- Maintain lines of communication with WCMC and CBD Secretariat for coordinating the development of the NBSAP Forum community of practice
- Create linkages with existing expert discussion groups for key topics within the NBSAP Forum site, producing
- Collect and post key resources and materials

- Create and populate content to the NBSAP Forum site, but also other sites (e.g. wiki pages, the Agency's own website pertaining to NBSAPs, NBSAP Forum's accounts in different social network sites etc.)

Partnerships

- Create and strengthen key partnerships, primarily with activity coordinator in counterpart in Agency, and with the CBD Secretariat to ensure cohesion in the joint UNDP-UNEP implementation, but also with other partners with whom the project is expected to collaborate and create synergies with.
- Attend selected CBD organized NBSAP workshops.
- Maintain senior management in Agency informed of key issues to be addressed at the appropriate level.

EXPERT REVIEW SUPPORT

(English, French, Spanish, Russian)

Expertise mapping and support to match-making

- Prepare CV and bio in different languages, as well as profile for the NBSAP Forum and related pages (e.g. LinkedIn) for the purpose of the Expert Review Platform.
- Outline, according a pre-set 'NBSAP expertise taxonomy', own profile of expertise and qualifications, as well as interest in supporting NBSAP processes in different regions and countries.
- Indicate availability, through NBSAP Forum tools, for providing expert review support, keeping this information always up-to-date.
- Respond in a timely manner to requests for support.

Provision of Technical Support

- Play a pivotal role in the implementation of Output 2.1 (Peer & expert review).
- Be available for providing direct technical support to countries through: short-term missions, participation in webinars, and other project activities.
- Provide expert support to the global project team in the implementation of: Output 1.1 (Tools, methodologies, e-learning & guidance), Output 2.2 (Workshops) and Output 2.3 (Site moderation, adaptive feedback & evaluation).

Time management

- Maintain detailed records and evidence of support provided, including on the time-spent.
- Use file sharing platforms to make this information available to project manager and senior agency staff in real-time.
- Submit time-keeping sheets to activity coordinators for further processing.

ANNEX D: CO-FINANCING LETTERS

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

7th August 2013

Dr. Naoko Ishii
Chief Executive Officer & Chair
Global Environment Facility
1818, NW
Washington DC, 20433, USA

Dear Dr. Ishii

Subject: Co-financing support to global UNDP-UNEP-GEF project "Support to GEF Eligible Countries for achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 through a globally guided NBSAPs update process"

This letter seeks to acknowledge the formal intention and commitment of UNDP to co-finance the global UNDP-UNEP-GEF project titled "**Support to GEF Eligible Countries for achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 through a globally guided NBSAPs update process**".

UNDP will allocate a total of **\$1,000,000** co-finance to activities that directly relate to biodiversity policy analysis and the development of methodologies for assessing biodiversity finance, as follows:

- Develop, test, refine, design, print and disseminate global methodology, including biodiversity policy and expenditure review, costing of NBSAP strategies and actions, and development of resource mobilization plan (\$500,000).
- Develop supporting materials, including templates, guidance and global analyses of NBSAP costs (\$100,000).
- Support CBD-led global workshop and trainings on resource mobilization and host global workshops on lessons learned in resource mobilization (\$200,000).
- Consolidate lessons and findings into globally available case studies, materials, e-learning tutorials and disseminate broadly via the NBSAP Forum and other mechanisms (\$200,000).

UNDP looks forward to the swift approval of the project.

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Adriana Dinu'.

Adriana Dinu
Officer-in-Charge and
Deputy Executive Coordinator
UNDP - Global Environment Facility
United Nations Development Programme
Tel: +1 (212) 906-5560

CC: Mohamed Sessay, Regional Coordinator, UNEP
Jon Hutton, Director, UNEP-WCMC

Headquarters, United Nations Development Programme, UNDP-GEF, 304 45TH Street, New York, NY 10017 USA
Tel: +1 (212) 906-5000, Fax: +1 (212) 906-6998 www.undp.org



UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME


Programme des Nations Unies pour l'environnement Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente
Программа Организации Объединенных Наций по окружающей среде برنامج الأمم المتحدة للبيئة
联合国环境规划署



MEMORANDUM

To: Maryam Niamir-Fuller
Director, GEF Co-ordination Office

Date: 06 August 2013

From: Mohamed Sessay
Chief, GEF – BD/LD/BS DEPI 

Reference: DEPI/MS/Co

Subject: **Co-financing for GEF Project:** “Support to GEF Eligible Countries for achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 through a globally guided NBSAPs update Process” **ADDIS NO. 01160.**

This letter seeks to acknowledge the formal intention and commitment of UNEP to support the GEF project **ADDIS No. 01160** titled “**Support to GEF Eligible Countries for achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 through a globally guided NBSAPs update process**”, which is a joint UNDP/UNEP project with UNDP as the lead Agency. In the process of undertaking this project, UNEP is providing a total co-finance of **\$1,000,000** making contributions in various ways as follows:

1. UNEP WCMC is providing co-financing from the following UNEP-WCMC projects:
 - NBSAP Forum Support (Norwegian Funds channeled through UNEP) which is supporting activities of the recently established NBSAP Forum through the creation of the NBSAP Forum Portal and the delivery of thematic materials, resources and tools relating to targets and indicators and spatial mapping and data.
 - Improving the effectiveness and cooperation among biodiversity-related conventions and exploring opportunities for further synergies (ENRTP Funding) This project will further develop the NBSAP Forum support network and extend technical support on biodiversity and development mainstreaming, as well as inter-connectivity or bother biodiversity-related MEAs in the NBSAP process.
2. The UNEP DELC MEA support team will be part of the UNEP partnership and provide the necessary advisory and technical support services to countries (in particular LDCs and SIDs globally) through its regional support mechanisms to strengthen and ensure legal/policy preparedness of the “new generation NBSAPs”. Currently DELC anticipates in 2014-2015 UNEP Program of Work (POW) (and 2016-17) to assist developing countries and countries with economies in transition,



UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

Programme des Nations Unies pour l'environnement Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente
Программа Организации Объединенных Наций по окружающей среде برنامج الأمم المتحدة للبيئة

联合国环境规划署



MEMORANDUM

by *facilitating* implementation of the Strategic Plan, including NBSAPs, through strengthened legal, policy and institutional frameworks and capacity building missions to select countries.

3. UNEP's Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (DEPI), will sponsor the technical coordination activities of this project through staff time and technical supervision and implementation of the project by the contribution of non GEF DEPI teams such as those in UNEP Quality Assurance Section (QAS), and UNEP Corporate Services Section (CSS), the latter for involvement in fiduciary mechanisms and the former for ensuring programmatic quality. While the implementation of the proposed projects will last for 24 months, the above contributions from UNEP have been ongoing for the last 2 years, and will continue until completion of the project.

UNEP - DEPI looks forward to successful implementation of these projects.