

UN Environment GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2019
(1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019)

1. Identification	GEF ID.: 4970	<i>Umoja no.: GFL-5060-2740-4C69</i>
Project Number + Project Title	<i>Integrated Management of Protected Areas in Côte d'Ivoire, West Africa</i>	
Duration months	<i>Planned</i>	<i>60 months</i>
	<i>Extension(s)</i>	<i>Insert date & months added</i> <i>Insert date & months added</i>
Division(s) Implementing the project	<i>Division of Ecosystem, Biodiversity/Land Degradation</i>	
Executing Agency(ies)	<i>Ivorian Office of Parks and Reserves (OIPR), Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development</i>	
Names of Other Project Partners	<i>Foundation for Parks and Reserves of Côte d'Ivoire</i>	
	<i>Crown Agents</i>	
	<i>NGO Green Vision</i>	
	<i>CIAI</i>	
Project Type	<i>Full Size Project</i>	
Project Scope	<i>Abidjan – Côte d'Ivoire, West Africa</i>	
Region (<i>delete as appropriate</i>)	<i>Africa</i>	
Names of Beneficiary Countries	<i>Côte d'Ivoire</i>	
Programme of Work	<i>BD-1, BD-2, LD-3</i>	
GEF Focal Area(s)	<i>BD, LD</i>	
UNDAF linkages	<i>BD-1, BD-2, LD-3</i>	
Link to relevant SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s)	<i>BD-1, BD-2, LD-3</i>	
GEF financing amount	<i>4,240,000 \$</i>	
Co-financing amount	<i>48,745,550 \$</i>	
Date of CEO Endorsement	<i>April 6, 2015</i>	
Start of Implementation	<i>July 27, 2017</i>	
Date of first disbursement	<i>April 2017</i>	
Total disbursement as of 30 June	<i>1,125,338</i>	
Total expenditure as of 30 June	<i>655,976</i>	
Expected Mid-Term Date	<i>December 31, 2019</i>	
Completion Date	<i>Planned</i>	<i>July 26, 2021</i>
	<i>Revised</i>	<i>July 27, 2021</i>
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date	<i>July 27, 2021</i>	
Expected Financial Closure Date	<i>December 26, 2021</i>	

2. OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

To be completed by UNEP/GEF Task Manager

UN Environment Subprogramme(s) Healthy and productive ecosystems	Specify the relevant Expected Accomplishment(s) & Indicator(s) (a) The health and productivity of marine, freshwater and terrestrial ecosystems are institutionalized in education, monitoring and cross-sector and transboundary collaboration frameworks at the national and international levels.
<i>Describe any progress made towards delivering the stated PoW Expected Accomplishments and Indicators. State key changes since previous reporting period. [Section to be shared with relevant Regional and Global SubProgramme Coordinators]</i>	

For all GEF 6 and later projects:

GEF Core Indicators <i>Insert core indicator(s) from Core Indicator Worksheet to which the project contributes</i>	Indicative expected Results <i>[add figure approved at CEO endorsement/ approval]</i>
	Indicative expected Results <i>[add figure approved at CEO endorsement/ approval]</i>

To be completed by Project Manager, as relevant

Planned linkages with UNDAF	<i>The project will contribute the the outcome 3 of UNDAF 2017 – 2020 “By 2020, the public administrations implement policies which guarantee sustainable production and consumption and fighting climate change impacts”</i>
------------------------------------	---

Planned contribution to relevant SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s)	The project is contributing to SDG 15.
--	--

[complete the fiscal year and select: 1st PIR; 2nd PIR; Final PIR. Add more columns if needed]

Implementation Status	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 20__	FY 20__	FY 20__
	1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	... PIR	... PIR

*[complete the fiscal year in the first line; select **HS; S; MS; MU; U; HU; unknown; not rated** to rate the progress towards the development objective for the fiscal year you are reporting in the second line. Add more columns if needed]*

Development Objective Rating FY	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 20__	FY 20__	FY 20__
	S	S			

Component 1 : Improving the management of BNP and other protected areas

The Management and Management Plans (PAG) of the Banco National Park, Mount Sangbé National Park and the Upper Bandama Wildlife Reserve were developed and validated in workshop with all stakeholders.

The PAG of the 8 other protected areas concerned are drafted with the support of the

reading committees set up at the General Management and waiting for validation in the workshop.

Pending the finalization and validation of all the PAGs, the main achievements of the 2018 (second semester) and 2019 (1st semester) Annual Activity Plans (AAPs) validated by UN Environment have been focused on monitoring, monitoring - ecological, infrastructure rehabilitation, riparian measures and governance.

These are a total of 4,200 Men per day surveillance effort that has been made, 25.2 hectares of the arboretum, 80 km of paths, 10 hectares of bamboo and all the green spaces that have been maintained, as well as 100% of the windfalls cleared at Banco National Park and in the Dahliafleur Reserve.

In addition, 3 sessions of Local Management Committees were organized and 1 validated ecological monitoring methodology document, 12 auxiliaries and 4 agents trained in monitoring-ecological data collection technique and 1 phase of monitoring data collection fauna performed. The report of the data collection phase is being finalized.

Finally, 3 training sessions on the use of the SMART tool, wildlife data collection and flora data collection were organized for the benefit of some village auxiliaries and OIPR staff. In addition, the training session on gender is being prepared with the consultant responsible for this purpose.

Component 2 . : setting up an innovative financing mechanism for BNP

3 concept notes on innovative projects for protected areas were developed by OIPR and the Panafrican Council of Environmental Doctors (COPADEN) to mobilize additional resources have been produced.

With regard to the opening of a Banco endowment fund for the sustainable financing of the Park, the two working sessions carried out by the Project Coordinator and the Executive Director of the Foundation for Parks and Reserves of Côte d'Ivoire resulted in the production of a convention awaiting signature.

As part of the development of a public-private partnership for the promotion of ecotourism activities, OIPR and Conservation Leadership in Africa (LCA) have developed a common roadmap, including the establishment of 2 technical committee, for the monitoring of priority activities by 2020.

In addition, the project obtained a verbal agreement on a project proposal for logistical support estimated at 250 million CFA and the construction of a 1.5 km fence section on the western part of the Park.

Component 3: Integration of local biodiversity conservation initiatives in peripheral areas of protected areas

As part of the relocation of natural and legal persons located in the Banco National Park,

the strategy developed was discussed during the first meeting of the PROGIAP-CI Steering Committee held on March 6, 2019. To this end, guidelines have been given in order to lead the process with all the parties concerned, in particular the National Institut for agricultural training and the Ministry of Water and Forests.

In order to promote management benefits to the populations of the periphery of the protected area, they are mobilized to carry out various activities that provide them with income.

As such, all the unqualified personnel, 38 persons, were employed for the construction of the fence and the maintenance of the slopes of Banco Park and Dahliafleur Reserve At the level of ecological monitoring activities, 24 people from peripheral localities received 2 training sessions, under the same conditions as the Park agents, and were then used to collect data on fauna and flora.

In order to extend this initiative, a directory of local associations has been created and transmitted to the partner structures in order to facilitate and privilege local residents in the allocation of jobs resulting from the management of the Park and the activities of other stakeholders.

Then, as a prelude to the implementation of income-generating activities for the benefit of groups from these populations, a sensitization tour in all the localities of the periphery of the Banco Park and the Dahliafleur Reserve was carried out and the populations invited to submit project proposals.

Component 4: Reducing pressures on forest resources for increased flow of ecosystem services

At the level of Information, Education and Communication activities, 4 guided tours were organized for tourism institutions and professionals (3 NGOs, Leadership for Conservation in Africa, 11 travel agencies, police authorities, gendarmerie and justice). In addition, environmental education sessions for more than 3100 students were organized.

An awareness campaign for the benefit of 200 people is underway in the villages bordering the 2 protected areas.

Lastly, 2 agreements for the contractualization of maintenance and environmental education activities signed with 2 local NGOs (Green Vision, Guardians of nature) in order to benefit the population from the benefits of the management of the GNP, were renewed. As such, 100% of the labor-intensive works were carried out according to the "High Intensity Works by THIMO Work" approach by the NGO Vision Verte.

Implementation Progress Rating	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 20__	FY 20__	FY 20__
	S	S			
<i>Describe annual implementation progress, including any significant [expected and unexpected] environmental or other changes (Results) attributable to project implementation. Also, please discuss any major challenges to meet the objectives or specific project outcomes. [section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal 'Information on</i>					

Progress, challenges and outcomes on project implementation activities' and is the primary report that viewers can see before opening the detailed PIR]. The information must be consistent with the assessment and justification provided under 3.2.

[complete the fiscal year in the first line; select H; S; M; L; to rate the fiscal year you are reporting. Add more columns if needed]

Risk Rating	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 20__	FY 20__	FY 20__
	L	L			
<p>1. A clear demarcation between the park and the urban area west of the park, the so-called sensitive zone</p> <p>2. Remediation of the park due to reduced pollution, solid and liquid waste in the park and the distribution of waste containers to residents</p> <p>3. visibility of some of the wildlife species such as the big fish of the Banco River, chimpanzees and monkeys</p> <p>4. More amenities to access the park thanks to the layout of two tourist entrances</p> <p>5. Available visitor restoration devices</p>					

Stakeholder engagement	<p>1- Involvement of local population in Park management activities: 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</p> <p>2- All major activities record the participation of village chiefs, notables, youth and women representatives</p> <p>3- Major consultations are at the initiative of the prefectural body</p> <p>4. All key stakeholders participate to the Steering Committee and project planning activities</p>
-------------------------------	---

Gender mainstreaming	<p>A gender study was conducted with a projection of the implementation of the recommendations. in addition, a census of women's organizations was conducted in order to assist this organization in income-generating microprojects</p>
-----------------------------	--

Knowledge activities and products	<p>- More than 10 broadcasts on the first channel of the public television of a documentary film on the national parks and nature reserves of Côte d'Ivoire including 2 sequences especially on the Banco National Park.</p> <p>- 1 film distribution plan on various media (CD Rom, USB keys, ...) started in 2018 continues in 2019</p>
--	---

Stories to be shared	<p>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</p>
-----------------------------	--

3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK

Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the **UNEP Task Manager**¹ will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:

- (i) Progress towards achieving the project Results(s)- see section 3.1
- (ii) Implementation progress – see section 3.2

Section 3.3 on Risk should be first completed by the Project Manager. The UNEP Task Manager will subsequently enter his/her own ratings in the appropriate column.

3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project Results(s) [copy and paste the CEO Endorsement (or latest formal Revision) approved Results Framework, adding/deleting outcome rows, as appropriate]

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones ²	End of Project Target	Observations/ justification on rating	Progress rating ³
Objective⁴						
Objective 1 : Improving the management of the national Protected Areas Network	1. Percent increase in BNP METT score	PNB 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 10 points (METT = 83%)	The METT score increased by 5 points from 61% when the project was approved to 66%. The objective of achieving a score increase of 10 points at the end of the project is thus achieved in half	S
Objective 2 : Implement a mechanism of sustainable financing for the Banco National Park	2. 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	BNP has a financing mechanism durable	Project coordination has been agreed with the Parks and Reserves Foundation on a draft convention for the opening of a Banco national park gate, but the agreement has not yet been signed. In addition, the OIPR / LCA working group on the establishment of a PPP is continuing its work according to the adopted timetable	MS

¹ For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.

² Some projects are adopting/planning to adopt milestones for tracking the achievement of outcomes. Add the corresponding milestones in this column when applicable to inform the rating. Milestones are optional and may substitute for Mid-Term Target.

³ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (**HS**), Satisfactory (**S**), Marginally Satisfactory (**MS**), Marginally Unsatisfactory (**MU**), Unsatisfactory (**U**), and Highly Unsatisfactory (**HU**).

⁴ Add rows if your objective has more than 3 outcome indicators. Same applies for the number of outcomes.

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones ²	End of Project Target	Observations/ justification on rating	Progress rating ³
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	At least 6 local biodiversity conservation initiatives around the BNP were carried out	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 was 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	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	MS
	5. Carbon sequestration rate	Carbon sequestration rate is 50%		Carbon sequestration rate increased 50%		
Outcomes						
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		The 11 Management Plans are drafted including 3 (Banco, Mont Sangbé and Haut Bandama) validated in workshop with stakeholders	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones ²	End of Project Target	Observations/ justification on rating	Progress rating ³
	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	100% of programmed activities are executed	<p>4,200 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.</p> <p>3 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 being finalized.</p> <p>3 training sessions on the use of the SMART tool, the collection of data on fauna and flora carried out with village auxiliaries, OIPR agents and a consultant for the flora component. Data collection of the gender study in the field and from partners has been completed and a first report has been sent to the project management Unit for comments.</p>	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones ²	End of Project Target	Observations/ justification on rating	Progress rating ³
<p>Outcome 2: The capacity of OIPR staff and local actors in the management of protected areas are enhanced</p>	<p>1. Number of OIPR staff trained and Number of local actors trained in the end</p>	<p>Number of OIPR staff trained</p>	<p>Infiltration rate decreased by 75%</p>		<p>- 1 mission conducted by 2 OIPR executives (DG and DZS) from September 15 to 30, 2018 in Shepherdstown, West Virginia</p> <p>- 20 agents and 7 administrators trained in the SMART tool</p> <p>- 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 (CESO)</p> <p>- 29 actors trained in monitoring and evaluation data collection in August 2018</p> <p>In 2019, four training courses were conducted for the benefit of:</p> <p>- 1 agent trained in Morocco on the new procurement procedures.</p> <p>- 16 (4 agents and 12 auxiliaries) in collecting monitoring and ecological data in January 2019</p> <p>- 25 (17 auxiliaries and 8 agents) in the knowledge of the flora and plant formations of the PNB in April 2019</p> <p>The monitoring and evaluation Responsible participated in a management effectiveness evaluation training based on the IMET 2 tool in May 2019</p>	<p>S</p>

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones ²	End of Project Target	Observations/ justification on rating	Progress rating ³
<p>Outcome 3: A functional ecological monitoring and evaluation of the BNP and its management effectiveness</p>	<p>1. Tools for collecting, storing, analyzing and disseminating information are available in year 1 of the project</p>	<p>The monitoring and evaluation system is not in place</p>	<p>A database is set up</p>	<p>The database is operational Other parks have operational databases</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>S</p>
	<p>2. The field device and the various links of the system are installed</p>				<p>1 flora and 1 phase wildlife data collection started in the second quarter of 2019 to update the Park's ecological monitoring database As part of the planning, 1 Annual Activity Plan 2019 and 1 Procurement Plan (PPM 2019) have been prepared. Over the period from July 2018 to June 2019, 1 monitoring and evaluation mission and 2 follow-up technical missions were carried out by the OIPR's Control and Planning Unit and Technical</p>	<p>S</p>
<p>Outcome 4: Improved knowledge and management of other PA</p>	<p>1. State of conservation of different AP is known</p>	<p>The state of conservation of PAs is not well known</p>	<p>The state of conservation of PAs with acquired funding is known</p>	<p>The state of conservation of all PAs is known</p>	<p>1 review of biodiversity in national parks and nature reserves is available A template for a conservation status report on protected areas was prepared in 2018. A 2018 State of Conservation for each AP is available</p>	<p>S</p>
<p>Outcome 5: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new PA</p>	<p>1. METT score level</p>	<p>Several PAs have management effectiveness issues</p>	<p>50% of PAs have a management plan implemented</p>	<p>All PAs implement their management plans</p>	<p>7 out of 14 protected areas were evaluated in 2018 with the METT tool (Tai, Comoé, Mont Sangbé, Banco, Ehotilé, Azagny and Nimba) After validation of 3 management plans in 2019, 6 out of 14 protected areas now have this document</p>	<p>S</p>

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones ²	End of Project Target	Observations/ justification on rating	Progress rating ³
Outcome 6: 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	80% of BNP's operating costs are covered by its own resources	The revenues of the Banco come from visitors from an average of 7,000 visitors in 2016 to 10,000 in 2018 representing about 5% of recurrent expenses estimated at more than 100 million CFA a year	S
Outcome 7: 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	A funding strategy is put in place for new and old PAs that do not have one	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 2 meetings of the PPP with LCA think tank held in July 2018 and February 2019; a proposal for zoning and valuation plans available	S
Outcome 8: The strategy of integration of local conservation initiatives in buffer zones is implemented	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	A protection perimeter (security) is delineated around each new protected area	2,922 linear meters of protective fence established since February 2019 over 3,200 meters programmed 1 weekly technical monitoring carried out by the project team	S
	2. Information, Education and Communication Plan (IEC) for the benefit of local stakeholders	No information, education and communication (IEC) plan for local stakeholders	an IEC plan is developed and implemented	50% of riparian populations apply good biodiversity conservation practices	1 meeting with the Governor of the District of Abidjan and the Sub-Prefect of the City of Bingerville on financing tourism infrastructure 4 guided tours for tourism institutions and professionals (3 NGOs, Leadership for Conservation in Africa, 11 travel agencies, police, gendarmerie and justice authorities). Environmental education sessions for over 3100 students were organized. 1 awareness campaign for 200 people underway in the villages bordering the Banco National Park and the Dahliafleur Reserve.	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones ²	End of Project Target	Observations/ justification on rating	Progress rating ³
	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	50 riparian actors benefit from the financing of their resources generated project 8 monitoring companies created by local residents are approved by the Project	1 mission carried out to identify the 6 income-generating activities to be financed for the benefit of the groupings of the periphery in 2019 1 directory of 36 associations identified around the Banco Park (32) and the Dahliafleur Reserve (4) established	MS
<p>Outcome 9: Available alternatives to improve income strategies with local residents</p>	1. Number of local actors benefiting from microprojects	No microproject is funded for the benefit of local actors	At least 10 local actors derive their livelihood from projects or activities developed on the periphery of the park The infiltration rate of the park decreased by 20%	At least 50 local actors derive their livelihood from projects or activities developed by the project The infiltration rate of the park decreased by 20%	The priority projects of the populations are being collected by the riparian measures specialist of the project. These projects will be submitted for selection and funding decision to a special session of the Local Management Committee enlarged to the relevant technical structures The infiltration rate went from 0.61 indices / km in 2016 to 0.17 indices / km in 2018, a drop of 72%	MS
<p>Outcome 10: Good management practices applied in the park and its periphery • • Revenues up 60% of the</p>	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	At least 4 monitoring plans are developed and implemented	3,438 ha (100% of the parc area) under sustainable management thanks to the financing of the project	HS

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones ²	End of Project Target	Observations/ justification on rating	Progress rating ³
revenue of GNP 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	At least 4 riparian economic operators have implemented measures to treat their garbage	1 study on flora and typology of plant formations in progress Flora study findings will help define ecosystem services monitoring plans 1 ecological monitoring protocol adopted and implemented early 2019 for wildlife 1 report of monitoring results with the SMART tool provides information on the state of ecosystem services	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones ²	End of Project Target	Observations/ justification on rating	Progress rating ³
	3. Number of riparian companies having implemented sanitation measures				<p>3 companies (FILTISAC, CIMAF, wood processing company) and 2 public administrations (MACA, Ministry of Industry) have implemented sanitation measures:</p> <p>1 sawmill valorizes its wood residues with the contribution of riparian women who use them as a source of domestic energy</p> <p>FILTISAC treats wastewater before spilling out</p> <p>1 storm basin built by the cement plant CIMAF for the piping of water from the Yopougon industrial zone</p> <p>The "MACA" civilian prison also treats its wastewater before it is released into the wild</p> <p>1 treatment plant under construction for homes on the west side of the Park by the Ministry of Industry</p> <p>12 villages sanitation committees set up at Banco (8) and Dahliafleure (4)</p>	HS

Overall rating of project progress towards meeting project Result(s) (*To be provided by UNEP GEF Task Manager.*)

FY2018 rating [previous]	FY2019 rating [current]	Justification of the current FY rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods.
S	S	The project is delivering as planned and there are no major challenge affecting project progress.

Risks to the delivery of results

The second column should be completed by the Project Manager and the third column should summarize the recommendations that the Project Manager and Task Manager have agreed upon to address the problem/risk. Projects should complete only the relevant sections and are free to add/delete problems/risks. This section should inform the risk rating in section 3.3.

Problems/risks identified	Description of the problem/risk	Agreed recommended actions
on achieving targets		
on stakeholder engagement		
on gender actions		
on safeguards		
on delivering GEF Core Indicators		
on delivering of PoW EA		
on sustainability of results		
others		

3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs

Outputs ⁵	Expected delivery date ⁶	Implementation status as of 30 June 2018 ⁷	Implementation status as of 30 June 2019)	Progress rating justification (as much as possible, describe in terms of immediate gains to target groups, e.g. access to project deliverables, participation in receiving services; gains in knowledge, etc)	Progress rating ⁸
Output 1.1.1: Management plans for BNP and other PAs are updated	December-2018	41%	57		S
Activity 1.1.1.1 Update the BNP Management Plan	December-2018				S
Activity 1.1.1.2 Update or develop the management plan of the other PAs	December-2018				S
Output 1.1.2 The management plan for BNP and other PAs is implemented	27- July -21	7%	31		S
Activity 1.1.2.1 Implement the BNP Management Plan	27- July -21	7%	31		S
Activity 1.1.2.2 Support implementation of other PAs' management plans	27- July -21	7	31	Resources not available for administrative reasons	S
Output 1.2.1 OIPR officers and local actors trained in protected area management	27- July -21	3	34		S
Activity 1.2.1.1 Provide protected area management training to OIPR staff and local stakeholders	27- July -21	2	34	N/A	S
Activity 1.2.1.2 Sensitize OIPR officers to use any communication tool to educate local populations	27- July -21	20	40		S
Output 1.3 A monitoring and evaluation system for the implementation of the BNP management plan is put in place		21	41		S
Activity 1.3.1 Acquire monitoring and evaluation software	December-2017	100	100		S
Activity 1.3.2 Establish the baseline situation for Banco Park management	Dec. 18	0	100		S
Activity 1.3.3. Develop and implement an OIPR Executive Training Program and Technology Acquisition Program as part of the operationalization of Activity 1.3.1, and 1.3.2	Dec 2018	75	75		S

⁵ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision.

⁶ As per latest workplan (latest project revision)

⁷ Implementation may be assessed by qualitative assessments, percentage of delivery, and/or budget expenditure (planned and actually spent). The 2018 assessment should be copied from previous PIR.

⁸ To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager

Outputs ⁵	Expected delivery date ⁶	Implementation status as of 30 June 2018 ⁷	Implementation status as of 30 June 2019)	Progress rating justification (as much as possible, describe in terms of immediate gains to target groups, e.g. access to project deliverables, participation in receiving services; gains in knowledge, etc)	Progress rating ⁸
Activity 1.3.4 Conduct a gender study	June 2018	5	42	TDR developed, 3 CVs being analyzed for consultant recruitment 1 indicator monitoring framework completed for the year 2018	MS
Activity 1.3.5 Implement the monitoring and evaluation mechanism	27- July -21	12	28	1 Matrix of key indicators developed, 12 definition sheets of the key indicators produced 1 monitoring-evaluation plan available	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 not done)	27- July -21	85	85		S
Activity 1.4.1 : Make the inventory of PAs	Dec 2018	100	100		S
Activity 1.4.2 : Analyze the consideration of local communities and the private sector in PA management and prospects for enhancing participation in conservation efforts	Dec 2017	100	100		S
Activity 1.4.3 : Develop the Emergency Plan for PAs in Côte d'Ivoire (This emergency plan must be submitted to the Government for adoption and financing with the help of partners)	Dec 2018	50	50		S
Output 1.5.1: Two new 10,000 ha areas are integrated into the PA network	27- July -21	0	0		
Activity 1.5.1: Develop management plans for the two new protected areas		0	0	Creation of the 2 protected areas not effective	N/A
Activity 1.5.2: Implement management plans for the two new protected areas Output 1: (copy & paste from approved Results Framework) [activities may be included for reference, but the rating should focus on output delivery]	27- July -21	0	0	Activity linked to the creation of the 2 protected areas	N/A
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]	27- July -21	0	11		

Outputs ⁵	Expected delivery date ⁶	Implementation status as of 30 June 2018 ⁷	Implementation status as of 30 June 2019)	Progress rating justification (as much as possible, describe in terms of immediate gains to target groups, e.g. access to project deliverables, participation in receiving services; gains in knowledge, etc)	Progress rating ⁸
Activity 2.1.1: Develop and implement a communication strategy on the park's eco-tourism services	27- July -21	0	28		N/A
Activity 2.1.2: Develop and implement a plan to create ecotourism spaces and services Output 4:	27- July -21	0	2		N/A
Output 2.2 : An innovative strategy for funding protected areas is implemented Output 5:	27- July -21	0	22		
Activity 2.2.1: Develop and implement a business plan for BNP	27- July -21	0	45		N/A
Activity 2.2.2: Develop Public-Private Partnerships (PPP)	27- July -21	0	0	1 Convention on the tourist promotion of the Banco National Park signed with Luxe Voyages	S
Activity 2.2.3: Create a BNP-specific Fund housed at the Foundation	Dec 2018	0	0		U
Output 3.1.1: Local sectoral policies are modified	27- July -21	11	14		
Activity 3.1.1.1: Relocate the natural and legal persons installed in the Park and in the park security perimeter	27- July -21	10	10		S
Activity 3.1.1.2: Organize training seminars (two seminars) and sensitization of judicial authorities, law enforcement and stakeholders on compliance and enforcement of regulatory texts related to the protection of biodiversity	27- July -21	14	26		S
Activity 3.1.1.3: Take local regulatory and legal provisions to manage sacred spaces within the BNP	27- July -21	0	0	Access to sacred sites for worshipping suspended due to pollution	N/A
Output 3.2.1: Local actors are informed and sensitized on the management of natural resources	27- July -21	10	13		S
Activity 3.2.1.1: Sensitize local stakeholders to biodiversity conservation	December-2018	0	0		U
Activity 3.2.1.2 Implement an IEC strategy (local radio, television broadcasts, sensitization meetings, ...) for local actors	27- July -21	10	13		S

Outputs ⁵	Expected delivery date ⁶	Implementation status as of 30 June 2018 ⁷	Implementation status as of 30 June 2019)	Progress rating justification (as much as possible, describe in terms of immediate gains to target groups, e.g. access to project deliverables, participation in receiving services; gains in knowledge, etc)	Progress rating ⁸
Output 3.2.2: An integrated plan around BNP is prepared in a participatory way	27- July -21	0	11		
Activity 3.2.2.1: Develop in a participatory way the integrated management plan around BNP	December-2018	0	20		U
Activity 3.2.2.2: Implement the integrated management plan around BNP	27- July -21	0	0		N/A
Output 4.1.1: The livelihoods of local populations no longer depend on the park	27- July -21	0	5		
Activity 4.1.1.1 Finance the AGR for the benefit of local populations	27- July -21	0	4	Financing scheduled from 2019	N/A
Activity 4.1.1.2 Contractualize certain specific activities of the park with formal groups of young residents	27- July -21	20	40		S
Output 4.2.1: Sustainable management of forest and non-forest ecosystems is ensured	27- July -21	0	57		
Activity 4.2.1.1: Develop plans for sustainable management of forest and non-forest ecosystems	December-2018	0	100		U
Activity 4.2.1.2: Implement sustainable forest and non-forest ecosystem management plans	27- July -21	0	0	Not programmed	N/A
Activity 4.2.1.3 Implement indicators to monitor the evolution of biodiversity and the carbon stock, threats and evaluate the effectiveness of intervention actions	27- July -21	0	20	Matrix of monitoring indicators developed pending validation	S
Output 4.2.2: Monitoring plan developed and applied to assess ecosystem services provided by forests	27- July -21	0	1		
Activity 4.2.2.1: Develop the monitoring plan for forest ecosystem services	December-2018	0	10		U
Activity 4.2.2.2: Implement the forest ecosystem services monitoring plan	27- July -21	0	0		N/A
Output 4.2.3: Local stakeholders no longer pollute the park	27- July -21	9	56		
Activity 4.2.3.1: Perform environmental audit of riparian companies	27- July -21	0	0		U
Activity 4.2.3.2: Implement with local actors the sanitation measures	27- July -21	10	69	Safety Committees not yet functional	S

Overall project implementation progress ⁹ (*To be completed by UNEP GEF Task Manager.*):

FY2018 rating [previous]	FY2019 rating [current]	Justification of the current rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods.
S	S	Project implementation is going on smoothly. No major challenges to affect project delivery.

Risks in implementation

This section should be completed by the Project Manager and summarize implementation risks (e.g. procurement delays, reputational risks etc). The first column should be completed by the Project Manager and the second column should summarize the recommendations that the Project Manager and Task Manager have agreed upon to address the problem/risk. This section should inform the risk rating in section 3.3.

Problems/risks identified	Agreed recommended actions	By whom	When

3.3. Risk Rating *[Insert the Medium and High Risks and mitigation measures identified at CEO endorsement (e.g. Section A.5) and any relevant risk from safeguards screening and/or management plans.] Expand the table to include medium and high risks observed during implementation, e.g. problems identified in sections 3.1. and 3.2.*

Risk	Mitigation at CEO approval	Mitigation at implementation	Rank
Data collection risk, in terms of non-validated reports or other data that could be incorrect or misstated.	A focus of this project will be the development of new partners and new data sources beyond the project itself, moving toward a scenario with multiple data sources, some of which will be sources that can be used to validate other claims of progress or results. Example: the partnership with National Bureau of Statistics in Nigeria.		CEO: M TM: PM:
Partners, having made implementation commitments and set goals, back away from or abandon their goals as deadlines approach.	Broadly speaking, the project serves to support the partners and help them maintain progress on reaching their goals by providing a beneficial non-partisan political exposure, which partners		CEO: M TM: PM:

⁹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)

	will gain through their participation. The project will closely track partners' implementation and will leverage in a diplomatic fashion on its soft power to ensure that they deliver on their commitments. Specific webinars and one-on-one sessions will be organized with those partners which achieve commitments to share their success stories and best practices.		
Drafted and proposed legislation is not passed into law	Project activities tap the right expertise through GLOBE's extensive partnerships to inform and justify needed policy changes. Chapter and/or executive-level engagement activities create the necessary political will, momentum, and leadership for change. Legislation is the ideal to which the project will aspire, but where immediately feasible, regulatory responses may be sought in the interim. The the project-proposed legislation changes will be explained comprehensively and put in an international context in order to increase cross-party ownership and support.		CEO: M TM: PM:
ESERN [add cells as appropriate to capture all Medium and High Risks]			
Overall Risk Rating Project Manager			
Overall Risk Rating Task Manager			

FY2018 rating [previous]	FY2019 rating [current]	Justification of the current risk rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods.
Low	Low	No major risk affecting project implementation

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.
Substantial 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.

Modest 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.

Optional Annexes and/or Links:

- Project Steering Committee Minutes of the year reported
- Half yearly Report
- Quarterly Reports
- Risk Factor Table form previous template (recommended for substantial and high-risk projects)

Risks Factor Table

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

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.

Substantial 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.

Modest 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.

RISK FACTOR TABLE

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

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 [Roles and responsibilities]	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 : no comment	X				
											TM:					
Governance structure [oversight]	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 : no comment	X				
											TM:					
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: no comment	X				
											TM:					
Work flow Budget	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: no comment	X				
											TM:					
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: no comment	X				
											TM:					
Budget	Activities are progressing within planned budget	Minor budget reallocation needed	Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget	X							PM: no comment	X				
											TM:					

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																		
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							PM: no comment								
										TM:								
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: no comment		X						
										TM:								
Stakeholder engagement	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: no comment	X							
										TM:								

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: no comment	X					
											TM:						
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: no comment	X					
											TM:						
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: no comment	X					
											TM:						

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: no comment	X					
Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary											PM:						
											TM:						

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: no comment		X				
										TM:						
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: The project area is lowest level in the Abobo watershed where rainwater sometimes causes losses of vegetation cover with silting of the banco rive						
										TM:						
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: no comment	X					
										TM:						
Capacity issues	Sound technical and managerial capacity of	Weaknesses exist but have been identified and actions is taken to	Capacity is very low at all levels and partners	X						PM: no comment	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																	
	institutions and other project partners	build the necessary capacity	require constant support and technical assistance								TM:						
Others, please specify																	

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

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

Rank	Risk Statement ¹⁰		Action to Take	Who	Date
	Condition	Consequence			

¹⁰ Only for Substantial to High risk.

Rank	Risk Statement ¹⁰		Action to Take	Who	Date
	Condition	Consequence			

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High) (*Please include PIR risk ratings for all prior periods, add columns as necessary*):

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Low	Low	No major Risk affecting project implementation
		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

Annexe: Project Steering Committee Minutes of the year reported (next page)