

1- Identification

1.1 Project details

GEF ID	5788	SMA IPMR ID	30692
Project Short Title	Cote d'Ivoire Coffee-Cocoa	Grant ID	S1-32GFL-000620
		Umoja WBS	GFL/11207-14AC0003-SB006685
Project Title	Assessment of land degradation dynamic in coffee - Cocoa production areas and northern the country to promote SLM practices and carbon stock conservation (ALDD-SLM/CSC)		
Project Type	Medium Sized Project (MSP)	Duration months	Planned
Parent Programme if child project			Age
GEF Focal Area(s)	Land Degradation	Completion Date	Planned -original PCA
Project Scope	National		Revised - Current PCA
Region	Africa	Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval	December 16, 2016
Countries	Côte d'Ivoire	UNEP Project Approval Date (on Decision Sheet)	15-Mar-17
GEF financing amount	1 726 027 USD	Start of Implementation (PCA entering into force)	15-Mar-17
Co-financing amount	19 400 000 USD (MINEDD) 5 000 000 USD (Conseil Café-Cacao) 800 000 USD (ROADCI) 250 000 USD (FEREADD) 151 220 USD (Commune de Korhogo)	Date of First Disbursement	January 12, 2018
Total disbursement as of 30 June	1 342 043 USD	Date of Inception Workshop, if available	July 4, 2018
Total expenditure as of 30 June	1 069 874 USD	Midterm undertaken?	Yes
		Actual Mid-term Date, if taken	february 8-10, 2023
		Expected Mid-Term Date, if not taken	
		Expected Terminal Evaluation Date	31 December 2023
		Expected Financial Closure Date	June 30, 2024

1.2 EA: Project description

The objective of the project is to maintain the functionality of the coffee and cocoa production areas in the center and to reverse the trend of land degradation in the northern part of the country by creating an enabling policy and capacity environment through the development of community-based land management plans and facilitating access to SLM best practices.

The project has three components as follows

Component 1: Identifying policies to support the dissemination of SLM good practices

Component 2: SLM Good Practices to support community livelihoods improvement

Component 3: Advocacy and Sensitization for Sustainable Land Management

The project is housed at the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MINEDD).

The implementing agency is the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

1.3 Project Contact

Division(s) Implementing the project

UN Environment Programme
Ecosystems Division

Executing Agency(ies)

Ministry of Environment and Sustainable
Development (MINEDD)
Coffee-Cocoa advice
ROADCI
FEREADD
Municipality of Korhogo

Name of co-implementing Agency

Names of Other Project Partners

TM: UNEP Portfolio Manager(s)

Ersin Esen

EA: Manager/Representative

TM: UNEP Task Manager(s)

Adamou Bouhari

EA: Project Manager

TM: UNEP Budget/Finance Officer

Paul Vrontamitis

EA: Finance Manager

TM: UNEP Support/Assistant

Eric Mugo

EA: Communications lead, if relevant

Kouadio Jean

Charlotte Ehounou

n/a

2- OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

TM: UNEP Current Subprogramme(s)

Nature Action

TM: Healthy and Productive Ecosystems

Biennium 2022-2023
Healthy and Productive Ecosystem

TM: PoW Indicator(s)

(i) The number of countries and transboundary collaboration frameworks that have made progress in monitoring and maintaining the health and productivity of marine and terrestrial ecosystems with the assistance of UNEP; and
(iii) The number of countries and groups of countries that improve their cross-sectoral and transboundary collaboration frameworks for marine and terrestrial ecosystem management with the assistance of UNEP

EA: UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages

Outcome 3 of UNDAF 2017 – 2020 : By 2020 the public administration implement policies which ensure sustainable production and consumption and fight against Climate Change , creation of income and resilience to climate change of vulnerable population

EA: Link to relevant SDG Goals

Goal 2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture and Goal 15: Life on Land

EA: Link to relevant SDG Targets

SDG Target 2.4: By 2030, ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agricultural practices that increase productivity and production, that help maintain ecosystems, that strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters and that progressively improve land and soil quality. Indicator: 2.4.1 Proportion of agricultural area under productive and sustainable agriculture.

SDG Target 15.3: By 2030, combat desertification, restore degraded land and soil, including land affected by desertification, drought and floods, and strive to achieve a land degradation neutral Indicator: 15.3.1 Proportion of land that is degraded over total land area.

TM: GEF core or sub indicators targeted by the project as defined at CEO Endorsement/Approval, as well as results

	Indicators - Not Applicable (an Old Project)	Targets - Expected value			Materialised to date
		Mid-term	End-of-project	Total Target	
✓	3: Area of land and ecosystems under restoration				
✓	3.1: Area of degraded agricultural lands under resto				
✓					
✓					
✓					
✓					

Implementation Status

2023

6th PIR

FY 2023
FY 2022

PIR #

6th PIR

5th PIR

Rating towards outcomes (DO)
(section 3.1)

MS

MS

Rating towards outputs (IP)
(section 3.2)

MS

MS

Risk rating
(section 4.2)

M

L

2.3 Implementation status

FY 2021	4th PIR	MS	MS	L
FY 2020	3rd PIR	MS	MS	M
FY 2019	2nd PIR	MU	MS	L
FY 2018	1st PIR	S	S	M
FY 2017				
FY 2016				
FY 2015				

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

M: Given that the project still has some important milestone to delivered and that the country is heading to an election, there is Medium Risk of slow down of the project delivery.

2.4 Co-finance

EA: Planned Co-finance

40,101,220

EA: Actual to date:

7,760,000

EA: Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges.

During the project execution, the country has experiences many political and social crisis which led to the disruption of most of the socioeconomic situation of the country. Some announced projects have never materialised and national institutions become so weak they can not provide substantial cofinancing. The COVID 19 has also exacerbated the situation.

2.5 Stakeholder

EA: Date of project steering committee meeting

february 8,9,10, 2023 a self evaluation conducted to serve as a mid-term review

EA: Stakeholder engagement
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

Within the framework of the implementation of the project, formal meetings with the various stakeholders made it possible to collect their opinions in order to propose a better intervention strategy in the field. Engagement with local governments and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in Daoukro, Korhogo, Soubré, Yamoussoukro, Dimbokro, Bouna; regions for their full participation in project activities related to SLM
Thus, they are in favor of the implementation of the activities selected by consensus in the project area in order to contribute to the achievement of the expected results (information-awareness, capacity building of the staff of partner organizations and local populations. awareness on agroforestry, new techniques of SLM and on the implementation of micro-projects.

2.6 Gender

TM: Does the project have a gender action plan?

Yes

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

During capacity building, emphasis was placed on the activities of women and young people. The techniques of market gardening, multiplication of banana and cassava plants are all methods that have been taught to them.
Meetings with women's associations and cooperatives in the localities and village communities where the project is being tested have made it possible to obtain their support in overcoming their precarious situation with a view to improving their living conditions. This is in line with the recommendation of the gender mainstreaming assessment conducted by the project last year. To this end projects targeting women have been developed and will be implemented in the coming months as planned. Training of local communities including 40 women opinion leaders on agroforestry and establishment of nurseries were conducted.

2.7. ESSM

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

Yes

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

No

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

Potical support to the project

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

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

No

TM & EA: If yes, please describe the complaint(s) or grievance(s) in detail including

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

The good cultural practices provided should reinforce the achievements of past years. Training on agroforestry and nurseries establishment included safeguards issues related to these types of activities. The local representative of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development are in the forefront of these activities to ensure that no safeguard issues are encountered. Furthermore, the activities conducted responded to local and social needs and therefore designed and conducted in participative manner with no-one-left behind principle. The nurseries are community owned with define role and benefit sharing rule established. The agroforestry activities are mostly on individual farms voluntarily proposed by owners to pilot test the practice.

2.8. KM/Learning

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

As usual, awareness-raising activities were carried out during the National Fortnight for the Environment with a point of honor on June 17, World Day for the Celebration of the Fight against Desertification and Drought. Production of awareness-raising materials and participation in radio and television programs targeting the local population and other stakeholders. The populations received training on agroforestry practices and the establishment of nurseries using improved seed varieties, as well as the SLM guide.

Please attach a copy of any products

EA: Main learning during the period

The strong interest of the populations for everything that can lead them to better production and therefore to the improvement of their living conditions

2.9. Stories

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

The techniques of good practice were welcomed with joy by the populations, in particular the multiplication of cuttings of banana trees and cassava. These populations see in these techniques not only a reduction in expenses for acquiring plants, but also and above all, a source of income through the establishment of for-profit nurseries.

3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	EA: Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	TM: Progress rating
Objective							
To maintain functionality of cocoa-coffee production zones in the central and reverse land degradation trend in northern parts of the country by creating an enabling capacity and policy environment through development of community land use plans and facilitating access to good SLM practices	An enhanced enabling environment within the agricultural sector	EA to fill	EA to fill	EA to fill	EA to fill	EA to fill	
	Number of participatory land degradation assessment reports	No cohesive country level legal and regulatory framework with integrated SLM practices	Regulatory framework under development	Country level policy, legal and regulatory frameworks that integrate SLM principles developed	50%	The political, legal and regulatory framework at the national level which integrates the principles of SLM has been developed and submitted for signature.	MU
Outcome 1							
An Enabling Environment for SLM							
	Number of participatory land degradation assessment reports	Non-availability of land degradation statistics in the study areas	Availability of the report assessing the level of land degradation in the study areas	Availability of local natural resource management plans	100%	The SLM mapping was carried out with the support of stakeholder institutions. However, it needs to be revised.	S
	Number of development plans that incorporate SLM	No-availability of local plans integrating natural resource management	Availability of local natural resource management plans	6 local development plans	100%	The development plans of 6 pilot regions have been elaborated	S
	Number of orders issued						
	Many local institutions for the dissemination of SLM best practices have their capacities strengthened and tools developed	Only 40% of ANADER and CNRA staff and 5% of farmers are aware of good SLM practices.	60% of the staff of CNRA, ANADER and the Farmers have their capacity reinforced.	100% of the staff of CNRA, ANADER and the Farmers have their capacity reinforced.	80%	Stakeholders are aware of and committed to the project	MS
Outcome 2							
Local institutions for the dissemination of SLM Good Practices have their capacities strengthened and tools developed	Number of local institutions disseminating SLM best practices have strengthened capacities and developed tools	No institutions at the local level with a clear mandate to support SLM	At least 5 local institutions disseminating SLM best practices have their capacities strengthened and tools are developed with consideration of gender to support them in disseminating SLM best practices	At least 10 local institutions disseminating SLM best practices have their capacities strengthened with consideration of gender and tools are developed to support them in disseminating SLM best practices	40%	Institutions have been identified and arrangements are being made for their capacity building	MU
	Number of legal frameworks developed	Legal framework with less consideration	Evaluation Report Recommendations		50%	The development of the legal framework is subject to the issuance of a decree by the President of the Republic	MU
	Number of informed policies developed	No documents produced to support SLM/SM	Note to policymakers for advocacy on gender-sensitive SLM	A Charter is developed, adopted and negotiated with all stakeholders	30%	The drafting of the charter is in progress	MU
Outcome 3							

Alternative welfare options to reduce pressure on natural resources and increase incomes	Number of good practices developed	Lack of official documentation of local sustainable soil management practices	Official document of local sustainable management practices	various of SLM best practices developed, tested and disseminated through awareness raising and capacity building	100%	At least 111 good practice SLM techniques have been developed	S
	Number of good practices tested				20%	The techniques of good practices in SLM concerning agroforestry, cassava cropping, living hedges, FIP were highly appreciated during the capacity building sessions for actors and stakeholders. We hope that these are the ones that will be the subject of evaluation in the next field missions.	U
	Number of people reached			1200 actors	40%	There are 420 trained participants including 24 facilitators in the project coverage area who are responsible for relaying the knowledge acquired and supervising the people concerned in the localities. These people are also responsible for verifying the applicability of good cultural practices in terms of SLM	MU
	Number of good practices inventoried				80%	le guide de Bonnes Pratiques en matière de GDT répertorie 111 techniques couvrant plusieurs domaines (conservation des eaux et des sols (22), techniques culturales (13), techniques de fertilisation des sols (10), techniques de foresterie et d'agroforesterie (16), gestion des ressources naturelles (15), techniques de gestion durable de l'eau (11), aménagement durable des terres (17) et pratiques organisationnelles en matière de GDT (7).	MS
	Number of sites identified			6 locations	100%	At least 6 pilot villages have been selected in the regions and are concerned	S
	Number of stakeholders identified				80%	These are the actors and stakeholders identified in the 6 regions covered by the project. Thus, in each region, the standard composition includes representatives of the administration, local authorities, the regional council, the town hall, the services under supervision, ANADER, CNRA, SODEFOR, civil society, NGOs, the local community ,etc. That is about 70 people taking gender into account.	S
	Number of rural infrastructures to support income regeneration for local communities in order to reduce the pressure on natural resources and promote the adaptation of measures and mechanisms created for their sustainability put in place				70%	4 water reservoirs were built on the sites identified with the participation of the village communities to general satisfaction.	MS

Outcome 4

Institutions and actors capable of ensuring Sustainable Land Management	Number of stakeholder groups and stakeholders trained				80%	The sessions held during the first half of the year saw the participation of several actors at the level of the administration, local communities, decentralized structures, youth associations, women's and youth cooperatives, society Civil Society, Non-Gov	MS
	Number of steering committee sessions held				80%	A mid-term self -evaluation meeting of the project activities was held from February 8 to 10, 2023.	MS
	Number of workshops and seminars held				89%	2 workshops were organized with the actors of the project	MS

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

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

Output	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2022 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2023 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	EA: Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	TM: Progress rating
Under Comp 1					
Elaborate local development plans integrating the management of natural resources on the basis of the studies conducted, taking into account the gender aspect and the specific situation of each region	Décember 31, 2021	100%	100%	The local development plans are completed	S
Create TDM oversight committees	Décember 31, 2023	20%	20%	The decree creating the platform although having been introduced is still not yet available. Thus, no action aimed at the creation or installation of this platform can be carried out. This involuntary delay negatively impacts the smooth running of actions in the field	U
Under Comp 2					
Strengthen the operational capacities of local institutions for the dissemination of SLM Good Practices	Décember 31, 2023	40%	90%	The operational capacities of local institutions for the dissemination of good SLM practices have been strengthened. Their mission will be to relay knowledge and provide good practices in SLM to the communities for which they will be responsible. These ar	S
Develop tools to disseminate good SLM practices	Décember 31, 2023	100%		Capacity building tools have been developed	S

Under Comp 3

Strengthen the capacities of stakeholders (deconcentrated and decentralized services, civil society, beneficiaries) in SLM practices	Décember 31, 2023	40%	95%	During the first half of 2023, as part of the forums organized, the project team carried out capacity building missions for actors and stakeholders in the 6 regions. Thus, took part the representatives of the administration, the Regional Council, ANADER, the Town Hall, Waters and Forests, civil society of 5 representatives including 3 men and 2 women from at least 10 villages. There were about 500 registered participants for the Regions of PORO (Korhogo), NAWA (Soubré), BOUNKANI (Bouna), N'ZI (Dimbokro), IFFOU (Daoukro), Autonomous District of Yamoussoukro. These sessions met with the general satisfaction of the learners who wanted it to be renewed and constituted a real platform for exchanging experiences, knowledge and information. This is how representatives of certain villages have expressed the wish to be part of the project in its extension.	S
Support local bushfire control committees	Décember 31, 2023	20%	20%	Working sessions were conducted with stakeholders to raise awareness on preventive measures against bushfires.	U
Create pilot plots for the production of fodder, living hedges, biomass, organic fertilizer, etc.	Décember 31, 2023	50%	50%	The first works have begun, including the realization of nurseries, cleaning, provision of plots (dedicated space) by the community	MS
Restore severely degraded sites using agroforestry techniques	Décember 31, 2023	60%	30%	During the 2022-2023 financial year, due to a lack of resources, the establishment of new plots could not take place. However, it will resume soon with the establishment of nurseries of different species for agroforestry.	MU
Improve and disseminate new SLM techniques	Décember 31, 2023	70%	90%	Materials for the dissemination of good practices are developed Publication of the Guide to Good Practices Stakeholder awareness	S
Set up rural infrastructures (water catchment and storage structures, firebreaks, living hedges, seed banks, food exchange, establishment of artificial pastures and transhumance corridors etc.)	Décember 31, 2023	80%	90%	Construction of four (04) water reservoirs: in the villages of Mamougou (Poro Region), Loukoukro (Autonomous District of Yamoussoukro), Guehio (Nawa Region), Niandégue (Bounkani)	S
Identify and implement micro-projects	Décember 31, 2023	60%	60%	Establishment of cassava fields in Guehio in Nawa and Koffi sèbrègbèkro in the Iffou region Food projects with support for the establishment of pepper fields in Loukoukro (Autonomous District of Yamoussoukro). Creation of an Akpi (Ricinodendron heudelotii) plantation in Loukoukro. Creation of a cooperative of cassava producers in Loukoukro with a view to empowering them. Unfortunately, these initiatives did not meet with the expected success.	MS
Set up rural infrastructure management committees	Décember 31, 2023	30%	30%	The process of setting up these committees has begun. Meetings were held with the communities to be held in each region.	MU
Promote improved seeds	Décember 31, 2023	90%	90%	The beneficiaries of the project were sensitized on improved seeds in the context of improving agricultural yield and their well-being. As a result, improved seeds were offered to them	S
Under Comp 4					
Promote sustainable land management with local actors	Décember 31, 2023	80%	100%	Ongoing with sensitization and training sessions for populations and stakeholders, implementation of agroforestry, realization of infrastructures,	S
Develop guides for the promotion of sustainable land management at local, regional and national levels	Décember 31, 2023	100%	100%	SLM Good Practice Guides are developed and available	S
Organize a local forum in each of the country's target areas	Décember 31, 2023	20%	100%	Activity carried out in all regions	U
Create radio and television programs on SLM	Décember 31, 2023	0%	50%	in progress	U
Organize workshops and seminars on SLM	Décember 31, 2023	20%	60%	Organization of the mid-term evaluation workshop in February and the forums in	MS
Under Comp 5					

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

To Step 3

4 Risk Rating

4.1 Table A. Project management Risk

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

Risk Factor	EA's Rating	TM's Rating
1 Management structure - Roles and responsibilities	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
2 Governance structure - Oversight	Low : Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet at least once a year and Active membership and participation in decision-	Low : Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet at least once a year and Active membership and participation in decision-making processes. SC provides direction/inputs.
3 Implementation schedule	Moderate: Project progressing according to work plan and Adaptive management and regular monitoring. Moderate likelihood of potential	Moderate: Project progressing according to work plan and Adaptive management and regular monitoring. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project
4 Budget	Moderate: Activities are progressing within planned budget and Balanced budget utilisation including PMC. Moderate likelihood of	Substantial: Minor budget reallocation needed with no changes beyond the margins of 10% across the different components – excluding the PMC or Imbalanced utilisation of budget
5 Financial Management	Moderate: Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for and Audit reports provided regularly and confirm correct use of	Moderate: Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for and Audit reports provided regularly and confirm correct use of funds. Moderate likelihood of potential
6 Reporting	Moderate: Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and Reports are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project	Moderate: Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and Reports are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues.
7 Capacity to deliver	Moderate: Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners and Capacity gaps were addressed before	Moderate: Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners and Capacity gaps were addressed before implementation or during early stages.

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

4.2 Table B. Risk-log

Implementation Status (Current PIR)

6th PIR

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

[illegible]

Consolidated project risk

M

M

H

M

M

M

=

This section focuses on the variation. The overall rating is discussed in section 2.3.

4.3 Table C. Outstanding Moderate, Significant, and High risks

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

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIR-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	Additional mitigation measures for the next periods		
			What	When	By whom
Land conflicts	To apply the provisions of the National Rural Land Tenure Security Program which provide for - Delimitation of village lands;- - - Insuance of title deeds to holders of customary rural land rights, i.e. land certificates and titles; - Consolidation of the rights granted through an established mechanism	Raising awareness of customary authorities in order to allow women's access to land ownership. This approach aims to contribute to the empowerment of women through agricultural activities and market gardening in particular. The project team acted in this direction with the customary authorities	Continue to sensitize customary authorities, in particular for free access of women to land ownership.	2023	the state Communities and local authorities The Coordinator
Conflicts between farmers and breeders	Awareness actions for the sedentarization of livestock with the creation of enclosures, dedicated pastures	Awareness meetings for farmers and breeders were held in the villages concerned under the chairmanship of professional, religious, customary authorities, etc.	Encourage local communities to embrace the policy of living together and tolerance	2023	the state Communities and local authorities The Coordinator
Political instability			Take measures to appease the social climate	2023	the state
Drought	Awareness actions have been carried out and the resumption of nurseries and planting has been advised.	Awareness and information meetings on the scourge have been organized in order to encourage beneficiaries and stakeholders to adopt a strategy for adapting to the effects of climate change.	Adoption of a new cultural calendar	2023	Local communities Supervisors Coordinator
Financial		UNEP officials were engaged	Facilitate disbursement	2023	UNEP

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

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

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

GEO Location Information:

Location Name Required field		Latitude Required field	Longitude Required field	Geo Name ID Required field if the location is not an exact site	Location Description Optional text field	Activity Description Optional text field
Mamougou		N 9° 35' 26"	O 5° 52' 46"	GeoNames	Savanes	Establishment of water reservoir
Niandegue		N 9° 15' 33"	O 2° 53' 45"	GeoNames	Zanzan	Establishment of water reservoir
Loukouro		N 6° 34' 38"	O 4° 52' 29"	GeoNames	Lacs	Establishment of water reservoir and a plantation of Akpi (Ricinus communis)
Gueho		N 5° 48' 36"	O 6° 37' 25"	GeoNames	Bas Sassandra	Food crop projects with support for the establishment of pepper fields and water reservoir
Ahwa		N 6° 39' 55"	O 4° 40' 20"	GeoNames	Lacs	
Koffiébregbékro		N 7° 29' 25"	O 3° 42' 10"	GeoNames	Lacs	agroforestry with acacia mangium and cedrela plants coupled with cocoa or cashew trees. Seeds were provided to make the nursery

[Annex any linked geospatial file]

High Risk (H): There is a probability of greater than 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.

Significant Risk (S): There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.

Moderate Risk (M): There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.

Low Risk (L): There is a probability of up to 25% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.

RISKS: Management structure - Roles and responsibilities:

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

RISKS: Governance structure - Oversight

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

RISKS: Implementation schedule

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

RISKS: Budget

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

RISKS: Financial management

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

RISKS: Reporting

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

RISKS: Capacity to deliver

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

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