



PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR)

for the project:

Regional Capacity building of COMESA Member States in Eastern and Southern Africa for Enhanced Transparency in Climate Change Monitoring, Reporting and Verification as defined in the Paris Agreement

Regional
(The Comoros, Eritrea, Seychelles, Zambia)

FY23

July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023

Executing Partners



**REGIONAL CENTRE FOR
MAPPING OF RESOURCES
FOR DEVELOPMENT**

Project Information			
Project Title:	Regional capacity building of COMESA member states in Eastern and Southern Africa for enhanced transparency in Climate Change Monitoring, Reporting and Verification as defined in the Paris Agreement.		
Country(ies):	Regional (the Comoros, Eritrea, Seychelles, Zambia)	GEF ID:	10093
GEF Agency(ies):	Conservation International	Duration In Months:	57 Months
Executing Agency(ies):	<p><u>Executing Agency:</u> The Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) - Climate Change Unit.</p> <p><u>Partners:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry Agriculture, Fisheries, Environment, Territory Planning and Urban, The Comoros • Ministry of Water, Land and Environment, Eritrea • Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change, Seychelles • Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources, Zambia • The Vital Signs Monitoring Programme. <p>The Regional Center for Mapping. Resources for Development (RCMRD).</p>	Actual Implementation Start Date:	January 2023
GEF Focal Area(s):	Climate Change	Expected Project Completion Date:	September 30, 2027
GEF Grant Amount:	4,200,000	Expected Financial Closure Date:	March 31, 2028
Expected Co-financing:	1,546,000	Date of Last Steering Committee Meeting:	N/A project has not started implementation yet
Co-financing Realized as of June 30, 2023:	N/A – project hasn't started implementation yet. Partners are re-confirming committed amounts.	Mid-Term Review-Planned Date:	May 2025
Date of First Disbursement:	March 31, 2023	Mid-Term Review-Actual Date:	TBD
Cumulative disbursement as of June 30, 2023	\$545,219	Terminal Evaluation-Planned Date:	TBD
PIR Prepared by:	Victor Esendi	Terminal Evaluation-Actual Date:	TBD
CI-GEF Project Manager:	Charity Nalyanya Laureen Cheruiyot	CI-GEF Finance Lead:	Elizabeth Mast

Minor Amendment Categories	Minor Amendment Justification Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5%. Please select the box that is most applicable for FY23 and include an explanation for the minor amendment request.
Results Framework <input type="checkbox"/>	
Components and cost <input type="checkbox"/>	
Institutional and implementation arrangements <input type="checkbox"/>	
Financial management <input type="checkbox"/>	
Implementation schedule <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The implementation period was increased due delays in start-up of the project. There was delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA (Executing Agency).
Executing Entity <input type="checkbox"/>	
Executing Entity Category <input type="checkbox"/>	
Minor project objective change <input type="checkbox"/>	
Safeguards <input type="checkbox"/>	
Risk analysis <input type="checkbox"/>	
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5% <input type="checkbox"/>	
Co-financing <input type="checkbox"/>	
Location of project activity <input type="checkbox"/>	
Other <input type="checkbox"/>	

MINOR AMENDMENT RESPONSE FROM CI-GEF

All the minor amendments have been approved by CI-GEF

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

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

SECTION I: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS STATUS SUMMARY

PROJECT SUMMARY

The overall objective is “To strengthen capacity of COMESA member States to comply with Transparency Requirements of the Paris Agreement through establishment of an Eastern and Southern Africa Regional CBIT transparency framework for Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) of climate actions, report on Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and knowledge dissemination”.

To accomplish the targets, the project will include four components:

Component 1: Strengthen national and regional transparency frameworks for Monitoring and Tracking NDCs and climate actions,

Component 2: Strengthen capacity of stakeholders from participating countries to measure, report and verify emissions in AFOLU and other IPCC sectors,

Component 3: Establishment of a regional CBIT integrated platform for learning and knowledge management of transparency related activities and

Component 4: Monitoring and Evaluation

PRIOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION STATUS

N/A. This is the first PIR.

CURRENT PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION STATUS (FY23)

The project was officially launched during the inception meeting in Mahe, Seychelles in February 2023. A partner meeting was held between 6th and 7th March 2023, with the main objective being to introduce each partner to their role on the project ahead of the inception meeting. The outcome was clarity on project goals and work plan.

The regional inception workshop was held from 8th to 10th March 2023 at Savoy Seychelles Resort and Spa in Mahe, Seychelles. The workshop brought together technical experts from the respective Ministries in three (3) participating Member States namely, the Comoros, Seychelles, and Zambia. Eritrea was not able to participate due to other national priorities but there are plans for a national inception workshop in FY24. Days 1 and 2 (8th and 9th March 2023) focused on the project launch and partner planning meeting. This was followed by a training session on the CIGEF’s financial, procurement, and reporting requirements including prohibited practices, reporting templates, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E), and environmental and social safeguards.

The total number of participants at the inception workshop was 20 (65% men and 35% women). During this period, national-level inception meetings took place in Seychelles, Eritrea, and Zambia.

SUMMARY: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS STATUS

PROJECT PART	PRIOR FY22 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	CURRENT FY23 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING ¹	RATING TREND ²
OBJECTIVE	N/A This is the first year of implementation therefore, there is no prior project implementation rating.	MS	N/A This is the first year of implementation therefore, there is no prior project implementation rating.

¹ **Implementation Progress (IP) Rating:** Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more details about IP rating, please see the Appendix I of this report

² **Rating trend:** Improving, Unchanged, or Decreasing

PROJECT PART	PRIOR FY22 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	CURRENT FY23 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING ¹	RATING TREND ²
COMPONENTS AND OUTCOMES	N/A	MS	N/A This is the first year of implementation therefore, there is no prior project implementation rating.
ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS		N/A (No planned ESMF activities were implemented due to a delay in signing of the grant agreement with COMESA)	N/A This is the first year of implementation therefore, there is no prior project implementation rating.

PROJECT RISK RATING³

RISKS	N/A This is the first year of implementation	H	N/A This is the first year of implementation
-------	--	---	--

³ Risk Rating: Low (L), Moderate (M), Substantial (S), High (H)

SECTION II: PROJECT RESULTS IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS STATUS AND RATING

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

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

a. Progress towards Achieving Project Expected Objective:

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

PROJECT OBJECTIVE:	To strengthen capacity of COMESA Member States to comply with Transparency Requirements of the Paris Agreement through establishment of an Eastern and Southern Africa Regional CBIT transparency framework for Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) of climate actions, report on NDCs and knowledge dissemination.
---------------------------	--

OBJECTIVE INDICATORS	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ⁴	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
Indicator a: Number of countries with a national GHG inventory system that is compliant with IPCC requirements <i>(Target: 4 Countries)</i>	Implementation has not yet started due to delays.	NS	There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in the start of implementation.
Indicator b: Number of stakeholders (men and women) from each country skilled to collect, process and feed GHG data into the GHG inventory system. <i>(Target: 688 direct beneficiaries with 30% female)</i>	Implementation has not yet started due to delays in signing agreement with COMESA.	NS	There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
Indicator c: Number of National Transparency strategies and Action plans as well as one Regional Transparency Strategy and Action plan developed to facilitate enhanced transparency <i>(Target: 4 National Transparency strategies and Action</i>	Implementation has not yet started due to delays in signing agreement with COMESA.	NS	There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.

⁴ **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

OBJECTIVE INDICATORS	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ⁴	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
<i>plans and 1 one Regional Transparency; 1 Regional Transparency strategies and Action plans)</i>			
Indicator d: Number of regional platforms for learning and knowledge management established (<i>Target: 1 functional regional platform</i>)	Implementation has not yet started due to delays in signing agreement with COMESA.	NS	There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
Indicator e: Number of national academic institutions with gender mainstreamed systems strengthened to train stakeholders to transparently measure, report and verify emissions on agriculture, forestry and land-use sector NDC targets (<i>Target: At-least 2 Academic institutions</i>)	Implementation has not yet started due to delays in signing agreement with COMESA.	NS	There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
Indicator f: Number of regional platforms developed for gender inclusive learning, sharing and knowledge management (<i>Target: At-least 1 functional regional platform for learning and knowledge management established</i>)	Implementation has not yet started due to delays in signing agreement with COMESA.	NS	There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.

OBJECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	JUSTIFICATION
MS	This section is rated Moderately Satisfactory because 100% of the indicators have not started due to the delay in signing the Grant Agreement by COMESA. However, inception workshops, recruitment of national coordinators and engagement with COMESA and partners are progressing well.

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

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

COMPONENT 1	Component 1: Strengthen national and regional transparency frameworks for Monitoring and Tracking NDCs and climate actions
Outcome 1.1:	Technical capacities and institutional frameworks of participating countries to transparently plan, monitor and report on their NDC targets and climate actions improved.

Outcome 1.2: **Outcome 1.2.:** A Regional institutional framework for COMESA Member Countries to transparently plan, monitor and report on their NDC targets and climate actions improved.

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ⁵	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
<p><i>Outcome Indicator 1.1.1: Number of national climate change co-ordination frameworks established to guide GHG data sharing, tracking and reporting of climate actions</i></p>	<p>Outcome target 1.1.1 4 functioning national institutional Frameworks -one for each project country; each with technical guidelines/templates on MRV data collection, transmission and tracking tailored to each participating country; and with partnership MoUs signed between Governments of participating countries and national level stakeholders; to guide GHG data sharing, tracking and reporting of climate actions</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>NS</p>	<p>There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.</p>
<p><i>Outcome Indicator 1.1.2: Number of gender inclusive technical guidelines/templates on MRV data collection, transmission, tracking and communication amongst</i></p>	<p>Outcome target 1.1.2 100 people trained and issued certificates per country (Total 400 people with at least</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>NS</p>	<p>There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.</p>

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

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ⁵	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
<i>participating countries established</i>	30% women) – In the case of Seychelles, the specific requirement is at least 40% of the 100 people trained and issued certificates are men.			
<i>Outcome Indicator 1.2.1: Number of data sharing events among COMESA Member States that are participating in the CBIT project.</i>	Outcome target 1.2.1 12 data sharing events among COMESA member states involving national focal points of the four project participating countries and COMESA staff.	N/A	NS	There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
<i>Outcome 1.2.2 Indicator: Number of partnership MOUs signed between COMESA, Governments, and stakeholders to guide data sharing and to implement the regional transparency strategies and action plans.</i>	Outcome target 1.2.2 1 Partnership MOU signed between COMESA, Governments, and stakeholders to guide data sharing and to implement the regional transparency strategies and action plans.	N/A	NS	There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.

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

MS	This section is rated Moderately Satisfactory because 100% of the indicators have not started due to the delay in signing the Grant Agreement by COMESA. However, inception workshops, recruitment of national coordinators and engagement with COMESA and partners are progressing well.
-----------	--

COMPONENT 2	Strengthen capacity of stakeholders from participating countries to measure, report and verify emissions in AFOLU and other IPCC sectors
--------------------	---

Outcome 2.1:	Capacity of participating national academic institutions strengthened to train relevant Government officials (men and women) to transparently measure, report and verify emissions on agriculture, forestry and land-use sector NDC targets.
---------------------	--

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ⁶	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
Outcome Indicator 2.1.1: Number of long-term sustainable academic certificate programs in Terrestrial Carbon Accounting (TCA) and Agriculture Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (AMRV) established at least 2 African institutions.	Outcome target 2.1.1 One TCA-AMRV certificate program established, and institutionalized training being undertaken at each of two African institutions.	N/A	NS	There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
Outcome Indicator 2.1.2: Number of people trained on TCA and AMRV	Outcome target 2.1.2 48 persons (12 per country – at least 30% women) trained in TCA and MRV.	N/A	NS	There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.

OBJECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	JUSTIFICATION
MS	This section is rated Moderately Satisfactory because 100% of the indicators have not started due to the delay in signing the Grant Agreement by COMESA. However, inception workshops, recruitment of national coordinators and engagement with COMESA and partners are progressing well.

COMPONENT 3	Establishment of a regional CBIT integrated platform for learning and knowledge management of transparency related activities
--------------------	--

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

Outcome 3.1: Enhanced transparency through establishment of a regional platform for learning, sharing and knowledge management

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ⁷	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
<p>Outcome Indicator 3.1.1: A functional regional web-based integrated platform for learning and knowledge management of transparency related activities in Eastern and Southern Africa</p>	<p>Outcome target 3.1.1 One functional regional platform for learning and knowledge management established.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>NS</p>	<p>There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.</p>
<p>Outcome indicator 3.1.2: Number of National and Regional Transparency Strategy and Action Plans developed.</p>	<p>Outcome target 3.1.2 Four National Transparency strategies and Action plans as well as one Regional Transparency Strategy and Action plan developed to facilitate enhanced transparency.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>NS</p>	<p>There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.</p>
<p><i>Outcome indicator 3.1.3: Linkages and partnerships established between governments and stakeholders (e.g. academic institutions, CSOs, Private sector institutions etc.) to implement the National and Regional Transparency Strategy and Action Plans</i></p>	<p>Outcome target 3.1.3 Four partnership MoUs at national level between Governments and stakeholders; as well as one regional partnership MOU signed between COMESA and project participating countries.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>NS</p>	<p>There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.</p>

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

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ⁷	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
<i>Outcome indicator 3.1.4: Number of regional peer exchange programs/workshops held and Number of participants (Male and Female)</i>	<p>Outcome target 3.1.4 (a) Sixteen national peer exchange programs/workshops (4 in each project country) [10 participants in each national workshop (160 participants).]</p> <p>Outcome target 3.1.4 (b) Ten regional peer exchange programs/workshops [8 participants in each regional workshop- 2 from each country (80 participants)].</p>	N/A	NS	There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
<i>Outcome indicator 3.1.5 Number of published comprehensive consolidated CBIT project reports and policy briefs covering all the four countries</i>	<p>Outcome target 3.1.5 A comprehensive consolidated final CBIT project report and a policy brief covering all the four countries will be published at the end of the project.</p>	N/A	NS	There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.

OBJECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	JUSTIFICATION
MS	This section is rated Moderately Satisfactory because 100% of the indicators have not started due to the delay in signing the Grant Agreement by COMESA. However, inception workshops, recruitment of national coordinators and engagement with COMESA and partners are progressing well.

COMPONENT 4	Monitoring and Evaluation.
--------------------	----------------------------

Outcome 4.1:	A monitoring and evaluation framework for the project
---------------------	---

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ⁸	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
<i>Outcome Indicator 4.1.1: Number of M&E Reports generated by the project</i>	Outcome target 4.1.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sixteen (16) Quarterly Technical and Financial Reports - Five (5) Annual Progress Implementation Reports (PIRs) - One Mid-Term Evaluation Report - One Terminal Evaluation Report 	N/A	NS	There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.

OBJECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	JUSTIFICATION
MS	This section is rated Moderately Satisfactory because 100% of the indicators have not started due to the delay in signing the Grant Agreement by COMESA. However, inception workshops, recruitment of national coordinators and engagement with COMESA and partners are progressing well.

^{8 8} **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

c. Overall Project Results Rating

OVERALL PROJECT RESULTS IMPLEMENTATION RATING

OVERALL RATING	JUSTIFICATION	RATING TREND ⁹
MS	This section is rated Moderately Satisfactory because 100% of the indicators have not started due to the delay in signing the Grant Agreement by COMESA. However, inception workshops, recruitment of national coordinators and engagement with COMESA and partners are progressing well. In addition to the Grant Agreement signing, capacity needs assessments will be conducted for each country before implementation starts.	N/A This is the first year of implementation therefore, there is no prior project implementation rating.

d. Recommendations

CORRECTIVE ACTION(S)	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DEADLINE
1. Continuous Engagement with COMESA and the countries: Maintain a proactive and open line of communication with COMESA throughout the project's lifecycle. To collaborate closely with COMESA to address any concerns they may have and to build a strong working relationship.	AFD/CI-GEF	June 2024
2. Parallel Activities: Identify activities that can be run in parallel to make up for lost time and expedite the project's progress. Ensure that parallel activities are well-coordinated and do not lead to additional bottlenecks or confusion	COMESA/AFD	June 2024

⁹ Rating trend: Increasing, Unchanged or Decreasing

SECTION III: PROJECT RISKS STATUS AND RATING

a. Progress towards Implementing the Project Risk Mitigation Plan

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

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

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

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING ¹⁰	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY23 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND ¹¹
<p>Risk 1: Corona Virus Pandemic (COVID-19) which will cause delays and/or slow implementation of project activities including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delays to set-up the project - Delays to recruit project staff - Delay/long periods before the procurement and delivery of GHGI hardware to participating countries. <p>Low stakeholder turn-out/involvement corona Virus Pandemic (COVID-19) will cause delays and/or slow</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The project will prepare the following safeguard plans which will clearly indicate activities being put in place to address risks brought about by COVID-19: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Labor and Working Conditions - Accountability and Grievance Mechanism - Stakeholder Engagement Plan 2. Quarterly technical and financial reports submitted to CI-GEF Agency should clearly indicate project implementation progress, any delays and adaptive measures being put in place by project teams. This measure will enable the Agency to provide guidance on how best to adapt to the 	N/A – project hasn't started implementation yet. Though Corona Virus incidents has reduced due to global and government measures.	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.	High (H)	Moderate	Decreasing

¹⁰ **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

¹¹ **Rating trend:** Increasing, Unchanged or Decreasing

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING ¹⁰	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY23 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND ¹¹
<p>implementation of project activities including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delays to set up the project - Delays recruiting project staff - Delay/long periods before procurement and delivery of GHGI hardware. - Low stakeholders turn-out/involvement 	<p>situation on the ground from technical and financial perspectives.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The project team will develop and implement the project's Adaptive Management Plan to the COVID-19 situation. This plan will also include activities that will be implemented by project managers (leads) to ensure that their teams deliver selected project activities while working remotely. 4. During implementation, the project budget will cover procurement and recurrent costs of PPE and utilities such as hand sanitizers, face masks, gloves among others, for project staff. 5. Creation of a COVID-19 repository and preparing a communication strategy for disseminating information related to COVID19 with project teams and stakeholders. This measure will also entail communicating to stakeholders the impact that COVID-19 will have on the project and the adaptive measures required. 						

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING ¹⁰	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY23 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND ¹¹
Risk 2: Due diligence of the Executing Agency (EA) during PPG Phase was inconclusive	<p>This task will be completed within the first 3-months of implementation phase.</p> <p>Financial Risk Assessments (FRA) will be completed before granting to any selected partners. Granting will only be done when partners have met the requirements based on the financial risk assessment. The outputs of this assessment will be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Financial Risk Assessments (FRA) of partner institutions (including the EA) conducted and applicable mitigation measures put in place. b. Contracts/Agreements signed. 	N/A – project hasn't started implementation yet.	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.	High (H)	High (H)	Unchanged
Risk 3: Weak inter-sectoral coordination at national and regional levels	Strengthen coordination through regular meetings of the National coordination committees and Project Steering committee.	N/A – project hasn't started implementation yet.	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.	High (H)	High (H)	Unchanged
Risk 4: Political risks associated with changes in governance, security, and/or government policies	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establishment of an inter-ministerial coordinating committee will also ensure sustainability of this project even after any political or institutional changes. 2. Utilize COMESA as a Regional Economic Cooperation body as it provides a framework for sustainability. 	N/A – project hasn't started implementation yet.	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.	Low (L)	Low (L)	Unchanged

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING ¹⁰	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY23 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND ¹¹
Risk 5: Being a regional project, weak coordination and involvement of national institutions.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A functional PSC represented by project implementation partners and national focal point institutions. 2. Involvement of COMESA country desk officers in each of the project participating country. 3. The PMU will be made more effective and efficient to coordinate countries through regular communication and consultative meetings and by working closely with the project county leads as well as with CBIT national focal points. 4. Holding participatory quarterly project reporting and work planning meetings. 	N/A – project hasn't started implementation yet.	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.	Substantial (S)	Substantial (S)	Unchanged
Risk 6: Expert retention risks	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The project will train a pool of staff at the national levels that will serve as focal points. 2. ToTs will also be undertaken. 	N/A – project hasn't started implementation yet.	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.	Moderate (M)	Moderate (M)	Unchanged
Risk 7: Lack/Low number of lecturers to train the courses developed in the universities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participating Academic institutions will be actively involved from the beginning in design, implementation and making of management training programmes. 2. Awareness and incentives, especially development of cost recovery strategies for sustainability of all training programmes. 	N/A – project hasn't started implementation yet.	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.	High (H)	High (H)	Unchanged

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING ¹⁰	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY23 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND ¹¹
Risk 8: Low enrollment in the courses	Design deliberate outreach and awareness creation schemes at the start of the project focusing on the value and anticipated positive impacts of the project.	N/A – project hasn't started implementation yet.	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.	High (H)	High (H)	Unchanged
Risk 9: No uptake of GHG emission MRV technologies/approaches by recipient countries	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop a project exit strategy and action plan: A project exit strategy and action plan will be developed in consultation with stakeholders. The Strategy will provide actions which will ensure the project's long-term impact – including identification of measures to mitigate the risk of no uptake of GHG emission MRV technologies/approaches by the recipient countries. 2. Identify and empower country specific "influential champions": The project will identify country specific "influential champions" from operational, strategic and political levels across various key stakeholders. The champions will be empowered to communicate and raise awareness about the 	N/A – project hasn't started implementation yet.	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.	High (H)	High (H)	Unchanged

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING ¹⁰	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY23 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND ¹¹
	<p>project at various national and regional forums.</p> <p>3. Active involvement of GHG sectoral teams from government institutions and other state and non-state actors throughout the project cycle: GHG sectoral teams from government institutions and other state and non-state actors will be involved throughout the project cycle (including involvement in planning and decision making among others) – PIF, PPG and Implementation Phase.</p> <p>4. Capacity building activities responsive to country needs: Trainings and other capacity building activities/content will be tailored to respond to each project country's and stakeholders' needs.</p> <p>5. Packaging of information tailored to specific audience: Capacity building material/content will be simplified and packaged in a language</p>						

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING ¹⁰	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY23 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND ¹¹
	understood by target stakeholders and tailored to each target audience e.g., government, CSOs, private sector, academia etc.						
Risk 10: Climate variability	Weather forecasts will inform when and how project activities (such as workshops, stakeholder engagement, travel etc.) will take place.	N/A – project hasn't started implementation yet.	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.	Moderate (M)	Moderate (M)	Unchanged

OVERALL RATING OF PROJECT RISKS	JUSTIFICATION	RISK RATING TREND ¹²
High	This Project's risk rating is High . 50% of output and outcome targets have been rated high. It was challenging for the project to track the risks because of the delay in signing the Grant Agreement with COMESA. Tracking these risks will be possible once the implementation of activities commences.	N/A This is the first year of implementation therefore, there is no prior project implementation rating.

Recommendations

MITIGATION AND CORRECTIVE ACTION(S)	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DEADLINE
None. Risks will be tracked once the implementation of activities commences.	N/A	N/A

¹² **Rating trend:** Increasing, Unchanged or Decreasing

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

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

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

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

MINIMUM ESMF INDICATORS	PROJECT TARGET	END OF YEAR STATUS	CUMULATIVE STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ¹³	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
ACCOUNTABILITY AND GRIEVANCE MECHANISM					
1. Number of conflict and complaint cases reported to the project's Accountability and Grievance Mechanism	3	Zero (0)	Zero (0)	IS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation. The AGM was shared with all stakeholders during the inception workshops. Zero complaints have been received.
2. Percentage of conflict and complaint cases reported to the project's Accountability and Grievance Mechanism that have been resolved (for projects)	(3 conflicts and complains) 100%	Zero (0)	Zero (0)	D	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.

¹³ **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

<p><i>approved before November 2020)</i></p> <p>3. Number of times the Accountability and Grievance Mechanism is communicated/diss eminated to stakeholders (<i>for projects approved after November 2020)</i></p>					
GENDER MAINSTREAMING					
<p>1. Number of men and women who participated in project activities (e.g. meetings, workshops, consultations).</p>	<p>Men – 150 and Women -75 Total - 225</p>	<p>Zero (0)</p>	<p>Zero (0)</p>	<p>D</p>	<p>N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.</p>
<p>2. Number of men and women who received benefits (e.g. trainings: outcome 1.1 Target is 400 people of which 30% women; Outcome 2.1: 48 persons (12 per country – at least 30% women) trained in TCA and MRV)</p>	<p>Men- 314 and women – 134 Total - 448</p>	<p>Zero (0)</p>	<p>Zero (0)</p>	<p>D</p>	<p>N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.</p>
<p>3. Number of strategies, plans (e.g. management plans and land use plans) and policies derived from the project that include gender</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Zero (0)</p>	<p>Zero (0)</p>	<p>D</p>	<p>N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.</p>

considerations (this indicator applies to relevant projects)					
STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT					
1. Number of people (sex disaggregated) that will be involved in project implementation phase	200 (130 Men, 70 Women)	200	20 (13 Men, 7 Women)	IS	In FY23, Inception workshops were held where the project was officially launched. A total of 20 people (13 men, 7 women) attended the workshop. National-level inception meetings took place in Seychelles, Eritrea, and Zambia
2. Number of stakeholder groups (government agencies, civil society organizations, private sector, indigenous peoples and others) that will be involved in the project implementation phase	10	Zero (0)	Zero (0)	D	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
1. Number of engagement (e.g. meeting, workshops, consultations) with stakeholders during the project implementation phase (on an annual basis)	15	Zero (0)	Zero (0)	D	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
LABOUR & WORKING CONDITIONS					
1. Percentage of project implementation partners at the various levels	100%	Zero (0)	Zero (0)	D	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.

having the required conditions in place.					
--	--	--	--	--	--

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

N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.

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

N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.

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

N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.

e. ESMF lessons learned and Knowledge Management Products (KMPs)¹⁴ developed and disseminated

N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.

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

SUMMARY: PROJECT ESMF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY TYPE OF PLAN

ESMF PLAN REQUIRED BY THE PROJECT	CURRENT FY23 IMPLEMENTATION RATING	RATING TREND
Accountability and Grievance Mechanism	S	Not applicable
Gender Mainstreaming Plan (GMP)	N/A	Not applicable
Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)	N/A	Not applicable

¹⁴ Knowledge Management Products are those that are both intended to transmit knowledge but at the same time enable action by their audiences. For example, a lessons learned report, compilation of good practices and recommendations, etc.

SUMMARY: PROJECT ESMF IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY TYPE OF PLAN

ESMF PLAN REQUIRED BY THE PROJECT	CURRENT FY23 IMPLEMENTATION RATING	RATING TREND
ESS 7: Labour Management Procedures	N/A	Not applicable

OVERALL PROJECT ESMF IMPLEMENTATION RATING

RATING	JUSTIFICATION	RATING TREND
NA	Despite the project not having started implementation, they did create a flyer to socialize the AGM and distributed among stakeholders during the inception meeting. Currently, there is no data reported for the other indicators, so there is not sufficient advances to provide a rating for ESMF.	Not applicable

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

CORRECTIVE ACTION(S)	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DEADLINE
NA	NA	NA

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

Required topics

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

Additional topics (please choose two)

2. Engagement of the private sector
3. Scientific and technological issues
4. Interpretation and application of GEF guidelines
5. Financial management and co-financing
6. Project institutional arrangements, including project governance
7. Capacity building
8. Implementation of safeguard policies, including gender mainstreaming, accountability and grievance mechanisms, stakeholder consultations
9. Factors that improve likelihood of long term sustainability of project impacts
10. Factors that encourage replication, including outreach, dissemination of lessons learned, and communications strategies

SECTION VI: PROJECT GEOCODING

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

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

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

Geo Location Information	Location No. 1	Location No. 2	Location No. 3	Location No.4
<p>CLASSIFICATION <i>Indicate whether the site is NEW (for new sites this FY23), EXISTING (already existing in the previous PIR) or CEO Endorsed/Approved (indicate whether the site is included at CEO Endorsement/Approval). Please add more columns for projects with more than 3 locations. Note: if the site is NEW, provide a justification in the box after this table</i></p>	National (Existing)	National (Existing)	National (Existing)	National (Existing)
<p>GEO NAME ID <i>Provide the location's Geo Name ID in a numerical format. IDs are available in the GeoNames' geographical database covering all countries and containing millions of placenames with free access at: http://www.geonames.org.</i></p>				
<p>LOCATION NAME <i>Name of the geographic locations in which the activity is taking place. In instance when a GeoNames ID is provided above, the name of the said ID should be reflected. Otherwise, the location name provided will be considered as an exact location.</i></p>	The Comoros	Eritrea	Seychelles	Zambia
<p>LATITUDE <i>Provide locations in Decimal Degrees WGS84 format, a notation expressing geographic coordinates as decimal fractions of a degree. Include at least four decimal points.</i></p>	11.6455° S,	12040"-18002" N,	4.6796° S,	13.1339° S,
<p>LONGITUDE <i>Provide locations in Decimal Degrees WGS84 format, a notation expressing geographic coordinates as decimal fractions of a degree. Include at least four decimal points.</i></p>	43.3333° E	36o30"- 43o23" E	55.4920° E	27.8493° E
<p>LOCATION DESCRIPTION <i>(Optional field) Text description that qualifies in a sentence or so the location in which an activity is taking place, such as for example "mini-grid energy system" or "park ranger site".</i></p>				
<p>ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION</p>				

<i>(Optional field) Text description that qualifies in a sentence or so the activity taking place at the location, for example, "Installing a mini-grid energy system".</i>				
---	--	--	--	--

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

(Geo Name ID: Location Name)

Justification: N/A

Project Map and Coordinates

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

(Geo Name ID: Location Name)

Map: N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.

APPENDIX I: PROJECT ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING

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

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

APPENDIX II: RISK RATINGS

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

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

APPENDIX III: PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT EXPECTED OUTPUTS

INDICATORS	PROJECT TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING ¹⁵	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
Outcome 1.1.: Technical capacities and institutional frameworks of participating countries to transparently plan, monitor and report on their NDC targets and climate actions improved.				
Output 1.1.1: Focal points in each of the IPCC emission sectors defined, strengthened, institutionalized and functioning as efficient units of GHG data collection, processing and reporting to the national focal point.				
Output Indicator 1.1.1: Number of IPCC emission sectors with functioning formally established focal points.	Target 1.1.1: Sectoral focal points for the 5 IPCC GHG emission sectors operational in each of the 4 project participating countries.	N/A	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
Output 1.1.2: A national climate change institutional framework with a strengthened national focal point for intra-country coordination established to guide GHG data collection, sharing, tracking and reporting of climate actions.				
Output Indicator 1.1.2: <i>Number of functioning formally established national frameworks with functional MoUs between sectors at national level; (For Seychelles -with appropriate legal framework to facilitate data sharing between sectors).</i>	Target 1.1.2: 4 National institutional Frameworks -one for each project country; -4 National technical guidelines/templates on MRV data collection, transmission and tracking tailored to each participating country; and -4 partnership MoUs signed between Governments of participating countries and national level stakeholders.	N/A	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
Output 1.1.3: A national climate change framework for inter-ministerial coordination and GHG data sharing established in each project participating country.				
Output Indicator 1.1.3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Number of governance structures.</i> • <i>Number of meetings of the governance structures.</i> 	Target 1.1.3: 4 national level inter-ministerial coordination committees. (A National Climate Change Council in the case of Seychelles)	N/A	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
Output 1.1.4: Country specific MRV system indicators for tracking NDCs and climate actions developed- and for Seychelles mainly specific for the fivefold sector of AFOLU.				
Output Indicator 1.1.4: <i>A list of MRV system indicators identified and defined.</i>	Target 1.1.4: 4 project countries using their country specific indicators to track NDCs and climate actions.	N/A	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.

¹⁵ **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

Output 1.1.5: National Green House Gas Inventories (GHGI) and functional on-line MRV platforms established and feeding into the regional online MRV Platform				
Output Indicator 1.1.5.: Number of data sharing platforms.	Target 1.1.5: 4 National functional GHGI inventory frameworks with associated on-line MRV	N/A	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
Output 1.1.6: National and Regional Trainings and thematic learning events on MRV systems, tracking NDCs in the fivefold sector of AFOLU and climate actions undertaken.				
Output Indicator 1.1.6.: Number of men and women trained, and learning events undertaken.	Target 1.1.6 (a): 15 National capacity building trainings on MRV system and tracking NDCs and climate actions (3 Trainings per participating country – for Seychelles, the 3 training programs are a specific need on TCA, AMRV and GHG Accounting for landfill Methane); 5 Regional capacity building trainings on the MRV systems; and 4 Regional thematic learning events (Waste, Industrial processes, Energy, Agriculture, and Forestry and Land use) Target 1.1.6 (b): 100 people per country trained and issued certificates (Total 400 people with at least 30% women) – In the case of Seychelles, the specific requirement is at least 40% of the 100 people trained and issued certificates are men.	N/A	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
Output 1.1.7: National Transparency Strategy and Action Plans for enhanced transparency systems and CBIT coordination developed.				
Output Indicator 1.1.7: Number of National Transparency Strategies and Action Plans.	Target 1.1.7: 4 National Transparency Strategies and Action Plans (1 per country)	N/A	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
Outcome 1.2: A Regional institutional framework for COMESA Member Countries to transparently plan, monitor and report on their NDC targets and climate actions improved.				
Output 1.2.1.: A regional climate change framework for inter-country coordination established to guide GHG data sharing, tracking NDCs and reporting of climate actions.				
Output Indicator 1.2.1: Number of functional data sharing	Target 1.2.1: 1 Regional institutional framework for data	N/A	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.

agreements between the participating countries.	sharing among COMESA Member States.			
Output 1.2.2.: Sectoral Technical guidelines and templates to guide MRV data transmission and communication amongst participating countries established.				
Output Indicator 1.2.2: Number of guidelines and templates to guide MRV data sharing.	Target 1.2.2: 1 Regional technical guidelines/template on MRV data collection, transmission and tracking amongst participating countries	N/A	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
Output 1.2.3: Regional on-line MRV platform for COMESA countries established and operationalized				
Output Indicator 1.2.3: Number of regional on-line MRV platforms for COMESA countries.	Target 1.2.3: 1 regional integrated online MRV platform for COMESA countries.	N/A	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
Outcome 2.1.: Capacity of participating national academic institutions strengthened to train relevant Government officials (men and women) to transparently measure, report and verify emissions on agriculture, forestry and land-use sector NDC targets.				
Output 2.1.1.: Training program on Terrestrial Carbon Accounting and Agriculture MRV developed.				
Output Indicator 2.1.1: Number of curriculums developed (A curriculum totaling at least 2500 teaching hours. (Or a curriculum totaling 1500 contact hours and 500 non-contact hours for both TCA and AMRV each).	Target 2.1.1: One curriculum for TCA and MRV developed.	N/A	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
Output 2.1.2.: Training of trainers' program delivered to at least two Academic institutions; (delivered to at least four academic staffs (men and women) of the University of Seychelles).				
Output Indicator 2.1.2: Number of academic institutions with capacity to offer training in MRV	Target 2.1.2: Two academic institutions conducting training in MRV; possibly including University of Seychelles that specifically expressed the need to conduct training.	N/A	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
Output 2.1.3.: Two Academic institutions deliver training to 48 (12 per country – at least 30% women) national participants from 4 participating countries and open to the other COMESA member states				
Output Indicators 2.1.3.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of persons trained in TCA and MRV by the regional academic institutions. Percent of men/women enrolled in the TCA – AMRV program 	Target 2.1.3: 48 persons (12 per country – at least 30% women) trained in TCA and MRV. (a specific request from Seychelles is for the 12 persons to be from across the AFOLU sector and university of Seychelles trained in TCA and MRV); and At least 40%	N/A	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.

	of participants enrolled in the TCA-AMRV certificate programs, delivered by regional universities, are women. (In the case of Seychelles, it was recommended that 50% are specifically women)			
Outcome 3.1.: Enhanced transparency through establishment of a regional platform for learning, sharing and knowledge management				
Output 3.1.1.: A regional web-based integrated platform for learning and knowledge management of transparency related activities designed, operational and regularly updated.				
Output Indicator 3.1.1: Number of updates made to the web-based platform.	Target 3.1.1: One quarterly update made to the web-based platform by the national focal points.	N/A	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
Output 3.1.2.: A Regional Transparency Strategy and Action Plan for enhanced transparency systems and CBIT coordination developed and in use.				
Output Indicator 3.1.2: Number of regional Transparency strategy documents in place and being implemented.	Target 3.1.2: One regional transparency strategy and Action Plan.	N/A	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
Output 3.1.3.: Linkages and partnerships established between government institutions and stakeholders to implement the transparency action plans at national and regional level.				
Output Indicator 3.1.3: Number of MoUs between Government Institutions and stakeholders.	Target 3.1.3: Four national MoUs between Governments of the participating countries and stakeholders; as well as one regional MOU signed between COMESA and project participating countries.	N/A	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
Output 3.1.4: Annual Regional and National published reports and policy briefs capturing lessons learnt, best case practices, challenges and opportunities from participating countries using a common communication language.				
Output Indicator 3.1.4: Number of annual reports and information materials shared.	Targets 3.1.4: 4 national reports (1 per country) and a 4 policy briefs (1 per country); capturing lessons learnt, best case practices, challenges and opportunities shared annually.	N/A	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.
Outcome 4.1: A monitoring and evaluation framework for the project				
Output 4.1.1: Periodic M&E reports generated and submitted to CIGEF Agency.				
Output Indicator 4.1.1: Number of periodic M&E Reports submitted to CI-GEF	Target 4.1.1: Sixteen (16) Quarterly Technical and Financial Reports; Five (5) Annual Progress Implementation Reports (PIRs)	N/A	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.

Output 4.1.2: Mid-Term and Terminal Evaluation Reports generated by the project				
Output Indicator 4.1.2: Number of Mid-Term and Terminal Evaluation Reports generated by the project	Target 4.1.2: One Mid-Term Evaluation Report and One Terminal Evaluation Report	N/A	NS	N/A – There was a delay in signing grant agreement with COMESA hence the delay in start of implementation.