



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Global
Country (ies):	Global
Project Title:	The Coastal Fisheries Initiatives Global Partnership
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP /GLO/838/GFF
GEF ID:	9128
GEF Focal Area(s):	International Waters
Project Executing Partners:	CI, UNDP, UNEP, WB, WWF and University of Washington
Project Duration:	5 years

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	20 April 2017
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01 October 2017
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	30 June 2022
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	
Actual Implementation End Date³:	

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 2,652,294
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	USD 11,850,000
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	USD 588,204
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	USD 3,555,000

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.

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

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	24 June 2019 Global Call
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	Mid-point 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:	
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	Yes

Ratings

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

Status

Implementation Status <i>(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):</i>	1 st PIR
--	---------------------

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Gunilla Greig, Fishery Officer, FIDF	Gunilla.TegelskarGreig@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Nicolas Gutierrez, Fishery Resources Officer, FIAFD	Nicolas.Gutierrez@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 8}	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹⁰
Global Environmental Objective: The CFI aims to contribute to the global objective of having, worldwide, coastal fisheries delivering sustainable environmental, social and economic benefits. Project Development Objective: To strengthen global partnership for the purpose of enhancing the understanding and application of integrated, participatory and collaborative approaches, among local and global partners who co-develop and utilize frontier tools to assess coastal fisheries performances, and identify empirically effective pathways towards environmental, social and economic sustainability for these fisheries.						
Outcome 1.1: Collaboration among environmental and development agencies and organizations is managed, coordinated, enhanced and intensified, at the global as well as national and regional levels	Platform or mechanisms functioning which permits collaboration among development and environmental agencies and organizations working in fisheries	Inadequate global platform or mechanism for collaboration among development and environmental agencies and organizations working in fisheries.		Global Steering Committee (GSC) functioning well with linkages well defined and Program Governance and Programme Coordination Arrangements functioning smoothly	The GSC fully operational, including quarterly conference-call meetings. Satisfaction with CFI Global-consultation meeting has been expressed by partners.	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 Kindly note that, in the approved results framework, at the outcome level, no distinction has been made between indicators and targets. In addition, where Output indicators are outlined, milestones have been defined to indicate progress towards achieving output and outcome targets alike. The results framework will be reviewed before the next PIR is due

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ 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 8}	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹⁰
Outcome 1.1: continued	Annual internal review by partners rate coordination efforts as satisfactory or highly satisfactory. Independent midterm review and terminal evaluation of the CFI rate progress towards CFI objective as satisfactory or highly satisfactory	Lack of coherence across mechanisms which might facilitate global cooperation and coordination on marine fisheries issues.	Global Partnership Coordination Unit (GPCU), Global Steering Committee and Global Reference Group (GRG) functioning well with linkages well defined and Programme Governance and Coordination Arrangements functioning smoothly.	GPCU, GSC and GRG functioning well with linkages well defined and Program Governance and Programme Coordination Arrangements functioning smoothly	The GPCU is nearly fully established (the communication consultant will be on-board early September 2019).	S
Outcome 1.1: continued	At least 3 new national and/or regional and/or global project/program proposals by GEF Agencies, other partners and governments are based on CFI best practices and include strong collaboration between different GEF agencies and other partners	Limited integration among the different approaches that are used by governments in their partnerships with developments and environmental agencies and organizations to ensure sustainability in the fisheries sector.			While there has not been enough time for new projects based of CFI best practice to be initiated, collaboration /co-funding has been developed with, for example, a Sida- (Swedish-) funded project on the implementation of the FAO small-scale fisheries guidelines and a USAid-funded project on	

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ^{7 8}	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹⁰
					mangroves. In addition, the EU-funded Fish4ACP project is considering using elements of the CFI Fisheries Performance Assessment Tool for assessing fisheries sustainability of value chains.	
Outcome 1.2: Progress of CFI Program is systematically monitored and reported.	<p>CFI M&E system defined and operational.</p> <p>Reports and evaluations published on schedule.</p> <p>Annual review meetings (GSC, GRG etc.) monitor and guide Programme performance</p> <p>Programme and projects are well managed and addressing risks and challenges.¹¹</p>	No Project or Programme M&E system in place	<p>M&E system functioning, and delivering PIRs, biannual PPRs available to GCU and GSC.</p> <p>Midterm program review carried out and reports available.</p>	<p>M&E system functioning, and delivering PIRs, biannual PPRs available to GCU and GPSC.</p> <p>Terminal programme evaluation carried out and reports available</p>	<p>M&E system largely defined and operational.</p> <p>All reports due have been submitted.</p> <p>The Global Steering Committee meeting regularly. The GRG will meet collectively and when the need arise.</p>	S

¹¹ Currently four of the five child projects are operational.

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ^{7 8}	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹⁰
Outcome 1.2: continued	Midterm and terminal program assessments against ToC carried out, and reports available.	CFI Programme Theory of Change developed in collaboration with CFI Partner Agencies	Midterm program assessment carried out and reports available	Terminal programme assessment carried out and reports available.	N/A	
Outcome 2.1: Best practices and tools for environmentally, socially and economically sustainable fisheries are documented, analyzed and shared	4 technical documents on selected topics prepared and disseminated through IW:LEARN activities and other learning mechanisms	Lessons learned from major relevant programmes not being applied to better influence fisheries policies and strategies.	Defined audiences informed of CFI lessons learned	4 best-practice publications published on CFI Portal and project results presented at global decision-making meetings	Development of technical documents/best-practice publications will be initiated further into project and programme implementation.	MS
	3 south-south learning exchanges through field visits and other learning events.	CFI knowledge-management strategy does not exist	<p>Defined audiences informed of CFI lessons learned.</p> <p>CFI global consultations held annually to share lessons learned and strengthen coordination among agencies and partners.</p> <p>2 CFI Knowledge products prepared and disseminated</p>	<p>Knowledge-management strategy developed and operational</p> <p>At least four knowledge-products prepared and disseminated</p>	The global-consultation / programme inception meeting served as a learning exchange, as representatives from national teams participated and examples of pilot-site activities were provided/lessons shared. At this meeting, the four knowledge products (one for each of the other child projects) were identified.	

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ^{7 8}	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹⁰
	Fisheries Performance Assessment Tool (FPAT) disseminated widely through IW:LEARN platforms and shared at 4 knowledge-sharing events		CFI global consultations held annually to share lessons learned and strengthen coordination among agencies and partners.	FPAT published	The FPAT will be disseminated once fully developed and tested. One global consultation held (October 2018). The second one is being planned (for November 2019).	
Outcome 2.1: Continued	4 global workshops carried out targeting key government officials, RFBs and staff of environ/dev agencies and organisations and to promote a shared understanding on key fisheries governance and mgmt. concepts. 6 countries / regional organisations refer to CFI best practices (in) national and regional policies and strategies and are under implementation, as appropriate	Governments currently do not receive consistent advice from development and environmental agencies and organizations		4 global workshops carried out	No global workshops held. No evidence of countries/regional organisations referring to CFI best practices yet. These targets can only be expected to be delivered on at a later stage of project implementation.	

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ^{7 8}	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹⁰
Outcome 2.2: CFI Program Communication and Outreach Strategy is established and operational.	<p>Communication Team for CFI Programme is established, composed of communication specialists from CFI Agencies</p> <p>CFI Web Portal functioning and regularly updated.</p> <p>GRG effective as CFI ambassadors as indicated by web references to CFI</p>	CFI Communications and Outreach strategy does not exist	Communications team for CFI established	<p>CFI communication toolbox developed and used across different media</p> <p>15 key government representatives and project staff supported</p>	<p>Communication team will fully established early-September 2019.</p> <p>Web portal functioning albeit not as regularly updated as ought to be the case without a dedicated communication officer.</p> <p>Re. the GRG, cf. Output 1.1.2 below.</p>	MS
Outcome 3.1: Fisheries Performance Assessment Tool (FPAT)¹² is developed and in operation for CFI fisheries	<p>FPAT developed.</p> <p>Pilot test for CFI and non-CFI¹³ fisheries are completed.</p> <p>Training and capacity building program for using the FPAT carried out</p>	There are some tools available to assess whether fisheries are sustainably managed, but none can meet the needs for the CFI performance evaluation.	Triple bottom line FPAT fully developed ready for piloting	<p>Ecological component of Fisheries Performance Assessment Tool developed, consulted and validated.</p> <p>Broadly applicable triple bottom line Fisheries Performance Assessment Tool developed, consulted and validated.</p>	The work to develop revised Fisheries Performance Indicators (FPI+), on the basis of which the Tool is elaborated, is ongoing.	MS

¹² Previously referred to as the Fisheries Performance Assessment Instrument

¹³ While the uptake of the FPAT in non-CFI fisheries will be promoted, due to budgetary constraints the GPSC has concluded that the project can only cover CFI fisheries. This is also reflected in the revised wording of Output 3.1.3

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ^{7 8}	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹⁰
				Triple bottom line Fisheries Performance Assessment Tool piloted, refined, designed and trained.		

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹⁴

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
2.1	Recruitment of knowledge-sharing consultant	PMU	Q3 2019
2.2	Recruitment of communication consultant	PMU	Q3 2019
3.1	Contract has been signed and implementation has begun. Regular follow-ups on stated deliverables with service provider.	LTO	Q4 2019

¹⁴ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹⁵	Expected completion date ¹⁶	Achievements at each PIR ¹⁷					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁸ 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 Global Program Coordination Unit and Global Program Steering Committee established and operational.	Q3 2019	The GPCU has been established and is operational. During the second global-consultation/Programme inception meeting (October 2018), it was confirmed that the six implementing agencies would function as Programme Steering Committee. Steering-committee calls are being organized at least quarterly.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	75%	Overall delay in the start of project implementation. Communication and Knowledge-sharing consultants not yet on-board (will start mid-August and early September 2019, respectively).
Output 1.1.2 Global Reference Group	Q3 2019	The GRG, including its members and TORs, was established prior to the reporting period. Its	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	10%	

¹⁵ 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.

¹⁶ As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹⁷ 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)

¹⁸ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

established and operating as needed.		members will be contacted to recommit, following the delay in project implementation. No meetings have been held but will be organized as the need arise to draw on the group's/individual members' expertise.						
Output 1.1.3 Program Governance and Coordination Arrangements developed and operational.	Developed and operational – operating throughout the project.	Monthly (minuted) conference calls were held between the six implementing agencies in view of the global inception meeting (held on 23-26 October 2018). These calls have since developed into quarterly steering-committee meetings. FAO-internal Global-Partnership Project Task Force established (and have met). A programme-level communication group has also been established for bi-monthly calls.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	25%	
Output 1.2.1 CFI Program-level Monitoring and Evaluation System established and operational.	Q4 2019	The Global Inception meeting (October 2018) agreed on a set of common indicators for measuring impact at the programme level, in line with the Programme Theory of Change structure. Each child	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	30%	

		project currently establishing their methodologies and baseline for delivering on the agreed indicators.						
Output 1.2.2 Timely biannual PPRs available to GCU and GSC.	Ongoing throughout the project.	Two PPR submitted (the first PPR covering two reporting periods)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	30%	
Output 1.2.3 Midterm program review and terminal evaluations carried out and reports available.	Q2 2022	N/A at this stage.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0%	
Output 1.2.4 Midterm and terminal program assessments against ToC carried out, and reports available.	Q2 2022	N/A at this stage	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0%	
Output 2.1.1 Knowledge Management Strategy developed and operational.	Strategy completed in Q4 2019 and operational throughout the project.	A draft Programme knowledge-management strategy has been developed and circulated to the PSC (implementing agencies) for comments.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	10%	Recruitment of knowledge-management consultant near-finalised.

Output 2.1.2 Four commonly agreed CFI knowledge products, with a dissemination/ uptake programme, prepared with proposed themes that include gender and innovative financing with links to PPPs.	Q4 2021	Preliminary agreement on which global knowledge product each of the regional projects, as well as the Challenge Fund, would develop was reached at the Global inception meeting in October 2018. Gender will be mainstreamed in all the products and the WB will focus on innovative financing.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	10%	
Output 2.1.3 CFI global consultations held annually to share lessons learned and strengthen coordination among agencies and partners.	Annually throughout the project.	The first global consultation since the project became operational - its inception meeting - with representatives from all five child projects was held in October 2018.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	25%	
Output 2.1.4 Fishery performance assessment methodology and experiences published and disseminated.	Q4 2021	This work has not commenced.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0%	Publication and dissemination of the FPAT will follow once the Tool has been developed and tested.
Output 2.2.1 CFI communication toolbox developed and	Toolbox/ strategy completed in Q4 2019 and	A draft Programme communication strategy has been developed and circulated to the PSC (implementing agencies)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	10%	Recruitment of communication consultant near-finalised.

used across different media.	operational throughout the project.	for comments.						
Output 2.2.2 Targeted external communication activities carried out.	Q2 2022	<p>Information on various events/processes has been channelled through the CFI website.</p> <p>A number of blog posts issued.</p> <p>An article published in the IW:LEARN Newsletter following the Global inception meeting and another one, on gender, following the CFI WA gender workshop.</p> <p>One government representative and several project staff (from three of the child projects) participated in the 2018 GEF IW Biennial Conference.</p>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	15%	
Output 3.1.1 Ecological assessment toolkit, including for data-poor fishery stocks, developed and pilot-tested in both CFI and non-CFI	Q4 2021	A development team has been recruited, and development of the data-limited assessment module initiated.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	10%	

fisheries.								
Output 3.1.2 Fisheries Performance Assessment Tool, for triple- bottom line, developed.	Q4 2021	A baseline assessment tool based on the Fisheries Performance Indicators is under development. The tool was introduced at the inception workshops for the Latin America and West Africa projects respectively.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	5%	
Output 3.1.3 Fisheries Performance Assessment Tool pilot- tested and its use technically supported in both CFI and non-CFI fisheries.	Q2 2022	Not yet initiated	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0%	

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 main achievements during the reporting period were:

- (i) The conclusion of recruitment of staff for the Global Coordination Unit, and the near completion of the recruitment of communication and knowledge-sharing consultants, and the establishment of the Global Programme Steering Committee;
- (ii) The successful organisation and implementation of the Global consultation/ inception meeting, including (a) provisional agreement on the respective projects' global knowledge product and (b) identification of common indicators for measuring impact at the Programme level);
- (iii) Draft communication and knowledge sharing strategy shared with GPSC Members; and
- (iv) Fisheries Performance Assessment Toolkit-development teams recruited and tool development underway. The theoretical development of a bio-economic module to be integrated into the FPAT has been initiated, and a beta version of the e-learning course to introduce the FPAT to the regional projects and their FPAT focal points has been developed.

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

Max 200 words:

The recruitment of the Project Coordinator took longer than expected (onboard 1 September 2018) but, in order not to further delay the launch of the Global Partnership project, preparations for the Programme and Global Partnership inception workshop commenced prior to their taking up their post, in order that the workshop could be held in October 2018, marking the launch of the Global Partnership project as well as the Programme.

The recruitment of communication consultant, to advance work within Component 2, has also taken a little longer than expected, thus delaying some of the activities planned.

In addition, the contracting process between the University of Washington and the FAO experienced some delays, thus delaying work under Component 3 (the Fisheries Performance Assessment Tool). The contract was signed in March 2019.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating¹⁹	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating²⁰	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	MS	While there has been an initial delay in implementation, the project has made reasonable progress in the last year and there is currently nothing to indicate that the Development objective would not be achieved.
Budget Holder	S	MS	With the recruitment of project staff nearly completed and major contracts finalised, implementation rate is improving.
Lead Technical Officer²¹	S	MS	Despite delays, not least in contracting processes, the project is moving forward moderately satisfactory.
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	MS	This was the first year of implementation and with the project team now fully on-board it is expected that moving forward the programme/project will pick up momentum.

¹⁹ **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.

²⁰ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

²¹ 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 ²² . 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 ²³	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁴	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Some partners in the geographies of the CFI Program are not willing or able to adopt a more integrated and coordinated approach to coastal fisheries.	Medium	The CFI Global Partnership includes several organizations whose primary goals are conservation related, whilst some others are focusing on food security. By developing a common vision in the CFI Program Framework, the partners have committed themselves to working through a	No risk-mitigation plan was presented. Overall, the global-consultation meetings, which include the national administrations, and the programme	The risk log has not been updated; it is still considered overall relevant.

²² **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.

²³ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²⁴ 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”.

			shared platform and towards joint results. The Project will further cement this commitment and will also work to realign and harmonize different approaches and practices through a strong-knowledge sharing programme. The Project's Steering Committee and Reference Group will ensure that the partners are able to work collectively and mitigate any issues or differences in their approaches.	steering committee work to ensure a common approach and no issues have arisen as yet.	
2	The CFI Global Partnership is not as effective as distinct regional advocacy and coordination mechanisms.	Low	The imperative need for harmonizing the different approaches and practices in coastal fisheries management, when advocated through the global partnership, will be far more convincing to the national policy makers, than when addressed in more localized fora. Moreover, the global partnership will allow for the development and dissemination of a commonly agreed (across the regions) FPAT that will greatly help the policy-makers and other actors in judging the triple-bottom impacts of their interventions and making improvements and to track progress towards improved fisheries-management outcomes.		
3	The knowledge capitalized and shared through the CFI Global Partnership is compromised or misconstrued by actors with vested interests, particularly in the case of the fisheries performance assessment.	Low	Actors within the CFI geographies may wish to portray their fisheries as performing well and use methodologies masking a priori shortcomings. Numerical and quantitative scoring rubrics will be set when assessing fisheries performance, to limit subjectivity. Moreover,		

			information/data collection will be led by regional projects with personnel who are familiar with the situation in each fishery, thereby making large distortions difficult.		
4	Some CFI child projects lack the technical and institutional capacities to use the FPAT efficiently.	Low	The methodology on which the FPAT is based has been successfully used in a range of low-information fisheries, and is within the technical and financial reach of users who only need to make modest investments in data gathering, even relying primarily on expert knowledge. Moreover, the Project will provide customized training and technical support to the partners who need and request it.	In order to provide an additional awareness-raising and training tool, an e-learning course is being developed. This will be useful not only for FPAT users, but also for high-level officials.	
5	Climatic events could have adverse effects on fishery resources and, consequently, on the CFI Program in general and on the Global Partnership Project in particular.	Low	The present El Nino is one of the strongest ever recorded. If a La Nina develops, global weather patterns could (again) be thrown into chaos. The GCU as well as the respective management unit of each child project will carefully monitor the situation and adapt their strategies and work plans accordingly.		

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
Low	Low	Too early to conclude whether any of the events indicated in the risk statements are about to materialise but overall risk still regarded as low.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²⁵

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	No	A review of the project results framework is forthcoming, most notably to better specify indicators, targets and milestones at the outcome and output level, respectively.
Project Outputs	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
Project extension	<div>Original NTE: Revised NTE:</div> <div>Justification:</div>

²⁵ 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. No gender analysis or equivalent has been undertaken. However, gender will be mainstreamed into the four global knowledge products and technical documents referred to above.

Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data? How is the project tracking gender impacts and results? The project results framework is yet to be reviewed, including from a gender-mainstreaming perspective (components 2 and 3).

Does the project staff have gender expertise? No specific gender expertise amongst project staff, but project staff have good relations with and access to gender specialists within the Organization.

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
- improving women's participation and decision making; and or
- generating socio-economic benefits or services for women.

The project's Component 2, on communication and knowledge sharing, will help disseminate results of the other four CFI projects, including on contributions to women's access to natural resources, their participation in decision making and the socio-economic benefits generated.

As for Component 3, while some gender-sensitive Fisheries-Performance Indicators will be included, gender disaggregation is not considered within the Fisheries Performance Assessment Tool.

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. Also, this project is mainly about coordinating, collating and communicating with and on behalf of the other four child projects.

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: The project had no stakeholder-engagement plan.

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

- **list all stakeholders engaged in the project:** This project is focused on coordinating with the other four child projects and facilitating communication and knowledge sharing among these projects as well as externally. Thus, the main stakeholders are the four projects which, in turn, access their respective stakeholders. In addition, the project are liaising with other projects, donors and partners, both at the regional and global level.
- **briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.** The main events for liaising with the key project (Programme) partners are (a) the GPSC meetings and (b) the Global consultations. Contacts with non-CFI projects and partners, are currently at a more ad-hoc basis, e.g. at the kick-off meetings of other projects or by jointly elaborating work plans for project implementation.

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. Having said that, Component 2 of the project is in itself about telling the stories of this and the other four CFI projects.

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

<https://news.iwlearn.net/gef-coastal-fisheries-initiative>

<https://news.iwlearn.net/gender-in-the-gef-costal-fisheries-initiative>

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁶	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
International Organization	UNEP	In-kind	150,000	45,000		150,000
Knowledge Institution	Univ. of Washington	In-kind	2,500,000	750,000		2,500,000
International Organization	FAO	In-kind	9,200,000	2,760,000		9,200,000
TOTAL			11,850,000	3,555,000		11,850,000

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

²⁶ 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.