

**UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2015
(1 July 2014 to 30 June 2015)**

1. PROJECT GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Title:	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use for Improved Human Nutrition and Well-being (Biodiversity for Food and Nutrition Project – BFN Project)		
Executing Agency:	Bioversity International (formerly International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI))		
Project partners:	Governments of Brazil, Kenya, Sri Lanka, Turkey. AVRDC, Crops for the Future, Earth Institute at Columbia University, World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), WFP.		
Geographical Scope:	Global/Multi-country		
Participating countries:	Brazil, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Turkey		
GEF project ID:	3808	IMIS number:	UNEP: GFL-2328-2715-4B07 FAO 606659
Focal Area(s):	Biodiversity	GEF OP #:	BD
GEF Strategic Priority/Objective:	BD SO2:SP4; SP5	GEF approval date:	November 2011
UNEP approval date:	November 2011	Date of first disbursement:	18 April 2012
Actual start date:	April 2012	Planned duration:	60 months
Intended completion date*:	October 2016	Actual or Expected completion date:	TBD
Project Type:	FSP	GEF Allocation:	US\$5,517,618
PPG GEF cost:	\$ 260,000	PPG co-financing:	\$ 380,000
Expected MSP/FSP Co-financing*:	\$ 29,552,314.20	Total Cost:	\$35,709,932.20
Mid-term review/eval. (planned date):	Nov/Dec 2015	Terminal Evaluation (actual date):	TBD
Mid-term review/eval. (actual date):	October 2015	No. of revisions:	NA
Date of last Steering Committee meeting:	December 2014	Date of last Revision:	NA
Disbursement as of 30/6/2015*:	UNEP US\$ 1,788,363 FAO US\$ 1,465,827	Date of financial closure:	TBD
Date of Completion:	TBD	Actual expenditures reported as of 30/6/2015:	UNEP US\$ 1,332,973 FAO US\$ 968,837
Total co-financing realized as of 30/6/2015:	US\$ 7,202,235	Actual expenditures entered in IMIS as of 30/6/2015:	UNEP US\$ 290,063
Leveraged financing:	US\$ 173,431		

<p>Project summary</p>	<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>The Development Goal 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 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.</p> <p>The project will address declining diversity by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PROVIDING EVIDENCE - Demonstrating the nutritional value of agricultural biodiversity and the role it plays in promoting healthy diets and strengthening livelihoods. 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. 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. <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"> • Outcome 1: Relevant sectors, including agriculture, environment and public health in the four partner countries adopt and utilise the integrated knowledge base on BFN to build support for biodiversity conservation and enhanced well-being. • Outcome 2: Enhanced policy frameworks and markets support the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use across sectors. • Outcome 3: Tools, knowledge and best practices adopted and scaled up in development programs, value chains and local community initiatives.
-------------------------------	---

<p>Project status FY 2013</p>	<p>In 2013, 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 Committee meetings were held in all countries to review and approve work plan 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 were carried out in Kenya and preliminary planning and logistics for baseline surveys in Sri Lanka and Turkey were made. In Brazil and Kenya preliminary contacts were established with national data holders for setting up national databases on the nutritional properties of local agrobiodiversity and associated traditional knowledge. Awareness-raising activities were carried out mostly at the global level through the setting up of a Global portal www.b4fn.org, the free online publication of the <i>Diversifying Food and Diets</i> and other relevant outreach material.</p>
<p>Project status FY 2014</p>	<p>In 2014, baseline surveys were completed in all countries, which also prioritised target species and undertook some gap analysis for food composition data to drive further nutrition analysis. Brazil also pilot tested the FAO guidelines for the inclusion of biodiversity indicators in national food consumption surveys. Turkey analysed 33 of the 41 target species. Cross-sectoral national policy platforms were established in all countries and the BFN was able to help shape a number of important policy documents on biodiversity and human health that emerged from the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA 18) (23-28 June 2014) that helped define and develop the COP 12 Decision XII/21 in October of the same year. At the national level, countries continued to engage with decision-makers to mainstream biodiversity into the national policy framework. Countries also organized a number of awareness-raising events such as traditional food fairs, and participated in important international events linked to nutrition and food security.</p>
<p>Project status FY 2015</p>	<p>Knowledge base</p> <p>In 2015, countries made significant headway in generating evidence for 93 prioritised species, particularly with regard to undertaking food composition analysis and gap analyses of food composition data. All countries have identified organizations for hosting their national databases on biodiversity for food and nutrition and associated traditional knowledge and all are planning national Biodiversity and Nutrition Symposia to review data collection in the project and to identify and fill gaps in knowledge and evidence. The first of these national symposia was organized in Sri Lanka in December 2014.</p> <p>The BFN project has added to the knowledge and evidence base by contributing to the CBD/WHO led publication 'Connecting Global Priorities: Biodiversity and Human Health' and participated in a series of events and prominent global meetings.</p> <p>FAO assisted the project by providing more complete data on the composition of biodiversity for nutrition by collecting and compiling additional compositional data on pork, cassava, fish and rice to be included into the next edition of the FAO/INFOODS Food Composition Database for Biodiversity to be published in the second half of</p>

	<p>2015. The FAO/INFOODS e-Learning Course on Food Composition Data, which includes a lesson on biodiversity, has been integrated into the teaching of over 20 universities, which will increase the availability and quality of compositional data including on biodiversity.</p> <p><i>Policy and Regulatory Framework</i></p> <p>During the reporting period FAO and Bioversity collaborated on the drafting of the <u>Voluntary Guidelines for Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Policies, Programmes and National and Regional Plans of Action</u>, which was endorsed at the Fifteenth Regular Session of the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture in January 2015. All countries established cross-sectoral national policy working groups, which are revising existing national legislation to identify entry points for the mainstreaming of biodiversity for food and nutrition. Agricultural, nutrition and biodiversity policies are being scrutinised for gaps and opportunities where the BFN initiative can make an impact. Country revisions to the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) in Brazil led to the inclusion of several indicators referring to BFN to monitor the general status of biodiversity conservation. Turkey follows close behind, whereas Kenya is spearheading the drafting of a Biodiversity Conservation Policy for Busia County. A policy proposal was prepared and shared with Bioversity. Funds for this proposal are being sought. In Sri Lanka opportunities are being sought for the mainstreaming of BFN into the new Multi-sectoral Nutrition Action Plan. Sri Lanka has also developed Terms of Reference for a Policy Consultant to review and promote policy recommendations in line with the BFN project outputs. The development of an interactive e-learning course on mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into nutrition practices will continue in 2015 led by Brazil with assistance from the GPMU. With regards to new marketing options for BFN, all countries are striving to link in the future rural entrepreneurs to markets while promoting the sustainable production and consumption of nutrient-rich indigenous crops and fruits to diversify diets.</p> <p><i>Increased awareness and outscaling</i></p> <p>Considerable efforts were devoted to this Component in all countries. National and regional diversity fairs were organized in the second half of 2014 and the beginning of 2015 where local biodiversity and associated traditional knowledge were showcased to the wider public. National conferences were organized around this topic and activities of the BFN initiative highlighted in all occasions. At the global level, milestones include the publication of the <i>State of Knowledge Review on the Interlinkages between Biodiversity and Health</i>, published in June 2015. A video on the Alaçatı Herb Festival was produced and contributions to thematic blogs provided on project achievements and the importance of biodiversity for food and nutrition.</p>
<p>Planned contribution to strategic priorities/targets</p>	<p>The project will contribute to the GEF Biodiversity Strategic Objective 2 (SO2) to mainstream biodiversity in production landscapes/seascapes and sectors and its Strategic Programmes 4 and 5.</p> <p>SP4 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,</p>

	<p>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>SP5 Fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services respectively: The outcomes of the Project will also contribute to 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 project¹

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 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). Describe any significant environmental or other changes (results) attributable to project implementation. Also, please discuss any major challenges to meet the **objectives** or specific project **outcomes** (not more than 300 words)

Considerable progress was made during the reporting period to strengthen the evidence base that will be used to promote the conservation and sustainable use of nutritionally promising species identified by the project. Under **Component 1 - Knowledge base**, countries generated or compiled food composition data for 93 species. Associated traditional knowledge for some of the species was also documented and developed into recipe books and information material for wider distribution. Sri Lanka still faces delays in project implementation, which are hopefully resolved with the appointment of the new NPC in December 2014. The running of a training workshop by FAO in the second half of 2014 to build capacity on food composition and biodiversity indicators has kick-started compositional analysis of priority species and a plan for food composition analysis was drafted and FAO provided comments. Countries have also made headway in negotiating the hosting of national databases on biodiversity for food and nutrition and associated traditional knowledge. The first national Biodiversity and Nutrition Symposium was held in Sri Lanka in December 2014 to communicate project experiences and identify gaps in national and international knowledge and evidence. The meeting's success has prompted other countries to organize similar annual initiatives at the national level. With regard to **Component 2 – Policy and Regulatory Framework**, countries have established cross-sectoral policy platforms and have assessed suitable policy entry points for the development of national strategies promoting the mainstreaming of BFN, chiefly the revision of their National Bioersity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs). In Brazil, following advocacy by the BFN Team, in the draft NBSAPs USD \$60 million were pledged for the protection of BFN and two indicators that explicitly mention BFN were included to monitor and assess the country's biodiversity status and its progress in achieving the National Biodiversity Targets that are closely aligned with the CBD Aichi Targets. Other countries are in the processing or planning phase. Further, the project contributed to the drafting of the *FAO Voluntary Guidelines for mainstreaming biodiversity for nutrition*, which were endorsed at CGRFA-15 in January 2015 and to the drafting of the CBD/WHO led 'Connecting Global Priorities: Biodiversity and Human Health A State of Knowledge Review'. Key messages around mainstreaming BFN are prominent in both publications. Together with the CBD, WHO and other partners, the GPMU will facilitate the mainstreaming of BFN by participating in events leading up to the CBD's SBSTTA 19 (1-7 Nov 2015) and COP13 (November 2016) and other prominent global meetings in 2015/2016. Significant headway was made by all countries in **Component 3 – Raising awareness**. All countries organized seminars, workshops and food fairs to promote BFN although actions have yet to translate into targeted national information events and strategies scheduled to commence in the second half of

¹ Or immediate project objective

2015. The documenting of best practices continues at the country and global level, with Kenya, Turkey and Brazil developing training manuals and guidelines for the collection and sustainable use of targeted biodiversity and documenting recipes and information based on traditional knowledge. The GPMU continues in its efforts to document best practices from around the world and has embarked in the redesign of the project website which will focus more prominently on relevant country successes.

Progress towards the stated GEF Strategic Priorities and Targets if identified in project document ²(not more than 200 words)

During the reporting period, the project contributed to **SP4** through the inclusion of guidelines for the conservation, sustainable use and benefit sharing of agricultural biodiversity in broader policy and regulatory frameworks such as the abovementioned FAO [Voluntary Guidelines for mainstreaming biodiversity for nutrition](#) and the CBD/WHO led '*Connecting Global Priorities: Biodiversity and Human Health A State of Knowledge Review*'. In all countries, efforts to strengthen biodiversity mainstreaming have mainly been channelled through revisions to the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), although efforts are being made to identify other suitable policy entry points. In Brazil, two indicators that explicitly mention BFN were included to monitor and assess country progress in achieving the National Biodiversity Targets that are closely aligned with the CBD Aichi Targets. Additional consultations on other targets are being held in 2015. Furthermore, Brazil's 5th National Report to the CBD explicitly mentions the project's mainstreaming efforts. Ties were strengthened also with several international treaties, (i.e. ITPGRFA and ICN2) with the aim of providing guidelines and recommendations for the mainstreaming of BFN conservation and sustainable use. Considerable steps have been taken in all countries towards the achievement of **SP5** linked to fostering markets for biodiversity goods. Following market surveys in all four countries, nine market outlets selling traditional biodiversity products were opened across Sri Lanka; in Kenya two grants were secured to investigate opportunities for linking smallholders to institutional markets; in Turkey links were established with einkorn wheat producers and with wild edible collectors, and exploratory talks held with the private sector to develop marketing opportunities for these species; in Brazil, efforts are targeting linking producers of socio-biodiversity products (mostly family farmers and extractivist communities living in marginalised areas) with existing policy programmes that tackle food and nutrition security nationwide such as the School Meals Programme (PNAE) and the Food Procurement Programme (PAA).

² Projects that did not include these in original design are encouraged to the extent possible to retrofit specific targets.

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 2015	Progress rating
<p>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 biodiversity for food and nutrition</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>The NBSAP revision process in Brazil has led to the inclusion of BFN status as an indicator of biodiversity loss in the National Biodiversity Targets 2011-2020. Many other efforts and initiatives in Brazil continue which will ultimately result in enhanced mainstreaming including the current development of online modules on BFN targeting CECANES and other actors. In all other countries desk reviews are being carried out to assess suitable policy entry points for the mainstreaming of BFN, including reviewing current NBSAPs.</p> <p>The GPMU contributed to the drafting of the guidelines for mainstreaming biodiversity into Policies, Programmes and National and Regional Plans of Action on Nutrition, which were endorsed by the CGRFA in January 2015.</p>	<p>S</p>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2015	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	In Brazil, 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. Capacity building on best practices for mobilising biodiversity to improve dietary diversity was carried out in Busia among women groups operating under the umbrella of the CBO SINGI.	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2015	Progress rating
	<p>3. By the end of the project, the newly acquired knowledge on the composition and consumption and the awareness campaign on the target species will result in an increased consumption and production</p>	<p>Dietary assessment surveys show limited use of the target species</p> <p>Production/availability data not readily available or show limited use</p>	<p>At least 2 countries have collected and analysed baseline data on the consumption of the target species in the pilot sites</p> <p>Production/availability data are collected in pilot sites</p>	<p>At least 2 countries have demonstrated at their pilot sites an impact of the gained knowledge on the target species resulting in an increase by at least 10% the proportion of households or individuals consuming the target species as a result of project intervention</p> <p>At least 2 countries have demonstrated an increase of 10% in production/availability of the target species in pilot sites</p>	<p>Brazil is monitoring the increased consumption of target species by observing the increase in demand by the School Feeding and School Procurement programs. Additional food consumption surveys were carried out among communities in the Centre-west region.</p> <p>Sri Lanka has collected baseline consumption data for two of the pilot sites, which have since been dropped. Follow up consumption surveys will be carried out in the second half of 2015. Turkey is carrying out a literature review of available consumption data.</p> <p>Turkey analysed the composition of 43 priority foods, Kenya 6, Brazil compiled data for several priority foods, and Sri Lanka to start analysis in 2016.</p>	<p>S</p>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2015	Progress rating
	<p>4. Enhanced awareness and political support translates into increased budgetary support for the conservation and deployment of nutritionally rich biodiversity</p>	<p>At baseline, budgetary allocations for the conservation and deployment of biodiversity for food and nutrition are largely unknown</p>	<p>Baseline information on current resources and budgetary allocations targeting the conservation and deployment of biodiversity for food and nutrition collected</p>	<p>Increased allocation of resources and/or budget towards the conservation and deployment of biodiversity for food and nutrition by the end of the project in at least one country</p>	<p>Political support for the BFN project in the four participating countries is strong. In Brazil, revisions to the NBSAP have led to the inclusion of several indicators referring to BFN to monitor the biodiversity conservation trends. Final approval of indicators for the National Biodiversity Targets 2011-2020 and targets and initiatives for the Federal Government's Multi-year Budget planning for 2016-2019 are expected by the end of 2015. Between 2012 to 2015, more than USD \$60 million were pledged to protect biodiversity for food and nutrition. Awareness of the project in relevant global forums (CBD, CGRFA etc) is also strong and presenting useful opportunities. Awareness of project activities and accomplishments is translating into opportunities to leverage funds for BFN activities both nationally and globally, such as Bioversity support towards the development of a Biodiversity Policy in Busia County.</p>	<p>S</p>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2015	Progress rating
<p>Outcome 1 Relevant sectors, including agriculture, environment and public health in the four partner countries adopt and utilise the integrated knowledge base on BFN to build support for biodiversity conservation and enhanced well-being</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>No integrated knowledge base exists in any of the four countries</p>	<p>At least three local communities, and ten national agencies have contributed to a national integrated knowledge base</p>	<p>At least seven local communities and 20 national agencies have contributed to a national integrated knowledge base</p>	<p>Collaboration with national agencies for data collection is ongoing in all countries. Ninety-four villages in Turkey, 3 communities in Busia, 21 quilombola communities in the Centre-West region of Brazil and communities at the 3 pilot sites in Sri Lanka provided information on the use of local crops in nutrition as well as recipes, some of which were used in cooking demonstrations and food fairs. Information collected is being transformed into booklets, guidelines on best practices and recipe books for dissemination within the communities and to the wider public.</p>	<p>S</p>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2015	Progress rating
	<p>2. 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</p>		<p>At least one intersectoral ministerial meeting highlighting the importance the integrated knowledge base on BFN held in each country</p>	<p>At least one national sectoral plans or strategies highlighting the importance of nutritionally rich biodiversity developed in each country</p>	<p>Relevant stakeholders and actors in all countries have been participating in workshops, meetings and other forums to review information compiled to date. Some of this information is beginning to be used by partners to influence relevant plans and strategies such as NBSAPs. As mentioned above, in Brazil the status of BFN conservation has been included as an indicator of biodiversity health in national revisions to the NBSAP. In Sri Lanka an international conference on BFN was organised in Dec 2014 attended by multi-sectoral stakeholders and a similar conference is being planned in the second half of 2015 in Kenya.</p> <p>At the global level information emerging from the project has fed into a number of important processes, conventions and treaties such as CBD and the CGRFA leading to the endorsement of the <i>Voluntary Guidelines for Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Policies, Programmes and National and Regional Plans of Action</i> at CGRFA15 in January 2015.</p>	<p>S</p>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2015	Progress rating
<p>Outcome 2 Enhanced policy frameworks and markets support the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use across sectors.</p>	<p>1. Policy recommendations developed by the project support cross-sectoral mainstreaming of BFN</p>	<p>No policy recommendations developed</p>	<p>Policy documents with relevant recommendations drafted in each of the countries</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>All countries are currently reviewing existing policy frameworks for suitable entry points for mainstreaming BFN.</p> <p>Along with Brazil, which has a well- established cross-sectoral national policy platform in place, countries made significant progress in identifying key change agents in relevant national institutions and engaging them in the drafting of guidelines for the mainstreaming of agrobiodiversity into relevant national strategies. Kenya is drafting a Biodiversity Policy for Busia County that recognises the importance of BFN. In Turkey and Sri Lanka efforts are being directed towards the revision of the NBSAPs and the Nutrition and Health policies. Considerable progress was also made at the global level in engaging relevant agencies and treaties for the mainstreaming of BFN (see outcome 1.2 above).</p>	<p>S</p>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2015	Progress rating
	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	All countries have identified new markets in the pilot sites. Brazil is providing support and nutritional data generated by the project to the National School Meals Programme and the Food Procurement program to help create markets for target species. Increased procurement of these species is being monitored as an indirect measure of increased supply and raised income for family farmers. In Turkey the private sector is being engaged in the marketing of einkorn wheat and other wild edibles. Sri Lanka has opened nine market outlets for the sale of traditional agrobiodiversity and Kenya recently secured two grants for linking farmers to institutional markets. Project kick-off is scheduled for the 2 nd half of 2015.	S

<p>Outcome 3: Tools, knowledge and best practices adopted and scaled up in development programs, value chains and local community initiatives</p>	<p>1. Increased number and types of relevant programmes mobilizing nutritionally rich biodiversity using best practices developed by the project</p>	<p>No programmes using best practices to deploy nutritionally rich biodiversity at the beginning of the project</p>	<p>At least one initiative promoting the mobilization of nutritionally rich biodiversity using project developed best practices under consideration and review in each country</p>	<p>At least one initiative promoting the mobilization of nutritionally rich biodiversity using best practices developed by the Project underway in each country</p>	<p>Countries and the Global Project Management Unit all developed tools and knowledge and initiatives to mobilize BFN. Highlights in Brazil include contributing to the drafting of the <i>New Nutritional Guidelines</i>, developing an outline for an e-learning course on mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into nutrition practices and capacity building with Quilombola communities in Goias. Brazil and Turkey both published guidelines for the sustainable collection of wild foods. Kenya drafted a training manual on sustainable home-gardening practices, meal planning, food processing and preservation developed by the project, while a 'stories from the field' section in the project website captured the implementation of these tools on the ground. Although Sri Lanka is behind schedule compared to other countries, it opened 9 market outlets for traditional foods and organised a food fair to raise awareness of the importance of BFN. Similar initiatives were successfully organised in other countries. The GPMU contributed to the <i>State of Knowledge Review on the Inter linkages between Biodiversity and Health</i>, showcasing best practices stemming from the project.</p>	<p>MS</p>
--	--	---	--	---	--	------------------

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

FY2015 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and explaining reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods
S	Overall performance at the objective and outcome level is adequate and the majority of countries are making progress in a timely manner. Political changes in Sri Lanka and subsequent adjustments at the head of the national project management unit caused a temporary holdup in the implementation of project activities. Remedial action has been taken through the appointment of a new NPC in December 2014, who is fast tracking activities. There was no change in this rating from the previous reporting period.

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

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
MS: Project Objective Indicator: Component 3.1: “Increased number and types of relevant programmes mobilizing nutritionally rich biodiversity using best practices developed by the project” - The reason for the MS rating of this target at the Outcome level is due to slow action in Sri Lanka in follow up activities at pilot sites. The Project GPC is schedule to visit Sri Lanka at the end of August in order to address this. The changeover in NPC and other political factors have contributed to this but have now been largely addressed.	GPMU and Sri Lanka NPMU	December 2015, to be reported at 4 th ISC

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
N/A			

3.2 Project implementation progress

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
Output 1.1: Assessments of nutritional value of agrobiodiversity and associated traditional knowledge (ATK) of prioritised species is carried out in three ecosystems in, Turkey (3) and Sri Lanka (3) and one ecosystem in Kenya (1) and at national level in Brazil				
Activity 1.1.1 National steering committees to refine and validate criteria and finalise site selection	March 2013	100%	NSCs established in all four countries. Sites and target species	S

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			have been selected in all four countries.	
Activity 1.1.2 Develop working and collaborative arrangements between stakeholders and communities in targeted ecosystems	March 2014 ongoing	100%	Working agreements and collaborative arrangements have been established in all four countries.	S
Activity 1.1.3 Plan and undertake training of appropriate groups in methodology to assess baseline data on local agrobiodiversity and foods (including loss of food options), collection of associated indigenous knowledge, and assess dietary diversity	May 2014	100%	Training of target groups on methodology to assess baseline data on BFN, community health, dietary diversity and ATK was carried out for all countries.	S
Activity 1.1.4 Determine baseline status of community biodiversity for food and nutrition (including loss of food options), dietary diversity and where possible nutritional and health status and other relevant data.	Dec 2015	Brazil – 70%* ³ Kenya – 100% Sri Lanka – 30% Turkey – 100%	Agrobiodiversity surveys were completed in all countries. In Brazil the CECANES of Goias and Ceará are collecting baseline data from local communities as well as national level data on the school purchase of fruit species listed in the “Plants for the Future Initiative”. Turkey has collected all data, which is currently being analysed. Due to budgetary constraints, Kenya will not be carrying out dietary diversity surveys but did an agro-biodiversity study, while in Sri Lanka two of the sites where surveys had been initiated have since been dropped.	S
Activity 1.1.5 Document food-associated indigenous knowledge, including sustainable use practices for agricultural biodiversity	Dec 2015	Brazil – 30%* ⁴ Kenya – 80% Sri Lanka – 10% Turkey – 85%	In <i>Brazil</i> the CECANES of Goias and Ceará are documenting food-associated indigenous knowledge as part of a desk review of earlier projects. In <i>Kenya</i> : Surveys on IK	S

³ Although Brazil is not working at the community level, several activities carried out in collaboration with national partners (CECANES) are contributing to community-level data

⁴ Although Brazil is not working at the community level, several activities carried out in collaboration with national partners (CECANES) are contributing to community-level data

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			<p>were completed and the report is being finalised.</p> <p><i>Turkey:</i> 1778 questionnaires including on IK were collected and data is being analysed.</p> <p>This activity has yet to be carried out in Sri Lanka but partners have been identified and ToRs developed to address this.</p>	
<p>Activity 1.1.6 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>June 2015</p>	<p>Brazil – 30%*5 Kenya - 80 % Sri Lanka – 75% Turkey – 85%</p>	<p><i>Brazil</i> does not have pilot sites, but the CECANE from the Federal University of Goiás is working with Quilombola communities to document the loss of options for food and nutrition security, focusing specifically on evaluating whether the prioritized species are: 1) cultivated/naturally present in the communities; 2) consumed regularly nowadays and why; 3) viewed as a “childhood food” or something that was consumed in the past. The Project is ongoing and results will be part of the Dissertation of one Master Student. Final results are expected by mid-2016 and will be also organized as a “case study”.</p> <p><i>Kenya:</i> Surveys were completed and the report is being finalised.</p> <p><i>Sri Lanka:</i> Baseline surveys have been completed but data are still being analysed. One additional new site still needs to be surveyed.</p>	<p>MS</p>

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			<p><i>Turkey:</i> Surveys were conducted among wild edible collectors, consumers and sellers to gather information on target species, on the degradation of targeted ecosystems and erosion of biodiversity loss. Results are being analysed. Additionally, the project will compare collected data with data being gathered as part of the <i>National Biodiversity Inventory and Monitoring Project</i> to inventory Turkish biodiversity.</p>	
<p>Activity 1.1.7 Prioritize locally important agricultural biodiversity species to be targeted for nutrient compositional analysis (activity linked to the Output 1.2).</p>	<p>Mar 2014</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>All countries have developed a list of priority crops and species. Collectively the project will analyse 154 species. A database listing priority species is available from the GPMU.</p>	<p>S</p>
<p>Activity 1.1.8 Undertake participatory planning with communities for food-based interventions to improve community diets, including prioritization of key nutrient-rich traditional foods (see Output 3.1 key activities)</p>	<p>Mar 2017, ongoing</p>	<p>Brazil – 10% Kenya – 40% Sri Lanka - 25% Turkey – 50%</p>	<p>Collaboration with the CECANE UFG will allow of the documentation of traditional recipes. The NPMU will then suggest the re-inclusion of the most nutrient-dense species in School Feeding Programmes, accompanied by nutrition education interventions targeting students and communities.</p> <p><i>Kenya:</i> The project in Busia has initiated a number of interventions around good practices.</p> <p><i>Sri Lanka:</i> Participatory planning for food-based interventions was initiated in one of the three pilot sites – Gampola - but this activity still requires urgent attention in other pilot sites</p>	<p>S</p>

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			<p><i>Turkey:</i> Participatory activities with local organizations were included and merged with other local initiatives.</p> <p>Timing and implementation of this activity is based on the completion of earlier activities but is generally on track</p>	
<p>Activity 1.1.9 Monitor and assess the impact of the food-based interventions with local communities. Document and publish findings including presenting research findings back to communities.</p>	<p>Mar 2017, ongoing</p>	<p>Turkey 50% Monitoring procedures implemented</p>	<p>Turkey: Studies are ongoing Activity yet to commence</p>	<p>S</p>
<p>Output 1.2: National portal on local foods, containing databases on nutritional properties of agrobiodiversity and associated traditional knowledge (ATK), developed in each country relying on pre-existing infrastructure and linked to relevant national and global nutritional databases</p>				
<p>Activity 1.2.1 Identify key national agrobiodiversity nutritional data holders and develop collaborative agreements between relevant partners for information access, sharing and exchange</p>	<p>June 2015</p>	<p>Brazil – 100% Kenya – 90% Sri Lanka – 100% Turkey – 100%</p>	<p>In Brazil, Sri Lanka and Turkey: data holders have been identified and platforms are being assessed for hosting of the nutritional data generated by the project. In Brazil, an agreement was signed with the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation for the inclusion of the BFN Nutritional Database within the Information System on Brazilian Biodiversity⁶ (SiBBr). The alpha version of the database will be ready for testing in July 2015 whereas the final version is expected for February 2016.</p> <p>In Kenya data-sharing mechanisms and collaborative agreements are well embedded in the national food composition project and data will be included in the National Food Composition tables. For other data, sharing agreements will be finalised</p>	<p>S</p>

⁶ <http://www.sibbr.gov.br/>

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			in the second half of 2015 once the host organization has been identified. In Sri Lanka and Turkey, data holders have been identified and collaborative partnerships established.	
<p>Activity 1.2.2 Review existing relevant food and nutritional data at the national level and information management tools and approaches employed</p>	June 2015	Brazil – 80% Kenya – 100% Sri Lanka 20% (ongoing) Turkey - 100% (ongoing)	<p><i>Brazil:</i> agreements with four CECANES were signed and researchers are compiling existing nutritional data for the prioritized species, using the FAO-INFOODS compilation methodology. Most of the nutritional data for the target species was delivered in May 2015. Missing data to be analysed.</p> <p><i>Kenya:</i> Nutritional data of target species analysed and to be included in the National Food Composition database.v</p> <p><i>Sri Lanka:</i> TORs are being developed for a consultant to be hired to undertake this review.</p> <p><i>Turkey:</i> Nutritional data of target species analysed.</p>	S
<p>Activity 1.2.3 Strengthen infrastructure and capacity for developing a national portal and database/information system on nutritional properties of agrobiodiversity according to international standards (INFOODS-FAO)</p>	Dec 2015	Brazil – 20% Turkey – 75% Activity yet to commence in other countries.	<p><i>Brazil:</i> An agreement was signed with the Ministry of Science, Technology and innovation for the hosting of the BFN Nutritional Database in the Information System on Brazilian Biodiversity (SiBBR). The alpha version will be available for testing in July 2015 (expected). See activities 1.1.3 and 1.2.2.</p> <p><i>Turkey:</i> A consultant was recruited to develop a national information</p>	MS

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			<p>system. Activities have begun and will be completed in 2015.</p> <p><i>Sri Lanka</i> are exploring options to develop infrastructure within the PGRC</p>	
<p>Activity 1.2.4 Identify training needs and undertake relevant training</p>	<p>June 2015</p>	<p>Brazil – 100% Sri Lanka – 80% Turkey – 100%</p> <p>Activity yet to be carried out in Kenya</p>	<p><i>Brazil:</i> The portal is being developed with SiBBR and no training is required.</p> <p><i>Kenya:</i> No training will be required as the data will feed into the Food Composition database.</p> <p><i>Sri Lanka:</i> National capacity exists to manage quality food composition data and training on data compilation was carried out in Dec 2014.</p> <p><i>Turkey:</i> Training needs were determined and activities planned. To strengthen capacity for developing a national food database, the project's nutrition expert will be attending <u>FoodComp 2015</u> a two-week training on managing quality food composition data.</p>	<p>MS</p>
<p>Activity 1.2.5 Design appropriate database for associated indigenous knowledge of local foods and sustainable use practices for agricultural biodiversity</p>	<p>Mar 2016, Ongoing</p>	<p>Brazil – 40% Turkey – 50%</p> <p>Activity yet to commence in other countries.</p>	<p><i>Brazil:</i> information is being collected by the Federal University of Goias with quilombola communities and by the Federal University of Ceara with a local community in the Northeast. The data being collected includes information on whether and how the prioritized species are consumed and also traditional culinary recipes. The nutritional database will include the data collected, on a section</p>	<p>S</p>

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			<p>designed specifically for the inclusion of recipes. This section will also allow the inclusion of other traditional and new recipes with foods from Brazilian biodiversity.</p> <p><i>Turkey:</i> Surveys were conducted among wild edible collectors, consumers and sellers to gather information on indigenous knowledge surrounding the collection and preparation of local foods. The information was used to develop a series of brochures that have been included the national databases (not yet accessible to the public). Information includes a short description of the prioritized species, traditional use of local foods and recipes. A book collecting this information is being drafted. Survey questionnaires are still being analysed and results will be published and loaded into the database.</p>	
<p>Activity 1.2.6 Update content with existing national data and update regularly with data emerging from project</p>	<p>Mar 2017, Ongoing</p>	<p>Brazil – 40%</p> <p>Activity yet to commence in other countries.</p>	<p><i>Brazil:</i> See activity1.2.3</p>	<p>S</p>
<p>Activity 1.2.7 Ensure national databases and information systems are linked to key global nutritional databases and information systems</p>	<p>Mar 2017</p>	<p>Activity yet to commence</p>	<p>This activity will take place when nutrition data are available.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Output 1.3. The contribution of information generated by the project contributes to global knowledge generation and is reflected in an increase of the Nutritional Indicators for Biodiversity on food composition and consumption</p>				
<p>Activity 1.3.1 Provide training on collecting data for Biodiversity Indicators for Food Composition and Consumption</p>	<p>June 2015</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>Global training to countries was provided by FAO in November 2013. National training was</p>	<p>S</p>

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			provided by FAO in 2012 to Brazil and in 2014 to Turkey and Sri Lanka.	
Activity 1.3.2 Determine in each country baseline data for Nutrition Indicator for Biodiversity on food composition and consumption, in collaboration with national coordinator of INFOODS-FAO	June 2015	Brazil – 80% Kenya – 25% Sri Lanka – 80% Turkey – 90%	Data are being collected and compiled and countries will submitted their data to FAO in December 2015	MS
Activity 1.3.3 Identify food consumption surveys and methods used or to be used in each country	Dec 2014	Brazil – 100% Kenya – 25% Sri Lanka - 100% Turkey – 100%	Brazil: Surveys methodologies were identified. Kenya: A team was set up and is identifying tools for the consumption survey which will be carried out in the second half of 2015. Sri Lanka: Survey methodologies were identified and used for data collection. Turkey: Survey methodologies were identified and used for data collection.	S
Activity 1.3.4 Adapt Dietary Diversity methodology and/or other methods aimed collecting intake data on consumption of foods from agrobiodiversity	Dec 2015	Brazil – 100% Sri Lanka - 70% Turkey – 100%	Brazil: A project to pilot test FAO’s guidelines for the inclusion of food biodiversity indicators in food consumption surveys was completed. Results will be published as a scientific paper. Kenya: Due to budget constraints, Kenya will not be undertaking this activity. Sri Lanka: Ongoing. Turkey: Methodologies for collecting food consumption data were adapted and surveys completed. Data is being analysed	S

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			and will be available in the second half of 2015.	
<p>Activity 1.3.5 Evaluate trend of the Nutrition Indicator for Biodiversity on food consumption and composition between the beginning and the end of the project.</p>	<p>Mar 2017, ongoing</p>	<p>Sri Lanka - 50% Turkey – 50%</p>	<p><i>Brazil:</i> Food composition data is being collected in partnership with CECANEs. The NPMU will also identify food consumption surveys and send to FAO.</p> <p><i>Sri Lanka:</i> A FAO training will be delivered in September on the biodiversity indicators. It is expected that national baseline data on nutrition indicators will be collected in preparation for this activity.</p> <p><i>Turkey:</i> Work has started on the assessment of indicators of food composition and consumption and will continue till project completion.</p>	<p>S</p>
<p>Output 2.1: Cross-sectoral national policy platforms for mainstreaming agricultural biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into nutrition, health and education programmes established</p>				
<p>Activity 2.1.1 Develop terms of reference (TORs) for cross-sectoral national working group with core mandate for development of policies and strategies</p>	<p>July 2014</p>	<p>Brazil – 100% Kenya – 100% Sri Lanka - 100% Turkey – 100%</p>	<p>BFN Brazil is firmly embedded in three cross-sectoral national working groups: the Government Action Plan for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity, Brazil's multi-year budget planning, and the National Plan of Organic Production and Agroecology. Collaboration was strengthened with the National Council for Food Security (CONSEA) and the Interministerial Food Security Chamber (CAISAN).</p> <p><i>Kenya:</i> stakeholders of the cross-sectoral policy platform were identified and agreements developed.</p>	<p>S</p>

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			<p><i>Sri Lanka:</i> stakeholders of the cross-sectoral policy platform were identified and agreements developed.</p> <p><i>Turkey:</i> Stakeholders were identified and TORs developed.</p>	
<p>Activity 2.1.2 Establish and collaborate with cross-sectoral national working group and identify individuals to spearhead policy development and implementation</p>	<p>July 2014</p>	<p>Brazil – 100% Kenya – 100% Sri Lanka - 100% Turkey – 100%</p>	<p>Brazil: same as 2.1.1. Furthermore, the NSC in Brazil includes representatives from five other federal government initiatives (PAA, PNAE, PNAN, PNPSB and Pró-Orgânico.</p> <p><i>Kenya:</i> Individuals were identified to spearhead the revision of the NBSAP as well as the drafting of a Biodiversity Policy for Busia County that recognizes the importance of BFN. Cross-sectoral collaboration is ongoing.</p> <p><i>Sri Lanka:</i> TORs were developed for a policy consultant to review the National Nutrition Policy and the NBSAP and prepare guidelines for its revision.</p> <p><i>Turkey:</i> Individuals were identified to spearhead this activity. Cross-sectoral collaboration is ongoing to review a number of important policies where BFN can be mainstreamed.</p>	<p>S</p>

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
<p>Activity 2.1.3 Design action plan to build capacity and awareness of policy options and mainstreaming tools and disseminate relevant information widely</p>	<p>Dec 2016</p>	<p>Brazil – 100% Kenya – 25% Turkey – 50% (Ongoing)</p>	<p>Brazil: same as 2.1.2, but the nature of the project design in Brazil integrates ongoing federal public policies that already present some options for biodiversity mainstreaming into nutrition, health and education programmes. Also the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), including the Action Plan for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity, will serve as an umbrella for biodiversity mainstreaming and information dissemination. The NPMU strengthened partnership with CONSEA/CAISAN to mainstream BFN in different sectors related to Food and Nutrition Security policies.</p> <p><i>Kenya:</i> This activity is planned for the second half of 2015.</p> <p><i>Sri Lanka:</i> This activity was postponed due to the late start in project activities.</p> <p><i>Turkey:</i> Awareness-raising activities on mainstreaming BFN are being carried out at the national policy level, mainly in regards to the updating of the NBSAP.</p>	<p>S</p>
<p>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</p>				
<p>Activity 2.2.1 Undertake review of national policies and strategies, identifying barriers, gaps and opportunities</p>	<p>Dec 2015</p>	<p>Brazil – 100% Kenya – 100% Sri Lanka - 20% Turkey – 80%</p>	<p>Revision of the NBSAPs and other relevant policies is being undertaken in Brazil and Kenya.</p> <p><i>Kenya:</i> a review of national policies and strategies, barriers and gaps</p>	<p>S</p>

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
		(ongoing)	<p>was completed. The review has informed the next phase of policy consultations in Busia county to initiate the drafting of a biodiversity policy.</p> <p><i>Sri Lanka:</i> A consultant was hired at the end of 2014 to undertake activities falling under 2.2.1 and 2.2.2</p> <p><i>Turkey:</i> National policies and strategies are being reviewed and barriers and opportunities for mainstreaming were identified.</p>	
<p>Activity 2.2.2 Draft guidelines and recommendations to promote the mainstreaming of biodiversity for food and nutrition and publish a policy brief</p>	Dec 2016	Brazil -50% Kenya – 50%	<p><i>Brazil:</i> In 2014 and 2015, a consultant worked closely with partner initiatives PNAE and PNAN for the inclusion of BFN in projects and activities and reviewed the legal policy instruments related to Nutrition, Health, and Education (PAA, PNAE and PNAN), identifying gaps and opportunities to mainstream BFN in each of them. The FAO Guidelines for Mainstreaming BFN were widely distributed, translated into Portuguese and used in contributions to action plans.</p> <p><i>Kenya:</i> The drafting of a policy and of policy briefs are planned for the second half of 2015.</p> <p>No action was foreseen under this activity for the current reporting period.</p>	S
<p>Activity 2.2.3 Identify key ‘change agents’, potential champions and supporters of relevant policy reform</p>	Dec 2016	Brazil: 60% Kenya – 50%	<p><i>Brazil:</i> Same as 2.2.2. The projects “Health in School” (PSE),</p>	S

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			<p>“Educating with School Gardens and Gastronomy” (PEHEG) and the National Council on Food and Nutrition Security (CONSEA) were identified as entry points for BFN and the NPMU is working closely with them.</p> <p><i>Kenya:</i> The NPMU identified biodiversity champions within Busia county (Ministers of agriculture and health) and engaged them in fast-tracking the drafting and approval of the biodiversity policy process, as well as taking the lead in this process.</p>	
<p>Activity 2.2.4 Host Policy Learning Events to disseminate best practices, current thinking and to share lessons of experiences</p>	<p>Dec 2016</p>	<p>Brazil: 30%</p> <p>Activity yet to commence</p>	<p><i>Brazil:</i> Workshops were organized engaging FNDE (PNAE) technical personnel, nutritionists working with school meals and those responsible for revising capacity building material for the PEHEG (School Gardens) and PSE (Health in School Program).</p> <p>No action was foreseen under this activity for the current reporting period.</p>	<p>S</p>
<p>Activity 2.2.5 Develop implementation strategy and priority actions for international policies and strategies that promote the mainstreaming of local biodiversity into health, nutrition and agricultural programmes</p>	<p>Mar 2017</p>	<p>25%</p>	<p>Significant progress was made during the current reporting period in engaging international agencies and treaties to jointly promote BFN in relevant sectoral programmes and strategies.</p>	<p>S</p>
<p>Output 2.3: New marketing options for target species with high nutritional value identified and developed</p>				

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
<p>Activity 2.3.1 Undertake rapid appraisal to identify and assess markets or market niches and opportunities, including barriers and opportunities in project targeted ecosystems</p>	<p>June 2015</p>	<p>Brazil – 50% Kenya – 60% Sri Lanka – 10% Turkey – 90%</p>	<p><i>Brazil:</i> 11 food species from socio-biodiversity were included in PGPM-Bio for the 2014/2015 season. Price assessments for 10 more food value chains are being conducted.</p> <p><i>Kenya:</i> Market surveys were carried out and a report finalized. Opportunities for the marketing of indigenous foods were identified and gross margins in the production of various vegetables calculated in collaboration with farmer groups.</p> <p><i>Sri Lanka:</i> Preliminary activities focusing on markets were initiated.</p> <p><i>Turkey:</i> Market surveys were completed but data is still being analysed and a report finalised in the second half of 2015.</p>	<p>MS</p>
<p>Activity 2.3.2 Identify key actors and steps and formulate a vision and upgrading strategy for value chain or market development</p>	<p>June 2015</p>	<p>Brazil – 70% Kenya – 40% Turkey – 60% Sri Lanka – 20%</p>	<p><i>Brazil:</i> PNPSB is the national partner in Brazil implementing capacity building activities with 10 Local Production Systems (APLs) for value chain improvement. A list of sociobiodiversity food products is being drafted for the development of an inter-ministerial ordinance.</p> <p><i>Kenya:</i> Key actors were identified. A vision and upgrading strategy will be developed in the second half of 2015. Two grants were secured to further link smallholders to markets.</p> <p><i>Sri Lanka:</i> Nine market outlets for traditional agrobiodiversity were opened across the country.</p> <p><i>Turkey:</i> Key actors were identified and steps taken to link small-scale</p>	<p>MS</p>

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			producers and wild herb collectors to markets. Links were established with the private sector for the marketing of wild herbs.	
Activity 2.3.3 Develop guidelines/management plans for the sustainable production and use of wild and cultivated resources	Mar 2016	Brazil – 30% Turkey – 30% Activity yet to commence	<i>Brazil:</i> Booklets with best practices for the management of organic wild species were published by the partner Ministry of Agriculture in 2015. <i>Turkey:</i> Guidelines for the sustainable harvesting of wild herbs was produced.	S
Activity 2.3.4 Develop marketing and promotion strategies including food, diversity and trade fairs (see output 3.4)	Mar 2017, ongoing	Brazil – 60% Kenya – 25% Sri Lanka – 25% Turkey – 50%	<i>Brazil:</i> A number of food fairs on BFN were carried out in the reporting period. <i>Sri Lanka:</i> Nine new market outlets were opened across the country for the sale of traditional rice varieties and targeted agrobiodiversity and a Traditional Food Fair organised in December 2015, <i>Turkey:</i> The 2 nd edition of the Alaçatı Herb Festival was organised in March 2015 along with the hosting of a workshop on BFN.	S
Output 3.1: Best practices for mobilizing biodiversity for food and nutrition to improve dietary diversity identified and promoted				
Activity 3.1.1 Identify best practices for mobilizing and delivering biodiversity to improve dietary diversity and establish portal platform to document case studies covering GEF project experiences and other non-GEF examples	Ongoing	Global –50% Brazil – 40% Kenya – 90% Turkey – 50%	This is largely a globally-led activity identifying and documenting case studies and best practices from country partners and beyond on a platform hosted by the BFN project website. A research fellow was hired by the GPMU to develop the platform further.	S

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			<p><i>Brazil:</i> Booklets with best practices for the management of organic wild species were published by the partner Ministry of Agriculture in 2015. Links were strengthened with partner initiatives to develop strategies for the promotion of foods from Brazilian biodiversity in school meals and education programs, including educational materials and recipe books.</p> <p><i>Kenya:</i> Best practices were identified and are being used in efforts to promote BFN in various communities in Busia. Relevant dissemination materials are being developed in collaboration with national stakeholders.</p> <p><i>Sri Lanka:</i> This activity was postponed due to the late start in project activities.</p> <p><i>Turkey:</i> Regional coordinators are developing case studies documenting best practices, while an expert has begun developing a dedicated web page to showcase most relevant examples. The national portal is scheduled for completion in the second half of 2015.</p>	
<p>Activity 3.1.2 Global publication reviewing current best practices for mobilizing biodiversity to improve dietary diversity at outset of the project</p>	<p>Mar 2013</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>The <i>Diversifying Food and Diets</i> book was published, with the support of A4NH. Since 2014 the publication is now available open-access on the BFN and Bioversity websites and remains one of the most downloaded Bioversity publications.</p>	<p>S</p>

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
<p>Activity 3.1.3 Develop and disseminate information/materials and methodologies for implementing best practices in selected project pilot sites</p>	<p>Dec 2015</p>	<p>Brazil: 50% Kenya: 40% Turkey – 50% (ongoing)</p>	<p><i>Brazil:</i> Development and dissemination of information material continues and includes i) iii) two chapters on biodiversity and sustainable diets; iv) lectures, interviews, publications and booklets describing best practices for the management of organic, wild species.</p> <p><i>Kenya:</i> Draft leaflets and promotional materials are being routinely used in training activities in field days and open days in schools and farmer group field days, workshops and at major information events.</p> <p><i>Sri Lanka:</i> This activity was postponed due to the late start in project activities.</p> <p><i>Turkey:</i> Materials and information were developed and disseminated during the different events organised by BFN Turkey such as Alaçatı Herb Festival and Urla Artichoke Festival.</p>	<p>S</p>
<p>Activity 3.1.4 Organize participatory workshops with key stakeholders in selected sites and nationally to review and refine best practices</p>	<p>June 2015</p>	<p>Brazil: 80% Kenya – 80% Sri Lanka - 80% Turkey – 40% (ongoing)</p>	<p><i>Brazil:</i> Workshops organized with technical personnel linked to federal public policies partners of the BFN Project in Brazil (PNAE – FNDE and PNAN – “Health in school” program).</p> <p><i>Kenya:</i> Participatory workshops were organised with producers at the pilot sites to promote sustainable production methods for BFN.</p>	<p>MS</p>

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			<p><i>Sri Lanka:</i> Participatory workshops held with key stakeholders at the pilot sites to document and revise best practices.</p> <p><i>Turkey:</i> Meetings were held with local organizations at the three pilot sites to organize participatory workshops.</p>	
<p>Activity 3.1.5 Undertake training on best practices</p>	<p>Dec 2015</p>	<p>Brazil – 40% Turkey – 30% Kenya – 50%</p> <p>(ongoing)</p>	<p><i>Brazil:</i> To promote BFN at the national level, Brazil is developing an online course on mainstreaming biodiversity into nutrition practices and public policies in collaboration with the GPMU.</p> <p><i>Kenya:</i> A training of trainers on best practices was held in December 2014 and a draft Manual developed for further training and implementation of sustainable production methods for BFN.</p> <p><i>Sri Lanka:</i> This activity was postponed due to the late start in project activities.</p> <p><i>Turkey:</i> Preliminary training of producers on sustainable collection of wild edibles was carried out at the pilot sites following the market surveys. Additional training is planned for the second half of 2015.</p>	<p>S</p>
<p>Activity 3.1.6 Plan and implement best practices in selected sites</p>	<p>Mar 2017</p>	<p>Activity yet to commence</p>	<p>No actions were planned under this activity in the current reporting period.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Activity 3.1.7 Develop a training module on best practices for mobilizing biodiversity to improve dietary diversity which can</p>	<p>Mar 2016</p>	<p>Brazil - 40% Kenya – 50% Turkey – 10%</p>	<p><i>Brazil:</i> An advanced draft outline of the online training module on mainstreaming biodiversity into</p>	<p>S</p>

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
<p>be adapted for use in nutrition and health programs in the four project countries and more widely</p>		<p>(ongoing)</p>	<p>nutrition practices and health programs was prepared by the NPC in collaboration with an intern recruited by the GPMU. The outline is being circulated among key national stakeholder for comments. Consultants will be hired in Brazil to develop the content in the latter half of 2015.</p> <p>Kenya: A draft manual on best practices for sustainable, nutrition-sensitive agriculture was developed by NPMU and tested at the pilot site.</p> <p>Turkey: The activity was discussed during the NSC meeting and future activities planned.</p>	
<p>Output 3.2: Capacity of beneficiaries and stakeholders to deploy and benefit from biodiversity for food and nutrition enhanced</p>				
<p>Activity 3.2.1 Establish key competencies required among relevant stakeholder groups</p>	<p>Sept 2015</p>	<p>Brazil – 50% Kenya – 60% Sri Lanka – 20% Turkey – 100%</p>	<p><i>Brazil:</i> A consultant is working closely with partner initiatives and has identified key programs, projects and existing national capacity among stakeholders. The main programs identified were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. "Health in School" under PNAN (National Nutrition Policy) – the NPMU worked with PNAN and Nucane (School Feeding Centre at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro) to include BFN on videos and booklets to be integrated in the school curriculum and training of Professors in public schools. The materials are being finalized and will be available in 2016 	<p>MS</p>

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			<p>ii. "Educating with School Gardens" under PNAE (National School Feeding Programme) – This program is implemented by the University of Brasilia (specifically the "Tourism Excellence Centre" - Cet) in several municipalities and provides training and technical guidance for the creation of school gardens. The NPMU organized 2 workshops about BFN for CET staff responsible for the program and will provide seeds and seedlings of non-conventional vegetables and native fruits. However, activities were delayed due to budgetary cuts from PNAE.</p> <p>One of the products expected from the Consultant was a review of the competencies required among the different partner Ministries, taking in consideration the different programs and projects being implemented or planned. This product will probably be delivered in 2016.</p> <p><i>Kenya:</i> Two grants were secured to carry out a scoping study for linking smallholders to markets. An inception workshop will be carried out in the second half of 2015 to identify capacity and lack thereof among key stakeholders at project sites.</p> <p><i>Sri Lanka:</i> Some workshops on nutrition, healthy recipes, food safety and business skills were delivered to the women groups in</p>	

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			<p>charge of the new market outlets for BFN.</p> <p><i>Turkey:</i> Key competencies were established among relevant stakeholders (Ministries, Institutions, NGOs, etc.) and responsibilities for project activities officially assigned. Assignments are extended depending on project requirements.</p>	
<p>Activity 3.2.2 Assess training needs required</p>	<p>Sept 2015</p>	<p>Brazil: 50% Kenya – 0% Sri Lanka: 50% Turkey – 100%</p>	<p>Brazil: Training needs were assessed and an outline developed for the online course on BFN.</p> <p><i>Kenya:</i> This activity will be implemented during the second half of 2015. Two grants were secured to develop this activity.</p> <p>Sri Lanka: Training needs were assessed and a training carried out for producers and sellers for the traditional food outlets.</p> <p><i>Turkey:</i> Training needs were assessed and training delivered to collectors and consumers on the sustainable harvesting of wild edibles.</p>	<p>MS</p>
<p>Activity 3.2.3 Develop capacity building plan including action plan to implement training</p>	<p>Mar 2016</p>	<p>Brazil – 25% (ongoing) Activity yet to commence in other countries</p>	<p><i>Brazil:</i> This activity falls within the scope of the online course on mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into nutrition practices</p>	<p>MS</p>
<p>Activity 3.2.4 Strengthen partnerships and collaborations and encourage south-to-south exchanges among GEF partner countries to share information and expertise</p>	<p>Mar 2017, ongoing</p>	<p>Brazil – 10% Kenya – 50% Turkey – 20%</p>	<p><i>Brazil:</i> No actions were planned under this activity in the current reporting period.</p>	<p>S</p>

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
		(ongoing) Activity yet to commence in other countries	<p><i>Kenya:</i> Kenya and Turkey collaborated in the nutritional analysis of Bambara groundnut and finger millet samples from Busia. The NPC also visited the Food Composition Lab in Bursa.</p> <p><i>Sri Lanka:</i> In December 2014 the International Symposium on BFN allowed cross-country exchange of information and experiences.</p> <p><i>Turkey:</i> Consultations are in progress. An international congress is being planned for the second half of 2016 on Biodiversity and wild edibles.</p>	
Output 3.3: Information events that foster greater appreciation of biodiversity for food and nutrition as a resource for development and wellbeing conducted				
Activity 3.3.1 Develop terms of reference for national information events	Jan 2015, ongoing	Brazil – 50% Kenya – 50% Turkey – 40% Sri Lanka – 50%	<p>Information events that foster greater appreciation of BFN are being conducted in all countries (see narrative in 3.3), but organization is rather ad hoc or piggy-backing on existing events. Although all countries report taking steps towards the organization of national information events, this activity was flagged below as risky and one to possibly undergo revision during the next ISC in November 2015.</p> <p><i>Kenya:</i> This activity will be implemented during the second half of 2015 with the organization of a BFN conference.</p> <p><i>Sri Lanka:</i> A conference on BFN was conducted in December 2014.</p>	MS

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			<i>Turkey:</i> Consultations are in progress to deliver on this activity. A BFN conference is planned for 2016.	
Activity 3.3.2 Identify national information events taskforce	Jan 2015, ongoing	Brazil – 25% Turkey – 40% (ongoing)	<i>Brazil:</i> Collaboration is being strengthened with the National Council for Food Security (CONSEA) to deliver outputs for this activity. <i>Turkey:</i> Consultations are in progress to deliver on this activity. Yet to commence in other countries.	MS
Activity 3.3.3 Develop national information events strategies and action plans	July 2015	Turkey – 40% Activity yet to commence	<i>Brazil:</i> Collaboration is being strengthened with CONSEA to deliver outputs for this activity. <i>Turkey:</i> Consultations are in progress to deliver on this activity. Yet to commence in other countries	MU
Activity 3.3.4 Implement selected national information events	Mar 2017	Turkey – 40% Activity yet to commence	<i>Turkey:</i> Consultations are in progress to deliver on this activity. No action was foreseen under this activity for the current reporting period.	S
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				
Activity 3.4.1 Prepare guidelines for improved use; processing; food safety; packaging; quality control; marketing, certification (fair-trade, eco-labelling), promotion	Mar 2016	Brazil – 20% Turkey – 40%	<i>Brazil:</i> Information booklets on food plants from the Cerrado and the Amazon were prepared for <i>Organic Food Week</i> . <i>Turkey:</i> Guidelines for the foraging and collecting wild edibles were published and distributed.	MS

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
<p>Activity 3.4.2 Publish books based on traditional recipes for nutritionally rich foods from local biodiversity and recipes adapted to modern lifestyles</p>	<p>Mar 2017</p>	<p>Brazil – 80% Turkey – 50% (ongoing)</p>	<p><i>Brazil:</i> This activity was partially implemented in conjunction with the Food Procurement Programme and the National School Meals Programme.</p> <p><i>Turkey:</i> The drafting of a book documenting traditional recipes has commenced.</p>	<p>S</p>
<p>Activity 3.4.3 Global publication on the improved use of selected nutritionally-rich food from local biodiversity</p>	<p>Mar 2017</p>	<p>Activity yet to commence</p>	<p><i>Brazil:</i> This activity was partially implemented in conjunction with the Food Procurement Programme and the National School Meals Programme.</p>	<p>S</p>
<p>Output 3.5: Tools and methods for mainstreaming biodiversity into food and nutrition strategies upscaled and disseminated</p>				
<p>Activity 3.5.1 Review current status of mainstreaming biodiversity instruments, tools and approaches by sector and cross-sectorally with emphasis on mainstreaming into food and nutrition activities</p>	<p>July 2015</p>	<p>Global – 100% Brazil – 100% Kenya – 30% Sri Lanka – 30% Turkey – 100% (ongoing)</p>	<p>The <i>Voluntary Guidelines for Mainstreaming Biodiversity</i>, developed by FAO in collaboration with Bioversity, are being disseminated in several project countries and integrated into national policy recommendations</p> <p>Brazil is well advanced in the implementation of this activity and tools and methods for mainstreaming BFN into 3 public policies related to Nutrition, Education and Health were identified.</p> <p><i>Kenya:</i> a team was set up to review the current status of mainstreaming BFN by sector.</p> <p><i>Sri Lanka:</i> The Ministry of the Environment has started revising the NBSAP.</p>	<p>MS</p>

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			<i>Turkey:</i> A review of mainstreaming approaches and tools was completed.	
Activity 3.5.2 Inventory relevant instruments, tools and methods	July 2015, ongoing	Brazil – 100% Kenya – 10% Sri Lanka – 10% Turkey – 75%	<p>Brazil: In 2014, the NPMU participated in the development of the National Plan for Agroecology and Organic Production (PLANAPO) and contributed with technical inputs and institutional support to promote and strengthen sociobiodiversity within PLANAPO, both through the National Agroecology and Organic Production Committee (CNAPO) and the Interministerial Chamber of Agroecology and Organic Production (CIAPO). Following a request by CIAPO, MMA/BFN assessed existing overlaps between the PLANAPO and the National Plan for the Promotion of Sociobiodiversity Products Chains (PNPSB).</p> <p>The consultant working with public policies delivered an assessment of the current status of mainstreaming BFN into public policies related to Nutrition, Health and Education (PAA, PNAE and PNAN). The legal instruments related to Food Security and to each initiative were reviewed and the gaps and possibilities to mainstream BFN were identified. The NPMU plans to write a policy brief based on this evaluation.</p> <p>Turkey is well advanced in the implementation of this activity. Tools and methods for mainstreaming</p>	MS

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
			biodiversity into food and nutrition strategies are being document and include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Website designed by the Ministry of Health on nutrition and health targeting especially children (beslenme.gov.tr) • Case studies of the mainstreaming biodiversity into food and nutrition. • Brochures, leaflets, booklets and etc. • School gardens and workshops for children on BFN • Workshops and conferences on BFN • Media tools promoting healthy diets with some different public spots • Photo, painting, video and poetry competitions • Healthy school feeding programmes • Nutrition and exercise campaigns for the prevention of child obesity • Nutrition Friendly School Programme launched by the Ministry of Education 	
Activity 3.5.3 Guidelines for using tools and instruments for mainstreaming	Mar 2017	Brazil – 5% (ongoing)	Brazil is well advanced in the implementation of this activity.	S
Component 4 – Project management				
Activity 4.1 Establish arrangements for global and national project administration and implementation infrastructure including global and national coordination units	Mar 2013	100%	This activity was completed both at the global and national levels.	S

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
Activity 4.2 Plan and undertake a full project inception meeting	Mar 2013	100%	Activity completed.	S
Activity 4.3 Establish and operate project budgeting and accounting system	Mar 2013	100%	Activity completed.	S
Activity 4.4 Review and refine work plans with national project coordinators and partners in participating countries based on better understanding of local context	Yearly	100%	Original workplans were reviewed by national partners and amendments discussed during the 3 rd ISC meeting in Sri Lanka in Dec 2014.	S
Activity 4.5 Establish project International Steering Committee and conduct annual meetings	Yearly	100%	The 1 st ISC was carried out in April 2012. The activity is ongoing and the 3 rd ISC successfully carried out in Sri Lanka in Dec 2014.	S
Activity 4.6 Establish project National Steering Committees and conduct regular meetings	Yearly	100%	National Steering Committee meetings were held in all project countries. The activity is ongoing.	S
Activity 4.7 Where relevant, establish additional site or technical committees	Nov 2013	Turkey – 100%	A site committee comprising the Ministries of Education, Agriculture, and NGOs has been established in the project site in Kenya . A site supervisor was identified and hired.	S
Component 5 – Monitoring and evaluation				
Activity 5.1 Finalise and disseminate project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan	Mar 2013	100%	Country partners were provided with the Project M&E Plan and relevant timelines As part of Output 1.1 country partners are required to undertake 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.	S
Activity 5.2 Establish reporting plan and requirements, templates	Mar 2013	100%	This activity was completed and requirements and templates were shared will all national partners.	S

Outputs	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating
Activity 5.3 Submit project and financial reports to GEF	2013-2017	100%	Project and financial reports are being submitted to the donor on a regular basis. The activity is ongoing.	S
Activity 5.4 Organise and implement project Mid-Term Evaluation	Mar 2015	Activity yet to commence	UNEP is to take lead this activity and collaborate with FAO. Delayed for several reasons. The implementing agencies are currently organising the MTR, which is planned for the second half of 2015.	U
Activity 5.5 Organise and implement project Final Evaluation	Mar 2017	Activity yet to commence	This activity was not planned to be initiated during the reporting period indicated.	N/A

Overall project implementation progress

FY2015 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the rating for this FY and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
S	Generally, implementation of the majority of activities and outputs is in reasonable compliance with the project workplan which was revised during the 3 rd ISC Meeting, i.e. many indicators and targets were reformulated to make them clearer and more realistic. For already highlighted reasons, Sri Lanka is lagging in a number of activities and outputs and this will require remedial action, now underway with a new and active NPC. Many activities are still ongoing but progress has been made to date with some notable achievements in Brazil, Kenya and Turkey. There remain 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 Sri Lanka in terms of changed implementation and management/administration arrangements and appointment of the new NPC. Recent changes in the administrative requirements involved for the disbursement of funds was also a challenge in Sri Lanka and this has now been addressed.

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

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Activity 1.1.4 Determine baseline status of community biodiversity for food and nutrition (including loss of food options), dietary diversity and	GPMU and Sri Lanka NPC	October 2015

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<p>where possible nutritional and health status and other relevant data.</p> <p>One baseline survey is still outstanding in Sri Lanka. GPMU is working with Sri Lanka NPC to expedite this. ToRs were developed and approved</p>		
<p>Activity 1.1.6 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>Still unclear if countries were able to do this and to what extent. Attention to this activity will be addressed during the next the ISC meeting in November 2015.</p>	GPMU	November 2015
<p>Activity 1.2.3 Strengthen infrastructure and capacity for developing a national portal and database/information system on nutritional properties of agrobiodiversity according to international standards (INFOODS-FAO)</p> <p>Urgent attention to this activity is needed in both Sri Lanka and Kenya. This will be given attention on next two country missions, August and September 2015 respectively.</p>	GPMU and NPCs	September 2015
<p>Activity 1.2.4 Identify training needs and undertake relevant training</p> <p>Urgent attention to this activity is needed in both Sri Lanka and Kenya. This will be given attention on next two country missions, August and September respectively.</p>	GPMU and NPCs	September 2015
<p>Activity 1.3.2 Determine in each country baseline data for Nutrition Indicator for Biodiversity on food composition and consumption, in collaboration with national coordinator of INFOODS-FAO</p>	GPMU and NPGs	December 2015

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
The activity does not state that data have to be submitted to FAO		
<p>Activity 2.3.1 Undertake rapid appraisal to identify and assess markets or market niches and opportunities, including barriers and opportunities in project targeted ecosystems</p> <p>Attention to this activity will be given in next country mission to Sri Lanka and Turkey where reports are yet to be finalised and during the next ISC meeting in Kenya.</p>	GPMU and NPCs	November 2015
<p>Activity 2.3.2 Identify key actors and steps and formulate a vision and upgrading strategy for value chain or market development</p> <p>Urgent attention to identification of key actors in Sri Lanka is needed. This will be given attention on next country mission in August</p>	GPMU and NPCs	September 2015
<p>Activity 3.1.4 Organize participatory workshops with key stakeholders in selected sites and nationally to review and refine best practices</p> <p>Attention to this activity will be given during the next ISC meeting in Kenya and Sri Lanka.</p>	GPMU and NPCs	September 2015
<p>Activity 3.2.1 Establish key competencies required among relevant stakeholder groups</p> <p>Urgent attention to identification of key actors in Sri Lanka is needed. This will be given attention on next country mission in August. GPC to discuss with NPCs the practicalities and usefulness of these activities with a view to revising at ISC</p>	GPMU and NPCs	September 2015
<p>Activity 3.2.2 Assess training needs required</p>	GPMU and NPCs	December 2015

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<p>Remaining countries encouraged to finalise reports documenting training needs. GPC to discuss with NPCs the practicalities and usefulness of these activities with a view to revising at ISC</p>		
<p>Activity 3.2.3 Develop capacity building plan including action plan to implement training</p> <p>GPC to discuss with NPCs the practicalities and usefulness of these activities with a view to revising at ISC</p>	GPMU and NPCs	December 2015
<p>Activities 3.3.1 through 3.3.3 Develop ToRs for national information events; Identify national information events taskforce; Develop national information events strategies and action plans</p> <p>GPC to discuss with NPCs the practicalities and usefulness of these activities with a view to revising at ISC</p>	GPMU and NPCs	December 2015
<p>Activity 3.5.1 Review current status of mainstreaming biodiversity instruments, tools and approaches by sector and cross-sectorally with emphasis on mainstreaming into food and nutrition activities</p> <p>Attention to this activity will be given in next country mission to Sri Lanka and Turkey where reports are yet to be finalised and during the next ISC meeting in Kenya.</p>	GPMU and NPCs	December 2015
<p>Activity 3.5.2 Inventory relevant instruments, tools and methods</p> <p>Attention to this activity will be given in next country mission to Sri Lanka and Turkey where reports are yet to be finalised and during the next ISC meeting in Kenya.</p>	GPMU and NPCs	December 2015

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
<p>Activity 1.1.5 Document food-associated indigenous knowledge, including sustainable use practices for agricultural biodiversity</p> <p>The GPMU to encourage NPCs and country partners to prepare reports and where possible a series of scientific publications on food associated indigenous knowledge and food cultures</p>	<p>Surveys and assessment were undertaken in most countries. Some remain in Sri Lanka. Efforts to document and report on food associated indigenous knowledge continues and improves</p>	<p>GPMU and NPCs</p>	<p>December 2014</p>
<p>Activity 1.1.6 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>The GPMU to encourage NPCs and country partners to prepare reports and where possible a series of scientific publications on the impact of degradation of targeted ecosystems on food cultures, food options and nutrition</p>	<p>Surveys and assessment were undertaken in most countries. Some remain in Sri Lanka. Efforts to document and report on food associated indigenous knowledge continues and improves</p>	<p>GPMU and NPCs</p>	<p>December 2014</p>
<p>Activity 2.3.1 Undertake rapid appraisal to identify and assess markets or market niches and opportunities, including barriers and opportunities in project targeted ecosystems</p> <p>All countries encouraged to finalise reports documenting market opportunities</p>	<p>Ongoing marketing appraisal and assessments and opportunities are underway in all countries</p>	<p>GPMU and NPCs</p>	<p>December 2014</p>

Problem(s) identified in previous PIR	Action(s) taken	By whom	When
<p>Activity 3.2.1 Establish key competencies required among relevant stakeholder groups.</p> <p>All countries encouraged to finalise reports documenting key competencies required</p>	<p>Countries continue to assess key competencies on a case-by-case basis</p>	<p>GPMU and NPCs</p>	<p>September 2014</p>
<p>Activity 3.2.2 Assess training needs required.</p> <p>All countries encouraged to finalise reports documenting training needs</p>	<p>Countries continue to assess key competencies on a case-by-case basis</p>	<p>GPMU and NPCs</p>	<p>September 2014</p>
<p>Activity 3.3.2 Identify National Information Campaign Taskforce</p> <p>Now that the project is well established and knowledge is being actively produced efforts over the remainder of the year will focus on gearing up communications including national information campaigns. This will include a special training session at the 3rd ISC meeting</p>	<p>It is questionable whether such a taskforce is required or desirable by countries. National information events continue in all countries despite the absence of a formal taskforce and countries are responding adequately to needs and opportunities. As suggested above, the GPC plans to discuss with NPCs the practicalities and usefulness of these activities with a view to revising at ISC</p>	<p>GPMU, Bioversity Communications Focal Point, NPMUs and country partners and national communications partners</p>	<p>December 2014</p>

3.3. Risk

RISK FACTOR TABLE

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
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
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 satisfactorily understood, however, some problems have arisen with the change of appointment in the NPC in Sri Lanka and transfer of funding. This is partly due to significant political changes recently in Sri Lanka which has included major changes in leadership and staffing in respective ministries which continues to contribute further delay in the onset of activities.		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
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
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					PM/ UNEP TM, FAO Steering committees, both national and international, and site committees have met on a regular basis and continue to perform their required roles satisfactorily. As indicated above, Sri Lanka has lagged slightly because of the new challenging political environment but their national steering committee continues to meet and guide actions. The fact of having two implementing agencies make the reporting, (Narrative and budget) complicated and burdensome for GPMU and NPCs. It also makes monitoring of progress and budget expenditure for implementing agencies very difficult.		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	
INTERNAL RISK																	
Project management																	
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						PM/ UNEP TM, FAO Internal communications are generally satisfactory. The GPMU has clear lines of communication with all NPMUs as well as the wider number of country partners in the four countries. The project has also set up a project-related Listserve regarding specific activities across the project technical components. Although relationships between team members are generally satisfactory, it is clear that the various levels of responsibility on NPCs and other country partners, both project and non-project, can affect internal communications. Issues of communication were a major focus of capacity building at the last 3 rd ISC meeting and some of these barriers and solutions were discussed. Information flow on budgetary issues could be improved and a new format was developed between GPMU and FAO to obtain more details to improve budget approval.		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	
INTERNAL RISK																	
Project management																	
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						PM/ UNEP TM, FAO Across the four country partners, project progress has been generally satisfactory and the majority are on schedule. The rather slow start up in Sri Lanka has meant that workplan activities are behind schedule in this country. It was also foreseen after an early period of implementation that revisions and rationalisation to the work plan were required. These revisions were undertaken during and following the 2 nd and 3 rd ISC meetings.		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						PM/ UNEP TM, FAO No co-financing provided by UNEP for this 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	
INTERNAL RISK																	
Project management																	
Budget	Activities are progressing within planned budget	Minor budget reallocation needed	Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget		X						PM/ UNEP TM, FAO Activities are progressing satisfactorily within planned budget. Budget limitations still exist in Kenya, but are being partly addressed by securing external grants to help cover some of the activities. Total leveraged funding totals USD\$ 137,000. Recent political changes in Sri Lanka have delayed disbursement of funds. Major budget revision was necessary for Brazil which was done in the beginning of 2015. Details on budget expenditure and work planning were requested by FAO and partially received.		x				
Financial management	Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for	Financial reporting slow or deficient	Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds	X							PM/ UNEP TM, FAO Generally funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for. With the information received, FAO is not really able to monitor budget expenditures or planning due to insufficient details provided. The new format is expected to improve the situation.		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	
INTERNAL RISK																	
Project management																	
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						PM/ UNEP TM, FAO Country and global reports are generally satisfactory and submitted on time. Reporting requirements represent some burden on NPCs, given project-related responsibilities and additional non-project responsibilities on a few of the NPCs. However, there was a marked improvement in the level of country reporting from the majority of partners over the last 12 month period following the capacity building workshop held during the 3 rd ISC meeting (Dec 2014) and after agreeing to simplify reporting requirements.		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	
INTERNAL RISK																	
Project management																	
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						PM/ UNEP TM, FAO Having undertaken major stakeholder mapping during project preparation, countries have 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, where appropriate, with identified stakeholders were established. Kenya is engaging in the multi-sectoral Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) initiative at national level, yet with a large number of CBOs and farming communities as well as county district administration at the County level in Busia. Brazil is engaging with a substantial number of stakeholders at the federal, regional and municipal levels. Some bottlenecks exist in Sri Lanka in bringing in the strategic nutrition community		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
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
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					PM/ UNEP TM, FAO The GPMU has established a Project website, supported by other communication tools including flyers, project newsletter and relevant social media. To improve the website, the GPMU has recruited s short-term staff to assist with ongoing external communications who is providing support to updating and revision of communication tools including the project website. Country partners are developing similar communication tools at the national level. The Project has maintained a high profile at the global level with recent involvement in FAO-CGRFA, CBD, WHO, EXPO2015, and WFP initiatives.		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	
INTERNAL RISK																	
Project management																	
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						PM/ UNEP TM, FAO 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. Strong measures have been put in place nationally, such as in Brazil and Kenya, while considerable efforts are being made at an international level to promote the mainstreaming of the BFN approach.		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						PM/ UNEP TM, FAO The Project is largely based on sound scientific and technical approaches which have been validated elsewhere or tested in pilot sites.		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
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
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						PM/ UNEP TM, FAO Project decisions are based on the agreed project framework and work plan and opportunities for synergy with other initiatives. Staff has 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
EXTERNAL RISK																
Project context																
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					PM/ UNEP TM, FAO Kenya and Turkey have all been scenes of recent political unrest but at this stage does not appear to be a threat to project implementation. Sri Lanka recently held elections which had some ramifications for project implementation but these seem to be largely overcome now.		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					PM/ UNEP TM, FAO The pilot sites and other areas where the project is being implemented were not affected by severe weather events, other than the normal vagaries and weather patterns, or major environmental stress factors 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	
EXTERNAL RISK																	
Project context																	
Social, cultural and economic factors	There are no evident social, cultural and/or economic issues that may affect project performance and results	Social or economic issues or changes pose challenges to project implementation but mitigation strategies have been developed	Project is highly sensitive to economic fluctuations, to social issues or cultural barriers	X							PM/ UNEP TM,FAO No major social, cultural or economic factors (other than that referred to above under political stability and budgetary (Kenya)) 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	
EXTERNAL RISK																	
Project context																	
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						PM/ UNEP TM, FAO Generally, capacity of institutions and project partners to implement project activities and objectives appears to be satisfactory. However, in a project of such scope additional opportunities and areas of need always arise. Areas where capacity is deemed too weak are closely monitored and if not able to be addressed by project funds leverage funding is sought (see examples above of Kenya in current reporting period). During the reporting period in-country training around outputs 1.2 and 1.3 was undertaken in Sri Lanka as well as a communications workshop for NPCs prior to the 3 rd ISC meeting, focusing on influencing policy and mainstreaming.		X				
Others, please specify										N/A							

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

N/A

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

FY2015 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Medium	
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	
<p><i>A Risk Mitigation Plan was presented during the previous PIR (2013-2014) reporting period which highlighted the following:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <p>1. Management structures and roles at the national level still require some attention to details. There remains high staff turnover among national partner organisations and various competing demands on NPCs' time and duties</p> <p>Country missions were undertaken by the GPC (two with the FAO project focal point) during the reporting period. Individual and partner meetings were held to address many of these issues and these have been essentially sorted out in Sri Lanka and Brazil where new NPCs have been appointed. In Brazil the NPC is entirely devoted to the project and is now able to engage more effectively with national partners.</p> <p>2. Level of reporting and untimely delivery of reports particularly co-financing</p> <p>Communication was a strong area of focus during the 3rd ISC meeting, which was preceded by a dedicated workshop for the four NPCs. The importance of effective communication has been understood and is reflected in the quality of the most recent country reports that has significantly improved. Timely co-finance reports still remain an issue.</p> <p>3. Budget continues to remain an issue in Kenya</p> <p>The GPMU has devoted significant time and efforts to secure additional support and funding for the Kenya Team. A Borlaug fellow was posted to the field and has contributed substantially to the documentation of best practices. Further, two grants have been secure from the Australian Centre for International Agriculture Research and the McArthur Foundation to develop activities connected to outputs 2.3 and 3.2 on building capacity for smallholders to develop sustainable market options and value chains for targeted agrobiodiversity.</p> <p>4. Sri Lanka remains lagging behind the other partners and has still to consolidate their planning and delivering in the remaining 2.5 years of the project. A close communication and advisory of the GPMU seems therefore necessary..</p> 	

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** in collaboration with FAO 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 **X** No

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

The GPMU undertook a number of country missions during the reporting period with a forthcoming country mission to Sri Lanka (August/Sept), Turkey (Sept), Kenya (Sept) and Brazil (Oct) scheduled. Trip reports including information collected and recommendations made can be made available upon request. National teams continue to meet on a regular basis through NSCs and other technical and site committees and have reported against a comprehensive set of outputs, milestones and indicators. In Kenya, the NPC has undertaken frequent trips to the project site to engage with Busia County staff and to brief them on project activities. This has contributed to ownership and buy-in from the Ministry at the County level and has led to a proposal for a major biodiversity policy in the county. Plans to set up a cross-sectoral site committee in Busia to foster support for and mobilize community participation is ongoing. A number of committee meetings were held during which teams were formed to spearhead key project activities. National BFN stakeholders are meeting regularly at National Steering Committee meetings to discuss project progress and implementation barriers.

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

Baseline information, both quantitative and qualitative, was collected prior to and during the current reporting period. Documentation of traditional knowledge associated with target species is still being gathered and analysed. This information is currently being analysed and prepared for peer-review and other publications.

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

The GPMU, FAO, UNEP and country partners spent considerable time both pre- and post- 3rd ISC meeting in December 2014 reviewing the project suite of indicators and workplan activities and have undertaken a process of revision. It is felt that the current indicators provide a useful body of quantitative and qualitative information to measure success in implementing activities included in the project work plan.

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?

With the opportunity to revisit and revise the project indicators and activities during the most recent 3rd ISC meeting, it is felt these are now more realistic, measurable and achievable though some challenges remain such as fully capturing what is happening in relation to mainstreaming through instruments such as the NBSAPs revision and ways of capturing 'enhanced awareness and political support'. Other indicators that are a little more intangible are also challenging to handle. The project continues to explore ways of capturing these measures and turning them into a compelling case. To date the project has not experienced major problems in tracking of indicators though has highlighted earlier the demands on NPCs and country partner time does limit how effectively this is achieved.

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 of certain indicators was undertaken during the 3rd ISC meeting, as well as revisions of certain activities at the outputs level. This was clearly documented and endorsed by the ISC. Country partners have been working with the revised logframe and work plan since the beginning of 2015. Following the revisions, the key assumptions of the project remain largely valid but the level of implementation was downscaled for many indicators, compared to the initial ones. This was seen necessary as the initial planned indicators were unrealistic to be achieved within the time and reality frame.

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 impacts have been highlighted as a result of the project. According to actual knowledge of the project, the project has not directly contributed to any negative environmental effects though there are indications that the project itself could be affected. Generally, the pilot sites and other areas where the project is being implemented have not been affected by severe environmental events or major environmental stress factor, nor have they had significant environmental impacts. The project is also guided by the 'Checklist for Environmental and Social Issues' developed for the project to assist in the monitoring of potential negative effects.

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

The importance of using the annual ISC meetings to review status of targets and the opportunity to revise accordingly is strongly recommended. Having two implementing agencies is a challenge in terms of budgeting, planning and reporting, not only for the countries but also for the executing and implementing agencies. Also monitoring of expenses and planning is difficult by the implementing agencies as each agency is receiving only budgetary information related to their part of the project, which is so far not detailed enough to be able to judge expenditures.

5. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS

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

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

Brazil, Kenya and Turkey have all made progress in promoting outreach and awareness and have been strategic when partnering at the national level. For example in Kenya the project has successfully drafted biodiversity policies in Busia county; in Brazil BFN considerations are included in the draft NBSAP; or Turkey has increased the scientific evidence of the priority species (food composition, consumption and traditional knowledge) based on which advocacy, value chains, market opportunities, standards and policies are being carried out

- **Institutional arrangements, including project governance**

The implementation is somehow challenging for country partners as well as the executing agency because of the extensive project logframe and workplan, the co-implementing arrangements. This is exacerbated when there have been required changes in relation to national project coordinators such as most recently in Sri Lanka. In the first year of the project this also occurred twice, in Turkey and Kenya requiring added efforts and communication to describe and again clarify the project. Other political processes at the national level such as the fallout from the recent elections in Sri Lanka also delay implementation. Added to this, is the ongoing challenge of ensuring the transfer and disbursement of funds from the two separate implementing agencies, which is often due to the unsatisfactory level of details received.

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

Concrete results, both on-the-ground and normative

Global

- Collectively countries have documented nutritional data for 93 species, surpassing the mid-term target of 65 priority species. Traditional knowledge of the species is also being documented and converted to publications for wider dissemination
- Project successes to date are attracting support both at the national and international level and leveraged funds were secured for carrying out additional activities beyond the project's original work plan and expectations.
- Enrichment of the *Voluntary guidelines for mainstreaming biodiversity into Policies, Programmes and National and Regional Plans of Action on Nutrition*, endorsed by the CGRFA in 2015, through including elements of the BFN project
- Collaboration with CBD and WHO on the publication *Connecting global priorities: biodiversity and human health: a state of knowledge review*
- Collaboration with a range of stakeholders for inputs of biodiversity and nutrition into the Milano *Urban Food Policy Pact* which will be signed in October 2015

Brazil

- Country revisions to the draft National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) in Brazil have led to the inclusion of several indicators referring to BFN to monitor the general status of biodiversity conservation. Final approval of indicators for the National Biodiversity Targets 2011-2020 and targets and initiatives for the Federal Government's Multi-year Budget planning for 2016-2019 are expected by the end of 2015. Between 2012 to 2015, more than USD \$60 million were pledged to protect biodiversity for food and nutrition.
- Guidelines developed for the sustainable collection and use of sociobiodiversity products
- Capacity building activities on BFN carried out for staff of the main policy programmes linked to nutrition and food security
- Development of a draft outline for an online course on BFN mainstreaming targeting policy makers as well as practitioners
- Capacity development in universities on BFN, including the compilation of analytical data on food composition to be followed by the chemical analysis of the priority species

Kenya

- The Busia Biodiversity Policy proposal and process now underway

- In Kenya, the decentralised platform of stakeholders that has been put in place in Busia County is a fine example of an inclusive participatory process which is garnering strong political will and attracting a number of opportunities to leverage the BFN project
- Collaboration with the revision of the national food composition table of Kenya with the objective to include biodiverse foods. Funds for compilation and analysis were received from FAO Kenya

Sri Lanka

- Opening of 9 market outlets for the sale of traditional agrobiodiversity

Turkey

- Analysis of nutrient and anti-oxidant contents of 43 wild and underutilized species, as well as investigation of their consumption and traditional knowledge
- Extensive collaboration with related ministries, NGOs, institutes, the public and commercial companies to increase public awareness on the benefits of biodiversity (with emphasis on edible wild foods), consumption and marketing opportunities
-
- Guidelines developed for the sustainable collection and use of wild foods.