

1- Identification

1.1 Project details

GEF ID	5454	SMA IPMR ID	23545
Project Short Title	COMIFAC ABS	Grant ID	S1-32NPL-000002
		Umoja WBS	32NPL-11267-SB-001121-14AC0003
Project Title	Ratification and Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol for the member countries of the Central African Forests Commission (COMIFAC)		
Project Type	Medium Sized Project (MSP)	Duration months	Planned
Parent Programme if child project			Age
GEF Focal Area(s)	Africa	Completion Date	Planned -original PCA
Project Scope	Regional		Revised - Current PCA
Region	Africa	Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval	13-Nov-14
Countries	Burundi, Cameroon, Central Africa	UNEP Project Approval Date (on Decision Sheet)	25-May-15
GEF financing amount	US\$1,762,557	Start of Implementation (PCA entering into force)	25-May-15
Co-financing amount	US\$9,200,000	Date of First Disbursement	1-Jul-15
		Date of Inception Workshop, if available	16-Mar-15
Total disbursement as of 30 June	USD1,762,557	Midterm undertaken?	No
Total expenditure as of 30 June	USD1,576,351.51	Actual Mid-term Date, if taken	
		Expected Mid-Term Date, if not taken	N/A
		Expected Terminal Evaluation Date	31-Dec-23
		Expected Financial Closure Date	30-Jun-24

1.2 EA: Project description

Ratification of the Nagoya Protocol and the implementation of its basic provisions by the member countries of the Central African Forests Commission (COMIFAC).

Component 1: Ratification of the Nagoya Protocol. This component aims at carrying out all the necessary activities in the 8 countries that have not ratified or acceded to the Protocol yet, to put the request through the legislature or relevant national authority.

Component 2: Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol. This component will be carried out in all the COMIFAC countries, starting with Rwanda and Gabon that have already ratified the Nagoya Protocol, followed by the others as they ratify or accede to the Nagoya Protocol.

1.3 Project Contact

Division(s) Implementing the project	Ecosystems Division	Executing Agency(ies)	Law Division
Name of co-implementing Agency		Names of Other Project Partners	Key Ministries and agencies in charge of policy and implementation of the Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD) of the participating countries
TM: UNEP Portfolio Manager(s)	Ersin Esen	EA: Manager/Representative	Tita Korvenoja
TM: UNEP Task Manager(s)	Andre Toham	EA: Project Manager	Emmanuel Adonsou
TM: UNEP Budget/Finance Officer	Paul Vrontamitis	EA: Finance Manager	Aini Aini
TM: UNEP Support/Assistant	Eric Mugo	EA: Communications lead, if relevant	N/A

2- OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

TM: UNEP previous Subprogramme(s)

Environmental governance
foundational sub-programme

Nature action sub-programme

Subprogramme 4 Environmental
Governance

TM: UNEP Current Subprogramme(s)

TM: PoW Indicator(s)

Indicator (i): Number of national or subnational entities that, with UNEP support, adopt integrated approaches to address environmental and social issues and/or tools for valuing, monitoring and sustainably managing biodiversity.

Direct Outcome: 2.7 Natural assets are valued, monitored and sustainably managed.

/ Number of national or subnational entities that adopt or adapt economic, regulatory or decision-support tools for valuing, monitoring and sustainably managing

EA: UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages

The project contributed to the Strategic priority 3: Environmentally sustainable management, climate change and land use planning (Burundi UNDAF 2019-2023), to the Strategic Pillar IV: Resilience, Early Recovery, and Food Security (Outcome 4.1: By 2020, people (especially vulnerable groups) in target areas are more resilient to environmental, social, and economic shock (Cameroon UNDAF 2018-2020); to Promotion of sustainable and equitable development and regional integration and outcome 5 : the populations and other public and private actors make more rational use of natural resources and improve food security (Central African Republic UNDAF 2012-2016); to the Strategic priority 2 : Sustainability, reduction of environmental risks, fight against climate change and building resilience; (Chad UNDAF 2017-2021); to the Strategic Axis 3 Diversification of the economy based on the following growth-promoting sectors: agriculture, in the broad sense, tourism, coupled with the continued industrialization of our economy for a short, medium and long term impact. In particular, for the agro-pastoral sector, this involves strengthening food security and the economic inclusion of poor women, particularly in rural areas (Congo: UNDAF 2020-2024); to the Strategic Priority Area 4 : Sustainable management of natural resources and fight against climate change and outcome The Congolese State improves the management of its natural resources (mining, energy, biodiversity and land) and the associated benefits, disaster management mechanisms and is committed to the green economy (DR Congo UNDAF 2013-2017), to the Strategic orientation 5 Act on Environmental Regulation in the Republic of Equatorial Guinea and outcome: The country has a stronger legislative and institutional framework that guarantees sustainable management of the environment; adaptation to climate change and mitigation of its effects (Equatorial Guinea UNDAF 2013-2017), to the Strategic priority: Environmental sustainability and resilience: and its outcome by 2022, Gabon will improve the preservation of biodiversity and the management of its natural resources, particularly forestry, mining, energy and land, in a manner compatible with environmental sustainability (Gabon: UNDAF 2018-2022), to the strategic priority 1: Economic Transformation and Outcome 2 by 2023 Rwandan Institutions and communities are more equitably productively and sustainably managing natural resources and addressing climate change and natural disasters (Rwanda: UNDAF 2018-2023), to the Strategic orientation: (3) promotion inclusive sustainable growth and resilience (Sao Tome and Principe UNDAF 2017-2021).

EA: Link to relevant SDG Goals

SDG Goals 17 and 15

EA: Link to relevant SDG Targets

Target 17.14 Enhance policy coherence for sustainable development; 17.14.1 Number of countries with mechanisms in place to enhance policy coherence of sustainable development

Indicator 15.6.1: Number of countries that have adopted legislative, administrative and policy frameworks to ensure fair and equitable sharing of benefits.

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

Indicators

Targets - Expected value		
Mid-term	End-of-project	Total Target

Materialised to date

Implementation Status

2023

8th PIR

FY 2023

FY 2022

FY 2021

FY 2020

FY 2019

FY 2018

FY 2017

FY 2016

FY 2015

PIR #

8th PIR

7th PIR

6th PIR

5th PIR

4th PIR

3rd PIR

2nd PIR

1st PIR

Rating towards outcomes (DO)
(section 3.1)

S

S

S

S

S

S

S

S

Rating towards outputs (IP)
(section 3.2)

S

S

S

S

S

S

S

S

S

Risk rating
(section 4.2)

L

L

L

L

L

L

L

L

L

EA: Summary of status
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

Rating towards outcomes: The rating is S because of legal, institutional and regulatory frameworks have been developed and key national stakeholders have ratified the Nagoya Protocol and increase understanding on ABS to promote sustainable use of genetic resources. COMIFAC countries have developed and started the implementation of their ABS strategies and action plans activities.

EA: Planned Co-finance

9,200,000

EA: Actual to date:

600,000

2.4 Co-fin	EA: Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges.	German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development) which had promised 6,000,000 did not contribute to the project and, many participating countries and the COMIFAC Secretariat as executing agencies have not reported on co-financing.	
	EA: Date of project steering committee meeting	N/A	
2.5. Stakeholder	EA: Stakeholder engagement (will be uploaded to GEF Portal)	Various stakeholders involved in the project, including traditional healers, government officials and local communities, local research institutions, research institutions, academia, NGOs, media and the business community. The project also included policy makers and regulators for issuance of various types of permits.	
	TM: Does the project have a gender action plan?	✓ No	
2.6. Gender	EA: Gender mainstreaming (will be uploaded to GEF Portal)	In all participant countries, gender consideration and gender equality are promoted. Training and Capacity Building workshops have emphasized both roles of women, men and youth ensuring their involvement.	
	TM: Was the project classified as moderate/high risk at CEO Endorsement/Approval Stage?	✓ No	TM: Have any new social and/or environmental risks been identified during the reporting period? ✓ No
2.7. ESSM	TM: If yes, what specific safeguard risks were identified in the SRIF/ESERN?		TM: If yes, please describe the new risks, or changes
	TM & EA: Has the project received complaints related to social and/or environmental impacts (actual or potential) during the reporting period?	✓ No	
	TM & EA: If yes, please describe the complaint(s) or grievance(s) in detail including the status, significance, who was involved and what actions were taken.		
	EA: Environmental and social safeguards management (will be uploaded to GEF Portal)	The indigenous people and local communities, as holders of traditional knowledge associated to genetic resources are in centre of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS, therefore their interests are considered and protected during the ABS implementation processes	
Learning	EA: Knowledge activities and products (will be uploaded to GEF Portal)	A capacity building manual has been developed and be utilized as a training tool aimed at a range of ABS actors and decisions makers.	
		Please attach a copy of any products	

2.8. KM/

EA: Main learning during the period

N/A

2.9. Stories:

EA: Stories to be shared
(section to be shared with communication division/
GEF communication)

N/A

3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE

3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes (Development Objectives)

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)	EA: Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	TM: Progress rating
Objective							
Objective: All 10 member countries of the Central African Forests Commission (COMIFAC) have ratified of /acceded to the Nagoya Protocol and all member countries of COMIFAC started the implementation of its basic provisions.	Number of countries that will have submitted NP ratification protocols to the CBD Secretariat	Gabon and Rwanda have ratified the Nagoya Protocol		All 10 member countries of the Central African Forests Commission ratified or acceded to the Nagoya Protocol and started its implementation.	100%	All member countries of COMIFAC (100%) have ratified or acceded to the Nagoya Protocol including: Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Democratic Republic of Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Republic of Congo, Rwanda and Sao Tome & Principe.	S
Outcome 1							
Outcome 1.1: National authorities to take informed decisions on the ratification of the Protocol and future implementation	a. By 2016, 70% parliamentarians are trained about the importance of ABS and how it is linked to natural resources management (NRM).	Parliamentarians and decision makers in COMIFAC countries are still not fully aware of the importance of ABS for their national development.		70% of parliamentarians trained about the importance of ABS and how it is linked to natural resources management (NRM).	80%	Awareness raising activities of parliamentarians in all participating countries completed	S
Outcome 2							
Outcome 1.2: Basic provisions of the Nagoya Protocol implemented in target countries	a. By 2017, at least 9 of the COMIFAC countries have implementation strategies and actions plans and are executing activities;	Rwanda and Gabon have ratified the Protocol and are now implementing; but it is as yet unclear if they have a strategy for implementation		By June 2022, 10 of the COMIFAC countries have developed strategies and action plans and are executing activities.	100%	All 9 countries (100%) that have developed their ABS strategy and action plan under this project.	S
Outcome 3							
Outcome 1.3: Countries share information and gain from the experiences of the other members of the COMIFAC.	a. By 2016, 75% of stakeholders in COMIFAC countries share information liberally on ABS related topics.	The Groupe de Travail Biodiversité en Afrique Central (GTBAC) is one of the main platforms for exchange of information for COMIFAC countries on these matters.			80%	Continuous information on ABS related topic sharing between COMIFAC member countries	S

	b. By 2017, at least 70 % of COMIFAC stakeholders indicate to regularly use the online regional platform for information gathering.				70%	Virtual regional online platform through GTBAC for ABS focal points, researchers, and jurists for exchange of information from the participating member countries	S
--	---	--	--	--	-----	---	---

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

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

Output	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2022 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2023 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	EA: Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	TM: Progress rating
Under Comp 1					
Ratification of the Nagoya Protocol. This component aims at carrying out all the necessary activities in the 8 countries that have not ratified or acceded to the Protocol yet, to put the request through the legislature or relevant national authority.					
Output 1.1: Scoping study of the existing laws and regulation related to ABS	30-Sep-20	100%	100%	Completed	S
Output 1.2: Analysis of the implications of ratification of the Protocol.	30-Sep-20	100%	100%	Completed	S
Output 1.3: Public awareness of key stakeholders on the obligations and provisions of Nagoya Protocol.	30-Sep-20	100%	100%	Completed	HS
Output 1.4: Instruments for accession/ ratification deposited by relevant government departments.	30-Sep-20	100%	100%	Continuous follow-up with the project country team of Equatoria Guinea on the confirmation of the deposit of its bill of the ratification in New York and by the SCD Secretariat	S
Under Comp 2					
Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol. This component will be carried out in all the COMIFAC countries, starting with Rwanda and Gabon that have already ratified the Nagoya Protocol, followed by the others as they ratify or accede to the Nagoya					
All ten countries that have ratified the Nagoya Protocol have launched domestic processes for the elaboration of their national ABS strategies. Capacity building needs have been integrated in their national ABS strategies. Insufficient funding under this project did not permit the achievement of the valorisation of genetic resources. In this area, the beneficiary countries' expressed UNEP's assistance in the implementation of their National Strategy Action Plans and adding value.					
Output 2.1: Stocktaking and assessment	30-Sep-20	100%	100%	Completed	S
Output 2.2: Strategy and action plan for the implementation of ABS measures	30-Sep-20	100%	100%	Completed	S
Output 2.3: Building capacity among stakeholders	30-Sep-20	100%	100%	Completed	S

Under Comp 3

<p>Sub regional Cooperation and coordination. Countries are expected to share information and gain from the experiences and improve knowledge and understanding of the other members of COMIFAC on the Nagoya Protocol. This will be achieved by means of regional and bilateral exchanges as appropriate.</p>					
Output 3.1: Experiences and Best Practices shared	30-Sep-20	95%	95%	Continuous information sharing is performed via the virtual regional platform meetings of GTBAC or other regional meetings for national ABS focal points, researchers, and jurists from the participating countries in collaboration with COMIFAC Secretariat.	

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

4 Risk Rating

4.1 Table A. Project management Risk

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

Risk Factor	EA's Rating	TM's Rating
1 Management structure - Roles and responsibilities	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood.
2 Governance structure - Oversight	Low : Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet at least once a year and Active membership and participation in decision-	Low : Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet at least once a year and Active membership and
3 Implementation schedule	Moderate: Project progressing according to work plan and Adaptive management and regular monitoring. Moderate likelihood of potential	Moderate: Project progressing according to work plan and Adaptive management and regular monitoring.
4 Budget	Low : Activities are progressing within planned budget and Balanced budget utilisation including PMC. Low likelihood of potential negative	Low : Activities are progressing within planned budget and Balanced budget utilisation including PMC.
5 Financial Management	Low : Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for and Audit reports provided regularly and confirm correct use of funds. Low	Low : Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for and Audit reports provided regularly and
6 Reporting	Low : Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and Reports are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress	Low : Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and Reports are complete and accurate with a
7 Capacity to deliver	Low : Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners and Capacity gaps were addressed before	Low : Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners and Capacity gaps

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)

8th 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.

Risk	Risk affecting:	Risk Rating						Variation respect to last rating		Δ	Justification	
	Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	PIR 6	PIR 7			PIR 8
Risk 1: Lack of political will and low in-country technical capacity.	All outcomes & outputs	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	=	No Change
Risk 2: Private sector investors being driven from the COMIFAC countries if implementation of the Nagoya Protocol is carried out by building elaborate structure of laws and regulation that is virtually difficult to comprehend and is business-unfriendly needs also to be recognized.	Outputs 2.3	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	=	No Change
Impelementation Schedule		Not Applicable	L	L	L	L	M	M	M	M		we are missing Audit report from Rwanda, Report on activities completed by the COMIFAC
	All outcomes & outputs										↓	

Consolidated project risk	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	This section focuses on the variation. The overall rating is discussed in section 2.3.
---------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

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

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

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	Additional mitigation measures for the next periods		
			What	When	By whom
Risk 1 & 2	N/A	N/A	N/A	n/A	N/A
Implementation schedule	N/A	Budget revision was completed recently which will allow to conduct audit in Rwanda and one activity at regional level with COMIFAC	Project Audit in Rwanda	Dec-23	Project Team

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.

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	No
Components and cost	No
Institutional and implementation arrangements	No
Financial management	No
Implementation schedule	Explain in table B
Executing Entity	No
Executing Entity Category	No
Minor project objective change	No
Safeguards	No
Risk analysis	No
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	No
Co-financing	No
Location of project activity	No
Other	No

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

Version	Type	Signed/Approved by UNEP
Original Legal Instrument		
Amendment 1	Revision	
Extension 1	Extension	

Entry Into Force (last signature Date)	Agreement Expiry Date	Main changes introduced in this 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 location 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](https://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=42/1.84/82.79) (<https://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=42/1.84/82.79>) or GeoNames(<https://www.geonames.org/>) 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\(https://geportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx\)](https://geportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx)

Location Name Required field		Latitude Required field	Longitude Required field	Geo Name ID Required field if the location is not an exact site	Location Description Optional text field	Activity Description Optional text field
Kigali		-1.9399	30.0622			
Malabo		3.7564	8.7777			
Yaoundé		3.8549	11.5104			

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

[Annex any linked geospatial file]