



GEF-6 REQUEST FOR ONE-STEP MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT APPROVAL

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|
| Project Title: | Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD (Pacific) | | |
| Country(ies): | Regional (Cook Island, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshalls Island, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu) | GEF Project ID: ¹ | TBD |
| GEF Agency(ies): | UNEP | GEF Agency Project ID: | 01583 |
| Other Executing Partner(s): | Environmental Ministries in the participating countries | Submission Date: | June 15, 2017 |
| GEF Focal Area(s): | Biodiversity | Project Duration (Months) | 24 months |
| Integrated Approach Pilot | IAP-Cities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Commodities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Food Security <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| Name of Parent Program: | N/A | Agency Fee (\$) | 120,697 |

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND PROGRAM²:

| Focal Area Objectives/programs | Focal Area Outcomes | Trust Fund | (in \$) | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | | | GEF Project Financing | Co-financing |
| BD-EA: Integrate CBD Obligations into National Planning Processes through Enabling Activities | Outcome 11.1 Development and sectoral planning frameworks at country level integrated measurable biodiversity conservation and sustainable use targets. | GEF TF | 1,270,500 | 590,000 |
| Total project costs | | GEF TF | 1,270,500 | 590,000 |

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To provide financial and technical support to GEF-eligible Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in their work to develop high quality, data driven sixth national reports (6NR) that will improve national decision-making processes for the implementation of NBSAPs; that report on progress towards achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (ABTs) and inform both the fifth Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO5) and the Global Biodiversity Strategy of 2021 – 2030.

| Project Components/ Programs | Financing Type ³ | Project Outcomes | Project Outputs | Trust Fund | (in \$) | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| | | | | | GEF Project Financing | Confirmed Co-financing |

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC and to be entered by Agency in subsequent document submissions.

² When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on [GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF](#).

³ Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|
| 1. Project inception meeting and identification of funding resources | TA | <i>A functional cross-sectoral steering committee (SC) in each participating country is formed to prepare the 6NR, project timelines and methods are developed, funding is mobilized and training and capacity building activities are complete.</i> | <p>1.1. The SC is formed, roles for the preparation of the 6NR are assigned, and a production plan and timeline is developed.</p> <p>1.2. Funding and resource are acquired, including the submission of a funding request and the identification of other funding sources.</p> <p>1.3. Participation in training and capacity building opportunities on the use of the CBD online reporting tool and the development of data that reports on progress in achieving the targets and activities in the post-2010 NBSAP.</p> | GEFTF | 165,000 | 100,000 |
| 2. Assessment of progress towards each ABT and/or national equivalent | TA | <i>Stakeholder owned reports for each ABT and/or national equivalent are produced and compiled.</i> | <p>2.1. Scoping report/zero draft for each ABT and/or national equivalent is prepared and includes analysis on gender.</p> <p>2.2. Consultations with stakeholders are undertaken.</p> <p>2.3. Gender-sensitive reports for each ABT and/or national equivalent are developed</p> | GEFTF | 770,000 | 300,000 |
| 3: Production and submission of 6NR | TA | <i>A Stakeholder owned 6NR is produced and submitted to the CBD</i> | <p>3.1. The draft 6NR is compiled, undergoes a technical peer review, revised and finalized.</p> <p>3.2. The 6NR is validated and officially submitted to the CBD.</p> | GEFTF | 220,000 | 100,000 |

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------------|-------|------------------|----------------|
| | Subtotal | | 1,155,000 | 500,000 |
| | Project Management Cost (PMC) ⁴ | GEFTF | 115,500 | 90,000 |
| | Total GEF Project Financing | | 1,270,500 | 590,000 |

For multi-trust fund projects, provide the total amount of PMC in Table B, and indicate the split of PMC among the different trust funds here: (N/A)

C. SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE

Please include confirmed co-financing letters for the project with this form.

| Sources of Co-financing | Name of Co-financier | Type of Co-financing | Amount (\$) |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Recipient Government | Environmental Ministries in the participating countries | In-kind | 430,000 |
| Recipient Government | Environmental Ministries in the participating countries | Grant | 160,000 |
| Total Co-financing | | | 590,000 |

D. GEF/LDCF/SCCF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), TRUST FUND, COUNTRY(IES), FOCAL AREA AND PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS

| GEF Agency | Trust Fund | Country/ Regional/Global | Focal Area | Programming of Funds | (in \$) | | |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| | | | | | GEF Project Financing (a) | Agency Fee ^{a)} (b) | Total (c)=a+b |
| UNEP | GEFTF | Regional | N/A | Set-aside | 1,270,500 | 120,697 | 1,391,197 |
| Total Grant Resources | | | | | 1,270,500 | 120,697 | 1,391,197 |

a) Refer to the [Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies](#).

E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS⁵

Provide the expected project targets as appropriate.

| Corporate Results | Replenishment Targets | Project Targets |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 6. Enhance capacity of countries to implement MEAs (multilateral environmental agreements) and mainstream into national and sub-national policy, planning financial and legal frameworks | Development and sectoral planning frameworks integrate measurable targets drawn from the MEAs in at least 10 countries | <i>Number of Countries: 11</i> |
| | Functional environmental information systems are established to support decision-making in at least 10 countries | <i>Number of Countries: 11</i> |

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT?

(If [non-grant instruments](#) are used, provide an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF Trust Fund) in Annex B.

N/A

⁴ For GEF Project Financing up to \$2 million, PMC could be up to 10% of the subtotal; above \$2 million, PMC could be up to 5% of the subtotal. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project financing amount in Table D below.

⁵ Provide those indicator values in this table to the extent applicable to your proposed project. Progress in programming against these targets for the projects per the *Corporate Results Framework* in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#), will be aggregated and reported during mid-term and at the conclusion of the replenishment period. There is no need to complete this table for climate adaptation projects financed solely through LDCF and/or SCCF.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

1. Project Description. Briefly describe: a) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed; b) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects; c) the proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area⁶ strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project; d) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF/SCCF, CBIT and co-financing; e) global environmental benefits (GEFTF), and adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF); and 6) innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

Overview

The sixth national reports (6NR) to Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) will provide key sources of information from which final progress towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 can be reviewed. Countries are encouraged to initiate the process to prepare the 6NR as early as possible to ensure its submission by 31 December 2018. Given the time required to finalize a national report, Parties are encouraged to start preparing their national report using the CBD online reporting system (<https://chm.cbd.int/submit/online-reporting>) as soon as possible. The reporting timeline is significant, in that it coincides with the Fifth Edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook. This information will provide the main rationale for the follow up work on the Strategic Plan beyond this decade and will help shape of the post-2020 global biodiversity agenda. It is therefore essential that these reports provide an accurate and up-to-date reflection of national and global progress to address the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (ABTs).

The thirteenth meeting of the CBD Conference of the Parties (COP 13) adopted 6NR guidelines and a reporting template. The sixth national report contains six sections: (a) information on the targets being pursued at the national level; (b) implementation measures taken, assessment of their effectiveness, and scientific and technical needs; (c) assessment of progress towards each national target; (d) assessment of the national contribution to the achievement of each Aichi Biodiversity Target; (e) assessment of the national contribution to the achievement of each target of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation; and (f) updated biodiversity country profiles.

The CBD Secretariat has prepared a reference manual that complements guidelines for the 6NR and is intended to assist Parties in preparing their 6NR by the reporting deadline, in accordance with decision XIII/X and Article 26 of the Convention. The reference manual provides suggestions on the types of information Parties may wish to include in their 6NR and sources of information they may wish to draw on. This includes other reporting and assessment processes related to biodiversity, such as those related to other biodiversity-related conventions and multilateral environmental agreements, as well as relevant information managed or maintained by international organizations. It was made available in UNEP/CBD/COP/13/21 and a revised version will be available shortly.

This project proposes to enhance CBD's efforts to build national reporting capacity by providing targeted and timely technical and financial support to a wide range of GEF eligible countries in an effective and cost-efficient manner. The project objective is to support parties to develop high quality, data driven 6NRs, that are owned by stakeholders, and more accurately report on progress towards achieving the ABTs and implementing National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs) using nationally verified data, with the purpose of informing the fifth Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO5) and the Global Biodiversity Strategy of 2021 – 2030. The project will include trainings and capacity building opportunities that are based on the information provided in the 6NR reference manual, and that are developed and executed in close collaboration with the CBD Secretariat. The project will also support Parties to assess each national target using a stakeholder consultation process, and to participate in a technical peer review process. This will help to ensure the preparation of a comprehensive report and create ownership of its conclusions.

Global environmental problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed:

⁶ For biodiversity project, in addition to explaining the project's consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives and programs, please also describe which Aichi target(s) the project will directly contribute to achieving.

Biodiversity is currently being lost at unprecedented rates due to human activities around the globe. To address this problem, the CBD COP adopted a Strategic Plan in 2002 (Decision VI/26). In its mission statement, CBD Parties committed themselves to more effective and coherent implementation of the three CBD objectives with the purpose of, achieving a significant reduction of the current rate of biodiversity loss at the global, regional and national level by the year 2010, as a contribution to poverty alleviation and to the benefit of all life on earth. These agreements became known as the 2010 Biodiversity Commitments, for which a set of targets and indicators were later established.

The targets associated with the 2010 Biodiversity Commitments inspired action at many levels; however they were not achieved at a sufficient enough scale to successfully address the pressures on biodiversity. While the commitments did result in some understanding of the linkages between biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being, biodiversity issues were insufficiently integrated and generally not reflected into broader policies, strategies, programmes, actions and incentive structures. As a result, the underlying drivers of biodiversity loss were not significantly reduced at the global level. The diversity of genes, species and ecosystems continued to decline, as the pressures on biodiversity remained constant or increased in intensity, mainly as a result of human actions. This loss has profound impacts on human wellbeing, and compromises the ability to adapt to future stressors and shocks.

COP 10 decisions recognize that achieving positive outcomes for biodiversity requires actions at multiple entry points. The new Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (CBD COP decision XI/2) reflects this perspective by including 20 headline targets for 2015 or 2020, which are referred to as the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (ABT), and are organized under five strategic goals. The goals and targets comprise aspirations for achievement at the global level and a flexible framework for the establishment of national or regional targets. The decision invites Parties to set their own targets within this flexible framework, taking into account national needs and priorities, while also considering how national actions contribute to the achievement of the global targets. NBSAPs are the key conduit for implementing the Strategic Plan and achieving the ABTs at a national level, and are a central policy-making tool for national biodiversity management. The Convention requires countries to prepare a national biodiversity strategy, or equivalent instrument, and to ensure that it, and the principles of conservation and sustainable use, are integrated into the planning and activities of those sectors whose activities can have an impact (positive and negative) on biodiversity. Consequently, post-2010, countries were called to revise their NBSAPs, or equivalent documents, with the purpose of setting national targets to attain the Strategic Plan, and prescribe national strategies and actions to achieve them. It is these targets whose implementation and attainment will be assessed during the 6NR process.

Parties are required by Article 26 of the Convention to submit national reports to the COP on measures taken to implement it, and the effectiveness of those actions in meeting the Convention's objectives. The 6NR will focus on monitoring the effectiveness of national strategies and actions in achieving National and Aichi Biodiversity Targets (ABT) and related biodiversity outcomes. This will require an assessment of progress on achieving national targets, using the global and/or national indicators of biodiversity status and trends. However, reporting places a significant burden on countries and results are generally superficial. A lack of spatial data analysis, root cause analysis, and monitoring changes in the status and trends of biodiversity at regular intervals is resulting a pervasive lack of evidence based evidence-based reporting and decision making. These gaps are compounded during assessments regarding the impact of NBASP actions, many of which are not financeable, measurable or sufficiently detailed to be enacted. Many parties will be challenged to populate the CBD online reporting system because of these issues and the variability in post 2010 NBSAPS and previous national reports. The 6NR approach necessitates new thinking about how to development a dynamic reporting framework and decision support system that builds the capacity of countries to that facilitate dynamic monitoring, reporting and decision making to ensure they can to more efficiently and effectively undertake their national reporting obligations.

Most Parties have identified lack of financial, human and technical resources as limiting their implementation of the Convention. Meanwhile, technology transfer under the Convention has been very limited, and there is concern that insufficient scientific information for policy and decision-making is a further obstacle for the implementation of the Convention. Many countries do not find themselves able to commit the necessary funds,

planning, and time for following up on their international commitments with sufficient technical quality. Without the benefit of external assistance and extra guidance, capacity in several countries is simply not sufficient for carrying out the assessment and consultation in a truly participatory fashion and with adequate technical and scientific standards. This is particularly the case for Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS).

Because the global biodiversity strategic plan is ending in 2020, and because there is need to have quality reporting from Parties on progress in implementing the plan, COP 13 requested that the GEF “*provide adequate funding for the preparation of the sixth national report in a timely and expeditious manner*”. In particular, this project proposes to address the need to engage broad groups of stakeholders (including both men and women) at the national level in the process of developing data driven assessment process of progress towards ABT achievement. The project ensures that national biodiversity planning process will continue to contribute to the national policy agenda and be considered in decision-making processes both at global level and in participating countries. In addition, this project will reduce the barriers of Parties to integrate issues pertaining to the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization (the ‘Nagoya Protocol’). This project will also build the capacity of Parties to align reporting on implementation of the CBD 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action (decision XII/7).

Baseline scenario or associate baseline projects

Parties view their capacities to undertake national reporting efforts as insufficient, both financially and technically. During national reporting discussions at COP 13, Parties requested that the CBD Executive Secretary, “*subject to the availability of resources, and, where possible and appropriate, in collaboration with relevant partners and related process, to organize capacity-building activities ... support developing countries, in particular the least developed countries and small islands developing States, as well as Parties with economies in transition, in the preparation of their 6NR*” (decision XIII/27, paragraph 6). In the same decision, Parties also requested that the GEF, “*provide adequate funding for the preparation of the 6NR in a timely and expeditious manner to developing countries, in particular least developed countries and small island developing States, as well as Parties with economies in transition*” (decision XIII/27, paragraph 3).

At COP 12, Parties requested the preparation of an assessment of capacity-building and awareness raising needs related to the coherent and synergistic implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions at the national level. The assessment was undertaken by UNEP-WCMC. Parties (UNEP/CBD/BRC/WS/1/INF/1) identified a number of capacity-building needs related to national reporting (Piloting Integrated Processes and Approaches to Facilitate National Reporting to Rio Conventions). These include:

- strengthening institutional capacity on the mobilization of information,
- managing and processing data for effective flow of information and knowledge,
- developing methods of data analysis, and
- drafting of national reports.

Similar capacity building needs have also been identified through previous GEF-funded support for national reporting in Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS). These capacity-building needs can be addressed via the 6NR support project, through providing technical support regarding the national reporting process as well as the development of the content of 6NRs.

To support the achievement of Strategic Plan, UNDP, UN Environment, through its World Conservation Monitoring Center (UNEP-WCMC), and the Secretariat to the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD) are also collaborating on the GEF-funded “*Global Support to NBSAP*” project. The project partners provide technical support and capacity building services to 128 GEF eligible countries during the NBSAP revision and early implementation process. As a result, the quality benchmark and policy relevance of the next generation of NBSAPs is improving and the level public participation in their preparation is increasing. These actions contribute to the global achievement of ABT 17, which states, “*By 2015, each Party has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and has commenced implementing an effective, participatory and updated national*

biodiversity strategy and action plan.” The project is measurably improving the incorporation of Aichi-inspired biodiversity conservation and sustainable use targets into NBSAPs by implementing two work streams: (1) the development and delivery of global learning materials, and (2) the delivery of direct technical support. The delivery of one-on-one support and the peer review of NBSAPs are also the important tools to improve NBSAP quality and assist countries to align their NBSAPs with the ABTs. This project will utilize a similar project model and building on the strengths of this existing partnership in successfully building the capacity of GEF-eligible countries.

The proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area strategies, with a brief description of the expected outcome and components of the project

Parties are required by Article 26 of the Convention to submit national reports to the COP on measures taken for the implementation of the Convention and their effectiveness in meeting the objectives of the Convention. The 6NR are due by 31 December 2018. Given the time required to prepare, approve and submit a national report, Parties are encouraged to start preparing their 6NR well before the deadline.

The 6NR should provide a final review of progress in the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and towards the ABT, including relevant national targets, based on information concerning the implementation of NBSAPs and other actions taken to implement the Convention. Parties should provide updates since the last national report was submitted. This includes information on new, recently completed and ongoing actions or efforts. It also includes recent changes to the status and trends of biodiversity and related pressures.

Parties are encouraged to involve relevant stakeholders in the preparation of their national report. This includes national focal points for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya Protocol, as well as the national focal points for the biodiversity-related Conventions, the Rio Conventions and other relevant international and regional conventions. Representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities, as well as representatives from relevant sectors, business, civil society organizations and non-governmental organizations should also be involved in 6NR preparation.

Countries to be supported under this MSP (Pacific)

There are 143 Parties to the CBD that are GEF eligible to receive support for 6NR production. This 6NR Pacific Project proposes to work with 11 countries (listed in Table 1.1), which will be supported through UN Environment. These countries have acceded to the CBD and have submitted the previous national reports as per table 1.1 below

Table 1.1 Dates of accession/ratification and dates of submission of previous national reports to the CBD by the countries proposed to be supported under this MSP

| Country name | Date of accession to the CBD | Date of submission of the 4 th NR | Date of submission of the 5 th NR |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| Cooke Island | 1993/12/29 | 2011/04/14 | N/A |
| Fiji | 1993/12/29 | 2010/07/08 | 2014/07/25 |
| Kiribati | 1994/11/14/ | 2013/06/27 | 2015/03/03 |
| Marshall Islands | 1993/12/29 | N/A | N/A |
| Micronesia (Federated State of) | 1994/09/18 | 2010/06/22 | 2014/12/09 |
| Nauru | 1994/02/08 | N/A | 2014/03/31 |
| Niue | 1996/05/28 | 2009/03/31 | 2014/03/27 |
| Palau | 1999/04/06 | N/A | 2014/03/31 |
| Tonga | 1998/08/07 | 2010/06/28 | 2014/05/07 |
| Tuvalu | 2003/03/02 | 2010/01/28 | N/A |
| Vanuatu | 1993/12/29 | N/A | 2014/08/08 |

Therefore, **the objective** of this project is to provide financial and technical support to GEF eligible parties to the CBD in their work to develop high quality, data driven 6NRs that will improve national decision-making processes for the implementation of NBSAPs, that report on progress towards achieving the ABTs and inform both the GBO5 and the Global Biodiversity Strategy of 2012 – 2030. This objective will be achieved through the following components, outcomes and outputs.

Component 1: Project inception meeting & identification of funding resources

Outcome 1: A functional steering committee (SC) is formed to prepare the 6NR, project timelines and methods are developed, funding is mobilized, where necessary, and training and capacity building activities are complete.

Output 1.1: The SC and coordination role(s) for 6NR preparation are assigned, and a production plan and timeline is developed. Activities include: (a) deciding on the working arrangements and methods for preparing the 6NR, including issues related to the use of the online reporting tool; (b) identifying the responsible actors and organizations for the different elements of the report; (c) identifying the relevant stakeholders for each national target or target component; and (d) holding the inception meeting.

Output 1.2: Funding and Resource are acquired, including the submission of a funding request and the identification of other funding sources. Activities include: (a) identifying of other sources of funding and in-kind support, and (b) identifying partner organizations, agencies and centers of excellence to support the project.

Output 1.3: Participation in training and capacity building opportunities for the project team and the steering committee. Activities include: (a) training in the use of the CBD online reporting tool, and (b) training in the development of data that reports on progress in achieving the targets and activities in the post-2010 NBSAP.

Component 2: Assessment of progress towards each national target

Outcome 2: Stakeholder owned reports for each ABT and/or national equivalent are produced and compiled

Output 2.1: A scoping report/zero draft for each ABT and/or national is prepared. Activities include: (a) preparing the initial draft elements of the national report, including data and progress assessments that are already available for each ABT and/or national equivalent; (b) identifying information gaps for each ABT and/or national equivalent that is required to undertake the assessment of implementation measures and the assessment of progress towards national targets required in 6NR sections II and III.

Output 2.2: Consultations with stakeholders are undertaken to verify data and progress assessments and address information gaps. Activities include: (a) facilitating a process that convenes experts from a full range of disciplines, including women, indigenous groups and business sectors, to determine the status of NBSAP implementation, identify data gaps and validate spatial information; and (b) working with experts during stakeholder workshops to draw conclusions on national progress related to NBSAP implementation and achievement of ABT, in support of Decision VII/25. Given the breadth of the national targets adopted by countries, multiple consultations may need to be undertaken, and can include national focal points for the Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols, national focal points for the other biodiversity-related conventions, Rio Conventions and other relevant international and regional processes and agreements, representatives of other government ministries and local governments, representatives of indigenous peoples and local community organizations, research and academic bodies, the private sector, bodies representing the agricultural, forestry, fishery, tourism or other sectors, environmental management bodies, non-governmental organizations, women's organizations, and agencies addressing sustainable development and poverty eradication.

Output 2.3: Gender-sensitive reports for each ABT and/or national target equivalent are developed, and are based on the information collected during the activities that are described above. Activities include: (a) developing progress assessments for each ABT and/or national target equivalent; (b) reviewing NBSAP

implementation (c) reviewing actions to mainstream biodiversity (d) assessing of the effectiveness of the actions undertaken to implement the Strategic Plan and NBSAPS. The individual assessments serve as a series of small, stand-alone reports, which when combined, constitute the main body of the 6NR. This output builds the capacity of countries to facilitate dynamic monitoring, reporting and decision making to ensure they can more efficiently and effectively undertake their national reporting obligations. It also ensures that gender issues are mainstreamed.

Component 3: Sixth National Report production and submission

Outcome 3: A Stakeholder owned 6th National Report is produced and submitted to the CBD

Output 3.1: The 6NR is compiled, reviewed, revised and finalized. Activities include: (a) compiling the target level assessments into a comprehensive draft 6NR, and following all formatting requirements to ensure consistency across targets; (b) circulating the draft 6NR to the SC and UNDP/UN Environment for a technical peer review; (c) revising the assessment to incorporate additional data sources and technical expertise; (d) facilitating additional stakeholder consultations, as needed; (e) developing a final 6NR report; and (f) obtain final approval from steering committee. Depending on the comments received during the review period, a country may wish to make the report available for a second round of peer review. Following the peer review the report will be revised and the final version produced

Output 3.2: The 6NR is validated and officially submitted to the CBD. Activities include: (a) official validation of the report by the government, which often requires approval from the Minister or Cabinet; and (b) submitting the 6NR as an official document to the CBD in accordance with Article 26. The 6NR should comply with national procedures for such submissions. If the 6NR is being prepared with the use of the online reporting tool, the report may be submitted directly to the Secretariat through this system. Parties not using the online reporting tool may send their 6NR to the main email address of the SCBD (secretariat@cbd.int). A national report submitted in document form should be accompanied by an official letter from the national focal point or the senior government official responsible for the implementation of the Convention.

Incremental reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTE, and co-financing

The project seeks to offer instructive guidance and a suite of responsive technical support services for enhancing 6NR quality and catalyzing their transformative role as effective policy instruments, and thereby contributing to achievement of the Strategic Plan and related ABT. Parties are required by Article 26 of the Convention to submit national reports to the COP on measures taken to implement it, and the effectiveness of those actions in meeting the Convention's objectives. The 6NR will focus on monitoring the effectiveness of national strategies and actions in achieving National and Aichi Biodiversity Targets (ABT) and related biodiversity outcomes. This will require an assessment of progress on achieving national targets, using the global and/or national indicators of biodiversity status and trends. However, reporting places a significant burden on countries and results are generally superficial. A lack of spatial data analysis, root cause analysis, and monitoring changes in the status and trends of biodiversity at regular intervals is resulting a pervasive lack of evidence based evidence-based reporting and decision making. These gaps are compounded during assessments regarding the impact of NBASP actions, many of which are not financeable, measurable or sufficiently detailed to be enacted. Many parties will be challenged to populate the CBD online reporting system because of these issues and the variability in post 2010 NBSAPS and previous national reports. The 6NR approach necessitates new thinking about how to develop a dynamic reporting framework and decision support system that builds the capacity of countries to that facilitate dynamic monitoring, reporting and decision making to ensure they can to more efficiently and effectively undertake their national reporting obligations.

Most Parties have identified lack of financial, human and technical resources as limiting their implementation of the Convention. Meanwhile, technology transfer under the Convention has been very limited, and there is concern that insufficient scientific information for policy and decision making is a further obstacle for the implementation of the Convention. Many countries do not find themselves able to commit the necessary funds,

planning, and time for following up on their international commitments with sufficient technical quality. Without the benefit of external assistance and extra guidance, capacity in several countries is simply not sufficient for carrying out the assessment and consultation in a truly participatory fashion and with adequate technical and scientific standards. This is particularly the case for Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS).

| <i>Current Baseline</i> | <i>Alternative</i> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Without GEF funding, reports may be delivered, but there will likely be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal technical input • Minimal use of data, information and knowledge • Low levels of stakeholder engagement • No external expert review • Lack of full alignment with implementation approaches • Lack of full alignment with reporting processes to other conventions and processes | <p>With GEF funding, countries will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be provided with full technical support • Be provided with support on data, information and knowledge related to key issues • Be able to fully engage with stakeholders • Be provided with external peer review and become part of a community of practice around all Aichi Biodiversity Targets • Have support to integrate national reporting into NBSAP implementation processes • Have support to fully align their reporting with other reporting requirements |
| <p>Minimal adherence to reporting deadlines: In the baseline scenario, countries typically will not adhere to reporting deadline of Dec 2018, which will limit the ability of Parties to determine national and global progress towards achievement of the ABT and implementation National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs), and to develop information for the GBO5 and the Strategic Plan.</p> | <p>Parties will receive sequenced technical support to to develop high quality, data driven 6NR by the deadline, and the data can be used to inform GBO5 and the Strategic Plan.</p> |
| <p>Minimal technical input: In the baseline scenario, countries will generally be financially limited to development and use of data to inform national reporting. As a result, the 6NR will lack the sufficient technical stringency and analytical depth that is required. Many countries do not find themselves able to commit the necessary funds, planning, and time for following up on their international commitments with sufficient technical quality. Therefore, in many GEF-eligible countries, the 6NR would be developed with insufficient or inaccurate data on the status of biodiversity and ecosystems.</p> | <p>Parties will receive financial resources and benefit from access to technical capacity building opportunities that will enable them to develop high-quality, data driven national reports. In GEF-eligible countries, this project will allow Parties to invest in developed more accurate data on the status of biodiversity and ecosystems, and to incorporate it into national reporting frameworks, and related assessments of NBSAP implementation and ABT achievement.</p> |
| <p>Low levels of stakeholder engagement: In the baseline scenario, stakeholders will be minimally engaged in the national reporting process.</p> | <p>Stakeholder consultations will be undertaken to verify 6NR data and progress assessments and address information gaps. Experts will be engaged to draw conclusions on national progress related to NBSAP implementation and ABT achievement, in support of Decision VII/25. Given the breadth of the national targets adopted by countries, multiple consultations be undertaken, and can include national focal points for the Cartagena and Nagoya Protocols, national focal points for the other biodiversity-related conventions, Rio Conventions and other relevant international and regional processes and agreements, representatives of other government ministries and local governments,</p> |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>representatives of indigenous peoples and local community organizations, research and academic bodies, the private sector, bodies representing the agricultural, forestry, fishery, tourism or other sectors, environmental management bodies, non-governmental organizations, women's organizations, and agencies addressing sustainable development and poverty eradication. Engaging a variety of stakeholders in the reporting process will also help to successfully mainstream biodiversity into national development planning frameworks and sector planning processes.</p> |
| <p>No external peer review: 6NR reports will lack consistency and quality and there will be variability in the quality of data and types of expertise used to develop the assessment. Without this mechanism, stakeholders may not have the opportunity to comment on the report in its more final stages or work together to improve the accuracy and accountability of the report.</p> | <p>Parties will be provided the opportunity to circulate the draft 6NR to the SC and UNDP/UN Environment for a technical peer review; and revise the assessment accordingly to incorporate additional data sources and technical expertise. Additional stakeholder consultations will be facilitated, as needed. Depending on the comments received during the review period, a country may wish to make the report available for a second round of peer review. This will ensure professional and consistent standards across 6NR, and that the best available data and expertise are being used to develop it. A checklist will be developed and made available in multiple languages. This mechanism also allows peer-to-peer feedback.</p> |
| <p>Not fully aligned with implementation approaches</p> | <p>Improvements in reporting processes can support improved cooperation among different national entities. This will strengthen cooperation mechanisms and information management in general and lead to more efficient reporting, and more efficient use of reported information, including in the context of follow-up and review of SDG progress. If properly established, such processes assist not only the reporting process, but also support awareness raising at the national level, and decision making relating to implementation of the Convention through improvements in information management and use</p> |
| <p>Not fully aligned with and benefiting from reporting to other conventions and processes</p> | <p>This project will assist in operationalizing coherence at the national level in reporting to conventions. Achievement of the ABTs is not only about CBD implementation, as each of the other biodiversity-related conventions also adopted ABT-related obligations. Sharing and accessing relevant information for biodiversity-related decision-making more broadly amongst national focal points, and working to ensure use of the same information processes, will provide opportunities to identify areas of duplication and generate options to harmonize and streamline processes for collecting, storing, sharing, analyzing and reporting biodiversity information by country.</p> |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Without the project, the sixth national report may be developed with insufficient or inaccurate data on the status of biodiversity and ecosystems, biodiversity strategy architects will continue to lack analytical and technical capacity, there will be limited stakeholder consultation, biodiversity will be insufficiently mainstreamed into key productive sectors and development plans, countries will continue to create financial planning for biodiversity strategy implementation based on incorrect assumptions and unrealistic projections, and strategies will quite likely lack sufficient policy traction at the national level and simply get shelved. | In the alternative, governments/countries will develop high quality sixth national report, 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. |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Global environmental benefits

There are two primary global environmental benefits to this project. First, it contributes to the global assessment of progress in achieving the ABTs, and to an understanding of the national contributions made to the Strategic Plan by doing so. The same information is also relevant to assessment of progress in addressing aspects of other international commitments including the SDGs). Second, it provide an important basis for consideration of the post-2020 global biodiversity strategy. The information developed during this project can be used not only to understand current biodiversity status and trends, but also to understand how well a country's actions are contributing to national and global conservation targets.

The results will provide a simultaneous and comparable snapshot of how countries are implementing CBD obligations, and the results of those strategies and actions. This project is an intervention in alignment with the GEF's mandate to generate global benefits by paying for the incremental costs of planning and foundational enabling activities that countries implement to generate global biodiversity benefits.

Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up

Innovation

Elevating biodiversity concerns into the policies and plans of government ministries and private sector companies is a goal that can take many years to achieve, and require tremendous amounts of energy and. This project builds the capacity of Parties to develop high quality 6NR that support ministries and CBD to communicate the value of biodiversity to improve ABT related outcomes to key sectors. These will be reports needed to make a compelling argument for conservation, influence development decisions and have the potential to improve outcomes for biodiversity and poverty. The reports will be gender responsive.

Included in the 6NRs will be direct and explicit linkages to Sustainable Development Goals and to national development goals and planning.

Sustainability

Institutional Sustainability: The project's sustainability will be assured by building institutional capacity to develop high quality, data driven national assessments of progress to achieve national biodiversity targets and to report on progress towards achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and implementing National Biodiversity

Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs) with the purpose of informing the fifth Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO5) and the Global Biodiversity Strategy of 2021 – 2030. The stakeholder driven reporting process will ensure ownership of the outcomes and help Parties to further set and evaluate the importance of a national conversation strategy, and the elements it is intended to address. In most GEF-eligible countries, these committees and structures operated or are operating through previous GEF projects targeting enabling activities. Measures will be taken to ensure adequate representation of the stakeholder's responsible gender equality and the involvement of indigenous peoples and other emerging issues, and to the engagement of focal points of other multilateral agreements and processes. Project design is a direct response to needs identified in the capacity assessment carried out by WCMC in 2012 with respect to national biodiversity planning, as well as needs assessments during the "Global Support to NBSAP" project. Both projects highlight the concept that biodiversity planning is a cyclical and incremental process of capacity building.

Sustainability through strengthening Networks: The technical sustainability of the outcomes of the project is dependent on the maintenance and management of the national, regional and global communications infrastructure. This project will be executed at country level but may have participation of various regional and global actors such as UNEP Regional offices, UNEP WCMC, and SCBD as deemed necessary. Networks will also include actors relevant to issues of gender equality.

Anchoring the project in the UNDAFs

UNEP will make sure this project is anchored in the individual country UNDAF processes, and thus will expose the results to the rest of the UN players in the region. This is crucial to making sure that the outputs and outcomes are visible to many other development agencies and therefore stand a better chance to attract more national and regional support in the future.

While the number of countries may pose a challenge for this mainstreaming due to differences UNDAF cycles, it will still be possible to capture and include it sometime within the 24 months of the project duration. A typical UNDAF framework runs for 5 years and has five pillars including (a) Human rights; (b) Gender mainstreaming; (c) Environment Sustainability; (d) Capacity development; and (e) Results based management. This 6th NR project is based on the environment angle but addresses all the others- and so it will be easy for any country to articulate and mainstream the project in UNDAF. Further, the completed 6NRs will be used as a key document in the drafting of UNDAFs and therefore play a key part in informing UNDAFs, though the various stakeholders involved in the compilation of the 6 NRs. Each of the 17 countries will interrogate their own UNDAF documents and make sure the project answers to their requirements..

Potential for scaling up

The proposed project builds on the positive results of previous projects, including the enabling activities funding and technical support packages provided to Parties during the post-2010 NBSAP revision process. All project activities are designed with maximum replicability as an integral aim. Integral project components, such as the consultation teams, the multi-sectoral stakeholder groups, the technical peer review framework and the thematic biodiversity committees, have been used in previous GEF-funded projects that are focused on enabling activities project. These approaches will be replicated and refined in this project, and the scaled up for use during other GEF supported enabling activities.

The project is also already drawing interesting lessons on the importance of inter-agency collaboration and on the need to involve the Convention in partnerships. During the development of the Third and Fourth National reports, and implementation of the 'Global Support to NBSAP' project, UNEP had a similar mode of using an umbrella program encompassing many countries. This modus operandi has several advantages which could be replicated in other GEF and non-GEF projects that involve mandatory enabling activities. The advantages include:

- The umbrella approach is aimed at reducing transaction costs of individual country requests, providing the GEF, and UNEP an opportunity for managing the biodiversity Enabling Activities more strategically in close partnership with the CBD and other key global actors.
- A second aspect that is already being replicated from previous umbrella projects is parallel training for country teams for issues pertaining to the project and organized by the SCBD.

2. Child Project? If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

N/A

3. *Stakeholders*. Will project design include the participation of relevant stakeholders from civil society organizations (yes ☒ /no ☐) and indigenous peoples (yes ☒ /no ☐)? If yes, elaborate on how the key stakeholders engagement is incorporated in the preparation and implementation of the project.

Countries are expected to involve a wide multi-sectoral group of stakeholders in the various stages of consultations, and where possible, are encouraged to include the entities listed in Table 3.1. During the funding of previous enabling activities, GEF eligible countries conducted stakeholder mapping exercises for biodiversity issues. Participating parties may re-engage those working groups during the 6NR reporting period. Where there are emerging issues, such as gender equality, additional stakeholders will be invited to participate in the process.

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. Existing guidance repeatedly emphasizes that during the transition from biodiversity planning to biodiversity implementation (and related progress assessments and reporting), then everyone with a stake in the outcome of the NBSAP needs to be engaged. At the country level, UNDP and UNEP generally recommend instituting a national steering committee that includes 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. This project will create the means for ensuring that, at the country level, the development of the 6NR will be a widely inclusive and participatory process.

The project will follow SCBD training modules recommendations for stakeholder engagement, which include involving the following sets of actors:

- national ministries that are responsible for managing the environment portfolio in each participating country;
- national ministries responsible for production sectors (e.g., fisheries, forestry, agriculture)
- national ministries responsible for development sectors (e.g., infrastructure, mining, energy, transportation)
- national ministries responsible for finance, budgeting
- other national stakeholders, including multi-sectoral government ministries, local authorities, local communities, civil society organizations (CSOs), local non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and universities;
- private sector entities;
- local communities and indigenous peoples;
- international NGOs, such as BirdLife International, IUCN and the World Wildlife Fund;
- multi-lateral agencies, such as FAO, the World Bank and others. Section 5 gives a detailed identification of relevant institutions and their expected roles in the consultations.

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. 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.

Table 3.1: Potential stakeholders

| |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Government ministries:</p> <p>Ministry of Environment</p> <p>Ministry of Energy, Mineral Resources:</p> <p>Ministry of Fisheries</p> <p>Ministry of Health/Public Health</p> <p>Ministry of Housing</p> <p>Ministry of Trade/ Commerce</p> <p>Ministry of Science and Technology</p> <p>Ministry of Education</p> <p>Ministry of Finance</p> <p>Ministry of Energy</p> <p>Ministry of Women’s Affairs/responsible for gender issues</p> <p>Ministry of Tourism</p> <p>Ministry of Water Resources</p> <p>Ministry of Industrialization</p> <p>Ministry of Information and Communication</p> <p>Ministry of Lands</p> <p>Ministry of Labor</p> <p>Agricultural extension agencies,</p> <p>National focal point(s) for Multilateral Environmental Agreements</p> |
| <p>Legislature-</p> <p>For example, Parliaments, Congressional Bodies, Senates, Member of Parliament</p> |
| <p>Judiciary</p> <p>Civil Courts, Criminal Courts, Police, Roll of Advocates, Judges, Magistrates</p> |
| <p>Taxonomists, National Museums, Zoological /Botanical gardens, Herbaria, Arboreta, germplasm and seed bank managers, plant and animal breeding bodies etc, Universities, Forest Associations, Wild Life Protection Services</p> |
| <p>Communication</p> <p>Print, Audio & Visual Media</p> |
| <p>Private Businesses/Sector/Industry:</p> <p>Oil Industry, Pharmaceuticals, Financial Institutions,</p> <p>Telecommunication Companies, Food and Beverage Companies, Extractive/Mining companies, agro-biotechnology industry associations,</p> |
| <p>Academia & Research Institutions:</p> <p>Public and private agricultural research bodies,</p> <p>Colleges, polytechnics and universities or training establishments,</p> |

Civil Society Groups / NGOs/UN Agencies:

Indigenous, minority and local community associations, Farmer Associations, Human rights groups, Conservation NGOs, Bilateral aid groups, NGOs working in the area of gender and environment

4. *Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.* Are gender equality and women's empowerment taken into account (yes ☒ /no ☐)? If yes, elaborate how it will be mainstreamed into project implementation and monitoring, taking into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of women and men.

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 COP 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 ABT, and indicators." The project will be a vehicle for further implementing these decisions. The reporting template will consider gender when assessing process in achieving the ABDT and/or national target equivalent. All Parties will be encouraged to undertake strategies and actions that highlight women's role in conservation/sustainable use and that address the need for a more gender-equitable sharing of its benefits.

5. *Benefits.* Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. Do any of these benefits support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) and/or adaptation to climate change?

Socio-economic benefits

This project is an enabling activity where practical interventions or basic research for new data from the field will not be done. However the project will ensure all norms regarding social safeguards will be employed in the following ways;

- In-depth analysis and articulation of relationship of BD conservation to human wellbeing. In particular, issues on how biodiversity conservation, or lack of it, affects both men and women, and how it affects livelihoods and poverty levels of local rural communities will be brought out in the consultations and in the final reports, along with measures identified to address issues, where possible.
- Issues of BD conservation and poverty alleviation should be well articulated in the consultations in during NR6 preparation. In addition, during the project implementation, there will be deliberate inclusiveness of both men and women in formulation and implementation of the national consultation processes as well as collecting of gender disaggregated (information) data where possible.
- Integration of national biodiversity into poverty eradication and development plans: It will be necessary for the assessments to look at how NBSAPs were integrated into national development and poverty reduction policies and strategies, national accounting, economic sectors and spatial planning processes and the MDGs and SDGs
- Human Rights and Indigenous peoples: In most of the participating countries, the population is highly stratified and contains various indigenous peoples and minority groups and so it will be necessary to factor issues on the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Environmental safeguards

Environmental safeguards for a project refer to the inclusion of measures to make sure the project does not cause any direct or inadvertent harm to the environment due to its activities and the modus operandi engaged throughout the project life span or beyond. The aim of this project is the exact anti-thesis for causing environment harm i.e. the project addresses planning and strategies for making sure Biodiversity is conserved and utilized in the best manner possible.

6. *Risks*. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental future risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and if possible, propose measures that address these risks:

| Risk | Level | Risk Mitigation |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| The third, fourth and fifth national reporting projects to the CBD showed that many countries were slow to prepare and remit this information to the GEF implementing agency. Often requests were incomplete or contained inconsistent texts. | Medium | The financial and technical support packages are designed to support countries to develop timely, data driven national reports. Working with SCBD, UNDP and UNEP will ensure there is better articulation of the requirements and needs of each country must during the project. As part of their contribution to this project, UNDP and UNEP will prepare a capacity building and guidance package to assist countries to complete the SCBD developed template addressing and related to country requests after engagement and consultation with the relevant participating countries. |
| Previous national reports often missed the opportunity to involve civil society in consultations. | Low | A major component of this project is technical support related to stakeholder engagement in the reporting process. Countries also received funding to undertake this exercise during the post-2010 NBSAP revision process and demonstrated significant improvement in doing so. UNDP and UNEP will ensure that individual country proposals contain a comprehensive list of the stakeholders that will be engaged in the process. In partnership with the SCBD, experts will be engaged to train country teams on how to facilitate a comprehensive stakeholder engagement process. |
| The third, fourth and fifth national reporting projects to the CBD showed that many countries do not have adequate capacity to prepare CBD reports, and Parties generally do not review key issues such as gender when preparing their national reports, as this is not explicitly referred to in the decision, guidelines or template. | Low | The project will build on the capacity building program that SCBD, UNDP and UNEP implement to support parties with NBSAP revision and implementation. In addition, UNDP and UNEP-WCMC will maintain a technical support facility through the NBSAP Forum to support countries during project. UNEP, through UNEP-WCMC, will also provide a technical peer review of the draft reports. The operational procedures and substantive guidance will also be located on in the CBD website in multiple languages. |
| There is a risk that countries will not review gender issues substantially. | Low | UNEP will ensure that gender issues are fully mainstreamed into the 6NR. |

7. *Cost Effectiveness*. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

The proposed project will ensure that the investments already placed in national reporting (3-5NR) and NBSAP development, revision and implementation, including GEF funding, UNDP and UNEP co-financing, and government co-financing, will achieve the intended result of achieving the Strategic Plan and the related Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and that help to transform the biodiversity, finance and development trajectories and provide a pathway toward sustainable development. By collecting and reporting on foundational conservation data, it lays the foundation for more efficient execution of future conservation strategies and actions. By collaborating through the NBSAP Forum, and the existing partnership channels and capacity building and technical support networks developed during the “*Global Support to NBSAP*” project, this project will ensure that all tools developed will be rapidly 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. Additional cost savings will be achieved by rolling out regional groupings of multiple countries simultaneously. This enables effective oversight by the implementing agencies, and enhances lesson learning quicker while the countries are executing a similar project at the same time. The umbrella program mechanism is highly cost effective, as it saves countries the time and expense of developing single country projects, and improves the efficiencies for the implementing agencies and the GEF Secretariat. In addition, this project is an intervention that serves to align the GEF's mandate to generate global benefits by paying for the incremental costs of planning and foundational enabling activities that countries implement to generate global biodiversity benefits.

If GEF funds are not provided, the countries would "self-finance" the preparation of the 6NR. Past experience has shown that this method is very ineffective, and that many countries may not develop the 6NR, or will be very late in doing so.

In both cases, the functioning of the CBD, in particular its decision-making processes, will be seriously affected. Without a significant number of national reports, the CBD COP cannot review the implementation of the Strategic Plan and consequently provide adequate guidance for the CBD implementation at various levels. This will hamper production of GBO5 and possible development of post-2020 global biodiversity strategy

8. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives [not mentioned in 1]:

This project relies on coordination with the ministries that are responsible for managing the environment portfolio in each participating country. However, during consultations, stakeholders and discussants will come from a very wide institutional and sectoral spectrum. Table 3.1 of section 3 above provides a list of stakeholders and includes Government Ministries or departments. The importance of involving all these government based institutions and other non-government stakeholders are that the results from the project will be firmly embedded in the country fabric, and necessary policies are made for Biodiversity conservation. The project will collaborate with the following projects:

- Global Support to NBSAP Project, which works at the global level to develop and deliver global learning materials and direct technical support to further achievement of ABT 17. The delivery of one-on-one support, the peer review of NBSAPs and moderation of the NBSAP Forum are important tools that the project uses to improve NBSAP quality and assist countries to align their NBSAPs with the ABTs. Both projects have the same implementing agencies and similar methods will be deployed by both projects.
- 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). (2) National Reporting to the CBD (3NR and 4NR umbrellas):
- 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.

9. Institutional Arrangement. Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation:

The project will be implemented over a two-year period. UNDP and UNEP are the GEF agencies for this project and will implement it directly (through UNDP-GEF and UNEP-GEF units), being thereby accountable to the GEF for the use of funds.

The Global Coordination Committee

At the global level, the Global Coordination Committee (GCC), which is composed of representatives from UNEP/UNEP-WCMC, UNDP, SCBD and the GEF Secretariat, will guide the project. The GCC will act as a coordinating committee to discuss and monitor the progress of the program. All GCC members will attend the sessions at their own cost. The Chairmanship will be provided by the SCBD, co-chaired by the GEF. The committee will meet virtually or face-to-face, whenever possible during international events. This operational modality was adopted in past umbrella enabling activities and was found to be successful. This GCC is the current convener and the host of the NBSAP Forum, which provides online technical and capacity building support to countries to meet their CBD obligations.

The National Steering Committee

At national level, the national ministry(s) that is responsible for managing the environment portfolio in each participating country will guide the Project. This entity will chair a Steering Committee (NSC). The committee will also include CBD national focal points, the authority that has responsibility for NBSAP coordination and national reports. It should be expanded as appropriate to include additional national stakeholders that can provide operational and technical oversight of the project, and should include women.

The NSC is responsible for adopting the project's strategic decisions, reports, annual work plans, budgets and financial procurement, as well as the use of financial resources. The NSC will meet regularly twice a year, and whenever necessary in addition, to oversee the project execution and monitor its conformity with the approved project workplan and deliverables.

The NSC will have the following roles:

- Provide strategic operational and technical advice on the implementation of project activities to ensure the achievement of project objectives
- Ensure coordination/complementarities between the project and other ongoing activities in the country,
- Ensure inter-agency coordination, including with the focal points of other relevant intergovernmental agreements and processes;
- Ensure full and appropriate participation of stakeholders in project activities;
- Provide policy guidance and technical backstopping to the project;
- Approve reports and annual work plans, budgets and financial procurement, as well as control of the use of financial resources; and
- Approve the 6NR

Project Implementation and Execution Arrangement:

Project execution at national level

The government national ministry(s) that is responsible for managing the environment portfolio in each participating country, or otherwise appointed by the Ministry, will be the National Executing Agency (NEA). The NEAs will host the project management unit (PMU), which will be composed of the Project Manager and a financial assistant. The project manager will be supervised by a senior level manager at the NEA. The Project Manager will oversee all the activities of the project as per the TORs given in (Annex 6), and following the work-plan shown in (Annex 3). He/She will further follow the reporting requirements summarized in (Annex 8) and the project key deliverables are given in (Annex 4).

The role of the implementing agencies (UNEP) in project oversight

UNEP Ecosystem Division (GEF) will manage the project through a designated Task Manager (TM). The TM will work together towards fulfillment of the project's objectives and will be the lead focal point in each of the agencies for the project. The TM will be assisted by a project assistant and will be responsible for receiving country proposals and the subsequent disbursement of funds. The TM will be responsible for monitoring project implementation for the countries supported until the reports are submitted. Due to the project's global character, senior technical staff within UN Environment will closely monitor key activities and the work of the TM. A small technical group already exists to support the development and early implementation of NBSAPs. From an administrative point of view, staff members within Ecosystem Division/WCMC 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.

The implementing agencies will disburse the \$100,000 per country. They will process the proposals, legal instruments and disbursements to the countries, which will be done simultaneously for all the countries and will use the UNEP Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) which is a legal document to be signed with each country before work commences.

Use of international consultants during project implementation:

Implementation support services, which are different from oversight services, will be treated as direct project costs linked to its implementation. These direct costs will be charged directly to the project on actual cost basis. UNEP and UNDP will work closely with the SCBD to train the country teams on development of the 6NR through regional consultations. As necessary, the implementing agencies and national teams may engage consultants to provide high quality technical support.

Possible Participation of the SCBD for development of 6th national report

The SCBD intends to participate in the work on development of the 6NR through regional trainings and consultations for LDCs and SIDS similar to those done for 4th and 5th national reports.

10. Knowledge Management. Outline the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives, to assess and document in a user-friendly form, and share these experiences and expertise with relevant stakeholders.

The proposed project builds on the efforts of SCBD, UNDP and UNEP to develop new and innovative knowledge management tools to enhance global learning about the development, implementation and reporting on biodiversity strategies and actions, and to circulate them throughout the world. These efforts are ensuring that national biodiversity reporting and planning documents become more relevant policy instruments and are mainstreamed into other sectoral plans, strategies and policies.

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.

The implementing agencies will partner with SCBD to ensure each Party has opportunities to build their capacity to use of the CBD online reporting tool and to development of data that reports on progress in achieving the targets and activities in the post-2010 NBSAP. Learning and knowledge exchange will primarily take place online, and build on SCBD learning tools and the NBSAP Forum's existing community of practice. These existing mechanisms provide a wealth of interactive possibilities for sharing and multiplying knowledge, and for reaching out to very large audiences to share online learning modules, resources and best practices, and to interact with practitioners from around the world.

11. Consistency with National Priorities. Is the project consistent with the National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions? (yes ☒ /no ☐). If yes, which ones and how: NAPAs, NAPs, NBSAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NCs, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, etc.

The project is constant with national strategies and plans, and reports and assessments, The 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. NBSAPs are the primary means of its implementation. Currently, most GEF-eligible countries worldwide have worked with UNDP and UNEP review and revise their NBSAPs, in line with the Strategic Plan and the related ABT. This project is an opportunity for enhancing synergies with the GEF-funded projects in Section 8 that further the biodiversity-related Conventions. The project builds on the investment to develop post-2010 NBSAPs by ensuring that the strategies and actions within them are being effectively implemented, that outcomes can be measured using data, that planning processes can be revised accordingly and that policy and decision-makers can integrate this information into appropriate policies, institutional processes and national sectoral action plans.

All of the 17 countries have ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity and are therefore committed to implementing the Decisions of the CBD Conference of Parties (COP). This project is in conformity and responds to several Decisions of the COP and resultant guidelines as follows:

- COP Decision X/10-National Reporting: The project responds to this COP Decision and the resultant specific SCBD document on Guidelines for sixth National Report is given at the SCBD website.
- Notification for 6th National Report: The proposal responds to the recent SCBD Notification to Parties to prepare the 6th National Reports. This notification informs Parties that the deadline for submitting duly completed sixth National Report to the CBD is 31st December 2017.
- AICHI targets: The project will further be in complicity with the 2011-2020 Strategic Plan for Biodiversity & Aichi BD Target 17 for biodiversity as agreed by countries in COP 10.
- NBSAPS and PRSPs: Most of the 17 countries developed their initial PRSPs and later versions of them. NBSAP were integrated into PRSPs, MDGs and now probably SDGs. This 6NR project will articulate how the countries faired in this area.

12. M & E Plan. Describe the budgeted monitoring and evaluation plan.

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 implementing agencies to apply periodic surveys aimed at assessing progress towards achieving project objectives and the capacity needs of project beneficiaries. This will improve project performance during implementation.

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

A. Record of Endorsement⁷ of GEF Operational Focal Point (S) on Behalf of the Government(S): (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this template. For SGP, use this [SGP OFP endorsement letter](#)).

| NAME | POSITION | MINISTRY | DATE (MM/dd/yyyy) |
|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| Joseph Brider | GEF Operational Focal | National Environment | 03/05/2017 |

⁷ For regional and/or global projects in which participating countries are identified, OFP endorsement letters from these countries are required even though there may not be a STAR allocation associated with the project.


| | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| | Point and Director, National Environment Service | Service, COOK ISLAND | |
| Joshua Wycliffe | GEF Operational Focal Point & Permanent Secretary | Ministry of Local Government, Housing & Environment, FIJI | 03/30/2017 |
| Taouea Reiher | GEF Operational Focal Point and Ag. Director, MELAND | Ministry of Environment, Lands & Agricultural Development, KIRIBATI | 03/15/2017 |
| Clarence Samuel | GEF Operational Focal Point and Director of OEPPC | Office of Environmental Planning & Policy Coordination, MARSHALL ISLANDS | 03/17/2017 |
| Andrew Yatilman | GEF Operational Focal Point & Director | Office of Environ & Emergency Management, FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA | 03/28/2017 |
| Reagan Moses | GEF Operational Focal Point & A/Secretary for Commerce, Industry & Environment | Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Environment, NAURU | 03/17/2017 |
| Sauni Tongatule | GEF Operational Focal Point & Director, DOE | Department of Environment, NIUE | 03/14/2017 |
| King M. Sam | GEF Operational Focal Point & Special Assistant to Minster | Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment & Tourism, PALAU | 03/16/2017 |
| Palula Ma'u | GEF Operational Focal Point & CEO for MEIDECC | Ministry Meteorology, Energy, Information, Disaster Management, Environment, Climate Change & Communication, TONGA | 03/22/2017 |
| Moe Saitala | GEF Operational Focal Point and Ag. Director, Department of Environment | Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Trade, Tourism, Environment & Labour, TUVALU | 03/30/2017 |
| Jessie Benjamin | GEF Operational Focal Point & Director General | Ministry of Climate Change, Adaptation, Meteorology, Geo-Hazards, Environment & Energy, VANUATU | 03/29/2017 |

B. GEF Agency(ies) Certification

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies⁸ and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for a medium-sized project approval under GEF-6.

| Agency Coordinator, Agency name | Signature | DATE (MM/dd/yyyy) | Project Contact Person | Telephone | Email Address |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------------|-----------|---------------|
|---------------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------------|-----------|---------------|

⁸ GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, and SCCF

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ms. Kelly West UN Environment/GEF Coordinator Portfolio Manager Corporate Services Division UN Environment |  | June 15, 2017 | Mohamed Sessay, Senior Programme Officer | +254 715881848 | mohamed.sessay@unep.org |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|

C. ADDITIONAL GEF PROJECT AGENCY CERTIFICATION (*Applicable only to newly accredited GEF Project Agencies*)

For newly accredited GEF Project Agencies, please download and fill up the required [GEF Project Agency Certification of Ceiling Information Template](#) to be attached as an annex to this project template.

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).

See below

ANNEX B: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A

List of annexes

- Annex 1: Project Logical Framework
- Annex 2: Detailed GEF and Co-Finance Budgets
- Annex 3: Workplan and Timetable
- Annex 4: Key Deliverables and Benchmarks
- Annex 5: Structure and Format of the 6th National Report and its Submission
- Annex 6: Terms of Reference of Key Personnel
- Annex 7: Project Implementation Arrangements
- Annex 8: Reporting Requirements and Responsibilities
- Annex 9: UNEP Environmental, Social and Economic Review Note (ESERN)
- Annex 10: M&E Plan
- Annex 11: OFP Endorsement and Co-finance Letters

ANNEX 1: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

| | INDICATOR | BASELINE | TARGETS | MEANS OF VERIFICATION | RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Objective: To provide financial and technical support to GEF-eligible Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in their work to develop high quality, data driven sixth national reports (6NR) that will improve national decision-making processes for the implementation of NBSAPs; that report on progress towards achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (ABTs) and inform both the fifth Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO5) and the Global Biodiversity Strategy of 2021 – 2030. | Number of countries that have produced their 6 th National reports and submitted them to the CBD Sec | In the past the GEF eligible countries have been supported to conduct country planning for BD conservation including initial NBSAPs, four rounds of national reports for biodiversity. This planning has been useful in guiding the countries and the COPs in BD conservation. | 11 National reports produced and uploaded on the CBD website by end of project | Project reports. Minutes of the PSC. Terminal evaluation Project website at the SCBD. Interviews with government agents, CBD focal points | 1. Development and sectoral planning frameworks at country level integrated measurable biodiversity conservation and sustainable use targets during the NBSAP process. 2. The 17 countries are enabled and informed for better decision making in BD conservation |
| Outcome 1: A functional steering committee is formed to prepare the 6NR, project timelines and methods are developed, funding is mobilized and training and capacity building activities are complete | Percentage of countries with functional steering committees | All the participating countries do not have functional project steering committees for the production of the 6 th NR | At least 80% of the countries have functional steering committees by midterm of the project and 100% by project end | Project reports. Minutes of the PSC. Terminal evaluation Interviews with government agents, CBD focal points | Relevant key institutions will be willing to second their staff for membership of the steering committee |
| Outputs: | | | | | |

| | INDICATOR | BASELINE | TARGETS | MEANS OF VERIFICATION | RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | 1.1. The SC is formed, roles for the preparation of the 6NR are assigned, and a production plan and timeline is developed. 1.2. Funding and resource are acquired, including the submission of a funding request and the identification of other funding sources. 1.3. Participation in training and capacity building opportunities on the use of the CBD online reporting tool and the development of data that reports on progress in achieving the targets and activities in the post-2010 NBSAP. | | | | |
| Outcome 2: Stakeholder owned reports for each ABT and/or national equivalent are produced and compiled | Percentage of all identified stakeholders registered in a comprehensive stakeholder inventory involved in producing and compiling of ABTs and/or national equivalent | 0% | 100% | Project reports. Minutes of the PSC. Terminal evaluation Interviews with government agents, CBD focal points | Forming partnerships between relevant stakeholders interested in biodiversity conservation issues and in development issues |
| | Percentage of countries that have produced reports for each ABT and/or national equivalent | 0% | At least 80% of the countries have produced reports for each national targets by midterm of project time frame and 100% by project end | | |
| | Number of countries with reports for each ABT and/or national equivalent includes a gender section | 0% | 11 | | |
| | 2.1. Scoping report/zero draft for each ABT and/or national equivalent is prepared. 2.2. Consultations with stakeholders are undertaken. 2.3. Reports for each ABT and/or national equivalent are developed | | | | |
| Outcome 3: A Stakeholder owned 6th national Report is produced and submitted to the CBD | Percentage of the number of countries submitting 6NRs to the CBD | None of the participating countries have submitted the 6 th NR to the CBD | 50% of the countries submit 6NRs to the CBD by midterm and 100% at project end | Project reports. Minutes of the PSC. Terminal evaluation | The ongoing training by SCBD will support countries and contribute to better articulation of country requirements for the |

| | INDICATOR | BASELINE | TARGETS | MEANS OF VERIFICATION | RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS |
|--|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|---------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| | | | | Interviews with government agents, CBD focal points | project |
| | Outputs: 3.1. The draft 6NR is compiled, undergoes a technical peer review, revised and finalized. 3.2. The 6NR is validated and officially submitted to the CBD. | | | | |

ANNEX 2: DETAILED GEF AND CO-FINANCE BUDGETS

See attached file

ANNEX 3: WORKPLAN AND TIMETABLE

| | | Months | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | Activity | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |
| 1. Project inception meeting and identification of funding resources | 1.1. A functional cross-sectoral Steering committee in each participating country is formed, roles for the preparation of the 6NR are assigned, and a production plan and timeline is developed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1.2. Funding and resource are acquired, including the submission of a funding request and the identification of other funding sources. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1.3. Participation in training and capacity building opportunities on the use of the CBD online reporting tool and the development of data that reports on progress in achieving the targets and activities in the post-2010 NBSAP. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Assessment | 2.1. Scoping | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | Months | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | Activity | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |
| of progress towards each ABT and/or national equivalent | report/zero draft for each ABT and/or national equivalent is prepared and includes analysis of gender. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2.2. Consultations with stakeholders are undertaken | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2. 3. Gender-sensitive reports for each ABT and/or national equivalent are developed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3: Production and submission of 6NR | 3.1. The draft 6NR is compiled, undergoes a technical peer review, revised and finalized. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2.Technology needs assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 3.2. The 6NR is validated and officially submitted to the CBD | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UNEP Closure | Final inventory of non-expendable equipment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Equipment transfer letter | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Final expenditure statement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Independent terminal evaluation report | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

ANNEX 5: STRUCTURE AND FORMAT OF THE 6TH NATIONAL REPORT AND ITS SUBMISSION

| Component | Activities | Deliverables/Outcomes | Benchmarks |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Project inception meeting and identification of funding resources | <p>1.1. Deciding on working arrangements and methods for preparing the 6NR, identifying the responsible actors and organizations for the different elements of the report; (c) identifying the relevant stakeholders for each national target or target component; and (d) holding the inception meeting.</p> <p>1.2. Identifying sources of funding and in-kind support, from agencies and centers of excellence.</p> <p>1.3. Workshops/training sessions organized on use of the CBD online reporting tool, and development of data that reports on progress in achieving the targets and activities in the post-2010 NBSAP.</p> | <p>The SC is formed, roles for the preparation of the 6NR are assigned, and a production plan and timeline is developed.</p> <p>Funding and resources is secured for project</p> <p>Well-trained team in use of CBD online reporting tool and the development of data that reports on progress in achieving the targets and activities in the post-2010 NBSAP.</p> | Preparation of 6 th National report is well underway with Steering Committee functioning efficiently, roles and responsibilities been discharged fully according to agreed timeline and sufficient resources are available |
| 2. Assessment of progress towards each ABT and/or national equivalent | 2.1. Prepare initial draft elements of the national report and also identifying information gaps for each ABT and/or national equivalent that is required for assessment of implementation measures and progress towards national targets required in 6NR sections II and III. | <p>Scoping report/zero draft for each ABT and/or national equivalent is prepared.</p> <p>Consultations with stakeholders undertaken.</p> <p>Reports for each ABT and/or national equivalent are developed</p> | State of progress towards each ABT and/or national equivalent is available and contributes to finalization of the 6 th National report. |

| Component | Activities | Deliverables/Outcomes | Benchmarks |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>2.2. Convening multi-disciplinary team of experts and organizing stakeholder consultations.</p> <p>2.3. Developing progress assessments for each ABT and/or national target equivalent; reviewing NBSAP implementation and actions to mainstream biodiversity and assessing effectiveness of actions undertaken to implement the Strategic Plan and NBSAPS.</p> | | |
| 3: Production and submission of 6NR | <p>3.1. Preparation (compiling, reviewing, etc.) of the 6th National Report</p> <p>3.2 Organising workshop to validate the 6th national report.</p> | <p>The draft 6NR is compiled, undergoes a technical peer review, revised and finalized.</p> <p>The 6NR is validated and officially submitted to the CBD.</p> | A comprehensive 6 th national report is presented to CBD on schedule by 90% of the participating countries in the project. |

ANNEX 6: STRUCTURE AND FORMAT OF THE 6TH NATIONAL REPORT AND ITS SUBMISSION

1. The sixth national report (6NR) contains seven sections:
 - (a) Information on the targets being pursued at the national level;
 - (b) Implementation measures taken, assessment of their effectiveness, associated obstacles and scientific and technical needs to achieve national targets;
 - (c) Assessment of progress towards each national target;
 - (d) Description of the national contribution to the achievement of each global Aichi Biodiversity Target (ABT);
 - (e) Description of the national contribution to the achievement of the targets of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (completion of this section is optional);
 - (f) Additional information on the contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities to the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets if not captured in the sections above (completion of this section is optional);
 - (g) Updated biodiversity country profiles.
2. To facilitate the preparation of the 6NR, a template that contains specific questions with a selection of possible answers accompanies each section of the report. Space is provided for Parties to include narrative information to further substantiate these responses, and to indicate relevant websites, web links or documents where additional information may be found. This eliminates the need to include this information directly in the national report.
3. CBD prepared a resource manual that provides further explanations on the use of the guidelines, and contains directions to potential sources of information to use during 6NR preparation.⁹
4. To facilitate 6NR preparation, CBD developed an online reporting tool. It can be accessed at: <https://chm.cbd.int>. The tool allows multiple nationally designated users to draft elements of the national report and prepare it for review, internal approval and formal submission. It also allows for parts of the national report to be submitted as they are finalized or for the entire report to be submitted once all of the sections are completed. For those Parties with limited Internet access or who prefer to submit their national reports in document form, an offline version of the reporting templates will be made available. If the national report is submitted in document form, it should be accompanied by an official letter from the national focal point or the senior government official responsible for the implementation of the Convention. Parties not using the online reporting tool may send their sixth national report to the main email address of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (secretariat@cbd.int).

⁹ The resource manual is being made available at: <https://www.cbd.int/nr6/resource-manual>

ANNEX 6: TERMS OF REFERENCE OF KEY PERSONNEL

For each participating country, a National Project Manager will be recruited. He/She will act as Executive Secretary to the Project Steering Committee and will be responsible for all aspects of project management and coordination in collaboration with the project stakeholders to ensure adequate project implementation. The National Project Manager will also perform a range of technical tasks in support of the project activities and will be directly responsible for the implementation of all components. The Project National Manager will be employed by the National Executing Agency (NEA). He/she will report to the NEA and the PSC. Her/his main duties and responsibilities will include:

(a) Managerial /coordination Tasks:

- Establish, and equip an effective Project Management Unit that will also act as the Secretariat to the project Steering Committee, if so required.
- Define the operational, administrative and financial working procedures of the PMU, within the context of the NEA
- Define communication, reporting and coordination mechanisms of the PMU
- Define the inter-institutional coordination and communication mechanisms, including those with the EA, national partners, all members of PMU, and other relevant project stakeholders.
- Draft TOR and define contractual arrangements for any sub-contracting/ consultants for the national executing partners at national levels. TOR will be based entirely on the activities, work-plans and budgets set forth in the project support documents and will also clearly specify requirements and provide a template for technical and financial reporting from the implementing partners to the PMU where necessary.
- Prepare half-yearly consolidated technical and financial progress reports as per guidelines included in the project document and based on (a) inputs received from other contractors/consultants , and (b) project-level activities conducted by other stakeholders for the project. The reports will be based on the structure of the project logical framework (and any revisions thereof) and will include revised budgets and workplans, status of the M&E plan implementation, etc. These reports will be the trigger to further disbursements of funds when they have been accepted by UNEP DGEF.
- Ensure the full compliance of all aspects of project implementation with UNEP's operational, administrative and financial management procedures (guidelines to be provided by UNEP/Ecosystems Division in the legal instrument to be signed between UNEP and the National Executing Agency
- Coordinate and update the project's M&E framework and ensure its adequate implementation with inputs from all project executing partners.
- Will monitor risk management and adaptive actions to be taken for the project.
- Present reports on project progress at annual PMU meetings (for their review and endorsement).
- Prepare and implement a project's visibility plan to ensure adequate dissemination of project results and lessons learned.

It is envisaged that the National Project Manager and the Project Management Unit will be hosted by the Executing Agency.

Profile: Minimum 5 years of experience in project management and implementation, preferably with UN-implemented projects; academic background and relevant direct experience related to the technical scope of the project, particularly with regard to Multilateral Conventions, protected areas, climate change, and biodiversity conservation; experience in environmental and capacity building issues is highly desirable; leadership as well as strong management and interpersonal skills; computer skills; strong communication and presentation skills; high flexibility and capacity to work under pressure. Full command of the English language, is required for this post.

ANNEX 7: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND EXECUTION ARRANGEMENTS

Project execution at national level

The government national ministry(s) that is responsible for managing the environment portfolio in each participating country, or otherwise appointed by the Ministry, will be the National Executing Agency (NEA). The NEAs will host the project management unit (PMU), which will be composed of the Project Manager and a financial assistant. The project manager will be supervised by a senior level manager at the NEA. The Project Manager will oversee all the activities of the project as per the TORs given in (Annex 7), and following the work-plan shown in (Annex 4). He/She will further follow the reporting requirements summarized in (Annex 8) and the project key deliverables are given in (Annex 5).

The role of the implementing agencies (UNEP) in project oversight

UNEP Ecosystem Division (GEF) will manage the project through a designated Task Manager (TM). The TM will work together towards fulfillment of the project's objectives and will be the lead focal point in each of the agencies for the project. The TM will be assisted by a project assistant and will be responsible for receiving country proposals and the subsequent disbursement of funds. The TM will be responsible for monitoring project implementation for the countries supported until the reports are submitted. Due to the project's global character, senior technical staff within UN Environment will closely monitor key activities and the work of the TM. A small technical group already exists to support the development and early implementation of NBSAPs. From an administrative point of view, staff members within Ecosystem Division/WCMC 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.

The implementing agencies will disburse the \$100,000 per country. Specifically, countries will be invited to request the funds following the established procedures of UNEP. They will process the proposals, legal instruments and disbursements to the countries, which will be done simultaneously for all the countries and will use the UNEP Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) which is a legal document to be signed with each country before work commences.

Use of international consultants during project implementation:

Implementation support services, which are different from oversight services, will be treated as direct project costs linked to its implementation. These direct costs will be charged directly to the project on actual cost basis. UNEP and UNDP will work closely with the SCBD to train the country teams on development of the 6NR through regional consultations. As necessary, the implementing agencies and national teams may engage consultants to provide high quality technical support.

Possible Participation of the SCBD for development of 6th national report

The SCBD intends to participate in the work on development of the 6NR through regional trainings and consultations for LDCs and SIDS similar to those done for 4th and 5th national reports

ANNEX 8: REPORTING REQUIREMENTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

| Reporting requirements | Due date | Format appended to legal instrument as | Responsibility of: |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Procurement plan (goods and services) | 2 weeks before project inception meeting | N/A | National Executing Agency (NEA) |
| Inception Report | 1 month after project inception meeting | N/A | Implementing Agency (IA) & NEA |
| Expenditure report accompanied by explanatory notes | Quarterly on or before 31 July, 31 January of each year | Annex | NEA |
| Cash Advance request and details of anticipated disbursements | Half yearly or when required | Annex | NEA |
| Progress report | Half-yearly on or before 31 January | Annex | NEA |
| Inventory of non-expendable equipment | Yearly on or before 31 January | Annex | NEA |
| Co-financing report | Yearly on or before 31 July | Annex | NEA |
| Minutes of steering committee meetings | Yearly (or as relevant) | N/A | EA |
| Mission reports and “aide memoire” for executing agency | Within 2 weeks of return | N/A | NEA & IA |
| Final report | 2 months of project completion date | Annex | NEA |
| Final inventory of non-expendable equipment | | Annex | NEA |
| Equipment transfer letter | | Annex | NEA |
| Final expenditure statement | 3 months of project completion date | Annex | NEA |
| Independent terminal evaluation report (to be done jointly with the UNEP Evaluation & Oversight Unit). | 6 months of project completion date | Annex | NEA & IA |

ANNEX 9: UNEP ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL and ECONOMIC REVIEW NOTE (ESERN)

| | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Identification | Addis Project # 01583 |
| Project Title | Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD (Pacific) |
| Managing Division | Ecosystems Division |
| Type/Location | National |
| Region | Pacific |
| List Countries | Cook Island, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshal Island, Micronesia, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu |
| Project Description | To project will provide financial and technical support to GEF-eligible Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in their work to develop high quality, data driven sixth national reports (6NR) that will improve national decision-making processes for the implementation of NBSAPs; that report on progress towards achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (ABTs) and inform both the fifth Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO5) and the Global Biodiversity Strategy of 2021 – 2030. |
| Estimated duration of project: | 2017-2019 |
| Estimated cost of the project : | GEF Grant: 1,391,198 Co-finance: 590,000 |

II. Environmental Social and Economic Screening Determination

A. Summary of the Safeguard Risks Triggered

| Safeguard Standard Triggered by the Project | Impact of Risk ¹⁰ (1-5) | Probability of Risk (1-5) | Significance of Risk (L, M, H) |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| SS 1: Biodiversity, natural habitat and Sustainable Management of Living Resources | 1 | 1 | L |
| SS 2: Resource Efficiency, Pollution Prevention and Management of Chemicals and Wastes | 1 | 1 | L |
| SS 3: Safety of Dams | 1 | 1 | L |
| SS 4: Involuntary resettlement | 2 | 2 | L |
| SS 5: Indigenous peoples | 1 | 1 | L |
| SS 6: Labor and working conditions | 1 | 1 | L |
| SS 7: Cultural Heritage | 2 | 1 | L |

¹⁰ Refer to UNEP Environment, Social and Economic Sustainability (ESES): Implementation Guidance Note to assign values to the Impact of Risk and the Probability of Risk to determine the overall significance of Risk (Low, Moderate or High).

| | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| SS 8: Gender equity | 1 | 2 | L |
| SS 9: Economic Sustainability | 2 | 2 | M |
| Additional Safeguard questions for projects seeking GCF-funding (Section IV) | | | |

B. ESE Screening Decision¹¹ (Refer to the UNEP ESES Framework (Chapter 2) and the UNEP's ESES Guidelines.)

Low risk ☒ Moderate risk ☐ High risk ☐ Additional information required ☐

C. Development of ESE Review Note and Screening Decision:

Prepared by: Name: Mohamed F. Sessay Date: 24 April 2017

Safeguard Advisor: Name: _____ Date: _____

Project Manager: Name: _____ Date: _____

D. Recommended further action from the Safeguard Advisor:

¹¹ **Low risk:** Negative impacts negligible: no further study or impact management required.

Moderate risk: Potential negative impacts, but less significant; few if any impacts irreversible; impact amenable to management using standard mitigation measures; limited environmental or social analysis may be required to develop a ESEMP. Straightforward application of good practice may be sufficient without additional study.

High risk: Potential for significant negative impacts, possibly irreversible, ESEA including a full impact assessment may be required, followed by an effective safeguard management plan.

III. ESES Principle and Safeguard checklist

(Section III and IV should be retained in UNEP)

| Precautionary Approach |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| The project will take precautionary measures even if some cause and effect relationships are not fully established scientifically and there is risk of causing harm to the people or to the environment. |
| Human Rights Principle |
| The project will make an effort to include any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular vulnerable and marginalized groups; from the decision making process that may affect them. |
| The project will respond to any significant concerns or disputes raised during the stakeholder engagement process. |
| The project will make an effort to avoid inequitable or discriminatory negative impacts on the quality of and access to resources or basic services, on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups. ¹² |

| Screening checklist | Y/N/ Maybe | Comment |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Safeguard Standard 1: Biodiversity, natural habitat and Sustainable Management of Living Resources | | |
| Will the proposed project support directly or indirectly any activities that significantly convert or degrade biodiversity and habitat including modified habitat, natural habitat and critical natural habitat? | N | Not anticipated, on the contrary the project will improve all habitats and ecosystems. |
| Will the proposed project likely convert or degrade habitats that are legally protected? | N | No negative impacts are expected to existing Pas. On the contrary the project seeks to improve decision-making on implementation of National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plans (NBSAPs) and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets in countries. |
| Will the proposed project likely convert or degrade habitats that are officially proposed for protection? (e.g.; National Park, Nature Conservancy, Indigenous Community Conserved Area, (ICCA); etc.) | N | No negative impacts are anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project likely convert or degrade habitats that are identified by authoritative sources for their high conservation and biodiversity value? | N | No negative impacts are anticipated. On the contrary, the project activities are designed to enhance national decision-making processes for the implementation of National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plans (NBSAPs) and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. |
| Will the proposed project likely convert or degrade habitats that are recognized- including by authoritative sources and /or the national and local government entity, as protected and conserved by traditional local communities? | N | Not anticipated. |

¹² Prohibited grounds of discrimination include race, ethnicity, gender, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, religion, political or other opinion, national or social or geographical origin, property, birth or other status including as an indigenous person or as a member of a minority. References to “women and men” or similar is understood to include women and men, boys and girls, and other groups discriminated against based on their gender identities, such as transgender people and transsexuals.

| Screening checklist | Y/N/ Maybe | Comment |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Will the proposed project approach possibly not be legally permitted or inconsistent with any officially recognized management plans for the area? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project activities result in soils deterioration and land degradation? | N | On the contrary, the project activities are designed to improve biodiversity and ecosystems in countries |
| Will the proposed project interventions cause any changes to the quality or quantity of water in rivers, ponds, lakes or other wetlands? | Y | It will contribute to conservation of ecosystems through improved decision-making and funding |
| Will the proposed project possibly introduce or utilize any invasive alien species of flora and fauna, whether accidental or intentional? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Safeguard Standard 2: Resource Efficiency, Pollution Prevention and Management of Chemicals and Wastes | | |
| Will the proposed project likely result in the significant release of pollutants to air, water or soil? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project likely consume or cause significant consumption of water, energy or other resources through its own footprint or through the boundary of influence of the activity? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project likely cause significant generation of Green House Gas (GHG) emissions during and/or after the project? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project likely generate wastes, including hazardous waste that cannot be reused, recycled or disposed in an environmentally sound and safe manner? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project use, cause the use of, or manage the use of, storage and disposal of hazardous chemicals, including pesticides? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project involve the manufacturing, trade, release and/or use of hazardous materials subject to international action bans or phase-outs, such as DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants or the Montreal Protocol? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project require the procurement of chemical pesticides that is not a component of integrated pest management (IPM) ¹³ or integrated vector management (IVM) ¹⁴ approaches? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project require inclusion of chemical pesticides that are included in IPM or IVM but high in human toxicity? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project have difficulty in abiding to FAO's International Code of Conduct ¹⁵ in terms of handling, storage, application and disposal of pesticides? | N | Not anticipated. |

¹³ "Integrated Pest Management (IPM) means the careful consideration of all available pest control techniques and subsequent integration of appropriate measures that discourage the development of pest populations and keep pesticides and other interventions to levels that are economically justified and reduce or minimize risks to human health and the environment. IPM emphasizes the growth of a healthy crop with the least possible disruption to agro-ecosystems and encourages natural pest control mechanisms <http://www.fao.org/agriculture/crops/thematic-sitemap/theme/pests/ipm/en/>

¹⁴ "IVM is a rational decision-making process for the optimal use of resources for vector control. The approach seeks to improve the efficacy, cost-effectiveness, ecological soundness and sustainability of disease-vector control. The ultimate goal is to prevent the transmission of vector-borne diseases such as malaria, dengue, Japanese encephalitis, leishmaniasis, schistosomiasis and Chagas disease." (http://www.who.int/neglected_diseases/vector_ecology/ivm_concept/en/)

| Screening checklist | Y/N/ Maybe | Comment |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Will the proposed project potentially expose the public to hazardous materials and substances and pose potentially serious risk to human health and the environment? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Safeguard Standard 3: Safety of Dams | | |
| Will the proposed project involve constructing a new dam(s)? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project involve rehabilitating an existing dam(s)? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project activities involve dam safety operations? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Safeguard Standard 4: Involuntary resettlement | | |
| Will the proposed project likely involve full or partial physical displacement or relocation of people? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project involve involuntary restrictions on land use that deny a community the use of resources to which they have traditional or recognizable use rights? | Maybe | As a consequence of improved decision-making on implementation of NBSAPs to improve biodiversity and ecosystems. |
| Will the proposed project likely cause restrictions on access to land or use of resources that are sources of livelihood? | Maybe | As a consequence of improved decision-making on implementation of NBSAPs to improve biodiversity and ecosystems. |
| Will the proposed project likely cause or involve temporary/permanent loss of land? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project likely cause or involve economic displacements affecting their crops, businesses, income generation sources and assets? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project likely cause or involve forced eviction? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project likely affect land tenure arrangements, including communal and/or customary/traditional land tenure patterns negatively? | Maybe | As a consequence of improved decision-making on implementation of NBSAPs to improve biodiversity and ecosystem management. |
| Safeguard Standard 5: Indigenous peoples¹⁶ | | |
| Will indigenous peoples be present in the proposed project area or area of influence? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project likely affect livelihoods of indigenous peoples negatively through affecting the rights, lands and territories claimed by them? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the project negatively affect the development priorities of indigenous peoples defined by them? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the project potentially affect the traditional livelihoods, physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the project potentially affect the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge | N | Not anticipated. |

¹⁵ Find more information from http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/agphome/documents/Pests_Pesticides/Code/CODE_2014Sep_ENG.pdf

¹⁶ Refer to the Toolkit for the application of the UNEP Indigenous Peoples Policy Guidance for further information.

| Screening checklist | Y/N/ Maybe | Comment |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| and practices? | | |
| Safeguard Standard 6: Labor and working conditions | | |
| Will the proposed project involve the use of forced labor and child labor? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project cause the increase of local or regional unemployment? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Safeguard Standard 7: Cultural Heritage | | |
| Will the proposed project potentially have negative impact on objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values and archeological sites that are internationally recognized or legally protected? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project rely on or profit from tangible cultural heritage (e.g., tourism)? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project involve land clearing or excavation with the possibility of encountering previously undetected tangible cultural heritage? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Will the proposed project involve in land clearing or excavation? | N | Not anticipated. |
| Safeguard Standard 8: Gender equity | | |
| Will the proposed project likely have inequitable negative impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls? | N | Not anticipated |
| Will the proposed project potentially discriminate against women or other groups based on gender, especially regarding participation in the design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits? | N | No, on the contrary it will enhance role of women in natural resources management and the sharing of benefits from conservation |
| Will the proposed project have impacts that could negatively affect women's and men's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services? | N | The project will identify the policy actions needed to boost women's empowerment so that they can play a more effective role in conservation and creating wealth for their families. |
| Safeguard Standard 9: Economic Sustainability | | |
| Will the proposed project likely bring immediate or short-term net gain to the local communities or countries at the risk of generating long-term economic burden (e.g., agriculture for food vs. biofuel; mangrove vs. commercial shrimp farm in terms of fishing, forest products and protection, etc.)? | Y | The project will generate policies that encourage employment of local population in conservation. |
| Will the proposed project likely bring unequal economic benefits to a limited subset of the target group? | N | Not anticipated |

IV. Additional Safeguard Questions for Projects seeking GCF-funding

| | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Community Health, Safety, and Security | | | |
| Will there be potential risks and negative impacts to the health and safety of the Affected Communities during the project life-cycle? | | | |
| Will the proposed project involve design, construction, operation and decommissioning of the structural | | | |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| elements such as new buildings or structures? | | | |
| Will the proposed project involve constructing new buildings or structures that will be accessed by public? | | | |
| Will the proposed project possibly cause direct or indirect health-related risks and impacts to the Affected Communities due to the diminution or degradation of natural resources, and ecosystem services? | | | |
| Will the proposed project activities potentially cause community exposure to health issues such as water-born, water-based, water-related, vector-borne diseases, and communicable diseases? | | | |
| In case of an emergency event, will the project team, including partners, have the capacity to respond together with relevant local and national authorities? | | | |
| Will the proposed project need to retain workers to provide security to safeguard its personnel and property? | | | |
| Labor and Supply Chain | | | |
| Will UNEP or the implementing/executing partner(s) involve suppliers of goods and services who may have high risk of significant safety issues related to their own workers? | | | |

ANNEX 10: BUDGETED M&E PLAN

| M&E item | Budget | Purpose | responsibility |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Inception workshop | \$4000 (from project budget) | To launch the project, confirm responsibilities & workplan, and publicize the initiative | National Executing Agency (NEA) |
| PSC six monthly meetings | \$1,000 (from project budget) | Monitor progress, adaptive management, strategic guidance | NEA convening (PSC members) |
| Quarterly financial reports | - | Monitor funds usage | EA to submit to UNEP FMO |
| Six monthly technical reports | - | Monitor progress on technical issues | EA to submit to UNEP Task Manager |
| Project Terminal Evaluation | \$30,000 (from project budget) | Check if project outputs and outcomes have been achieved. | Independent evaluator organized by UNEP Evaluation & Oversight Unit |
| | \$35,000 | | |

ANNEX 11: OFP ENDORSEMENT AND CO-FINANCE LETTERS

See attached files