****

**Annual Project Report YYYY**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project title:** Integrating global environmental priorities into national policies and programmes | | | | | |
| **Country:** Kiribati | **Implementing Partner:** Environment and Conservation Division (ECD), Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development (MELAD) | | | **Management Arrangements:** NIM | |
| **Atlas Project ID/Award ID number:** 00083621 | | | **Atlas Output ID/Project ID number:** 00092010 | | |
| **UNDP-GEF PIMS ID number:** 4936 | | | **GEF ID number:** 5130 | | |
| **Project start date (= ProDoc signature date):**  5-Mar-2015 | | | **Original Planned project closing date:** 5-Mar-2018 | | |
| **Revised project closing date:** | | |
| **Financing Plan & Expenditures** | | | | | |
| Total GEF Grant (U$S): 500,000 | | | Total Co-financing (as planned in CEO endorsement request) (U$S): 530,000 | | |
| GEF Grant Disbursed as of DD/MM (U$S): | | | GEF Grant Annual Expenditures (U$S): | | |
| **Project Contacts and Links** | | | | | |
| ***Partner*** | | ***Contact Name*** | | | ***Email Address*** |
| *Project Coordinator / Manager* | |  | | |  |
| *UNDP Country Office Programme Officer* | |  | | |  |
| *Project Implementing Partner* | |  | | |  |
| *GEF Operational Focal Point* | |  | | |  |
| *Other Partners* | |  | | |  |
| *UNDP Technical Adviser* | | *Mr. Tom Twining-Ward* | | | *tom.twining-ward@undp.org* |
| *UNDP Programme Associate* | | *Ms. Eva Huttova* | | | *eva.huttova@undp.org* |
| *Project website, etc.* | |  | | | |
| *Links to media coverage* | |  | | | |
| **Brief project summary:** | | | | | |
| This project is in line with the GEF-5 CCCD Programme Frameworks two (2) and five (5), which calls for countries (2) to generate, access and use information and knowledge and (5) to enhance capacities to monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends. It is a direct response to national priorities identified through the NCSA conducted in 2007-2011 and reiterated in the recently approved Kiribati Integrated Environment Policy (KIEP) and the soon-to-be approved Kiribati Joint Implementation Plan for Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management (KJIP). Through a learning-by-doing process, this project will harmonize existing environmental information systems, and integrate internationally accepted measurement standards and methodologies, as well as develop a more consistent reporting on the global environment. Under the first component, the project will target the development of capacities at the individual and organizational level, strengthening technical skills to collect data and transform information into knowledge. Under the second component, the project will target a more holistic construct of monitoring and evaluation systems through strengthening the institutionalization of these systems as a means to feed lessons learned and best practices from interventions to decision-makers/policy-makers. Through the provision of better environmental information, the project will increase the capacity of national and local levels’ stakeholders and counterparts to diagnose and understand complex dynamic nature of global environmental problems and develop local solutions; including the greater capacity to monitor and evaluate environmental programs and projects and also to better report on the state of the environment, including the national reports to the MEAs. Finally, the development of capacity of decision-makers will strengthen the environmental governance system in place in Kiribati. | | | | | |
| **Link to Project QA assessment implementation report for the reporting period:** | | |  | | |

# **I. Executive Summary**

*(one page maximum)*

*A concise brief on the progress towards the Project key deliverables, and outputs (project output is the same as CPAP output), related to Country Programme Outcome and SP Output and Outcome during the reporting period. The section should also include key results related to the capacity development, gender equality (marker), environment and social safeguard, partnership, South-South and Triangular Cooperation efforts, implementation issues/challenges and the main lessons learnt.*

# **II. Implementation Progress**

## ***Progress toward Development Objective:***

*For each indicator, the Project Manager should enter the cumulative progress since project start directly into the box in the far right column.*

| **Objectives and Outcomes** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Status of Implementation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective:** To improve information management and compliance monitoring in order to achieve global environmental benefits. | 1. ECD stated as the primary source for environmental information in Kiribati by a significant number of national, regional and international development partners | * Capacity of the main stakeholders for translating environmental information from EMIS into decision-making is low and dispersed over many organizations | * 50% of stakeholders have benefitted from capacity development activities for better use of this information in decision-making and policy-making |  |
| 1. Reported availability of better environmental monitoring information | * Collection and use of up-to-date environmental management information is ad-hoc and feebly coordinated | * Up-to-date environmental information is being used by policy-makers and also by the public |  |
| 1. Quality of monitoring reports and communications to measure implementation progress of the Rio Conventions | * Current reports are produced with limited data, weak analysis and weak trend analysis * There are not fully responding to the national and international requirements. | * Reports present adequate disaggregated data at local level, are informative and present environmental trends over time |  |
| 1. Capacity development scorecard rating | Capacity for:   * Engagement: 3 of 9 * Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 6 of 15 * Policy and legislation development: 3 of 9 * Management and implementation: 3 of 6 * Monitor and evaluate: 1 of 6   (total score: 16/45) | Capacity for:   * Engagement: 6 of 9 * Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 10 of 15 * Policy and legislation development: 7 of 9 * Management and implementation: 5 of 6 * Monitor and evaluate: 4 of 6   (total targeted score: 32/45) |  |
| **Outcome 1:** An operational environmental management information system (EMIS) providing accurate and timely information.  **Output 1.1:** An environmental data repository with standards, norms and protocols to collect, analyze, store and make available accurate, and reliable environmental information related to all three Rio Conventions, and of direct use by decision-makers.  **Output 1.2:** An information technology architecture in place to store, manage and provide public access to environmental information.  **Output 1.3:** Environmental information available and disseminated to stakeholders. | 1. An environmental data repository architecture in place | * No data architecture is in place to structure environmental information at ECD | * Environmental data is stored in a structured way and easily accessible |  |
| 1. Information technologies in place to store the data repository | * Limited technology is in place to support data management for an EMIS | * Hardware, communication and networking equipment is in place to store environmental data and provide easy access to this information |  |
| 1. Agreements for data sharing in place | * Information is shared on an ad-hoc basis among institutions following formal requests made at Secretary level | * 3-4 agreements are in place between ECD and 3-4 agencies/institutions to share data on a regular basis |  |
| 1. Use of this environmental information in decision-making and policy-making | * Limited environmental information is used to develop policies and programmes | * 3-4 policies, programmes or plans are developed using environmental information from the EMIS |  |
| 1. Environmental information is shared regionally and internationally | * Limited interaction exists at the regional level to share environmental information | * 2 regional sharing procedures in place by the end of the project |  |
| 1. Quality, quantity and timeliness of reports submitted to conventions | * Reports are not submitted on time and do not contain much primary collected data | * National communications/ reports are submitted on time and contain primary data collected by the EMIS |  |
| 1. Public states higher awareness of environmental information products | * Public and decision-makers are not aware about existing environmental information | * 50% of Members of Parliament are aware about existence of easily accessible environmental information at ECD |  |
| **Outcome 2:** A Compliance Monitoring System (CMS) developed and tracking key environmental indicators.  **Output 2.1:** An institutionalized set of environmental indicators.  **Output 2.2:** An operational compliance monitoring system. | 1. Adequate environmental indicators monitored | * The existing set of environmental indicators is not comprehensive and does not respond to the information requirements | * Set of environmental indicators in place and responds to national and international information requirements |  |
| 1. Adequate national standards, norms, procedures for monitoring these environmental indicators are officially in place | * There is no unified set of standards, norms and procedures to collect data, conduct observations and make sampling | * Adequate official standards, norms and procedures are in place and use by the relevant institutions |  |
| 1. An in-service training programme for public servants include course(s) covering environmental information management and monitoring system | * There is no training programme for public administrators on environmental information management and monitoring system | * The catalogue of in-service training programme include course(s) on environmental information management and monitoring system |  |
| 1. Number of public servants trained by taking the course(s) on EMIS and CMS | * 0 | * 100 Public Servants are trained using the new training programme |  |

## ***Key outputs delivered during reporting period:***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Outcome** | **Key Outputs** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# **III. Project Implementation Challenges**

*Please identify and analyse project critical risks and project issues that:*

*1) had an impact on project deliverables (quality, schedule) during the reporting period, or*

*2) were newly identified during the reporting period and are being addressed by the project (in the case of risks, describe project prosed means to mitigate their effects or decrease the likelihood of impact in the future, and in the case of issues, how to resolve them).*

***a. Updated project risks and actions***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Risk Description** | **Type** | **Date identified** | **Mitigation Measures** |
| Enter a brief description of the risk | Environmental  Financial  Operational  Organizational  Political  Regulatory  Strategic  Other | dd-mm-yyyy | What actions will be taken to mitigate this risk |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

***b. Updated project issues and actions***

*Explain the main implementation issues encountered in the course of implementation during the year and the proposed actions to solve the issues.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Issue Description** | **Mitigation Measures, Actions Taken** |
| Enter a brief description of the risk | What actions will be taken to mitigate this risk |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# **IV. Annexes**

*Meetings/workshops minutes/reports, Knowledge products, Lessons Learnt, Gender analysis, etc.*