

## PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR)

for the project:

**The deployment of EarthRanger, a data visualization and analysis software to strengthen Protected Area Management Effectiveness in Africa's National Parks**

**FY23**

*July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023*



Project Information			
<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>The deployment of EarthRanger a data visualization and analysis software to strengthen Protected Area Management Effectiveness in Africa's National Parks</b>		
<b>Country(ies):</b>	Botswana, Republic of Congo, Mozambique	<b>GEF ID:</b>	10551
<b>GEF Agency(ies):</b>	Conservation International	<b>Duration In Months:</b>	50 <sup>1</sup>
<b>Executing Agency(ies):</b>	<b>Executing Agencies</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Allen Institute for Artificial Intelligence (AI2)</li> <li>Conservation International (Africa Field Division)</li> </ul> <b>Executing Partners</b> <b>Botswana:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Botswana Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP)</li> <li>51 Degrees Ltd</li> </ul> <b>Mozambique:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Administration for Conservation Areas (ANAC)-Mozambique</li> <li>Peace Parks Foundation (PPF) – Mozambique</li> </ul> <b>The Republic of Congo:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ministry of Tourism and Environment</li> <li>African Parks (AP)</li> <li>Noé</li> <li>Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)</li> </ul>	<b>Actual Implementation Start Date:</b>	May 5 <sup>th</sup> 2022
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Biodiversity	<b>Expected Project Completion Date:</b>	April 30 <sup>th</sup> , 2026,
<b>GEF Grant Amount:</b>	\$2,407,360	<b>Expected Financial Closure Date:</b>	October 20 <sup>th</sup> 2026
<b>Expected Co-financing:</b>	\$4,801,400	<b>Date of Last Steering Committee Meeting:</b>	September 1st 2026
<b>Co-financing Realized as of June 30, 2023:</b>	\$2,070,156	<b>Mid-Term Review-Planned Date:</b>	March 2024
<b>Date of First Disbursement:</b>	August 26 <sup>th</sup> , 2022	<b>Mid-Term Review-Actual Date:</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> May 2024
<b>Cumulative disbursement as of June 30, 2023</b>	\$200,000	<b>Terminal Evaluation-Planned Date:</b>	March 2026
<b>PIR Prepared by:</b>	Tabby Njung'e Jessica Baillie	<b>Terminal Evaluation-Actual Date:</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> January 2026 – 30 <sup>th</sup> April 2026

<sup>1</sup> **Implementation phase:** May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2022 - December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2025 (44 Months) + **6 Months Terminal Evaluation:** 1<sup>st</sup> January 2026 – 30<sup>th</sup> April 2026 = 50 Months

<b>CI-GEF Project Manager:</b>	Charity Nalyanya Laureen Cheruiyot	<b>CI-GEF Finance Lead:</b>	Amalia Matallana
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------	------------------

<b>Minor Amendment Categories</b>	<b>Minor Amendment Justification</b> Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5%. Please select the box that is most applicable for FY23 and include an explanation for the minor amendment request.
Results Framework <input type="checkbox"/>	
Components and cost <input type="checkbox"/>	
Institutional and implementation arrangements <input type="checkbox"/>	
Financial management <input type="checkbox"/>	
Implementation schedule <input type="checkbox"/>	
Executing Entity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The Mozambique National Sustainable Development Fund (FNDS) was removed and replaced with the National Administration for Conservation Areas (ANAC), a department under the Ministry of Land and Forest.
Executing Entity Category <input type="checkbox"/>	
Minor project objective change <input type="checkbox"/>	
Safeguards <input type="checkbox"/>	
Risk analysis <input type="checkbox"/>	
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5% <input type="checkbox"/>	
Co-financing <input type="checkbox"/>	
Location of project activity <input type="checkbox"/>	
Other <input type="checkbox"/>	

<b>MINOR AMENDMENT RESPONSE FROM CI-GEF</b>
All the minor amendments are approved by CI-GEF.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

The CI-GEF Project Agency Project Implementation Report (PIR) is composed of six sections:

**Section I: Project Implementation Progress Status Summary:** provides a brief summary of the project as well as the implementation status and rating of the previous and current fiscal years;

- Section II:** **Project Results Implementation Progress Status and Rating:** describes the progress made towards achieving the project objective and outcomes, the implementation rating of the project, as well as recommendations to improve the project performance, when needed;
- Section III:** **Project Risks Status and Rating:** describes the progress made towards managing and mitigating project risks, the project risks mitigation rating reassessment as needed, as well as recommendations to improve the management of project risks;
- Section IV:** **Project Environmental and Social Safeguards Implementation Status and Rating:** describes the progress made towards complying with the Environmental & Social Safeguards and the Plans prepared during the PPG phase, the safeguard plans implementation rating, as well as recommendations to improve the project safeguards;
- Section V:** **Project Implementation Experiences and Lessons Learned:** describes the experiences learned by the project managers and the lessons learned through the process of implementing the project; and
- Section VI:** **Project Geocoding:** documents the precise and specific geographic location(s) of activities supported by GEF investments based on information available in project documentation.

## SECTION I: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS STATUS SUMMARY

### PROJECT SUMMARY

The project objective is to strengthen the management effectiveness of priority Protected Areas (PAs) in Africa to deliver global environmental benefits through the deployment of the EarthRanger protected area management system and related technologies. This project is implemented in six terrestrial protected areas spread across Botswana, Mozambique, and the Republic of Congo which will result in improved management of at least 4.9 million Hectares. The sites are Chobe National Park (CNP) in Botswana; Limpopo National Park (LNP) and Zinave National Park (ZNP) in Mozambique; Nouabalé-Ndoki National Park (NNNP), Odzala-Kokoua National Park (OKNP), and Conkouati-Douli National Park (CDNP) in the Republic of Congo.

The expected outcomes of the project are (i) Strengthened institutional and technical capacity of participating countries to effectively manage protected areas, (ii) Additional PAs in Africa are identified and the respective Countries commit to installing EarthRanger technology, (iii) An integrated monitoring and evaluation framework for the project. This will be delivered as relevant for each PA through EarthRanger (ER) incorporation into project sites, the establishment of a functional control room, installation of communication equipment, trainings on EarthRanger as well as through knowledge sharing and information events within and across the countries.

### PRIOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION STATUS

Not applicable as the project is in its first year of implementation

### CURRENT PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION STATUS (FY23)

#### **Project setup**

The project PMU was recruited consisting of the technology lead, finance lead, grants manager, project manager from CI and the EarthRanger (ER) partners director. Setup activities including due diligence and contracting of four partners (AP, WCS, Noe, and PPF) were finalized. The project was launched on the 6<sup>th</sup> of October 2022 and where 41 participants attended (33% women, 67% men). The full inception workshop report is available [here](#). This was followed by online press releases covered in the partner sites as follows <https://www.earthranger.com/news/new-gef-funded-project-to-deploy-earthranger-to-strengthen-protected-areas-in-africa-prevent-poaching-and-reduce-human-wildlife-conflict> and [High-tech help for park rangers in Africa | GEF \(thegef.org\)](#)

In readiness for project activities, revision of Environmental Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) for the 5 sites in Mozambique and the Republic of Congo was undertaken. The assessment found that the project will have a minimal environmental impact on communities. ESIAs for the five sites were resubmitted to CI-GEF and approved. Each site nominated safeguard and MEL leads who will monitor approved mitigation measures, act as focal points for the grievance mechanisms, and points of contact for the project work.

#### **Component 1: In FY23, 100% of the outputs are under implementation.**

**Outcome 1.1:** Procurement of equipments in RoC and Mozambique are ongoing but activities delayed in Botswana where they are in the early setup and procurement stages. ER software was installed in 5 parks in RoC and Moz except in Botswana. Control room construction is underway in CDNP, and in the contracting or procurement stage in the other parks.

In Q4, training was conducted by the ER team including ER operators training; administrators training; ER mobile application training. To ensure sustained capacity after the project ends, partners nominated an ER champion that will ensure retained EarthRanger and related support equipment expertise after the project ends. In Mozambique, 39 (33 Men and 6 women) were trained. In RoC 27 (6 in NNNP, 10 in CDNP and 11 on OKNP). This included 21 men and 6 women.

In Botswana, delays were experienced in the project start up pending confirmation of the Chobe National Park assessment recommendations by the government partner. In the last quarter, approval was received and a consultant (51degrees) through AI2 hired to support implementation of project activities. A stakeholder meeting was held in Kasane in Q4 bringing together 21 participants. During the meeting partners discussed communication equipment to be installed, control room and staffing.

Similarly, during the period, Connected Conservation Foundation donated \$50k cash and communication network equipment valued at Cisco cost price (with no margin) of \$173,000 with the actual price been higher for works which will support CNP

communication network. The \$50k donation channeled via AI2 is expected to cover part of an onsite network engineer's 3-year salary to work on the LoRa network, purchase of some sensors and remote support for the network. In June, construction and solar power system, VHF and HF radio communication network equipment funded through GEF and AI2 were advertised, and procurement and installation are scheduled to start in FY24.

#### Component 2: In FY23, 100% of the outputs are under implementation.

**Outcome 2.1:** Additional PAs in Africa are identified and the respective Countries commit to install the EarthRanger technology: 100% of the outputs under implementation and on schedule in RoC and Moz with activities delayed in Botswana. The annual EarthRanger user conference led by Allen Institute for Artificial Intelligence (AI2) was held in Nairobi between 4-6 November 2022. The conference attended by ~350 people across 5 continents aims at sharing experiences on the use of EarthRanger technologies in protected area management. The terms of reference for the steering committee and regional working group were presented during the project launch and partners asked to nominate institutional representatives. A national project steering committee was partly established in RoC (16 institutions- no individual nominations yet) and Mozambique (9 members) constituting of government partners, CI, AI2 and implementing partners at each of the site. Each of the partners also nominated representative to the regional working group which consisting of 13 members (4Female and 9Male). Botswana steering committee and regional working group members will be nominated in FY 24. The first meetings are also scheduled for September 2023.

#### Component 3: In FY23, 100% of the outputs are under implementation.

**Outcome 3.1:** An integrated monitoring and evaluation framework for the project: 90% of activities under implementation including submission of 4 progress reports, 1 workplan, 1 PIR and 5 METT assessments.

#### Risk and Challenges

**Risk 1: Delays due to slow response from governments:** In Botswana, the project is behind schedule due to delayed approval and response from the government partner on project deliverables and baseline assessment report. This has since been addressed and partner support received. A consultant has also been appointed to support the implementation of the project in Chobe. The Republic of Congo institutions have been nominated for the steering committee, but no specific individuals have been assigned. To enhance rapport with the appointed government focal point, CI will conduct a field visit in Brazzaville in FY24 to meet the partners in person. In the meantime, online meetings have been scheduled with the government focal point and partners.

**Risk 2: Climate variability and the drastic changing weather patterns:** In ZNP for example the impact of cyclone Freddy has made access in/out of Zinave not possible by vehicle in Q3. It is expected that access around the park will be possible in FY 24.

### SUMMARY: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS STATUS

PROJECT PART	PRIOR FY22 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	CURRENT FY23 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING <sup>2</sup>	RATING TREND <sup>3</sup>
OBJECTIVE	N/A This is the first year of implementation therefore, there is no prior project implementation rating.	S	N/A This is the first year of implementation therefore, there is no prior project implementation rating.
COMPONENTS AND OUTCOMES	N/A This is the first year of implementation therefore, there is no prior project implementation rating.	S	N/A This is the first year of implementation therefore, there is no prior project implementation rating.
ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS	N/A This is the first year of implementation therefore,	MS	N/A This is the first year of implementation therefore,

<sup>2</sup> **Implementation Progress (IP) Rating:** Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more details about IP rating, please see the Appendix I of this report

<sup>3</sup> **Rating trend:** Improving, Unchanged, or Decreasing

PROJECT PART	PRIOR FY22 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	CURRENT FY23 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING <sup>2</sup>	RATING TREND <sup>3</sup>
	there is no prior project implementation rating.		there is no prior project implementation rating.

#### PROJECT RISK RATING<sup>4</sup>

<b>RISKS</b>	N/A This is the first year of implementation therefore, there is no prior project implementation rating.	<b>S</b>	N/A This is the first year of implementation therefore, there is no prior project implementation rating.
--------------	---	----------	---

<sup>4</sup> Risk Rating: Low (L), Moderate (M), Substantial (S), High (H)

## SECTION II: PROJECT RESULTS IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS STATUS AND RATING

This section describes the progress made since the start of the project towards achieving the project objective and outcomes, the implementation progress rating of the project, as well as recommendations to improve the project performance. This section is composed four parts:

- Progress towards Achieving Project Expected Objective: this section measures the likelihood of achieving the objective of the project
- Progress towards Achieving Project Expected Outcomes (by project component)
- Overall Project Results Progress Rating, and
- Recommendations for improvement

### a. Progress towards Achieving Project Expected Objective:

This section of the report assesses the progress in achieving the objective of the project.

<b>PROJECT OBJECTIVE:</b>	To strengthen the management effectiveness of priority Protected Areas (PAs) in Africa to deliver Global Environmental Benefits through the deployment of the EarthRanger Protected Area Management system and related technologies.
---------------------------	--

OBJECTIVE INDICATORS	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>5</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
Indicator 1: Number of countries with EarthRanger Protected Area Management system and related technologies compliant with PA needs. (Target: At least 4,901,650 ha)	2	IS	<p><b>LNP and ZNP (PPF)</b> began the procurement of digital radio and communication networks to be installed in FY 24. Repeater station locations for ZNP and LNP were determined and clearing for access started. The RFQ for a suitable contractor for the LNP control room was launched to be completed in FY24. Further an ICT Champion was assigned that will support continued technological capacities with PPF beyond the project. An ER profile was created in LNP and has been populated for rollout. ER is fully functional in ZNP. ER project kick off was conducted by AI2 in May 2023 including ANAC representatives.</p> <p>In <b>CDNP (Noe)</b>, the construction of the extension of the headquarters, operations room and lodging and armory began, to be completed in FY24. Similarly, 3G internet repeater stations were installed, and quotations received for 2-way communication systems. Quotations for GPS collar</p>

<sup>5</sup> O= Overdue; D= Delayed; NS= Not started on schedule; IS= Under implementation on schedule; and CA= Completed/Achieved



OBJECTIVE INDICATORS	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>5</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
			<p>for elephants were received and collaring will be done in FY24. In FY24, Noe will recruit a GIS technology person to act as the ER project champion.</p> <p>In <b>NNNP (WCS)</b>, vehicle tracking equipment was advertised and the internet was connected to the Ndoki II site. Control room equipment will be delivered in FY24. WCS will in FY24 recruit a telecommunications technician who will act as the ER project champion. Similarly, staff were trained in maintenance protocol for radio units and management of areas surrounding the antenna. The radio equipment including the vehicle tracking request for quotation was approved internally and will be procured in FY24. Construction of the control room will begin in FY24. In the meantime, a temporary control room is in use. Two ER accounts were created and are in use. In the last quarter, the ER team also conducted follow-up training</p> <p>In <b>OKNP(AP)</b>, solar equipment was procured and installed. Similarly, construction works started- to be completed in FY24. Similarly, the internet was connected in the South and East base with the North base scheduled for FY24. Repeater stations were also installed in South and East bases. Further sensors and tracking equipment were procured to be installed in FY24. The regional intelligence head also conducted training with rangers and control room staff on the use of ER in the field. In the last quarter, the ER team also conducted physical in person follow-up training.</p> <p>In <b>CNP</b>, a consultant to support project implementation was hired by AI2. RFQ for VHF and HF communication equipment as well as control room construction was launched and will be</p>

OBJECTIVE INDICATORS	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>5</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
			installed in FY24. Similarly, a draft ER instance was developed and presented to DWNP.
Indicator 2: Area of terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness by use of EarthRanger protected area management system and related technologies (Target: 4,901,650 ha).	<b>Baseline METT Scores</b> ZNP- 412,100 ha LNP-1,115,000 ha CDNP- 504,950ha NNNP-423,870ha OKNP-1,592,600ha CNP – 1,100,000ha	IS	Updated METT assessments have been conducted across ZNP, LNP, CDNP, NNNP, and OKNP. The size of the protected areas below is based on the METT results. CNP METT will be conducted in FY24. ZNP- 412,100 ha LNP-1,115,000 ha CDNP- 504,950ha NNNP-423,870ha OKNP-1,592,600ha CNP – 1,100,000ha
Indicator 3: Total number of direct beneficiaries (disaggregated by gender) skilled to utilize EarthRanger Protected Area Management system and related technologies.	Total : 66 RoC- 27 (M-21 ; F-6) Mozambique -39 (M-33 ; F-6)	IS	In Q4, AI2 conducted ER operators, mobile and admin training in RoC and Mozambique ( <i>See outcome indicator 2.1 on training description</i> )  In Mozambique, 39were trained. This included operators,mobile training and administrators training. This training was done live and online.  In RoC 27 (6 in NNNP, 10 in CDNP and 11 on OKNP). This included 25 who undertook the ER operators and mobile training. Out of these 16 undertook the ER admin training.
Indicator 4: Number of additional African countries interested and committed to install Earth Ranger technology or other PA management technologies.	1	IS	EarthRanger system has been in use in Kenya since 2018. In FY23, we worked with Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Heritage to secure GEF 8 (\$10.6m) funding that will among other activities (see below) support the installation of relevant HWC mitigation infrastructure and technologies.

OBJECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	JUSTIFICATION
---	---------------

**S**

This section's rating is **Satisfactory (S)** because 100% of the output activities are **under implementation/schedule**. In FY23, procurement of equipment's commenced together with updating of the METT too assessments and are progressing well.

## b. Progress towards Achieving Project Expected Outcomes (by project component).

This part of the report assesses the progress towards achieving the outcomes of the project.

<b>COMPONENT 1</b>	Installation of Earth Ranger software together with other required technologies and infrastructure to achieve Earth Ranger readiness.
--------------------	---

<b>Outcome 1:</b>	Strengthened institutional and technical capacity of participating countries to effectively manage protected areas
-------------------	--

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>6</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
Outcome Indicator 1.1.: Hectares of protected areas with improved METT score	At least 4,901,650 hectares of protected areas with improved METT scores	<b>Baseline METT Scores</b> ZNP- 66/99 LNP-63/99 CDNP- 58/99 NNNP-71/99 OKNP-81/99 CNP – FY24	<b>IS</b>	The project is in its first year of implementation. A progress METT assessment will be at mid and end of project with the next one scheduled for FY25.
Outcome Indicator 1.2: Number of protected areas in the participating countries utilizing EarthRanger technology to manage the PAs.	All the 6 target protected areas in the participating countries utilizing EarthRanger technology to manage the PAs.	4	<b>IS</b>	<p>Initial training discussions were held with the 4 partners in RoC and Mozambique. It was agreed that each of the parks would be trained on the three main areas including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operators training: Mostly for the radio operators, allowing for visualizations and extraction of reports.</li> <li>• ER mobile training: on the ER mobile app where the senior field person would be trained who in turn would carry out the ToTs. The training is more appropriate for rangers, scouts, and capturing field observations.</li> <li>• Tableau and administrators training: Includes training on the tableau (if the site is using tableau) and equips the team to make desired changes to the system.</li> </ul> <p>EarthRanger is now in use in LNP, ZNP, NNNP, CDNP and ONKP. For these sites baseline assessment of the partners on ER use indicated that the PAs are more effective and efficient due to adopting EarthRanger and</p>

<sup>6</sup> <sup>6</sup> **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>6</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
				<p>supporting infrastructure. They particularly thought the following features helped in better park management specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Real-time position of teams and vehicles in the field</li> <li>○ Immobility alert for elephant collars eliminating human error of late notice.</li> <li>○ Exportable incidents database e.g., arrests, Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC)</li> <li>○ Having information available in one place, as well as the ability to access information remotely.</li> <li>○ Ability to integrate ER with other applications e.g., SMART.</li> </ul> <p>A draft CNP ER instance has been created for CNP. This was presented to DWNP in April 2023 and will continually be updated after training.</p>

OBJECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	JUSTIFICATION
<b>S</b>	This section's rating is <b>Satisfactory (S)</b> because 100% of the indicators <b>are under implementation/schedule</b> . In FY23, baseline assessments, METT too assessments and trainings commenced and are progressing well.

<b>COMPONENT 2</b>	<b>Learning, knowledge sharing and scaling the EarthRanger technology across Africa.</b>
--------------------	--

<b>Outcome 2:</b>	Outcome 2.1: Additional PAs in Africa are identified and the respective countries commit to install the EarthRanger technology.
-------------------	---

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>7</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
Outcome Indicator 2.1.: Number of additional PAs identified, and number of African countries	At least 6 new PAs identified, and 3 African countries	<b>1</b>	<b>IS</b>	Kenya has committed \$10.6m in GEF 8 funding. The project locations tentatively include Larger Kajiado, Laikipia and Tsavo.

<sup>7</sup> **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>7</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
committed to install the EarthRanger software and other technologies (GEF8 LoEs, Co-financing pledges)	committed to install Earth Ranger Technology in GEF8			<p>The specific sites will be determined in the PPG phase. The project components include:</p> <p><b>Component 1:</b> Support integrated management of HWCs and institutional strengthening. This component will enhance an integrated approach to the management of wildlife data, HWC mitigation, and response to contribute to the long-term outcome of healthy, stable, or increasing populations of threatened wildlife globally.</p> <p><b>Component 2:</b> Enhancing surveillance and monitoring of zoonotic and animal diseases. This component aims to reduce the threats from illegal, unsustainable, and/or high zoonotic risk wildlife use and trade by enhancing disease surveillance and developing monitoring systems of zoonotic and animal diseases that have a potential spillover effect on humans and livestock.</p> <p><b>Component 3:</b> Strengthening community-led conservation to address HWCs and livelihoods. This component will contribute to the long-term view that community benefits ensure societal buy-in for wildlife conservation by supporting communities to effectively manage wildlife and enhance women and youth inclusion in wildlife governance and management and secure associated wildlife corridors and dispersal areas.</p> <p><b>Component 4:</b> Project Coordination, Learning, and Knowledge Sharing This component aims to contribute to the long-term outcome that collaboration, capacity development, and partnership will ensure maximum effectiveness of collective efforts towards global wildlife conservation for development.</p> <p><b>Component 5:</b> Monitoring and Evaluation (M&amp;E) This component will establish a functional M&amp;E Framework which will include financial and technical progress reports, workplan, and Project Implementation Reports among others.</p> <p>In FY24, CI will continue to engage with government partners to fine tune the components to deliver on HWC monitoring technological and mitigation impact as well as attend the World Bank capacity building</p>

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>7</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
				webinars on HWC, Zoonotic disease monitoring and community engagements.

OBJECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	JUSTIFICATION
<b>S</b>	This section's rating is <b>Satisfactory (S)</b> because 100% of the indicators <b>are under implementation/schedule</b> . Overall, the project outcome indicators under this component are progressing well.

<b>COMPONENT 3</b>	<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>
--------------------	----------------------------------

<b>Outcome 3:</b>	<b>Outcome 3.1: An integrated monitoring and evaluation framework for the project</b>
-------------------	---

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>8</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
Outcome Indicator 3.1: Number of M&E reports submitted to the CIGEF Agency for review and approval, and the Number of Evaluations conducted by CI-GEF	Periodic technical and financial reports submitted to CIGEF for review and approval: <i>At least 3 Annual Workplans and Budget, 12 Quarterly Reports, 3 Annual Progress Implementation Reports (PIRs)</i>	1 annual plan 4 Quarterly reports 1 PIR	<b>IS</b>	During the year, partners nominated their project Monitoring and Evaluation and Learning (MEL) representatives who would be the point of contact for all MEL activities including the finalization of the MEL framework, collection of baselines and Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) assessment. METT assessments were carried out across the five sites. To align with on-ground partner activities, the full METT tool as developed by IUCN was utilized and results as relevant were translated to the summarized GEF METT tool. Further partners were trained on the project MEL framework and baseline data gathered on gender, infrastructure, and technologies as well as EarthRanger use and effectiveness. Similarly, online baseline surveys for each of the project sites were conducted on ER use, park equipment and gender and training needs. This information will be used to monitor project progress. Further the FY23 workplan was submitted and approved in addition to 4 quarterly technical and financial reports.

<sup>8</sup> **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

OBJECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	JUSTIFICATION
<b>S</b>	This section's rating is <b>Satisfactory (S)</b> because 100% of the indicators <b>are under implementation/schedule</b> . Overall, the project outcome indicators under this component are progressing well.

### c. Overall Project Results Rating

COMPONENT 1 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	JUSTIFICATION	RATING TREND
<b>S</b>	<p>This section is rated <b>Satisfactory (S)</b> because 100% of the indicators <b>are under implementation/schedule</b>.</p> <p>Overall, the project kicked off well with 100% of the activities in their first stages of implementation. Procurement of equipment's, trainings and METT assessments are progressing well. The project is highly likely to achieve the set targets and objectives if this momentum is maintained.</p>	N/A This is the first year of implementation therefore, there is no prior project implementation rating.

### d. Recommendations

CORRECTIVE ACTION(S)	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DEADLINE
None		

### SECTION III: PROJECT RISKS STATUS AND RATING

#### a. Progress towards Implementing the Project Risk Mitigation Plan

This section describes the activities implemented to manage and reduce high, substantial, modest, and low risks of the project. This section has three parts:

- Ratings for the progress towards implementing measures to mitigate project risks and a project risk annual reassessment.
- Recommendations for improving project risks management.

#### Progress towards Implementing the Project Risk Mitigation and Plan Project Risks Annual Reassessment

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING <sup>9</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY23 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND <sup>10</sup>
<b>Risk 1:</b>  EarthRanger control room and software affected by climate change and variability (heavy rains and/or high atmospheric temperature, high relative humidity) and rodents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Procurement and installation of climate-proof equipment and technology</li> <li>Necessary measures will be put in place to prevent rodents e.g., by application of pesticides, disinfection, and regular cleaning of the control rooms among others.</li> <li>A room will be designated for relocation and storage of hardware in case the control room is damaged.</li> </ul>	Regular testing and maintenance of the equipment is carried out. PPF and AP have a dedicated ICT manage and technology manager who review their sites and ensures IT requirements are met and provide overall support.  Training of field staff on correct upkeep of radio units and surrounds of the antenna undertaken by WCS.  Current facilities are currently kept very clean, neat, and tidy and it is not envisaged (being a Conservation Area) to apply any pesticides or poisons. rodent traps installed as relevant.  For Botswana a maintenance contract will be include for the suppliers of the equipment during the life of the project	<b>IS</b>	The partners are habituated to these climate change and variability challenges and the need to protect equipment having operated in the areas for more than a decade.	H	H	Unchanged

<sup>9</sup> **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

<sup>10</sup> **Rating trend:** Increasing, Unchanged or Decreasing



PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING <sup>9</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY23 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND <sup>10</sup>
<b>Risk 2:</b>  Wildlife crime in the protected areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Installation of the EarthRanger technology and building capacity of protected area management staff to utilize the technology for monitoring park boundaries, and movement patterns of rangers and wildlife, enable rangers to communicate with each other over radio transmitters, enable the staff to submit timely and quality reports thereby ensuring that protected area management planning is based on complete, reliable and real-time data.</li> <li>EarthRanger technology is applied to improve the safety of rangers by making sure that their activities are coordinated, and</li> </ul>	AI2 conducted ER operators, mobile and admin training in RoC and Mozambique as detailed above. These trainings including Operators training: Mostly for the radio operators allowing for visualizations and extraction of reports. ER mobile training: on the ER mobile app where the senior field person would be trained who in turn would carry out the ToTs. The training is more appropriate for rangers, scouts, and capturing field observations. Tableau and administrators training: Includes training on tableau (if the site is using tableau) and equips the team to be make desired changes to the system.	IS	Training conducted; use and effectiveness will be monitored as the partners continue to use their ER profiles.	H	M	Decreasing

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING <sup>9</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY23 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND <sup>10</sup>
	injury caused to each other by crossfire is avoided.						
<b>Risk 3:</b>  Safeguard compliance especially during and after the construction activities. The construction activities might have adverse effects on the environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Safeguards specialist will be part of the project to ensure compliance with the safeguard requirements throughout the project life.</li> </ul>	The PMU worked with CI-GEF to update the ESIA. The assessment identified low environmental impact associated with all the constructions. This is because the construction is being carried out on existing office premises that has already been cleared hence no trees would be cleared. Similarly, mitigation measures for waste and water management as relevant were identified for each site ensuring waste was adequately handled and disposed during the construction	IS	<p>The updated ESIAs were reviewed for each of the 5 sites in RoC and Mozambique. Adequate mitigation measures were identified. Similarly, each of the sites identified a safeguards focal point who will be in charge of monitoring implementation of the safeguards. For Botswana, the ESIA will be prepared in FY 24 and submitted to the CI-GEF for approval.</p> <p>For all sites, the CI-project safeguard specialist will carry out a field assessment that will further confirm adequate implementation of the mitigation measures including recommendation measures for any gaps.</p>	H	M	Decreasing
<b>Risk 4:</b>  Lack of security of the EarthRanger hardware in the control rooms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only designated personnel will have access to the control rooms.</li> <li>Only designated personnel will have keys to the control room.</li> </ul>	<p>Each of the site in RoC and Mozambique have designated control room staff in charge of the control room.</p> <p>For Botswana, biometric entry requirements will be installed to ensure only authorized person have access to the control room</p>	IS	<p>The sites have designated personnel for the control rooms. NNNP has 4 (men) control room staff.</p> <p>ONKP has 6 (1 woman and 5 men) control room staff.</p> <p>CDNP has is in the process of hiring a GIS specialist in FY24.</p>	H	H	Decreasing

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING <sup>9</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY23 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND <sup>10</sup>
				ZNP have 2(women) control room staff. LNP has 6(3 men 3 women) control room staff. CNP control room staff will be assigned in FY24. 51 degrees has recommended to DWNP to hire one operator, a watchkeeper and a network engineer			
<b>Risk 5:</b>  High turn-over of trained staff as an expertise retention risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identification of a technology champion in each selected protected area</li> <li>The project will undertake a Training of Trainers (ToTs). Facilitators of ToTs to be identified in each PA.</li> </ul>	Each of the sites were requested to designate a ER champion who is tech savvy. WCS and Noe are in the process of hiring a telecommunication and GIS specialist respectively who will also act as their ER champion. One of the training models of the ER team specifically for field operators is that a senior personnel/ranger is trained who then conducts ToTs of other personnel. This was undertaken for example for WCS	IS	Sites have dedicated staff for ER and related technologies. Plans for ToTs will be implemented in FY24.	H	H	Unchanged
<b>Risk 6:</b>  Data Management risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EarthRanger data are securely stored in the cloud and the project will build on existing systems and enhance them to ensure that data are sent to the central repository.</li> </ul>	ER data is stored in the cloud hence adequate backup is provided. All sites have established internet connectivity upgraded through the GEF project as well which allow cloud backup.	IS	Cloud backup available for all data	L	L	Decreasing

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING <sup>9</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY23 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND <sup>10</sup>
<b>Risk 7:</b>  Lack of electricity to power the control room	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One of the criteria used to identify target protected areas is access to electricity. Backup power supply, such as a generator and solar equipment, will be included in the procurement if it does not exist at a site.</li> </ul>	All sites have solar backup systems of 150-300kW which include solar battery power backup systems of 12-48V. Additional power backup systems have been budgeted and installed (for AP, WCS, Noe).	IS	Solar backup systems have been procured and installed for Roc and Moz sites. Solar backup systems have been budgeted and advertised for CNP.	M	M	Decreasing
<b>Risk 8:</b>  Social and Environmental impacts of installing radio and LoRa towers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safeguards screening will be undertaken to identify the safeguards triggered by this project</li> <li>For all the safeguards triggered by this project, a subsequent Environmental Safeguard Plan will be developed and implemented to avoid, minimize and mitigate potential adverse environmental</li> </ul>	ESIA's for the 5 sites in RoC and Moz have been updated and approved.  Monitoring of the mitigation measures conducted quarterly including a schedule field assessment in FY24.	IS	Adequate mitigation measures have been identified for the sites. Similarly, equipment procured by the project do not emit harmful waves as the towers already exist at the sites and the project is only upgrading the towers	H	H	Decreasing

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING <sup>9</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY23 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND <sup>10</sup>
	and social impacts						
<b>Risk 9:</b>  Inability to maintain proper functioning of the EarthRanger technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training of Trainers will be undertaken in each protected area</li> <li>• Development and implementation of project exit strategy and action plan</li> <li>• Inclusion of at least a three-year maintenance plan or service level agreement (SLA) for the hardware installed in each protected area.</li> </ul>	Each of the sites were requested to designate a ER champion who is tech savvy. WCS and Noe are in the process of hiring a telecommunication and GIS specialist respectively who will also act as their ER champion. One of the training models of the ER team specifically for field operators is that a senior personnel/ranger is trained who then conducts ToTs of other personnel. This was undertaken for example for WCS	IS	Dedicated tech savvy staff appointed by each of the 5 sites to support in training and support and maintenance of the equipment	H	H	Decreasing
<b>Risk 10:</b>  Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic which will cause delays and/or slow implementation of project activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project will prepare the following safeguard plans clearly indicating activities put in place to mitigate risks brought about by COVID-19 pandemic: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Labor and Working Conditions</li> <li>o Accountability and Grievance Mechanism</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Coronavirus risk has decreased significantly and globally with travel restrictions minimized across all sites and back to normal. <a href="https://www.gov.uk/foreign-travel-advice/mozambique/coronavirus">https://www.gov.uk/foreign-travel-advice/mozambique/coronavirus</a>  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/foreign-travel-advice/botswana/coronavirus">https://www.gov.uk/foreign-travel-advice/botswana/coronavirus</a>  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/foreign-travel-advice/congo/coronavirus">https://www.gov.uk/foreign-travel-advice/congo/coronavirus</a>	IS	Coronavirus risk decreased globally.	H	L	Decreasing

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING <sup>9</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY23 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND <sup>10</sup>
	<p>o Stakeholder Engagement Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarterly technical and financial reports submitted to CI-GEF Agency clearly indicating project implementation progress, any delays and adaptive measures put in place by project teams. This measure will enable the Agency to guide on the best ways to adapt to the situation on the ground from technical and financial perspectives.</li> <li>The project team will develop and implement the project's Adaptive Management Plan to the COVID-19 situation. The plan will specify activities to be implemented by project managers</li> </ul>	<p>The accountability and grievance mechanism, stakeholder engagement plan and labor clarifications have been developed and or clarified each of the partner ESIA plans. Partners were socialized on these mechanisms in the inception workshop as well in FY23.</p> <p>Botswana ESIA to be developed in FY24</p>					

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING <sup>9</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY23 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND <sup>10</sup>
	<p>(leads) to ensure delivery of selected project activities while working remotely.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During implementation, the project budget will cover procurement and recurrent costs of PPE and utilities such as automatic dispenser of hand washing soap and water, hand sanitizers, face masks, hand gloves among others, for project staff.</li> <li>• Creation of a COVID-19 repository and preparing a communication strategy for disseminating information on the pandemic among project teams and stakeholders. This strategy will also entail communicating to stakeholders the impact of COVID-</li> </ul>						

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING <sup>9</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY23 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND <sup>10</sup>
	19 on the project and the adaptive and mitigation measures required.						
<b>Risk 11:</b>  Pre-liminary Due diligence of the Executing partner institutions was conducted by CI during PPG Phase.	CI- Afd had granted some partners/grantees before and had conducted previous due diligence. However, full Financial Risk Assessments (FRA) will be completed before granting to any selected partners. Granting will only be done when partners, including the Government, have met the requirements based on the financial risk assessment. The outputs of this assessment will be: a. Partners identified and their respective detailed ToRs defining their roles developed and approved by the GoA. b. Budgets allocated to the Partners in correspondence with their ToRs. c. Financial Risk Assessments (FRA) of partner institutions conducted and applicable mitigation measures put in place.	Due diligence of PPF, AP, WCS and AP have been completed and grant agreements detailed the procurement limits executed. Financial reports for the four quarters have been received and reviewed with no red flags.	IS	PPF, AP, WCS and AP passed their due diligence and identified to have adequate mechanisms in place. The PMU also provide backup support on technical and financial reporting including provision of additional documentation and justifications as relevant for procurements above the CI-GEF limits.	H	H	Decreasing



PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING <sup>9</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY23 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND <sup>10</sup>
	d. Contracts/Agreements signed.						
<b>Risk 12: Delayed response from government partners</b>	New risk- the PMU has continually engaged the government partners on project project progress including sharing summary quarterly progress reports	In Botswana, implementation is conducted through a consultant and CI Botswana country office. We have scheduled monthly progress meetings with DWNP/51D/AI2 and CI to ensure we are continually on the same and addressing emerging issues..	IS	DWNP has given an approval of the recommended approach to the project, participate in the monthly meetings and appointed a focal point through which the project can make project reports and requests	High	High	Decreasing

OVERALL RATING OF PROJECT RISKS	JUSTIFICATION	RISK RATING TREND <sup>11</sup>
<b>Substantial</b>	<p>This Project's risk rating is <b>Substantial</b>.</p> <p>58% of output and outcome targets have been rated high, 25% were rated Moderate and 17% rated low. There were no major risks that materialized in this fiscal year. Mitigation measures were well administered; however, the risks is substantial due to the high turnover of trained staff and the protection of software from theft and natural calamities are beyond the control of the project staff. The identified risks should be monitored to avoid loss and damage of the procured materials and properties.</p>	N/A This is the first year of implementation therefore, there is no prior project implementation rating.

## Recommendations

MITIGATION AND CORRECTIVE ACTION(S)	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DEADLINE
1. In addition to the identified mitigation strategies, the team can consider scheduling regular risk review meetings with key stakeholders to assess the effectiveness of mitigation measures and adjust strategies as needed. This iterative approach will ensure a dynamic and proactive risk management process.	AFD/CI-GEF	June 2024

<sup>11</sup> **Rating trend:** Increasing, Unchanged or Decreasing

<p>2. Given the high-risk rating and the mix of output and outcome targets with varying risk levels, it's crucial to establish a robust and consistent monitoring and evaluation process. This will help in promptly identifying any potential risks that might arise and taking proactive measures to mitigate them.</p>	<p>AFD/CI-GEF</p>	<p>June 2024</p>
---	-------------------	------------------

## SECTION IV: PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL MANAGEMENT IMPLEMENTATION STATUS AND RATING

This section of the PIR describes the progress made towards complying with the approved ESMF plans, as well as recommendations to improve the implementation of the ESMF plans, when needed. This section is divided into seven parts:

- Progress towards complying with the CI-GEF Agency's ESMF
- Information on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement
- Information on the progress towards achieving gender sensitive measures/targets
- Information on the implementation of the accountability and grievance mechanism
- ESMF lessons learned and Knowledge Management Products developed and disseminated
- Overall project ESMF implementation rating
- Recommendations

### a. Progress towards complying with the CI-GEF Agency's ESMF

MINIMUM ESMF INDICATORS	PROJECT TARGET	END OF YEAR STATUS	CUMULATIVE STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>12</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
<b>ACCOUNTABILITY AND GRIEVANCE MECHANISM</b>					
1. Number of conflict and complaint cases reported to the project's Accountability and Grievance Mechanism	0	1	1	IS	1 case in Q4, 2023 was reported with OKNP –involving a community incident at the park. The grievance has been logged with the partner and evaluated for eligibility with the CI project safeguards consultant. ODNP-African Parks: 5 cases were investigated in 2022 and 1 case in Q4, 2023 – representing 100% of cases submitted through the mechanism. The grievances will be reported and concluded in FY24. Similarly, as part of the ESIA update, each of the partners socialized the project with its immediate partners and staff and no objections to project were received attached to each of their ESIA's.
2. Percentage of conflict and complaint cases reported to the project's Accountability and Grievance Mechanism that have been resolved (for	100%	Zero (0)	Zero (0)	IS	1 grievance was received in Q4- The grievance will be logged and assessed for eligibility according to the project criteria in FY24Q1 and resolved accordingly in conjunction with the partner.

<sup>12</sup> O= Overdue; D= Delayed; NS= Not started on schedule; IS= Under implementation on schedule; and CA= Completed/Achieved

<p><i>projects approved before November 2020)</i></p> <p>3. Number of times the Accountability and Grievance Mechanism is communicated/disseminated to stakeholders <i>(for projects approved after November 2020)</i></p>	1	1	1	IS	The grievance mechanisms were socialized during the project inception meeting attended by both the implementing and government partners.
<b>GENDER MAINSTREAMING</b>					
<p>1. Number of men and women that participated in project activities (e.g. meetings, workshops, consultations)</p>	Men Women 138 24	Men Women 82 31	Men Women 82 31	IS	<p>FY23 Q2: The project held a financial, procurement and technical report and environmental and social safeguards training that was attended by 28 key partner staff which included 9 women and 21 men).</p> <p>FY23Q4: In Botswana the Consultant (1 male) was trained in procurement and environmental and social safeguards.</p> <p>FY23Q2: The project inception workshop was held in 6<sup>th</sup> October 2022 and attended by 41 participants (13 Women and 28 men). 6 attendees (33% women and 67% men) were from the Peace Parks Foundation (PPF) which will support execution in Mozambique; 11 attendees (36% women and 64% men) were from Noe and African Parks which will support project execution in the Republic of Congo and 11 (64% women and 36% men) were from Conservation International (9) and Allen Institute (2) representing the regional team.</p> <p>FY23Q4: Similarly, a technical launch meeting was held in Botswana which included 16 men and 5 women.</p> <p>FY23Q3: A stakeholder meeting between AI2, CCF, DWNP and CI to discuss the donation modalities (M-3 F-4)</p> <p><b>FY23:</b> Total is 113 (83M, 31W)</p>
<p>2. Number of men and women that received benefits (e.g. employment, income generating activities, training, access to natural</p>	Men Women 138 24	Men Women 83 13	Men Women 83 13	IS	<p>FY23Q3: During the reporting period, two eco-guard refresher trainings were held in NNNP. In total 30 eco-guards (29 men, 1 woman) received refresher training on human rights including training on managing prisoners and training on vulnerable populations, including women and children.</p>

resources, land tenure or resource rights, equipment, leadership roles) from the project					<p>FY23Q4: During the year, AI2 conducted ER operators, mobile and admin training in RoC and Mozambique (<i>See outcome indicator 2.1 on training description</i>) In Mozambique, 39 (33 M and 6 W). In RoC 27 (21 W and 6 Women).</p> <p><b>FY23:</b> Total is 96 (83M, 13W)</p>
3. Number of strategies, plans (e.g., management plans and land use plans), and policies derived from the project that include gender considerations (this indicator applies to relevant projects)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT</b>					
1. Number of government agencies, civil society organizations, private sector, indigenous peoples and other stakeholder groups that have been involved in the project implementation phase on an annual basis	6	12	12	IS	<p>A total of 12 institutions (4) government agencies, (7) CSOs/NGOs, and 1 private sector have participated in project implementation. This includes <b>RoC</b> (2 government and 3 CSOs); Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development and the Congolese Agency for Wildlife and Protected Areas(ACFAP), African Parks Network, Noe Conservation and Wildlife Conservation Society</p> <p><b>Mozambique</b> (2 governments and 1 CSOs) Ministry of Land and Environment Territorial Development, - National Administration for Conservation Areas -ANAC, Peace Parks Foundation</p> <p><b>Botswana</b> (1 government, 1 private sector, and 2 CSO). Department of Wildlife and National Parks Allen Institute for Artificial Intelligence (all countries) 51 degrees Ltd Connected Conservation Foundation Wilderness Wildlife Trust</p>
2. Number persons (sex disaggregated) that have been involved in project implementation phase (on an annual basis)	Men Women 381 24	Men Women 54 13	Men Women 54 12	IS	<p>FY23Q4: 54 men and 12 women trained on ER. ZNP (33M and 6W); CDNP ( 8M and 2W); NNNP( 3M and 3 W); ODNP(10M and 1W)</p>

3. Number of engagements (e.g. meeting, workshops, consultations) with stakeholders during the project implementation phase (on an annual basis)	36	8	8	IS	FY23Q2: 2(Inception meeting an Safeguard training) FY23Q3:3(3engagement meeting with government focal point in RoC,MoZ and Botswana FY23Q4: 2 meetings held with Botswana including one stakeholder workshop in Kasane
<b>ESS 1: Environmental and Social Impact Assessment</b> (delete if not applicable)					
Number of environmental and social assessments conducted.	6	5	5	IS	Five ESIAs were developed and approved via the CI-GEF Agency. Botswana CNP ESIA will be developed in FY24.
Percentage of ESMP /mitigation measures implemented to avoid/mitigate unintentional negative impacts.	100%	0	0		Constructions are underway in Conkouati Ndoki National park and constructions are beginning in Odzala and Limpopo National park. Restoration activities are scheduled on completion of the construction in FY24. No sites of cultural importance were disrupted as constructions are in designated office spaces. ESIAs concerns were shared with the project partners who will monitor implementation during the construction and implementation periods. A site assessment to monitor the implementation of safeguards is scheduled for FY24

## **b. Information on progress, challenges, and outcomes on stakeholder engagement**

The project inception workshop was held on 6<sup>th</sup> October 2022 and attended by 41 participants (13 Women and 28 men). 6 attendees (33% women and 67% men) were from the Peace Parks Foundation (PPF) which will support execution in Mozambique; 11 attendees (36% women and 64% men) were from Noe and African Parks which will support project execution in the Republic of Congo and 11 (64% women and 36% men), 5 representatives were from Botswana (Men) were from Conservation International (9) and Allen Institute (2) representing the regional team. The full inception report is available [HERE](#)

The project held a financial, procurement and technical report and environmental and social safeguards training that was attended by 28 key partner staff which included 9 women and 21 men. In Botswana, the consultant (1 male) was trained in procurement and environmental and social safeguards.

Similarly, a technical launch meeting was held in Botswana which included 16 men and 5 women. A stakeholder meeting between AI2, CCF, DWNP, and CI to discuss the CCF donation modalities (M-3 F-4). Several progress and update meetings were held with partners in each of the countries to discuss progress and plan for training needs. Similarly, physical training was held in RoC bringing in the three partners and one more was held in Mozambique online and live bringing in government (ANAC) and implementing partners.

There was a delayed response in Botswana which has led to delayed project implementation. Similarly, in Republic of Congo we have not been able to create a rapport with the government focal point delaying the full constitution of the steering committee and working group. This is also occasioned by language barriers. Similarly, there are differing mandates between the Ministry and the ACFAP where our partners are mostly in collaboration with the Ministry of Forest Economy and ACFAP where protected area management mostly lies. To respond to these challenges- continuous engagement and follow-up in Botswana's finally led to the response and approval of the project implementation plan in February 2023, leading to the physical technical launch of the project in Kasane in April 2023. Similarly, a consultant to support the quicker implementation of the project in Botswana will allow the project implementation. For Republic of Congo, the plan is to arrange for a physical meet and greet meeting in Brazzaville in FY24 including hosting a physical steering committee meeting. Similarly, translated quarterly progress reports have been shared with the government focal points as we await the steering committee and working group meetings in FY24.

## **c. Information on the progress towards achieving gender-sensitive measures/targets.**

Describe the progress towards achieving gender sensitive measures or targets as documented at CEO endorsement/approval in the gender action plan or equivalent. Please reply to the following questions in your description:

- a) All activities anticipated by the GMP were implemented? Yes/No Why?

No, A full gender assessment not conducted due to the lack of a safeguard consultant who has since been contracted. Scheduled for FY 24. At least 15% Women have been nominated in the national project steering committee and working groups and the annual Earthranger conference.

- b) Did the project face any challenges to implementing GMP as initially proposed? Please describe the challenges in case there were any.

The Challenges include the fact that the safeguard consultant who was only recruited in the last quarter.

- c) As compared to the original GMP, was any adaptive management applied to promote meaningful participation of women and advance towards other gender sensitive targets?

A baseline online gender assessment was conducted to understand the challenges faced by women rangers including cultural dynamics, accommodation and lack of necessary skillsets to apply for control room positions. A comprehensive response action will be designed and implemented in FY24.

#### **d. Information on the implementation of the accountability and grievance mechanism**

Project stakeholders were socialized with the AGM during the project inception period. Further, the stakeholder's engagement with the communities and staff as relevant as part of the ESIA. Partners in RoC and Mozambique shared the project activities with their key partners in their areas. No objections or challenges have been encountered. In FY24 - we will engage a safeguards specialist to undertake further socialization of the AGM.

The implementing partners engaged with community members through community meetings in villages or at the partner offices which enhances their voices being heard.

#### **e. ESMF lessons learned and Knowledge Management Products (KMPs)<sup>13</sup> developed and disseminated.**

The project proposal was summarized and translated into French and Portuguese and disseminated with all partners. Similarly, quarterly progress reports are translated to French and Portuguese and shared with the government focal points. The approved ESIA was also translated to French and Portuguese for the partners to enable them to share with their partners as relevant.

<sup>13</sup> Knowledge Management Products are those that are both intended to transmit knowledge but at the same time enable action by their audiences. For example, a lessons learned report, compilation of good practices and recommendations, etc.



**f. Overall project ESMF implementation rating** *(To be completed by the CI-GEF Agency)*

**SUMMARY: PROJECT ESMF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY TYPE OF PLAN**

ESMF PLAN REQUIRED BY THE PROJECT	CURRENT FY23 IMPLEMENTATION RATING	RATING TREND
Accountability and Grievance Mechanism	MS	Not applicable
Gender Mainstreaming Plan (GMP)	MS	Not applicable
Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)	S	Not applicable
ESS 1: Full/limited ESIA and Environmental & Social Management Plan (ESMP)	S	Not applicable

**OVERALL PROJECT ESMF IMPLEMENTATION RATING**

RATING	JUSTIFICATION	RATING TREND
MS	On the AGM, the project needs to strengthen the dissemination of the existence of the AGM among stakeholders, as it was done only once during the first year of implementation. In addition to this, because of the number and diversity of geographic areas and partner organizations, the project will need to proactively monitor grievances to guarantee a timely reporting. Currently, the project received a grievance in FY23Q4 and is in process to classify it and planning to resolve it (if applicable) in FY24 Q1. For the GMP the project has faced delays in the implementation of the activities set out in the plan, due to the delays in contracting a Safeguards consultant. For example, the gender assessment planned to be undertaken at the beginning of the project, has not been completed during this FY. Despite this, the proportion of women participating and benefiting is close to the target during this FY (15% women). On the SEP the project overachieved in the indicator linked to stakeholder groups and is on good track to achieve the other two targets. On ESS1 the project successfully completed 5 site-specific ESIA's which were reviewed and approved by the CI-GEF Agency ESMF Team. Currently, the project is pending to update one site specific ESIA, but all the work is delayed on that site and construction work will not start until the ESIA is updated and approved. During this FY the project is not yet reporting on the implementation of the mitigation measures included in those ESIA's/ESMPs, but this is aligned with the fact that contracts for construction work have not started until recently.	Not applicable

**g. Recommendations** *(To be completed by the CI-GEF Agency)*

CORRECTIVE ACTION(S)	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DEADLINE
The project should disseminate the existence of its AGM with all stakeholders regularly, track and register all grievances that might be reported, classify them as eligible or not, and resolve them accordingly.	PMU	June 2024
The project team needs to complete the specific gender assessment included in the approved GMP as soon as possible, so that any recommendations, gaps, or opportunities identified can be addressed/seize during project implementation.	PMU	December 2023

The project team should monitor closely and report on the implementation of mitigation measures established in the site-specific ESIA's, on a quarterly basis.	PMU	June 2024
The project team should track on a regular basis (at least monthly), any grievances that might have been received by partner organizations.	PMU	June 2024

## **SECTION V: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION EXPERIENCES, KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND LESSONS LEARNED**

### **Required topics**

- 1) Knowledge activities/products (when applicable), as outlined in the knowledge management plan approved at CEO endorsement/approval.

The project developed the following knowledge products.

- **Output 2.1.1:** Annual learning and knowledge-sharing event (EarthRanger User Conference) undertaken by each PA

The project supported PPF (1 woman) in Mozambique, AP (1 woman), and WCS (1 Man) in the Republic of Congo to attend the 7<sup>th</sup> ER annual regional EarthRanger user conference which brought together at least 35 countries' representatives across Africa, Asia, the US, and Latin America. It was useful to experience the breadth of ER applications including HWC, security and ranger management, asset management, conservation ecology research, and wildfire and degradation alerts, among others.

- **Output 2.1.2:** Information sharing events undertaken to enhance learning and promote scaling up:

The steering committee and regional working group will be held in Hold Annual national and Regional virtual events on Earth Ranger experience Regional women's ranger learning/knowledge exchange summit

- **Output 2.1.3:** Success stories, lessons learned, and best practices published and shared on blogs, websites, and other digital platforms (where the Earth Ranger software informed decisions in management effectiveness of PAs).

Published the project press release on Bloomberg, GEF, CI, and EarthRanger websites and social media to help promote the project, partnerships with AI2 (and other partners), and CI's work in advancing conservation technology and protected area management. The articles are available at:

- Bloomberg Article: [Africa's National parks Deploy Tracking Technology to Combat Poaching, Habitat Loss](#)
- GEF Article: [High-tech help for park rangers in Africa](#)
- Conservation International Article: [New GEF Funded Project to deploy EarthRanger to strengthen protected areas in Africa, prevent poaching and reduce human-wildlife conflict](#)
- EarthRanger Article: [New GEF-Funded Project to Deploy EarthRanger to Strengthen PAs in Africa](#)

Similarly, project partners shared their experiences in using EarthRanger where PPF shared an article on tracking wild-dogs over the ER platform and AP shared an article on how ER is enabling them to manage the park more effectively for example on deployment of vehicles, boats, and helicopters as well as streamlining the way gorillas are being monitored. Project documents were translated into French and Portuguese and shared with partners as well

- <https://www.peaceparks.org/a-wild-dog-revival-in-limpopo-national-park/>
- <https://www.africanparks.org/future-conservation-earthranger-and-african-parks>
- [https://www.conservation.org/docs/default-source/gef-documents/final\\_french\\_long\\_earthranger-project-\\_prodac\\_.pdf?sfvrsn=7ffedf36\\_0](https://www.conservation.org/docs/default-source/gef-documents/final_french_long_earthranger-project-_prodac_.pdf?sfvrsn=7ffedf36_0)
- [https://www.conservation.org/docs/default-source/gef-documents/portuguese\\_long\\_gef-earthranger\\_project-summary.pdf?sfvrsn=747cfb33\\_0](https://www.conservation.org/docs/default-source/gef-documents/portuguese_long_gef-earthranger_project-summary.pdf?sfvrsn=747cfb33_0)

Other activities:

Preparation and dissemination of an article that highlights 1-2 women who have benefitted from the project and the targeted efforts of the project to support women in this field will be implemented in FY24/25.

### Additional topics (please choose two)

#### Financial management and co-financing

- 1) The project has quite a lot of procurements some of which have required CI-GEF preapproval. This has at times delayed the project as the procurement and approval processes have been delayed. It would be useful in the future if the partners were trained in the beginning with project specific examples. Similarly, for pending procurements in FY24, we will request the partner to start the process at least three months before the equipment or construction is required as a buffer for any delays in the process.

For co-financing, it would be useful if during project proposal stage a draft budget was submitted alongside the co-financing letter allowing ease of coordination on co-financing vis a vis project financing

#### 2) Implementation of safeguard policies, including gender mainstreaming, accountability and grievance mechanisms, stakeholder consultations

We have had a challenge recruiting a project safeguard specialist as the earlier assigned person was not available during the implementation. We adapted by requesting support from Center for Communities which helped get 5 out of the 6 ESAs updated and approved. For Botswana, we will work with a consultant to carry out the pending works. Similarly, the project manager has been placed on the waiting list for CI-safeguards training and accreditation.

## SECTION VI: PROJECT GEOCODING

This section of the PIR documents the precise and specific geographic location(s) of activities supported by GEF investments based on information provided in the Project Document. The following information should be contained in this section:

- a. Geo Location Information of Project Location(s) for the current fiscal year
- b. Project Map and Coordinates from Project Document

### Geo Location Information of Project Location(s) for the current fiscal year (add additional columns as needed)

Geo Location Information	Location No. 1	Location No. 2	Location No. 3	Location No.4	Location No. 5	Location No.6
<b>CLASSIFICATION</b> Indicate whether the site is <b>NEW</b> (for new sites this FY23), <b>EXISTING</b> (already existing in the previous PIR) or <b>CEO Endorsed/Approved</b> (indicate whether the site is included at CEO Endorsement/Approval). Please add more columns for projects with more than 3 locations. Note: if the site is <b>NEW</b> , provide a justification in the box after this table	Zinave National Park (CEO Endorsed/Approved)	Limpopo National Park (CEO Endorsed/Approved)	Nouabalé-Ndoki (CEO Endorsed/Approved) National Park	Odzala-Kokoua National Park (CEO Endorsed/Approved)	Conkouati-Douli National Park (CEO Endorsed/Approved)	Chobe National Park (CEO Endorsed/Approved)
<b>GEO NAME ID</b>	7874687	9254063	10375728	2255876	10375656	933839

Provide the location's Geo Name ID in a numerical format. IDs are available in the GeoNames' geographical database covering all countries and containing millions of placenames with free access at: <a href="http://www.geonames.org">http://www.geonames.org</a> .						
<b>LOCATION NAME</b> Name of the geographic locations in which the activity is taking place. In instance when a GeoNames ID is provided above, the name of the said ID should be reflected. Otherwise, the location name provided will be considered as an exact location.	Zinave National Park	Limpopo National Park	Nouabalé-Ndoki National Park	Parc National d'Odzala	Conkouati-Douli National Park	Chobe National Park
<b>LATITUDE</b> Provide locations in Decimal Degrees WGS84 format, a notation expressing geographic coordinates as decimal fractions of a degree. Include at least four decimal points.	-21.62679	-23.65481,	2.46667	0.89194	-3.905	-18.6666
<b>LONGITUDE</b> Provide locations in Decimal Degrees WGS84 format, a notation expressing geographic coordinates as decimal fractions of a degree. Include at least four decimal points.	33.60992	32.1746	16.45	14.83833	11.47	24.5
<b>LOCATION DESCRIPTION</b> (Optional field) Text description that qualifies in a sentence or so the location in which an activity is taking place, such as for example "mini-grid energy system" or "park ranger site".	National park	National park	National park	National park	National park	National park
<b>ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION</b> (Optional field) Text description that qualifies in a sentence or so the activity taking place at the						

location, for example, "Installing a mini-grid energy system".						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Please provide a justification regarding changes in location during implementation. Justifications should also be provided in the event the geographic location of key project activities cannot be provided at CEO Endorsement/Approval stage.

**(Geo Name ID: Location Name)**

**Justification:** No changes in the locations during the project implementation.

### Project Map and Coordinates

Please provide geo-referenced information and image map where the project interventions took place. If available, please provide attachments as appropriate such as in the case of locations presented along geometric shapes in popular formats like shapefiles, KML and GeoJSON.

**(Geo Name ID: Location Name)**

Map:



## APPENDIX I: PROJECT ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING

Rating		Overdue (O)	Delayed (D)	Not started on schedule (NS)	Under implementation on schedule (IS)	Completed/Achieved (CA)
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	HS	0%		100%		
Satisfactory (S)	S	20%		80%		
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	MS	40%		60%		
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	MU	60%		40%		
Unsatisfactory (U)	U	80%		20%		
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	HU	100%		0%		

- **Highly Satisfactory:** 100% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project. The project can be presented as an example of “good practice” project,
- **Satisfactory:** 80% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project; except for only 20% that are delayed and/or overdue and need remedial action,
- **Moderately Satisfactory:** 60% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project; while 40% are delayed and/or overdue and need remedial action,
- **Moderately Unsatisfactory:** 40% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project; while 60% are delayed and/or overdue and need remedial action,
- **Unsatisfactory:** only 20% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project; while 80% are delayed and/or overdue and need remedial action, and
- **Highly Unsatisfactory:** 100% of the indicators: a) are overdue, and/or b) delayed in their implementation, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project.



## **APPENDIX II: RISK RATINGS**

Rating	
Low (L)	L
Moderate (M)	M
Substantial (S)	S
High (H)	H

- **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.
- **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.
- **Substantial Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.
- **High Risk:** There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.

## **APPENDIX III: PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT EXPECTED OUTPUTS**

INDICATORS	PROJECT TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>14</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
<b>Output Indicator 1.1.1:</b>				
<b>Outcome 1.1:</b> Strengthened institutional and technical capacity of participating countries to effectively manage protected areas.				
<b>Output 1.1.1:</b> Earth Ranger software incorporated in the existing PA management structure in the target countries.	All the 6 target PAs in the participating countries utilizing EarthRanger technology to manage the PAs.	5	IS	5 of the 6 sites have undertaken ER operator, mobile and administrators training. Botswana training is scheduled for FY24
<b>Output 1.1.2:</b> A dedicated, secure, and functional control room facility established to be used by management to improve real-time situational awareness through the deployment of EarthRanger technology in each PA in the target countries.	All the 6 PAs in the target countries with fully equipped control rooms running EarthRanger software.	0	IS	<p>No control room construction is scheduled in ZNP. Similarly, although construction and procurement of contractors and equipment has started, none of the control rooms are fully completed.</p> <p>For LNP, ZNP in Mozambique construction and procurement of the software and hardware required towards a functional control room has started to be completed in FY24.</p> <p>OKNP and CDNP have laid the foundation for the control rooms and scheduled for completion in FY 24</p> <p>NNNP postponed its construction to FY24. In the meantime, they will use the temporary control room to run ER.</p>

<sup>14</sup> **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

<b>Output 1.1.3:</b> Required built infrastructure and internet network capabilities installed in the selected protected areas in the target countries.	Built infrastructure and internet. network capabilities installed and functional in the six selected PAs in the target countries	5	IS	All the 5 sites in RoC and Mozambique reported having internet connection. For CDNP 3G internet repeater stations were installed. For NNNP internet was connected to the Ndoki II site. In ONKP, the internet was connected in the South and East base with the North base scheduled for FY24.
<b>Output 1.1.4:</b> Digital radio or other appropriate communications network (as appropriate for the context e.g., LoRa) installed and functional in the selected protected areas in the target countries.	All the 6 selected PAs in the target countries with digital radio or other appropriate communication (e.g., LoRa network) installed and functional.	5	IS	<p>In Mozambique digital radio and communication network were procured to be installed in FY24 for LNP and ZNP.</p> <p>CDNP received 2-way communication systems. GPS collars were procured, and collaring will be done in FY24.</p> <p>For NNNP, vehicle tracking equipment was procured.</p> <p>For ONKP, repeater stations were also installed in South and East bases. Further, sensors and tracking equipment were procured to be installed in FY24.</p> <p>CNP communication equipment have been advertised to be installed in FY24.</p>

<b>Output 1.1.5:</b> EarthRanger software installed and functional in the selected PAs in the target countries.	All the 6 selected PAs in the target countries with functional EarthRanger software	5	IS	<p>EarthRanger profiles have been established for all 5 sites in RoC and Mozambique.</p> <p>A draft ER instance exist for CNP and will continuously be populated in FY24 following further DWNP input.</p>
<b>Output 1.1.6:</b> Protected area management staff trained to utilize EarthRanger software (sensors, radios, satellite collars, and other data transmitters)	At least 20 Protected Area management staff trained to utilize EarthRanger software (Men = 14; Female = 6)	66 M-54 W-12	IS	<p>In Mozambique, 39 (33M,6W) were trained..</p> <p>In RoC 27-21M and 6W (6 in NNNP, 10 in CDNP and 11 on OKNP) were trained physically.</p>
<b>Outcome 2.1:</b> Additional PAs in Africa are identified and the respective Countries commit to install the EarthRanger technology.				
<b>Output 2.1.1:</b> Annual learning and knowledge sharing event (EarthRanger User Conference) undertaken by each PA	At least 1 learning visit (EarthRanger User Conference) undertaken by each PA once during the duration of the project	1	IS	<p>One EarthRanger Conference was organized by AI2 in Kenya in November 2022. Three project participants from WCS, AP, and PPPF were supported to attend. In FY24, participants from Noe and CNP will be invited to attend the conference in Capetown.</p>

<b>Output 2.1.2:</b> Information sharing events undertaken to enhance learning and promote scaling up	At least 1 information-sharing event held per target country per year	2	IS	<p>One inception meeting was held to launch the project where both government and non-government partners were reintroduced to the project outcomes and intended impact per park. In FY24, the steering committee and working group meeting will be held for each of the countries.</p> <p>Similarly, a technical launch workshop was held in Kasane, Botswana where DWNP staff were taken through the baseline capacity, infrastructural and equipment capacity assessment which was used to inform the project.</p>
<b>Output 2.1.3:</b> Success stories, lessons learnt and best practices published and shared on blogs, websites, and other digital platforms (where the EarthRanger software has informed decisions in the management of protected areas).	At least 6 success stories, lessons learnt, and best practices shared by the project team during the project's lifetime (At least 2 success stories, lessons learned, and best practices shared by the project annually)	6	IS	<p>4 articles announcing the project launch were published on Bloomberg, GEF, CI, and ER websites (links shared above).</p> <p>Similarly, PPF and AP shared their experiences in using ER to track wild dogs as well as improve their logistical efficiencies.</p>
<b>Outcome 3.1:</b> An integrated monitoring and evaluation framework for the project				
<b>Output 3.1.1:</b> Periodic M&E reports submitted to the CIGEF Agency	At least 3 Annual Workplans and Budget, 12 Quarterly Technical and Financial Reports; and 3 Annual Progress Implementation Reports (PIRs) submitted to CIGEF for review and approval.	1workplan 4 Quarterly reports 1 PIR	IS	The project published 1 work plan 4 quarterly reports and 1 PIR that were approved by CI-GEF
<b>Output 3.1.2:</b> Mid-Term Evaluation and Terminal Evaluation conducted by CIGEF	One Mid-Term Evaluation and One Terminal Evaluation conducted by CIGEF	O	NS	Due in FY24 and FY26.