

GEF - PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR)

Document Generated by: BDLT TM

At: 2024-09-17 12:11:45

Table of contents

1 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION	3
1.1 Project Details	3
1.2 Project Description	4
1.3 Project Contacts.....	5
2 Overview of Project Status	7
2.1 UNEP PoW & UN.....	7
2.2. GEF Core and Sub Indicators.....	7
2.3. Implementation Status and Risks	7
2.4 Co Finance	8
2.5. Stakeholder.....	8
2.6. Gender	10
2.7. ESSM	10
2.8. KM/Learning	10
2.9. Stories	11
3 Performance	12
3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes	12
3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs (Implementation Progress)	19
4 Risks	24
4.1 Table A. Project management Risk	24
4.2 Table B. Risk-log.....	24
4.3 Table C. Outstanding Moderate, Significant, and High risks.....	25
5 Amendment - GeoSpatial	26
5.1 Table A: Listing of all Minor Amendment (TM).....	26
5.2 Table B: History of project revisions and/or extensions (TM)	26

UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2024
Reporting from 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024

1 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

1.1 Project Details

GEF ID: 3395	Umoja WBS: WBSE-SB-000686.09
SMA IPMR ID: 201115	Grant ID: S1-32GFL-000344
Project Short Title: NEPAD SIP Project	
Project Title: SIP: Institutional Support to New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) and Regional Economic Communities (RECs) for Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Scale-up in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA)	
Duration months planned:	48
Duration months age:	168
Project Type:	Full Sized Project (FSP)
Parent Programme if child project:	
Project Scope:	Regional
Region:	Africa
Countries:	
GEF Focal Area(s):	Land Degradation
GEF financing amount:	\$ 3,735,809.00
Co-financing amount:	\$ 6,014,550.00
Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval:	2010-05-26
UNEP Project Approval Date:	2010-08-26
Start of Implementation (PCA entering into force):	2010-08-26
Date of Inception Workshop, if available:	2011-11-30
Date of First Disbursement:	2010-11-15
Total disbursement as of 30 June 2024:	\$ 2,837,545.00

Total expenditure as of 30 June:	\$ 2,837,545.00
Midterm undertaken?:	No
Actual Mid-Term Date, if taken:	
Expected Mid-Term Date, if not taken:	2017-08-30
Completion Date Planned - Original PCA:	2014-06-30
Completion Date Revised - Current PCA:	2019-06-30
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date:	2019-06-30
Expected Financial Closure Date:	2019-12-31

1.2 Project Description

Land degradation is recognized as a global threat that is particularly manifest in SSA. As such, a regional approach is needed to investments to enhance the ability of sub-Saharan stakeholders to catalyze the scale up of local actions that in aggregation will secure global environmental benefits, while reducing the overall cost of securing these benefits. In response to this need GEF has approved the Strategic Investment Program (SIP) for SLM in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) within the TerrAfrica shared vision to scale up implementation of SLM activities.

An important crosscutting element within the SIP is the project “Institutional Support to New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) and Regional Economic Communities (RECs) for Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Scale-up in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA)”. This project anchors the SIP portfolio through channeling services to countries, through the respective Regional Economic Communities, to improve and benefit from Knowledge Management (KM) and M&E tools. Specifically, it aims to support SSA countries in the planning, implementation, and monitoring of programmatic SLM investments in order to (i) support SSA countries in improving natural resource based livelihoods by reducing land degradation (development objective); and (ii) prevent and reduce the impact of land degradation on ecosystem services in SIP investment areas (global environmental objective). The project is set up using an ecosystem approach and capitalizes on NEPAD and the RECs comparative advantages of enhancing African development processes. The project comprises five components.

Component 1 focuses on regional coalition building to enhance capacities for negotiation, lobbying and advocacy for the effective use of M&E and knowledge to inform and guide policy and investment planning processes. Within this component, strategies and mechanisms for effective advocacy and leadership will be developed. This coalition building provides a critical basis for the enhancement of awareness, skills and support to influence and shape policy and planning processes utilizing M&E and KM approaches described in the components below. The project will build on the considerable work already done with NEPAD and RECs on TerrAfrica as well as CAADP and EAP and the sub-regional environmental action plans. Component 2 seeks to enhance regional knowledge management (including M&E) aiming at strengthening capacities of the stakeholders to more effectively collect, analyze, manage and access valid data and information at the levels of discrete project, national program, and regional

program. Mechanisms will be advanced that allow data and information to be utilized for learning, knowledge generation, policy and practice across the investment portfolio. This includes development of appropriate guidelines, methodologies and tools as well as enhancement of skills and technical know-how of stakeholders. This will lead into generation of data and information sets which will be made available for decision making in/and policy formulation. This component 2 is further contributed to through component 3 which involves support to country SLM programs seeking to enhance the capacities of stakeholders at all levels to more effectively engage in and support knowledge management and peer learning. Thus the effectiveness of the SLM investment portfolio will be strengthened at country and regional levels. This component starts with developing effective strategies and mechanisms for knowledge management. Secondly the awareness, skills and support for KM will be enhanced. Also knowledge and lessons learned on SLM will be documented and disseminated. Component 4 focuses on improved SIP Programme coordination through establishing and strengthening the SLM Service Network structures and procedures. Within this component M&E and KM portfolio progress and performance will be reviewed and reflected upon for learning and strategic and operational management. Component 5 deals with overall project management and will ensure a well coordinated and managed implementation of the project. The first four components are specifically geared towards capacity development processes.

These 5 building blocks contribute to meeting the SIP goals of regional knowledge exchange and common M&E approaches, and help strengthen the overall GEF portfolio in Africa while promoting greater mainstreaming of SLM into national planning. By enhancing the enabling environment through the removal of specific barriers, including institutional and governance, knowledge and technology and financial and economic, this project will help SSA countries in scaling up SLM. SSA countries can also better secure regional and global environmental assets and natural resource-based livelihoods by preventing and reducing the impact of land degradation on ecosystem services in priority areas.

1.3 Project Contacts

Division(s) Implementing the project	Ecosystems Division
Name of co-implementing Agency	
Executing Agency (ies)	NEPAD Secretariat (in collaboration with WB, UNDP, IFAD, FAO, AfDB in GEF TerrAfrica SIP)
names of Other Project Partners	
UNEP Portfolio Manager(s)	Johan Robinson
UNEP Task Manager(s)	Adamou Bouhari
UNEP Budget/Finance Officer	Paul Vrontamitis
UNEP Support Assistants	Eric Mugo
Manager/Representative	
Project Manager	
Finance Manager	
Communications Lead, if relevant	



2 Overview of Project Status

2.1 UNEP PoW & UN

UNEP Current Subprogramme(s):	Thematic: Nature action subprogramme
UNEP previous Subprogramme(s):	Productive and Healthy Ecosystem
PoW Indicator(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nature: (iii) Number of countries and national, regional and subnational authorities and entities that incorporate, with UNEP support, biodiversity and ecosystem-based approaches into development and sectoral plans, policies and processes for the sustainable management and/or restoration of terrestrial, freshwater and marine areas
UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages	This is a regional project. It links to all african countries national agenda on the UNCCD Convention.
Link to relevant SDG Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goal 15: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss
Link to relevant SDG Targets:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15.3 By 2030, combat desertification, restore degraded land and soil, including land affected by desertification, drought and floods, and strive to achieve a land degradation-neutral world

2.2. GEF Core and Sub Indicators

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

Indicators	Targets - Expected Value			Materialized to date
	Mid-term	End-of-project	Total Target	
	(NULL)			

Implementation Status 2024: 9th PIR

2.3. Implementation Status and Risks

	PIR#	Rating towards outcomes (section 3.1)	Rating towards outputs (section 3.2)	Risk rating (section 4.2)
FY 2024	9th PIR	U	U	S
FY 2023	8th PIR	U	U	S
FY 2022	7th PIR	U	U	S

FY 2021	6th PIR	U	U	S
FY 2020	5th PIR	U	MS	M
FY 2019	4th PIR	MU	MS	M
FY 2018	3rd PIR	MU	MS	M
FY 2017	2nd PIR	MS	MS	M
FY 2016				
FY 2015				

Summary of status

This project is currently not active. The project executing partner, the NEPAD Secretariat was wound up prior to completion of the project activities. UNEP is in the process of negotiating the reinitiation of the project activities with the regional partners, the Regional Economic Commissions involved in the project.

2.4 Co Finance

Planned Co-finance:	\$ 6,014,550
Actual to date:	549,890
Progress	<p>Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges:</p> <p>The project cofinancing has not experience significant increase since 2017 because of the project cession of activities as result as EA dismantlement and issues of questionable reporting which led UNEP to stoping the project until an audit is undertaken. However, as the EA ceased to exist and the agreement ended, the project is being revamped with a UNCCD Accredited NGO and directly with RECs secretariat. The momentum is expected to lead to the project conclusion with real impact on monitoring LDN in Africa region and it will serve as a model for the entire UNCCD countries on LDN monitoring in line with SDG 15.</p>

2.5. Stakeholder

Date of project steering	2011-11-30
---------------------------------	------------

committee meeting	
Stakeholder engagement (will be uploaded to GEF Portal)	The discussion with Regional Economic Commissions has raised hope to see an africa wide dynamic in monitoring LDN and use information from different sub-region to accelerate LDN targets achivement in Africa.

2.6. Gender

Does the project have a gender action plan?	Yes
Gender mainstreaming (will be uploaded to GEF Portal):	The project is policy based and regional in nature without activities executed on the ground. However, the revamping with LDN targets will be done with clear consideration of gender mainstreaming and equity in the assessment and the recommendations for acceleration LDN target which will be tabled to policy makers.

2.7. ESSM

Moderate/High risk projects (in terms of Environmental and social safeguards)	Was the project classified as moderate/high risk CEO Endorsement/Approval Stage? No If yes, what specific safeguard risks were identified in the SRIF/ESERN?
New social and/or environmental risks	Have any new social and/or environmental risks been identified during the reporting period? No If yes, describe the new risks or changes?
Complaints and grievances related to social and/or environmental impacts	Has the project received complaints related to social and/or environmental impacts (actual or potential) during the reporting period? No If yes, please describe the complaint(s) or grievance(s) in detail, including the status, significance, who was involved and what actions were taken?
Environmental and social safeguards management	The social and environmental safeguards issues will be considered in the next cycle with focus on ESS related to LDN targets acceleration in Africa.

2.8. KM/Learning

Knowledge activities and products	The regional approach to assessing LDN target has been a learning process during the cycle. The development of revised work Plan and roadmap has been a learning participative process. the assessment os status of LDN implementation in the next cycle will be an
--	---

	important learning for the project and stakeholders.
Main learning during the period	Regional approach for addressing LDN target achievements and way for accelerating have been key learning process for the project.

2.9. Stories

Stories to be shared	Not yet generated
-----------------------------	-------------------

3 Performance

3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period(numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
Support SSA countries in the planning and implementation of programmatic investments to scale up SLM using an ecosystem approach in order to:- Support SSA countries in improving natural-resource based livelihoods by reducing land-degradations (development objective); and- Preventing and reducing the impact of land degradation on ecosystem services in SIP investment areas (global environmental	1. Increasing use of SIP results and lessons to inform PRSP and sectoral strategies, as well as Global conventions and regional agreements	Baseline data unavailable, but It will be provided through “Consultancy - Development of SIP Indicator “ replaned for beginning of Year 3.	To be defined by the consultancy on baseline data	Gradual increase in numbers of countries incorporating SLM priority issues in PRSPs and sectoral strategies	60%	26 countries have defined SLM as priority in their national policies and strategies	MS
Support SSA countries in the planning and implementation of programmatic investments to scale up SLM using an ecosystem approach in order to:- Support SSA	2. Positive trend in score on Composite Index for SLM Enabling Environment among investment countries	Baseline data unavailable, but It will be provided through “Consultancy - Development of SIP Indicator “ replaned	To be defined by the consultancy on baseline data	Gradual increase in numbers of countries incorporating SLM priority issues in PRSPs and sectoral strategies	60%	26 countries have defined SLM as priority in their national policies and strategies	MS

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period(numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
countries in improving natural-resource based livelihoods by reducing land-degradations (development objective); and- Preventing and reducing the impact of land degradation on ecosystem services in SIP investment areas (global environmental		for beginning of Year 3.					
Support SSA countries in the planning and implementation of programmatic investments to scale up SLM using an ecosystem approach in order to:- Support SSA countries in improving natural-resource based livelihoods by reducing land-degradations (development objective); and- Preventing and reducing the impact of land degradation on ecosystem services in SIP investment areas (global environmental	3. 60% change in SLM applications adopted by land users in SIP investment areas, against baseline data	Baseline data unavailable, but it will be provided through "Consultancy - Development of SIP Indicator " replanned for beginning of Year 3.	To be defined by the consultancy on baseline data	Gradual increase in numbers of countries incorporating SLM priority issues in PRSPs and sectoral strategies	60%	26 countries have defined SLM as priority in their national policies and strategies	MS
Outcome 1:Enhanced capacities for negotiation,	1. Regional, sub-regional, national and	Inadequate capacities for	At least 15% increase in numbers	At least 30% increase in numbers	60	Through The Training of journalists of	S

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
lobbying and advocacy for the effective use of M&E and knowledge to inform and guide policy and planning processes	sub-national organizations demonstrate increased capacity for SLM advocacy and demonstrate the capacity and political will to align their respective programs under agreed upon strategic priorities and reasons behind successes/challenges	negotiation, lobbying and advocacy for effective M&E use and knowledge to inform and guide policy and planning.	of country level SLM platforms and networks demonstrate increased capacity for and actively engaged in SLM advocacy by Yr 3 .	of country level SLM platforms and networks demonstrate increased capacity for and actively engaged in SLM advocacy by Yr. 4		rural radio broadcasting-Dissemination of SLM best practices organized by TerrAfrica Secretariat, The West Africa journalist coalition for SWLM has been implemented that will support SIP project advocacy activities.	
Outcome 1: Enhanced capacities for negotiation, lobbying and advocacy for the effective use of M&E and knowledge to inform and guide policy and planning processes	2. Number of donor platforms tabling discussions around SLM policy/practices and reasons for/against	2. Number of donor platforms tabling discussions around SLM policy/practices and reasons for/against		Discussions around SLM policy/practice tabled in at least 70% of donor platform discussions attended by RECs/NEPAD	60%	2 Country strategic investment completed last year (Togo and Niger) 3 other are on-going (Burkina Faso, Lesotho and Senegal	S
Outcome 1: Enhanced capacities for negotiation, lobbying and advocacy for the effective use of M&E and knowledge to inform and guide policy and planning processes	3. Concrete decisions around changes in SLM policy/practice arising from regional level forums	Knowledge and lessons on SLM not fully utilized to inform and negotiate in policy and planning.		Decision sheets outlining core changes to SLM policy and practice as a result of regional policy forums	60%	Not available	S
Outcome 2: Stakeholders more effectively collecting, analyzing, managing and	1. 60% increase in numbers of countries and SIP operations	Insufficient guidelines, methodologies and	By Yr. 3 , at least 40% of countries and SIP operations	• At least 60% of countries and SIP operations	60%	Work on aggregation and harmonisation of SLWM M&E systems focusing on key SLWM indicators has been undertaken in ECOWAS	S

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period(numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
accessing valid data and information	effectively utilizing the SIP indicators tool-kit (incorporating and assessing SIP indicators) and reasons for use/non-use	tools for data collection at different levels.	incorporating and reporting (as relevant and appropriate to their specific context)	incorporating and reporting (as relevant and appropriate to their specific context).		and COMESA Report on the Special Project Steering Committee Meeting - September 2013 -with a full attendance of all RECs and NPCA staff. PIRs submittedLessons learned for decision makers from a review of experiences of the TerrAfrica strategic investment programme on SLM in Sub-Saharan Africa (SIP) under the NEPAD TerrAfrica partnership framework 2016Baseline for land degradation and restoration in Africa Presented in April 2017 in Ouagadougou.	
Outcome 2: Stakeholders more effectively collecting, analyzing, managing and accessing valid data and information	Regular reports on SIP progress and performance, aggregating Program level indicators, discussed during annual stakeholder and steering committee and resulting in new lessons and decisions	Insufficient data and information sets generated and made available for decision making at different levels	undefined	Program progress and performance reported on an annual basis using Program level aggregation of core indicators, and resulting in decision-sheets and lessons learnt document	50%	Rapport on the Special Project Steering Committee Meeting - December 08th, 2011 in the margins of the seventeenth session of the Conference of Parties (COP 17) of the United Nations Framework Convention to Combat Climate Change (UNFCCC), in Durban, South Africa with a success attendance of all RECs stakeholders and NPCA Staff	MS
Outcome 2: Stakeholders more effectively collecting, analyzing, managing and accessing valid data and information	3. Types of M&E guidelines being utilized at country and operations level and reasons for use or non-use	Inadequate skills and technical know how of stakeholders at different levels (for data collection and information	No yet defined At least 60% of guidelines generated being effectively utilized of countries and	At least 80% of guidelines generated being effectively utilized of countries	40%	Activity on-going, but slow pending M&E consultancy at RECs level	MU

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period(numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
		management).	operations by Yr. 3 .				
Outcome 3:Stakeholders at all levels more effectively engaging in and supporting knowledge management and peer learning to strengthen the effectiveness of the SLM investment portfolio	1. 50% increase in countries and SIP operations actively generating, communicating and utilizing new knowledge on SLM policy and practice	Lack of effective strategies and mechanisms for knowledge management at all levels.	At least 30% increase/annum in numbers of countries and SIP operations generating new knowledge products (including best practice/lessons learnt)	At least 30% increase/annum in numbers of countries and SIP operations generating new knowledge products (including best practice/lessons learnt)	40%	NEPAD SLWM Knowledge management roadmap has been developed and its implementation underway through the (i) Inventory of the existing TerrAfrica knowledge management tools (Step 1) , (ii)the Collection for update knowledge management tools (Step 2) and (iii) the knowledge assessment needs (Step 3) .	MU
Outcome 3:Stakeholders at all levels more effectively engaging in and supporting knowledge management and peer learning to strengthen the effectiveness of the SLM investment portfolio	2. 50% increase in numbers of country, regional and program level SLM platforms and networks integrating discussions around best practices generated through the overall SIP Program and reasons behind increase/not	Lack of awareness, skills and support for knowledge management and learning	Not Defined	Communication and knowledge products reach at least 60% of key stakeholders (disaggregated by region, country and type) with at least 75% expressing high level of satisfaction with content and form	50%	26 countries are implementing SLM programs; ECOWAS launched officially their SLM program. ECCAS and COMESA are preparing the launching of their programs	S
Outcome 3:Stakeholders at all levels more effectively engaging in and supporting knowledge management and peer learning to strengthen the effectiveness of the SLM investment portfolio	3. Effectiveness of regional learning workshops as knowledge generation and learning platforms	Inadequate documentation and dissemination of knowledge and lessons /experiences on SLM.	n	At least 75% of participants express high level satisfaction with the extent to which regional learning workshops have	40%	Only ECOWAS has a regional learning workshop, where 90% of the participants expressed high level satisfaction	MS

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
				been effective as knowledge generation and learning platforms			
Outcome 3: Stakeholders at all levels more effectively engaging in and supporting knowledge management and peer learning to strengthen the effectiveness of the SLM investment portfolio	4. Numbers, types and perceptions of stakeholders on utility and usefulness of TerrAfrica knowledge base	Baseline data not yet available, but Consulting for training needs assessment & documentation (planning for oct - dec 2011) will collect and offer it.	Not defined	At least 30% increase in users accessing TerrAfrica knowledge base/annum (disaggregated by country/region/type) with at least 60% of users expressing high level of satisfaction with content and utility	40%	TerrAfrica knowledge product has been disseminated during side event December 08th, 2011 in the margins of the seventeenth session of the Conference of Parties (COP 17) of the United Nations Framework Convention to Combat Climate Change (UNFCCC), in Durban	MS
Outcome 4: SIP Program effectively and efficiently managed	1. REC and NEPAD effectively manage SIP operations, including active and effectively supporting M&E and KM across the Program	Project Management structures and processes (Service network structures and processes) not yet well established.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audits and assessments indicate high level of satisfaction with the degree to which financial and procurement policies are adhered to by end of Yr. 2 and onwards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audits and assessments indicate high level of satisfaction with the degree to which financial and procurement policies are adhered to by end of Yr. 2 and onwards 	40%	NEPAD SLM Team has been strengthened with a recruitment of a communication and advocacy expert.	MS
Outcome 4: SIP Program effectively and efficiently managed	2. Country level stakeholders express high level of satisfaction	SIP program and performance indicators for	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 60% of Stakeholders (at operations, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 60% of Stakeholders (at operations, 	30%	Overall implementation level of the NEPAD-REC project has been slow due to the delay in the signing of LOA at RECs	MU

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period(numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
	with REC and NEPAD management of SIP and support to SIP operations and activities	regular program review and learning not yet established.	country and regional level) express high level satisfaction with REC and NEPAD support and management of SIP by beginning of Yr. 3 and onwards	country and regional level) express high level satisfaction with REC and NEPAD support and management of SIP by beginning of Yr. 3 and onwards		level. But 3 out of the 4 RECs have signed now, which should enable implementation to be speeded on the ground.	
Outcome 4: SIP Program effectively and efficiently managed	1. Collaborative agreements effectively implemented	Collaborative agreements not yet established for SIP Program.	All parties express high level satisfaction with regards to implementation of collaborative agreements annually	parties express high level satisfaction with regards to implementation of collaborative agreements annually	40%	Implementation of collaborative agreements between NEPAD, ECOWAS, ECCAS, COMESA and EcoAgriculture partners through the signing of the Letter Of Agreement and adoption of the work plan	MS
Outcome 5: Project Management structures and processes established and functioning	2) Staff with necessary skills and expertise recruited	Any staff not yet recruited	All required staff in place with clear ToRs by the end of Year one	All required staff in place with clear ToRs by the end of Year one	50%	Recruitment of communication and advocacy officer Recruitment of M&E Officer	MS
Outcome 5: Project Management structures and processes established and functioning	2) Office equipment necessary for smooth running of KM &M&E secretariat acquired	Office equipment not yet acquired by project secretariat	All required staff in place with clear ToRs by the end of Year one	All necessary & budgeted for office equipment purchased by the end of Year one	50%		MS
Outcome 5: Project Management structures and processes established and	2) Operational procedures/manuals for effective management	Any operational procedures/manuals for effective	Any operational procedures/manuals for effective	Operational management procedures and	40%	Organization of a special steering committee meeting Finalization of the work plan and budget by ECOWAS, ECCAS,	MS

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
functioning	and administration developed in consultation with REC representatives	management and administration of the programm not yet developed by both NEPAD and RECs	management and administration of the programm not yet developed by both NEPAD and RECs	policies in place by end of Year one		COMESA and EcoAgriculture	
Outcome 5: Project Management structures and processes established and functioning	Financial management procedures and procurement policies developed and necessary software acquired	Financial, policy, technical management procedures and tools not yet acquired.	Financial, policy, technical management procedures and tools not yet acquired.	Financial management procedures and policies in place by end of Year one	40%	The reporting templates and financial management system of COMESA and ECCAS has been improved for better manage the SIP project.	MS

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

Component	Output/Activity	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%)	Implementation status as of current reporting period (%)	Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress Rating
1 Output 1: Regional Coalition Building - Enhanced capacities for negotiation, lobbying and advocacy for the effective	Activity 1: Multiple approaches and mechanisms for linking knowledge (including science & local/indigenous knowledge), technology, practice and policy developed	2024-12-31	50	50	No activities were undertaken in the reporting period	U

Component	Output/Activity	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%)	Implementation status as of current reporting period (%)	Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress Rating
	use of M&E and knowledge to inform and guide policy and planning processes.					
1 Output 1: Regional Coalition Building - Enhanced capacities for negotiation, lobbying and advocacy for the effective use of M&E and knowledge to inform and guide policy and planning processes.	Activity 2: Best practices/lessons learnt, tools & guidelines and relevant documents with a specific focus on linking knowledge, science, practice and policy for SLM developed and disseminated	2024-12-31	50	50	No activities were undertaken in the reporting period	U
1 Output 1: Regional Coalition Building -	Activity 3 : SLM platforms and network (for example Communities of Practice; Thematic Groups) strengthened for enhancing their engagement in influencing and shaping policy and planning processes	2024-12-31	50	50	No activities were undertaken in the reporting period	U

Component	Output/Activity	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%)	Implementation status as of current reporting period (%)	Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress Rating
Enhanced capacities for negotiation, lobbying and advocacy for the effective use of M&E and knowledge to inform and guide policy and planning processes.						
2 Output 2: Regional Knowledge Management (focusing on M&E) - Stakeholders more effectively collecting, analyzing, managing and accessing valid data and	Activity 1 : SIP Indicators toolkit developed and disseminated Activity 2 : Methodology for program level aggregation of data & information developed and agreed on Activity 3: Guidelines on different options & types of data collection methodologies that can be used in different contexts, capacities etc. developed and disseminated. Activity 4 : Establish resource base on relevant M&E guidelines methods and tools and make available to SIP stakeholders and wider community Activity 5 : Appropriate training materials for use at different levels and for different stakeholders developed Activity 6 : Stakeholders at different levels trained in the use of data collection, analysis and management methods and tools Activity 7 : Peer network of subject matter specialists and experts (with mandates and relevant experience on SLM, including KM and M&E for SLM) established and accessible to different stakeholders Activity 8 : Key SLM benchmarks identified and agreed on Activity 9 : Data and information against benchmarks regularly collected, analyzed and made accessible to countries through	2024-12-31	50	50	No activities were undertaken in the reporting period	U

Component	Output/Activity	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%)	Implementation status as of current reporting period (%)	Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress Rating
information	a collaborative approach, drawing on existing sources where possible Activity 10 : Conduct impact assessments and peer reviews (based on NEPAD peer review system) Activity 11 : Data and information on cross-border ecosystems and biodiversity collected and made available (e.g. Land degradation, EIAs)					
3 Output 3: Support to Country Program - Stakeholders at all levels more effectively engaging in and supporting knowledge management and peer learning (*including community levels) to strengthen the effectiveness of the SLM investment portfolio	Activity 1 : Knowledge management strategy developed, based on an ecosystem approach. Activity 2 : Establishment/strengthening of effective program/continental, regional and national SLM knowledge management mechanisms and processes Activity 3: Values of KM&M&E assessed, documented and disseminated to key stakeholders using appropriate communication media Activity 4 : Stakeholders trained in appropriate KM strategies, processes and tools (including process skills, such as facilitation of learning events and learning networks) Activity 5 : Stakeholders provided with technical support to facilitate and promote knowledge generation and peer learning at community/local levels Activity 6 : Regional learning events on policy, technology, monitoring and different thematic topics convened Activity 7 : Best practices and lessons on SLM (e.g. technology, policies, strategies) identified and disseminated using appropriate media for different target audiences (including video, radio etc)	2024-12-31	50	50	No activities undertaken during the reporting period	U
4 Output 4:	Activity 1 : SLM coordination units and task forces established and	2024-12-31	50	50	No project activities were undertaken	U

Component	Output/Activity	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%)	Implementation status as of current reporting period (%)	Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress Rating
SIP Program Coordination - SIP Program effectively and efficiently managed	functioning in each region Activity 2 : Specialized agencies identified and partnership arrangements for effective technical support on KM and M&E established between agencies, RECs, and NEPAD Activity 3 : NEPAD M&E and KM Secretariat and RECs SLM coordination unit trained in key topics required for SIP program management and coordination based on a training needs assessment Activity 4 : Program implementers regularly reflect on program progress and performance, identify lessons learnt and use this to review and strengthen strategies and operations as necessary Activity 5 : Program implementers regularly report on program progress and performance (horizontally and vertically) through aggregating and utilizing M&E information and best practice Activity 6 : Program progress and performance regularly evaluated				during the reporting period	
5 Output 5: Project Management	Activity 1 : Functional management structure in place Activity 2 : Operational procedures/manuals for management and administration developed Activity 3 : Financial and procurement management systems in place	2024-12-31	50	50	No project activities were undertaken during the reporting period	U

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

4 Risks

4.1 Table A. Project management Risk

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

Risk Factor	EA Rating	TM Rating
1 Management structure - Roles and responsibilities	Moderate	Low
2 Governance structure - Oversight	Moderate	Low
3 Implementation schedule	Moderate	High
4 Budget	Moderate	Low
5 Financial Management	Moderate	Substantial
6 Reporting	Moderate	Low
7 Capacity to deliver	Moderate	Low

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

4.2 Table B. Risk-log

Implementation Status (Current PIR)

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.

Risks	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Current PIR	Δ	Justification
Delays in the project implementation	All outcomes/outputs							H	↑	Due to resources use issues and the circumstance related to NEPAD reforms the project EA has changed

Risks	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Current PIR	Δ	Justification
Delays in the project delivery due to resources use issues and decision to go for a new dynamic in the framework of LDN targets								H	↑	

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

Additional mitigation measures for the next periods

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	What	When	By Whom
Delays in the project delivery due to resources use issues and	Conduct an independent audit	Revamping of the project with new EA	Discussions and planning in collaboration with RECs . ENDA and UNEP	During the cycle	UNEP. ENDA and RECS
Implementation schedule					
Financial Management					

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

5 Amendment - GeoSpatial

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

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

Minor Amendments	Changes
Results Framework:	Yes
Components and Cost:	No
Institutional and implementation arrangements:	Yes
Financial Management:	Yes
Implementation Schedule:	
Executing Entity:	Yes
Executing Entity Category:	No
Minor project objective change:	No
Safeguards:	No
Risk analysis:	No
Increase of GEF financing up to 5%:	No
Location of project activity:	No
Other:	No

Minor amendments

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

Version	Type	Signed/Approved by UNEP	Entry Into Force (last signature Date)	Agreement Expiry Date	Main changes introduced in this revision

Version	Type	Signed/Approved by UNEP	Entry Into Force (last signature Date)	Agreement Expiry Date	Main changes introduced in this revision
	Amendment & Extension	2015-07-17	2015-07-17	2017-06-30	Agreement extension and workplan revision
	Extension	2017-06-30	2017-06-30	2019-06-30	Agreement extension and workplan revision

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 Description	Activity Description
The project is a regional Capacity Building project with no physical activities on the ground					

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

n/a

[Annex any linked geospatial file]