

UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2023

Reporting from 1st July 2022 to 30 June 2023

INSTRUCTIONS TO COMPLETE THIS PIR

1. Instructions in blue are directed to Task Managers / Administrative Officers
2. Instructions in red are directed to Project Managers and Executing Agencies
3. When filling up the respective cells, use the Normal style from the template. The text will look like this.

1. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

1.1. Project details

This entire table is to be prepared by Task Managers

1. IDENTIFICATION

Identification Table	GEF ID.: 5811	Insert Umoja no.: S1-32GFL-000620-SB-006167
Project Title	Closing the Gaps in Great Green Wall: Linking sectors and stakeholders for increased synergy and scaling-up	
Duration months	36 N/A	36 30 th June 2022
		Insert date & months added
Division(s) Implementing the project	Ecosystems Division, GEF Biodiversity and Land Degradation Unit, UNEP	
Name of co-implementing Agency	N/A	
Executing Agency(ies)	International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)	
Names of Other Project Partners	National Agencies of the GGW Panafrican Agency of the Great Green Wall (PAGGW) African Union Réseau Bilital Maroobé (RBM) CARI-Réseau Sahel Desertification (ReSaD) Sudanese Environmental Conservation Society (SECS)	
Project Type	Medium Size Project	
Project Scope	Regional	
Region	Africa	
Countries	Senegal, Mauritania, Niger, Mali, Burkina Faso, Chad, Sudan, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Djibouti	
Programme of Work	Healthy and Productive Ecosystems	
GEF Focal Area(s)	Land Degradation	
UNSDCF / UNDAF linkages	N/A	
Link to relevant SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s)	The project is consistent with the SDGs, particularly Goal 15 on life on land. It will directly contribute to the following indicators: 15.1.1; 15.2.1; 15.3.1 and 15.4.1	
GEF financing amount	1,726,400	
Co-financing amount	12,035,943	
Date of CEO Endorsement	13 June 2016	

Start of Implementation	1 st August 2016	
Date of first disbursement	1st September 2016	
Total disbursement as of 30 June 2021	1,406,230	
Total expenditure as of 30 June 2023	1,688,416.00	
Expected Mid-Term Review Date	December 2019	
Completion Date	Planned	31 May 2020
	Revised	30 June 2022
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date	December 2023	
Expected Financial Closure Date	October 2023	

1.2. Project description

This project sought to strengthen networks and networking in participating countries and at regional levels and in capacity building of partners which are already active in GGW and UNCCD implementation, which are expected to bring new partners into the initiative through a polycentric approach to be undertaken. A specific focus lies also on better linkages among sectors and on integrating pastoralists, women and groups with specific vulnerabilities to create synergies in implementation and up-scaling of SLWM through addressing socio-economic inequalities and imbalances of the land use systems to achieve higher productivity and improved well-being of these groups. A further element of the solution sought for lies in the strengthening of land productivity through attracting higher investments.

Component 1: Adaptive learning and management

GGW countries adopt a common set of indicators for cross-sectoral monitoring to inform planning and policy-making

1.1. All participating countries having a functional multi-sectoral engagement in implementing the SLM/GGW is obtained

1.2. A Framework of indicators and participatory approaches is established by partners for greater understanding and monitoring of landscape system dynamics and the linkages between livelihood and conservation objectives

1.3 Learning and awareness-raising publications are developed and endorsed by at least 5 countries through participatory process and disseminated to improve understanding and monitoring of landscape system dynamics and the linkages between livelihood and conservation objectives

1.4. 500 Government and NGO representatives trained in the use and interpretation of appropriate tools, including Total Economic Valuation of ecosystem goods and services

Component 2: Participation, diversity and equity

National governments in GGW countries increasingly establish inclusive mechanisms to engage civil society in GGW and SLM

2.1. 10 networks strengthened at national and regional level and more engagement of civil society (especially marginalized group organizations) in government consultations and dialogue on the Great Green Wall and other SLM issues in all countries

2.2. Learning fora conducted for 11 countries to address specific challenges related to engagement of marginalized groups in SLM

Component 3: Investment for Policy Implementation

Stakeholders actively promote appropriate investment partnerships to scale up SLM good practices

3.1. Training workshops for 11 countries to strengthen capacity of different actors (government, nongovernment and private sector) to identify and address policy implementation and investment barriers and opportunities

3.2. A set of guidelines for improved private sector engagement, including recognition of the role of local land managers as private investors and identification of suitable enabling and asset investments

3.3. Local planning processes are improved in 30 locations through better participation of different stakeholder groups and sectors and greater capacity of those groups to articulate SLM priorities and benefits

Component 4: Project Management, monitoring and evaluation

Project Management outcome: Project efficiently implemented, monitored and evaluated within the agreed time frame

Project management output: Project management structure established and functioning, project workplan, monitoring and evaluation plan agreed and followed, project activity delivered.

1.3. History of project revisions

To be completed by Task Managers

Version	Date	Main changes introduced in this revision
Rev0 (CEO ED)		
:		
:		
RevN (latest version at the time of this PIF)		

2. OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

To be completed by UNEP Task Manager

2.1. UNEP Subprogramme(s)

UN Environment Subprogramme(s) Healthy and productive ecosystems	<p>Specify the relevant Expected Accomplishment(s) & Indicator(s)</p> <p>Expected accomplishments: (a) The health and productivity of marine, freshwater and terrestrial ecosystems are institutionalized in education, monitoring and cross-sector and transboundary collaboration frameworks³³ at the national and international levels</p>
---	--

	<p>Indicators:</p> <p>(i) Increase in the number of countries and transboundary collaboration frameworks that have made progress to monitor and maintain the health and productivity of marine and terrestrial ecosystems</p> <p>(ii) Increase in the number of countries and transboundary collaboration frameworks that demonstrate enhanced knowledge of the value and role of ecosystem services</p> <p>(iii) Countries and groups of countries that improve their cross-sector and transboundary collaboration frameworks for marine and terrestrial ecosystem management</p> <p>(iv) Increase in the number of education institutions that integrate the ecosystem approach in education frameworks</p>	
<p><i>Describe any progress made towards delivering the stated PoW Expected Accomplishments and Indicators. State key changes since previous reporting period. (maximum one paragraph)</i></p> <p>A meeting to support the national alliance of the GGW in Sudan was organized in August 2022. Unfortunately the project finances to support the meeting bounced back due to existing embargos on transactions with Banks in Sudan.</p>		
Expected Accomplishment	Indicator	Progress
<i>Add rows as needed</i>		

2.2. GEF Core Indicators (for all GEF 6 and later projects):

GEF Core Indicators	Indicative expected Results		
	N/A		
<i>Discuss GEF core indicators targeted by the project, as well as expected results. (maximum one paragraph)</i>			
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Expected values at</i>		<i>FY2021</i>
	<i>Mid-term</i>	<i>End-of-project</i>	

2.3. Implementation status and risk

[complete the fiscal year and select: 1st PIR; 2nd PIR; Final PIR; select HS; S; MS; MU; U; HU; unknown; not rated to rate the progress towards outcomes and outputs in third and fourth lines; select H; S; M; L; to rate risks for the fiscal year you are reporting in the fifth line. Add more columns if needed]

Implementation Status	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
	1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR	6 th PIR	7 th PIR

Rating towards outcomes (section 3.1)	Not rated	MS	S	U	S	S	S
Rating towards outputs (section 3.2)	Not rated	MS	S	U	S	S	S
Risk rating (section 3.3)	Not rated	L	M	H	L	L	L

Summary of status. Please structure as follows, highlighting progress, challenges and main achievements, as needed:

Rating towards outcomes: The rating is X because this, this, and this. This should be aligned with progress reported on section 3.1.

Rating towards outputs: Aligned with progress reported on section 3.2.

Overall risk rating: justify consolidated project risk given on Table A in section 3.3.

The overall progress of project implementation is more than 95% achieved. Several activities were implemented following the 4th steering committee meeting held virtually in June – July 2021. The main activities implemented during this reporting period are summarized below:

OUTPUTS

Outcomes is rated **satisfactory** because the implemented activities have contributed significantly to the three main outcomes.

The national great green wall alliance meetings supported have allowed the countries to strengthen the national structures and engage diverse stakeholder groups.

The indicator framework developed is a first step to support the national GGW agencies to effectively monitor the implementation of the GGW at national scale but also provides a uniform metric that can monitor implementation at the regional level.

A common platform for stakeholders' engagement that includes CSOs, private sector and government is being realized following the project's support of their participation in GGW activities nationally and regionally.

Capacity building and communication for the project has been carried out at local, national and regional level on sustainable land management, natural resource economics that has supported the development of SLM plans at the different levels.

Outcome 1: GGW countries adopt a common set of indicators for cross-sectoral monitoring to inform planning and policy-making

Activity 1.1.1. 11 country meetings (government and CSO) on SLM/GGW dialogue

Supporting countries to hold national GGW alliance meetings

3 countries including Ethiopia, Djibouti and Chad were targeted for support in 2020 – 2021 reporting period. Between November and December, we contacted Chad, Djibouti and Ethiopia to finalize the Terms of Reference, cost and logistics for holding the meetings in their countries. All countries were contacted to help develop their ToRs. We received already response from Djibouti and by December we had already shared a draft contract with the focal point.

The contract for Djibouti was completed and the national alliance meetings were held in May 2021. The meeting engaged different stakeholder including local level government agriculture and regional council departments, civil society organizations, youth organizations among others. The objectives of the national alliance meetings was to sensitize national and regional actors on the

vision of the GGW. The full report outlining the recommendations and outcomes can be found in annex 1.

Progress on the Ethiopia GGW meeting did not progress much in the year because of covid 19 and national elections that made the conditions for holding national meetings untenable.

In Senegal, a new government decree allowing the mobilization of GGW actors was received in June 2021. We are underway to support them to hold the national meetings in the 2022 reporting period.

Activity 1.2.1 Regional workshop to develop framework of indicators

In December, IUCN advertised a consultancy¹ to support the analysis of existing sustainable land management (SLM) in the Great Green Wall. This is the first step in pooling together information and data on the indicators that exist and prioritize those that can be monitored. The output of the study was to inform the national discussions on indicators in four countries namely Burkina Faso, Chad, Ethiopia and Nigeria.

The indicators consultancy was completed in May 2021 and the draft report was shared with the National Agency of the Great Green Wall, Niger, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia and Nigeria, to help in formulation of a follow-up discussion. The final report is being finalized. The advanced draft report is attached in Annex 2

Nigeria convened a national Great Green Wall meeting to further discuss and prioritize indicators useful for monitoring the national implementation of the Great Green Wall. The full meeting communiqué is attached in annex 3.

Discussion around the indicators have been the basis for developing the UNCCD Accelerator monitoring framework. These outputs continue to greatly contribute to the discussions on goals and outcomes for the Great Green Wall.

Outcome 2: National governments in GGW countries increasingly establish inclusive mechanisms to engage civil society in GGW and SLM

Activity 2.2.2 Publication of a report addressing policy barriers, marginalized groups and solutions

In November 2020, we restarted the discussion with SOS Sahel on supporting CSOs to convene and further discussion on how better they can be engaged in the Great Green Wall. We drafted a Terms of Reference for this work, which involved not only convening discussion but enhancing communication of the Great Green Wall amongst the CSOs and enhancing their participation on the newly formed e-platform of the GGW. The activity was completed in June 2020. The final report will be submitted by SOS-Sahel.

Outcome 3: Stakeholders actively promote appropriate investment partnerships to scale up SLM good practices

Activity 3.1.1 4 multi-country trainings on appropriate investment, policy barriers related and private sector engagement

For this activity, IUCN mobilized an e-conference that brought together multiple stakeholders including the private sector to discuss and get recommendations on how to better engage the private sector in sustainable land management across the Sahel.

In November to December 2020, we managed to develop the terms of reference for the conference and also mobilize and convene collaborating institutions, which included the Pan African Agency of the Great Green Wall, UNEP, GEF, UNCCD, WBCSD, CARI-Resad and WOCAT among others.

¹ https://hrms.iucn.org/iresy/index.cfm?event=vac.offline.download&offline_vacancy_id=4815

The event “Mobilizing Private Investment in the Great Green Wall” was held by IUCN between March 23rd – 25th, 2021 virtually. The event attracted over 750 participants over 3 days who participated 18 events. Participants were drawn from a wide array of organization including governmental, intergovernmental, non-governmental, universities, individuals and private sector interested in investment in the Great Green Wall. The key recommendations from the conference including

1. An estimated US\$ 2.6 - 4.3 billion is needed to restore the 100 million hectares of land in Sahel and achieve the goals of the Great GreenWall, which will only be accessed by incentivising sustainable investment by private sector in land restoration.
2. Scaling up action to deliver the goals of the Great Green Wall depends on innovations in both private and public sector, based on partnership between private and public investors, civil society organisations and land users.
3. Overcoming the barriers to investment in the Great Green Wall requires good information, awareness raising, implementation of relevant investment pilots, capacity building, and addressing ‘aggregators’, such as land tenure and public policy.
4. Governments, supported by development partners, need to promote innovative investments in the Great Green Wall that bridge the gap in finance to tackle long-term sustainability challenges.

The recommendations were shared with the National Agencies of the GGW focal points as well as the participants. The e-conference has led to further discussion on development of projects engaging the private sector including the Great Green Wall umbrella programme for possible GCF funding.

Activity 3.2.1 Publication of a study on environmental economics of SLM and private sector engagement

In December the publication comments from independent reviewers were taken into account in order to move the publications to the next stage. The publication is now in the final stages of editing and formatting for printing.

Activity 3.2.2 Publication of a study on regional experiences in appropriate investments in sustainable pastoralism

In November, the manuscript was sent to an independent reviewer for comments, which were received in December. The comments are being integrated into the publication and will be sent to the publications committee for final approval.

The publication is currently in the final stages of editing and formatting for printing.

Project management

Project Partner Agreement

The project cooperation agreement between UNEP and IUCN for the implementation of this project expired on the 31st May, 2020. UNEP issued a new contract to IUCN dated 12 October 2020. However, during the review by the IUCN legal office, some clauses required amendment. The contract was eventually signed by IUCN with the request for an immediate amendment to the discussed clauses. This decision was made in the interest of ensuring the implementation of the project activities. The amendment was pursued but hasn't yet been finalized.

Challenges to project implementation.

- The first is the slowdown of implementation of activities at country level due to COVID19 pandemic. There has been slow response and commitment to conduct activities.

The countersigning of the new contract presented a challenge as the IUCN legal office viewed the new contract as one that would need to go through the internal signoff stages and also because there were different internal contractual considerations.

OUTPUT

Output rating for the project is **satisfactory** because the project outputs are more than 95% completed as of June 2021. The activities that required a push at the beginning of the reporting year including two studies (one on sustainable pastoralism in the GGW and the other on Private sector engagement in the GGW) are at the final stages, the regional private sector engagement e-conference was successfully held, the development of indicators for monitoring the Great Green Wall has progressed well with key outputs in place.

Activity 1.1.1. 11 country meetings (government and CSO) on SLM/GGW dialogue

Djibouti held the national alliance meeting has strengthened the delivery of this activity. Ethiopia have a new date for the meeting in August 2020 while Senegal is also being supported to deliver a series of meetings to support the governments new decree on strengthening the engagement of stakeholder through the national agency of the great green wall. Now 4 out of the 11 countries have successfully their meetings. 2 more countries to be supported by end of the project.

Activity 1.2.1 Regional workshop to develop framework of indicators

Consultancy was advertised and consultant was recruited in January 2021. The preliminary data and information on indicators was collated with a recommended indicator framework developed.

Activity 1.2.3 Use of the indicators framework in 3 pilot countries implementation of indicators to monitor landscape system dynamics

Three were mobilized to hold national meetings on indicators. Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Niger and Nigeria Nigeria held a national meeting to discuss and prioritized indicators according to the recommended framework of indicators. Burkina Faso, Niger and Ethiopia and expected to hold similar meeting in the next quarter.

Activity 1.3.1 Translate and dissemination of 4 existing publications on SLM, landscape dynamics and ecosystem services

This activity is completed with key publications available in both French and English available to the GGW countries to support the implementation of the Great Green Wall.

Activity 1.3.2 Publication of one Synthesis study on integrating environment and economic development through the GGW (endorsed by at least 5 countries)

Publication reviewed by external author and was submitted to the IUCN publications committee. The publication was approved for final editing and typesetting and is currently being completed.

Activity 1.3.3 Communication (Implementing actions from the communication strategy of BRICKS)

Communication of the GGW is being conducted at multiple level with one key event being the UNCCD COP14 where IUCN through several side-events was able to communicate about the vision and goal of the Great Green Wall.

Communication has also been done through the private e-conference event organized under the project 2021, the Global Landscapes Forum 2021 among other online events.

Activity 1.4.1 2 regional training on environmental economics, Valuation of ecosystem goods and services (participation of at least 5 countries each)

This activity is completed

Activity 1.4.2 4 trainings on Landscape Management Approaches and SLM (participation of at least 3 countries each)

These training activities were successfully completed in December 2019.

Activity 2.1.1 Identification of 5 national CSOs networks and support in participating in dialogues, regional networks and public dialogue on SLM, GGW and UNCCD

This activity is considered complete though opportunities of engaging these CSOs still available under the remaining project activities. This has been done through the private sector e-conference organized by IUCN through the GEF/UNEP funding in 2021 and also through the funding for SOS-Sahel workshop on further engagement on the GGW platform. CSOs have also been engaged through the national alliance meeting convened by Djibouti and the national indicators discussion workshop in Abuja convened by the National Alliance of the GGW Nigeria.

Activity 2.1.2 Engagement of 5 regional networks in projects activities (through the project inception meeting): RBM, ReSaD, WAMIP, WISP, e-GGW network
Engagement of CSOs in the GGW implementation has been at the heart of the project and we have managed to build a CSOs online platform in partnership with SOS Sahel. This in addition to the constant engagement of CSOs has allowed the groups represented to participate and improve their understanding of the GGW initiative and are seeing their contribution and add value to the implementation of the initiative. These networks have been continually engaged throughout the project. This activity presents little to no risk in terms of CSO engagement.

Activity 2.1.3 Establishment of e-GGW network for 11 countries continually updated
The online CSOs platform was completed and launched in June 2020 with support from SOS Sahel. Through project funding to SOS-Sahel, we supported a further improvement of the platform and engagement of CSOs.

Activity 2.2.1 1 Regional learning forum addressing specific challenges (previously identified), policy barriers and marginalized groups' engagement in SLM (target participation of 11 countries)
The CSOs forum was held successfully in 2018

Activity 2.2.2 Publication of a report addressing policy barriers, marginalized groups and solutions
An initial report was already developed out of discussion that were conducted during the project activities with the CSOs but we would like to engage further with SOS Sahel to develop a publication outlining in detail the main barriers to participation of CSOs in the Great Green Wall and how to overcome them.

Activity 2.2.3 1 regional learning forum on sustainable pastoralism, barriers and marginalization (target participation of 11 countries)
This forum was held on the margins of the Desertif 'actions 19 conference in Ouagadougou in June 2019.

Activity 3.1.1 4 multi-country trainings on appropriate investment, policy barriers related and private sector engagement
There were initial discussions with African Union, UNCCD and UNEP but not much progress has been made. We organized a virtual e-conference that engaged the with private sector in the GGW. This activity provided traction for the development of ideas and programmes geared to mobilizing private sector finance for land restoration in the Sahel.

Activity 3.2.1 Publication of a study on environmental economics of SLM and private sector engagement
This publication is at an advanced stage with the manuscript already developed and only needs to be finalized. Publication reviewed by external author and will next be submitted to the IUCN publications committee.

Activity 3.2.2 Publication of a study on regional experiences in appropriate investments in sustainable pastoralism
This publication is at an advanced stage with the manuscript already developed and only needs to be finalized. Publication reviewed by external author and submitted to the IUCN publications committee. Final editing and publishing is in progress.

Activity 3.3.1 1 Regional training on local planning processes (participation of at least 5 countries)
This activity was completed with the support of CARI ReSaD.

Activity 3.3.2 Support to 5 national partners to integrate SLM in local planning processes (target 6 locations per country)
This activity was completed with the support of CARI ReSaD.

Risks

Project risk is low as of 30th June 2023. Between July 2022 and December 2023, we spent most of the time preparing the closing reports. Also because of the covid19 pandemic, the project was unable to make significant progress on implementation. However, 2022 has allowed us to push forward significantly with activities which has been excellent for the project.

2.4. Co-financing

<p>Planned Co-finance Total: <i>(total only)</i></p> <p>Actual to date: <i>Complete (in \$ and %). State the date for which this value is valid)</i></p>	<p><i>Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges.</i></p> <p>\$12.035,943</p> <p><i>(maximum one paragraph)</i> \$ 3,100,000</p>
--	--

2.5. Stakeholder engagement

<p>Stakeholder engagement</p>	<p><i>Describe progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO endorsement). For older projects that did not have a Stakeholder Engagement Plan in the CEO Endorsement Document, simply mention any kind of stakeholder engagement activities undertaken during the reporting period.</i></p> <p><i>(maximum two paragraphs)</i></p> <p>During the fiscal year, we continued to engage the country focal points especially with regards to supporting the national alliance meetings and the sustainable land management training held in Ethiopia. With regards to CSOs engagement, we were only able to engage those from Nigeria, Ethiopia and Sudan through the training that was supported by CARI and CEIDEL. The mid-term review consultants also attempted to engage the country focal points as well as the CSOs in process but the response from the countries remained in part.</p> <p>One challenge that the project has constantly faced in the poor response of the member countries. This has been especially because of the nature of the project which is seen as have little investment in on-ground activities within the countries. However, this has constantly been explained to members that this project is an enabling activity that is working to fill in the gaps at a regional level and therefore focuses more on a high-level outcome and support the countries to achieve more with their national programmes and projects.</p>
--------------------------------------	---

2.6. Gender

<p>Gender mainstreaming</p>	<p><i>Describe progress, challenges and outcomes related to the gender-responsive measures documented at CEO Endorsement/ Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent. Older projects that were designed before gender mainstreaming should proactively report any possible gender benefits, as appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>Gender consideration is one of the key considerations in the implementation of project activities. We have ensured that at least there is one third representation of gender during the national alliance meeting of Nigeria but also through the SLM training held in Ethiopia.</i></p> <p><i>Participation of Women still remains a challenge within the project due to structural composition of the steering committee for example most of the country GGW country focal points are male. However, for activities where we are able to determine participation, we try as much as possible to ensure that women are presented adequately.</i></p>
------------------------------------	---

	<i>(maximum two paragraphs)</i>
--	---------------------------------

2.7. Environmental and social safeguards management

Environmental and social safeguards management	<p><i>Describe progress, challenges and outcomes related to the environmental and social safeguard-responsive measures documented at CEO Endorsement/ Approval in social safeguard action plan or equivalent. Older projects that were designed before environmental and social safeguard mainstreaming should proactively report any possible social safeguard benefits, as appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>(maximum one paragraph)</i></p> <p>The project is about soft activities and do not have anticipated safeguard issues</p>
---	--

2.8. Knowledge management

Knowledge activities and products	<p><i>Provide a narrative of knowledge activities/ products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement/ Approval</i></p> <p><i>(maximum one paragraph)</i></p> <p>Two publications still await to be completed including “environmental economics and private sector engagement in the GGW and “Pastoralism and the Great Green Wall: restoring rangelands, building resilience”. These two studies been review and approved for publishing. They are undergoing printing process currently.</p>
--	--

2.9. Stories to be shared

Stories to be shared	<p><i>Optional for mature projects: Provide a brief summary of any especially interesting and impactful project results that are worth sharing with a larger audience, and/or investing communications time in, if any.</i></p> <p><i>Despite the low level of financing of this project as MSP, its impact seems to be more visible within the countries GGW team as the project has used a participative process and countries teams took the lead in implementing the few activities and it has allowed to strengthen collaboration of the country's teams with the CSO in the implementation of the GGW.</i></p> <p><i>The project has given CSO opportunities to support GGW implementation by putting in place some impactful outcome like establishment of Non-State Actors plaform led by the SOS Sahel with the project financial support.</i></p> <p><i>The project has been instrumental in fostering south-north cooperation between CSO. For exemple the ReSAD (Sahel Desertification Network) has bring together NGO from GGW countries and Europe to work together around the Land Degradation Network</i></p> <p>[section to be shared with communication division/ GEF communication]</p>
-----------------------------	--

3. PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK

Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the **UNEP Task Manager**² will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:

- (i) Progress towards achieving the project Results(s)- see section 3.1
- (ii) Implementation progress – see section 3.2

Section 3.3 on Risk should be first completed by the Project Manager. The UNEP Task Manager will subsequently enter his/her own ratings in the appropriate column.

3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes

[copy and paste the CEO Endorsement (or latest formal Revision) approved Results Framework, adding/deleting outcome rows, as appropriate]
(Ensure that each entered indicator has a baseline, end of project and current period value)

² For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ³	Baseline level ⁴	Mid-term target ⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 th June 2023	Progress rating ⁶
<p>Objective⁷ To achieve greater implementation of policies for sustainable land management in the Sahel (GGW countries) through enhanced investment, inter-sectoral coordination, and engagement of marginalised groups.</p>	<p>1. Number of cross-sector collaboration mechanism in policy implementation in relation to the GGW</p>	<p><i>Only one country (Senegal National Agency) has a functional cross – sectoral mechanism; Four countries (Niger, Burkina Faso, Chad and Mali National Agencies) has an established mechanism but not inclusive and do not meet regularly and Six countries (Djibouti, Nigeria, Sudan , Eritrea Mauritania and Ethiopia National GGW Coordination) have not reporting existence of a functional cross-sectoral mechanism</i></p>	<p><i>Participating countries commitment to implement mechanisms for multi-sectoral engagement</i></p>	<p><i>100% of participating countries have a functional multi-sectoral engagement in implementing the SLM/GGW, which is aligned to SDGs.</i></p>	<p><i>11 in the process of revitalizing or establishing GGW national alliances (a multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholders engagement mechanism).</i></p> <p><i>7 countries (Senegal, Niger, Burkina Faso, Nigeria, Chad, Mali, Djibouti) have multi-sectoral coordination mechanism that includes CSOs representatives in consultations</i></p> <p><i>The Panafrican Agency of the GGW is also engaged as the project partner to support the establishment of GGW national alliances for countries who do not have yet their GGW national alliance.</i></p>	<p>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</p>

³ Add rows if your project has more than 3 key indicators per objective or outcome.

⁴ Depending on selected indicator, quantitative or qualitative baseline levels and targets could be used (see Glossary included as Annex 1).

⁵ Many projects did not identify Mid-term targets at the design stage therefore this column should only be filled if relevant.

⁶ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). See Annex 2 which contains GEF definitions.

⁷ Add rows if your project has more than 4 objective-level indicators. Same applies for the number of outcome-level indicators.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ³	Baseline level ⁴	Mid-term target ⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 th June 2023	Progress rating ⁶
	<p>2. Number of countries that have functional multi-sectoral coordination mechanism that includes CSOs representatives in consultations</p>				<p><i>7 countries (Senegal, Niger, Burkina Faso, Nigeria, Chad, Mali, Djibouti) with multi-sectoral coordination mechanism that includes CSOs representatives in consultations</i></p> <p><i>2 countries (Ethiopia, Djibouti) have multi-sectoral coordination mechanism that include different ministries (environment, Agriculture, water etc.) Mechanism supported to include CSOs engagement.</i></p> <p><i>2 countries (Mauritania, Sudan) in progress to establish their mechanism and are already working with various CSOs to implementing their national GW plan.</i></p> <p><i>1 country (Eritrea) recently active in the framework of this project</i></p>	<p>Satisfactory (S)</p>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ³	Baseline level ⁴	Mid-term target ⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 th June 2023	Progress rating ⁶
	<p>3. Availability of cross-sectoral and ecosystem-scale reporting system</p>	<p><i>No reporting system available SLM interventions focus on site-level impacts and there is little accounting for positive or negative externalities</i></p>	<p><i>Indicator system for improved cross-sectoral and ecosystem-scale reporting developed in line with SDG</i></p>	<p><i>5 participating countries include reporting on ecosystem / landscape scale impacts of GGW implementation</i></p>	<p><i>A results framework and indicators for GGWSSI exist.</i></p> <p><i>A framework of indicators based on some selected key indicators and a methodology for reporting has been developed</i></p> <p><i>Nigeria have reviewed the indicators nationally and further identified priority indicators that the National Agency of the GGW could report against</i></p> <p><i>Burkina Faso, Ethiopia and Niger have mobilized similar meetings to identify priority indicators</i></p> <p><i>The indicators were used as input to develop the monitoring framework for the Great Green Wall Accelerator with the GGW countries.</i></p>	<p>Satisfactory (S)</p>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ³	Baseline level ⁴	Mid-term target ⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 th June 2023	Progress rating ⁶
	<p>4. Presence of marginalised groups representatives or structures engaged in policy dialogue and implementation</p>	<p><i>Women and indigenous peoples are not formally represented in decision making processes</i></p>	<p><i>Identification of main representative organisations of women and IPs and engagement in GGW discussions</i></p>	<p><i>Representatives of women and indigenous peoples are routinely engaged in GGW dialogue</i></p>	<p><i>Women and indigenous people groups like pastoralist are currently engaged in GGW dialogues. Pastoralists' networks such Reseau Billital Marobé (RBM) and APSS are participating to GGWSSI regional Steering Committee meeting.</i></p> <p><i>Participating countries are engaged in building an inclusive mechanism for consultation that will include pastoralists and women.</i></p>	<p>Satisfactory (S)</p>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ³	Baseline level ⁴	Mid-term target ⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 th June 2023	Progress rating ⁶
<p>Outcome 1: GGW countries adopt a common set of indicators for cross-sectoral monitoring to inform planning and policy-making</p>	<p>1. Number of countries that have functional multi-sectoral coordination mechanism that includes CSOs representatives in consultations</p>	<p><i>Few cross-sectoral mechanism within ministries in relation to GGW in most countries except Senegal that has a Supervisory Board of the GGW composed of representatives of nine ministries and representatives of CSOs</i></p> <p><i>A few initiatives have tried to strengthen the engagement of Civil Society in the GGW</i></p>	<p><i>Country meetings are done with commitment of at least 3 ministries in each country in engaging with CSOs in the GGW</i></p>	<p><i>At least 5 functioning coordination mechanisms one in each country which include multiple stakeholders</i></p>	<p><i>. 4 countries supported to hold their national alliance meetings (Nigeria, Burkina Faso, Djibouti and Mali) which has contributed further to strengthening the countries' GGW coordination mechanisms that are inclusive of CSOs</i></p> <p><i>3 countries (Ethiopia, Djibouti and Senegal) have been supported to prepare for their national alliance meetings by helping develop terms of reference for the meeting that is inclusive of government as well as CSOs. Meetings to be held in current quarter.</i></p> <p><i>2 countries (Mauritania, Sudan) in progress to establish their mechanism and are already working with various CSOs to implementing their national GGW plan.</i></p>	<p>Marginally Satisfactory (MS)</p>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ³	Baseline level ⁴	Mid-term target ⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 th June 2023	Progress rating ⁶
	<p>2. Use of goals, indicators and reporting that demonstrates the dual developmental-environmental impacts of SLM</p>	<p><i>Common indicators are being promoted but there is no structured approach to reporting on the dual environmental-economic benefits of SLM and demonstrating the contribution of investments across multiple sectors</i></p>	<p><i>Common indicator set developed and training conducted in relation to ecosystem values of SLM and SDG 15</i></p> <p><i>Publication of studies related to ecosystem management and developmental and environmental benefits of SLM</i></p>	<p><i>At least 3 national GGW reports/ plans include options for capturing the environmental externalities of SLM and recommendations for scaling up landscape-scale interventions in line with SDG 15 implementation</i></p>	<p><i>Existence of GGWISS results framework with indicators.</i></p> <p><i>Terms of reference elaborate to help set the scope of work that need to be done in order to develop a framework of indicators</i></p> <p><i>2 publications under review: (i) Environmental benefits of the GGW and private sector engagement; (ii) Pastoralism and the GGW: restoring rangelands, building resilience</i></p> <p><i>4 existing publication demonstrating the dual developmental-environmental impacts of SLM are translated and available in English and French.</i></p> <p><i>An indicator framework that prioritizes possible tier 1 indicators has been developed and shared with GGW countries.</i></p>	<p>Satisfactory (S)</p>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ³	Baseline level ⁴	Mid-term target ⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 th June 2023	Progress rating ⁶
	3. Number of countries with national mechanism and common define approach as result to ensure coordinated implementation (at local, national, regional and global levels)	<i>Implementation and reporting on the GGW are made almost exclusively by a single agency and there is lack of coordinated cross-sectoral action (exceptions are Senegal and Ethiopia)</i>	<i>National mechanisms for coordinated action and reporting are established and functioning</i>	<i>3 countries conduct improved monitoring against commonly locally-defined indicators and integrate in national reporting against the GGW and UNCCD in line with Goal 15 of SDG implementation</i>	<i>4 countries (Mali, Burkina Faso, Djibouti and Nigeria) already support to strengthen their coordination mechanism including discuss and develop a framework for monitoring</i>	Satisfactory (S)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ³	Baseline level ⁴	Mid-term target ⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 th June 2023	Progress rating ⁶
	<p>4. Number of Government and NGO representatives participated in regional trainings on environmental economics, valuation of ecosystem goods and services, landscape management approaches and SLM and number of participants</p>	<p><i>Low rates of up-scaling of SLM due to low awareness creation through lack of sensitization and community mobilization as well as absence of trainings and capacity building</i></p> <p><i>Some actions are undertaken in some countries (e.g. Senegal, Burkina Faso) for the implementation of environmental education tools in various training and schools' curricula but still low to cover the need in capacities strengthening</i></p>	<p><i>2 regional training on environmental economics, Valuation of ecosystem goods and services and trainings Landscape Management Approaches and SLM are done</i></p>	<p><i>Within the GGW countries at 500 Government and NGO representatives trained through the regional learning fora and multi-countries trainings</i></p>	<p><i>The training in Ethiopia held in December 2019 for participant from 4 countries adds up to make 4 trainings on landscapes management and approaches completed.</i></p> <p><i>1 multi country training (10 GGW countries represented) on environmental economics, Valuation of ecosystem goods and services</i></p> <p><i>2 regional training on integrating SLM in local planning</i></p> <p><i>5 trainings of trainers on integrating SLM in local planning process</i></p> <p><i>More than 620 representatives from governments, NGOs and local level CSOs from 11 countries participated in regional trainings and fora and GGW dialogues organized through the project.</i></p>	<p>Satisfactory (S)</p>

<p>Outcome 2: National governments in GGW countries increasingly establish inclusive mechanisms to engage civil society in GGW and SLM</p>	<p>1. Number of coordination mechanism between national and regional networks established and capacitated on SLM dialogue and implementation</p>	<p><i>Sub-regional and national networks exist but there is lack of coordination and consensus over engagement in the GGW and lack of capacity to articulate a progressive view of the cross-sectoral benefits of the GGW</i></p>	<p><i>10 national and regional networks are capable of articulating new arguments on SLM and are representing a wider constituency</i></p>	<p><i>Networking at regional level contributes to consensus-based policy and investment recommendations</i></p>	<p><i>Civil Societies Organization online platform created and launched in June 2020 to enhance communication, networking and experience sharing for CSOs</i></p> <p><i>More than 10 CSOs networks including national and regional have their capacity built to engaging in GGW/SLM dialogues. This includes: (Réseau Billital Marobé (RBM); Réseau Sahel Désertification (ReSaD); Sudanese Environment Conservation society (SECS); Women Advancement Initiative (Nigeria); APSS; AFAO; Nafore NGO of Mauritania; Lead Tchad; Drynet; Enda in Senegal; CNCOD in Niger; Yakamata Development Initiative in Nigeria; NGO Paix et Lait in Djibouti, Tupalga in Burkina Faso);</i></p> <p><i>Within the GGW countries, more than 60 CSOs and networks (including famers, pastoralists and women's associations) are reached by the project capacity building activities through trainings and fora.</i></p>	<p>Satisfactory (S)</p>
---	--	---	--	---	--	-------------------------

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ³	Baseline level ⁴	Mid-term target ⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 th June 2023	Progress rating ⁶
	<p>2. Number of countries with marginalized groups representative and/or structures included in GGW dialogue and implementation</p> <p>Number of women groups representatives in the GGW dialogue and implementation</p>	<p><i>In most countries pastoralists are not adequately involved in GGW implementation.</i></p> <p><i>In most countries women groups are not adequately involved in GGW implementation.</i></p>	<p><i>Pastoralist Civil Society and networks and women's groups are engaged in GGW dialogue in 5 countries and regionally</i></p>	<p><i>Pastoralist, women and other disadvantaged groups are actively involved in GGW actions and in related policy dialogue in at least 5 countries and regionally</i></p>	<p><i>Pastoralist and women CSOs/networks are engaged in GGW dialogue in more than 5 countries (Senegal, Niger, Burkina Faso, Nigeria, Chad, Mali).</i></p> <p><i>2 bigger pastoralist networks in west Africa (Réseau Billital Maroobé (RBM) and APESS) are present in more than 5 GGW countries and are engaged in GGW dialogues in order to foster inclusion of pastoralists groups in GGW implementation. RBM is member of the project Steering Committee.</i></p> <p><i>3 women groups are participating in GGW related dialogues through project activities. It includes West Africa Women Association (WAWA), Tewazone of Mauritania, Women Advancement Initiative (Nigeria)</i></p> <p><i>1 Youth network "Jeunesse Unie pour le Developpement Durable (JUDEV D)" represented in West and Central Africa is empowered to contributing to GGW initiative.</i></p>	<p>Satisfactory (S)</p>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ³	Baseline level ⁴	Mid-term target ⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 th June 2023	Progress rating ⁶
	<p>3. Presence of sectors considered in environmental and socioeconomic sustainability concerns in GGW dialogue and action</p>	<p><i>The structural social disadvantage of women is not addressed within any of the current GGW implementation activities</i></p>	<p><i>Key other sectors linked to the GGW implementation are identified</i></p>	<p><i>Synergy between GGW implementation and identified sectors established and key recommendations for implementation agreed between stakeholders and in line with SDG implementation</i></p>	<p><i>CSOs are identified key actors in the implementation of the GGW and more the 60 CSOs engaged in GGW dialogues through the project activities.</i></p> <p><i>Private sector is also identified and GGW and private sector forum discussed for 2020.</i></p> <p><i>Pastoralists are also identified as key actors in GGW implementation as GGW areas is mostly drylands and rangelands. Pastoralism and rangelands restoration conference were organized to foster synergy between GGW implementation and pastoralism as tool for land restoration</i></p>	<p>Satisfactory (S)</p>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ³	Baseline level ⁴	Mid-term target ⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 th June 2023	Progress rating ⁶
<p>Outcome 3: Stakeholders actively promote appropriate investment partnerships to scale up SLM good practices</p>	<p>1. Number of countries with awareness raising events on opportunities for investing in SLM, particularly investments for local land managers, and capacity to engage the private sector</p>	<p>Awareness of investment options amongst active GGW partners is weak and dialogue with private sector more or less zero</p>	<p>Publication of one set of guidelines for sustainable investments in GGW area and endorsed by at least 5 out of 11 countries</p>	<p>5 countries demonstrate active dialogue with private investors over innovative financing options</p>	<p>Set of guidelines for investment in GGW are contained in the 2 publications - (i) Environmental benefits of the GGW and private sector engagement; (ii) Pastoralism and the GGW: restoring rangelands, building resilience).”</p> <p>The private investment e-conference brought together private investor, NGOs and the government on the same table to discuss the opportunities for private sector engagement and how this can realized. This important discussion created room for discussing how this is possible and led to the development of project ideas including the GGW umbrella programme among others.</p>	<p>Satisfactory (S)</p>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ³	Baseline level ⁴	Mid-term target ⁵	End-of-project target	Level at 30 th June 2023	Progress rating ⁶
	2. Evidence of policies reviewed and dialogue sessions to identify and address policy implementation and investment barriers and opportunities	<i>Policy dialogue focuses on generic advice over policy agendas rather than specific dialogue over individual policy or legal documents</i>	<i>Policies reviewed in target countries and specific sector policy barriers and opportunities are identified</i>	<i>Dialogue between multiple stakeholders over options for modifying or improving implementation of policies supportive of SDG implementation</i>	<i>IUCN has engaged in discussion at the UNCCD COP14 with multiple stakeholders as to how it could be possible to advance LDN implementation and reporting within the GGW countries with possible project to be executed by the Global Mechanism of the UNCCD in some of the GGW countries. There are similar discussions ongoing to influence the perception as investments of a number of funding organization to the Sahel</i>	Marginally Satisfactory (MS)
	3. Number of countries where participatory planning exercises at local level which include SLM priorities took place	<i>Participatory planning is carried out by some Civil Society Organizations but plans remain at project level and are not adopted in public planning</i>	<i>Partner organizations identified and trained in participatory environmental action planning</i>	<i>Investment options/strategies are reflected in local SLM planning in at least 5 countries and in line with indicator 15.9 of Goal 15 of SDG.</i>	<i>Partner organizations identified and trained in participatory environmental action planning in 5 countries (Burkina Faso, Niger, Mali, Senegal and Chad). Those countries were beneficiary of local planning trainings and training of trainers for integrating SLM in local planning</i>	Highly Satisfactory (HS)

3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs

Outputs ⁸	Expected completion date ⁹	Implementation status as of 30 June 2017 (%)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2018 (%)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2019 (%)	Implementation status as of 30 th June 2022(%)	Implementation status as of 30 th June 2023 (%)	Progress rating justification (as much as possible, describe in terms of immediate gains to target groups, e.g. access to project deliverables, participation in receiving services; gains in knowledge, etc)	Progress rating ¹⁰
Output 1. 1: All participating countries having a functional multi-sectoral engagement in implementing the SLM/GGW is obtained	May 31, 2021	8%	39%	54%	90%	90%	4 out of target “at least 5 countries” supported to hold their national alliance meetings	Satisfactory (S)
Activity 1.1.1: 11 Country meetings (government and CSO) on SLM/GGW dialogue.	May 31, 2021	4%	26%	45%	90%	90%	4 out of a target “at least 5” countries supported to hold their national alliance meetings At least 3 more countries to be supported through to hold national alliance meetings	Satisfactory (S)
Output 1.2: A Framework of indicators and participatory approaches is established by partners for greater understanding and monitoring of landscape system dynamics and the linkages between livelihood and conservation objectives	May 31, 2021	5%	30%	30%	80%	80%	Framework of indicators developed 30% of National meetings already held.	Satisfactory
Activity 1.2.1: Regional workshop	May 31, 2018	3%	30%	30%	100%	100%	Publication on ecosystem services and SLM is under development. Two	Satisfactory

⁸ Outputs and activities as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision.

⁹ As per latest workplan (latest project revision)

¹⁰ To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager

Outputs ⁸	Expected completion date ⁹	Implementation status as of 30 June 2017 (%)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2018 (%)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2019 (%)	Implementation status as of 30 th June 2022(%)	Implementation status as of 30 th June 2023 (%)	Progress rating justification (as much as possible, describe in terms of immediate gains to target groups, e.g. access to project deliverables, participation in receiving services; gains in knowledge, etc)	Progress rating ¹⁰
to develop framework of indicators							deliverable remain including development of indicator framework and testing on the indicators at country level Indicator framework was developed through a consultancy process, which included conversations with National Agencies of the GGW	
Activity 1.2.2: Use of the indicators framework in 3 pilot countries implementation of indicators to monitor landscape system dynamics	May 31, 2021	0%	0%	0%	25%	25%	Meeting to discuss indicators has been completed for Nigeria, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia and Niger	Marginally Satisfactory (MS)
Output 1.3: Learning and awareness-raising publications are developed and endorsed by at least 5 countries through participatory process and disseminated to improve understanding and monitoring of landscape system dynamics and the linkages between livelihood and conservation objectives	May 31, 2021	21%	49%	82%		95%	In progress. No major problem.	Satisfactory (S)
Activity 1.3.1: Translate and dissemination of 4 existing publications on SLM, landscape	April 30, 2017	42%	52%	97%	100%	100%	Completed. English version of Desertif' action disseminated to the English speaking GGW countries	Satisfactory (S)

Outputs ⁸	Expected completion date ⁹	Implementation status as of 30 June 2017 (%)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2018 (%)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2019 (%)	Implementation status as of 30 th June 2022(%)	Implementation status as of 30 th June 2023 (%)	Progress rating justification (as much as possible, describe in terms of immediate gains to target groups, e.g. access to project deliverables, participation in receiving services; gains in knowledge, etc)	Progress rating ¹⁰
dynamics and ecosystem services								
Activity 1.3.2: Publication of one Synthesis study on integrating environment and economic development through the GGW (endorsed by at least 5 countries)	December 31, 2018	16%	34%	97%	99%	99%	In review stage. Publication to proposed to be merged with the one on environmental economics and private sector engagement in the GGW. It is in the final stages of publishing.	Satisfactory (S)
Activity 1.3.3: Communication on the GGW Initiative	May 31, 2020	21%	79%	79%	100%	100%	In progress.	Satisfactory (S)
Output 1.4: 500 Government and NGO representatives trained in the use and interpretation of appropriate tools, including Total Economic Valuation of ecosystem goods and services	May 31, 2020	17%	48%	81%	100%	100%	In progress. More than 600 representatives from governments, NGOs and local level CSOs from 10 countries out of 11 countries participated in regional and national trainings and fora	Highly Satisfactory (HS)
Activity 1.4.1: 2 regional training on environmental economics (Valuation of ecosystem goods and services) and private sector engagement (participation of at least 5 countries each)	February 28, 2019	3%	7%	50%	100%	100%	In Progress. The private sector part is still being initiated.	Satisfactory (S)

Outputs ⁸	Expected completion date ⁹	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2017 (%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2018 (%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2019 (%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 th June 2022(%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 th June 2023 (%)	Progress rating justification (as much as possible, describe in terms of immediate gains to target groups, e.g. access to project deliverables, participation in receiving services; gains in knowledge, etc)	Progress rating ¹⁰
Activity 1.4.2: 4 trainings on Landscape Management Approaches and SLM (participation of at least 3 countries each)	May 31, 2020	33%	73%	73%	100%	100%	No major problem	Highly Satisfactory (HS)
Output 2.1: 10 networks strengthened at national and regional level and more engagement of civil society (especially marginalized group organizations) in government consultations and dialogue on the Great Green Wall and other SLM issues in all countries	May 31, 2020	15%	58%	75%	100%	100%	In progress	Satisfactory (S)
Activity 2.1.1: Identification of 5 national CSOs networks and support in participating in dialogues, regional networks and public dialogue on SLM, GGW and UNCCD	May 31, 2020	21%	74%	74%	100%	100%	More than 10 CSOs networks including national and regional are currently engaged in GGW dialogues through project activities. All the dialogues convened through the project have ensured the participation of CSOs	Satisfactory (S)
Activity 2.1.2: Engagement of 5 regional networks in projects activities	October 30, 2016	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	completed	Satisfactory (S)

Outputs ⁸	Expected completion date ⁹	Implementation status as of 30 June 2017 (%)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2018 (%)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2019 (%)	Implementation status as of 30 th June 2022(%)	Implementation status as of 30 th June 2023 (%)	Progress rating justification (as much as possible, describe in terms of immediate gains to target groups, e.g. access to project deliverables, participation in receiving services; gains in knowledge, etc)	Progress rating ¹⁰
Activity 2.1.3: Establishment of e-GGW network for 11 countries continually updated	May 31, 2020	7%	11%	43%	100%	100%	Online platform completed and launched in June 2020 Further activities to strengthen the participation of CSOs conducted through platform improvement and mobilization of CSOs through SOS-Sahel funded activity.	Satisfactory (S)
Output 2.2: Learning for a conducted for 11 countries to address specific challenges related to engagement of marginalized groups in SLM	May 31, 2020	3%	39%	69%	95%	95%		Satisfactory (S)
Activity 2.2.1: 1 Regional learning forum addressing specific challenges (previously identified), policy barriers and marginalized groups' engagement in SLM (target participation of 11 countries)	August 31, 2018	3%	88%	95%	95%	95%	Pending study on barrier to CSOs engagement	Satisfactory (S)
Activity 2.2.2: Publication of a report addressing policy barriers, marginalized groups and solutions	September 30, 2018	3%	20%	20%	95%	95%	Term of Reference ready Consultancy with SOS Sahel completed. Activity on mobilization of discussions on barriers completed through support to SOS Sahel to convene activity. Final report to be provided.	Satisfactory (S)
Activity 2.2.3: 1 regional learning forum on sustainable pastoralism,	May 31, 2019	3%	7%	88%	100%		Completed	Highly Satisfactory (HS)

Outputs ⁸	Expected completion date ⁹	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2017 (%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2018 (%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2019 (%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 th June 2022(%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 th June 2023 (%)	Progress rating justification (as much as possible, describe in terms of immediate gains to target groups, e.g. access to project deliverables, participation in receiving services; gains in knowledge, etc)	Progress rating ¹⁰
barriers and marginalization (target participation of 11 countries)								
Output 3.1: Training workshops for 11 countries to strengthen capacity of different actors (government, nongovernment and private sector) to identify and address policy implementation and investment barriers and opportunities	May 31, 2020	6%	18%	20%	100%	100%		Satisfactory (S)
Activity 3.1.1: 4 multi-country trainings on appropriate investment, policy barriers related and private sector engagement	May 31, 2020	6%	17%	20%	100%	100%	<p>The main problem is the identification of the private sector to engage with and being able to be much representative and able to galvanise others to engage in GGW/SLM. After many tentative in 2017 and 2018 to organise the training in synergy with other events, the activity is still not completed.</p> <p>Initial discussions commenced with UNEP, African Union and UNCCD with regards to engagement of private sector within the GGW</p> <p>The e-conference was a step in the right direction as it brought together private sector interest in the GGW. However, there is still more work to be done at country level in identifying key private sector players in land restoration.</p>	Satisfactory (S)

Outputs ⁸	Expected completion date ⁹	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2017 (%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2018 (%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2019 (%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 th June 2022(%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 th June 2023 (%)	Progress rating justification (as much as possible, describe in terms of immediate gains to target groups, e.g. access to project deliverables, participation in receiving services; gains in knowledge, etc)	Progress rating ¹⁰
Output 3.2: A set of guidelines for improved private sector engagement, including recognition of the role of local land managers as private investors and identification of suitable enabling and asset investments	May 31, 2021	3%	8%	79%	95%	95%	No major problem.	satisfactory (S)
Activity 3.2.1: Publication of a study on environmental economics of SLM and private sector engagement	May 31, 2021	3%	7%	79%	895	95%	Pending copy-editing, translation and publishing	Satisfactory (S)
Activity 3.2.2: Publication of a study on regional experiences in appropriate investments in sustainable pastoralism	May 31, May 31 2021	3%	7%	79%	95%	95%	Pending copy-editing, translation and publishing	Satisfactory (S)
Output 3.3: Local planning processes are improved in 30 locations through better participation of different stakeholder groups and sectors and greater capacity of those groups to articulate SLM	July 31, 2018	35%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Completed	Highly Satisfactory (HS)

Outputs ⁸	Expected completion date ⁹	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2017 (%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2018 (%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2019 (%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 th June 2022(%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 th June 2023 (%)	Progress rating justification (as much as possible, describe in terms of immediate gains to target groups, e.g. access to project deliverables, participation in receiving services; gains in knowledge, etc)	Progress rating ¹⁰
priorities and benefits								
Activity 3.3.1: 1 Regional training on local planning processes (participation of at least 5 countries)	April 30, 2018	39%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Completed	Highly Satisfactory (HS)
Activity 3.3.2: Support to 5 national partners to integrate SLM in local planning processes (target 6 locations per country)	July 31, 2018	32%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Completed. 5 trainings of trainers being conducted in 5 countries engaging at least 6 localities (communes) in each country.	Highly Satisfactory (HS)

3.3. Risk Rating

Please choose the most relevant risk (choose only 1 risk)

Check (X)	Risk
	Delayed funding e.g. disbursement or allotment
	Implementing partners e.g. delays or lack of capacity
	Insufficient funding
	Stability of the countries involved e.g. political, socio-economic, natural disasters
	UNEP administrative processes e.g. delays due to legal, HR, procurement
	Problems with project design e.g. changes to logframe, activities
	Recipient country/organization/institution e.g. lack of ownership, capacity, e.t.c.
(X)	Covid 19
	No implementation challenge for this period

Table A. Risk-log

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

Risk	Risk affecting:	Risk Rating							Variation respect to last rating		
	Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	MTR	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5 (this PIR)	PIR7	Δ	Justification
Risk 1	Outcomes 1-3	L	L	L	L	L		L	=	=	<i>This explanation should focus on what changed respect to the previous rating.</i>
Inadequate access to government stakeholders and decision making processes may constrain efforts towards multi-stakeholder dialogue.	All outcomes & outputs	M	M	M	M	L	L	L	=	=	The Great Green Wall process has increasingly been owned by the countries and the agencies continue to received national support in most countries following the support rendered by the Project to mobilize national Alliance meetings.
Some marginal groups might not be accepted in the networks. Particularly in countries with a history of conflict between pastoralists and farmers there are challenges with building a concerted voice.	All outcomes & outputs	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	=	=	The Project has continued to support the engagement of marginal groups in the last reporting year by funding CSOs engagement and mobilization for participation in the GW CSOs platform through SOS Sahel.
Insufficient Civil Society actors will be motivated to	All outcomes & outputs	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	=	=	

engage in the GGW and UNCCD processes											
Emergencies emerge within target countries that derail other policy discourse and focus all attention on emergency response	All outcomes & outputs	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	=	=	The GGW progress as a whole has not been greatly hampered regionally in it's implementation. Pockets of unrest in some countries has resulted in slow implementation but this may not be significant across the GGW.
Despite advocacy for pastoralists, overarching political conflicts or farmer-herder conflicts might be too severe to mitigate	All outcomes & outputs	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	=	=	Overarching conflicts between farmers and pastoralists remains low but still requiring attention.
GGW investment opportunities may be unattractive to private sector actors, providing low returns or high transaction costs	All outcomes & outputs	M	M	M	M	M	L	L	L	=	Following the GGW private sector conference that the Project supported, we are experiencing a surge of interest in increasing sustainable investments that support land restoration.
Market failures and other barriers to the GGWI may limit opportunities for capitalising on social and ecological values of SLM through innovations such as environmental performance vouchers and facilities for eco-risk capital and the sale of management rights.	All outcomes & outputs	H	H	H	H	H	M	M	M	=	Although this has cannot be illustrated extensively, the Project has helped to influence the discussion around sustainable land management and land restoration
Communication costs might be too high to afford a communication network which is dense enough to build a "critical mass."	All outcomes & outputs	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	=	The CSOs platform has been one that has promoted engagement and communication. However, there is still need for a channels of communication at different levels, national, local and regional, which the Project has supported through national Alliance meetings across different countries.
Risk <i>k</i>						M			L	↓	
Consolidated project risk		n.a	M	M	M	L			L	↓	<i>Risk rating is Low for the overall project.</i>

Table B. Outstanding medium & high risks

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

Risk											Additional mitigation measures for the next periods
------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIR _{t-1} , MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	What	When	By whom
Risk : Market failures and other barriers to the GGWI may limit opportunities for capitalising on social and ecological values of SLM through innovations such as environmental performance vouchers and facilities for eco-risk capital and the sale of management rights.	Socioeconomic analysis study	11 countries conducted baseline studies which included socioeconomic analysis	Regional Synthesis of the baseline studies	immediate	Consultants/GGW Panafrican Agency
Risk					
Risk					
:					
<i>Add rows as needed to reflect additional risks</i>					

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

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

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

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

Project Minor 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 Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines.

Please tick each category for which a change occurred in the fiscal year of reporting and provide a description of the change that occurred in the textbox. You may attach supporting document as appropriate.

- Results 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

[Annex document linked to reported minor amendment]

Minor amendments	<i>[Provide a description of the change that occurred in the fiscal year of reporting]</i>
	N/A

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 Required field	Latitude Required field	Longitude Required field	Geo Name ID Required field <i>if</i> the location is not an exact site	Location Description Optional text field	Activity Description Optional text field
Great Green Wall Region	16.7522	30.4689	3371321	Great Green Wall Region	

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

[Annex any linked geospatial file]

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

N/A