

**UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2013  
(1 July 2012 to 30 June 2013)**

**1. PROJECT GENERAL INFORMATION**

<b>Project Title:</b>	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use for Improved Human Nutrition and Well-being (Biodiversity for Food and Nutrition Project – BFN Project)		
<b>Executing Agency:</b>	Bioversity International (formerly International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI))		
<b>Project partners:</b>	Governments of Brazil, Kenya, Sri Lanka, Turkey. AVRDC, Crops for the Future, Earth Institute at Columbia University, World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), WFP.		
<b>Geographical Scope:</b>	Global/Multi-country		
<b>Participating Countries:</b>	Brazil, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Turkey		
<b>GEF project ID:</b>	3808	<b>IMIS number:</b>	UNEP: GFL-2328-2715-4B07 FAO 606659
<b>Focal Area(s):</b>	Biodiversity	<b>GEF OP #:</b>	BD
<b>GEF Strategic Priority/Objective:</b>	BD SO2:SP4; SP5	<b>GEF approval date:</b>	November 2011
<b>UNEP approval date:</b>	November 2011	<b>First Disbursement:</b>	18 April 2012
<b>Actual start date:</b>	April 2012	<b>Planned duration:</b>	60 months
<b>Intended completion date:</b>	October 2016	<b>Actual or Expected completion date:</b>	TBD
<b>Project Type:</b>	FSP	<b>GEF Allocation:</b>	US\$5,517,618
<b>PDF GEF cost:</b>	\$ 260,000	<b>PDF co-financing:</b>	\$ 380,000
<b>Expected MSP/FSP Co-financing:</b>	\$ 29,552,314.20	<b>Total Cost</b>	\$35,709,932.20
<b>Mid-term review/eval. (planned date):</b>	April 2014	<b>Terminal Evaluation (actual date):</b>	TBD
<b>Mid-term review/eval. (actual date):</b>	TBD	<b>No. of revisions:</b>	NA

<b>Date of last Steering Committee meeting:</b>	April 2012	<b>Date of last Revision:</b>	NA
<b>Disbursement as of 30 June 2013:</b>	UNEP US\$ 932,000.00 FAO US\$ 131,942.00	<b>Date of financial closure:</b>	TBD
<b>Date of Completion:</b>	TBD	<b>Actual expenditures reported as of 30 June 2013.</b>	UNEP US\$ 689,511 FAO US\$ 108,513
<b>Total co-financing realized as of 30 June 2013:</b>	US\$ 1,790,749	<b>Actual expenditures entered in IMIS as of 30 June 2013:</b>	UNEP US\$ 290,063
<b>Leveraged financing:</b>	0		

<b>Project summary</b>	<p>Hotspots of biodiversity, the countries of Brazil, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Turkey are home to a vast array of agricultural biodiversity (largely plant genetic resources), which are scarcely explored, appreciated or conserved. The nutritional potential of many of these plants and animals remains untapped, yet many of these species are rapidly disappearing due to environmental pressures or lack of use. The project seeks to address the issue of diminishing local agrobiodiversity by contributing to the improvement of global knowledge of biodiversity for food and nutrition and by so doing enhance the well-being, livelihoods and food security of target beneficiaries in the four countries through the conservation and sustainable use of this biodiversity and the identification of best practices for up-scaling.</p> <p><b>The Development Goal</b> of the Project is to contribute to the improvement of global knowledge of biodiversity for food and nutrition and thereby enhance the well-being, livelihoods and food security of target beneficiaries in Brazil, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Turkey through the conservation and sustainable use of this biodiversity and the identification of best practices for up-scaling. The <b>Project Objective</b> is to strengthen the conservation and sustainable management of agricultural biodiversity through mainstreaming into national and global nutrition, food and livelihood security strategies and programmes.</p> <p>The project will address declining diversity by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PROVIDING EVIDENCE - Demonstrating the nutritional value of agricultural biodiversity and the role it plays in promoting healthy diets and strengthening livelihoods.</li> <li>2. INFLUENCING POLICIES - Using the evidence generated from the project to influence policies, programmes and markets that support the conservation and sustainable use of agricultural biodiversity with nutrition potential for improved human nutrition and wellbeing.</li> <li>3. RAISING AWARENESS - Developing tools, knowledge and best practices for scaling up the use of biodiversity for food and nutrition in development programmes, value chains and local community initiatives.</li> </ol>
------------------------	---

	<p>Project implementation is based on three inter-related components that will directly address the identified barriers to mainstreaming biodiversity for food and nutrition through the following Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Outcome 1:</b> Relevant sectors, including agriculture, environment and public health in the four partner countries adopt the integrated knowledge base on BFN to build support for biodiversity conservation and enhanced well-being.</li> <li>• <b>Outcome 2:</b> Enhanced policy and regulatory frameworks support the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use across sectors.</li> <li>• <b>Outcome 3:</b> Tools, knowledge and best practices adopted and scaled up in development programs, value chains and local community initiatives.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Project status FY 2013</b></p>	<p>During the reporting period, project implementation at the country level focused largely on developing working agreements among relevant national stakeholders to carry out project activities and identify roles and responsibilities. National steering committees were held in all countries to review and approve workplan and budgets for 2013-2014; refine and validate criteria for site selection and for the prioritization of locally important agricultural biodiversity species; and agree on methodologies for carrying out baseline surveys of community biodiversity for food and nutrition at the study sites. Baseline surveys have so far only been carried out in Kenya, though preliminary planning and logistics for baseline surveys in Sri Lanka and Turkey were made. In Brazil and Kenya preliminary contacts have been established with national data holders for setting up national databases on the nutritional properties of local agrobiodiversity and associated traditional knowledge.</p> <p>The Global Project Management Unit (GPMU) successfully developed a number of awareness-raising products for the Project, including the project website/portal (<a href="http://www.b4fn.org">www.b4fn.org</a>), banner, logo, newsletters, flyers and a visual documentation of case studies that successfully use and promote the use of local agrobiodiversity <a href="http://www.b4fn.org/the_map.html">http://www.b4fn.org/the_map.html</a>. The joint Bioversity/Earthscan publication <a href="#">Diversifying Food and Diets</a> was published in April 2013.</p> <p>While the execution agreement with UNEP and Bioversity was signed in November 2011, the execution agreement between the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and Bioversity was signed only in March 2013 and the disbursement of funds to the Implementing Agency took place in May 2013. This has caused some delay in the implementation of project activities falling under the implementation responsibility of FAO. The appointment of new national project coordinators (NPCs) in Kenya and Turkey, the delayed appointment of the NPC in Sri Lanka and political unrest at the time of the Kenya national elections in April 2013 has also slowed down project progress in the two countries.</p> <p>Country reports and other material stemming from project implementation to date are listed at the end of this section and are available from the GPMU upon request.</p>

	<p><b>Knowledge base</b></p> <p><i>Brazil</i></p> <p>In September 2012, the National Project Coordinator (NPC) spent 3 weeks in FAO in Rome discussing strategies for upscaling the FAO training workshop on food composition and indicators to the Brazilian context and translating some of the training material into Portuguese. Within the framework of the BFN project, the National Project Management Unit (NPMU) aims to train other groups within relevant institutions in Brazil to compile and produce national nutritional data from the agrobiodiversity species targeted by the project using FAO guidelines.</p> <p><i>Kenya</i></p> <p>A baseline survey was carried out at the project sites in Busia County. A total of 164 households were surveyed and assessed for nutritional and health status, food security, sanitation and socio-economic status. Results of this survey have been collected in a report and are available from the GPMU upon request.</p> <p>Phenotypic and molecular characterization of bambara groundnut (<i>Vigna subterranea</i>) landraces is being undertaken with co-funding support from the National Council for Science and Technology. Composition analysis of the different landraces will also be undertaken for select macro- and micro-nutrients, along with an investigation into the legume's purported medicinal properties.</p> <p><i>Sri Lanka</i></p> <p>During the National Steering Committee (NSC) meeting held in June 2013, multidisciplinary teams were established and plans made to undertake baseline surveys at the three identified pilot sites during the second half of 2013. Three MSc students, two from the University of Ghent (NL), and one from the MDP Program at Columbia University (US), have travelled to Sri Lanka and will be engaged in baseline survey work and in documenting work at the three identified pilot sites.</p> <p><i>Turkey</i></p> <p>A technical inception workshop and the NSC were held in March 2013 in Antalya. During the meetings key next steps for implementing the BFN project in Turkey were discussed, including the preparation of the baseline surveys, which will start in late August 2013. During the technical inception workshop, 29 target species were selected, 9 of which are common to the three study sites. Topics discussed, selected pilot sites and target species are summarised in a report which is available from the GPMU upon request.</p> <p><b>Policy and Regulatory Framework</b></p> <p><i>Brazil</i></p> <p>A preliminary inventory of publications that promote the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation into food and nutrition strategies has been drafted and is available from the GPMU upon request. Furthermore, the national Project Manager of the BFN Project is currently following the "Managing Global Governance" (MGG) course</p>
--	---

	<p>organised by GIZ - a five-month advanced training and dialogue programme for which she will identify actors and stakeholders involved in biodiversity mainstreaming in Brazil and the current availability of approaches, tools and methods for promoting mainstreaming into relevant national strategies and programmes. The national Project Manager will also develop a comprehensive Action Plan describing follow-up actions and implementation in the Ministry of the Environment in Brazil.</p> <p><i>Kenya</i></p> <p>A questionnaire was developed to explore new marketing options for sustainably produced biodiversity products with high nutritional value and is available from the GPMU upon request.</p> <p><b>Raising awareness</b></p> <p><i>GPMU</i></p> <p>Significant progress was achieved by the Global Project Management Unit (GPMU) in developing awareness-raising products for the Project, including the project website/portal (<a href="http://www.b4fn.org">www.b4fn.org</a>), banner, logo, newsletters and flyers. The GPMU is also actively creating a visual documentation of case studies that successfully use and promote the use of local agrobiodiversity. The case studies are being showcased on a dedicated <a href="#">webpage</a> on the project portal.</p> <p>The joint Bioversity/Earthscan publication <a href="#">Diversifying Food and Diets</a> was published in April 2013. The book was formally launched as part of the <i>Issues in Agricultural Biodiversity series</i> at the 14<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture held in Rome between 15-19 April 2013 and subsequently at the International Conference on Forests for Food Security and Nutrition held on 13-15 May 2013 at FAO in Rome. The BFN project was also flagged at the two events.</p> <p>The GPMU was also successful in establishing collaborative agreements with the University of Ghent and the Global Master's in Development Practice (MDP) Program to engage undergraduate and post-graduate students to assist countries in carrying out project activities. Three students travelled to Sri Lanka in June 2013 to assist the national project team in carrying out the baseline surveys.</p> <p><i>Kenya</i></p> <p>The BFN Project was highlighted by the Kenya NPC at the "Regional workshop to address inter-linkages between human health and biodiversity in the WHO African region" held in Maputo, Mozambique, from 2-5 April 2013. Recommendations stemming from the report highlighted the need to integrate health-biodiversity linkages into national health strategies and action plans. The Kenya National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) was used as a model for this exercise. The meeting also recognised the importance of the CBD's Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Targets. The meeting report is available from the GPMU upon request.</p> <p><i>Turkey</i></p> <p>Among the recommendations stemming from the NSC Meeting held in Turkey in March 2013, was the development</p>
--	---

of a dedicated website to promote awareness of the BFN Project in Turkey and to foster greater information exchange among national stakeholders involved in the project.

**Project Management**

*Brazil*

The National Steering Committee (NSC), which was held on 8 February 2013, gathered 25 participants from the government sector, academia, national research institutes and the project management foundation (FUNBIO). Participants discussed the workplan, identified overlaps with existing projects/programs and assign roles and responsibilities to carry out project activities. Following this, the National Project Management Unit visited each project partner individually to re-assess the project’s goals and discuss methodology. Details of the meeting and assigned roles and responsibilities were captured in a document which is available from the GPMU upon request.

*Kenya*

The National Steering Committee was held on 20 March 2013. The meeting drew together 22 participants from the government sector, academia and national research institutes. A meeting report and meeting presentations are available from the GPMU upon request. Site Committees were also established. The appointment of a new national project coordinator and political unrest at the time of the national elections in April 2013 has slightly slowed down project implementation in the country.

*Sri Lanka*

The project was officially launched on 29-30 November 2012 alongside two additional initiatives focusing on agrobiodiversity: the *Biodiversity for Adaptation to Climate Project*, and the *Pricing the Biodiversity of the Island Project*, underlining the important role that agricultural biodiversity plays for Sri Lanka. A National Steering Committee was held in June 2013, followed by a Technical Training Workshop to cover key practices and concepts including multidisciplinary approaches and participatory practices the delayed appointment of the NPC in Sri Lanka has impacted rate of progress in the country.

*Turkey*

The NSC was held in March 2013 in Antalya, Turkey. The meeting, which brought together 42 participants from the government sector, academia and national research institutes, addressed key next steps in implementing the BFN project in Turkey including the baseline surveys in pilot sites. In June 2013 the GPMU was officially informed that the National Project Coordinator in Turkey had been replaced.

<p><b>Planned contribution to strategic priorities/targets</b></p>	<p>The project will contribute to the <b>GEF Biodiversity Strategic Objective 2 (SO2)</b> to mainstream biodiversity in production landscapes/seascapes and sectors and its <b>Strategic Programmes 4 and 5</b>.</p> <p><b>SP4</b> Strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity: The outcomes of the Project will contribute to the GEF's Strategic Programme 4 through the incorporation of biodiversity conservation, sustainable use and benefit sharing in broader policy and regulatory frameworks. This will be achieved by improving scientific knowledge about the links between food systems and ecosystems, improving capacity, raising awareness, particularly at government level, and developing incentives for conservation. The Project will establish multi-sectoral policy platforms at the national level to target and monitor the mainstreaming of biodiversity into agriculture, health and nutrition sectors using indicators and information generated by the Project. The Project will also link its public awareness activities aimed at consumer attitudes and behaviour to public policy forums and institutions working to improve diets through use of biodiversity and re-focus food systems studies and agricultural census data to incorporate considerations of biodiversity. At the global level, successful models and experiences leading to specific policies and policy actions will be shared across countries to jump-start and accelerate mainstreaming biodiversity in sectors responsible for food, nutrition and food security policies. The process of mainstreaming Project results and outcomes will be facilitated by contributing to the new NBSAP process and by ensuring that both Implementing Agencies take measures to guarantee the Project is embedded in the UNDAF mechanism and their respective programmes of work.</p> <p><b>SP5</b> Fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services respectively: The outcomes of the Project will also contribute to the GEF's Strategic Programme 5 through the analysis of market chains and the development of an enabling environment for improved, equitable value chains promoting underutilised plants. This will be done <i>inter alia</i> through capacity building among farmer groups, processors, agricultural educational organisations and institutions and policies, improving links to the formal market sector, improved marketing of traditional foods, and public awareness campaigns among consumers. Advocacy and awareness-building will address dietary diversity and nutrition as expressed in official, commercial and popular media. Specifically each country will link market chains to development of regional foods, linked to local ecosystems.</p>
--	--

## 2. PROJECT OBJECTIVE

### *Global environmental objective(s) of the project*

The Project Objective is to strengthen the conservation and sustainable management of agricultural biodiversity through mainstreaming into national and global nutrition, food and livelihood security strategies and programmes. The Project will seek to achieve these goals and objectives through implementation of three components which designed to improve: the knowledge base (Component 1); the policy and regulatory framework (Component 2); and awareness and outscaling (Component 3). Global knowledge will encompass globally relevant tools, lessons and best practices.

### *Progress made towards meeting the project objective(s)*

Although the project is at a very early stage progress has been made towards mainstreaming through the area of awareness and communication and policy frameworks. At the global level awareness-raising products for the Project include the project website/portal ([www.b4fn.org](http://www.b4fn.org)), newsletters, flyers, a visual documentation of case studies that successfully use and promote the use of local agrobiodiversity. The case studies are also showcased on a dedicated [webpage](#) on the project portal. The joint Bioversity/Earthscan publication *Diversifying Food and Diets*, published in April 2013, is also an important contribution to this end. Groundwork for establishing the evidence base on the importance of biodiversity for food and nutrition has commenced with countries planning and undertaking baseline assessments and laying the foundations for subsequent data management. Brazil has undertaken a preliminary review of policies, plans and strategies to assess mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation into food and nutrition strategies has been drafted. Furthermore, the project is reviewing the current availability of approaches, tools and methods for promoting mainstreaming into relevant national strategies and programmes. The outcomes of this review will be shared with the other countries in the forthcoming ISC and training in November 2013. In Sri Lanka, desk reviews are being conducted to assess suitable entry points for the development of national strategies promoting the mainstreaming of BFN.

### *Progress towards the stated GEF Strategic Priorities and Targets if identified in project document*

The project is already contributing to better understanding of the level of biodiversity conservation, sustainable use of biodiversity for food and nutrition by reviewing current levels of awareness and integration in policy and regulatory frameworks. In some instances e.g. Brazil and Kenya, the Project has identified previously established multi-sectoral policy platforms at the national level to target and monitor the mainstreaming of biodiversity into agriculture, health and nutrition sectors using indicators and information generated by the Project.



**RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK**

**3.1 Progress towards achieving the project objective (s)**

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2013	Progress rating
<p><b>Objective</b> To strengthen the conservation and sustainable management of agricultural biodiversity through mainstreaming into national and global nutrition, food and livelihood security strategies and programmes.</p>	<p>1. By the end of the project, NBSAPs, Nutrition and Health Action Plans/Strategies and National AgBD and Agricultural Strategies show enhanced promotion and awareness of conservation and deployment of nutritionally rich biodiversity</p>	<p>At baseline, relevant national plans and strategies show limited awareness of the benefit and value of nutritionally rich biodiversity</p>	<p>Project has drafted recommendations for revision of relevant national strategies and plans</p>	<p>At least one politically significant national document drawing attention to the importance of conservation and deployment of nutritionally rich biodiversity is endorsed in each country by the end of the project</p>	<p><b>Brazil</b> A set of measures and programmes is already in place in Brazil aimed at strengthening the conservation and sustainable use of agricultural biodiversity by mainstreaming into national and global nutrition, food and livelihood security strategies and programmes. Their coordinated action will be described in a publication to be developed in 2014.</p> <p><b>Sri Lanka</b> Desk reviews are being conducted to assess suitable entry points for the development of national strategies promoting BFN.</p>	<p><b>S</b></p>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2013	Progress rating
	2. By the end of the project, relevant Ministries, NGOs and private sector routinely promote gender sensitive good practices to deploy nutritionally rich biodiversity	At baseline, few Ministries, NGOs or private sector bodies consider deployment of nutritionally rich biodiversity	Project has undertaken extensive lobbying of relevant Ministries, NGOs or private sector to promote best practices for deployment of nutritionally rich biodiversity	At least one national agency/sector in each country routinely promotes gender sensitive good practices to deploy nutritionally rich biodiversity by the end of the project	<b>Brazil</b> Public policies and programmes already promote gender-sensitive good practices and consider the intellectual property rights of indigenous people to traditional knowledge regarding nutritionally-rich biodiversity. This is ongoing in other countries.	<b>S</b>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2013	Progress rating
	3. FAO's Third State of the World report on PGR demonstrates enhanced deployment of nutritionally rich biodiversity	At baseline, FAO's previous two State of the World's reports had limited information on the conservation and utilization of nutritionally rich biodiversity	Project partners highlight relevant new information on nutritionally rich biodiversity to the national SoW3 reporting mechanism	Each country has produced a national summary on project achievements and outcomes to inform the national SoW3 reporting mechanism	FAO's Third State of the World Report on PGR is now scheduled for presentation at the 18 <sup>th</sup> Session of the CGRFA in 2020/2021. Prior to this date the more comprehensive State of the World's Biodiversity for Food and Agriculture will be presented at the 16 <sup>th</sup> Session of the CGRFA in 2016/2017. Plans for this publication were discussed at the recent 14 <sup>th</sup> Regular Session of the CGRFA in April 2013 at which the project participated. The project will work closely with national partners during the preparatory process to ensure that countries capture project results and outputs	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2013	Progress rating
	4. Biodiversity Indicators (FAO and others) show increased composition analysis and consumption of nutritionally rich biodiversity	At baseline, Biodiversity Indicators have not been tested in any of the four countries	Each country has prepared a national baseline report on Biodiversity Indicators	Each country has prepared a national end of project report on Biodiversity Indicators	Training for implementation of Biodiversity Indicators is scheduled for November 2013	<b>MS</b>
	5. Enhanced awareness and political support translates into increased budgetary support for the conservation and deployment of nutritionally rich biodiversity	At baseline, budgetary allocations for the conservation and deployment of nutritionally rich biodiversity are negligible	Evidence of the role of AgBD in contributing to improved diets and nutrition presented to senior planners	At least a 5% budgetary increase towards the conservation and deployment of nutritionally rich biodiversity in each county by the end of the project	This is ongoing in countries. In Brazil several programmes, policies and projects have allocated funds for the conservation and use of BFN.	<b>S</b>
	6. Scale-up Nutrition (SUN) Programme shows uptake of project-identified, agrobiodiverse nutrition-sensitive interventions	No uptake at the beginning of the project	Evidence of the role of AgBD for "Nutrition-Sensitive Development" across different sectors shared with SUN Task force teams	Best practices of AgBD for "Nutrition-Sensitive Development" incorporated into some country framework programmes for the SUN Initiative	Currently the project is putting significant emphasis on establishing the infrastructure to document the evidence base for the role of AgBD in Nutrition-Sensitive interventions. This will be shared with country programmes of the SUN Initiative	<b>S</b>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2013	Progress rating
<b>Outcome 1</b> Relevant sectors, including agriculture, environment and public health in the four partner countries adopt the integrated knowledge base on BFN to build support for biodiversity conservation and enhanced well-being	1. Local communities, and national agencies have contributed to the documentation of the value and benefits of BFN for improving food security and income generation	No integrated knowledge base exists in any of the four countries	At least 5 local communities, and 10 national agencies have contributed to a national integrated knowledge base	At least 10 local communities in 10 pilot sites and 20 national agencies have contributed to a national integrated knowledge base	Of the four countries, <b>Kenya</b> has completed a baseline survey in the selected pilot site to document existing BFN and associated traditional knowledge. In <b>Turkey</b> baseline surveys are set to start in late August. In <b>Sri Lanka</b> they commence in July 2013.	<b>S</b>
	2. Increase in no. of users accessing integrated information systems in each country by project end		10% increase in users per year beginning the year after national information portals are established	50% increase in users compared to first year when national knowledge base was created	Ongoing	<b>S</b>
	3. Relevant sectors and agencies in 4 partners countries have accessed and adopted information on the value and benefits of biodiversity for food and nutrition for relevant plans and strategies		At least one intersectoral ministerial meeting highlighting the importance the integrated knowledge base on BFN held in each country	At least two national sectoral plans or strategies highlighting the importance of nutritionally rich biodiversity developed in each country	<b>Ongoing</b> Groundwork for this outcome has been initiated.	<b>S</b>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2013	Progress rating
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Enhanced policy and regulatory frameworks support the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use across sectors.	1. Policy recommendations developed by the project support cross-sectoral mainstreaming of BFN	No policy recommendations developed	Policy documents with relevant recommendations drafted in each of the countries	At least one policy recommendation per country developed by the project by year 5 which supports cross-sectoral mainstreaming of BFN is under adoption in at least one country	Ongoing	<b>S</b>
	2. New markets are contributing to improved income generation of smallholders	No new markets exist in pilot sites	New markets identified in pilot sites	At least 5% of farming families and user groups in pilot sites show a 10% increase in income derived from nutritionally rich biodiversity	Ongoing <b>Kenya</b> has developed a baseline market survey to assess institutional market options	<b>S</b>
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Tools, knowledge and best practices adopted and scaled up in development programs, value chains and local community initiatives	1. Increased number and types of relevant programmes mobilizing nutritionally rich biodiversity using best practices developed by the project	No programmes using best practices to deploy nutritionally rich biodiversity at the beginning of the project	At least one initiative promoting the mobilization of nutritionally rich biodiversity using project developed best practices under consideration and review in each country	At least one initiative promoting the mobilization of nutritionally rich biodiversity using project developed best practices underway in each country	Ongoing	<b>S</b>
	2. Increased diversity of nutritionally rich biodiversity and area under cultivation	Baseline diversity of nutritionally rich biodiversity in pilot sites established at project baseline	At least 5% increase in species diversity of nutritionally rich biodiversity conserved by farming families in pilot sites	At least 10% increase in species diversity of nutritionally rich biodiversity conserved by farming families in pilot sites	Ongoing	<b>S</b>

**Overall rating of project progress towards meeting project objective(s)**

FY2013 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and explaining reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods
<b>S</b>	Progress at the objective and outcome level is generally being implemented in a timely manner. Countries have started the ongoing process of reaching out to local communities in pilot sites and are contributing relevant knowledge and information. This information, together with other information being reviewed and collected in each country, will eventually contribute to an enhanced knowledge base for the project. Since the project PPG phase, Brazil has decided that the focus of its activities will be largely at the federal level and this is going to influence the number of pilot sites and local communities which the project can target. This change will have to be reflected in revisions to the project document. There will be a slight delay in progress towards Project Objective Indicator 4 (Biodiversity Indicators) and the preparation of national baseline reports on Biodiversity Indicators. To address this issue, training on Biodiversity Indicators has been planned for November 2013 following the next ISC meeting.

**Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating**

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<b>MS:</b> Project Objective Indicator 4: Comprehensive training on the implementation of Biodiversity Indicators to be organised	Nutrition division of FAO	November 2013

This section should be completed if project progress towards meeting objectives was rated MS, MU, U or HU during the previous Project Implementation Review (PIR) or by the Mid-term Review/Evaluation.

Problem(s) identified in previous PIR	Action(s) taken	By whom	When
NA			

3.2 Project implementation progress

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2013 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
<p><b>Output 1.1: Assessments of nutritional value of agrobiodiversity and associated traditional knowledge (ATK) is carried out in three ecosystems in Brazil, Turkey and Sri Lanka and one ecosystem in Kenya</b></p>				
<p><b>Activity 1.1.1</b> National steering committees to refine and validate criteria and finalise site selection</p>	<p>March 2013</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>NSCs established in all four countries. Sites and target species have been selected in all four countries.</p>	<p>S</p>
<p><b>Activity 1.1.2</b> Develop working and collaborative arrangements, along the lines of Community Biocultural Protocols, between stakeholders and communities in targeted ecosystems to establish standards for engaging with communities which set out their customary values, rights and rules and which regulate benefit sharing.</p>	<p>March 2013</p>	<p>70%</p>	<p>Community Biocultural protocols developed in <b>Kenya</b>. These are available from the GPMU upon request.</p> <p>In <b>Brazil</b>, the project will work with local communities that are engaged in other projects and for which Biocultural protocols have already been established.</p> <p><b>Sri Lanka</b> – Community biocultural protocols have been develop and will be used during the baseline surveys to be carried out and completed in the second half of 2013.</p> <p>Because of delays in setting up national management arrangements and changes to the National Project Coordinator in <b>Turkey</b> this activity has yet to get underway.</p>	<p>MS</p>



Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2013 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
<p><b>Activity 1.1.3</b> Plan and undertake training of appropriate target groups (research scientists, field and community workers, local community members, etc.) in methodology to assess local agrobiodiversity and foods (including loss of food options), collection of associated indigenous knowledge, assess nutritional and dietary diversity, assess community nutritional and health status and data gathering and options for community biodiversity management.</p>	<p>March 2013</p>	<p>50%</p>	<p>The activity was delayed in most countries due to the hold-up in fund transfers and has not yet been completed. In <b>Kenya</b>, training of farmer groups, scientists and community workers was undertaken during the baseline survey. Training was provided on methodology to assess community health status, data gathering and options for community biodiversity management through homegardens. This activity will continue throughout the project period. Because of delays in the setting up of national management arrangements in <b>Sri Lanka</b> and <b>Turkey</b> this activity has yet to get underway.</p>	<p>MS</p>
<p><b>Activity 1.1.4</b> Determine baseline status of community biodiversity for food and nutrition (including loss of food options), dietary diversity, nutritional and health status and other relevant data, (including identifying and prioritizing any traditional foods with no or little nutrient data which are most promising in terms of community acceptability in a community food-based promotion strategy.</p>	<p>March 2013</p>	<p>50%</p>	<p>In <b>Brazil</b> the project intends to build on relevant data gathered as part of earlier projects in selected project sites. In <b>Kenya</b> the baseline survey was successfully carried out and results of the survey are available from the GPMU upon request. In <b>Sri Lanka</b> and <b>Turkey</b>, because of setbacks in establishing national management arrangements and changes in NPC, baseline surveys were delayed are now scheduled to start in July and August 2013 respectively.</p>	<p>MS</p>

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2013 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
<p><b>Activity 1.1.5</b> Document food-associated indigenous knowledge, including sustainable use practices for agricultural biodiversity including neglected and underutilized species that are important to local food systems and nutritional security.</p>	<p>March 2013</p>	<p>50%</p>	<p>In <b>Brazil</b> the project intends to build on relevant data gathered as part of earlier projects in selected project sites. In <b>Kenya</b> this activity was carried out as part of the baseline survey. Further ongoing assessments of food-associated indigenous knowledge will be carried out on target species. Because of delays in the setting up national management arrangements in Sri Lanka and Turkey this activity has yet to get underway.</p>	<p>MS</p>
<p><b>Activity 1.1.6</b> Document the loss of options for food and nutrition security resulting from the degradation of the targeted ecosystems and erosion of biodiversity loss.</p>	<p>March 2013</p>	<p>25%</p>	<p>In <b>Kenya</b> results for this activity are summarised in the Baseline survey report available from the GPMU upon request. Because of delays in the setting up national management arrangements in <b>Sri Lanka, Brazil</b> and <b>Turkey</b> this activity has yet to get underway.</p>	<p>MS</p>
<p><b>Activity 1.1.7</b> Prioritize locally important agricultural biodiversity species to be targeted for nutrient compositional analysis (activity linked to the Output 1.2).</p>	<p>March 2013</p>	<p>85%</p>	<p><b>Brazil</b> is focusing on a select number of species that were earlier identified as part of the <a href="#">Plants for the Future Initiative</a>. <b>Kenya</b> has also completed this activity and prioritised a number of indigenous vegetables, root crops, cereals, fruits and animal source foods. Preliminary priority species lists have been drawn up by both <b>Sri Lanka</b> and <b>Turkey</b>.</p>	<p>MS</p>

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2013 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
<p><b>Activity 1.1.8</b> Undertake participatory planning with communities for food-based intervention to improve community micronutrient status, including prioritization of key micronutrient-rich traditional foods and identification of most appropriate delivery mechanisms for mobilizing such biodiversity (homegardens, school gardens and meals, awareness and education campaigns etc.).</p>	<p>March 2017</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>The activity is scheduled to start in 2014. In <b>Brazil</b> the activity will focus on determining the effects of increased consumption and use of BFN on health and nutritional status of target populations and delivery of BFN through national procurement programmes. In <b>Kenya</b> nutritionally-rich species will be promoted through homegardens, school gardens and community-owned gardens.</p>	<p>S</p>
<p><b>Activity 1.1.9</b> Monitor and assess the impact of the food-based intervention.</p>	<p>March 2017</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>The activity is scheduled to be initiated in 2014.</p>	<p>S</p>
<p><b>Activity 1.1.10</b> Document and publish findings including appropriate tools to present research findings back to communities.</p>	<p>March 2017</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>The activity is scheduled to be initiated in 2014.</p>	<p>S</p>
<p><b>Output 1.2: National portal on local foods, containing databases on nutritional properties of agrobiodiversity and associated traditional knowledge (ATK), developed in each country and linked to relevant national and global nutritional databases</b></p>			<p>The delay in implementation of this output was largely the result of delay in the signing of the agreement between Bioversity and FAO and the consequent hold-up in fund transfers.</p>	
<p><b>Activity 1.2.1</b> Identify key national agrobiodiversity nutritional data holders and develop collaborative agreements between relevant partners within countries for information access, sharing and exchange (if necessary, a national Information management Committee could be established)</p>	<p>March 2014</p>	<p>40%</p>	<p><b>Brazil</b> has identified key national data holders but is yet to develop collaborative agreements between partners. In <b>Kenya</b> activities are more advanced. Data holders have been identified and collaborative agreements are being finalized. Because of delays in the setting up national management arrangements in <b>Sri Lanka</b> and <b>Turkey</b> this activity has yet to get underway.</p>	<p>S</p>

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2013 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
<b>Activity 1.2.2</b> Review existing food and nutritional data at the national and international level and information management tools and approaches employed	March 2014	30%	Ongoing. <b>Brazil</b> has started reviewing existing national data. Other countries have identified national data holders.	S
<b>Activity 1.2.3</b> Establish the necessary infrastructure and capacity for developing a national portal and database/information system on nutritional properties of agrobiodiversity	March 2015	10%	<b>Only Brazil</b> has partially started this activity.	S
<b>Activity 1.2.4</b> Identify training needs and undertake relevant training	March 2015	30%	This activity was not planned to be initiated during the current reporting period. <b>Brazil</b> has partially started this activity.	S
<b>Activity 1.2.5</b> Design the national agrobiodiversity nutritional database and information system based on international standards (INFOODS-FAO)	March 2015	20%	This activity was not planned to be initiated during the current reporting period. <b>Brazil</b> has partially started this activity.	S
<b>Activity 1.2.6</b> Design appropriate database for associated indigenous knowledge of local foods and sustainable use practices for agricultural biodiversity	March 2016	20%	This activity was not planned to be initiated during the current reporting period. <b>Brazil</b> has partially started this activity.	S
<b>Activity 1.2.7</b> Update content with existing national data and update regularly with data emerging from targeted ecosystems and project in general	March 2017	15%	This activity was not planned to be initiated during the current reporting period. <b>Brazil</b> has partially started this activity.	S
<b>Activity 1.2.8</b> Ensure national databases and information systems are linked to key global nutritional databases and information systems	March 2017	15%	This activity was not planned to be initiated during the current reporting period. <b>Brazil</b> has partially started this activity	S
<b>Output 1.3: The contribution of biodiversity indicators for food composition and consumption for agricultural biodiversity conservation and sustainable use assessed</b>				

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2013 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
<b>Activity 1.3.1</b> Provide training on collecting data for Biodiversity Indicators for Food Composition and Consumption	November 2013	15%	Training for this Activity is set to be provided to countries in November 2013. Arrangements are underway	S
<b>Activity 1.3.2</b> Determine in each country baseline data for Nutrition Indicator for Biodiversity on food composition in collaboration with national coordinator of INFOODS-FAO	March 2014	15%	Ongoing. <b>Brazil</b> has partially started this activity.	S
<b>Activity 1.3.3</b> Yearly reporting on Nutrition Indicator for Biodiversity on food composition	March 2017	20%	Ongoing. <b>Brazil</b> has partially started this activity.	S
<b>Activity 1.3.4</b> Identify food consumption surveys and methods used or to be used in each country	March 2014	20%	Ongoing. <b>Brazil</b> has partially started this activity.	S
<b>Activity 1.3.5</b> Adapt Dietary Diversity methodology and/or other methods aimed collecting intake data on consumption of foods from AgBD	March 2014	20%	Ongoing. <b>Brazil</b> has partially started this activity.	S
<b>Activity 1.3.6</b> Collect baseline data, through dietary assessment surveys, in each country for Nutrition Indicator for Biodiversity on food consumption at national level	March 2014	0%	Ongoing.	S
<b>Activity 1.3.7</b> Evaluate trend of the Nutrition Indicator for Biodiversity on food consumption between the beginning and the end of the project, through new data collection (linked to 1.1.9)	March 2014	0%	Ongoing	S
<b>Output 2.1: Cross-sectoral national policy platforms for mainstreaming agricultural biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into nutrition, health and education programmes established</b>				
<b>Activity 2.1.1</b> Develop terms of reference (TORs) for cross-sectoral national working group with core mandate for development of policies and strategies that promote the mainstreaming of local biodiversity into health, nutrition and agricultural programmes	March 2013	50%	Activities under this output will not be a priority for <b>Brazil</b> since cross-sectoral national policies and programmes that promote agricultural biodiversity are already in place. Some actions will be undertaken, however, to strengthen these links.	MS

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2013 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			<p>In <b>Kenya</b> cross-sectoral working groups are already in place. TORs for these were developed and are available from the GPMU upon request.</p> <p>Because of delays in the setting up of national management arrangements in <b>Sri Lanka</b> and <b>Turkey</b> this activity has yet to get underway.</p>	
<p><b>Activity 2.1.2</b> Establish cross-sectoral national working group with core mandate for development of policies and strategies that promote the mainstreaming of local biodiversity into health, nutrition and agricultural programmes and identify or appoint individuals to spearhead policy development and implementation</p>	<p>March 2013</p>	<p>50%</p>	<p>In <b>Brazil</b> and <b>Kenya</b> cross-sectoral working groups have already been established.</p> <p>Because of delays in the setting up of national management arrangements in <b>Sri Lanka</b> and <b>Turkey</b> this activity has yet to get underway.</p>	<p>MS</p>
<p><b>Activity 2.1.3</b> Develop a list of stakeholders to be involved in the policy and strategy development process and consult broadly</p>	<p>March 2013</p>	<p>50%</p>	<p>Project stakeholders in <b>Brazil</b> will be drawn from existing cross-sectoral policies and programmes that, to some extent, promote the mainstreaming of agriculture into nutrition and health strategies. In <b>Kenya</b>, a list of stakeholders was developed for <b>Kenya</b> for current and potential stakeholders and is available from the GPMU upon request.</p> <p>Because of delays in the setting up national management arrangements in Sri Lanka and Turkey this activity has yet to get underway.</p>	<p>MS</p>

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2013 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
<p><b>Activity 2.1.4</b> Design action plan, including training programme, to build capacity and awareness of policy options and mainstreaming tools and disseminate relevant information widely</p>	<p>March 2014</p>	<p>10%</p>	<p>One country partner from MMA <b>Brazil</b> is attending the Managing Global Governance” (MGG) course – a five-month advanced training and dialogue programme. As part of this training, the national partner will identify actors and stakeholders involved in biodiversity mainstreaming in Brazil and the current availability of approaches, tools and methods for promoting mainstreaming into relevant national strategies and programmes. This individual will also develop a comprehensive Action Plan describing follow-up actions and implementation in the Ministry of the Environment in Brazil and will share this information with other project country partners in Sri Lanka, Turkey and Kenya</p>	<p>S</p>
<p><b>Output 2.2: National and international policy guidelines and recommendations that promote the mainstreaming of agricultural biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into nutrition, health and education developed</b></p>				
<p><b>Activity 2.2.1</b> Undertake review of national policies and strategies for appropriateness for the mainstreaming of local biodiversity into health, nutrition and agricultural programmes, identifying barriers, gaps and opportunities</p>	<p>March 2014</p>	<p>30%</p>	<p><b>Brazil</b> has identified partners and identified actions. Ongoing in <b>Kenya</b>. Because of delays in the setting up of national management arrangements in <b>Sri Lanka</b> and <b>Turkey</b> this activity has yet to get underway. One country partner staff from Brazil is currently following the GIZ Managing Global Governance” (MGG) course (see activity 2.1.4) in Bonn and has been tasked with</p>	<p>S</p>

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2013 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			reviewing current international practices on mainstreaming biodiversity (including GEF, CBD, FAO, UNEP, IIED and other relevant agencies) across sectors with special attention to mainstreaming biodiversity for food and nutrition, and advise on how these might be adapted and revised for the BFN Project and partner country contexts.	
<b>Activity 2.2.2</b> Draft national strategy to promote the mainstreaming of biodiversity for food and nutrition	March 2015	30%	This activity was not planned to be initiated during the current reporting period. However, <b>Brazil</b> has started drafting a national strategy	S
<b>Activity 2.2.3</b> Identify key 'change agents', potential champions and supporters of relevant policy reform	March 2015	20%	This activity was not planned to be initiated during the current reporting period. However, <b>Brazil</b> has started identifying key "change agents"	S
<b>Activity 2.2.4</b> Host Policy Learning Events to disseminate best practices, current thinking and to share lessons of experiences	March 2015	0%	This activity was not planned to be initiated during the current reporting period.	S
<b>Activity 2.2.5</b> Draft appropriate policy amendments or first versions of policy where appropriate	March 2015	0%	This activity was not planned to be initiated during the current reporting period.	S
<b>Activity 2.2.6</b> Carry out internal consultation on draft policy and revise as appropriate	March 2015	0%	This activity was not planned to be initiated during the current reporting period.	S
<b>Activity 2.2.7</b> Carry out broad consultation on policy and revise based on feedback	March 2015	0%	This activity was not planned to be initiated during the current reporting period.	S
<b>Activity 2.2.8</b> Publish a policy brief which provides guidance on development and implementation of international national policies and strategies that support the mainstreaming of agricultural biodiversity conservation into health and nutrition	March 2015	0%	This activity was not planned to be initiated during the current reporting period.	S



Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2013 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
strategies				
<b>Activity 2.2.9</b> Develop implementation strategy and priority actions for policies and strategies that promote the mainstreaming of local biodiversity into health, nutrition and agricultural programmes, including ongoing monitoring	March 2017	0%	This activity was not planned to be initiated during the current reporting period.	S
<b>Output 2.3: New marketing options for biodiversity foods with high nutritional value identified and developed</b>				
<b>Activity 2.3.1</b> Undertake studies to identify and assess markets or market niches and opportunities, including local procurement for school and hospital meals, with potential for sustainably produced biodiversity products with high nutritional value, including identification of barriers and opportunities in project targeted ecosystems	March 2013	50%	<p>Activities 2.3.1 through 2.3.5 will receive priority focus following the implementation of planned training in Markets and Value Chains which is scheduled for November 2013</p> <p><b>Brazil</b> identified and assessed opportunities for including BFN in local/national procurement programs. The Food Procurement Program (PAA), the Ministry of Health and the National Fund for Education Development have been identified as possible entry points.</p> <p><b>Kenya</b> has partly implemented this activity, exploring opportunities for promoting BFN in hospitals, clinics, as well as secondary and primary schools in the selected site. Opportunities for the integration of BFN in local/national procurement programs in Kenya are being explored.</p> <p><b>Sri Lanka</b> has indicated in using project resources and outputs to establish a “Local Food Outlet” in an</p>	MS

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2013 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			area close to Kandy. Such an outlet has already been established in Colombo by the DoA. Activity still to be initiated in Turkey.	
<b>Activity 2.3.2</b> Identify key steps and actors and priority food products in value chain for which nutritional content is already known or can be readily determined	March 2014	25%	<b>Brazil</b> has identified key steps and actors (see Activity 2.3.1).	S
<b>Activity 2.3.3</b> Determine priority issues related to food product development, quality control, labelling and packaging and undertake appropriate R&D and training with a focus on small scale processing of local foods and low income rural producers (see output 3.3)	March 2015	20%	This activity was not planned to be initiated during the current reporting period though some activity has been partially implemented in <b>Brazil</b> .	S
<b>Activity 2.3.4</b> Develop guidelines or management plans for the sustainable production and use of wild and cultivated resources to ensure that commercialization does not impact negatively on agronomic production practices or on-farm biodiversity.	March 2016	20%	This activity was not planned to be initiated during the current reporting period, though it has been partially implemented in <b>Brazil</b> in conjunction with the PAA and the Ministries of Agriculture and Environment.	S
<b>Activity 2.3.5</b> Develop marketing and promotion strategies such as food and trade fairs (see output 3.4)	March 2017	20%	This activity was not planned to be initiated during the current reporting period, though it was partially implemented in <b>Brazil</b> in conjunction with the PAA and the Ministries of Agriculture and Environment.	S
<b>Output 3.1: Best practices for mobilizing biodiversity to improve dietary diversity identified and promoted</b>				
<b>Activity 3.1.1</b> Assess and identify a set of best practices, including nutritional quality documentation, home and school gardens, school meal programmes, demonstration sites, value-adding, promotion, education and awareness, policy-frameworks, for mobilizing and delivering biodiversity to	March 2013	80%	Ongoing. This activity has been partially implemented in <b>Brazil</b> . Other country partners have tentatively identified best practices or best bets for their specific pilot	MS

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2013 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
improve dietary diversity and test and validate in selected project pilot sites (see output 1.1)			sites. The GPMU, in addition to documenting case studies of best practices in the publication below (activity 3.1.2) has also initiated a global portal to document best practices, see activity 3.1.8 below.	
<b>Activity 3.1.2</b> Publication reviewing current best practices for mobilizing biodiversity to improve dietary diversity at outset of the project (Earthscan publication)	March 2013	100%	The activity is complete. The book <i>Diversifying Food and Diets</i> was published in April 2013 and has been disseminated widely including to country partners.	S
<b>Activity 3.1.3</b> Develop and disseminate information/materials and methodologies for implementing best practices in selected project pilot sites	March 2014	40%	This activity has been partially implemented in <b>Brazil</b> in conjunction with the Ministries of Agriculture, Environment and Social Development and Fight against Hunger.	S
<b>Activity 3.1.4</b> Organize participatory workshops with key stakeholders in selected sites and nationally to review and refine best practices	March 2014	40%	This activity has been partially implemented in <b>Brazil</b> in conjunction with the Ministries of Agriculture, Environment and Social Development and Fight against Hunger.	S
<b>Activity 3.1.5</b> Undertake training on best practices	March 2014	0%	This activity was not planned to be initiated during the current reporting period	S
<b>Activity 3.1.6</b> Pilot and implement best practices in selected sites	March 2017	20%	Ongoing. This activity has been partially implemented in <b>Brazil</b> in conjunction with the Ministries of Agriculture, Environment and Social Development and Fight against Hunger.	S
<b>Activity 3.1.7</b> Document best practices, covering GEF project experiences and other non-GEF examples, and develop a training module on best practices for mobilizing biodiversity to improve dietary diversity which can be adapted for use in	March 2017	10%	Ongoing. This activity has been partially implemented in <b>Brazil</b>	S

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2013 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
nutrition and health programs in the four project countries and more widely				
<b>Activity 3.1.8</b> Establish portal platform to document case studies which show 'what really works' when it comes to mobilizing biodiversity	March 2017	60%	This activity is on-going. The GPMU has set up a dedicated webpage on the project website <a href="http://www.b4fn.org/the_map.html">http://www.b4fn.org/the_map.html</a> that showcases what works on the ground. The GPMU is also actively making contact with scientists and civil society around the world to document best practices for mobilising and raising awareness	S
<b>Output 3.2: Capacity of producers, processors, users and researchers to deploy and benefit from nutritionally relevant biodiversity enhanced</b>				
<b>Activity 3.2.1</b> Review key steps/tasks involved in deploying nutritionally relevant local biodiversity, including market chains	March 2014	0%	Activities 3.2.1 through 3.2.5 will be initiated following the global project training on Markets/Value chains scheduled for November 2013	S
<b>Activity 3.2.2</b> Carry out analysis of actors and assessment of actors' roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis deployment of nutritionally relevant local biodiversity including market chains	March 2014	0%	Activities 3.2.1 through 3.2.5 will be initiated following the global project training on Markets/Value chains scheduled for November 2013	S
<b>Activity 3.2.3</b> Establish the key competencies required among relevant stakeholder groups in order to facilitate deployment of nutritionally relevant local biodiversity	March 2014	0%	Activities 3.2.1 through 3.2.5 will be initiated following the global project training on Markets/Value chains scheduled for November 2013	S
<b>Activity 3.2.4</b> Assess training needs required for deployment of nutritionally relevant local biodiversity	March 2014	0%	Activities 3.2.1 through 3.2.5 will be initiated following the global project training on Markets/Value chains scheduled for November 2013	S
<b>Activity 3.2.5</b> Develop capacity building plan to address deployment of local biodiversity including action plan to implement training	March 2016	0%	Activities 3.2.1 through 3.2.5 will be initiated following the global project training on Markets/Value chains	S

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2013 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			scheduled for November 2013	
<b>Activity 3.2.6</b> Monitor and evaluate the capacity building plan	March 2016	0%	This activity is not planned to be initiated during the reporting period indicated	S
<b>Activity 3.2.7</b> Strengthen partnerships and collaborations and encourage south-to-south exchanges among GEF partner countries to share information and expertise in relevant areas including exchange visits and workshops, linkages to existing networks and so forth	March 2015	0%	This activity is not planned to be initiated during the reporting period indicated	S
<b>Output 3.3: National information campaigns that foster greater appreciation of biodiversity as a resource for development and wellbeing conducted</b>				
<b>Activity 3.3.1</b> Develop terms of reference for National Information Campaign taskforce	March 2014	0%	Ongoing	S
<b>Activity 3.3.2</b> Identify National Information Campaign taskforce, with broad stakeholder participation, to plan and coordinate national campaign using community-based, participatory, cross-sectoral and inter-disciplinary approaches including social marketing	March 2014	0%	Ongoing	S
<b>Activity 3.3.3</b> Review and analyse other relevant national and international information campaigns, such as "Go Local", which have successfully promoted local biodiversity as a resource for development and wellbeing and determine good practices, key tools and activities, useful case studies and important lessons learned which might be replicated in project countries	March 2014	0%	Ongoing	S
<b>Activity 3.3.4</b> Develop National Information Campaign Strategy which should include: objectives; target audience; key messages and key slogans; information campaign tools and activities; budgets and resources; timelines and action plans; and evaluation (ensure campaign includes sufficient activities to support key interventions and prioritized species identified in the project)	March 2015	10%	This activity has been partially implemented in <b>Brazil</b> in conjunction with the Ministries of Agriculture and Health and the National Fund for Education Development	S
<b>Activity 3.3.5</b> Identify sources of national capacity important to implementation of the National Information Campaign Strategy	March 2014	10%	Ongoing. This activity has been partially implemented in <b>Brazil</b> in	S

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2013 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
and identify gaps in capacity and undertake necessary training to address these			in conjunction with the Ministries of Agriculture and Health and the National Fund for Education Development	
<b>Activity 3.3.6</b> Implement selected National Information Campaign Strategy activities at pilot scale including in selected target community (see output 1.1) and revise accordingly	March 2017	0%	This activity is not planned to be initiated during the reporting period indicated	S
<b>Activity 3.3.7</b> Monitor, evaluate and assess impact of National Information Campaign Strategy	March 2017	0%	This activity is not planned to be initiated during the reporting period indicate	S
<b>Activity 3.3.8</b> Document and publish manual on 'promoting biodiversity for food, nutrition and wellbeing'	March 2017	20%	Ongoing. Activities towards this have been partially implemented in <b>Brazil</b> in conjunction with the Ministries of Agriculture and Health and the National Fund for Education Development	S
<b>Output 3.4: Guidelines for improved use of nutritionally-rich foods from local biodiversity, including processing, food safety measures, and recipes adapted to modern lifestyles based on traditional food systems developed</b>				
<b>Activity 3.4.1</b> Countries select and finalise list of target species and foods, taking into account species prioritized in output 1.1 for focus of guidelines on improved use	March 2014	50%	Ongoing. The selection and prioritization of target species had been completed in <b>Brazil, Kenya and Turkey</b> .	S
<b>Activity 3.4.2</b> Review analysis of market chains (e.g. value-chain analysis and "filiere" methodology – output 2.3) and other relevant information relevant to improving utilization of target species	March 2014	25%	Ongoing. This activity has been partially implemented in <b>Brazil</b> in conjunction with the Food Procurement Programme and the National School Meals Programme	S
<b>Activity 3.4.3</b> Prepare guidelines for sustainable production and improved use; processing; food safety; packaging; quality control; marketing, certification (fair-trade, eco-labelling), promotion	March 2016	25%	Ongoing. This activity has been partially implemented in <b>Brazil</b> in conjunction with the Food Procurement Programme and the National School Meals Programme	S

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2013 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
<b>Activity 3.4.4</b> Each country to develop and publish book based on traditional recipes for nutritionally rich foods from local biodiversity and recipes adapted to modern lifestyles	March 2016	10%	Ongoing. This activity has been partially implemented in <b>Brazil</b> in conjunction with the Food Procurement Programme and the National Policy on Food and Nutrition	S
<b>Activity 3.4.5</b> Develop a global publication on the improved use of selected nutritionally-rich food from local biodiversity	March 2017	15%	Ongoing. This activity has been partially implemented in <b>Brazil</b> in conjunction with the Food Procurement Programme and the National Policy on Food and Nutrition. The GPMU is also documenting a series of case studies (both project and non-project) which will contribute to this activity (see Activity 3.1.8)	S
<b>Output 3.5: Tools and methods for mainstreaming biodiversity into food and nutrition strategies upscaled and disseminated</b>				
<b>Activity 3.5.1</b> Review status of mainstreaming biodiversity tools and approaches by sector and cross-sectorally with particular emphasis on mainstreaming into food and nutrition activities	March 2014	25%	<b>Brazil</b> is well advanced in the implementation of this activity. One country partner staff from Brazil is currently following the GIZ Managing Global Governance” (MGG) course (see activity 2.1.4) in Bonn and has been tasked with reviewing current international practices on mainstreaming biodiversity (including GEF, CBD, FAO, UNEP, IIED and other relevant agencies) across sectors with special attention to mainstreaming biodiversity for food and nutrition, and advise on how these might be adapted and revised for the BFN Project and partner	S

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2013 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			country contexts.	
<b>Activity 3.5.2</b> Inventory relevant tools and methods for mainstreaming biodiversity into food and nutrition activities (National Sustainable Development Strategies; National Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers; National Nutrition Policies, Strategies and Action plans etc.)	March 2015	25%	<b>Brazil</b> is well advanced in the implementation of this activity	S
<b>Activity 3.5.3</b> Draft guidelines for using tools for mainstreaming and methodologies to support inclusion of biodiversity into food and nutrition activities	March 2017	25%	<b>Brazil</b> is well advanced in the implementation of this activity	S
<b>Output 4: Project Management</b>				
<b>Activity 4.1</b> Establish arrangements for overall global and national project administration and implementation infrastructure including global and national coordination units	March 2013	100%	This activity was completed both at the global and national levels.	S
<b>Activity 4.2</b> Plan and undertake a full project inception meeting to address capacity building related to relevant project methodologies, approaches and general technical guidance as well as project management and administration	March 2013	100%	Activity completed	S
<b>Activity 4.3</b> Establish and operate project budgeting and accounting system	March 2013	100%	Activity completed	S
<b>Activity 4.4</b> Review and refine work plans with national project coordinators and partners in participating countries based on better understanding of local context	Yearly	Ongoing	Original workplans are being internally reviewed by national partners. Amendments to the workplans will be discussed during the 2 <sup>nd</sup> ISC to be held in November 2013.	S
<b>Activity 4.5</b> Establish project International Steering Committee and conduct annual meetings	Yearly	Ongoing	The 1 <sup>st</sup> ISC was carried out in April 2012. The activity is ongoing	S
<b>Activity 4.6</b> Establish project National Steering Committees and conduct regular meetings	Yearly	Ongoing	National Steering Committee meetings have been held in all project countries. The activity is ongoing.	S
<b>Activity 4.7</b> Establish other relevant committees including Site Committees and other committees, working groups identified	November 2013	Ongoing	A site committee comprising the Ministries of Education, Agriculture,	S



Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2013 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
for other project outputs			and NGOs has been established in the project site in <b>Kenya</b> . A site supervisor has been identified and hired.	
<b>Activity 4.8</b> Establish International Technical Advisory Committee to provide backstopping and guidance to technical components and define roles and responsibilities of project international partners	2013-2014	100%	At present the TAC comprises representatives from the International Partners	S
<b>Activity 4.9</b> Finalise and disseminate project Communication Strategy	2013-2014	50%	Ongoing. GPMU has developed the global project website and a variety of tools including flyers, brochures and newsletters as part of the project communication strategy. Country partners are still finalising their national communication tools	S
<b>Activity 4.10</b> Establish overall project Capacity Building Plan, including essential project management process-related training such as developing effective partnerships	2013-2014	50%	Ongoing. Preliminary training needs were identified and addressed at the project's first inception meeting in 2012. Priority training needs in the areas of Markets and Value Chains and Implementation of FAO Biodiversity Indicators have been identified and will be addressed in November 2013. At the national level capacity and training needs to deploy nutritionally relevant local biodiversity will be identified and assessed as part of Activity 3.2.4 of Output 3.2	S
<b>Output 5: Monitoring and Evaluation</b>				
<b>Activity 5.1</b> Finalise and disseminate project Monitoring and Evaluation Framework	March 2013	100%	Country partners have been provided with the Project M&E Plan and relevant timelines	S
<b>Activity 5.2</b> Implement participatory Monitoring and Evaluation plan, tools, and methods with targeted communities, including	2013-2017	0%	As part of Output 1.1 country partners are required to undertake	MS

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2013 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
necessary training			participatory planning and M&E of relevant interventions at pilot sites. Therefore it is suggested that any participatory M&E plans are left to this particular output	
<b>Activity 5.3</b> Establish reporting plan and requirements, templates	March 2013	100%	This activity has been completed and requirements and templates have been shared with all national partners	S
<b>Activity 5.4</b> Submit project and financial reports to GEF	2013-2017	Ongoing	Project and financial reports are being submitted to the donor on a regular basis. The activity is ongoing.	S
<b>Activity 5.5</b> Organise and implement project Mid-Term Evaluation	March 2015	0%	This activity was not planned to be initiated during the reporting period indicated	S
<b>Activity 5.6</b> Organise and implement project Final Evaluation	March 2017	0%	This activity was not planned to be initiated during the reporting period indicated	S

Overall project implementation progress <sup>1</sup>

FY2013 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the rating for this FY and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
MS	While implementation of most activities and outputs is in substantial compliance with the original project workplan there are certain activities that will require urgent attention and necessary remedial action. This has arisen as a consequence of a number of factors including: delays at the national level in setting up the necessary national management arrangements; delays in formally appointing NPCs and changes to NPCs in Kenya and Turkey; delays in finalizing and signing of the grant agreement between FAO and Bioversity; poor understanding by country partners of co-implementing arrangements and the administrative requirements involved in disbursement of funds; some limitations in regards to the implementation of certain outputs e.g. biodiversity indicators. Collectively these issues and factors have contributed to the current rating. Issues with internal project

<sup>1</sup> Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)

	communication and reporting and misunderstandings regarding terminology and meaning in the global workplan and logframe may have also contributed.
--	--

**Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating.**

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<p><b>MS. <u>Activity 1.1.2 through 1.1.7 :</u></b>                      Because of delays in the setting up of national management arrangements and changes to the National Project Coordinator in Turkey, these activities have yet to get underway in specified countries. The GPC is scheduled to visit Turkey in August/September to guide the new NPC in project implementation and will give priority to facilitating implementation of activities assessed as MS or below. Likewise, the GPC will discuss immediately these issues in Sri Lanka</p>	<p>GPC, NPC in Turkey, and Turkey country partners; and NPC and country partners Sri Lanka</p>	<p>September 2013 (Turkey); July 2013 (Sri Lanka)</p>
<p><b>MS. <u>Activities 2.1.1 to 2.1.3:</u></b>                      Because of recent changes in NPC personnel in Turkey and delays in setting up national arrangements in Sri Lanka (and Turkey) these particular activities will be prioritised for action. In addition, the GPC is scheduled to visit Turkey in August/September to guide the new NPC in project implementation</p>	<p>GPC and NPCs in Turkey and Sri Lanka</p>	<p>September 2013</p>
<p><b>MS. <u>Activity 2.3.1 (and other relevant activities in Output 2.3):</u></b>                      Activities and opportunities for marketing and value chains will be explored when country partners come together for a planned training on Markets and Value Chains for NUS</p>	<p>Bioversity NUS Marketing Experts</p>	<p>November 2013</p>
<p><b>MS. <u>Activity 3.1.1</u></b> Encourage countries to assess and finalise a potential list of best</p>	<p>GPC and NPCs</p>	<p>July 2013</p>

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
practices or best bets for interventions to mobilise biodiversity for food and nutrition		
<p><b>MS. Activity 5.2:</b>                      Review the relevance of this activity, and other workplan activities, at the forthcoming ISC meeting in light of current M&amp;E efforts already included in Activity 5.1. There is also an element of participatory M&amp;E included in activities 1.1.8 and 1.1.9. Activity 5.2 would seem to be superfluous to needs</p>	ISC Committee	November 2013

This section should be completed if project **progress** was rated MS, MU, U or HU during the previous Project Implementation Review (PIR) or by the Mid-term Review/Evaluation.

Problem(s) identified in previous PIR	Action(s) taken	By whom	When
NA			

**3.3. Risk**

There are two tables to assess and address risk: the first “risk factor table” to describe and rate risk factors; the second “top risk mitigation plan” should indicate what measures/action will be taken with respect to risks rated **Substantial** or **High** and who is responsible to for it.

RISK FACTOR TABLE										
<p><b>Project Managers</b> will use this table to summarize risks identified in the <b>Project Document</b> and reflect also <b>any new risks</b> identified in the course of project implementation. The <b>Notes</b> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, <b>as relevant</b>. The “Notes” column has one section for the Project Manager (<b>PM</b>) and one for the UNEP Task Manager (<b>TM</b>). If the generic risk factors and indicators in the table are not relevant to the project rows should be added. The <b>UNEP Task Manager</b> should provide ratings in the right hand column reflecting his/her own assessment of project risks.</p>										

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating						
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																	
<b>Project management</b>																	
Management structure	Stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood	Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others	Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems		X						PM/UNEP TM; FAO Generally roles and responsibilities are well understood however some problems have arisen such as the change of appointment in the NPCs in Kenya and Turkey and delays in the appointment of the NPC in Sri Lanka. There may be a requirement to clarify roles and the level of responsibility involved. This also includes additional layer of complexity and challenge for countries and executing agency in dealing with co-implementation arrangements		X				

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating						
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																	
<b>Project management</b>																	
Governance structure	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet periodically and provide effective direction/inputs	Body(ies) meets periodically but guidance/input provided to project is inadequate. TOR unclear	Members lack commitment Committee/body does not fulfil its TOR	X							<b>PM/ UNEP TM, FAO</b> National and international steering committees and site committees have met on a regular basis	X					
Internal communications	Fluid and cordial	Communication process deficient although relationships between team members are good	Lack of adequate communication between team members leading to deterioration of relationships and resentment		X						<b>PM/ UNEP TM, FAO</b> Although relationships between team members are generally good it is clear that the various levels of responsibility on NPCs and other country partners, both project and non-project, can affect internal communications		X				

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating						
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																	
<b>Project management</b>																	
Work flow	Project progressing according to work plan	Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall timetable	Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation		X						<b>PM/ UNEP TM, FAO</b> The rather slow start up especially in Sri Lanka and Turkey has meant that some workplan activities are behind schedule. After one year implementation it is also apparent that revisions and rationalisation to the workplan are required.		X				
Co-financing	Co-financing is secured and payments are received on time	Is secured but payments are slow and bureaucratic	A substantial part of pledged co-financing may not materialize		X						<b>PM/ UNEP TM, FAO</b> No co-financing provided by UNEP for this reporting period		X				
Budget	Activities are progressing within planned budget	Minor budget reallocation needed	Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget		X						<b>PM/ UNEP TM, FAO</b> Minor budget revisions and reallocations will be required		X				
Financial management	Funds are correctly managed and transparently	Financial reporting slow or deficient	Serious financial reporting problems or indication of	X							<b>PM/ UNEP TM, FAO</b> Generally funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for	X					

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																
<b>Project management</b>																
	accounted for		mismanagement of funds													
Reporting	Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues	Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues	Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of project reporting		X											
										<b>PM/ UNEP TM, FAO</b> Country and global reports are generally submitted on time. However the level of details and accurate reporting of progress especially at activity level must be improved						



Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating						
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																	
<b>Project management</b>																	
Stakeholder involvement	Stakeholder analysis done and positive feedback from critical stakeholders and partners	Consultation and participation process seems strong but misses some groups or relevant partners	Symptoms of conflict with critical stakeholders or evidence of apathy and lack of interest from partners or other stakeholders	X							<b>PM/ UNEP TM, FAO</b> Each country has a steering committee and technical committees that provide guidance and enhance collaboration. Various bodies such as agricultural, health and conservation ministries, universities and NGOs are working collaboratively on project activities. Collaborative agreements were appropriate with identified stakeholders have been established	X					
External communications	Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public understand project and are regularly updated on progress	Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is successfully transmitted	Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners or misunderstandings concerning objectives and activities evident	X							<b>PM/ UNEP TM, FAO</b> The GPMU has established a well-received Project Website, supported by other communication tools including flyers and a project newsletter. Country partners are in the process of developing similar communication tools at the national level.	X					

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating						
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																	
<b>Project management</b>																	
Short term/long term balance	Project is addressing short term needs and achieving results with a long term perspective, particularly sustainability and replicability	Project is interested in the short term with little understanding of or interest in the long term	Longer term issues are deliberately ignored or neglected	X							<b>PM/ UNEP TM, FAO</b> The Project is taking into account the need to address short term needs and achieving results with a long term perspective, particularly sustainability, replicability and the potential to out-scale and scale up activities	X					
Science and technological issues	Project based on sound science and well established technologies	Project testing approaches, methods or technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks	Many scientific and /or technological uncertainties	X							<b>PM/ UNEP TM, FAO</b> The Project is largely based on sound scientific and technical approaches which have been validated elsewhere	X					

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																
<b>Project management</b>																
Political influences	Project decisions and choices are not particularly politically driven	Signs that some project decisions are politically motivated	Project is subject to a variety of political influences that may jeopardize project objectives	X						<b>PM/ UNEP TM, FAO</b> Project decisions are based on the agreed project work plan and opportunities for synergy with other initiatives. Staff have been appointed based on agreed terms of reference. Transparency in financial and technical reporting, and country visits by the executing agency show that project decisions are not politically driven.	X					
Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary										NA						

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating						
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	
<b>EXTERNAL RISK</b>																	
<b>Project context</b>																	
Political stability	Political context is stable and safe	Political context is unstable but predictable and not a threat to project implementation	Very disruptive and volatile		X						<b>PM/ UNEP TM, FAO</b> Kenya, Turkey, Brazil have all been scenes of recent political unrest but at this stage does not appear to be a threat to project implementation		X				
Environmental conditions	Project area is not affected by severe weather events or major environmental stress factors	Project area is subject to more or less predictable disasters or changes	Project area has very harsh environmental conditions	X							<b>PM/ UNEP TM, FAO</b> The pilot sites and other areas where the Project is being implemented have not been affected by severe weather events or major environmental stress factors. There have been no serious environmental impacts during the current reporting period.	X					
Social, cultural and economic factors	There are no evident social, cultural and/or economic issues that may affect project	Social or economic issues or changes pose challenges to project implementation	Project is highly sensitive to economic fluctuations, to social issues or cultural barriers	X							<b>PM/ UNEP TM,FAO</b> No social, cultural or economic factors (other than that referred to above under political stability) were encountered during the current reporting period.	X					

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
<b>EXTERNAL RISK</b>																
<b>Project context</b>																
	performance and results	but mitigation strategies have been developed														
Capacity issues	Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners	Weaknesses exist but have been identified and actions is taken to build the necessary capacity	Capacity is very low at all levels and partners require constant support and technical assistance		X						<b>PM/ UNEP TM, FAO</b> Generally, capacity of institutions and project partners to implement project activities and objectives appears to be sound. However, weaknesses do exist and have been identified and action is being taken to build the necessary capacity		X			
Others, please specify										NA						

*If there is a significant (over 50% of risk factors) discrepancy between Project Manager and Task Manager rating, an explanation by the Task Manager should be provided below*

NA

**TOP RISK MITIGATION PLAN**

Rank – importance of risk  
 Risk Statement – potential problem (condition and consequence)  
 Action to take – action planned/taken to handle the risk  
 Who – person(s) responsible for the action  
 Date – date by which action needs to be or was completed

Rank	Risk Statement <sup>2</sup>		Action to Take	Who	Date
	Condition	Consequence			
1	Management structures and roles at the national level. Clear and effective national mechanisms must be finalised, and relevant roles and responsibilities articulated and understood by all. This also includes additional layer of complexity and challenge for countries and executing agency in dealing with co-implementation arrangements	Poor implementation and delivery of project outputs	This is particularly pertinent for Turkey and Sri Lanka. GPC to discuss with NPCs in Turkey and Sri Lanka and in the short-term plan a country mission to Turkey	GPC and NPCs (Turkey and Sri Lanka)	August or September 2013
2.	Project workplan including timing and logic of activities needs to be reviewed, as do indicators at higher level of the project logframe	Poor implementation and delayed deadlines	Revision of project workplan	GPC, NPCs and ISC members	November 2013
3	At present, internal communication between	Poor implementation and delays in outputs and key	Review current communication issues and develop improve internal	GPMU, GPC, NPCs and ISC members	November 2013

<sup>2</sup> Only for Substantial to High risk.

Rank	Risk Statement <sup>2</sup>		Action to Take	Who	Date
	Condition	Consequence			
	the GPMU and national management mechanisms is far from ideal	deliverables	communication approaches, identifying roles and responsibilities at forthcoming ISC meeting		
4.	Poor level of reporting and untimely delivery of reports	Delayed internal clearance within Bioversity and delayed report, and below-par, reports sent to implementing agencies	Include item on forthcoming ISC agenda including sessions on reporting requirements	GPMU, GPC and NPCs	November 2013
5	There appears to be some misunderstanding by countries of the budget arrangements by co-implementing agency and the need to follow two parallel budgetary systems. There are also some inconsistencies within budgets by implementing agency and the respective outputs/components they are responsible for	Poor delivery of activities	Include item budget revisions and review at forthcoming ISC	GPMU, GPC and NPCs, Implementing Agencies	November 2013
6	Inadequate capacity at the national level exists in relation to certain outputs for example the implementation of biodiversity indicators for food consumption and composition	Failure to deliver output in a timely fashion	Identify current capacity/training weaknesses, starting with forthcoming training in Biodiversity Indicators and Markets/Value Chains.	FAO and Bioversity	November 2013

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High)

FY2013 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Medium	There remain a number of important areas of project management and implementation which need urgent attention. It is envisaged that most of these will be adequately addressed in the next few months up to and including remedial action to be taken at the forthcoming ISC meeting in November 2013, when back-to-back training to address inadequate capacity will also be undertaken.
<b>If a risk mitigation plan had been presented for a previous period or as a result of the Mid-Term Review/Evaluation please report on progress or results of its implementation</b>	
NA	



#### 4. RATING MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Based on the answers provided to the questions in 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 below, the **UNEP Task Manager** will provide ratings for the following aspects of project monitoring and evaluation:

- (i) Overall **quality** of the Monitoring & Evaluation plan
- (ii) Performance in the **implementation** of the M&E plan

4.1. Does the project M&E plan contain the following:

- Baseline information for each outcome-level indicator Yes  No **X**
- SMART indicators to track project outcomes Yes **X** No
- A clear distribution of responsibilities for monitoring project progress. Yes **X** No

4.2. Has the project budgeted for the following M&E activities:

- Mid-term review/evaluation Yes **X** No
- Terminal evaluation Yes **X** No
- Any costs associated with collecting and analysing indicators' related information Yes **X** No

Please rate the **quality** of the project M&E plan (use HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU): **S**

4.3 Has the project:

- Utilized the indicators identified in the M&E plan to track progress in meeting the project objectives; Yes **X** No
- Fulfilled the specified reporting requirements (financial, including on co-financing and auditing, and substantive reports) Yes **X** No
- Completed any scheduled MTR or MTE before or at project implementation mid-point; Yes  No **X**
- Applied adaptive management in response to M&E activities Yes **X** No
- Implemented any existing risk mitigation plan (see previous section) Yes  No **X**

Please rate the performance in **implementing** the M&E plan (use HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU): **S**

4.4. Please describe activities for monitoring and evaluation carried out during the reporting period

National teams reported against a comprehensive set of outputs, milestones and indicators in June 2013. National partners also undertook national steering committee meetings as well as national inception meetings in some countries. Kenya undertook extensive field visits to pilot sites for the purpose of baseline surveys and data collection. The NPCs and various country partners also undertook various stakeholder assessments, surveys and visits to field sites. The Global Project Coordinator undertook visits to field sites, stakeholders and country partners in both Kenya and Turkey during the reporting period.

4.5. Provide information on the quality of baseline information and any effects (positive or negative) on the selection of indicators and the design of other project monitoring activities

Quality baseline information is still being collected for certain countries including Sri Lanka and Turkey. In the case of Kenya, extensive baseline data, both quantitative and qualitative, has been collected and is currently being analysed. Extensive baseline information has been collected or planned especially for Component 1 in relation to output 1.1 while specific outputs from other components also include an element of baseline assessment such as the marketing survey which Kenya has recently developed for output 2.3.

4.6. Provide comments on the usefulness and relevance of selected indicators and experiences in the application of the same.

The current indicators provide a useful body of quantitative and qualitative information to measure success in implementing activities in the work plan. To date, there have been no major problems in assessing progress against indicators (or at least those which can be assessed in the expected period). Having said this, it is recommended that participants at the forthcoming ISC in November 2013 take time to review the extensive suite of indicators developed during the PPG phase with a view to rationalising these and reducing to those which are most realistic, achievable and relevant.

4.7. Describe any challenges in obtaining data relevant to the selected indicators; has the project experienced problems to cover costs associated with the tracking of indicators?

See Comments Above. There may be challenges in assessing progress against certain indicators especially at the project objective level. This will require a review of the logframe (and workplan) at the next ISC meeting. To date the project has experienced no major problems to cover costs associated with the tracking of indicators which fall within the current timeframe.

4.8. Describe any changes in the indicators or in the project intervention logic, including an explanation of whether key assumptions are still valid

A review and revision and possible subsequent changes in certain indicators or in the project intervention logic, including key assumptions is required and recommended for the forthcoming ISC project meeting in November when all country partners are together. At this stage, the key assumptions of the project remain valid but this should be reviewed in line with above.

4.9. Describe how potential social or environmental negative effects are monitored

The project has employed participatory and community-based approaches and includes a broad range of stakeholders from local communities to government agencies. These processes provide an effective means to monitor potential social and environmental negative effects arising as a result of the project. To date, no negative social or environmental impacts have been highlighted as a result of the project. The project is also guided by the 'Checklist for Environmental and Social Issues' developed for the project.

4.10. Please provide any other experiences or lessons relevant to the design and implementation of project monitoring and evaluation plans.

At this stage it is too early to comment on this, given the delay in signing of the Agreement between FAO and Bioversity and the fact that Turkey and Sri Lanka have been slow to commence implementation because of delay in setting up national project management structures and identification and appointment of national project coordinators. Given the project partners have now had over one year since the beginning of the project, it is recommended that a major review of the design and implementation of the project is undertaken at the next ISC meeting.

## 5. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS

5.1. Please summarize any experiences and/or lessons related to project design and implementation.

- **Institutional arrangements, including project governance;**

The project logframe and workplan are extensive and the co-implementing arrangements and all this entails in implementation of activities present new challenges for country partners. This is exacerbated when there have been required changes in relation to national project coordinators. In the first year of the project this has occurred twice, in Turkey and Kenya requiring added communication to describe and again clarify the project. Other political processes at the national level also delay the setting up of national project management arrangements. Added to this, is the challenge of trying to ensure the transfer and disbursement of funds from the two separate implementing agencies. Moreover, terminology, methodologies and approaches are often new to many country partners and open to interpretation, especially when there are significant changes in those partners who might not have been involved or consulted at the PPG phase. Given this array of challenges means that the first year of implementation is a period rich in experiences and/or lessons learned related to project design and implementation and that the planned 2<sup>nd</sup> International Steering Committee should be an opportunity for serious reflection on this and an opportunity for tweaking both design and implementation.

- **Capacity building;**

Given the technical complexity and cross-sectoral and multi-disciplinary nature of the work and processes involved in this project (and the above-mentioned terminology, methodologies and approaches are often new to many country partners and open to interpretation) it could be argued that more rigour is needed in relation to identifying who needs training and what is, and how it is, delivered.

- **Factors that encourage replication, including outreach and communications strategies;**

So far some of the communication tools developed for the project – including the BFN website, BFN Portal of Good Practices in Mobilising BFN, BFN Project Newsletter and the just published project book 'Diversifying Food and Diets' – have all been highly commended and well received by both country partners and other non-project parties. This has certainly improved communication and awareness and should in the long-term with other project outputs and results contribute significantly to replication and sustainability.

5.2. *Please highlight a few major achievements resulting so far from the project implementation,*

- **Concrete results, both on-the-ground and normative**

As part of a global baseline assessment of good practices for mobilising biodiversity for food and nutrition the project published in April 2013 the book, *Diversifying Foods and Diets: Using Agricultural Biodiversity to Improve Nutrition and Health* [http://www.b4fn.org/the\\_book.html](http://www.b4fn.org/the_book.html). Together with the accompanying portal describing additional case studies of good practices [http://www.b4fn.org/the\\_map.html](http://www.b4fn.org/the_map.html) a strong foundation has now been established which provides guidelines on best practices for mobilising biodiversity for food and nutrition.

## **Country documents available from the GPMU upon request**

### **Brazil**

- Report of the National Steering Committee Meeting (São Paulo, February 2013)
- List of Brazilian publications that promote the mainstreaming of biodiversity into food and nutrition

### **Kenya**

- Biodiversity baseline questionnaire
- Baseline Survey report
- Community Biocultural Protocol
- List of stakeholders to be involved in the policy and strategy development process
- Proceedings of the National Steering Committee (Nairobi, March 2013)
- Report of the Regional Workshop on the Inter-linkages between biodiversity and human health
- TORs for inter-sectoral working groups

### **Turkey**

- Report of the National Steering Committee Meeting (Antalya, March 2013)