



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	West Africa
Country (ies):	Republic of Cabo Verde, Republic of Côte d'Ivoire, Republic of Senegal
Project Title:	Delivering Sustainable Environmental, Social and Economic Benefits in West Africa through Good Governance, Correct Incentives and Innovation
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/RAF/837/GFF
GEF ID:	9126
GEF Focal Area(s):	Multi Focal Area
Project Executing Partners:	Governments of: Cabo Verde (Min. de L'Économie et de L'Emploi & Min. de L'Agriculture et de L'Environnement); Côte d'Ivoire (Min. des Ressources Animales et Halieutiques & Min. de L'Environnement et du Développement Durable); Senegal (Min. de la Pêche et de L'Économie Maritime & Min. de L'Environnement et du Développement Durable); and the Abidjan Convention (UNEP)
Project Duration:	60 months

Milestone Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	11 May 2017
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01 October 2017
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	10 May 2022
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	N/A
Actual Implementation End Date³:	N/A

¹ As per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

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

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	6,133,027
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴ (USD):	45,551,500
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	756,033
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	13,665,450

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	First PSC scheduled 15-16 July 2019 in Mindelo, Cabo Verde
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	Mid-term of project implementation
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	N/A
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	N/A
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	Yes

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

⁵ 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.

⁶ 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

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	S
Overall implementation progress rating:	S
Overall risk rating:	Medium

Status

Implementation Status (1 st PIR, 2 nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	1 st PIR
---	---------------------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Gunilla Greig, Fishery Officer, FIDF	Gunilla.TegelskarGreig@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Henry De Bey, Fishery Officer, FIAX	Henry.DeBey@fao.org
Budget Holder	Jacqueline Alder, FishCode Manager, FIDF	Jacqueline.Alder@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Chris Dirkmaat, Executive Officer, CBC Kuen Morebotsane, Technical Officer, CBC	Chris.Dirkmaat@fao.org Kuen.Morebotsane@fao.org

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Objective(s): Global Environmental Objective: To promote responsible fisheries governance and management leading to more sustainable coastal fishery resource utilisation and safeguarding of marine ecosystems in three countries in West Africa (Cabo Verde, Côte d'Ivoire and Senegal). Project Development Objective: To support enhanced fisheries and value chain governance and management creating sustainable contributions to social and economic development in West Africa (Cabo Verde, Côte d'Ivoire and Senegal)						
Outcome 1.1: National fisheries policies, strategies and actions are coherent and effective	a) EAF is referred to as the approach for fisheries management and development in relevant policy and strategy documents and implementation plans follow EAF principles. b) Political declarations in all three countries explicitly mention the desire to implement relevant international	<i>N.B.: baseline level is at the component level</i> There is increasing political will to improve fisheries governance and management – both in the project countries and on the continent as a whole – but lack of policy coherence and limited capacities constitute a barrier to sustainable resource utilisation and livelihoods. The fisheries sector usually falls under agriculture development policies and is not addressed	N/A	a) Future sectoral policy documents and / or implementation plans of the three countries refer to the ecosystem approach to fisheries b) The political declarations of the Ministers of the three countries in high-level bodies (COFI, CSRP, CPCO, ECOWAS, etc.) explicitly express a desire to implement relevant regional and international instruments c) At least one new	The technical work has not yet been initiated, implying no concrete results at the outcome level. However, the appointment of national project co-ordinators in the respective national administrations, the near-completion of the recruitment of the national teams, including long-term national consultants, along with a gender-sensitive and gender-responsive results framework, is in itself an achievement, in the sense that a good	S

⁷ 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.

⁸ 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.

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).

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Outcome 1.2: <i>Management plans are implemented</i>	and regional instruments, including the SSF Guidelines and the Gender & Youth section of the AUC Policy Framework and Reform Strategy for Fisheries and Aquaculture in Africa (AUC PFRS).	adequately. At the same time, there are not enough cross-sectoral links and coordination. The understanding of basic concepts such as EAF, co-management, gender equality, tenure and access rights regimes, etc. is insufficient. Fishing tends to be dealt with separately from postharvest activities instead of taking a value chain approach.		or revised policy or new or revised technical paper on the importance of fisheries at the national level in each of the 3 countries describes the specific contribution of artisanal fisheries and the importance of the respective roles of men and women throughout the value chain	foundation, with good engagement, has been laid for the technical activities expected to lead to the results outlined. This is valid for Outcomes 1.1, 1.2, 2.1 and 2.2.	
	c) Gender sensitive information on how coastal fisheries contribute to overall national development goals exists and is shared with national and local institutions and development partners.	Initiatives and activities with regard to fisheries management are often driven by donors and development partners and governments have limited capacities to ensure consistency, take ownership of results and manage a viable		a) At least two fisheries in the project countries	Cf. Outcome 1.1 In addition, a	S
	a) Fisheries management plans in the					

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
and create sustainable benefits	<p>three Project countries, representing at least 0.01% of world catches, are implemented and include gender-responsive co-management and secure tenure and access rights regimes, or similar.</p> <p>b) Human activities which contribute to the degradation of mangroves in Cote d'Ivoire and Senegal are identified and corrective measures are undertaken to assure the sustainable management of mangroves.</p> <p>c) Communities at the pilot</p>	<p>implementation process. Fisheries decision-making bodies do not involve enough women and do not sufficiently consider gender issues. On-going policy and legal framework reforms lack provisions for implementation of EAF and other relevant international and regional instruments. Likewise, co-management is promoted but the regulatory and institutional tools and capacities are not yet in place for its successful implementation, including the capacity of coastal communities to effectively engage in and contribute to management and development processes.</p>		<p>are subject to management plans that include gender-sensitive co-management and land tenure and access rights regimes, or the like</p> <p>b) 700 ha of mangroves are preserved in Côte d'Ivoire and Senegal</p> <p>c) At least five pilot site communities in the three countries are involved in gender-sensitive co-management supported by national institutions</p>	<p>coordinator for work on mangroves in Senegal and Côte d'Ivoire has been recruited and baseline information for mangrove planting at the respective pilot sites collected.</p>	

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
<i>Outcome 1.3: Coastal communities participate in fisheries management and sustainable development processes</i>	<p>sites across the three countries are involved in gender-responsive co-management supported by national institutions.</p>					
	<p>a) A number of fishers and fish workers (men/women) benefit from improved natural-resources management through increased revenues and/or other perceived livelihood improvements.</p> <p>b) A number of fishers and fish workers (men/women) actively participate in</p>			<p>a) At least 10% of the reference population of fishers and fish workers (men / women) benefit from improved management of natural resources through improved income and / or perceptible improvements to livelihoods</p> <p>b) At least 10% of the reference population of fishers and fish workers (men / women) are actively involved in decision-making</p>	<p>In addition to what has been noted under Outcome 1.1, the formation of two women-processor associations and one organisation of Ivorian fishers at one of the pilot sites in Côte d'Ivoire, will have increased the capacity of these coastal communities to effectively engage in, and contribute to, management and development processes.</p>	S

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	<p>decision-making processes related to coastal fisheries management and development.</p> <p>c) The value-chain approach influence positively fisheries management</p>			<p>processes related to the management and development of coastal fisheries</p> <p>c) At least two successful pilot activities on how the value chain approach has positively influenced fisheries management</p>		
Outcome 2.1: <i>Fishery product quality and decent working conditions are improved throughout the value chain</i>	<p>a) Percentage of women processor or fish seller organisations that have participated in the project and that have adopted improved practices leading to a 20-% reduction in their post-harvest losses.</p> <p>b) Percentage of</p>	<p>There is limited understanding and consideration of the how the different stages of the value chain are linked and contribute to sustainable fisheries and livelihoods. Postharvest actors are generally not part of decision-making with regard to fisheries management and tend to have insecure access to</p>		<p>a) At least 60% of women's processor or fish seller organizations (on the pilot sites) participate in the project and adopt improved practices and reduce post-harvest losses by 20 percent</p> <p>b) 20% of the above-mentioned persons consider that their working conditions have improved</p> <p>c) At least one</p>	No progress as yet in addition to what has been outlined under Component 1.	S

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Outcome 2.2: Value chains are more efficient and create incentives for responsible fisheries and sustainable livelihoods	the above who perceive that their working conditions have improved.	resources. Small-scale processing and trading activities do not to have a recognised professional status and the difficulty of accessing raw material creates risks, in particular for women processors, and contributes to poverty and unsustainable coastal fisheries.		organization of women producers per country has increased their sales revenue in new markets through improved practices.		S
	c) Number of women-processor organisations that have increased their revenues from sales in new national and regional markets because of improved practices.	Postharvest losses are estimated to some 20-25 %, sometimes up to 50%, in Africa and occur in particular in the artisanal sector. Practices for artisanal fish processing, in particular smoking, constitute a health hazard and consume precious wood (mangroves) with negative environmental effects. There are				
	a) The consumption of mangrove wood for fish smoking has decreased in Project sites (in Cote d'Ivoire and Senegal)			a) The consumption of mangrove wood for fish smoking has decreased by 10% at the project sites (in Côte d'Ivoire and Senegal)		
	b) Sustainably fished products from project			b) At least two types of sustainably exploited fishery products by country can be found in medium and large		

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	sites can be found in supermarkets in the three countries.	successful examples of improving both product quality and working conditions in the region, in particular in Cote d'Ivoire and in Senegal.		supermarkets		
Outcome 3.1: <i>Knowledge generated and results achieved are communicated and shared with local, national and regional partners</i>	a) Key messages based on project experiences are taken up by relevant regional organisations and are reflected in their policy and strategy documents.	There is limited exchange of experiences and lessons learnt among governments, development partners and regional organisations. Coherent approaches to fisheries governance and management are lacking both at national and regional levels.		a) At least two policy and strategy documents contain key messages based on project experiences.	Work to share knowledge generated and results achieved, to be taken up in policy and strategy documents, will follow upon technical results having been obtained under Components 1 and 2; project is now under implementation and, while knowledge management has not commenced, communication	S

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
<i>Outcome 3.2: A functional project M&E system is in place</i>	a) The project is successfully implemented and regularly evaluated.			a) At least 75% of targets are reached at 80%	<p>around the project has been undertaken, including through the dissemination of information to regional projects and partners.</p> <p>A functional M&E system is well under way, enabling project progress to be tracked effectively.</p>	S

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹⁰

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?

¹⁰ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1.1 Modifications to regulations, policies and strategies that take into account the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries and co-management, including relevant international instruments, are proposed.	Q4 Y5	Consultants recruited to help initiate reviews and formulate recommendations, in collaboration with, in the first instance, the National Project Coordinators.					5%	

¹¹ 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.

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

¹³ 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)

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

<u>Output 1.1.2</u> A gender inclusive and participatory assessment of public policy for fisheries is elaborated (in collaboration with the development of FPAT).	Q4 Y5	Cf. Output 1.1.1. In addition, a “Coastal Fisheries Initiative West Africa project Checklist to address gender issues”, has been developed, which will inform work within this and other outputs.					5%	
<u>Output 1.1.3</u> Government coordination mechanisms, including consultative frameworks, are put in place and promote coherence and synergies among existing development projects and initiatives in coastal fisheries and related sectors.	Q4 Y5	Not yet initiated.					0%	
<u>Output 1.2.1</u>	Q4 Y5	National					5%	

Coastal fisheries management plans are formulated and/or improved in line with EAF and relevant international instruments, and implemented		consultants recruited for the pilot sites, which will help inform this line of work, including undertaking stakeholder analyses.						
<u>Output 1.2.2</u> Mangrove management and rehabilitation programmes are carried out and linked to fisheries objectives.	Q4 Y5	Field missions to pilot sites have been undertaken in order to assess the status of mangroves as well as fish-smoking operations, and to sensitise actors on the importance and role of mangroves.					10%	
<u>Output 1.2.3</u>	Q4 Y5	Not yet initiated.					0%	

Support is provided to the national institutional structures in charge of fisheries management so that they have the appropriate capacities to implement EAF, relevant international instruments and co-management.								
<u>Output 1.3.1</u> Coastal fishers and fish workers organisations are formalised and/or strengthened.	Q4 Y5	Following a joint UNEP/FAO/MIRAH ¹⁵ CFI mission to Sassandra (one of the pilot sites in Côte d'Ivoire), two women-processor associations have been formed, as well as one organisation of Ivorian fishers.					33%	

¹⁵ Ministère des Ressources Animales et Halieutiques

<p><u>Output 1.3.2</u></p> <p>The capacity of coastal fishers and fish workers to participate in fisheries management & dev processes are enhanced.</p> <p><u>Output 2.1.1</u></p> <p>Improvements to regulatory and normative frameworks for the control of fishery products (quality/sanitary standards) and the promotion of decent working conditions are proposed and their application supported</p>	Q4 Y5	National consultants to be posted at the respective pilot sites have been recruited/are in the final stages of being recruited – they will work on this and other outputs.					5%	
	Q4 Y5	Not yet initiated.					0%	

where adopted.								
<u>Output 2.1.2</u> Public-private partnerships supported to improve quality control of fishery products and working conditions (<i>cf.</i> self-monitoring)	Q4 Y5	Not yet initiated					0%	
<u>Output 2.2.1</u> Innovations and good practices are developed, and awareness of these is raised among stakeholders in order to create fairly distributed livelihood benefits while contributing to sustainable fisheries.	Q4 Y5	National consultants to be posted at the respective pilot sites have been recruited/are in the final stages of being recruited – they will work on this and other outputs.					5%	

<p><u>Output 2.2.2</u></p> <p>Small-scale fishers and fish workers' (especially women) access to national and regional markets for fisheries products is facilitated and improved.</p> <p><u>Output 3.1.1</u></p> <p>Project communication strategy is developed and implemented and effective communication products developed for sharing project results and lessons learnt.</p>	Q4 Y5	Not yet initiated					0%	
	Q4 Y5	<p>Recruitment of communication consultant to progress this work is near completion (expected start date is August 2019).</p> <p>Updated information on the Project has been added to the CFI website and blog posts on main events shared.</p>					5%	

<u>Output 3.1.2</u> Project experiences are shared through existing platforms and networks, and collaboration is strengthened.	Q4 Y5	Project staff as well as representatives from the three countries have attended global events to share experiences, including one IW:LEARN event and one international conference on women in fisheries.					10%	
<u>Output 3.1.3</u> Training, awareness raising and other communication products needed for Project activities are developed and utilised.	Q4 Y5	Not yet initiated					0%	
<u>Output 3.2.1</u> Project monitoring system operating and providing	Q4 Y5	Inception workshop successfully held. Two PPRs submitted.					50%	

systematic progress information related to Project outcome and output targets in all three countries.		<p>The project results framework has been reviewed (including outputs, indicators, targets, baseline and activities) – it will be put to the Project Steering Committee in July 2019.</p> <p>A detailed work plan has been drafted for each country, accounting for the revised results framework.</p>						
<p><u>Output 3.2.2</u></p> <p>Implementation and evaluation reports as well as CFI Programme ToC assessments to allow Project management and supervisory bodies to ensure the</p>	Q4 Y5	Not yet initiated					0%	

functioning of operations and achievement of expected results.								
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

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

Max 200 words:

The reporting period has had the character of an inception phase, following the Project Coordinator taking up their post on 1 September 2018, undertaking field missions to the pilot sites, to inform the recruitment of national consultants and the elaboration of national work plans as well as to inform, and solicit support from, stakeholders, including local and regional administrations.

The main achievements during the reporting period included: (a) finalisation of the recruitment of the National Project Officers (NPO) and the near-finalisation of the recruitment of national consultants, (b) visits to all pilot sites, (c) initiation of dialogue with FAO colleagues on collaboration with a Swedish-funded project for the implementation of the FAO small-scale fisheries guidelines, (d) the review of the draft gender strategy (June 2017) and its recommendations, which were then incorporated into (e) the review of the project results framework, in parallel with (f) the elaboration of national work plans. The comprehensive review of the project results framework provides a more up-to-date and gender-responsive framework for project implementation. These activities largely fall within Component 3, focusing on liaising with stakeholders and launching the project in the three countries, recruitments, setting up an adequate M&E system, and seeking additional funding for project implementation.

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

Max 200 words:

The recruitment of both the Project Coordinator and the NPOs has taken considerably longer than expected – the former was onboard in September 2018 and the recruitment of the NPOs was completed in February 2019. This delay, in turn, affected the recruitment of national consultants as well as the elaboration of national work plans; however, considerable efforts have been made to make up for lost time and implementation of project activities is underway in all three countries.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating¹⁶	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating¹⁷	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	While there has been an initial delay in implementation, the project has made very good progress in the last ten months and there is currently nothing to indicate that the Development objective would not be achieved.
Budget Holder	S	S	Agrees with the above. Rapid progress has been made, including a solid foundation of well-developed work plans in each country. At the global level, regular contact with the other projects have been maintained and project is sharing information at the regional and global scale.
Lead Technical Officer¹⁸	S	S	Agrees with above comments. In just a few months, a number of staff have been on-boarded and trained, the results framework revised and a clear plan has been established for going forward.
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	MS	The first year of implementation so the focus was understandably on having project teams in place. Implementation should improve from year 2 on.

¹⁶ **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.

¹⁷ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁸ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

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 ¹⁹ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	Still valid

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.

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 <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant .

	Risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
--	------	---------------------------	-------------------	--	-----------------------------------

¹⁹ **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.

²⁰ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²¹ 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 ²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Changes in decision makers, or other events beyond the control of the Project, lead to changes in policies and or the political will to support the Project.	M	In the Project-formulation phase, governments – as well as other stakeholders – have been closely involved, and the Project will continue to work closely with governments to foster buy-in and commitment from relevant institutions, including through national and local champions. In addition, specific activities have been incorporated for creating awareness among government officials and politicians.	As this risk refers to events beyond the control of the Project, no mitigation actions foreseen, in addition to continued close collaboration with governments and other stakeholders.	<i>The Risk Matrix has not yet been discussed in the Project Task Force.</i>
2	Coastal communities do not engage with the Project and key stakeholders do not participate in the Project.	M	The Project mitigates this risk through planned and significant networking and coordination and collaborative activities, joint planning, regular meetings between the main partners and sharing of information and development. At Project-site level, Project consultants will be based close to communities and, together with government counterparts, work in partnership with communities and fisheries actors.	Visits have been paid to all Project pilot sites in order to engage with key stakeholders – including professionals, civil society and local/regional administration. Representatives have also been invited to a regional training workshop (to be held in July 2019) in order to further enhance their engagement and technical capacity.	

	Risk	Risk rating²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
3	The required data and information, or the means for obtaining the data needed (through partner collaboration), are not available.	M	The lack of data is a common weakness in the context of fisheries governance and management. The Project will work closely with both relevant authorities and resource users and will hence have access to existing data. Through partnerships with other initiatives, such as the EAF Nansen project, new data will also be generated.	Too early in Project implementation to embark upon mitigation actions, other than close collaboration with partners.	
4	Insufficient capacity to implement the proposed governance and fisheries management changes in a manner that builds long-term sustainability.	M	The scope of the Project has been agreed with relevant authorities and representatives of fisheries actors (small-scale fisheries CSOs). The Project will assist governments to better assess strategies and tools that are available and support capacity building accordingly. The Project will promote arrangements that are feasible and sustainable in the long-term.	Training workshop planned for national and pilot-site teams in order to enhance their capacity, including on governance and fisheries-management issues. Additional capacity-building events are foreseen.	
5	Regional and national market demand for improved quality products is weak.	L	Existing information and perceptions indicate that there is not a lack of demand but of good quality products and of distribution channels. The Project will base its support to improved market access and enhanced product quality on thorough value chain and market analyses.	Value-chain analyses will be part of the training provided for national and pilot-site teams (incl. consultants and representatives from local and regional administrations).	

	Risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
6	Better quality products lead to fish becoming inaccessible for poorer population groups.	M	While the intention is that improvement of quality will lead to that some products can be sold with a premium price in order for small-scale fishers and fish workers improve their income and livelihoods, a major effect of introducing better post-harvest practices will be a decrease in postharvest losses. This means that more produce will be available in the markets overall. It will be important though that the Project monitor prices and possible effects on food and nutrition security in the Project sites.		
7	Lack of willingness and ability of development partners to collaborate.	M	Many different partners were involved in the Project preparation phase and the CFI Program as a whole is a partnership. Continued dialogue and collaboration with partners will mitigate risks of non-cooperation.	Contact with development partners maintained, including partners not previously involved in the project.	
8	Necessary decisions beyond national level, for example with respect to shared stock management and migration of fisher folk, cannot be made because of lack collaboration at the regional level	M	The Project will ensure contacts with governments of neighbouring countries and regional bodies to promote collaboration on issues beyond national control or through regional initiatives or existing processes such as CECAF, SRFC, FCWC, CCLME and GCLME.	The project is in regular contact with, above all, regional bodies and projects, including CECAF, the CCLME and ECOWAS.	

	Risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
9	Perceived gender roles and cultural practices hinder increased involvement of women in strengthened livelihood activities.	M	The Project will apply a gender sensitive approach and work with both men and women, as appropriate, also for activities that target women more specifically. Women already play an important role in the postharvest sector and the Project is not seeking to drastically change gender roles but to support those who are more vulnerable and promote gender equity.	Results framework reviewed in order to render it gender sensitive/gender responsive and a <i>"Coastal Fisheries Initiative West-Africa project Checklist to address gender issues"</i> , elaborated. This will help address potential obstacles to women's involvement in implementing, and benefitting from, the project.	

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
M	L/M	The risk matrix has been reviewed by the PMU. None of the risks originally identified seem likely to materialise at this stage. No additional risks have been identified.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²²

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	No	
Project Outputs	Yes	All outputs have been reviewed in order to ensure that they are still relevant in the country context and, more importantly, to reflect the incorporation into the results framework of the project gender strategy (submitted in June 2017).

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
Project extension	<div>Original NTE: Revised NTE:</div> <div>Justification:</div>

²² 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)?

Was a gender analysis undertaken or an equivalent socio-economic assessment? Please briefly indicate the gender differences. *A draft gender strategy was submitted in June 2017.*

Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data? *Yes, the results framework has been reviewed in order to render outputs, indicators, targets and activities gender sensitive and, in some cases, gender responsive. This will be put to the Project Steering Committee in July 2019.*

How is the project tracking gender impacts and results? *As above.*

Does the project staff have gender expertise? *Yes, one of the National Project Officers is a gender specialist.*

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

- closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources; *YES*
- improving women's participation and decision making; *YES*
- generating socio-economic benefits or services for women. *YES*

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: *Indigenous Peoples not explicitly targeted in this project.*

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))

If your project had a stakeholder engagement plan, specify whether any new stakeholders have been identified/engaged: *N/A*

If a stakeholder engagement plan was not requested for your project at CEO endorsement stage, please

- list all stakeholders engaged in the project: *Stakeholders primarily include fisher and fish-worker organisations, as well as national and local administrations. The respective ministerial orders establishing the national project committees are attached to this report (for Senegal and Cabo Verde, respectively; the Côte d'Ivoire order remains to be signed).*
- briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes: *Fisher and fish-worker organisations as well as administrations participated in regional and national inception workshop(s) (September 2018 and May 2019, respectively), and project teams have engaged with these at all pilot sites (December 2018 – April 2019) in order to (a) inform them about the project and solicit their engagement and (b) inform the elaboration of national work plans. Workshop and back-to-office reports can be supplied.*

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

It is too early in project implementation to speak about how it has helped improve people's livelihood and achieve expected global environmental benefits.

- Please provide the links to publications, video materials, etc.

<http://www.fao.org/blogs/blue-growth-blog/mainstreaming-gender-in-west-africas-coastal-fisheries-initiative/en/>

<http://www.fao.org/blogs/blue-growth-blog/coastal-fisheries-initiative-underway-in-west-africa/en/>

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²³	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	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Government	Cabo Verde	In-kind Contrib.	3,000,000	900,000		3,000,000
Government	Cote d'Ivoire	In-kind Contrib.	6,000,000	1,800,000		6,000,000
Government	Senegal	In-kind Contrib.	5,000,000	1,500,000		5,000,000
International Organization	Abidjan Convention & UNEP	In-kind Contrib.	1,150,000	345,000		1,150,000
CSO's	CAOPOA FENACOPECI, Fisher Ass. CPV	In-kind Contrib.	101,500	30,450		101,500
International Non-profit	MSC	In-kind Contrib.	1,000,000	300,000		1,000,000
International Non-profit	Birdlife	In-kind Contrib.	300,000	90,000		300,000
Private	CONXEMAR	Contrib.	2,000,000	0		2,000,000
International Organization	FAO	In-kind and Cash Contrib.	27,000,000	8,100,000		27,000,000
TOTAL			42,551,500	13,665,450		42,551,500

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

²³ 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.

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.