



Global Environment Facility

Monique Barbut
Chief Executive Officer
and Chairperson

1818 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20433 USA
Tel: 202.473.3202
Fax: 202.522.3240/3245
E-mail: mbarbut@TheGEF.org

October 01, 2009

Dear Council Member,

I am writing to notify you that we have today posted on the GEF's website at www.TheGEF.org, a medium-sized project proposal from UNEP entitled ***Global (Afghanistan, Eritrea, Lao PDR, Liberia, Mauritius, Palau): Piloting Integrated Processes and Approaches to Facilitate National Reporting to Rio Conventions***, to be funded under the GEF Trust Fund (GEFTF). The GEF grant amount has increased by \$100,000 to cover eligible expenses for sharing of experiences and upscaling opportunities, as well as disseminating lessons learned at national level and the need to share them at international level by producing adequate materials and publications.

The overall objective (goal) of the project is to pilot nationally-driven integrated processes and approaches to reporting to the three Rio Conventions (CBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC). More specifically, the project will (a) develop integrated approaches to data collection/analysis and information management of relevance to the three Rio Conventions; (b) increase synergies in the process of reporting to the three Conventions without compromising COP decisions in this regard; and (c) contribute to improved overall planning and decision-making processes at the country-level related to the implementation of these Conventions.

The project proposal is being posted for your review. We would welcome any comments you may wish to provide by October 15, 2009, in accordance with the new procedures approved by the Council. You may send your comments to gcoordination@TheGEF.org.

If you do not have access to the Web, you may request the local field office of the World Bank or UNDP to download the document for you. Alternatively, you may request a copy of the document from the Secretariat. If you make such a request, please confirm for us your current mailing address.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Barbut', enclosed within a hand-drawn rectangular box.

Copy: Alternates, GEF Agencies, STAP, Trustee



GEF

REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL
PROJECT TYPE: MSP
THE GEF TRUST FUND

Submission Date: September 08, 2009

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

GEFSEC PROJECT ID:3707

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:

COUNTRY(IES): Afghanistan, Eritrea, Mauritius, Palau, Lao PDR, Liberia

PROJECT TITLE: Piloting Integrated Processes and Approaches To Facilitate National Reporting to Rio Conventions (FNR_Rio)

GEF AGENCY(IES):, UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC),

GEF FOCAL AREA(S): SGP/CB/LDC-SIDS Support / Multi Focal Areas

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): CB-2

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: N/A

Expected Calendar (mm/dd/yy)	
Milestones	Dates
Work Program (for FSPs only)	n/a
Agency Approval date	December 2009
Implementation Start	April 2010
Mid-term Evaluation (if planned)	March 2012
Project Closing Date	December 2013

A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK (Expand table as necessary)

Project Objective: The overall objective (goal) of the project is *to pilot nationally-driven integrated processes and approaches to reporting to the three Rio Conventions* (CBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC). More specifically, the project will (a) develop integrated approaches to data collection/analysis and information management of relevance to the three Rio Conventions; (b) increase synergies in the process of reporting to the three Conventions without compromising COP decisions in this regard; and (c) contribute to improved overall planning and decision-making processes at the country-level related to the implementation of these Conventions.

Project Components	Indicate whether Investment, TA, or STA²	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	GEF Financing¹		Co-Financing¹		Total (\$) c=a+ b
				(\$ a)	%	(\$ b)	%	
1. Component 1: Situational Analysis and Reporting Process Design		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved cost-effectiveness achieved for reporting to Rio Conventions Linkages and synergies for reporting to the Rio Conventions at national level identified and strengthened Duplication in reporting processes identified and eliminated 	<p>Output 1.1: Inventory and analysis report of convention reporting requirements in terms of institutional arrangement, linkages, content and format is prepared.</p> <p>Output 1.2: Analysis report of existing data and information management systems at the country level with recommendations for designing more integrated systems is prepared.</p> <p>Output 1.3: Manual on implementation of Integrated Reporting approach is produced.</p>	70,000	50.87	67,600	49.13	137,600

<p>2. Component 2: Implementation of Integrated Reporting Processes and Experimenting Options for Report Design</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhanced country capacities to identify cross-convention programmes and projects for cost-effective financing and MEA implementation A more cooperative environment for information sharing among national institutions involved in convention implementation 	<p>Output 2.1: Institutional frameworks for integrated reporting to Conventions is established or strengthened.</p> <p>Output 2.2: National convention-related data collection, analysis and information management systems with agreed standardized collection and analysis procedures are established or enhanced.</p> <p>Output 2.3: Capacities (systemic, institutional and individual) of relevant institutions for data collection, analysis and information management through provision of necessary training and computing equipment are enhanced.</p> <p>Output 2.4: assessment report of the quality of national reports is prepared.</p>	434,700	51.2	415,000	48.84	849,700
<p>3. Component 3: Sharing of Experience and Upscaling opportunities</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better informed policy decision-making at the national and global level, supporting efficient and integrated reporting to Rio Conventions 	<p>Output 3.1: Technical Working Group (TWG) on Integrated Reporting from countries participating in the project established for information and experience sharing is established and met.</p> <p>Output 3.2: International events on lesson learned and best practices for integrated reporting organized are held.</p>	216,300	60.15	168,280	39.85	384,580
4. M&E				35,000	100.00			35,000

Project Management	84,000	35.90	150,000	64.10	234,000
Total Project Costs	840,000	51.19	800,880	48.81	1,640,880

¹ List the \$ by project components. The percentage is the share of GEF and Co-financing respectively of the total amount for the component.

² TA = Technical Assistance; STA = Scientific & Technical Analysis.

B. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT (expand the table line items as necessary)

<i>Name of Co-financier (source)</i>	<i>Classification</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>%*</i>
Government of Afghanistan	Government	In-Kind	75,000	9.36
Government of Eritrea	Government	In-Kind and cash	100,000	12.49
Government of Lao PDR	Government	In-Kind	75,000	9.36
Government of Liberia**	Government	In-Kind	200,000	24.97
Government of Mauritius**	Government	In-Kind	200,880	25.08
Government of Palau**	Government	In-Kind	100,000	12.49
UNEP	Implementation Agency	In-Kind	50,000	6.24
Total Co-financing			800,880 B	100%

* Percentage of each co-financier's contribution at CEO endorsement to total co-financing.

** During the project preparation phase three pilot countries have increased their in-kind contribution from \$75,000 each, that were previously pledged at the PIF approval stage.

C. FINANCING PLAN SUMMARY FOR THE PROJECT (\$)

	<i>Project Preparation a</i>	<i>Project b</i>	<i>Total c = a + b</i>	<i>Agency Fee</i>	<i>For comparison: GEF and Co-financing at PIF</i>
GEF financing	30,000	840,000	870,000	84,000	954,000
Co-financing	20,000	800,880	820,880		820,880
Total	50,000	1,640,880	1,690,880	84,000	1,774,880

D. GEF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES)¹

<i>GEF Agency</i>	<i>Focal Area</i>	<i>Country Name/ Global</i>	<i>(in \$)</i>		
			<i>Project (a)</i>	<i>Agency Fee (b)²</i>	<i>Total c=a+b</i>
UNEP	BD+LD+CC	Global	840,000	84,000	924,000
Total GEF Resources			840,000	84,000	924,000

¹ No need to provide information for this table if it is a single focal area, single country and single GEF Agency project.

² Relates to the project and any previous project preparation funding that have been provided and for which no Agency fee has been requested from Trustee.

E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

<i>Component</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks</i>	<i>GEF amount (\$)</i>	<i>Co-financing (\$)</i>	<i>Project total (\$)</i>
Local consultants*	912.00	361,000	468,000	829,000
International consultants*	39.00	156,000	38,000	194,000
Total	951.00	517,000	506,000	1,023,000

* Details to be provided in Annex C.

F. PROJECT MANAGEMENT BUDGET/COST

<i>Cost Items</i>	<i>Total Estimated person weeks</i>	<i>GEF amount (\$)</i>	<i>Co-financing (\$)</i>	<i>Project total (\$)</i>
Local consultants*	82.8	25,200	34,200	59,400
International consultants*	3	12,000	12,000	24,000
Office facilities, equipment, vehicles and communications*		37,100	16,400	53,500
Travel*		20,200	-	20,200
Others**				
Total		94,500	62,600	157,100

* Details to be provided in Annex C. ** For others, it has to clearly specify what type of expenses here in a footnote.

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? yes no

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex E an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your agency and to the GEF Trust Fund).

H. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN: For more details and assumptions see the Logframe.

Objectives and Outcomes	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline/ Target	Mid Point Target	End of Project target	Means of Verification	Monitoring/ Sampling frequency	Location/ Group	Responsibility of Monitoring	Time frame	Cost reference
<i>Project Objective</i>										
Experiment nationally-driven integrated processes and approaches to reporting to the three Rio Conventions (CBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD)	Number of pilot countries implementing an integrated approach to reporting to CBD, UNFCCC and UNCCD.	0	N/A	3 of 6	Feedback on trials from pilot countries	End of Project	Pilot countries	NEAs & IEA	End of Project	Terminal Evaluation
	Total number of reports submitted	52% (22 of 42 reports)	60%	70%	Convention secretariat reporting databases and records	Yearly	Convention Secretariats	IEA	Yearly	PIRs, Midterm and Terminal Evaluation
	Number of reports submitted within 6 months of submission deadline (per convention)	13	N/A	6	Convention secretariat reporting databases and records	End of Project	Convention Secretariats	IEA	End of Project	Terminal Evaluation
<i>Outcomes (and Outputs)</i>										
Component 1: Situational Analysis and Reporting Process Design										
1. Cost – effectiveness achieved for reporting to Conventions (CBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD)	Average of ratio between quality and cost of reporting	The baseline value will be assessed during the project's inception phase (Output 1.2)	N/A	The Target value will be assessed during the project's inception phase	0=empty, 1=limited use, 2=acceptable, 3=high quality	Start and end of the Project	National Agencies	NEAs & IEA	Yearly	PIRs, Midterm and Terminal Evaluation

Objectives and Outcomes	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline/ Target	Mid Point Target	End of Project target	Means of Verification	Monitoring/ Sampling frequency	Location/ Group	Responsibility of Monitoring	Time frame	Cost reference
				(Output 1.2)						
2. Convention linkages and synergies at the national level identified and strengthened	Linkages between Conventions are mapped, with areas of under-exploited synergy or overlap highlighted (see also measures for Outcome 4)	0	N/A	Comprehensive map of areas of synergy produced, and distributed to country focal points	Map of linkages and overlaps of reporting requirements	End of Project	Convention Secretariats and National Agencies	IEA	End of Project	Terminal Evaluation
Component 2: Implementation of Integrated Reporting Processes and Experimenting Options for reports design										
3. Duplication in reporting processes identified and eliminated	Level of consistency between reports on duplicate/overlap information	To be compiled during project inception phase	Tools developed	70% consistency	Comparative study of original and integrated reporting processes	Start, middle and end of the Project	Convention Secretariats and National Focal Points	IEA	Yearly	PIRs, Midterm and Terminal Evaluation
4. Enhanced country capacity to identify cross-convention programmes and projects for cost-effective financing and implementation	Number of staff trained in analysis of cross-convention reporting	0 staff specifically trained	2 staff per country trained	N/A	Training reports, feedback.	Year 2	National Agencies	NEAs	Mid term	PIRs and Midterm Evaluation
	Number of coordination meetings between national focal points, to discuss integration of	no routine meeting	At least one meeting	At least one meeting	Records of national coordination meetings	On going	National Focal Points	NEAs	Yearly	PIRs, Midterm and Terminal Evaluation

Objectives and Outcomes	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline/ Target	Mid Point Target	End of Project target	Means of Verification	Monitoring/ Sampling frequency	Location/ Group	Responsibility of Monitoring	Time frame	Cost reference
n	convention reporting									
	National data stores created, and number of people accessing	no central national data stores	data requests from 5 different institutions/agencies	data stores active in 3 pilot countries	National central data stores (e.g. modelled on CBD's CHM) will be developed, with integral record keeping	On going	National Focal Points	NEAs	Yearly	PIRs, Midterm and Terminal Evaluation
5. Fewer barriers to, and more cooperative environment for, information sharing among national institutions involved in convention implementation making	Number of derivative products created from national reports	0	Tools developed	1 new product developed by each country	Derivative products produced: e.g. summary of national reporting, posters, leaflets/brochures.	On going	National Focal Points	NEAs & IEA	Yearly	PIRs, Midterm and Terminal Evaluation
	Number of stakeholders (institutions, agencies or organisations) participating in reporting processes	average of 10 institutions	average increase of 10%	average increase of 25%	Records of stakeholder engagement workshops for national reporting	On going	National Focal Points	NEAs	Yearly	PIRs, Midterm and Terminal Evaluation
Component 3: Sharing of Experience and Upscaling opportunities										
6. Better informed policy decision-making at the national and	Number of countries actively incorporating data from reporting into national development	None	1 country	2 countries	Survey of countries	On going	National Focal Points	NEAs & IEA	Yearly	PIRs, Midterm and Terminal Evaluation

Objectives and Outcomes	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline/ Target	Mid Point Target	End of Project target	Means of Verification	Monitoring/ Sampling frequency	Location/ Group	Responsibility of Monitoring	Time frame	Cost reference
global level of opportunities and practicality of integrated reporting to Rio Conventions	planning									
	Side-events promoting integrated approach	None	1	3	Number of attendees at side events plus trend and sources of the Project website hits	On going	Convention Secretariats	IEA	Yearly	PIRs, Midterm and Terminal Evaluation

Cost of acquisition of essential baseline data during first year of project: The cost of obtaining baseline data is budgeted in partially from the GEF fund and the rest from co-financing of the NEAs in participating countries.

Cost of project inception workshop: For this project, the national inception workshops are not crucial in early stages. This workshop will involve 30-50 experts in each country mainly from governmental agencies. Six countries are already part of the present project. In order to the inception workshop to be useful, prior dynamic exchanges and documents preparation will be needed. During the workshop, issues encountered during first 2 years and adapted methodology to carry out implementation of the MSP, will be discussed. The cost of the inception workshops are merged with the workshops of the Output 1.2.

Cost of Mid-Term Review/Evaluation: The cost of Mid-Term evaluation is estimated at **\$12,000 \$.** It will be carried out by a consultant/team selected by the UNEP in collaboration with the EA. This review will be carried out at the end of the Year 2 of the MSP together with the second PIR process.

Cost of Terminal Evaluation: The cost of terminal evaluation is estimated at **\$23,000 \$.** It will be carried out by a team, selected by UNEP..

Any additional M&E costs: Possible costs are already included in the consolidated project budget

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION: In addition to the following questions, please ensure that the project design incorporates key GEF operational principles, including sustainability of global environmental benefits, institutional continuity and replicability, keeping in mind that these principles will be monitored rigorously in the annual Project Implementation Review and other Review stages.

A. STATE THE ISSUE, HOW THE PROJECT SEEKS TO ADDRESS IT, AND THE EXPECTED GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS TO BE DELIVERED:

1. As part of their obligations to multi-lateral environmental agreements or Conventions (hereafter the term Conventions will be used and will refer to the three Conventions for which GEF is the/a financial mechanism, namely CBD, UNFCCC and UNCCD), countries are required to report regularly to the convention bodies. Each convention provides guidance on content and format of these reports, often independent from the other Conventions, resulting in duplication, overlaps, inefficiencies and most often creating unnecessarily an "artificial" institutional fragmentation at the national level along individual convention themes. Developing countries, especially LDC/SIDS, with limited institutional and human resource capacities are heavily burdened by such Convention requirements; and the institutional fragmentation is one of the root causes for cost-inefficiencies and lack of coherence among some of the reports submitted to Convention secretariats. Another related root cause is that current GEF support modalities for reporting (through Enabling Activities) are compartmented along the focal areas which are convention-oriented. Opportunities for integrated processes for reporting have not yet been fully explored.
2. The governments of Afghanistan, Eritrea, Lao PDR, Liberia, Mauritius and Palau recognize the importance of integrated processes and approaches to facilitate national reporting to the Rio Conventions and have made commitments to support this project. Additional technical and financial assistance, however, is required to strengthen capacity in each of these countries in order to achieve the project goals, in view of the difficulties experienced during their current social and economic situations.
3. The project will undertake specific actions to strengthen the national policy and planning framework for reporting to the Rio Conventions, strengthen capacity for international cooperation, and undertake capacity building activities. These activities will be coordinated with other national programmes and strengthen current mechanisms through intersectoral collaboration.
4. Although there is obvious value to national reporting to the Rio Conventions, the burden on individual Parties is heavy. The reports require a large amount of detailed information. This burden is compounded by the fact that there is no coordination between the Conventions in terms of when the individual reports are required. In addition, frequent changes to the individual reporting formats add to the complexity of national reporting. Efforts to harmonize the national reporting formats would provide a further step. However, the differences in scope, periodicity and the nature of the information mean that it is difficult to envisage a single request or questionnaire for all processes that can fulfil all the information requirements of these instruments.
5. Therefore, through providing examples and models for integrated reporting to the Rio Conventions, the project will demonstrate how reporting to MEAs can be improved by streamlining of processes at the national level. This will constitute a significant contribution to the global debate on streamlining and harmonization of national reporting to MEAs and will support efforts to promote synergies between MEAs. The project will develop synergies between the three Rio Conventions at

the national level and will thus demonstrate how nationally-driven synergetic approaches will strengthen developing countries' capacity to MEA implementation.

B. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH NATIONAL AND/OR REGIONAL PRIORITIES/PLANS:

6. The project is fully in line with national priorities expressed in sectoral and intersectoral assessment processes such as the National Action Plans to Combat Desertification (NAPs), NBSAPs, National Communications, National Capacity Self-Assessments (NCSAs), National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs), etc. The NCSAs aimed at analysing and identifying priority cross-cutting capacity needs have consistently cited integrated approaches to reporting and information management as top national priorities for synergetic implementation of the Conventions.
7. Specifically, at the national level, there are shortages of financial resources and trained staff to undertake all reporting processes, and to coordinate data and information sharing related to the reporting mechanisms. Environmental data management is inadequately represented in governmental systems, and existing initiatives require more capacity.
8. The project is also in line with national development plans, which call for efficiency, institutional coordination, policy harmonization and integrated information systems. It is countries' views that support for integrated implementation of Conventions directly contribute to building national capacities for overall environmental management and meeting national development goals.

C. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH [GEF STRATEGIES](#) AND STRATEGIC PROGRAMS:

9. The project is consistent with GEF focal area strategies in terms of institutional strengthening for information management, establish baseline data for enhanced monitoring, and coordination for achieving on-the-ground results. The project contributes to the implementation of pathways 2, 3 and 4 of the GEF strategic approach to enhance capacity building and the GEF Business Plan. The project also responds to the recommendations of several convention bodies and the Joint Liaison Group of the Rio Conventions on synergetic implementation of conventions at the national level.

D. JUSTIFY THE TYPE OF FINANCING SUPPORT PROVIDED WITH THE GEF RESOURCES.

10. Reporting is taking place on individual Conventions, in each of the six pilot countries. Due to limited resources and capacity, the level of reporting is currently low (measured by timeliness and completeness of reporting, and by subsequent use of documents). Given the separate evolution of the three Conventions, the reporting requirements have also developed separately, and are not harmonised: there is considerable overlap in requirements, resulting in duplication of effort and occasional confusion/conflicts in the content of the reports. The timing of the reports is also not harmonised: this results in the long-term diversion of capacity and resources away from core national environmental agendas.
11. Without GEF funding (business-as-usual scenario) and in the absence of the proposed Alternative scenario, there is unlikely to be any change in the reporting approach funded by individual Convention Parties. Continued donor funding (including significant amounts from the GEF) will therefore be required to support inefficient,

duplicative national reporting, which would most likely remain at a relatively low level of quality, coverage and usefulness. The GEF Alternative focuses on the analysis of reporting requirements, reduction of duplication and overlap, and the development and testing of proposed integrated reporting approaches. The proposed \$0.84m investment from the GEF would be supported with \$0.775m in co-financing, and channeled towards the critical activities necessary to develop this initiative: initially this would be at national scales and contributing to global scale through the pilot countries.

12. The benefits to the individual countries would be: a) a reduced reporting burden (likely to be reflected in cost) for individual Conventions, and b) improved quality (accuracy, consistency, timeliness) in reporting outputs, rendering them more useful. The reduced burden in a) would allow two courses of action at national level: either i) to reduce national expenditure on reporting and increase expenditure elsewhere (e.g. implementation activities), or ii) to maintain the level of expenditure on reporting, producing markedly improved quality outputs. Regarding the global benefits the option i) would be expected to directly produce Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs), as countries are able to divert more resources to contributions to GEBs as prescribed by their individual priorities (e.g. outlined in NBSAPs, etc). The improvements in quality of reporting would have significant impacts at the global level in terms of the way in which that reporting can influence understanding and debate at the global level, and feed into policy and decision-making at that level. Once trialed and refined in the pilot countries, the integrated reporting approach would be available for acknowledgement and potentially adoption by the three Conventions, for roll-out globally. In this way, the GEF funding would be catalytic to increased cost-effectiveness of reporting to the CBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC in every country Party to those Conventions. Reporting on lessons learned, and techniques for implementation will form a key part of the proposed project's knowledge sharing component (Component 3).
13. Given the current low level of harmonization of convention reporting, through a subsequent roll-out of the pilot integrated approach, the funding for this project could have a major catalytic impact in all other convention parties.

E. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELATED INITIATIVES:

14. The project activities and coordination mechanisms will be designed in a way allowing for strong links to relevant on-going projects, mainly GEF Enabling Activities, at the national level. Such a link will be established through the institutional role that the GEF and Convention focal points play in multi-focal projects, a model that has been tested and proved successful in implementing NCSA projects. To the extent possible and paying due diligence to the design stage, the project will avoid creating yet another independent process but rather will bring on-going reporting processes together in a closely linked and planned manner. The Secretariats of the three Rio Conventions will be key working partners in project implementation and are expected to assist in dissemination of experiences and lessons learnt.
15. The project will avoid duplication of activities at the national level, through participation of relevant stakeholders. The project activities are additional and complementary to those of other live initiatives and projects (thus strengthening the overall reporting network), by establishing cooperative activities in order to maximize synergies between concerned agencies.
16. The project will take into consideration the findings of projects and initiatives on harmonization of national reporting to the biodiversity-related conventions and will also inform the current initiatives and thinking in this regard. This is particularly relevant as the CBD is part of those initiatives as well as of this project. The project will learn from

the concluded and ongoing 4th CBD national reporting particularly the linkages between the reporting and Biodiversity 2010 Targets. The project will also integrate the new reporting requirement of the UNCCD Convention through the 4th National Reporting Implemented by UNEP in collaboration with WCMC and UNCCD Secretariat.

F. DISCUSS THE VALUE-ADDED OF GEF INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROJECT DEMONSTRATED THROUGH INCREMENTAL REASONING :

17. The project is an ‘enabling activity’ which essentially addresses capacity building issues relating to national reporting. It will essentially result in a win-win situation for participating countries and for the GEF as financial mechanism in rationalizing institutional, human and financial resources used for reporting. Freed resources resulting from such integration/streamlining could be utilized for projects that address concrete activities to deal with global environmental challenges. Global environmental benefits will accrue to all four GEF focal areas since better quality information management will support better policies, decision-making and natural resource management for achieving national sustainable development, conserving the global environment and implementing environmental Conventions. The GEF is uniquely positioned to support the project objectives and it is unlikely that these would be achieved in the absence of the catalytic role to be played by the GEF. Global environment benefits will arise from an integrated approach especially when applying the ecosystem approach at the national level, and without incremental GEF finance, integrating global issues into national development planning is not likely to be realised in any coherent way.
18. The GEF involvement in this project will be instrumental in helping countries meet their Convention obligations in a cost-effective manner. The GEF as the/a financial mechanism for the Rio Conventions has considerable leverage to facilitate integration of Convention reporting processes at the national level in accordance with COP decisions and guidance on reporting. Without GEF support through this project, these countries will continue their reporting processes business-as-usual spreading institutional and human resources too thinly across the Conventions and losing opportunities for testing more cost-effective processes and approaches. The project will build on a baseline of GEF and non-GEF activities and results. The project will ensure that cross-institutional gains attained during the NCSA projects in these countries will be sustained by maintaining and furthering support for multi-sectoral and integrated approaches to implementing convention obligations and generating multi-focal area benefits.
19. The project aims at achieving cost-effectiveness at the level of data collection, reporting and capacity building support to meet convention obligations and thereby more effectively using GEF investments. An Incremental Cost Analysis as well as an Incremental Cost Matrix are detailed in the Annex.1 of this document.

G. INDICATE RISKS, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS, THAT MIGHT PREVENT THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) FROM BEING ACHIEVED AND OUTLINE RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURES:

20. Countries who requested this project indicated commitment to integrated reporting to Conventions through their letters of endorsement. These are LDC/SIDS countries who always welcome initiatives to reduce the burden associated with MEA implementation. Risks to the project can be of political and operational nature. On the political side, Conventions may understand, incorrectly, that the objective of this project is to change the convention guidance given to countries with regard to reporting requirements and formats. To mitigate such risks, the project will involve, from the onset, the Convention secretariats in the situational analysis and the design of the project and will have, during

project implementation, regular communication with, and produce briefings for, the secretariats and relevant bodies on objectives, processes, experiences and outputs of the project in order to prevent any misunderstanding. Furthermore, the GEF CEO has already written to Convention secretariats to solicit their views and support to this project. Operationally, full incorporation of on-going (business as usual) efforts focusing on reporting may not be achieved because of the complexity of the parties involved (different Implementing Agencies (IAs), Executive Agencies, etc). The project will establish a clear and detailed joint work plan as well as developing mutual agreement on coordination and management among executing parties.

21. Overall, the project has been designed to minimize risk. Risk reduction in conservation and sustainable use activities has been a key consideration in the design of the project, including the management structure, strategic approach and integration of best practice. International experience and guidelines have been taken into account. In addition, UNEP is committed to continuance of follow up activities at project pilot countries to ensure that project achievements can be sustained, and lead to further improvements.
22. One category of external risk that could have a far-reaching effect on the project is macro-economic factors (such as a downturn in either national or the global economy). While current development indicators have shown growth trends in all four countries in recent years, if any of the participating countries experience a financial crisis during the period of the MSP, this could affect their motivation to contribute the in-kind agreed co-financing, or result in delays in the provision of such contribution. In such an event, adjustments and financial resources shifting would have to be made to the project approach to ensure continuation of the activities.
23. Another risk is the potential shift in government priorities associated with political changes. Such change could result in a reduction in priority for environment conservation. This risk is partially offset by the adherence of the project to national policy priorities and plans that underpin government programmes, and in some cases, strong baseline conditions. The project participatory approach and adaptive management involving all relevant stakeholders would mitigate this risk, including all levels of governmental and non-governmental communities/agencies. The risk that countries are unwilling to cooperate with other countries should also be noticed. However, the UNEP role and expertise in promoting international cooperation and regional integration will help to mitigate this risk.
24. The countries participating in this project have highly centralized government systems that can result in barriers to cooperation between different sectoral agencies, and to participation of stakeholders. The project approach of promoting intersectoral cooperation and capacity building campaigns is expected to ensure that all relevant stakeholders are engaged in the outcome of the project. The stakeholder participation plan, as a tool, will be of great help in addressing this issue. Access to adequate communication equipment will be assured.
25. The project's integrated approach requires sufficient technical capacity at the outset. Current capacity within the NEAs to take on integrated reporting approaches, and particularly the need for community, private sector or stakeholder participation, is limited. The project will address this weakness through training and other capacity building measures at the outset, with an emphasis at governmental level. These measures will be strategic and designed for long-term impact through measures such as training of trainers, best use of trained staff, production of training materials and establishment of institutional links.

26. There are challenges for participating countries for finding appropriate national consultants. Other challenges refer to communication (e.g. long delays of hearing from some pilot countries during the development of the MSP).
27. The logical framework matrix presented in the Annex.1 of this document details the project-related risks and assumptions. Risks are mitigated, to the extent possible, by the project strategy and activities.

H. EXPLAIN HOW COST-EFFECTIVENESS IS REFLECTED IN THE PROJECT DESIGN:

28. By testing ways of harmonizing reporting nationally, the project considers approaches towards development of a harmonized information management infrastructure for the treaties within their existing defined mandates. This will inform discussions on how the Convention secretariats could improve effectiveness and efficiency in gathering, handling, disseminating and sharing information.
29. The project aims to increase cost-effectiveness at the national level, by pooling resources that are currently spread between agencies, processes, and focal points in charge of the Rio Conventions and achieve a streamlined approach to national reporting to these Conventions. While a substantial input of resources and funds is provided by the project, the aim is to set up cost-effective and efficient national reporting processes in the pilot countries. The lessons learned from the project will be significant for many other Parties to the Rio Conventions as well and it is expected that cost-effective harmonized approaches to national reporting to MEAs will be more widespread in the longer-term.

I. JUSTIFY THE COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE OF THE GEF AGENCY

30. The project is fully in line with the UNEP role of catalyzing the development of scientific and technical analysis and advancing environmental management in GEF-financed activities. UNEP provides guidance on relating the GEF-financed activities to global, regional and national environmental assessments, policy frameworks and plans, and to international environmental agreements. Currently, UNEP is developing project to support UNCCD indicator based 4th National Report, Land Degradation Assessment and Biodiversity 2010 indicators which will provide GEF with a range of relevant experiences, proof of concept, testing of ideas and access to the best available science and knowledge. The Joint Reporting project will explore the possibility of testing the performance and impact indicators in the recipient countries. In relation to the GEF multi- focal areas, the project is fully in line with UNEP comparative experience in reference with GEF/C 31/5 Annex H.
31. At corporate level, the project is fully in line with the UNEP Programme of Work (PoW) 2010- 2011 particularly the subprogramme 4: Environmental Governance, Expected Accomplishments (a) The United Nations system, respecting the mandate of each entity, progressively realizes synergies and demonstrates increasing coherence in international decision-making processes related to the environment, including those under multilateral environmental agreements); (b) Enhanced capacity of States to implement their environmental obligations and achieve their environmental priority goals, targets and objectives through strengthened laws and institutions; (c) National development processes and United Nations common country programming processes increasingly mainstream environmental sustainability in their implementation; (d) Improved

access by national and international stakeholders to sound science and policy advice for decision-making.

PART III: INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT

A. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT: UNEP is the GEF Implementing Agency of this project.

32. **International Executing Agency (IEA)** : UNEP-WCMC is the Executing Agency of the project. UNEP-WCMC (IEA) shall take responsibility for the execution of the project in accordance with the objectives, activities and budget and deliver the outputs and demonstrate its best efforts in achieving the project outcomes. It shall also coordinate activities with the Rio Convention Secretariats and address and rectify any issues raised by DGEF with respect to project execution in a timely manner. It shall also support the project mid-term review/evaluation as an adaptive management tool and develop a management response to the review. UNEP-WCMC shall collaborate with the project terminal evaluation, and provide all information requested by the evaluation team. It shall organize the tasks at global level and also serve as the secretariat to the Project Steering Committee.
33. **Project Steering Committee (PSC)**: A Project Steering Committee (PSC) composed of participating countries, UNEP/DGEF, UNEP/WCMC, GEF Secretariat and Rio Convention Secretariats and chaired by UNEP DGEF will provide strategic guidance on project implementation issues such as adaptive management and monitor and review progress on an annual basis. It will physically meet once a year and can be called as needs arise using modern telecommunication means.
34. **National Executing Agencies (NEAs)** Overall responsibility at the national level will be vested with the following National Executing Agencies (NEAs):
Afghanistan: National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA)
Eritrea: The Ministry of Land Water and Environment (MLWE)
Lao PDR: Water Resources and Environment Administration (WREA)
Liberia: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Mauritius: Ministry of Environment & National Development Unit (MENDU)
Palau: Office of Environmental Response and Coordination (OERC)
35. These agencies will implement the project in collaboration with other national, provincial and local government agencies, NGOs, private sector and local communities. In order to ensure joint programming of GEF interventions with related projects, formal and informal inter-agency links will be maintained. Each NEA will receive international technical assistance through the IEA and short-term consultancy inputs.
36. **National Steering Committee (NSC)**: A National Steering Committee (NSC) will be maintained in each country to provide guidance to the project and monitor progress and performance. The NSC will be chaired by the Head of the NEA or his/her representative. The NPC will act as the NSC secretary.

B. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT:

37. International and national project teams based in the six pilot countries (Afghanistan, Eritrea, Lao PDR, Liberia, Mauritius and Palau) provide a general indication of the various responsibilities for each position. All these positions are planned for the duration of the GEF project (three years). A limited number of short-term consultants will be hired during the MSP. Whenever possible, expertise will be sought through collaborating organizations. The Global Project Coordinator will develop detailed Terms of Reference.
38. **Global Project Coordinator (GPC)**; The Global Project Coordinator will provide overall direction for technical and administrative aspects of the project. The GPC will be appointed by UNEP-WCMC and is accountable to the UNEP-WCMC for the

achievement of project objectives, results, and all fundamental aspects of project execution. UNEP-WCMC is accountable to UNEP for the project for implementation in line with the agreement signed by the two institutions. The GPC will maintain regular communication with the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and national teams in the pilot countries. The GPC will be funded by GEF.

39. **National Project Coordinator (NPC):** The NPC will be appointed by each of the six National Executing Agencies (NEAs). The NPC will carry out activities as directed by the National Steering Committee (NSC), and will also be responsible for monitoring adherence to the overall project work plan, that forms the basis for project execution.
40. **National Project Assistant (NPA)** The NPA will be funded by GEF and responsible for administration and management, including effective and timely implementation of the project, and constant communication with the GPC. The NPA must be experienced in international project execution and accounting to ensure that UNEP/DGEF financial planning and reporting procedures are fully complied with. The NPA is working under the supervision of the NPC and will report to the GPC. 2

PART IV: EXPLAIN THE ALIGNMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF:


41. The project design is very closely aligned with the original PIF. The PIF was developed to target reporting requirements which are determined by the three Rio Convention secretariats. As such, Secretariats are easy to monitor, and for changes in approach and requirements to be captured. During the PPG phase the reporting requirements for each convention were monitored for change, to ensure that the demand and justification for such an integrated approach remains strong.
42. A few changes in terminology have been made throughout. For example the phrase used to describe the coordination between different reporting is “*integrated reporting*” rather than “*joint reporting*”. This is to ensure consistency, and because the project is specifically addressing an integrated approach to reporting which is currently being demanded by the participant countries.
43. The project amount has been increased by \$100,000 compared to the approved PIF. The rationale behind this increment are (i) the need for more funds to cover the activities in component 3: *Sharing of Experience and Upscaling opportunities*, as the national focus of the project, requests more support to participatory approach through the National Technical Working Group. Also the lessons learning at national level and the need to share the pilot countries national experiences at international level by producing adequate materials/publication required more financial support; (ii) the project is oriented toward activities at national level, due to the LDCs situation of the participating countries, there is need for more technical backstopping at national level in term of coordination and RBM. This has led to the need of strengthening national technical supports in six pilot countries.

Endorsement Records: Countries endorsement Letters are attached to this document.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>Title and Address</i>	<i>Endorsement date</i>
<i>Ms. Youlsau Bells,</i>	<i>Republic of Palau</i>	<i>National Environmental Planner, GEF OFP, Officer of the Environmental Response and Coordination</i>	Date: March 17, 2008
<i>Mr Mostapha Zaher,</i>	<i>Islamic Republic of Afghanistan</i>	<i>Director-General, GEF OFP, National Environment Protection Agency,</i>	Date: February, 28, 2008
<i>Mr Mogos Wolde-Yohannis,</i>	<i>Republic of Eritrea</i>	<i>Director General, Department of Environment, Ministry of Land, Water and the Environment,</i>	Date: February 26, 2008
<i>Mr Ben Turner Donnie</i>		<i>Executive Director, Environment protection Agency, Liberia</i>	Date: June 11, 2008
<i>Mr Ali Mansoor</i>	<i>Mauritius</i>	<i>Finance Secretary Ministry of Finance and Economic Development</i>	Date: 11 September 2008
<i>Mr Khampadith Khammounheuang</i>	<i>Lao PDR</i>	<i>Director of International Environment Division, Environment Department, WREA, Prime Minister's Office GEF Operational Focal Point</i>	Date: September, 9, 2008

PART V: AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO Endorsement.

<i>GEF Agency Coordinator, Agency name</i>	<i>Signature</i>	<i>Date (Month, day, year)</i>	<i>Project Contact Person</i>	<i>Telephone</i>	<i>Email Address</i>
<i>Maryam Niamir-Fuller, Director, UNEP Division of GEF Coordination</i>		September 08, 2009	Adamou Bouhari	+254 20 762 3860	Adamou.Bouhari@unep.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline/ Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Project Objective				
Experiment nationally-driven integrated processes and approaches to reporting to the three Rio Conventions (CBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of pilot countries implementing an integrated approach to reporting to CBD, UNFCCC and UNCCD. 	Baseline: 0 / 6 countries Target: 3 / 6 countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback on trials from pilot countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project will work closely with critical government offices (e.g. convention Focal points) to promote implementation of the integrated approach.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total number of reports submitted 	Baseline: 52% (22 of 42 reports of the participating countries) so far submitted since ratification/accession. Target: 70% of reports of the participating countries due for delivery during project period are submitted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convention secretariat reporting databases and records 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrated reporting will make reporting more efficient, and increase timely submission of reports.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of reports submitted within 6 months of submission deadline (per convention) 	Baseline: Current reporting is on average 13 months late. Target: Reporting on average 6 months late.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convention secretariat reporting databases and records 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrated reporting will make reporting more efficient, and increase timely submission of reports.
Outcomes (and Outputs)				
Component 1: Situational Analysis and Reporting Process Design				
7. Cost-effectiveness achieved for reporting to Conventions (CBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average of ratio between <u>quality</u> (assessed on a proposed 0-3 scale – see <i>Means of Verification</i> column), and <u>cost</u> of reporting (total expenditure of government and all contributing agencies) 	Baseline: The baseline value will be assessed during the project's inception phase (specifically the national assessments in Output 1.2) Target: Similarly, the target will also be assessed during inception.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of relative quality (0=empty, 1=limited use, 2=acceptable, 3=high quality) Check number of factual discrepancies between reports for different Conventions Records of expenditure on reporting, and level of GEF funding requests 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within countries, reporting on each convention is taking place. Cost of reporting is measurable, and not too fragmented between collaborating institutions. Integrated reporting could encourage increased scale and scope of national reporting, resulting in increased expenditure, funded from national sources.

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline/ Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
			for Enabling Activities relating to reporting	
8. Convention linkages and synergies at the national level identified and strengthened	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linkages between Conventions are mapped, with areas of under-exploited synergy or overlap highlighted (see also measures for Outcome 4) 	<p>Baseline: No synergies formally recorded</p> <p>Target: Comprehensive map of areas of synergy produced, and distributed to country focal points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Map of linkages and overlaps of reporting requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level and scope of reporting requirements for each convention remains constant No new related Conventions introduced
Component 2: Implementation of Integrated Reporting Processes and Experimenting Options for reports design				
9. Duplication in reporting processes identified and eliminated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of consistency between reports on duplicate/overlap information (% of duplicate questions which are answered using same information, where appropriate) 	<p>Baseline: To be compiled during project inception phase</p> <p>Target: 70% consistency</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comparative study of original and integrated reporting processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Duplicate reporting requests can be satisfied using the same information sources
10. Enhanced country capacity to identify cross-convention programmes and projects for cost-effective financing and implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of staff trained in analysis of cross-convention reporting 	<p>Baseline: 0 staff specifically trained</p> <p>Target: 2 staff per country trained</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training reports, feedback. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trained staff remain in post for a sufficient time
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of coordination meetings between national focal points, to discuss integration of convention reporting 	<p>Baseline: no routine meetings taking place</p> <p>Target: one meeting taking place for each convention reporting period</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Records of national coordination meetings (can be component of an existing committee) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desire to collaborate between different reporting offices is not unduly influenced by political factors. Meetings do need to be specifically called for these purposes, but should record opportunities for the relevant focal points (etc) to meet
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National data stores created, and number of people accessing 	<p>Baseline: no central national data stores</p> <p>Target: data stores active in 3 countries, with data requests from 5 different institutions,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National central data stores (e.g. modelled on CBD's CHM) will be developed, with integral record 	

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline/ Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
		agencies, departments, etc.	keeping	
11. Fewer barriers to, and more cooperative environment for, information sharing among national institutions involved in convention implementation making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of derivative products created from national reports 	<p>Baseline: No systematic development of derivative products, reporting focused on national reports</p> <p>Target: 1 new product developed by each country</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Derivative products produced: e.g. summary of national reporting, posters, leaflets/brochures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved reporting and higher quality outputs are more likely to make good posters, leaflets, etc. These derivative products will be driven by government, with partial support from project: they are not explicit project outputs.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of stakeholders (institutions, agencies or organisations) participating in reporting processes 	<p>Baseline: average of 10 institutions routinely engaging</p> <p>Target: average increase of 25% in number of stakeholders participating</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Records of stakeholder engagement workshops for national reporting 	
Component 3: Sharing of Experience and Upscaling opportunities				
12. Better informed policy decision-making at the national and global level of opportunities and practicality of integrated reporting to Rio Conventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of countries actively incorporating data from reporting into national development planning 	<p>Baseline: 0 countries – no formalised links</p> <p>Target: 2 countries</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey of countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Match between timing of national planning, and national reporting processes.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Side-events promoting integrated approach 	<p>Baseline: None</p> <p>Target: 1 side event organised per convention (COP or other meetings' schedules permitting)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of attendees at side events trend and sources of the Project website traffic/hits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key secretariat staff will be invited, to promote concept within secretariats. The side events will be augmented by specific reference to, or extracts from, integrated reports within convention documents.

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF)

GEFSEC Comments Responses	Responses
Financial plan prepared according to planned activities. However, it is not clear why in a project framework table where GEF indicative financing is calculated, total amount of funds for project management is 56% and total management costs are 64%. Further details of these numbers would be required.	As explained in the teleconference with GEFSEC, these calculations are in accordance with GEFSEC Instructions with regard to filling in the PIF financial information. 56% & 64% refers to the share of GEF and Co-financing respectively to the total amount for the component and not to the total project costs.
Total costs for implementation of joint reporting (item #2) in the same table are planned in amount of \$90000. In order to establish partnership and taking into consideration the fact that countries have accepted obligation to report to respected convention, local contributions to the project would be also very important. That opportunity probably should be explored	We agree that local contribution to the project would be very important to demonstrate commitment. Cofinancing indicated in the PIF project mainly comes from national sources, the exact amount per country is confirmed during the project preparation phase. The actual amount exceed the total committed of \$275,880
Project endorsement letters from Mauritius and Lao PDR are not submitted.	Both letters of endorsements are now attached to the PIF.

ANNEX C: CONSULTANTS TO BE HIRED FOR THE PROJECT USING GEF RESOURCES

<i>Position Titles</i>	<i>\$/ person week*</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks**</i>	<i>Tasks to be performed</i>
For Project Management			
Local			
National Project Coordinators (6 part time positions)	500	18	Project administrative coordination at national level
National Project Assistants (6 part time positions)	250	64.8	Project administrative support at national level
International			
Global Project Coordinator (part time position)	4000	3	Project coordination support at international level
Justification for Travel, if any: GPC visits to pilot countries, NPCs and NPAs local travels			
For Technical Assistance			
Local			
National Consultants (6 positions)	500	52	Six National studies 1 on : Situation analysis, report design and quality assessment and National options
National Consultants (6 positions)	500	60	Six National studies 2 on: Existing data and information collection, analysis and management and National options and needs (including training) assessments
National Consultants (6 positions)	500	180	Implementation of National options (Results of Studies 1&2) in six pilot countries
National Project Coordinators (6 positions)	500	240	Project technical coordination at national level
National Project Assistants (6 positions)	250	380	Project technical support at national level
International			
International Consultant	4000	5.2	International Consultant for Situational Analysis and Reporting Process Design (Component 1)
International Consultant	4000	13.6	International Consultant for Implementation of Integrated Reporting Process (Component 2)
Global Project Coordinator	4000	20.2	Project technical coordination at international level
Justification for Travel, if any: Technical Working Group meetings, Steering Committee meetings, workshops, side events (national and/or international).			

ANNEX D: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS

A. EXPLAIN IF THE PPG OBJECTIVE HAS BEEN ACHIEVED THROUGH THE PPG ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN.
PPG activities have been completed successfully.

B. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

The countries participating in this project have highly centralized government systems that can result in barriers during implementation of the MSP to cooperation between different sectoral agencies, and for participation of stakeholders.

Current capacity within the NEAs to take on integrated reporting approaches is limited. Some measures will be strategic and designed for long-term impact but the challenges of communication are an external issue to the project. Regular communication with pilot countries during the PPG phase has in some cases been hampered by issues such as Internet access, personnel changes and capacity to deal with a number of requests. There is a risk that the project progress might be impacted by such problems. The GPC should establish good personal relations with key stakeholders in the pilot countries during implementation of the MSP.

C. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

<i>Project Preparation Activities Approved</i>	<i>Implementation Status</i>	<i>GEF Amount (\$)</i>				<i>Co-financing (\$)</i>
		<i>Amount Approved</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>	<i>Uncommitted Amount*</i>	
Gather baseline information and consult stakeholders in six countries on design options and management arrangement for integrated reporting to conventions (justification: each country has its own system of dealing with information management and reporting processes. In addition, each country has its own institutional set up and it will be difficult for the project to dictate a top-down approach to design. Therefore, a bottom-approach is necessary to have effective implementation arrangement and to increase national ownership and buy-in from all stakeholders concerned)	Six national studies conducted	12,000	2,000	10,000		
Develop an overall project framework and write the details of each project component, detailed implementation and coordination arrangements, input-output budget, Monitoring	Completed and a visit has been made to Afghanistan.	18,000	18,000	0	0	20000

and evaluation plan, and various other operational details needed for a complete project brief. This will include international consultant travel to WCMC HQs in UK and a visit to one of the pilot countries. UNEP and WCMC will provide co-financing for hosting the consultant, towards covering the cost of WCMC-UNEP-Consultant consultation meeting and the production of the brief.						
Total		30,000	20,000	10,000	0	20,000

* Any uncommitted amounts should be returned to the GEF Trust Fund. This is not a physical transfer of money, but achieved through reporting and netting out from disbursement request to Trustee. Please indicate expected date of refund transaction to Trustee.

ANNEX E: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS

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

Not applicable.