



## UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2023

1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

### 1- Identification

#### 1.1 Project details

GEF ID	4970	SMA IPMR ID	33717
Project Short Title	PROGIAPCI	Grant ID	S1-32GFL-000621
		Umoja WBS	SB-007503
Project Title	Integrated Management of Protected Areas in Côte d'Ivoire, West Africa		
Project Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full Sized Project (FSP)	Duration months	Planned
Parent Programme if child project			Age
GEF Focal Area(s)	Multifocal Area	Completion Date	Planned -original PCA
Project Scope	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National		Revised - Current PCA
Region	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Africa	Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval	April 6, 2015
Countries	Ivory Coast	UNEP Project Approval Date (on Decision Sheet)	
GEF financing amount	\$4,240,000	Start of Implementation (PCA entering into force)	July 27, 2017
Co-financing amount	\$48,745,550	Date of First Disbursement	April 2017
		Date of Inception Workshop, if available	
Total disbursement as of 30 June	\$ 2,975,198	Midterm undertaken?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Total expenditure as of 30 June	\$2,372,826	Actual Mid-term Date, if taken	
		Expected Mid-Term Date, if not taken	June 30, 2020
		Expected Terminal Evaluation Date	December 30, 2023
		Expected Financial Closure Date	June 30, 2024

#### 1.2 EA: Project description

#### 1.3 Project Contact

Division(s) Implementing the project	Ecosystems Division GEF Biodiversity and Land Degradation Unit Biodiversity and Land Branch	Executing Agency(ies)	Ivorian Office of Parks and Reserves (OIPR), Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development
Name of co-implementing Agency		Names of Other Project Partners	NGO Green Vision, Crown Agents
TM: UNEP Portfolio Manager(s)	Ersin Esen	EA: Manager/Representative	Adama Tondossama
TM: UNEP Task Manager(s)	Adamou Bouhari	EA: Project Manager	Adama Tondossama
TM: UNEP Budget/Finance Officer	PaulVrontamitis	EA: Finance Manager	Evrard Kouakou
TM: UNEP Support/Assistant	Eric Mugo	EA: Communications lead, if relevant	

## 2- OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

2.1 UNEP PoW & UN	TM: UNEP Current Subprogramme(s)	Climate action subprogramme Nature action subprogramme Climate action subprogramme : - Indicators (i) for <b>Direct Outcomes 1.4 , 1.8</b> , - Indicators (iv) and (v) for <b>Direct Outcomes 1.3, 1.8</b>  Nature action subprogramme : - Indicators (i) for <b>Direct Outcomes 2.6 , 2.7</b> - Indicators (iii) for <b>Direct Outcomes 2.3, 2.9, 2.13</b> - Indicators (iv) for <b>Direct Outcomes 2.3</b>	TM: UNEP previous Subprogramme(s)	Subprogram3: Healthy and productive ecosystems	
	TM: PoW Indicator(s)				
	EA: UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages	Outcome 3 of UNDAF 2017 – 2020: By 2020 the public administration implements policies which ensure sustainable production and consumption and fight against Climate Change, creation of income and resilience to climate change of vulnerable populations			
	EA: Link to relevant SDG Goals	SDG goal 2; SDG goal 6; SDG goal 15	EA: Link to relevant SDG Targets	SDG Target 2.4; SDG Target 6.6; SDG Target 15.1; SDG Target 15.3; SDG Target 15.5; SDG Target 15.9	
: Core or Sub Indicators	TM: GEF core or sub indicators targeted by the project as defined at CEO Endorsement/Approval, as well as results				
	Indicators	Targets - Expected value			Materialised to date
		Mid-term	End-of-project	Total Target	
	1.2: Terrestrial protected areas under improved ma		3000 ha	3,000 ha	3,000 ha

2.2. GEF


Implementation Status      2023      6th PIR

2.3 Implementation status & Risk

	PIR #	Rating towards outcomes (DO) (section 3.1)	Rating towards outputs (IP) (section 3.2)	Risk rating (section 4.2)
FY 2023	6th PIR	S	S	L
FY 2022	5th PIR	S	S	L
FY 2021	4th PIR	S	S	L
FY 2020	3rd PIR	S	S	L
FY 2019	2nd PIR	S	S	L
FY 2018	1st PIR	S	S	L
FY 2017				
FY 2016				
FY 2015				

**EA:** Summary of status  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

The overall risk rating is low because the majority of risks are decreasing. The other risks are kept at the same level

2.4 Co-finance

<b>EA:</b> Planned Co-finance	48 745 550 \$	<b>EA:</b> Actual to date:	80%
<b>EA:</b> Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges.	Apart from the NGO CIAI which has made no contribution since the departure of its Director from Côte d'Ivoire, the level of mobilization of co-financing is generally satisfactory for the other stakeholders. At the date of 30th June 2022, it is 77.99% for government of Cote d'Ivoire, 96.5% for the Japan Cooperation, 100% for the Parks and Reserves Foundation, 77% for the NGO Vision Verte		

2.5 Stakeholder

<b>EA:</b> Date of project steering committee meeting	Nov-23
<b>EA:</b> Stakeholder engagement (will be uploaded to GEF Portal)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Involvement of local population in Park management activities</li> <li>2. Creation of direct and indirect jobs for more than one hundred residents who were recruited for the construction of the park fence as well as regular maintenance of the interior path</li> <li>3. All major activities record the participation of village chiefs, notables, youth and women representatives</li> <li>4. Major consultations are at the initiative of the prefectural body</li> <li>5. All the stakeholders participate in the sessions of the local management committees, the project steering committee and in the evaluations with the tools for evaluating the management effectiveness of the Banco National Park.</li> </ol>

**TM:** Does the project have a gender action plan?      Yes

2.6. Gender

**EA:** Gender mainstreaming  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

In addition, women were the main target in the distribution of the first batch of support to the populations with 3 groups of women benefiting from equipment for the processing of local agricultural products for the benefit of the female staff of the Ivorian Office of Parks and Reserves

In 2022, 1 training session on taking gender into account, together with an action plan, was organized by the AfDB Gender Focal Point, the GEF and AGEROUTE/PTUA on gender mainstreaming issues in OIPR activities has been held with the female staff of OIPR.

2.7. ESSM

**TM:** Was the project classified as moderate/high risk at CEO Endorsement/Approval Stage?

No

**TM:** Have any new social and/or environmental risks been identified during the reporting period?

No

**TM:** If yes, what specific safeguard risks were identified in the SRIF/ESERN?

**TM:** If yes, please describe the new risks, or changes

**TM & EA:** Has the project received complaints related to social and/or environmental impacts (actual or potential) during the reporting period?

No

**TM & EA:** If yes, please describe the complaint(s) or grievance(s) in detail including the date of the complaint, the nature of the complaint, the parties involved, the actions taken, and the results achieved.

**EA:** Environmental and social safeguards management  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

A fence (3200 meters, in 2019 and 5270 meters in 2022) has been built on the western and north boundaries of the park to strengthen his protection. In accordance with the Environmental and Social Impact Study of the Banco fence project, the demarcation was conducted in a consensual manner with the local populations before the start of works. The layout of the structure took into account the topography of the soil. The work was carried out without damage to vegetation and wildlife or oil spills. Workers were made aware of compliance with the texts governing protected areas. In addition, agents from the Banco National Park regularly monitored this by ensuring a continuous presence in the field. Staff have taken steps to ensure that the solid waste produced by the construction sites is collected and transported out of the park by the companies. Additional work is underway to ensure the sanitation of the exterior facades of the fence where discharges of wastewater from surrounding households create some pollution. With regard to measures on housing and equipment, the compensation measures put in place by the road construction project will compensate populations whose habitats and activities will be impacted. Finally, local residents continue to benefit from access to the park for the celebration of their traditional rites. Thus, the village community of Agban-Attie continues its sacrificial rite at the sacred source of the Banco River. For this purpose, an authorization is always given at the request of the Chiefdom by OIPR.

2.8. KM/Learning

**EA:** Knowledge activities and products  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

In 2022:  
- 1 article in the New York Times entitled "In Metropolis of 5 Million, Rainforest Is a Lifeline and a Junkyard"  
- 3 reports on international television (TV5 Monde, i24 News, Business 24)  
- 3 appearances in the international written press (Reuters, AFP)  
- 2 international radio reports

*Please attach a copy of any products*

**EA:** Main learning during the period

2.9. Stories

**EA:** Stories to be shared  
(section to be shared with communication division/  
GEF communication)

- The compliance of the management of the ritual sites in the Park with the principles of conservation has allowed to discover a new tourist attraction with the appearance of large catfish in the Banco River
- The populations living along the fence erected to the west and North of the Park affirm that the presence of this structure has contributed to limiting the aggressions of which they were victims.
- Chimpanzees and monkeys are becoming more and more visible in Banko National Park as it is established by the biodiversity baseline situation report produced in 2020 .
- the capacity of the park to offer environmental education services for the benefit of schools on the outskirts thanks to the renovation of the ecomuseum and the nature house

### 3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE

#### 3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes (Development Objectives)

Objective	Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	EA: Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	TM: Progress rating
	Objective 1: Improving the management of the national Protected Areas Network	Percent increase in BNP METT score	2013 METT Score is 58%	At the end of year 2 the BNP METT score increases by 10 points (METT = 68%)	BNP METT score increases by 21 points (METT = 82%)	25	The METT score increased by 25 points from 61% when the project was approved (2017) to 82% in mi-term (2019) and 86% in 2021. The objective of achieving a score increase of 15 points at the end of the project is thus achieved at mi-term	S
	Objective 2: Implement a mechanism of sustainable financing for the Banco National Park	A clear and effective strategy for research and capture of innovative and sustainable financing is defined and implemented	All parks, including BNP, do not have sufficient and sustainable financing	BNP experiment at least one financing mechanism sustainable and self-sustaining	1 financing mechanism durable has been established for BNP	100%	Project coordination has been agreed with the Parks and Reserves Foundation on a convention for the opening of a Banco national park gate. The agreement has been signed and a payment of US \$300 000 has been sent to the accounting officer for the supply of the gate. With a view to better management of BNP receipts, a system for collecting receipts from tourist entries into the BNP has been set up with a new application called TrsorPay. In addition, financing in the amount of 61,221,000 XOF intended to improve the tourist offer of the Banco National Park was obtained from the BIOPAMA program. In addition, the OIPR / LCA working group on the establishment of a PPP is continuing its work according to the adopted timetable. Leadership for Conservation in Africa (LCA) proposed 1 draft of tourism development plan for BNP. Otherwise, 3 conceptual notes of structuring projects proposed by COPADEN are available	S
	Objective 3 : Include the local initiatives in the BNP Management program	3. Number of biodiversity conservation programs conducted with riparian stakeholders in BNP	No local biodiversity conservation initiative around BNP	At least 2 local biodiversity conservation initiatives around BNP were achieved	3 local biodiversity initiatives around the BNP were carried out	67%	12 safety committees were set up around the Banco national park and Dahliafleur reserve followed by the delivery of forty rubbish bins for garbage conditioning. This initiative ended with the disposal of the garbage container, manage by sanitation companies in the municipalities bordering these two protected areas. Otherwise, some actions were stated with the prison manager in order to reduce the flow of solid and liquid waste into the park. This action was followed by the implementation of a vast awareness program for local populations. In addition, an awareness program of pangolin protection is being implemented with the NGO VISION VERTE. 1 Cooperative producing flower in the right of way of the high voltage line in Dahliafleur	S

Objective 4: Reduce pressure on forest resources and increase the flow of ecosystem services	4. Biodiversity evolution rate	Currently there is no inventory to serve as baseline	Rate of evolution of plant species characteristic of the Banco Forest shows that biodiversity is well preserved			1 inventory started in the second quarter of 2019 to update the flora of the park and to make the state of the plant species characteristic of the good conservation of the environment. The results of this study are available	MS
	5. Carbon sequestration rate	Carbon sequestration rate is 50%				The baseline situation was established at the PPG stage. No update was done at middle term. Status will be provided at the next reporting cycle	MU

Outcome 1

updated Management plans for BNP and other PAs	1. The activities programmed in the management plans of BNP and other PAs are updated	Management plans are not updated	All activities programmed in the management plan are updated	10 out of 11 Management Plans are updated (55%)	91%	10 out of 11 Management Plans are validated during a workshop by all stakeholders (Banco, Mont Sangbé, Iles Ehotilé, Azagny, Lamto Haut Bandama, Dahliafleur, Mont Nimba, Abokouamékro and Marahoué). The Mont Péko management plan remaining is awaiting validation in workshop.	S
	2. Percentage of implementation of activities programmed in the management plan in year 2	Insufficient implementation of activities programmed in the BNP management plan	50% of activities BNP are executed	82% of BNP management activities are executed	75%	12892 men per day of surveillance effort, 25.2 hectares of the arboretum, 80 km of track, 10 hectares of bamboo and all the green spaces maintained, 100% of the windfalls in the Banco National Park and in the Dahliafleur Reserve. 9 km of paths have been mechanically maintained, 3,2 km of fence and 2 entrance gates built at Banco national. At the level of the Haut Bandama Fauna and Flora Nature Reserve, 1130 man-days of patrols were carried out  These patrols made it possible to make arrangements that will promote the natural regeneration of degraded areas in the Haut Bandama Fauna and Flora Reserve.  9 sessions of Local Management Committees held and 1 monitoring-ecological methodology validated, 12 auxiliaries and 4 agents trained in monitoring-ecological data collection technique and 1 phase of wildlife monitoring data collection carried out. The report of the data collection phase is finalized.	S

Outcome 2

The capacity of OIPR staff and local actors in the management of protected areas are enhanced	1. Number of OIPR staff trained and Number of local actors trained in the end	Number of OIPR staff trained	Infiltration rate decreased by 75%	Infiltration rate decreased by more than 75%	91%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Park's aggression indices have fallen from 0.59 indices per km in 2016 to 0.05 indices per km in 2023. The regression rate is thus 91% between 2016 and 2023</li> <li>7 OIPR agents in training since June 2020 by LCA on PPP management</li> <li>1 mission conducted by 2 OIPR executives (DG and DZS) from September 15 to 30, 2018 in Shepherdstown, West Virginia</li> <li>20 agents and 7 administrators trained in the SMART tool</li> <li>20 OIPR officers sensitized and trained in the use of communication tools for the promotion of ecotourism in protected areas, with the assistance of the Canadian Organization Assistance Service (SACO) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>29 actors trained in monitoring and evaluation data collection in August 2018</li> <li>In 2019, four training courses were conducted for the benefit of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 agent trained in Morocco on the new procurement procedures.</li> </ul> </li> <li>16 (4 agents and 12 auxiliaries) in collecting monitoring and ecological data in January 2019 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>25 (17 auxiliaries and 8 agents) in the knowledge of the flora and plant formations of the PNB in April 2019</li> </ul> </li> <li>The monitoring and evaluation Responsible participated in a management effectiveness evaluation training based on the IMET 2 tool in May 2019.</li> <li>The document of the second phase of the "Programme Cadre de Gestion des Aires Protégées (PCGAP II)" is validated.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	S
---	---	------------------------------	------------------------------------	--	-----	--	---

Outcome 3

A functional monitoring and evaluation system of the BNP and its management effectiveness	1. Tools for collecting, storing, analyzing and disseminating information are available in year 1 of the project	The monitoring and evaluation system is not in place	A database is set up	The database is operational Other parks have operational databases at 90%	75%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 computerized monitoring and evaluation system for the national network of protected areas has been developed. Data on all actions is being entered into the database</li> <li>1 matrix of key indicators, 1 definition sheet for each key indicator, 1 indicator data collection sheet and 1 monitoring and evaluation plan developed in year 1 of the project</li> <li>1 flora and 1 phase wildlife data collection realized in 2019 to update the Park's ecological monitoring database</li> <li>As part of the planning, 5 Annual Activities Plans (2019, 2020, 2021 and 2022) and 5 Procurement Plans (PPM 2019, PPM 2020, 2021 and 2022) have been executed/still being implemented.</li> <li>Over the period from July 2018 to June 2020, 2 monitoring and evaluation mission and 4 follow-up technical missions were carried out by the OIPR's Control and Planning Unit and Technical</li> </ul>	S
	2. The field device and the various links of the system are installed					<p>Concerning the implementation of a monitoring-evaluation system of the BNP of the BNP, 1 Monitoring-Evaluation application to ensure better monitoring of project and program activities is being designed. In this</p>	S

Outcome 4



Outcome 5	Improved knowledge and management of other PA	1. State of conservation of different AP is known	The state of conservation of PAs is not well known	The state of conservation of PAs with acquired funding is known	The state of 7 all PAs is known	100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The conservation status of 10 protected areas with funding is known at the end of 2023</li> <li>1 review of biodiversity in national parks and nature reserves is available</li> <li>1 first version of the state of conservation report for protected areas in Côte d'Ivoire is available in 2023</li> <li>The 2018, 2019, 2021 and 2022 States of Conservation for each PA are available.</li> <li>It needs to collect data to study the state of new protected areas (Bossématié, Mabi-Yaya and Aghien)</li> </ul> <p>As part of the improvement of knowledge on the biodiversity of the GNP, 4 priority research</p>	S
Outcome 6	Improved management effectiveness of existing and new PA	1 . METT score level	Several PAs have management effectiveness issues	50% of PAs have a management plan implemented	78% of PAs have their management plans	73%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>14 PAs have their management plans</li> <li>7 protected areas were evaluated in 2018, 2019 and 2020 with the METT tool (Taï, Comoé, Mont Sangbé, Banco, Ehotilé, Azagny and Nimba)</li> <li>9 protected areas (Mont Sangbé, Taï, Nzo, Mont Tingui, Comoé, Iles Ehotilé, Banco and Azagny, Bossematié) evaluated with IMET</li> </ul>	S
Outcome 7	Enhanced financial sustainability for the management of BNP	1. Percentage of Park revenues in financing its activities	The Park does not finance its activities with its recipes	40% of the operating expenses of the BNP are covered by its own resources	Less than 5% of BNP's operating expenses covered by tourism revenues	50%	<p>The revenues of the Banco come from visitors from an average of 7,000 visitors in 2016 to 10,000 in 2018, 6000 to 2019 and 6,000 to 2020 representing about less of 5% of recurrent expenses estimated at more than 100 million CFA a year. Since 2021, the number of visits has increased with more than 15,000 visitors/year. However, this is still insufficient</p>	MS
Outcome 8	Measures are taken at the policy and regulatory frameworks levels to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity	1. Existence of protected areas funding strategy, including BNP	There is no innovative strategy for financing protected areas	A financing strategy is put in place for BNP	1 sustainable financing mechanism has been initiated to for PNB.	100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 list of priority investments likely to be the subject of a PPP drawn up with LCA</li> <li>1 agreement for the opening and management of an endowment fund with the Foundation for Parks and Reserves of Côte d'Ivoire (FPRCI) prepared pending signature. The counter opened to the FPRCI on behalf of the Banco National Park was supplied with 150 million CFA francs in 2021.</li> <li>3 meetings for a PPP with LCA think tank held in July 2018, February 2019 and January 2020: a proposal for zoning and valuation plans available</li> </ul> <p>With a view to better management of GNP receipts, a system for collecting receipts from tourist entries into the GNP has been set up with a new application called TrésorPay.</p>	S
		1. The local sector policy statement that has been modified	There is no case of modification of local sectoral policy	A protection perimeter (security) is delimited around the BNP		75%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8,500 linear meters of protective fencing installed, including 4,300 linear meters by the Abidjan Urban Transport Project and 4,270 linear meters by a donation from Japan established between 2019 and 2022</li> <li>1 weekly technical monitoring carried out by the project team</li> <li>Drainage activities have been carried out along the fence to facilitate the flow of</li> </ul>	S

The strategy of integration of local conservation initiatives in buffer zones is implemented	2. Information, Education and Communication Plan (IEC) for the benefit of local stakeholders	No integrated management plan around the park	an IEC plan is developed and implemented	90% implementation of the communication plan	75%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 meeting with the Governor of the District of Abidjan and the Sub-Prefect of the City of Bingerville on financing tourism infrastructure</li> <li>• 30 guided tours for tourism institutions and professionals (3 NGOs, Leadership for Conservation in Africa, 11 travel agencies, police, and gendarmerie and justice authorities).</li> <li>• Environmental education sessions for over 8601 students were organized.</li> <li>• 2 awareness sessions with the CESO Volunteer Advisor, Judith Tardif, in Akouedo-Attii and Carrière village, for 300 women</li> <li>• 4 awareness campaign for 928 people underway in the villages bordering the Banco National Park, Dahliafleur nature Reserve and Mabi-Yaya nature Reserve.</li> <li>• 2 agreements signed with the municipal radios of Yopougon and Attécoubé are being implemented</li> <li>• Arrangements are being taken to sign agreements with 3 television stations and 2 national radio stations</li> </ul>	S
	3. Integrated Management Plan Document around BNP	No integrated management plan around the park	10 organizations or groups of riparian actors benefit from the financing of their resources generate project 4 monitoring companies created by local residents are approved by the Project	12% implementation of the communication plan	65%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 income-generating activities have been financed in 2022 after a long-time process.</li> <li>• 1 directory of 36 associations identified around the Banco Park (32) and the Dahliafleur Reserve (4) established</li> <li>- 100% of the work requiring labor was carried out using the "High Labor Intensity Works (THIMO)" approach by the NGO Vision Verte with local residents. This is the clearing of windfalls and manual opening of the slopes.</li> </ul>	MS
<b>Outcome 9</b>							
Available alternatives to improve income strategies with local residents	1. Number of local actors benefiting from microprojects	No microproject is funded for the benefit of local actors	least 10 local actors derive their livelihood from projects or activities developed on the periphery of the park At The infiltration rate of the park decreased by 20%	The infiltration rate of the park decreased by more than 75%	65%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The priority projects of the populations are being collected by the riparian measure's specialist of the project in 2019. After analysis by the selection committee and approval of the Local Management Committee 4 out 24 projects submitted</li> <li>• 1 funding mechanism for support to populations living near National Parks and Nature Reserves was developed in 2019 and validated in 2020, for this purpose. The process for funding 4 microproject initiatives selected in 2020 is underway</li> <li>• The infiltration rate went from 0.61 indices/km in 2016 to 0.16 indices / km in 2019, a decrease of 74%</li> </ul>	MS
<b>Outcome 10</b>							
	1. Number of hectares under sustainable management	There is no monitoring plan to assess the ecosystem services provided by the Banco Forest	2 monitoring plans are developed and applied	2 monitoring plans implemented in 2019 and 2022	100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3,438 ha (100% of the parc area) under sustainable management thanks to the financing of the project.</li> <li>• A standardized data collection sheet has been developed for the collection of data on indicators for monitoring changes in biodiversity, carbon stocks and threats.</li> </ul>	S

Good management practices applied in the park and its periphery Revenues up 60% of the revenue of BNP evaluation Report project	2. Number of monitoring plans developed and applied to assess ecosystem services provided by forests (economic, social, water, biodiversity, carbon)	No follow-up of local actors	At least 2 riparian economic operators have implemented measures to treat their garbage	60%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 company and 1 penitentiary on the outskirts have taken actions to stop the discharge of wastewater in the park</li> <li>the Minister of the Environment put an end, on a report from the OIPR, to the establishment of a storage unit for used motor oil in the immediate periphery of the park</li> <li>1 study on flora and typology of plant formations was carried out in 2020. 1 methodological guide for vegetation and flora monitoring of Banco National Park is available.</li> <li>1 ecological monitoring protocol adopted and implemented early 2019 for wildlife.</li> <li>1 report of monitoring results with the SMART tool provides information on the state of ecosystem services</li> </ul>	MS
	3. Number of riparian companies having implemented sanitation measures			70%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 companies (FILTISAC, CIMAF, wood processing company) and 2 public administrations (MACA, Ministry of Industry) have implemented sanitation measures:</li> <li>1 sawmill valorizes its wood residues with the contribution of riparian women who use them as a source of domestic energy</li> <li>FILTISAC treats wastewater before spilling it out</li> <li>1 storm basin built by the cement plant CIMAF for the piping of water from the Yopougon industrial zone</li> <li>The "MACA" civilian prison also treats its wastewater before it is released into the wild</li> <li>1 wastewater treatment plant built for households on the west side of the park by the Ministry of Industry</li> <li>12 villages sanitation committees set up at Banco (8) and Dahliafleur (4)</li> </ul>	S

For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.

### 3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs (Implementation Progress)

Output	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2022 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2023 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	EA: Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	TM: Progress rating
<b>Under Comp 1 IMPROVING THE MANAGEMENT OF BNP AND OTHER PROTECTED AREAS</b>					
Output 1.1: Management plans for BNP and other PAs are updated	7/28/2023	90	90%	To date, 10 PAG out of the 11 planned updated. their implementation is done gradually according to the availability of financial resources.	S
Output 1.2 OIPR officers and local actors trained in protected area management	7/28/2023	87	87%	1 capacity building plan for OIPR staff is implemented and has enabled the training of several OIPR executives and agents both locally and abroad.	S
Output 1.3:1 A monitoring and evaluation system for the implementation of the BNP management plan is put in place	December 2017	100	100%	the determination of key monitoring-evaluation indicators coupled with regular monitoring has improved project results.	S
Output 1.4: State of conservation of other PAs in Côte d'Ivoire (especially those that do not have acquired funding) Those with funding like Taï, OIPR engage partners to do this work if not done)	7/28/2023	97	100%	An inventory of protected areas exists and highlights the achievements and the financial and material needs of the various parks and reserves. In addition, lobbying for the funding of conservation activities in protected areas that do not have funding continues with an emphasis on the involvement of the private sector through either the implementation of their CSR or the establishment of PPPs. .	S
Output 1.5.: Two new 10,000 ha areas are integrated into the PA network	7/28/2022	0	100%	3 protected areas with a total area of 88917 hectares have been created and integrated into the OIPR management network, these are the nature reserves of Mabi-Yaya in 2019, Aghien in 2020 and Bossématié in 2022. The drafting of the development and management plans began with the prior consultations and the development of the planning scheme. The challenges for the management of its spaces remains the mobilization of sufficient financial resources for the implementation of activities.	MS

Under Comp 2 : IMPLEMENTING A MECHANISM OF SUSTAINABLE FINANCING FOR THE BANCO NATIONAL PARK

	Output 2.1: The profits generated by the park are reinvested in its management Output 2: [activities may be included for reference, but the rating should focus on output delivery]	7/28/2022	88	90%	In the PNB, the OIPR works in close collaboration with the Ministry of Tourism to promote the BANCO NATIONAL PARK destination. Although insufficient, some improvements have been made to the PNB to increase the number of visitors to the park. However, the revenue from these visits cannot cover the management costs of the park. The challenge here remains the mobilization of financial means for a better valuation of the GNP.	S
	Output 2.2 : An innovative strategy for funding protected areas is implemented Output 5	7/28/2022	56		To improve the availability of financial resources for the management of the GNP, the OIPR has been working for some years to promote PPPs in parks and reserves for the management of tourist activities. In this sense, the management of the Banco restaurant has been entrusted to an individual and the LCA firm is involved in achieving this objective. In addition, 1 PNB window is open within the foundation for parks and reserves (FPRCI) in order to experiment with trust funds. However, supplying this window in order to have sufficient profits for the management of GNP remains a major challenge.	MS
<b>Under Comp 3</b>	<b>INCLUDE THE LOCAL INITIATIVES IN THE BNP MANAGEMENT PROGRAM</b>					
	Output 3.1.1 : Local sectoral policies are modified	7/28/2022	70	70%	In order to facilitate understanding of the role of the OIPR and the legal status of the GNP, the manager regularly organizes awareness-raising sessions for the administrative and judicial authorities. The meetings of the local management committee and the guided tours are used to this end. In addition, decisions regulating access to sites of interest for local populations have been taken. However, the question of the relocation of resident workers remains to be dealt with, although internal regulations have been adopted in this direction.	S
	Output 3.2.1 : Local actors are informed and sensitized on the management of nature resources	7/27/2022	100	100%	the local GNP management committee brings together the various stakeholders and the main actors involved in its management. The meetings are the place for raising awareness of these. However, thematic meetings are organized for them and they participate in community awareness activities.	HS
	Output 3.2.2.: An integrated plan around BNP is prepared in a participatory way	7/28/2021	75	75%	the PNB development and management plan was designed in a participatory manner with all the management stakeholders. This document was adopted in 2019 and is implemented on the basis of its planning scheme and the availability of financial means.	S
<b>Under Comp 4</b>	<b>REDUCING PRESSURE ON FOREST RESOURCES AND INCREASE THE FLOW OF ECOSYSTEM SERVICES</b>					
	Output 4.1.1: The livelihoods of local populations no longer depend on the park	7/28/2022	90	90%	The local communities around the GNP, especially the most vulnerable, including women, have benefited from IGA with the supply of equipment for the production of attiéké and the improvement of sanitary conditions in health centers. In this sense, 6 AGR/ISB have been financed and local residents participating in the guiding and development work in the park.	S
	Output 4.2.1: Sustainable management of forest and non-forest ecosystems is ensured	7/28/2022	57	60%	the manager makes it a point of honor to sustainably manage the BNP, namely that the integrity of the park is conserved and preserved. It is in this sense that surveillance and ecological monitoring activities are carried out. However, the implementation of the action plan for monitoring forest and non-forest ecosystems has been hampered by the availability of financial resources	S
	Output 4.2.2: Monitoring plan developed and applied to assess ecosystem services provided by forests	7/28/2022	35	50%	The park manager highlights the ecosystem services provided by the BNP. The challenges, however, remain the quantification of these services, in particular the supply of drinking water for the population of Abidjan, air quality and the improvement of rainfall, to allow a sound appreciation of the interest of the GNP by the decision-maker and the population.	MS
	Output 4.2.3: Local stakeholders no longer pollute the park	7/29/2022	82	85%	The pollution of the GNP has decreased considerably, with, among other things, the construction of a fence on the western limit, the establishment of several health committees in the riverside districts. The construction of the limiting dam upstream of the park and the Banco river remains an important project to stem this nuisance.	S
<b>Under Comp 5</b>						

The Task Manager will decide on the relevant level of disaggregation (i.e. either at the output or activity level).

4  
R  
i  
s  
k  
R  
a  
t  
i  
n  
g

4.1  
Tabl  
e A.  
Proj  
ect  
man  
age  
men  
t  
Risk

*Please refer to the Risk  
Help Sheet for more  
details on rating*

Risk Factor	EA's Rating	TM's Rating
1 Management structure - Roles and responsibilities <small>Governance structure - Strength</small>		
2		
3 Implementation schedule		
4 Budget		
5 Financial Management		
6 Reporting		
7 Capacity to deliver		

*If any of the risk factors is rated a Moderate or higher,  
please include it in Table B below*

4.2  
Tabl  
e B.  
Risk-  
log

Implementation Status (Current PIR)

*Insert ALL the risks identified either at CEO endorsement  
(inc. safeguards screening), previous/current PIRs, and  
MTRs. Use the last line to propose a suggested  
consolidated rating.*

	Risk affecting:	Risk Rating	Variation respect to last rating

Risk	Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	MTR	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	PIR 6	Δ	Justification
Risk 1: The harvesting of timber and non-timber resources by local people may compromise the project's intended outcomes.	Outcomes 1-3	M	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	=	The local populations are involved in the management activities of the Park. Maintenance and tourist orientation activities are carried out by local populations under contract with the NGO VISION VERTE. Although the process of identifying micro-projects took time, to date, initiatives of local populations are financed in order to improve their perception of BNP.
Risk 2 : Encroachment on protected areas	All outcomes & outputs	H	M	M	M	L	L	L	L		A clear demarcation between the park and the urban area west of the park, the called sensitive zone: In Banco national Park 3,2 linear meters of protective fence have been established on the western boundaries. An Information, Education and Communication programme has been implemented with the involvement of the authorities.
Risk 3 : Unchannelled runoff	Output 4.2.3 Output 3.1.1	H	S	S	M	M	M	M	M		A drainage activities have been carried out along the fence to facilitate the flow of rainwater and wastewater. 3 companies (FILTISAC, CIMAF, wood processing company) and 2 public administrations (MACA, Ministry of Industry) have implemented sanitation measures: 1 sawmill valorizes its wood residues with the contribution of riparian women who use them as a source of domestic energy, FILTISAC treats wastewater before spilling out 1 storm basin built by the cement plant CIMAF for the piping of water from the Yopougon industrial zone. The "MACA" civilian prison also treats its wastewater before it is released into the wild; 1 treatment plant under construction for homes on the west side of the Park by the Ministry of Industry; 12 villages sanitation committees set up at Banco (8) and Dahliafleur (4).
	Outcome 1.2	M	M	L	L	L	L	L	L		The Abidjan urban transport and Abidjan Metro projects have provided for the erection of fences on the north-western, northern and eastern edges of the BNP where the activities of certain economic operators were causing pollution of the Park. As part of the environmental assessments, the stakeholders concerned were consulted and measures were planned to take them into account in the environmental and social management plans for these projects.
Risk 4 : Distrust of local actors living on the periphery of the park who might think that this is a disguised eviction mechanism	Output 4.1.1	H	H	S	M	M	L	L	L		A funding mechanism for micro-projects has been validated. The first initiatives of selected local populations were validated by the Local Management Committee of the BNP. These projects will receive funding this year.
Risk 5 : Local people might consider the loan made to them as a gift; this could compromise the sustainability of IGA financing	All outcomes & outputs				S	M	L	L	L		measures devices has been set up for staff and for visitors.
Risk 6 : COVID											
<b>Consolidated project risk</b>			M	M	M	L	L	L	L	L	This section focuses on the variation. The overall rating is discussed in section 2.3.

#### 4.3

List here only risks from Table A and B above that have a risk rating of **M or higher** in the **current PIR**

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIR-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	Additional mitigation measures for the next periods		
			What	When	By whom







## Project Minor Amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines. Please tick each category for which a change occurred in the fiscal year of reporting and provide a description of the change that occurred in the textbox. You may attach supporting document as appropriate.

### 5.1 Table A: Listing of all Minor Amendment (TM)

Minor amendments	Changes	Minor amendments
Results framework		Since the departure from Côte d'Ivoire of its Director who participated in the preparation of the project, the NGO CIAI has not provided the expected co-financing. The activities planned under this co-financing, namely income-generating activities for the benefit of women, are supported by the project
Components and cost		
Institutional and implementation arrangements		
Financial management		
Implementation schedule	Explain in table B	
Executing Entity		
Executing Entity Category		
Minor project objective change		
Safeguards		
Risk analysis		
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%		
Co-financing	Yes	
Location of project activity		
Other		

### 5.2 Table B: History of project revisions and/or extensions (TM)

Version	Type	Signed/Approved by UNEP	Entry into Force (last signature Date)	Agreement Expiry Date	Main changes introduced in this revision
Original Legal Instrument					
Amendment 1	Revision				
Extension 1	Extension				

## GEO Location Information:

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap \(https://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=4/21.84/82.79\)](https://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=4/21.84/82.79) or [GeoNames \(http://www.geonames.org/\)](http://www.geonames.org/) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here \(https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx\)](https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx)

Location Name Required field	Latitude Required field	Longitude Required field	Geo Name ID Required field if the location is not an exact site	Location Description Optional text field	Activity Description Optional text field
AGBAN ATTIE	5.35767	-4.05122	ATTECOUBÉ		- 1 motorcycle donation to the village sanitation committee - 1 donation of equipment for processing local agricultural products (processing cassava into attiéké) to 1 women's group in the village
ABIDJAN AGBAN	4.69521	25.79951	ATTECOUBÉ		Donation of biomedical equipment to the Village Health Center
ANDOKOI	5.36614	-4.06865	YOPOUGON		Donation of biomedical equipment to the Village Health Center
ANONKOUA ASSOTÉ SOTRAPIM	5.43038	-4.06096	ABOBO		- 1 motorcycle donation to the village sanitation committee
ABOBO SAGBÉ CÉLESTE	5.41567	-4.03254	ABOBO		- 1 motorcycle donation to the village sanitation committee

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate. \*

[attach any relevant geospatial files]

**High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.  
**Significant Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.  
**Moderate Risk (M):** There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.  
**Low Risk (L):** There is a probability of up to 25% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.

**RISKS: Management structure - Roles and responsibilities:**

	Element 1		Element 2		Element 3: likelihood		Risk Level
Low	Well developed, <b>stable</b> Management Structure	and	Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood.		<b>Low</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Low : Well developed, <b>stable</b> Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Moderate	Well developed, <b>stable</b> Management Structure	and	Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood.		<b>Moderate</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Moderate: Well developed, <b>stable</b> Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Substantial	<b>Unstable</b> Management Structure	or	Individuals understand their own role but are <b>unsure</b> of responsibilities of others.		<b>Significant</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		Substantial: <b>Unstable</b> Management Structure or Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.
High	<b>Unstable</b> Management Structure	and	<b>Unclear</b> responsibilities or <b>overlapping functions</b> which lead to management problems.		<b>High</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		High: <b>Unstable</b> Management Structure and <b>Unclear</b> responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems. High likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.

**RISKS: Governance structure - Oversight**

Low	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies <b>meet at least once</b> a year	and	<b>Active</b> membership and participation in decision-making processes. SC <b>provides</b> direction/inputs.		<b>Low</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Low : Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet at least once a year and Active membership and participation in decision-making processes. SC provides direction/inputs. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Moderate	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies <b>meet at least once</b> a year	and	<b>Active</b> membership and participation in decision-making processes. SC <b>provides</b> direction/inputs.		<b>Moderate</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Moderate: Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet at least once a year and Active membership and participation in decision-making processes. SC provides direction/inputs. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Substantial	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies <b>do not convene regularly</b>	or	<b>Limited</b> membership and participation in decision-making processes or SC guidance/input provided to project is <b>inadequate</b> .		<b>Significant</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		Substantial: Steering Committee and/or other project bodies do not convene regularly or Limited membership and participation in decision-making processes or SC guidance/input provided to project is inadequate. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.
High	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies do not convene <b>regularly</b>	and	Steering Committee does <b>not</b> fulfil its TOR.		<b>High</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		High: Steering Committee and/or other project bodies do not convene regularly and Steering Committee does not fulfil its TOR. High likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.

**RISKS: Implementation schedule**

Low	Project <b>progressing</b> according to original work plan	and	<b>Adaptive management</b> is practiced and regular monitoring.		<b>Low</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Low : Project progressing according to original work plan and Adaptive management is practiced and regular monitoring. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Moderate	Project <b>progressing</b> according to work plan	and	<b>Adaptive management</b> and regular monitoring.		<b>Moderate</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Moderate: Project progressing according to work plan and Adaptive management and regular monitoring. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Substantial	Some changes in project work plan but <b>without major effect</b> on overall timetable	or	Measures taken are <b>not always adequate</b> and weak adaptive management.		<b>Significant</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		Substantial: Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall timetable Measures taken are not always adequate and weak adaptive management. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.
High	<b>Major delays</b> or changes in work plan or method of implementation	and	No measures taken and no adaptive management.		<b>High</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		High: Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation and No measures taken and no adaptive management. High likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.

**RISKS: Budget**

Low	Activities are <b>progressing</b> within planned budget	and	Balanced budget utilisation including PMC.		<b>Low</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Low : Activities are progressing within planned budget and Balanced budget utilisation including PMC. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Moderate	Activities are <b>progressing</b> within planned budget	and	<b>Balanced</b> budget utilisation including PMC.		<b>Moderate</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Moderate: Activities are progressing within planned budget and Balanced budget utilisation including PMC. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Substantial	<b>Minor</b> budget reallocation needed with no changes beyond the margins of 10% across the different components – excluding the PMC.	or	<b>Imbalanced</b> utilisation of budget or exhaustion of PMC before project completion.		<b>Significant</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		Substantial: Minor budget reallocation needed with no changes beyond the margins of 10% across the different components – excluding the PMC or Imbalanced utilisation of budget or exhaustion of PMC before project completion. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.
High	Major budget reallocation (>10%) across components or significant changes in budget lines (including any increase >5% from original budget)	and	<b>Poor</b> budget utilisation or exhaustion of PMC before project completion.		<b>High</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		High: Major budget reallocation (>10%) across components or significant changes in budget lines (including any increase >5% from original budget) and Poor budget utilisation or exhaustion of PMC before project completion. High likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.

**RISKS: Financial management**

Low	Funds are <b>correctly</b> managed and transparently accounted for	and	Audit reports provided regularly and confirm correct use of funds.		<b>Low</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Low : Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for and Audit reports provided regularly and confirm correct use of funds. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Moderate	Funds are <b>correctly</b> managed and transparently accounted for	and	Audit reports provided <b>regularly</b> and confirm <b>correct</b> use of funds.		<b>Moderate</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Moderate: Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for and Audit reports provided regularly and confirm correct use of funds. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Substantial	Financial reporting <b>slow</b> or deficient	or	Audit reports are not provided or indicate <b>minor</b> issues in the use of funds.		<b>Significant</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		Substantial: Financial reporting slow or deficient or Audit reports are not provided or indicate minor issues in the use of funds. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.
High	<b>Serious</b> financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds	and	Audit reports are <b>not provided</b> or indicate <b>incorrect</b> use of funds.		<b>High</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		High: Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds and Audit reports are not provided or indicate incorrect use of funds. High likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.

**RISKS: Reporting**

Low	Substantive reports are presented in a <b>timely</b> manner	and	Reports are <b>complete</b> and <b>accurate</b> with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues.		<b>Low</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Low : Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and Reports are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Moderate	Substantive reports are presented in a <b>timely</b> manner	and	Reports are <b>complete</b> and <b>accurate</b> with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues.		<b>Moderate</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Moderate: Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and Reports are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Substantial	Reports are complete and accurate but often <b>delayed</b>	Or	Reports <b>lack critical analysis</b> of progress and implementation issues.		<b>Significant</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		Substantial: Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed Or Reports lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.
High	<b>Missing</b> reports or <b>serious</b> concerns about <b>timeliness</b> of project reporting	and	Serious concerns about reports <b>quality</b> .		<b>High</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		High: Missing reports or serious concerns about timeliness of project reporting and Serious concerns about reports quality. High likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.

**RISKS: Capacity to deliver**

Low	<b>Sound</b> technical and managerial <b>capacity</b> of institutions and other project partners	and	Capacity gaps were <b>addressed</b> before implementation or during early stages.		<b>Low</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Low : Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners and Capacity gaps were addressed before implementation or during early stages. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Moderate	<b>Sound</b> technical and managerial <b>capacity</b> of institutions and other project partners	and	Capacity gaps were <b>addressed</b> before implementation or during early stages.		<b>Moderate</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery		Moderate: Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners and Capacity gaps were addressed before implementation or during early stages. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery
Substantial	<b>Weaknesses</b> persist and have been identified	Or	Capacity gaps require <b>longer time to address</b> and are continuously being addressed.		<b>Significant</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery		Substantial: Weaknesses persist and have been identified Or Capacity gaps require longer time to address and are continuously being addressed. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery

High	Capacity is very low at all levels	and	Inability to address capacity gaps or partners require constant support and technical assistance.	High likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery	High: Capacity is very low at all levels and Inability to address capacity gaps or partners require constant support and technical assistance. High likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery
------	------------------------------------	-----	---	--	---