PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF)

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT
For more **TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND**

information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title:	Mainstreaming biodiversity information into the heart of government decision making		
Country(ies):	Global, and 3 demonstration countries	GEF Project ID:	5730
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	01268
Other Executing Partner(s):	WCMC, 3 Ministries of Environment	Submission Date: Resubmission Date:	07 March 2014 25 March 2014
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration (Months)	48
Name of parent program (if applicable): • For SFM/REDD+ ☐ • For SGP ☐ • For PPP ☐		Project Agency Fee ($):	$475,000

A. INDICATIVE FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK:

Focal Area Objectives	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount ($)	Indicative Co-financing ($)
BDFA Objective 2: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks	GEFTF	5,000,000	15,000,000
Total Project Cost		**5,000,000**	**15,000,000**

B. INDICATIVE PROJECT FRAMEWORK:

Project Objective: Ensure biodiversity is taken into account in policy frameworks across government sectors by improving decision makers' access to and use of biodiversity information and embedding biodiversity information within national decision-making processes.

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount ($)	Indicative Cofinancing ($)

| Component 1: | TA | 1. Decision points or processes across government sectors are identified where biodiversity information can be influential, and response strategies devised

(Evidenced by: Mainstreaming strategies and initiatives to remove data sharing barriers)
This outcome will in particular contribute to achieving **Aichi Targets 2 and 19** | **1.1** Multi-sectoral development decisions and/or processes identified that have an unmet demand for / potential to be influenced by relevant biodiversity information

1.2 User groups at national level advise on, review and validate project outputs

1.3 An innovative strategy to mainstream biodiversity information into identified government decision processes is devised in each country *(i.e. each country has a demonstration strategy for a new approach that other countries can learn from, whether at national level or in a specific sector where a strong case can be made that biodiversity information can influence development decisions and outcomes)*

1.4 The most important barriers to biodiversity data sharing are identified in each demonstration country, and targeted interventions are devised to neutralise or address these

1.5 Up-scaling approach devised and implemented, including improved identification of entry points / response strategies achieved by sharing experiences, lessons, good practices, tools, etc. between countries and globally | GEFTF | 1,000,000 | 2,550,000 |
| Mainstreaming entry points, and response strategies | | | | | | |

Component 2:	TA	2. Technical stakeholders are more easily able to <u>acquire and share relevant data, and use this to communicate effectively</u>, for current and future information needs *(Evidenced by: Technical staff in governments and supportive institutions have improved ability to develop and deliver information products that support decision making with respect to biodiversity)* In *support of Aichi Target 19*	**2.1** Biodiversity information products and processes utilising innovative mechanisms and technologies are developed/strengthened and trialled to respond to the demands for biodiversity information identified under Outcome 1 **2.2** Public sector capacity to respond to future requests or opportunities for biodiversity information (including data standards, methodologies, etc.) is built/enhanced **2.3** Establishment or formalisation of partnerships necessary for the acquisition, sharing and delivery of biodiversity information, and catalyzing the further development of national biodiversity monitoring networks *(e.g. w/ a ToR or MoU)* **2.4** Up-scaling approach devised and implemented, including that capacity for responding with appropriate data/info is improved, iteratively, by replication and transfer of these innovative mechanisms and technology between countries and globally	GEFTF	2,850,000	9,150,000
Capacity to respond (using appropriate information)						

3

Component 3: Embed/ integrate necessary information into national development systems	TA	**3.** Policy frameworks, including accounting and reporting systems, across a range of sectors are incorporating biodiversity considerations *(Evidenced by: Policy frameworks modified to "pull"/demand biodiversity information for development decisions) In support of **Aichi Targets 2 and 19***	**3.1** Strategies and measures for integrating biodiversity information into decision-making, recommended by national user groups, based on iterative review and assessment of results, are identified and implemented **3.2** Capacity of decision makers across government sectors to respond (supported by biodiversity knowledge products) is enhanced, e.g. through cross-Ministerial foras being established to align development priorities and biodiversity data and priorities **3.3** Up-scaling approach devised and implemented, including that capacity for embedding biodiversity information into national systems, planning and reporting processes is enhanced, iteratively, by sharing experiences, lessons, good practices, tools, etc. between countries and globally	GEFTF	850,000	2,600,000
Subtotal					4,700,000	14,300,000
Project Management Cost (PMC)				GEFTF	300,000	700,000
Total Project Cost					**5,000,000**	**15,000,000**

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

Sources of Cofinancing	Name of Cofinancier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount ($)
National governments	3 focal countries and partner countries	In-Kind	$2,000,000
National governments	3 focal countries and partner countries	Cash	$1,900,000
International Organizations	IUCN, ICRAF, etc.	In-Kind	$4,000,000
Charitable organizations	GEO-BON, GBIF, etc.	In-Kind	$200,000
Regional technical organizations	SANBI, CONABIO, etc	In-Kind	$1,500,000
Implementing Agency	UNEP	Cash	$900,000
Executing Agency	WCMC	In-Kind	$400,000
Multilateral and bilateral donors	EU and member states	In-Kind	$1,000,000
Multilateral and bilateral donors	EU and member states	Cash	$2,200,000
Convention secretariat	CBD, other BD MEAs	In-Kind	$600,000
Convention secretariat	CBD, other BD MEAs	Cash	$300,000
Total Cofinancing			**$15,000,000**

D. INDICATIVE TRUST FUND RESOURCES ($) REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY:

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/Global	Grant Amount ($) (a)	Agency Fee ($) (b)	Total ($) c=a+b
UNEP	GEFTF	Biodiversity	Global	5,000,000	475,000	5,475,000
Total Grant Resources				**5,000,000**	**475,000**	**5,475,000**

E. **PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG):**

Please check on the appropriate box for PPG as needed for the project according to the GEF Project Grant:

	Amount Requested ($)	Agency Fee for PPG ($)[1]
• (upto)$100k for projects up to & including $3 million	_____	
• (upto)$150k for projects up to & including $6 million	120,000	11,400

PPG AMOUNT REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES) FOR MFA AND/OR MTF ROJECT ONLY

Trust Fund	GEF Agency	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	PPG (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total c = a + b
GEF TF	UNEP	Biodiversity	Global	120,000	11,400	131,400
(select)	(select)	(select)				
Total PPG Amount				**120,000**	**11,400**	**131,400**

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. PROJECT OVERVIEW
A.1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION.

The project will help governments to achieve sustainable development by bringing biodiversity and ecosystem services to the heart of government decision making using actionable environmental information. It focuses on in depth development of proofs of concept with a small number of carefully selected countries to: mobilise existing biodiversity data and information from a range of sources (national and international); to apply such information in forms that provide spatially explicit information on change in biodiversity and ecosystem services supply at the appropriate scales for managers and policy makers; and to catalyse the development of national biodiversity information networks capable of providing such policy-relevant, spatially explicit information to meet ongoing national needs. The outputs will be demand-driven, based on country-specific cross-sectoral information needs for decision making (Component 1). Each country will develop and trial innovative mechanisms and technologies for incorporating existing biodiversity information into the appropriate formats and processes for cross-sectoral decision making (Component 2). Learning from these innovative solutions, the approach will be applied globally, to facilitate the provision of demand-driven biodiversity information of decision makers in other countries and facilitating countries' reporting to Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs: also Component 2). Component 3 will focus on embedding and mainstreaming biodiversity information into cross-sectoral government systems and processes now and into the future. The project will improve the ability of governments and the international community to report progress against many of the Aichi Targets, and in particular will help to achieve Aichi Target 19 (knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved, widely shared

---

[1] PPG fee percentage follows the percentage of the GEF Project Grant amount requested.

and transferred, and applied) and Aichi Target 2 (biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems).

The project will achieve:

Globally,
- Proof-of-concept models, good practices, lessons and tools, developed iteratively and through active showcasing and facilitated interaction with the 3 demonstration countries
- Improved global understanding of and capacity to use biodiversity information to influence development outcomes

At national level, in 3 demonstration countries,
- Decision points or processes across government sectors where biodiversity information can be influential are identified, and innovative, strategic response strategies are developed
- Technical stakeholders are supported to more easily be able to acquire and share relevant data, and use this to communicate effectively, for current and future information needs
- Biodiversity data and information are integrated into decision making across government sectors and utilised to a greater extent within national-level policy processes, accounting systems, and reporting

The project would work with 3 countries who: (i) Are GEF-eligible; (ii) Are rapidly developing through agriculture, extractive sectors, or other growth sectors that present a high risk to biodiversity; alternatively, there is an unexploited opportunity to restore or rehabilitate biodiversity; (iii) Have a genuine willingness to act on biodiversity loss and are amenable to building the capacity within their governments to respond effectively; and (iv) Are capable and motivated to offer a showcase example / play a leadership role within their region and globally. It will also work with an international technical advisory group comprising world-leading countries on biodiversity information management and mainstreaming, such as China, Brazil and South Africa. Active emphasis in each component will be placed on up-scaling of project outputs.

A.1. THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS, ROOT CAUSES AND BARRIERS THAT NEED TO BE ADDRESSED

A great deal of the world's biodiversity has already been lost; this is a well-substantiated global environmental problem, with considerable consequences for human well-being[2]. Many signs point to negative impacts on biodiversity from development and economic production sectors. Notably, the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) concluded that modifications to ecosystems have been driven by rapid human economic development leading to the unsustainable use and degradation of biodiversity. Consequently, there has been a reduced capacity for ecosystems to provide the services upon which people are dependent. Through smarter economic development strategies, such negative impacts could be avoided, minimised or compensated for.

The Problem: The consequences of biodiversity loss through development strategies such as land use change and agricultural intensification are not always evident in government decision making processes. Biodiversity loss may result in the decline and loss of ecosystem services for local or downstream communities in the short or long term. Root causes are a lack of transparency about what is happening to biodiversity as it happens and a lack of explicit quantification of the trade-offs that are taking place. Linked to this is the limited political will and pressure to act to ensure the conservation

---

[2] See e.g. GBO-3: CBD Secretariat (2010) Global Biodiversity Outlook 3 [Link].

and sustainable use of biodiversity. Yet even when public and private actors are aware of the benefits from effecting policy and resource management changes, they may not have access to relevant information to support more sustainable decisions.

The preferred long-term solution is that governments are able to easily access relevant information about potential threats to, and changes in, biodiversity and the supply of ecosystem services; that this information is timely, of good enough quality and presented in an accessible way such that it can be used routinely within the decision making process. Government policies and decisions would therefore appropriately factor in and apply measures that take into account the value of biodiversity to sustainable development, while contributing to and facilitating green economic growth and poverty reduction. Currently, there are extremely promising developments in a number of countries around the world on indicators, accounting and tools for taking into account ecosystem services and biodiversity. Yet much of this work is still very new and experimental, as well as largely externally funded; it is not done by civil servants using domestic budgets as a matter of routine government business. In addition, at the global and regional levels, and in some more advanced countries, there are important developments in the acquisition and interpretation of remotely sensed data, and its integration with ground data, to develop near-real time spatially explicit information. This routine provision and use of biodiversity information, in a manner that governments consider to be part of their core mandate, would indicate that the information is in demand, and given due consideration in development decisions. Biodiversity would no longer be "invisible" in development decisions.

However, several critical barriers stand in the way of advancing towards the preferred long-term solution. These can be summarised as:

- *Limited cross-ministry / trans-disciplinary influence:* Actors within different sectors have different information needs and communicate in different ways. Development decision making processes can be "messy" and challenging to engage with, and other line ministries or sectoral stakeholders are better funded, with more established cases for their priorities.
- *Poorly targeted information initiatives:* Stakeholders are not always identifying the development decision points that tangibly affect biodiversity, nor responding in time with influential evidence in the right format to make their case. Within this, there may be limited understanding of how biodiversity information can help address national development priorities, and of what biodiversity data are required for the decision making process.
- *Unavailable / inconsistent information:* Either data does not exist, is dispersed, in incompatible formats, or otherwise inaccessible. Inconsistent data monitoring and analytical methods mean that data sets at different scales are currently not compatible.
- *Timeliness / relevance:* When information is made available, it is often several years out of date. Recommendations made on this basis can therefore be tenuous or obsolete. Other sectors and priorities competing for attention may have more regular, up-to-date or even real-time data.
- *Inefficient systems:* National environmental / biodiversity information systems are still rarely making good use of recent technological developments. Reporting to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) still relies primarily on narrative templates, with only emerging efforts on indicator-based reporting that uses biodiversity data to generate information on biodiversity change relevant to e.g. National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) / Aichi Targets.
- *Limited sharing / up-scaling efforts:* Countries may be facing similar constraints in parallel, yet not sharing experiences, lessons, good practices, tools, etc. that would boost their collective capacity.

The proposed GEF project aims to address these barriers by helping decision makers understand how biodiversity information can be used to inform key decision points or processes, empowering stakeholders with appropriate information for decision support, and providing capacity to create the infrastructure for addressing future needs. In addition, the project will integrate biodiversity

information into government decision making fully utilising both national and global level policy support and reporting systems.

A.2. THE BASELINE SCENARIO AND ANY ASSOCIATED BASELINE PROJECTS

Context and Issue

The third Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO-3)[3] made the case that effective action to address biodiversity loss depends on addressing the underlying causes or indirect drivers of that decline[4], with more evidence showing that the rate of biodiversity loss is not being significantly reduced by current efforts. A key lesson from this failure is that, while the CBD has near universal participation, those involved in its implementation rarely have the influence at the heart of national level decision making required to effect real change. Biodiversity conservation and sustainable use efforts are easily undermined by decisions from other ministries and sectors that fail to take biodiversity into consideration.

GBO-3 argues that we can no longer see the continued loss of, and changes to, biodiversity as an issue separate from the core development priorities of society. Long-term prosperity and human well-being is undermined by current trends in the state of our ecosystems. Achieving sustainable development will involve placing biodiversity in the mainstream of decision making. Mainstreaming therefore needs to be seen as the genuine understanding by government machinery as a whole that the future well-being of society depends on defending and appropriately managing the natural infrastructure on which we all depend. Some trade-offs between conservation and development are inevitable, and it is important that decisions are informed by the best available information and that the trade-offs are clearly recognized and accounted for. Decisions made at all levels need to take better account of biodiversity across all sectors, in particular the major economic sectors, and government has a key enabling role to play here.

Point of departure (GEF programmes and investments)

This project will depart from achievements in other GEF projects dealing with different aspects of biodiversity data, information, knowledge and mainstreaming, including natural capital accounting initiatives. Although relevant, they do not form part of the financial baseline for this project:

- **Biodiversity Indicators Partnership** (GEF-funded from 2007-2011): Implemented by UNEP. The CBD-mandated BIP is the global partnership (with over forty organizations) to promote and coordinate development and delivery of biodiversity indicators in support of the CBD, other MEAs, the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), national and regional governments and a range of other sectors.

- **Support to GEF Eligible Countries for Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 through a Globally Guided NBSAPs Update Process** (2014-2016): Implemented by UNDP and UNEP. The NBSAP Forum is a partnership between the Secretariat of the CBD (sCBD), UNEP, UNDP, Governments, NGOs and others, working to provide coordinated support NBSAP revision and implementation.

- **ProEcoServ** (2012-2016): Implemented by UNEP. The ProEcoServ project is piloting the bundling of ecosystem services and the integration of ecosystem services approaches into resource management and decision making.

---

[3] SCBD 2010, *Ibid*.
[4] The overwhelming majority of governments reporting to the CBD cited 5 main pressures or direct drivers as affecting biodiversity in their countries: (i) Habitat loss and degradation, (ii) Climate change, (iii) Excessive nutrient load and other forms of pollution, (iv) Over-exploitation and unsustainable use, and (v) Invasive alien species. There is evidence that these drivers are persistent and in some cases being intensified.

- **UNDP-GEF Biodiversity Mainstreaming portfolio** (described in detail under Component 1 baseline, below).
- **Global Forest Watch 2.0** (2013-2016): Implemented by UNEP. A mapping application that unites satellite technology, open data, and crowd-sourcing to guarantee access to timely and reliable information about forests.

Other relevant initiatives (non-GEF) Furthermore, a few existing and future initiatives contribute to the project's objective in different ways. Several of these initiatives will contribute to the baseline co-financing of the proposed project (described in more detail under *the baseline scenario*):

- **The NBSAP Forum (2013-2020):** provides support for action and implementation on NBSAPs through 2020 (GEF and non-GEF funded).
- **NBSAP 2.0: Mainstreaming Biodiversity and Development** (2012-2014): UK Government Darwin Initiative-supported project advancing biodiversity-development mainstreaming and African leadership for this.
- **Advancing Natural Capital Accounting** (2014 and ongoing, implemented by TEEB): to assist countries and the business community in efforts to embark on Natural Capital Accounting.
- **SANBI: Mobilizing Africa's Biodiversity Data** (2014-2016): aims to develop a Biodiversity Data Mobilization Strategy for Africa, whilst enhancing regional collaboration and capacity in biodiversity informatics.
- **IGAD Biodiversity Programme** (2014-2020): assessing existing national policies and information systems and developing regional common policy and information frameworks for biodiversity management in South Sudan-Ethiopia, Djibouti, Ethiopia and Kenya-Somalia.
- **The Biodiversity Finance Initiative** (BIOFIN: 2012-2015, managed by UNDP): aims to develop a methodology for quantifying the biodiversity finance gap at national level, improving cost-effectiveness through mainstreaming of biodiversity into national development and sectoral planning, and developing comprehensive national resource mobilising strategies.
- **UNEP Live** (on-going): a cutting-edge, dynamic new UNEP information platform to collect, process and share global environmental science and research.
- **OPERAs** (2013-2017): an EU-funded research consortium focusing on ecosystem services and natural capital science and on enabling stakeholders to apply these concepts in practice.
- **EU BON** (2013-2017): an EU-funded research consortium building the European biodiversity observation network.
- **Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network** (GEO BON: ongoing): aims to organize and improve biodiversity observations globally and make their biodiversity data, information and forecasts more accessible to policy makers, managers, and other users.
- **Global Biodiversity Information Facility** (GBIF: ongoing country funding): provides a single point of access to more than 400 million species records, shared freely by hundreds of institutions worldwide, making it the biggest biodiversity database on the Internet.
- **Protected Planet** (ongoing, UNEP-WCMC): an online portal for open-access to the World Database on Protected Areas.
- **ICRAF** (ongoing): Work by the World Agroforestry Centre to develop open-access maps of ecosystem resilience, diversity and degradation.
- **The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity** (TEEB: ongoing): a UNEP-facilitated global initiative focused on drawing attention to the economic benefits of biodiversity.

9

- **National Geomatics Centre of China** (ongoing): global land cover project looking at temporal and spatial land-use change.
- **National Institute for Space Research (INPE), Brazil** (ongoing): Cooperative programme to improve forest monitoring capabilities in developing countries.
- **Sub-Global Assessment Network** (ongoing)**:** a common platform for practitioners involved in ecosystem assessment at regional, sub-regional, national and sub-national levels.

In more detail per outcome / component, 'the baseline project' is:

Component 1: Mainstreaming entry points, and response strategies

OUTCOME 1: Decision points or processes across government sectors are identified where biodiversity information can be influential, and the barriers to data sharing identified

---

There are ongoing efforts to integrate biodiversity considerations into government decision-making and reporting processes, including development planning, integrated national accounting, and revised NBSAPs. For example, initiatives such as the NBSAPs 2.0 project, BIOFIN, and the NBSAP Forum. These initiatives, however, do not necessarily bring to bear data or information about biodiversity specifically, nor assist countries with the technical aspects of this. Working extensively on mechanisms for successful mainstreaming is the UNDP-UNEP Poverty Environment Initiative (PEI), which does bring environmental data into national development accounting systems, yet little of its country-led programming focuses on biodiversity (except Botswana). The UNDP-GEF Biodiversity Mainstreaming portfolio is large, with several examples of using biodiversity information to support decision-making[5]. Yet these projects are not necessarily networked or facilitated with a view to sharing lessons and up-scaling efforts around biodiversity data and information.

TEEB is a strong example of an initiative stimulating the awareness of the value of biodiversity, and various TEEB spin-off initiatives are increasingly starting to provide technical support to allow specifically economic information about biodiversity and ecosystems to be taken up in government systems. There are also numerous initiatives that are intending to get systems in place that draw on biodiversity information, such as the Wealth Accounting and the Valuation of Ecosystem Services (WAVES), the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA), and Advancing Natural Capital Accounting.

So far, however, most of the initiatives that exist to get biodiversity taken up as a priority, or taken into account in national accounting systems, are not well-linked to the initiatives (described under the Component 2 baseline scenario) that are working to put the necessary data in place, and address barriers to data acquisition and sharing. These barriers can be so profound that they may dictate the success or failure of mainstreaming efforts over the long-term.

Component 2: Capacity to respond (using appropriate information)

OUTCOME 2: Technical stakeholders (i.e. technical staff in governments and supportive institutions) are more easily able to acquire and share relevant data, and use this to communicate effectively, for

---

[5] The UNDP-GEF biodiversity mainstreaming portfolio includes projects that: (i) Promote the holistic valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem services to strengthen the business case for investments by governments and the private sector; (ii) Internalize the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services within national and sub-national plans, policies and accounting frameworks, and (iii) Promote engagement with sectors in production landscapes and seascapes to mainstream biodiversity and ecosystem management objectives.

Understanding of biodiversity is rapidly improving; advances are driven primarily by integration of data from different sources, enabled by data and metadata standards, interoperability, and enhanced computational power. They are underpinned by a change in paradigm about data sharing, collaboration and networking. The BIP is an example of where data sharing, collaboration and networking enabled a synthesis of over 30 biodiversity indicators that provided overwhelming evidence at a global scale that the CBD 2010 Biodiversity Target had not been achieved. In addition to this, major initiatives to collate and enhance open access to data and analytical tools are now in place including GBIF for species occurrence data sharing; Protected Planet for protected areas data; and the Biodiversity Heritage Library for biodiversity literature.

National and regional institutions have been established around the world in part to respond to the need for information exchange and technical and scientific cooperation in line with Articles 17 and 18 of the CBD, for example the National Geomatics Centre in China, National Institute for Space Research (INPE) in Brazil, CONABIO in Mexico, INBio in Costa Rica, Instituto Humboldt in Colombia, SANBI in South Africa, EU BON in Europe. In addition, thematic networks or initiatives are growing, including BirdLife International; the Ocean Biogeographic Information System; the Census of Marine Life; Global Forest Watch 2.0; the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF); the Gateway for the Global Invasive Alien Species Information Partnership; and a range of community-based biodiversity monitoring initiatives.

However, despite large amounts of biodiversity data now being freely available through the above initiatives and organizations, these data are often not in the appropriate format for feeding into decision making at the national level. This can be due to a range of reasons such as initiatives and organisations: having global mandate to address global needs and thereby overlooking national needs; being commissioned for specific research objectives and not realising the relevance to decision-makers; lacking in funding and capacity to share those lessons. Fundamentally, however, there is inadequate attention to providing spatially explicit time series (change) information that decision makers can use to understand the impact of policy implementation. There is a huge, unexploited opportunity to mobilise these already existing global, regional, and national data by analysing and repackaging into nationally-relevant formats and connecting directly to the priorities of decision makers. These data are currently under-utilised at the national level for decision making. This would also greatly facilitate countries to report to the CBD and other supranational policies and agreements.

Component 3: Embed/integrate necessary information into national development systems
OUTCOME 3: Policy frameworks, including accounting and reporting systems, across a range of sectors are incorporating biodiversity considerations

Integrating biodiversity into decision-making is the aim of many projects, however these projects often fail to achieve this. This is due to a failure to understand government priorities and needs, and to ensure that project outputs are truly fulfilling these needs. Initiatives such as EU BON, GEO BON, GBIF, Protected Planet and OPERAs sum up a solid investment of governments and organisations for the mobilisation and accessibility of biodiversity and ecosystem services information. Yet they do not take into account and/or fully address the main barriers identified here, i.e. that biodiversity information is not integrated into government decision-making, as they may not see the direct relevance to national development priorities.

11

A few ongoing initiatives are attempting to address this issue directly, including UNEP Live (embedding environmental data within UNEP reporting systems), ProEcoServ (integrating ecosystem assessment, scenario development and economic valuation of ecosystem services into sustainable national development planning) and the IGAD Biodiversity Programme (assessing national policies and developing regional policy frameworks for biodiversity management within the Horn of Africa). These very specific projects are restricted either to one geographical area or specific reporting requirement, and can therefore only form part of the solution. Furthermore, many of these initiatives are externally funded, and systems that have been set up have not been taken over by domestic budgets, in some cases because governments may not be convinced that these systems are truly addressing national development priorities.

A.3. THE PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE SCENARIO, WITH A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF EXPECTED OUTCOMES AND COMPONENTS OF THE PROJECT

UNEP is requesting GEF support for this project, through the Biodiversity Focal Area, to remove the identified barriers to acquiring and using biodiversity information to influence national development decision making, in at least 3 countries. The project budget will be used to develop proof-of-concepts in 3 countries, with considerable attention to the up-scaling and replication of project outputs through ongoing facilitated peer-to-peer learning and exchange within each component, aiming for a global showcase with wide capacity-building reach, through collaboration with the sCBD and other partners.

The GEF alternative is summarised below. All outcomes contribute to the *GEF/BDFA 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks*:

Component 1: Mainstreaming entry points, and response strategies

OUTCOME 1: <u>Decision points or processes</u> across government sectors are identified where biodiversity information can be influential, and the barriers to data sharing identified

---

The project will work with a set of motivated countries (see country criteria – p4) to <u>identify the government development decisions or processes that have a demand for relevant biodiversity and ecosystem services supply information that is currently not being met</u> (**Output 1.1**). Within this, each country would identify and assess either decision points or other "windows of opportunity" that biodiversity information and analyses would feed into. This may be linked to recently updated NBSAPs or NBSAP development processes, depending on the stage and possible entry points identified (across government sectors). It may also involve a user needs assessment identifying national priorities and information needs for biodiversity, including, for example, key questions about development options (e.g. to allow palm oil plantations or new agricultural development policies). This will include sectors other than natural resource management sectors for which biodiversity information should be critical and where changes in decisions will have significant impact. A vital element of this is responding to these nationally identified priorities with an innovative strategy and mechanism.

The process in each country would be led through and advised by a stakeholder / user group established to: (i) provide expert input throughout the life of the project; (ii) ensure continued relevancy of all outputs; and (iii) engage with and provide ownership of the project by all stakeholders, including the national CBD focal point and relevant project authority. This group would also act as a <u>user group to review and validate project outputs</u> (**Output 1.2**).

Through the guidance of the national stakeholder group, as well as the national project implementation team, a strategy will be developed to take advantage of the mainstreaming entry points in each country

(**Output 1.3**). This strategy will clarify the spectrum of "push and pull" for biodiversity data. For example, in some cases processes need biodiversity data and information and are not aware of its availability, in other cases there are decisions points where biodiversity information could be factored in but is not requested, yet more cases where there are reporting demands (such as CBD reports and State of the Environment reports) or planning processes that could make use of biodiversity data but have difficulty accessing it. Within this Component, each country's stakeholder working group would identify the most important barriers to biodiversity data sharing, and devise <u>strategic, well-targeted interventions to neutralise or address these barriers</u> (**Output 1.4**). Furthermore, even if systems can be set up and some barriers to exchange can be withdrawn, there needs to be enough political and/or senior civil service level demand to continue to budget (with domestic funds) for systems and adapt them to future needs.

Each country will develop a demonstration strategy and project for a new approach that other countries can learn from, whether at national level or in a specific sector where a strong case can be made that biodiversity information can influence development decisions and outcomes. <u>Up-scaling</u> (**Output 1.5**) will be a critical part of this, and every, outcome. By sharing experiences, lessons, good practices, tools, etc -- between countries and globally -- each participating country and other countries will become iteratively better at influencing development decisions and processes using biodiversity information.

Component 2: Capacity to respond (using appropriate information)

OUTCOME 2: Technical stakeholders (i.e. technical staff in governments and supportive institutions) are more easily able to <u>acquire and share relevant data, and use this to communicate effectively</u>, for current and future information needs.

As appropriate to each country's needs (identified under Output 1.1), an effort would be made to <u>respond to the key data needs and opportunities</u> identified (**Output 2.1**). Indicatively, this could involve, in each country as appropriate: a rapid data mobilisation exercise, including sourcing and repackaging of existing data (not new data gathering or monitoring); finding the current state of knowledge, where this information is housed/stored, in what format and by whom; and/or identifying global or regional datasets that can be relevant at national level.

A national action plan to meet the demand for biodiversity information identified under Output 1.1 would also be developed by each country. These efforts could consist of, as appropriate to each national context: transforming data into a format which is understood and easily accessible to decision makers and is relevant to key questions (form, timing, packaging, language, availability, accessibility, etc); and/or global data products/ tools downscaled to be nationally relevant (e.g. "ProtectedUganda.net" a national portal for ProtectedPlanet.net). Here, data could feed up into global products to 'clean' and refine data, or be used to update or revise nationally relevant communication products already in existence, e.g. national State of the Environment Report.

The project would <u>enhance public sector capacity to respond to this and other future requests or opportunities for biodiversity information</u> (**Output 2.2**). Indicatively, as relevant to each national context, this may involve: developing data standards and protocols; outreach from regional technical, mentoring, or targeted training on systems for national accounting, development processes, or permitting / approvals systems; closer collaboration with natural capital accounting initiatives, specific sectors or national-level systems; and/or streamlining processes to identify and fill data gaps.

13

Fundamental to the above activities is partnership development and analytical support (data validation, processing, etc.) to make remotely-sensed and in-situ data products available and applicable nationally, as well as ensuring relevant data are validated, endorsed by competent national institutions (e.g. statistical offices) and incorporated into national data management systems. This is likely to require an iterative dialogue between policy makers (potential users) and data holders and analysts (potential providers). The project would therefore support the establishment or formalisation of partnerships necessary for the acquisition, sharing and successful delivery of biodiversity information, as well as catalyzing the further development of national biodiversity monitoring networks (**Output 2.3**).

The first three outputs of this component will result in tried and tested examples of how innovative technologies and mechanisms can respond to national biodiversity data needs. These showcases can not only become shared lessons for national, regional, and global initiatives and organisations but could potentially be replicated or rolled out for other countries (**Output 2.4**).

Component 3: Embed/integrate necessary information into national development systems

OUTCOME 3: Policy frameworks, including accounting and reporting systems, across a range of sectors are incorporating biodiversity considerations

---

Here, the project will utilise the outputs from Components 1 and 2 to embed them into national systems as appropriate thereby ensuring that promising initiatives demonstrated via Components 1 and 2 become institutionalised into national business-as-usual. To initiate this process, the national user groups would lead a process to review experiences, assess lessons and findings, and provide recommendations to carry forward project outputs (an initial review may also feed into a mid-term project review). Stakeholders will secure opportunities and undertake the necessary efforts (e.g. necessary cooperation agreements put in place) to ensure that recommended measures are integrated into future planning, government decisions, investments, system development and implementation as appropriate (**Output 3.1**).

The project would also build the necessary capacities and provide technical support so that public officials (and, if applicable, other stakeholders) are able to act on these recommendations, e.g. by embedding proof-of-concept outputs into their ongoing national systems (**Output 3.2**). Technical support and expertise may also be provided through a regional technical partner to the project. Ultimately, as with each of the project components, the final output (**Output 3.3**) is a dedicated effort to seek out sharing, exchange and up-scaling opportunities reflective of a global project on embedding biodiversity information into national systems.

A.4. INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING AND EXPECTED CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE BASELINE, THE GEFTF, AND CO-FINANCING

The global benefits that will be delivered will be to secure biodiversity assets over 3 national landscapes, through addressing the development drivers of biodiversity loss and contributing to the up-scaling of these results, as follows:

Baseline practices	Alternative to be put in place by the project	Global environmental benefits

14

Component		
Component 1: Mainstreaming projects/initiatives are making gains, but not with strong enough link to data barriers and ongoing information systems	• National stakeholder identify development decision points where they can influence outcomes with better biodiversity info • Stakeholders are able to respond strategically to opportunities	• Reduce the development drivers affecting loss biodiversity in each of the 3 demonstration countries • Worldwide results through up-scaling strategy • *All dividends will be monitored and verified through the project lifespan in conjunction with the completion of corresponding GEF Tracking Tools.*
Component 2: Data and information projects/initiatives are making progress, but they not well-linked to mainstreaming and the long-term "demand-pull" for this information by national governments	• Data improvements linked directly to the barriers identified for entry points in the development processes	
Component 3: Governments may allow/enable externally-financed initiatives for biodiversity information, however they don't often take on the management of these with core budgets and adequate staffing after funded projects end. This is due to national budget-holders not seeing the relevance to their main development priorities	• Embed into ongoing info systems or processes • User group of national stakeholders guiding the integration process	

A.5. GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS (GEFTF)

The project will address the direct drivers of global biodiversity loss in at least 3 countries, and demonstrate proofs-of-concept yielding models and lessons for other countries to follow. As indicated under 'Context and Issues', while the CBD has near universal participation from the world's governments, those involved in its implementation rarely have the influence to promote action at the level required to effect real change. The project tackles the fact that biodiversity management efforts are being undermined by decisions from other ministries or sectors that fail to take into account biodiversity. The project is working on stimulating the "demand-pull" for better information about biodiversity at development decision points and within development processes and systems, as well as the successful provision of that information simply and cost-effectively over the long-term. The global environmental benefit of the project is to reduce the development drivers affecting biodiversity loss in each of the 3 demonstration countries, and achieve worldwide results on this front through a pro-active up-scaling and replication strategy.

A.6. INNOVATIVENESS, SUSTAINABILITY AND POTENTIAL FOR SCALING UP

Innovativeness: This project is innovative in its linking up of biodiversity mainstreaming and data barriers, specifically a focus on **multi-scale and multi-sectoral use of existing biodiversity information**. To date work on creating biodiversity indicators has been largely global in scope and limited to specific audiences, with associated national capacity support based on raising awareness of indicator development processes rather than investing in developing useful knowledge products from available data. There have been few tangible links between initiatives focusing on within-country development priorities and consequent information needs and those focusing on regional or global needs, or between work on information needs in a biodiversity-specific decision making context (e.g. CBD, NBSAPs) and work in other contexts (land use planning, national accounting, etc). There has

been little or no joined up efforts to make better use of what data we have. As such, opportunities have been lost and gaps have remained unfilled. At the same time there has been little integration of disconnected efforts to improve monitoring systems, to create indicators and reporting products, and to mainstream biodiversity into decision making.

This project takes a synergistic approach:

1) **It will find and make efficient use of available data, creating linkages and adding value across sectors and scales.** It will take state of the art monitoring products being developed in 'high capacity' countries and at regional to global scales and make them available at national scale to 'lower capacity' countries. It will create comparable national knowledge products in target countries that can be aggregated for regional and global use. It will bring together constituencies from different sectors with similar information needs.

2) **It will build resulting information products into existing and varied decision making processes.** It will take an iterative, rather than linear, approach to the generation and use of biodiversity information, recognising that the "push and pull" forces of data availability and decision maker needs cross-pollinate each other and can be mutually reinforcing. It will explore new avenues for using biodiversity information in various decision making contexts. It will focus on means to 'formalize' or embed information products within government process, for example by working with competent national entities such as national statistical offices.

Sustainability: The project strives for sustainability by ensuring that outputs (especially biodiversity information products) are embedded within (multiple) decision making processes. Indeed, all of project component 3 is dedicated to sustainability of project outputs, i.e. ensuring that biodiversity data and information are integrated into government decision making and utilised to a greater extent within national-level policy processes, accounting systems, investments frameworks and/or reporting, as well as formalizing the partnerships and networks required to realize this. This ensures that they are useful and used, and therefore raises the likelihood that they will be invested in. The indicator of success is that after the project lifespan, governments invest in and allocate appropriate staff to these systems as a matter of course. Equally, by focusing on efficient uses of available data to create products and feed into systems, the costs of sustaining them are minimised.

Potential for scaling up: The focus, across all components of the project on the art of the possible, on developing and testing proofs of concept and sharing lessons regionally and globally provides an enabling platform for scaling up the direct national benefits of the project more broadly. Within this, the creation of national biodiversity information products such as spatially explicit land cover change maps or aggregate population abundance measures from global data sources or the collation of widely distributed local data provides quick win opportunities for other countries to adopt. The fact that Parties to the CBD have called for the development of simple, cost effective indicators for widespread national use, to help overcome barriers and fill information gaps, including looking to other sectors and aggregating from national to global, suggests that there is likely to be significant interest in and demand for the products, tools and lessons emerging from the project. The project would actively encourage scaling up potential with the guidance and support of a dedicated International Technical Advisory Group (ITAG) with other national partners, e.g. South Africa, Brazil, Mexico, India, Korea and China. These partners would provide technical input and exchange at key project intervals.

The project will also address scaling up through establishing and maintaining knowledge networks with two key communities: the community of potential user countries (i.e. other countries that may learn from and adopt similar practices as those showcased by the project) and the community of potential implementing partners (i.e. organisations and/or countries that may learn from the approach and outcomes of the project and seek to replicate the approach in support of specific beneficiary countries relevant to their specific mandates). With regard to the first community of potential user countries, the

project will work through relevant multilateral regional structures, such as SADC, EAC and ECOWAS and AU in Africa, ASEAN and SAARC in Asia, OAS and CARICOM in Latin America and the Caribbean, the EU, the Arab League etc. With regard to the second community of potential implementing partners, the project will work with technical partners such as the National Geomatics Centre (China), the Wildlife Institute of India, and ICIMOD in Asia, CONABIO (Mexico), INBio (Costa Rica), Instituto Humboldt (Colombia) in Latin America, SANBI (South Africa), the Regional Centre for Mapping of Resources for Development (with 23 country members in East and Southern Africa) and COMIFAC in Africa, CIFOR, ICRAF, IUCN etc. This second community will also include all of the relevant UNEP regional offices and other UN agencies, as well as, key donor countries and multilateral funding agencies (World Bank etc.). In addition to providing key advice to project planning and implementation, the ITAG member countries have been selected as key drivers of south-south cooperation and special attention will be paid to supporting ITAG members in using project learning to advance their respective south-south cooperation goals around biodiversity management. The knowledge networks for these two communities will be established and maintained through a project website/portal, project publications, Listserves etc. (specific means of communication and sharing will be designed in consultation with active members of each community at the start of the project), as well as regular meetings and workshops, throughout the lifetime of the project, designed to keep all interested stakeholders updated and aware of project progress, achievements and lessons learned. The meetings and workshops will be held in the three target countries to maximise the opportunities to showcase the work of the project and allow for meaningful dialogue with the key actors in each country. Finally, specific bilateral relationships between the three target countries and actively engaging members of the knowledge networks will be fostered and supported by the project allowing for in-depth transfer of experiences and capacity through the use of study tours, in-country training, bilateral policy dialogues etc. The project would also foster an active collaboration with IPBES, to support up-scaling efforts. One of the functions of IPBES is building capacity for improving the science-policy interface at appropriate levels, and the outcomes and outputs described in the this project would help address capacity building needs that have already been discussed in the context of IPBES.

A.2. Stakeholders.

Key stakeholders to be engaged in project preparation include, *inter alia*: **Ministries of Environment / CBD Focal Points** (of participating countries)**:** Developing and validating the project document (ProDoc) in close collaboration with UNEP and WCMC. **Other national Government Line Ministries** e.g. Finance, Transport, Agriculture, Fisheries, Forestry, Health, Energy (participating countries): Involved via national project counterparts through national validation of the project ToRs/engagement strategies and plans at national level**. National technical centers and universities** (participating countries)**:** Involved via national project counterparts. Contribute to national situation assessments. **Civil Society Organisations (CSOs)** e.g. environmental organization and other sectoral bodies such as agricultural unions, development organizations, etc.: Involved both in data provision and key stakeholders in the mainstreaming process. **Regional technical partners** e.g. SANBI, CSIR (Southern Africa) or RCMRD (Eastern and Southern Africa): Project design and regional rapid situation assessments (either informally based on expert knowledge or using existing assessments already undertaken/underway). **CBD Secretariat:** Developing and validating the ProDoc in close collaboration with UNEP and WCMC. **UN agencies:** Ensure project is aligned with the UNDAFs and associated programming in each participating country (esp. UNDP biodiversity mainstreaming projects and relevant SGP projects). Ensure project documentation is in harmonization with other UN initiatives (through opportunities to review and contribute to drafts, esp. UNDP re biodiversity mainstreaming portfolio). **Private sector companies** e.g. tourism-based, extractive industries, energy, etc.: Involved both in data provision and key stakeholders in the mainstreaming process. **Other national**

17

governments e.g. those facing similar issues as the 3 project countries, having made efforts to address such issues through various means: Review of project concept through participation in e.g. a SBSTTA/WGRI side event or other comparable fora depending on timing. Identification of interest to participate in an International Technical Advisory Group, and potentially shape project ToRs at national level. **Other relevant organizations** e.g. BirdLife International, WWF, IUCN: Review of project concept through participation in e.g. a SBSTTA/WGRI side event or other comparable fora depending on timing.

A.3 Risk. Risks identified at this stage include:

Risk description	Mitigation measure
Implementation arrangements: The government nominates a national stakeholder / user group that is not representative and/or effective *Risk Level: Low*	Project partners are involved in nominations and vetting of national stakeholder / user group to ensure that this is an effective body with sufficient seniority and respect to lead the national work effectively. The nominated group would be jointly chaired by the CBD focal point with another eminent person from the development sector (e.g. head of national planning agency).
External factors: That national crises may pull decision-making attention away from longer-term development planning processes; priorities in government change rapidly due to external events (e.g. currency fluctuations, trade agreements, natural disasters) *Risk Level: Low*	The project at national level will be responsible to emerging development decision points. If a national crisis or other significant external event occurs, the national stakeholder / user group will be tasked to consider how such events can be responded to through the project approach (if relevant). For example if there is a natural disaster, what is the relevance of biodiversity and ecosystem services (forest intactness / flood risk), and is there any new entry point for biodiversity information that presents itself. The user group should not be "asleep" setting a priority at the outset and then not adapting to real world events through the project lifespan; it should recognise and respond to the dynamism of real-world decision-making and priority-setting.
Delivery: The project is trialling innovative proofs-of-concept. It is therefore inevitable that some aspects of the project may not succeed as anticipated *Risk Level: Low*	Unexpected outcomes, or even failures, should be embraced as part of the learning process when trialing an innovative approach. Failure is not always bad. It is sometimes bad, sometimes inevitable, and sometimes even good. Learning from organizational failures is anything but straightforward. Attitudes and activities required to effectively detect and analyze failures should be considered part of a context-specific learning strategy. See e.g. "The Failure Issue" of Harvard Business Review April 2011. Frank and honest review of causal factors in projects successes and failures is the only way that the project can be effective as a proof-of-concept and learning exercise. This approach will be well-integrated into the

	project's M&E approach.
The PIF operates under an unfounded assumption that information will create behaviour change. *Risk Level: High*	The project recognises the need to create a demand for information and not just deliver information on the assumption that it will be used in decisions. There is a high risk in projects such as these that simply supplying biodiversity information does not necessarily result in behaviour change. Through previous work, in particular on biodiversity mainstreaming for NBSAPs[6], we are well aware of the steps needed to integrate biodiversity into government processes and we will take these into account throughout all project components. In particular, to mitigate this risk we will: select countries based on political will and leadership; identify barriers and strategies; and adopt an iterative learning approach.
Other: Key data sets cannot be accessed *Risk Level: Medium*	Barriers to data access can be profound. The project will make all reasonable efforts to address barriers to data sharing, however some are likely to remain beyond the project lifespan, for example because of commercial sensitivities or concerns by the provider for how the data could be used that cannot be addressed.

A more detailed assessment of risks and preparation of a Risk Log would take place within the ProDoc development.

A.4. Coordination.

Internal and existing external project communication channels will ensure adequate coordination with other initiatives and with the broad range of partners and stakeholders mentioned in section A.2. The project will closely align with ongoing initiatives such as IPBES and the NBSAP Forum, as well as ongoing CBD Secretariat efforts. During the ProDoc development and project inception phases, relevant mechanisms will be identified and/or put in place to ensure effective coordination at national, regional and global levels, according to needs and opportunities.

B.   DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:
B.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions

According to the country selection criteria for this project, all participating countries will have ratified the CBD and have either revised or are revised their second-generation NBSAPs. The outputs of this project correspond to *inter alia* the following national obligations under the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, adopted at CoP 10 as the overarching framework on biodiversity: Development of NBSAPs, clarifying national biodiversity objectives, targets and implementation strategies; Monitoring and reporting on progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (particularly Target 19, however potentially applicable to the monitoring and reporting on all Aichi Targets); and Provision of National Reports on measures taken for the implementation of the Convention. The project will contribute in particular to the achievement of Targets 2 and 19.

Participating countries will have developed Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), National Development Plans (NDPs), development "visions" (Vision 2020, 2030, etc) and/or other comparable

---

[6] http://povertyandconservation.info/nbsaps

documents that set out development and poverty reduction approach of the country, and often set a course to achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) at national level. These have consequent implementation, investment/budgeting, monitoring and reporting frameworks. Furthermore, there are relevant sectoral policies and other frameworks that are relevant to national development priorities, e.g. agriculture, land management, mining, forests. Finally, UNDAFs describe the collective response of UN country teams to these national development priorities and systems. The project will support both countries obligations in the implementation of the applicable biodiversity strategies and frameworks, as well as those for national development. During the project lifespan it will also look for national implementation links to e.g. post-2015 sustainable development goals and IPBES science-policy capacity building.

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

The project will directly address <u>BDFA Objective 2 Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscape/seascapes and sectors</u> and, more specifically, <u>Outcome 2.2 Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks</u>. The outcomes of this project are designed to build on earlier GEF investments, as well as ensuring the capability and confidence of actors in tackling evolving and emerging issues both nationally and globally – thereby 'future-proofing' over the long-term.

B.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage for implementing this project:

UNEP is the voice for the environment within the UN system, tasked with helping governments promote the wise use and sustainable use of their environmental assets. Within its Programme of Work on Environmental Governance (Subprogramme 4), UNEP promotes and supports governments in mainstreaming the environment in their development planning processes, including through the UNEP-UNDP Poverty and Environment Initiative. Through the Division of Environmental Law and Conventions (DELC) UNEP has a rich history assisting governments in obtaining environmental information for decision-making, enhancing global and regional environmental cooperation, developing and applying national and international environmental law, advancing national and regional implementation of environmental objectives, and bridging major groups and governments in policy development and implementation processes. There are also links to be drawn with UNEP's efforts in supporting the IPBES programme of work, UNEP Live (inc. natural capital information for national use and upwards integration), and a growing focus on support to national Green Economy efforts including national accounting.

UNEP-WCMC is UNEP's specialist biodiversity assessment and information arm. UNEP-WCMC has considerable experience in supporting countries in integrating spatial mapping considerations, incorporating biodiversity and ecosystem service values and building NBSAPs that influence development decisions and improve outcomes for biodiversity and development. UNEP-WCMC is an executing partner (with UNDP and sCBD) in the NBSAP Forum, providing direct support to countries for action and implementation on NBSAPs through to 2020. UNEP-WCMC is contributing to many initiatives focusing on biodiversity and ecosystem service data (e.g. GEO BON) and on improving systems of national accounting to incorporate natural capital (e.g. World Bank WAVES initiative and UNSD/EEA work on experimental ecological accounting).The numerous capacities of UNEP itself (implementing agency) and WCMC (executing agency) will be brought to bear in project implementation. The numerous capacities of UNEP itself (implementing agency) and UNEP-WCMC (executing agency) will be brought to bear in project implementation. UNEP's science and technical focus will bring comparative advantages as summarized in the following table:

Areas of UNEP comparative	UNEP Thematic Priority Areas

advantage in the GEF (all Focal Areas)		Climate change	Disasters & conflicts	Ecosystems management	Environmental governance	Harmful substances & hazardous wastes	Resource efficiency
1. Sound science for national, regional and global decision-makers	Early warning and emerging issues			X	X		
	Science to Policy linkages			X	X		
	Environmental monitoring and assessment			X	X		
	Norms, standards, and guidelines			X	X		
	Enabling Activities for MEAs and synergies						
2. Cooperation, coordination and partnerships (regional or international)	Trans-boundary cooperation						
	Regional, or South-South cooperation			X	X		
	Global transformative actions						
3. Technical assistance and capacity building at country level (contribution to Bali Strategic Plan)	Technology assessment, demonstration, and innovation						
	Capacity building			X	X		
	Lifting barriers to market transformation						
4. Knowledge management, awareness raising and advocacy				X	X		

A. **RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT 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 OFP endorsement letter).

   N/A

B. **GEF AGENCY CERTIFICATION**

> **This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for project identification and preparation.**

Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	DATE *(MM/dd/yyyy)*	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email
Brenna VanDyke, Director, GEF Coordination Office, UNEP	*Brenna VanDyke*	25 March 2014	Mohamed Sessay; Portfolio Manager, UNEP GEF	+254 20 762 4294	Mohamed.sessay@unep.org