



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

### 2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



## 1. Basic Project Data

### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	Southern Africa (Benguela)
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Angola, Namibia, South Africa
<b>Project Title:</b>	Enhancing Climate Change resilience in the Benguela Current Fisheries System
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP/SFS/480/LDF and GCP/SFS/480/SCF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	5113
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	LDCF/SCCF
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	Benguela Current Convention
<b>Project Duration:</b>	– 5 Years (60 months)

### Milestone Dates:

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	December 17, 2014
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	December 15, 2015
<b>Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	December 14, 2020
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) <sup>2</sup></b>	January 24, 2021
<b>Actual Implementation End Date<sup>3</sup>:</b>	

### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	USD 4,725,000 (USD3,025,000 SCCF & USD 1,700,000 LDCF)
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>4</sup>:</b>	USD 19,166,000
<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):</b>	USD 1,789,254.82 (USD 1,260,456.71 SCCF & USD 528,789.11 LDCF)
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019<sup>5</sup></b>	USD 883,842

<sup>1</sup> as per FPMIS

<sup>2</sup> In case of a project extension.

<sup>3</sup> Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

<sup>4</sup> This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

<sup>5</sup> Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

## Review and Evaluation

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:</b>	10 September 2018
<b>Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):</b>	24 June 2019 - (ongoing)
<b>Mid-term review/evaluation actual:</b>	24 June 2019
<b>Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:</b>	
<b>Tracking tools/ Core indicators required<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>No</b>

## Ratings

<b>Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):</b>	Marginally Unsatisfactory	The project is 18 months behind implementation schedule due several levels of delay.  Delays of >6 months were experienced in contracting consultants that are responsible for delivering major outcomes under component 2 and 3, this further delayed disbursement and progress toward the objective. The erratic timing of recruitment disadvantaged on-the-ground activities that require national coordination and leadership.
<b>Overall implementation progress rating:</b>	Marginally Unsatisfactory	
<b>Overall risk rating:</b>	Medium – High	

## Status

<b>Implementation Status (1<sup>st</sup> PIR, 2<sup>nd</sup> PIR, etc. Final PIR):</b>	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR
--	---------------------

<sup>6</sup> Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

## Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Ben van Zyl, Project Coordinator, Benguela Current Commission (BCC)	<a href="mailto:ben@benguelacc.org">ben@benguelacc.org</a>
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Vasco Schmidt, Fisheries & Aquaculture Officer, SFS, Food & Agriculture Organisation (FAO)	<a href="mailto:Vasco.schmidt@fao.org">Vasco.schmidt@fao.org</a>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Alain Onibon, Regional Coordinator for Southern Africa a.i., FAO	<a href="mailto:Alain.onibon@fao.org">Alain.onibon@fao.org</a>
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division</b>	Kuena Morebotsane, Funding Liaison Officer, GEF Coordination Unit, FAO	<a href="mailto:Kuena.morebotsane@fao.org">Kuena.morebotsane@fao.org</a>

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Objective(s): To build resilience of the Benguela Current marine fisheries systems to climate change through implementation of adaptation strategies in order to ensure food and livelihood security.</b>						
	a) Climate change adaptation actions in fisheries and fishery dependent communities are incorporated into key policies and planning in the 3 project countries	0		At least one key policy or addenda to existing policies (at least one in each country), submitted to National Authorities and BCC for adaptation by project end	None as yet	MS
	b) # of small-scale fishery communities with adaptation plans under implementation	0		At least 9 communities have community-based adaptation plans under implementation by PY3	Progress towards adaptation plans for the two South Africa project communities of Hondeklipbaai, and Humansdorp needed	MS

<sup>7</sup> This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

<sup>8</sup> Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

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

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
	c) Climate monitoring and early warning systems providing timely and relevant information to target fishery communities	There are various programmes in place for monitoring important climate-driven extreme events and other risks, but the processing and dissemination of much of this information is not tailored to the sector's and fishery communities needs		Climate monitoring and early warning systems providing timely and relevant information to target fisheries communities by PY4	Progress being made to customising the climate early warning system to small scale fishery communities' needs, as a baseline, ABALOBi and Weather-dock partnered in the implementation of the Vessel Monitoring System (vms) track for a small scale community (Hondeklipbaai, South Africa). The system that was developed outside the project, provides early warning and search and rescue for fishermen The AIS safety at sea device is being piloted and we envisage of implementing it in communities which identified safety at sea as key action towards Climate	MU

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					Change Adaptation. In addition, a ToR is prepared for a consultant to undertake a gap analysis of existing and early warnings of extreme weather and environmental events linked to Climate Change or variability and make recommendation on addressing such gaps.	

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
	d) National fisheries management plans incorporate monitoring and adaptive response to climate variability and change	Existing management plans do not take into account climate variability and change		At least 3 national or regional fisheries management plans developed / revised to incorporate response to climate variability and change by PY4	Fisheries Management plans do exist for the hake fishery in Namibia and operational management procedures do exists for some fisheries in South Africa. The three countries requested the project to focus on the most vulnerable fisheries that are the pilchard fishery in South Africa, pilchard and rock lobster fisheries in Namibia and the sardinella fishery in Angola. Due to the complexity of a fisheries management plan the project team realise that due to limited funding a fisheries management plan framework with all the accompanied climate change data will be compiled	MU

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					<p>and submitted to the fisheries authority in each country. A costing will also be done to complete and implement the fisheries management plans. Once finalised, fisheries management plans will be shared to the 3 national fisheries authorities for consideration. In Angola, they have National Adaptation Programme for Action; Namibia: Namibia National Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan 2013 – 2017. Both action plans looks at cross-cutting issues concerning climate change and adaption. In this regard, fisheries sector has been included in the document.</p>	



## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<p><b>Outcome 1.1</b> Regional and national authorities, as well as major stakeholder groups, informed of vulnerabilities across the region to predicted impacts of climate variability and change</p>	<p><u>Indicator 1.1</u> Information about the vulnerability and adaptation options available to key stakeholders (BCC, national fisheries authorities, senior management in government, the commercial sector and NGOs, as well as community leaders)</p>	Very little suitable and regionally relevant information on climate change impacts and adaptation currently available.	Information generated through participatory assessments communicated to key stakeholders through a regional network and other mechanisms (developed under component 3).		At the stage of generating the information through participatory assessment. Vulnerability assessments and adaptation options workshop and meetings undertaken in the selected communities; presentation on VA and AP presented at National Working Groups in the 3 countries and at EAC (Ecosystem Advisory Committee) level.	MU
<p><b>Outcome 1.2</b> Climate change adaptation in fisheries and fishery-dependent communities mainstreamed into broader sectoral, food-security and climate change frameworks in all of the three countries</p>	<p><u>Indicator 1.2</u> # of key national plans/policies that have incorporated climate change adaptation actions</p>	0	Draft proposals for revision of existing policies completed	At least one key policy in each project country adopted under consideration by national authorities.	<p>No draft proposals yet.</p> <p>Project still assessing gaps, needs and opportunities for incorporation of climate change adaptation.</p>	U

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Outcome 2.1</b> Vulnerability to climate change and variability reduced in local, small-scale fisheries and fishing communities identified as being at high risk, considering all stages from production through to post-harvest and trade	Indicator 2.1.a) # of vulnerable small scale fisheries and fishing communities with adaptation action plans under implementation.	0	At least 9 high risk local fisheries or communities (7 in Angola and two in South Africa) with approved adaptation action plans being implemented		None with plans being implemented yet but 5 communities have identified adaptation plans (Tombwa, Cacuoco )	MU
	Indicator 2.1 b) # of households (disaggregated by gender) directly benefitting from implementation of the plans.	Baseline and targets to be determined after selection of pilot sites.		At least 4 communities (disaggregated by gender) directly benefiting surveyed from implementation of the adaptation action plans in the 3 countries.		No benefits yet because the plans are not yet being implemented. .
<b>Outcome 2.2</b> National and regional institutions are prepared and have the capacities to integrate climate change adaptation (CCA) in fisheries in practice, based on thorough consultative planning processes	Indicator 2.2 # of management plans that have been developed, or revised, to incorporate monitoring and adaptative responses to climate variability and change in national/regional fisheries	0		At least 3 management plans are being implemented (by Y4).	No national or regional fisheries management plan developed or revised. Project aims to insert relevant adaptation approaches in the joint management plans for Cape hakes and Cape horse mackerel by 2020	U

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<p><b>Outcome 2.3</b> Strengthened institutions and frameworks for effective monitoring and early warning to facilitate contingency planning at the regional and national levels</p>	<p><u>Indicator 2.3</u> Climate monitoring and early warning systems providing timely and relevant information to target fishery communities and other key stakeholders</p>	<p>Meteorological services in place in the region that provide early warning of extreme weather events. However, the processing and dissemination of much of this information is not tailored to the sector's and fishery communities' needs.</p>		<p>Climate monitoring and early warning systems modified and have started to provide timely and relevant information in all 3 countries. (by Y4)</p>	<p>Modification of systems to be done after a survey to be conducted by end of Q3 2019 and modified system will be implemented from Q4 2019 and Q1 2020. The project is aware of a fisheries early warning system in India and a similar mobile-phone, GSM-based system in Kenya. Hence, a survey is underway to determine what systems are replicable and how, acknowledging some factors such as electricity or mobile phone network. The</p>	U

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<p><b>Outcome 3.1</b> Increased awareness and capacity of stakeholders to enable and promote a proactive, forward-looking approach to climate change</p>	<p><u>Indicator 3.1</u> Extent of awareness and understanding of likely impacts of climate change and variability on the fishery sector by stakeholders and other affected individuals.</p>	Limited understanding and the capacity amongst all the stakeholders to prepare for and respond to CC impacts.	More than 25% of target stakeholders with moderate understanding and awareness	At least 50% of target stakeholders with moderate to high understanding and awareness'	At least 30% of target stakeholders have moderate awareness and understanding, Above is based on 50% of the target sites having received project support; i.e. from initial consultations and sensitization to raising awareness and understanding to, RVAs and AP development.	MS
<p><b>Outcome 3.2</b> Knowledge and understanding of stakeholders strengthened through targeted training on climate change risks and best adaptation practices in fisheries.</p>	<p><u>Indicator 3.2</u> Capacity perception index as determined from surveys at the end of each training event.</p>	Limited capacity at all levels.	Improvement in capacity perception index	Improvement in capacity perception index	No standard capacity perception index is available for application. A questionnaire has been developed for different workshops. In addition, the questionnaire is modified to enable phone interviews to diversity the data collection regarding perceived capacities. The questionnaire has been tested	MU

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					during a few workshops and show promise for gauging perceived capacities.	
<b>Outcome 4.1</b> Project implemented and monitored effectively and efficiently and best practices and lessons learned disseminated.	<u>Indicator 4.1a</u> Level of progress in achieving results.		30 – 40% progress in achieving project outcome targets	Project outcomes achieved and showing sustainability	Project being implemented, Monitoring system in place but still to be effectively used.	MU
	<u>Indicator 4.1b</u> M&E activities conducted according to the plan	0	100% implementation of the plan.		Project sites visited by project team and information fed into the monitoring system. Recording of indicators on the M&E matrix still to be instituted	MU
	<u>Indicator 4.1c</u> # of organizations that have received targeted products on best practices	0	At least 4 African and other institutions will have received targeted information products		No distribution yet but information products from the RVA and AP are under review before distribution to the targeted institutions.	MS

**Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating <sup>10</sup>**

---

<sup>10</sup> To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consult the Ministry in each country responsible for climate change.</li> <li>- Agree to package the RVA and AP approaches and outcomes for inclusion in national climate change policies and strategies.</li> <li>- Deliver the packaged material and, offer support to incorporate or integrate into policies and strategies</li> </ul>	Consultant; BCC	Q3, Y5
Outcome 1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Angola - contribute toward next National Development Plan and, the next Artisanal Fisheries Development Plan;</li> <li>- Namibia - contribute toward the revision and update of the National Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan (2013-2020).</li> <li>- South Africa - contribute toward ocean legislation under the National Environmental Management bill for Oceans ("Oceans Policy").</li> </ul>	Consultant; BCC	Q2, Y5
Outcome 2.1	<p>Angola</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Finalise APs for Tombwa and Cacuoco and mobilise implementation;</li> </ul> <p>Namibia</p> <p>For all sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Obtain gender disaggregated data for a sample of households that are dependent on fisheries;</li> <li>- Monitoring of AP implementation.</li> <li>- Target community leaders and local champions to gauge their perception of climate change, its impacts and</li> </ul>	Consultant; BCC	Q2, Y5

	<p>adaptation/ livelihood options. [5 out of 9 selected communities have validated adaptation plans and under implementation.</p>		
Outcome 2.2	<p>Management plan with climate change adaptation integrated</p> <p>Angola;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sardinella</li> </ul> <p>Namibia;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rock lobster fishery and,</li> <li>- Mariculture upscaling and diversification (p. 32 ProDoc).</li> </ul> <p>South Africa;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Small pelagics fishery.</li> </ul>	Consultant; BCC	Q2, Y5
Outcome 2.3	<p>Angola</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implement navigation and safety at sea measures, inclusive of skills building to operate the equipment.;</li> <li>- Determine viability of a community-based climate monitoring system – from data gathering to (for e.g.) cellphone or radio alerts.</li> </ul> <p>Namibia</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Determine the status of HABs monitoring and early warning – i.e. is it feasible to invest to improve it?</li> <li>- In consultation with Met Services, MET and MFMR, determine the feasibility of an early warning system for marine fisheries. Is it possible to use VMS for early warning?</li> </ul> <p>South Africa</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the use of VMS for early warning and, share lessons with</li> </ul>	Consultant; BCC	Q4, Y5



	<p>Namibia that could be applicable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support wider rollout of VMS for early warning by demonstrating its practical value.</li> </ul>		
Outcome 3.1	<p>Use local radio, social media and other preferred dissemination means in each location to generate awareness about;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What climate change impacts are observed at community/ sector level, how this relates to livelihoods;</li> <li>- What is climate change vulnerability, risk and adaptation;</li> <li>- Why are RVAs and APs important and how are they conducted/ developed;</li> <li>- What is the desired outcome from implementation of APs;</li> <li>- What are viable adaptation options based on best available knowledge.</li> </ul> <p>Execute on monthly and quarterly bases and plan in synch with project events (meetings, workshops, community consultations) for dissemination.</p>	BCC, Consultant	Ongoing until Y5 with periodic results/ progress reporting.
Outcome 3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Deliver three capacity development sessions in each country on climate change risks, hazards and vulnerability</li> <li>- Viable climate change adaptation options (inclusive of sustainable business development for livelihood diversification and employment creation);</li> <li>- Identify the trainers and commission the work;</li> <li>- Deliver the venue, food and beverage and logistics;</li> </ul>	BCC	Q4, Y5

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Carry out post-training M&amp;E – multiple choice questions to rate different aspects of the training.</li> </ul>		
Outcome 4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quarterly PIU visits for progress review session with the RPC and available project staff (could be planned when NCs are in Namibia or, M&amp;E Consultant can travel to where PSC or project events happen, to enable field visits as well);</li> <li>- Deliver annual PIRs and project progress reports;</li> <li>- Support annual work planning and budgeting in line with the Logframe;</li> <li>- Conduct at least one field visit to each country before project termination;</li> <li>- Support progress reporting during the PSC meetings;</li> <li>- Support implementation of M&amp;E Plan.</li> </ul>	BCC, M&E Expert	Ongoing until Y5 with periodic results/ progress reporting.

## 2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs <sup>11</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>12</sup>	Achievements at each PIR <sup>13</sup>					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR		
<b>Output 1.1.1</b> Participatory and integrated vulnerability assessments of fisheries and fishery-dependent communities undertaken in all three countries and results disseminated	Q3 Y3	<i>Methodology established</i>	Standardised vulnerability assessments of 9 communities (7 in Angola and 2 in South Africa), 4 fisheries (across all countries) and mariculture sectors in each country.	VA has been concluded and a Regional network of stakeholders has been established. The network will be used to communicate VA outcomes.			70%	Delays in VA undertaking in Angola. Namibia and South Africa have completed VAs for the fishery and fisheries communities as well as the Mariculture sectors. Angola has completed the Mariculture and fishery sector. A Regional Working Group is established as part of project network in the distribution of reports.
Output 1.1.2 Potential adaptation actions for the most vulnerable	Q2 Y3	<i>Draft community-level adaptation plans in 9 communities</i>	Adaptation options agreed	5 communities adaptation options identified (Tombwa &			80%	Currently, the consultants are carrying out Adaptation Planning follow-ups within the 3 communities (Tombwa and Cacuoco – Angola; Henties Bay – Namibia) for validation and

<sup>11</sup> Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

<sup>12</sup> As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

<sup>13</sup> Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

<sup>14</sup> Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

fisheries and fishery-dependent communities identified				Cacuoco (Angola); adaptation options validated and under implementation.				implementation.
<b>Output 1.1.3</b> Vulnerability assessments incorporated into the BCC and national planning/management programmes.	Q1 Y3			Requirements to incorporate vulnerability assessments and climate risk information reflected in the planning and management guidelines/procedures.			20%	Rhodes University appointed to consult for the activity; The consultant will not develop a full management plan, but prepare a policy brief that includes proposed adaptation plans that can be included into the management plans.
<b>Output 1.2.1</b> Draft policies/addenda to existing policies submitted for adoption.	Q3 Y4			Rhodes University appointed and signed contract on the 6 <sup>th</sup> May 2019 with the BCC to draft policies brief for the inclusion of adoption plans per country.			40%	A consultant (Rhodes University) has been appointed and will prepare a proposed draft policy that will be submitted to the relevant authorities at national and regional level.

<p><b>Output 1.2.2</b> Regional and national inter-agency/inter-sectoral mechanisms strengthened to ensure fisheries and mariculture sectors are well-placed within national, provincial and local frameworks.</p>	Q2 Y4	1 Ministerial Conference of BCC		<p>Nothing delivered to date.</p> <p>A National Intersectoral Committee in 2018 and report of the Namibian National Climate Change Working group was presented.</p>			0%	The process will only be done once the recommendation from the VA on national level has been validated and presented to the relevant authorities.
<p><b>Output 2.1.1</b> Community-based adaptation action plans developed and piloted in high-risk fisheries and communities</p>	Q4 Y3	Draft adaptation plans with 7 SSF		<p>Adaptation follow-up plans in Tombwa &amp; Cacuoco (Angola) and Henties Bay (Namibia); Piloting of the Abalobi application tool in Struisbay and St Helena (South Africa) as an adaptation tool. No adaptation plans</p>			50%	As part of UCT contract, the consultant is required to develop a community-based adaptation plan for the 5 communities.

				developed yet within the communities.				
<b>Output 2.2.1</b> Management plans in selected national fisheries and mariculture sectors in each country that include appropriate consideration of monitoring and adaptive responses to climate variability and change.	Q2 Y5			ToR developed and Rhodes University appointed to draft management plans in selected national fisheries and Mariculture sectors.			10%	The consultant is currently undertaking the activity.
<b>Output 2.3.1</b> National and regional frameworks for monitoring and disseminating information on extreme weather events and climate-induced risks in fisheries modified to	Q2 Y5			Project in the process of developing a ToR for this output and to be advertised in the three countries.			0%	ToR will be advertised in the three country major newspapers, the BCC website and SANCOR website.

address gaps in current coverage.								
<b>Output 3.1.1</b> Targeted, user-friendly information on impacts, risks and vulnerability to climate change and variability and adaptive responses produced and disseminated to national and regional stakeholders, and to local communities in the most highly vulnerable areas.	Q4 Y5			BCC and partner projects participated in the activities e.g. World Ocean Day (8 June 2019) – all three countries; climate change risks been raised on the radio/TV and newspapers in Angola (Radio – Kairos, Ecclesia, Mais, Lac; TV – TV Zimbo and TPA; Journal de Angola and Journal Expansao) and Namibia TV – NBC; Newspaper – Allgemeine Zeitung) and publication in			10%	Project requested for a graphic designer to develop further communication materials for awareness creation.

				FAO newspaper – June Edition; 2 Videos done for Namibia on vulnerability and adaptation.				
<b>Output 3.2.1</b> Training on climate change risks and adaptation conducted in selected communities	Q3 Y5			In partnership with FAO, an Adaptation Planning Training for technical experts in the countries conducted in March, South Africa. In addition, training of government technical experts on conducting adaptation in selected communities and community co-op members.			20%	Training needs from the communities in Namibia and South Africa have been identified, as well as the To date, a total of 78 people in Angola, 209 in Namibia and about 40 in South Africa trained per initiative since the inception of the project. Community members will be trained once the AP are validated per country.
	Q3 Y5			Nothing delivered to date.			0%	Community members, government technical experts and others will be identified for exchange programmes as per



								identified knowledge needs.
<b>Output 3.2.2</b> Training on climate change risks and adaptation conducted for stakeholders from government, universities, non-governmental organizations and industry.	Q4 Y5			About 60 scientists, economists, academics and those involved in working with climate change risks and adaptation trained across all 3 countries through a regional Adaptation Workshop in Cape Town, South Africa. Also, in Namibia and Angola, they have technical experts who have been part of the Adaptation process workshops with the community members.			30%	FAO and BCC partnered in the regional Adaptation Training; Technical experts trained during field work as well.

<b>Output 4.1.1</b> Project monitoring system established.	Q4 Y5			M&E plan received and refined			40%	Slow pace on the collation of information for the M&E system.
<b>Output 4.1.2</b> Midterm and final evaluations conducted	Q4 Y5			Mid-term evaluation underway			40%	Preparation for the Mid-term Evaluation; Mr James Gasana selected as lead Evaluator and Ms Alushe Hitula as the National Evaluator.
<b>Output 4.1.3</b> Project-related “best-practices” and “lessons-learned” assessed, published and disseminated	Q4 Y5			Format for systematically capturing lessons learnt developed			0%	The lessons learned collected during the RVAs and AP but not completed
	Q4 Y1			Fully operational webpage on the BCC website			50%	Webpage not continuously updated. Communication specialist and two of the Fisheries Assistant and one Fisheries Community Resource person will be trained on how operate the website / webpage.

## Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

**Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):**

- The project communities are identified as follows Hondeklipbaai, Humansdorp in South Africa; Caota, Tombwa, Caucoco, Kui & Nzeto, Ambriz, Miradouro da Lua, in Angola Angola and Lüderitz (Namibia)
- The development and implementation of Rapid Vulnerability Assessment (RVA) for the Small Scale Fisheries (SSF) and Vulnerability Assessment (VA) methodologies for the Large Scale Fisheries (LSF) (Sardinellas and Rock Lobster) and Mariculture sectors developed and approved by expert from the Benguela Current community.
- RVAs and Adaptation Planning (AP) conducted in the selected communities and a total of ten communities engaged to date in the three countries (Tombwa (Angola); Luderitz, Walvis Bay (Namibia); Humansdorp, Hondeklipbaai, (South Africa).
- The community-based adaptation action plans developed and piloted in two communities in South Africa Hondeklipbay (whereby they are utilizing the Abalobi mobile application as tool to market their products. Angola and Namibia recently conducted an Adaptation follow-up (Henties Bay and Tombwa).
- A stakeholder register developed and updated with total number of 552 people engaged on various platforms (fisherman, Non-Governmental Organisation, Government etc.).
- National Fisheries Climate Change Working Groups established in all three countries and met during the reporting period.
- The 1<sup>st</sup> Benguela Current Convention newsletter compiled and distributed to Project stakeholders.
- A project monitoring system established and operational.
- The project webpage is incorporated onto the BCC website and social media platforms (Twitter, Facebook, Instagram) are live with minimum updates.
- The mid-term evaluation inception meeting happened on the 24 June 2019 at the FAO Office, Windhoek (Namibia); MTE consultants met with the BCC in Swakopmund, Namibia 26 June 2019 and started with the process in Namibia (27 June- Henties Bay; 28 June –

Walvis Bay).

**What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?**

- In addition, within the fishing communities, cultural norms influence communication flow as women do not often express themselves freely in the presence of men. Response time on communication and the formulation of committees took considerable time. So consultants as well as the project team have decided to encourage the participation of women in the workshops and/ or separate them in order for the women to express themselves freely. This process has resulted in good outcomes from the community which is inclusive of information from both genders.
- *a legal dispute with Rhodes University in South Africa took time to resolve which affected progress with implementation*
- The initial slow pace in implementing project activities and outcomes was a result of BCC policies and procedures which are being addressed through the higher BCC structures (recommendations are made by the Ecosystem Advisory Committee, the Financial Advisory Committee for approval by the Commission). The BCC policies and procedures include the procurement policy, whereby if there is a purchase of items above USD3,000, the internal evaluation committee is required to assess the quotes, and the contract must be advertised in the 3 countries. Thus the process is timely and creates delays.

**Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment**

	<b>FY2019 Development Objective rating<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>FY2019 Implementation Progress rating<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>MU</b>	<b>MU</b>	<i>Although there was a delay in the project implementation, most of the activities are complete or in the process of completion. The project will now focus on the outputs which is based on the outcome of the activities.</i>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>MU</b>	<b>MU</b>	<i>As highlighted in section 1, the consequences of the slow start in project implementation, delays in signing of the project main contracts, delays in recruitment of project staff are evident now - implementation is still way behind schedule.</i>
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>17</sup></b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	<i>The project has now made progress towards activities related to VAs. There are still constraints in the issuance of contracts and organization of training related to adaptation. There is long lead time for recruitment and procurement processes. This clearly has hindered project progress and needs to be anticipated for the activities to come.</i>

---

<sup>15</sup> **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>16</sup> **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>17</sup> The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	<b>MU</b>	<b>MU</b>	<i>Based on the description of the activities undertaken, degree of outputs delivered and ratings on achievement of the project's outcomes and objectives in the tables above, the rating should be MU. Despite some progress in the last year (compared to delivery and ratings in 2018 PIR), it is unclear whether many of the project's planned results can be delivered before the formal end of the project in December 2020, given the previous delays and inherent challenges the project has faced (e.g. language, culture) and what still needs to be achieved (especially at outcome level).</i>
------------------------------------	-----------	-----------	--

### 3. Risks

#### Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid <sup>18</sup> . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Based on the project objective, outcomes and outputs, no adverse environmental or social impacts are likely	Yes, classification at project design is still valid. It would be important if the MTE team reviews this and applies the new FAO matrix of ESS criteria. We are asking all MTR teams of GEF projects to do this from now on.

*Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.*

---

<sup>18</sup> **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

**Risk ratings**

**RISK TABLE**

*The following table summarizes risks identified in the **Project Document** and reflects 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**.*

	<b>Risk</b>	<b>Risk rating<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>Mitigation Action</b>	<b>Progress on mitigation actions<sup>20</sup></b>	<b>Notes from the Project Task Force</b>
<b>1</b>	Inability to develop and implement a sufficiently holistic vulnerability assessment methodology, resulting in a failure to detect more obscure vulnerabilities in the fisheries systems.	low	A RVA and VA methodology were developed and piloted. Considering the diverse nature of the fishery and fisheries communities within all three countries, the methodology followed well-defined steps to give comprehensive consideration of impacts and vulnerabilities within the small and large scale fisheries.	The developed methodology proved to be sufficient and adequate to implement within all three countries without any obscure information	PTF assisted the VA methodologies, both for RVA and VA methods in the 3 fisheries sectors which the project is working on. Further improvements from the testing done during the preparatory TCP was implemented.

<sup>19</sup> GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

<sup>20</sup> If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period”.



	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
2	Insufficient time dedicated by collaborating and partner organizations and agencies to successfully implement the project components	Substantial	Commit more time to collaborate and engage with partner organisations and agencies to successfully implement the project.	A list of partner organisations, institutions and agencies was compiled and the project has started engaging them on different platforms e.g. workshops or meetings	More frequent communication and engagement would be good, and before problems arise.
3	Inadequate participation by all stakeholder groups to identify and prioritize adaptation needs in a sufficiently objective manner.	High	Stakeholder Engagement Strategy to be developed to ensure that all relevant stakeholders are involved in all the processes of the project implementation; and that awareness creation and engagement done at all levels of the project.	The project has engaged many stakeholders to update during the RVA and VA processes. However, once all the adaptation information has become available the Stakeholder Engagement Strategy will focus on distributing information to the right stakeholders in a manner that the information will create an affect to them.	Mobilisation of project stakeholders is a management aspect which BCC should find ways of ensuring participation

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
4	Some stakeholders (e.g. small-scale fishers) lack sufficient negotiation strength vis-à-vis others.	Medium	We are using the cards for participants to express their views by writing or one on one consultation in the native language they are comfortable with.	The workshops and meetings methods ensured full and fair participation and influence by all stakeholders.	
5	Climate-induced events, such as shifts in shared stocks, occur faster than the project is able to prepare and plan for.	Medium	The BCC has established an Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Working Group – to monitor environmental indicators; a Demersal and Pelagic Working Group for stock assessment and management advice.	The 3 working groups have met in September 2018, and June 2019 to discuss issues concerning the region in terms of stock assessment and environmental challenges.	
6	Climate-induced events cannot reliably be distinguished from changes caused by other factors such as overfishing or short-term variability.	Medium	The communities have raised concerns or issues regarding less fishing days due to storms. However, the project is not conducting any research to determine if storms are directly related to climate change or a natural variation of the system.	No progress to date on mitigation.	

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
7	Insufficient information on the fiscal policies governing Angola, making it difficult for the procurement processes and any other services requiring payments.	High	Sign an MOU with IPA (procurement) and Development Workshop (regarding activities in the communities) to avoid delays in the processes of procuring or carrying out activities and payments of DSA to community members.		MOU developed and in the process of signing. This is a key constraint for project implementation in Angola, and necessary steps were taken by BCC towards resolving. It does not affect project implementation in the other countries. Several options were pursued to solve the payment issues e.g. FAO Angola to help us with the Bank Account; opening an Account in Angola. BCC approached FAO and their proposal to take back the Angola component and implement it directly was not acceptable. The project opted to open an account with IPA

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

<b>FY2018 rating</b>	<b>FY2019 rating</b>	<b>Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>High</b>	High	The overall risk rating is still high. This is mainly emanating from the fact that project activities are way behind schedule. With a start date of December 2015, the project is now in its 4 <sup>th</sup> year of implementation yet only a few activities have been completed with project spending well below 50%. Its noted that the building blocks are now in place paving way for a possible increase in project activities.

## 4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months<sup>21</sup>

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
<b>Project Outcomes</b>	Yes	No changes to date because the project startup was delayed due to processes and procedures within the three countries, the appointment of the project team and signing of consultant contracts.
<b>Project Outputs</b>	No	

### Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
<b>Project extension</b>	No change yet. A no-cost extension likely to be requested based on MTR recommendations.

---

<sup>21</sup> Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

## 5. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)?

**Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data? How is the project tracking gender impacts and results?**

Some gender analysis was captured in the Training manual (Training Manual and Guidelines for Conducting community-level Rapid Vulnerability Assessments (RVA) produced through a TCP which is part of cofunding to this project

Data is collected at the various project workshops, meetings and other engagements during which we gather disaggregated gender information

**Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data? How is the project tracking gender impacts and results?**

The M&E system does have gender-disaggregated data, but none of the staff have expertise, although a questionnaire has been developed to assess the Household gender disaggregated adaptation benefits within the communities.

**Does the project staff have gender expertise?**

.[The project does not have any gender expertise, however, the project envisage on contracting a gender specialist to address the gap.

**If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:**

Under outcome 2.1 in which project is expected to contribute to the # of households (disaggregated by gender) directly benefitting from implementation of the adaptation plans.

## 6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

**Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.**

If applies, please describe the process and current status of on-going/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities

None of the fishing communities include indigenous communities as defined by the United Nations or as listed by International Work Group for Indigenous people (IWGA).

## 7. Stakeholders Engagement

Please report on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable))

Stakeholder Name	New Existing or	Engagement Events	Time / Date	Purpose	Outcome
Government institutions in the 3 countries	Existing	-Inception workshops -PSC/EAC meetings -General meetings		Governments engaged on providing guidance, recommendation and approval of reports, selection of communities or procurement	-Meeting or workshop reports -Approval -Minutes
<b>Angola</b> 1. IPA, MiREPET, IMPA 2. Cooperative members 3. Academy 4. MISFAMU 5. INIP 6. DNA	Existing	National Working Group members	August 2018 10 October 2018	Angola Climate Change related activities	-Meeting reports -Minutes
<b>Namibia</b> 1. Mariculture association 2. Rock lobster association Small Scale Fishers/Users (Hanganeni, Sea shell collectors, Lüderitz community)	New	National Working group members	-November 2018 -June 2019	Namibia Climate Change related activities	-Meeting reports -Minutes
<b>South Africa</b> 1. South African Maritime Safety Authority (SAMSA) 2. Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) 3. Fishery Community Representatives from Hondeklipbaai	New	National Working group members	April 2019	South Africa Climate Change related activities	-Meeting reports -Minutes



<p>Fishery</p> <p>4. Community Representatives from Humansdorp Fishers representative</p> <p>Kouga Local Municipality Local Economic Development Officer</p> <p>5. Aquaculture Association of South Africa</p> <p>6. Aquaculture Industry</p> <p>7. South African Pelagic Fishery Industry Association</p> <p>8. World Wide Fund for Nature</p> <p>9. Oceana (Fishing industry)</p> <p>10. South African National Botanical Institute (SANBI) – Green Climate Fund,</p> <p>11. Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAAS)</p>					
Masifundise	Existing	Project inception workshop	July 2017	They participated in the project inception workshop and have continued to engage on project activities	-Inception meeting reports -PSC meeting reports
Academia de Pescas e Ciencias do Mar do Namibe	Existing	-Angolan partner for the development of adaptation plans in LSF (RU)	January 2018	Undertake vulnerability assessments for Angolan semi-industry communities	-VA reports; -Adaptation plans
Development Workshop (Angola)	New	-Angolan partner for the development of adaptation plans in SSF (UCT)	January 2018	Undertake VAs for the Angolan selected communities	-VA Reports; -Adaptation plans
SANUMARC –	Existing	-Namibian	January 2018	Undertake VA	-VA Reports;

University of Namibia		partner for the development of adaptation plans in SSF and LSF (UCT and RU)		assessments for the Namibian selected communities	-Adaptation plans
University of Cape Town	Existing	- Being an academic institution, the university was selected to develop adaptation plans within the small scale fisheries and mariculture sectors of the Benguela region. Meetings discussing and planning the assignment were held and are ongoing. Face to face meeting held on 22 January 2018	January 2018	Undertake VAs in selected communities in the 3 countries	-VA Reports; -Adaptation plans
Rhodes University	Existing	- Being an academic institution, the university was selected to develop adaptation plans within the commercial national fisheries and mariculture sectors of the Benguela region. Meetings discussing and planning the assignment were held and are ongoing. Face to face meeting held on	Various meetings	Undertake VAs in selected fisheries in the 3 countries	-Vulnerability Reports; -Adaptation plans

		23 January 2018			
Fisheries communities in the 3 countries	Existing	RVAs and AP workshops	January 2018 – June 2019	Vulnerability Assessments and Adaptation planning	-Reports on their vulnerability and adaptation plans
Fishery industry	Existing	VA workshops	January 2018 – June 2019	Vulnerability Assessments and Adaptation planning	-VA reports and Adaptation planning reports
Mariculture sector	Existing	VA workshops	January 2018 – June 2019	VAs and Adaptation planning	-VA and AP reports
Media	New	Workshops and high profile meetings	October 2018 – June 2019	Journalists; radio; TV	News reports Article reports Radio

## 8. Knowledge Management Activities

### Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval

- Please tell us the story of your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihood and how it is contributing to achieve the expected global environmental benefits
- Please provide the links to publications, video materials, etc.

With the introduction of this project within the selected communities in the three (3) countries, we have engaged with various fishing communities to assess their vulnerabilities to climate change risks and variability as well as to identify adaptation options that will enhance their livelihoods. Due to the fact that although the project started January 2016, activities implementation was delayed we are still in the process of carrying out the vulnerability assessments. However, some adaptation options have been identified although these still need to be verified by the community members.

At this point, we have not assessed (through our M&E system) how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods and if the project is contributing to achieving the expected global environmental benefits. We intend on assessing that once we have completed the VAs and APs.

In addition, the project is still in the process of increasing awareness of climate change issues and developing associated communication materials to provide to the different stakeholders associated with the project.

So far, the project has created two videos in Namibia (VA in Luderitz and AP in Henties Bay) and one is in the process of being created in Angola as well. Regarding awareness, the project is carrying out a school poster contest to create and build awareness amongst the youth within the selected coastal communities. The posters will be used for a variety of awareness materials. A newsletter was created under the project for the whole BCC Secretariat and the associated projects. An article titled "Could marine aquaculture be an alternative livelihood option for vulnerable coastal fisher communities?" published in the FAO Aquaculture Newsletter No. 60, August 2019.

The videos will be uploaded once approved by the countries and a link will be provided as soon it has been done.

## 9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>22</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant and In-kind	960,000	695,000		960,000
Multi-lateral Agency	BCC	Grant and In-kind	3,000,000	15,042		3,000,000
Government	Angola	Grant and In-kind	5,000,000	23,400.00		5,000,000
Government	Namibia	Grant and In-kind	5,000,000	43,200.00		5,000,000
Government	South Africa	Grant and In-kind	5,000 000	7,200.00		6,000
CSO	Masifundise	Grant and In-kind	6,000	0		6,000
Other	GULLS	Grant and In-kind	100,000	100,000		100,000
Other	Ecofish	Grant and In-kind	100,000			100,000* <sup>23</sup>
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>19,166,000</b>	<b>883,842</b>		<b>19,166,000</b>

<sup>22</sup> Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

<sup>23</sup> Ecofish Project no more operational and did not provide their contribution There is need to have an adjustment in the expected total disbursement from project.

**Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement**

To date, there are no changes, apart from Ecofish Project that has been closed down. Due to late start, co-financing will also be affected and disbursement will be done on the slow pace. BCC advises that the low level of co-financing was because of delayed start but now that the project is in full swing they will be engaging government and partners more.

## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

**Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** - Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”); **Satisfactory (S)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** - Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U)** - Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** - The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

**Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice”. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.