



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2023 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	12
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	19
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	22
6. RISKS	24
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	29
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	30
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	31
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	33
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	35
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT.....	37
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	38

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Africa
Country (ies):	Benin
Project Title:	Strengthening capacity in the energy, agriculture, forestry and other land-use sectors for enhanced transparency in the implementation and monitoring of Benin's Nationally Determined Contribution (CBIT Benin)
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP /BEN/060/GFF
GEF ID:	10156
GEF Focal Area(s):	Climate change
Project Executing Partners:	Ministère du Cadre de Vie et des Transports, chargé du développement durable (MCVT) de la République du Bénin
Initial project duration (years):	3
Project coordinates: <i>This section should be completed ONLY by:</i> a) Projects with 1st PIR; b) In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.	YES

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	31-Mar-21
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01-Feb-2022
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	01-Feb-2025
Revised project implementation End date (if approved) ²	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	1,319,863
Total Co-financing amount (USD)³:	460,000
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	461,768
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)⁴:	141,685

¹ As per FPMIS

² If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit.

³ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO Document/Project Document.

⁴ The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023 ⁵	8,163
--	-------

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	22 - 23 Feb 2023
Expected Mid-term Review date ⁶ :	Aug 2023
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date ⁷ :	Aug 2024
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	<i>[It is mandatory for projects to update the TT or CI before Mid-Term or Terminal Evaluation stage. For projects that have a planned MTR or TE in the next fiscal year, please indicate YES here and provide the updated TT or CI as Annex.]</i>

Overall ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)
Overall implementation progress rating:	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)
Overall risk rating:	Low Risk (L)

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	Low
----------------------------------	-----

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	Akpovo, Edgar Romaric (MCVT) National Project Coordinator CBIT-BENIN	akpovoromarc@gmail.com
Budget Holder (BH)	Angue Obama Oyana, Isaias (FRBEN) FAO Representative	Isaias.AngueObama@fao.org

⁵ Please refer to the Section 13 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

⁶ The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2nd PIR, around half-point between EOD and NTE. The MTR report in English should be submitted to the GEF Secretariat within 4 years of the CEO Endorsement date.

⁷ The Terminal Evaluation date should be discussed with OED 6 months before the project's NTE date.

<p>GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)</p>	<p>Boni Yalla, Memanton (MCVT) Director of Planning, Administration and Finances</p>	<p>mboniyalla@gouv.bj</p>
<p>Lead Technical Officer (LTO)</p>	<p>Aw, Mohamadou (NFODD) Forestry Division Programme Officer</p> <p>Alternate: Bouda, Zoewinde Henri-Noel (SFWDD) Programme Policy Coordination Senior Forestry And Natural Resources Expert</p>	<p>Mohamadou.Aw@fao.org</p> <p>Zoewinde.Bouda@fao.org</p>
<p>GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)</p>	<p>Bergigui, Mohamed Fouad (OCBDD) GEF Portfolio Support and Project Development Specialist</p>	<p>Mohamed.Bergigui@fao.org</p>

2. Progress towards Achieving Project Objective(s) (Development Objective)

(All inputs in this section should be cumulative from project start, not annual)

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
Strengthening capacity in the energy, agriculture, forestry and other land-use sectors for enhanced transparency in the implementation and monitoring of Benin's Nationally Determined Contribution	Outcome 1.1 Strengthening of institutional arrangements for the coordination of energy and AFAT sector information and data in CTR processes and reports	Set up institutional arrangements and legal instruments defining the roles and responsibilities of the institutions involved in the energy and AFAT sectors, integrating the requirements of the CTR.	0		At least 2	Realization in progress (5.24%)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)
	Output 1.1.1: Preparation of an assessment of gaps and needs in institutional arrangements, data	Number of employees in key positions with knowledge of CTR and related institutional responsibilities, CTR, data collection, analysis	0	10	At least 20	Realization in progress (1.19%)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)

⁸ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

⁹ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

¹⁰ Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic co-benefits as well.

¹¹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**, **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**. Refer to Annex 1.

	collection, analysis and reporting to meet CTR requirements, focusing on priority NDC actions in the energy and AFOLU sectors.	and reporting requirements.					
	Output 1.1.2: Awareness-raising among decision-makers and practitioners in the energy and AFOLU sectors on the integration of institutional arrangements into CTR processes.	Number of employees in key positions who have participated in awareness-raising activities organized by the project.	0	At least 50% of MCVDD, MAEP and ME core staff designated to the NDC inventory and monitoring team participate in at least one capacity development activity	At least 75% of MCVDD, MAEP and ME core staff designated to the inventory team participate in at least one capacity development activity	Realization in progress (1.19%)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)
	Output 1.1.3: Preparation and adoption of a roadmap for the implementation of CTR institutional arrangements in the energy and AFOLU sectors.	Availability of legal or other types of provisions defining institutional arrangements in line with the CTR	No legal provision for CTR institutions and stakeholders in the energy and	Roadmap for setting up institutional arrangements for CTR in the developed energy	Roadmap for setting up institutional arrangements for CTR in the energy and AFOLU sectors, approved and adopted.	Realization in progress (1.43%)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)

			AFOLU sectors.	and AFOLU sectors.			
	Output 1.1.4: Strengthening of a sustainable multi-sectoral coordination mechanism integrating relevant institutions/stakeholders into national UNFCCC reporting processes.	Number of competent institutions involved	0	2	At least 3	Not planned for the period under review	
	Outcome 1.2: Improved data and information collection, QA/QC processes and system infrastructure	Improved archiving, development of QA/QC procedures and updating of IT infrastructure	0		1	No advancement (3.26%)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)
	Output 1.2.1: Best practices for data acquisition, information and systems infrastructure in the energy and AFOLU sectors collected and shared with other relevant priority sectors	Number of best practices identified and shared	0	3	At least 5	Realization in progress (1.84%)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)
	Output 1.2.2: Improved methods of regular and systematic documentation and archiving, as well as quality assurance and	Number of procedures/processes improved	0	1	At least 2 (common documentation and archiving procedure and improved	Not planned for the period under review	

	quality control processes, to ensure the reliability and sustainability of MRV and M&E systems in the energy and AFOLU sectors.				QA/QC plan taking into account all components of the climate change report - inventory, monitoring of mitigation and adaptation measures and support received)		
	Output 1.2.3: Upgrade of the information management system and infrastructure for the energy and AFOLU sectors	Number of interconnected nodes	0	2	At least 3	Realization in progress (1.43%)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)
	Outcome 2.1: Strengthened monitoring of NDC mitigation activities and reporting on greenhouse gas emissions inventories, energy sectors and AFOLU	Degree of increased institutional capacity on the enhanced transparency framework	0		At least 1 national/sectoral report prepared integrating tracking of progress in the implementation of NDC mitigation activities	Realization in progress (6.67%)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)
	Output 2.1.1: Strengthened technical capacity of relevant institutions to adopt and integrate CTR-	Number of beneficiaries of capacity-building activities developed by the project (broken down by gender)	0	At least 30% of MCVDD, MAEP and ME core staff	At least 75% of MCVDD, MAEP and ME core staff designated to the GHG	Realization in progress (3.33%)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)

	enhanced global MRV Outputs and other international tools for monitoring, reporting and verifying the implementation of priority NDC mitigation activities in the energy and AFOLU sectors.			designated to the GHG inventory and NDC monitoring team have participated in at least one capacity development activity.	inventory and NDC monitoring team have participated in at least one capacity development activity.		
	Output 2.1.2: Improved knowledge of activity data collection methodologies and development of country-specific emission factors in the energy and AFOLU sectors.	Number of employees demonstrating increased capacity	0	At least 10	At least 20	Realization in progress (3.33%)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)
		Number of emission factors developed	0	At least 1	At least 1		
	Output 2.1.3: Preparation and submission of national/sectoral greenhouse gas inventory reports for the energy and AFOLU sectors, in line with the latest UNFCCC reporting guidelines.	Number of sector reports produced	0	1	At least 2	Not planned for the period under review	

	Outcome 3.1: Strengthened monitoring and evaluation of NDC priority adaptation measures in the energy and AFAT sectors	Number of national/sectoral report integrating the monitoring and evaluation framework developed	0		At least 1	Realization in progress (5.90%)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)
	Output 3.1.1: Strengthened technical capacity in relevant institutions to adopt and integrate CTR Global M&E Outputs and other tools for monitoring and evaluating NDC priority adaptation actions in the energy and AFAT sectors.	Number of beneficiaries of capacity-building activities developed by the project (broken down by gender)	0	At least 30% of core staff at MCVDD, MAEP and ME designated to the GHG inventory team and NDC research team have participated in at least one capacity-building event.	At least 75% of core staff at MCVDD, MAEP and ME designated to the NC, RBA and NDC research teams have participated in at least one capacity-building event.	Realization in progress (4.23%)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)
	Output 3.1.2: Development of appropriate national/sectoral indicators and a monitoring and evaluation framework for NDC priority adaptation	Number of M&E indicators developed/selected	0	2	Minimum 5	Realization in progress (1.67%)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)
		Number of staff trained in monitoring and evaluation frameworks	0	10	Minimum 20		

	measures in the energy and AFAT sectors.						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Measures taken to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings on Section 2

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1.1 Strengthening of institutional arrangements for the coordination of energy and AFAT sector information and data in CTR processes and reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete the international consultants and Data infrastructure and data management specialist recruitment • Solve the difficulties of funds disbursement to the OP 	Project Management Unit, FAO Office	1 month
Outcome 1.2: Improved data and information collection, QA/QC processes and system infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete the Data infrastructure and data management specialist recruitment 	Project Management Unit,	2 months
Outcome 2.1: Strengthened monitoring of NDC mitigation activities and reporting on greenhouse gas emissions inventories, energy sectors and AFOLU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete the recruitment process of the Energy ETF (MRV and M&E) international expert 	Project Management Unit,	1 month
Outcome 3.1: Strengthened monitoring and evaluation of NDC priority adaptation measures in the energy and AFAT sectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance collaboration with institutions involved in the monitoring and evaluation of NDC • Enhance team work between AFOLU ETF (MRV and M&E) and Energy ETF (MRV and M&E) international experts 	Project Management Unit,	3 months

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as per the Implementation Plan/Annual Workplan)

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please DO NOT repeat Outcomes reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
Outcome 1.1 Strengthening of institutional arrangements for the coordination of energy and AFAT sector information and data in CTR processes and reports	Set up institutional arrangements and legal instruments defining the roles and responsibilities of the institutions involved in the energy and AFAT sectors, integrating the requirements of the CTR.			
Output 1.1.1 In-depth assessment of institutional arrangements, data collection, analysis and reporting on capacity gaps and needs to meet CTR requirements with a particular focus on NDC priority measures for the energy and AFAT sectors.	Number of employees in key positions with knowledge of CTR and related institutional responsibilities, CTR, data collection, analysis and reporting requirements.	At least 20	ToR design and related to : - Analyze international regulations on institutional arrangements and the transparency framework - Analyze the national regulatory framework	3-month delay

¹² Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

¹³ Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Workplan. Please be concise (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

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

			<p>for institutional arrangements in Benin</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analyze the obstacles to setting up an institutional system in the country - Map relevant institutions - Assess the capacities and needs of those institutions to respond to the enhanced transparency framework - Propose and implement a capacity-building action plan - Assess gender-specific needs - Propose and implement a gender action plan 	
<p>Output 1.1.2 Raising awareness among decision-makers and practitioners in the energy and AFAT sectors of the need to integrate institutional provisions into CTR processes</p>	<p>Number of employees in key positions who have participated in awareness-raising activities organized by the project.</p>	<p>At least 75% of MCVDD, MAEP and ME core staff designated to the inventory team participate in at least one capacity development activity</p>	<p>ToR design and related to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop a training and awareness-raising program based on the above-mentioned action plan 	<p>3-month delay</p>

			- Design communication and awareness-raising materials	
Output 1.1.3: Development and adoption of a roadmap for the implementation of the CTR's institutional arrangements for the energy and AFAT sectors.	Availability of legal or other types of provisions defining institutional arrangements in line with the CTR	Roadmap for setting up institutional arrangements for CTR in the energy and AFAT sectors approved and adopted.	ToR design and related to : - Develop a roadmap for the institutional arrangements of the enhanced transparency framework for the energy and AFAT sectors.	6-months delay
Outcome 1.2: Improved data and information collection, QA/QC processes and system infrastructure	Improved archiving, development of QA/QC procedures and updating of IT infrastructure			
Output 1.2.1: Collection and sharing of best practices in data and information acquisition and system infrastructure in the energy and AFAT sectors with other relevant priority sectors.	Number of best practices identified and shared	At least 5	ToR design and related to : - Identify best practices, and/or existing tools for data collection in the energy and AFAT sectors - Evaluate the various tools, existing practices, mechanisms and/or tools for data collection and management in the	3-month delay

			energy and AFAT sectors	
Outcome 1.2.3: Improved information management system and infrastructure for the energy and AFAT sectors	Number of interconnected nodes	Number of interconnected nodes	TDR design and related to : - Design an information management system (taking into account existing systems) to store and manage all GHG inventory information (estimates of existing and projected GHG emissions, emission factors used, activity data including selection criteria, evidence of QA/QC processes), progress monitoring of NDC actions and other essential climate and environmental information	6-months delay
Outcome 2.1 Strengthened monitoring of NDC mitigation activities and reporting of GHG inventories in the energy and AFAT sectors	At least 1 national/sectoral report produced incorporating monitoring of progress in implementing NDC mitigation activities			
Output 2.1.1 Strengthening the technical capacity of relevant institutions to adopt and integrate CTR-enhanced global MRV Outputs and other international tools for	Number of beneficiaries of capacity-building activities developed by the project (broken down by gender)	At least 75% of MCVDD, MAEP and ME core staff designated to the GHG inventory and NDC monitoring team have	ToR design and related to : - Map the institutions that can carry out the	3-month delay

<p>monitoring, reporting and verifying the implementation of priority NDC mitigation activities in the energy and AFOLU sectors.</p>		<p>participated in at least one capacity development activity.</p>	<p>measurement, reporting and verification of NDC mitigation actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analyze the capacity of these institutions to collect data and carry out measurement, reporting and verification of mitigation actions - Develop a plan for gender-specific capacity building on mitigation MRV 	
<p><u>Output 2.1.2</u> <u>Improved knowledge of methodologies for collecting activity data and developing country-specific emission factors in the energy and AFAT sectors.</u></p>	<p>Number of employees demonstrating increased capacity</p> <p>Number of emission factors developed</p>	<p>At least 20</p> <p>At least 1</p>	<p>ToR design and related to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analyze gaps in the GHG inventory in terms of activity data (using QA/QC reports where available) and emission factors at level 2 (following the results of the key category analysis). - Identify institutions that can develop emission factors and parameters, and those that can effectively collect activity data. 	<p>3-month delay</p> <p>3-month delay</p>

<p>Outcome 3.1 Strengthening monitoring and evaluation of NDC priority adaptation measures in the energy and AFAT sectors</p>	<p>1 national/sectoral report integrating the monitoring and evaluation framework developed</p>			
<p>Output 3.1.1 Strengthen the technical capacity of relevant institutions to adopt and integrate CTR-enhanced global M&E Outputs and other international tools for monitoring and evaluating NDCs in the energy and AFAT sectors.</p>	<p><u>Number of beneficiaries of capacity-building activities developed by the project (broken down by gender)</u></p>	<p>At least 75% of core staff at MCVDD, MAEP and ME designated to the NC, RBA and NDC research teams have participated in at least one capacity-building event.</p>	<p>ToR design and related to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mapping the institutions for data collection and carry out monitoring and evaluation of NDC adaptation actions - Analyze the capacity and capacity needs of institutions for data collection and carry out monitoring and evaluation of NDC adaptation actions. - Develop a gender-specific capacity-building plan on M&E systems - Design gender-sensitive training materials including the CTR MRV tools developed by the Capacity Building for Transparency Initiative (CBIT) AFAT global project and/or other available tools 	<p>4-month delay</p>

<p>Output 3.1.2 <u>Development of appropriate national/sectoral indicators and a monitoring and evaluation framework for NDC priority adaptation actions in the energy and AFAT sectors</u></p>	<p>Number of M&E indicators developed/selected</p> <p>Number of staff trained in monitoring and evaluation frameworks</p>	<p>Minimum 5</p> <p>Minimum 20</p>	<p>ToR design and related to :</p> <p>- Identify the various priority actions for NDC adaptation</p>	<p>Coming soon</p> <p>Coming soon</p>
---	---	--	--	---

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcomes of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR (max 400 words)

As part of the project's implementation, the Project Management Unit organized the inception workshop in two essential phases:

- the official project inception ceremony on January 31, 2023 at the Golden Tulip Hotel in Cotonou, attended by officials from the executing agency and the national side, as well as representatives of the project's stakeholder structures;
- the technical meeting held on February 07, 2023 with executives from the project's stakeholder structures.

Those meeting provided an opportunity not only to present the content of the project's various support documents, but also to examine them and make substantive and formal observations on the project's hypotheses, indicators, activities, Outcomes and components, with a view to making recommendations to the FAO and GEF for the smooth implementation of this initiative.

The first meeting of the Project Steering Committee was held from February 22 to 23, 2023 at the Hôtel Bel Azur in Grand-Popo, and the first meeting of the Technical Committee was held at the MCVDD.

For this first year of project implementation, no activities relating to the expected outputs have been carried out. These unimplemented activities are thematic in nature, and call for the expertise of international and national consultants still under recruitment.

Development Objective (DO) Ratings, Implementation Progress (IP) Ratings and Overall Assessment

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence and progress reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR. For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project Outcomes.

	FY2023 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Satisfactory (S)	Benin's CBIT initiative has been launched so that by 2024, the country will be preparing reports to the UNFCCC with a view to strengthening the Paris Agreement's CTR with improved components in the energy and AFAT sectors. Since the launch of activities following the establishment of the management team, the steering committee has been held and has helped to define the overall implementation framework with strategic orientations to reinforce the activities planned in the PTAB. Better still, in order to guarantee the quality of the project's thematic activities and to remain in phase with the prescriptions of the project document, the first session of the technical committee was also held. To date, almost all project consultants are in place and at the start of their contracts. A methodological framework is currently being prepared to lay the foundations of an appropriate methodology for achieving the objectives of this project. However, it should be noted that there has been a significant delay in the project, which has had an impact on the timetable for activities. New measures have been taken to overcome these difficulties and give fresh impetus to the overall strategy for implementing the activities.
Budget Holder	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project Unit must speed up with the technical activities as all the international consultants needed are already on board. Delivery should be done against work plan.
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Satisfactory (S)	The project management team has demonstrated consistent commitment to national procedures, budgets and predefined objectives. The main activities carried out to date have been successfully completed, testifying to the quality of management and the

¹⁵ **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁶ **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁷ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

¹⁸ In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

			commitment of stakeholders. However, a number of difficulties have led to a delay in relation to the initial deadlines. Appropriate corrective actions were quickly identified and implemented to remedy these situations. It is important to stress that despite this delay, the overall scope of the project has been preserved, and we are confident that the expected Outcomes will be achieved to a large extent.
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The project implementation is hugely delayed for some reasons, including but not limited to the difficulty build an operational arrangement with the OP, and the lack of experience for the OPIM process. The country team and the project team need an intensive training on the OPIM process. Procurement plan and Plan of Work and Budget (PWB) need to be developed/readjusted, considering the expected achievement by the end of this year. The implementation of the 2 plans (procurement and PWB) will need the close support of the Budget Holder, the Operations Officer and the Administration for effective implementation, in order to make up the time lost.
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The project faced significant delays during its inception to navigate the operational arrangements with the OP and to build the necessary OPIM capacities at both CO/OP levels. The Project team should fast-track implementation and proactively monitor risks to develop actionable and timely managerial responses. By using adaptive management, the project team can anticipate operational bottlenecks and put the project on track to meeting its targets.

¹⁹ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

This section is under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made to comply with the approved ESM plan. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Please indicate if new risks have emerged during this FY.

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
ESS 7: Decent Work				
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate:

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²⁰ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	The ESS Risk classification is still valid - Low

<i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i>
None

²⁰ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit (Esm-unit@fao.org) should be contacted. The project shall prepare or amend an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) or other ESS instruments and management tools based on the new risk classification (please refer to page 13 <https://www.fao.org/3/cb9870en/cb9870en.pdf>)

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified during the project implementation (including COVID-19 related risks). The last column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in the project, as relevant.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Lack of political will to support the project activities due to change government	Low	Y	Benin has now ratified the Paris Agreement and submitted its first NDC. This implies that the government at all levels and across all sectors is fully committed to implementation of the Paris Agreement and associated ETF requirements. To safeguard against changes in key government posts, risk management measures will include awareness raising among key decision makers combined with a strong stakeholder involvement plan.	0%	Monitoring the implementation of risk management actions should be done as the project activities are carried out and the project unit should integrate this aspect.

²¹ Risk ratings means a rating of the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
2	Lack of coordination among concerned ministries and local government authorities	Substantial	Y	To address risks associated with coordination the project will work through existing coordination mechanisms such as the Low Carbon and Climate Resilient Development Strategy (transversal axis) and the PSDA. Clear project institutional arrangements that specify roles and responsibilities of those concerned will be reinforced by working through these existing mechanisms.	0%	Monitoring the implementation of risk management actions should be done as the project activities are carried out and the project unit should integrate this aspect.
3	Limited cooperation on data and information sharing among stakeholders	Moderate	Y	To address risks associated with data management, consultation and data system assessments will be crucial elements of activities under Outputs 2.1.2 and 3.1.3. The project will also build on existing systems, where possible: the TNC with respect to mitigation and the PANA with respect to adaptation. Clear agreements between the different stakeholders will be established/reinforced to collect and hand over required data and information within the given regular government budget.	0%	Monitoring the implementation of risk management actions should be done as the project activities are carried out and the project unit should integrate this aspect.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
4	Inability for the government to fund the ETF related activities beyond the project cycle	Moderate	Y	The proposed CBIT project will include measures to mainstream ETF activities into government budgetary and extra-budgetary processes. It will be proposed that ETF reporting be incorporated into current and future PAG (Government Action Programme) processes.	0%	Monitoring the implementation of risk management actions should be done as the project activities are carried out and the project unit should integrate this aspect.
5	Gender mainstreaming hindered by resistance from local and national stakeholders	Moderate	Y	Clear initial communication on gender equality as one of the key monitoring elements for tracking progress of the project – particularly with respect to adaptation monitoring and reporting and co-benefits.	0%	Monitoring the implementation of risk management actions should be done as the project activities are carried out and the project unit should integrate this aspect.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
6	Transparency related work loses momentum as the Paris Agreement is not adopted	Moderate	Y	See risk 1 above. To address this issue CBIT project activities will focus on the potential positive externalities associated with improved data collection, monitoring and reporting of the energy and AFOLU sector mitigation and adaptation activities. These could include more effective targeting of initiatives to improve fuel, farm and land-use efficiency and strengthen energy independence and rural resilience. This 'no-regrets' approach will aim to highlight the need for and benefits of this transparency work that will go beyond the lifetime of the Paris Agreement.	0%	Monitoring the implementation of risk management actions should be done as the project activities are carried out and the project unit should integrate this aspect.
7	Climate	Low	Y	The proposed CBIT project will include mechanisms to overcome risks associated with acute climate crises by replacing physical events/activities with online ones	0%	Monitoring the implementation of risk management actions should be done as the project activities are carried out and the project unit should integrate this aspect.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
8	COVID and other pandemics	Low	Y	The proposed CBIT project will include mechanisms to vehiculate ETF activities through online events as far as attainable, should access to institutional premises become impossible for prolonged periods of time.	0%	Monitoring the implementation of risk management actions should be done as the project activities are carried out and the project unit should integrate this aspect.

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

FY2022 rating	FY2023 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
	Moderate	

7. Follow-up on Mid-term review or supervision mission (only for projects that have conducted an MTR)

If the project had an MTR or a supervision mission, please report on how the recommendations were implemented during this fiscal year as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
Recommendation 1:	
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation.....	
Recommendation.....	
Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize	

8. Minor project amendments

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% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines²². Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories and provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Outcomes framework			
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management			
Implementation schedule			
Executing Entity			
Executing Entity Category			
Minor project objective change			
Safeguards			
Risk analysis			
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%			
Co-financing			
Location of project activity			
Other minor project amendment (define)			

²² Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

Please report on progress and Outcomes and challenges on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan) included at CEO Endorsement/Approval during this reporting period.

Stakeholder name	Type of partnership	Progress and Outcomes on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government institutions			
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MAEP)	Collaboration	Presence as a member of COPIL and CT Strategic orientation and technical support for the project	Maintaining and strengthening collaboration
Ministry of Energy (ME)	Collaboration	Presence as a member of COPIL and CT Strategic orientation and technical support for the project	Maintaining and strengthening collaboration
Ministry of Infrastructure and Transport (MIT)	Collaboration	Presence as a member of COPIL and CT Strategic orientation and technical support for the project	Maintaining and strengthening collaboration
Ministry of Social Affairs and Microfinance (MASMF)	Collaboration	Presence as a member of COPIL and CT Strategic orientation and technical support for the project	Maintaining and strengthening collaboration
National Climate Change Committee (NCCC)	Collaboration	Presence as a member of COPIL and CT Strategic orientation and technical support for the project	Maintaining and strengthening collaboration
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research	Collaboration	Presence as a member of COPIL and CT Strategic orientation and technical support for the project	Maintaining and strengthening collaboration
Ministry of decentralization and local governance/ANCB	Collaboration	Presence as a member of COPIL and CT Strategic orientation and technical support for the project	Maintaining and strengthening collaboration
NGOs²³			
ONG UPE	Collaboration	Presence as a member of COPIL and CT Strategic orientation and technical support for the project	Maintaining and strengthening collaboration
ONG PRO ENVIRONNEMENT	Collaboration	Presence as a member of COPIL and CT Strategic orientation and technical support for the project	Maintaining and strengthening collaboration

²³ Non-government organizations

Private sector entities			
Benin Chamber of Commerce and Industry (CCIB)	Collaboration	Presence as a member of the Project Steering Committee and Technical Committee Strategic orientation and technical support for the project	Maintaining and strengthening collaboration
Others²⁴			
Resource persons	Collaboration	Presence as a resource person at the Project Steering Committee and Technical Committee sessions	Maintaining and strengthening collaboration
New stakeholders identified			

²⁴ They can include, among others, community-based organizations (CBOs), Indigenous Peoples organizations, women’s groups, private sector companies, farmers, universities, research institutions, and all major groups as identified, for example, in Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and many times again since then

10. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) during this reporting period.		
Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and Outcomes achieved during this reporting period.
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	Yes	<p>The gender analysis or equivalent Socio-Economic Assessment carried out during the project implementation phase can be summarized as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The presence of three (3) women against three (03) men forming the Management Unit recruited within the framework of project implementation. - The gender aspect was rigorously taken into account at the official launch of the CBIT project. Around 25% of the expected 50% of participants were women. - The first ordinary session of the Steering Committee was attended by eight (08) women out of 25 participants, who signed up regularly, including the COPIL director, who was a woman. - At the first ordinary session of the project's Technical Committee, seven (07) of the 25 participants were women.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	We cannot comment on gender-specific measures to close the gender gap until the gender analysis has been finalized.
Indicate in which Outcomes area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Yes	No realization
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	The improvement in women's participation and decision-making is marked by the presence of three (3) women against three (03) men forming the Management Unit recruited as part of the implementation of the CBIT project.
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	No realization

2023 Project Implementation Report

M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	No realization
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	Staff specializing in gender issues are : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the gender specialist recruited to ensure that the gender aspect and gender equality are taken into account in project implementation; - as well as gender and stakeholder focal points.
Any other good practices on gender	Yes	As another good practice, the Project Management Unit has two employees, one male and one female, to ensure the smooth running of project implementation activities.

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / Outputs (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval, <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
<p>Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.</p>	<p>The project does not have its own knowledge management strategy. However, related elements have been incorporated into the draft communication strategy, which has been drawn up and is currently being validated. As a Outcome, it is planned to proceed with the collection, structuring, archiving, sharing and updating of best practices as soon as the project's thematic activities really get underway.</p>
<p>Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.</p>	<p>A draft communication strategy has been drawn up and is currently being validated by the project's various bodies.</p> <p>In the meantime, while we wait for the effective implementation of the communication strategy, we are focusing on the optimal management of the project's internal communication. Concertation sessions are organized, and an exchange forum has been set up within the management team to ensure a smooth flow of information.</p> <p>The communication component of the project's official launch ceremony, organized during the period covered by this report, was highly appreciated for the effectiveness and appropriateness of the various media used to implement the strategy defined for this activity. The main communication challenges this year are fourfold:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ensure cohesion within the management unit; - create a visual identity for the project; - ensure the visibility of the project's actions and interventions; - work on building awareness of the project ;
<p>Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">None (No activity in the indicative work plan has yet been carried out)</p>
<p>Please provide links to related website, social media account</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">https://fb.watch/isJU_5W9qv/ https://youtu.be/nM23LZs6I-U</p>

	<p>https://youtu.be/WqpwGK2zlrA</p> <p>https://fb.watch/ipLwr6mh3g/?mibextid=RUbZ1f</p> <p>https://lepotentiel.bj/2023/01/21/lutte-contre-les-changements-climatiques-le-projet-cbit-officiellement-lance-au-benin</p> <p>https://levenementprecis.com/2023/02/01/transparence-dans-la-mise-en-oeuvre-des-decisions-de-la-cop-21-un-projet-de-renforcement-des-capacites-pour-la-veille-au-niveau-national-lance</p> <p>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FeIN4O9-zUc</p> <p>https://youtu.be/hP17_7ADjWY?t=190</p> <p>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cxTliZrWW6I</p> <p>https://youtu.be/kTFPbl1nN7k?t=1655</p> <p>https://youtu.be/MlCuE9JUjfU</p>
<p>Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project inception images - Project inception videos - Project objectives visual
<p>Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details</p>	<p>Ms AYOLA Olayèmi Lydia CBIT-Benin Project Communication Officer E-mail: ayolalydia@gmail.com / cbit.benin@gmail.com Telephone: +229 97 14 17 51 / +229 95 23 74 73</p>

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples and local communities involved in the project (as per the approved Project Document)? If yes, please briefly explain.

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

Do indigenous peoples and or local communities have an active participation in the project activities? If yes, briefly describe how.

YES - The involvement of the Association Nationale des Communes Bénin (ANCB) in our activities, notably on the project steering committee.

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁵	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ²⁶	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Recipient government	Ministry of the Living Environment and Sustainable Development (MCVDD)	In-kind	10 000 USD	8 163 USD	N/A	10 000 USD
GEF agency	FAO	In-kind	150 000 USD	0 USD	N/A	150 000 USD
GEF agency	FAO	In-kind	100 000 USD	0 USD	N/A	100 000 USD
GEF agency	FAO	Grant	200 000 USD	0 USD	N/A	200 000 USD
		TOTAL	460 000 USD	8 163 USD	N/A	460 000 USD

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

²⁵Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

²⁶Grant, Loan, Equity Investment, Guarantee, In-Kind, Public Investment, Other (please refer to the *Guidelines on co-financing* for definitions)

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_FI_GN_01_Cofinancing_Guidelines_2018.pdf

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits

Implementation Progress Rating. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project’s components and activities is in compliance with the project’s approved implementation plan.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice”
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Risk rating will assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:	
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.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, 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 moderate risk
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 low risks

Annex 2.

GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap](#) or [GeoNames](#) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#)

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location & Activity Description
Cotonou, Benin	6.3539739	2.4313757		Ministère du Cadre de Vie et des Transports, en charge du développement durable (MCVT)

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate.