



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

### 2021 – Revised Template



Period covered: 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021

## 1. Basic Project Data

### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	Canary Current Large Marine Ecosystem
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Cabo Verde, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Mauritania, Morocco and Senegal
<b>Project Title:</b>	Towards sustainable management of the Canary Current Large Marine Ecosystem (CCLME) – initial support to SAP implementation
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP/INT/985/GFF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	9940
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	International Waters
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	The Fishery Committee for the Eastern Atlantic (CECAF)
<b>Project Duration:</b>	18 Months
<b>Project coordinates:</b> <a href="#">(Ctrl+Click here)</a>	N 16° 0' 0" W 24° 0' 0" – Cabo Verde N 13° 30' 0" W 15° 30' 0" – The Gambia N 10° 50' 0" W 10° 40' 0" – Guinea N 12° 0' 0" W 15° 0' 0" – Guinea Bissau N 20° 15' 0" W 10° 30' 0" – Mauritania N 28° 30' 0" W 10° 0' 0" – Morocco N 14° 30' 0" W 14° 15' 0" – Senegal

### Milestone Dates:

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	06 September 2019
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	01 January 2020
<b>Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	30 June 2021
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) <sup>2</sup></b>	30 June 2022
<b>Actual Implementation End Date<sup>3</sup>:</b>	NA

<sup>1</sup> As per FPMIS

<sup>2</sup> In case of a project extension.

<sup>3</sup> Actual date at which project implementation ends - only for projects that have ended.

**Funding**

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	1 826 000 USD
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>4</sup>:</b>	6 600 000 USD
<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2021 (USD m):</b>	USD 94,721
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2021<sup>5</sup></b>	USD 1,038,000

**Review and Evaluation**

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee Meeting:</b>	2019
<b>Expected Mid-term Review date<sup>6</sup>:</b>	NA
<b>Actual Mid-term review date:</b>	NA
<b>Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022)<sup>7</sup>:</b>	No
<b>Expected Terminal Evaluation Date:</b>	March 2022
<b>Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022):</b>	Yes
<b>Tracking tools/ Core indicators required<sup>8</sup></b>	No

**Ratings**

<b>Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):</b>	Unsatisfactory
<b>Overall implementation progress rating:</b>	Unsatisfactory
<b>Overall risk rating:</b>	Moderate

<sup>4</sup> This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

<sup>5</sup> Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

<sup>6</sup> The MTR should take place about halfpoint between EOD and NTE – this is the expected date

<sup>7</sup> Please note that the FAO GEF Coordination Unit should be contacted six months prior to the expected MTR date

<sup>8</sup> Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

**Status**

<b>Implementation Status</b> <i>(1<sup>st</sup> PIR, 2<sup>nd</sup> PIR, etc. Final PIR):</i>	1 <sup>st</sup> PIR
--	---------------------

**Project Contacts**

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>Aboubacar Sidibé</b> Chief Technical Adviser Fisheries and Aquaculture Division-FAO	<a href="mailto:Aboubacar.Sidibe@fao.org">Aboubacar.Sidibe@fao.org</a>
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	<b>Amber Himes-Cornell</b> Fisheries Officer Fisheries and Aquaculture Division-FAO	<a href="mailto:Amber.HimesCornell@fao.org">Amber.HimesCornell@fao.org</a>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>Pedro de Barros</b> Senior Fishery Resources Officer Fisheries and Aquaculture Division-FAO	<a href="mailto:pedro.barros@fao.org">pedro.barros@fao.org</a>
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	<b>Kuena Morebotsane</b> FAO GEF Unit	<a href="mailto:Kuena.Morebotsane@fao.org">Kuena.Morebotsane@fao.org</a>

## 2. Progress Towards Achieving Project Objectives and Outcome (DO)

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

Project objective and Outcomes (as indicated at CEO Endorsement)	Description of indicator(s) <sup>9</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>10</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating <sup>11</sup>
<b>Objective(s): To create the conditions for the effective implementation of the Strategic Action Program (SAP) of the Canary Current Large Marine Ecosystem.</b>						
<b>Component 1: Strengthening partnerships and fostering investment for CCLME SAP implementation</b>						
<b>Outcome 1.1:</b> Management of the CCLME strengthened with the development of mechanisms for cooperation, partnerships and financing of the SAP	Recommendations on consortium and partnership mechanism for SAP implementation agreed.	Initial consultations undertaken during the earlier CCLME foundation project on potential governance mechanisms for SAP implementation	Conclusions of second consultative meeting of multi-sectoral consortium and partnership agreement.	Recommendations about mechanism for partnership, collaboration for SAP implementation agreed	An international Consultant was recruited to support the preparation for and facilitate the meeting on the partnership mechanism in the SAP implementation. However implementation of this activity was delayed due to COVID-19.	<b>U</b>

<sup>9</sup> This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

<sup>10</sup> Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

<sup>11</sup> Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)**, **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.

	An agreement on SAP financing strategy.	No agreed financing strategy for SAP implementation.	Draft proposal presented to countries, partners and donors at a roundtable meeting.	An agreed SAP financing strategy	No achievement during this period	<b>U</b>
<b>Component 2: Strengthening knowledge, management and capacity of fisheries institutions and communities for the sustainable use of transboundary fisheries resources and associated ecosystems</b>						

<p><b>Outcome 2.1:</b> Improved knowledge and understanding of the state of the CCLME including fish stocks, vulnerable species and habitats and ecosystem functioning, climate change impacts on the resources and fishing communities.</p>	<p>New peer-reviewed information about CCLME fish stocks, vulnerable species and habitats, ecosystem characterization and climate change impacts, available at least through the project's website</p>	<p>Limited information on transboundary fish stock assessment, vulnerable species, ecosystem characterization and functioning in the CCLME region.</p> <p>Poor understanding of impacts of climate change on marine living resources of CCLME and on fishing communities.</p>	<p>Conclusions of first regional ecosystem survey planning and analysis working group peer-reviewed by experts, disseminated.</p>	<p>Information peer-reviewed by experts available and disseminated at least through the project website.</p>	<p>Limited achievement in the project period. In the context of the collaboration with the EAF-Nansen one survey could be concluded in the CCLME region and one initiated before the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020.</p> <p>A Programme consultant has been recruited to support the work on ecosystem characterization and with the analysis of data and organization of scientific activities to address knowledge and capacity gaps for SAP</p>	<p><b>MU</b></p>
--	--	---	---	--	---	------------------

					implementation.	
<b>Outcome 2.2:</b> Strengthened capacities to enable implementation of an ecosystem approach to fisheries (EAF) in the context of broader multisectoral ecosystem management goals.	Options for the operationalization of the management frameworks.	Two regional management frameworks for transboundary pelagic and coastal fisheries initiated in project's phase 1	Current status and needs for operationalizing management frameworks presented to stakeholders.	Options on the operationalization of the management frameworks available	No achievement during this period	<b>U</b>
	Number of training modules developed and tested at least in one of the CCLME countries	No specific training material on EAF, co-management and MPA monitoring adapted to fishing communities' priority needs	Draft of three training modules content with regards to EAF, co-management and MPA monitoring for CCLME fishery communities.	Three training modules content with regards to 1) EAF, 2) co-management and 3) MPA monitoring for CCLME fishery communities developed	Limited achievement during this period. Discussions ongoing with the EAF-Nansen Program, the West Africa CFI project and the FAO SSF Programme on development of training materials on EAF for fishing communities. Also exchanging expertise with other FAO projects dealing with similar issues.	<b>MU</b>

<b>Component 3: Communication, monitoring and evaluation</b>						
<b>Outcome 3.1:</b> Effective and efficient results-based management and knowledge sharing	Number of knowledge products shared through IW: Learn, project website and other platforms.	0	0	At least one main knowledge project shared.	No achievement during this period	<b>U</b>
	Performance rating in PIRs and final evaluation report.	0	Satisfactory rating (at least)	Satisfactory (S) overall rating (at least)		<b>U</b>

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Action(s) to be taken</b>	<b>By whom?</b>	<b>By when?</b>
<b>Outcome 1.1:</b>	Make the RCU technically and administratively functional to implement the Project.	BH and LTO	As soon as possible, before the end of 2021.
<b>Outcome 2.1:</b>	Make the RCU technically and administratively functional to implement the Project.	BH and LTO	
<b>Outcome 2.2:</b>	Make the RCU technically and administratively functional to implement the Project. Reinforce linkages and exchanges with other projects engaging on similar activities, to gain synergies	BH and LTO	
<b>Outcome 3.1:</b>	Make the RCU technically and administratively functional to implement the Project.	BH and LTO	



### 3. Progress in Generating Project Outputs (Implementation Progress, IP)

*(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as planned in the Annual Work Plan)*

Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>13</sup>	Achievements at each PIR <sup>14</sup>					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments Describe any variance <sup>15</sup> or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR		
Output 1.1.1: Recommendations on consortium and partnership agreement to support SAP implementation, clarifying responsibilities of partners and agreements on related terms of references	The Chief Technical Advisor came on-board in June-July 2021. Project work plan is being reviewed and a strategy to speed up implementation is under preparation. Recruitment of the rest of the Regional Coordination Team is underway.	0					%	Implementation of the project has been delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic.
Output 1.1.2: A multi-sectoral financing strategy involving national, public and private partnerships, bilateral and multilateral donors pledging financial support for full SAP implementation established		0					%	
Output 1.1.3: An agreed operational plan to implement the CCLME SAP and to strengthen the capacities and investments by the countries to address priorities linked to development of National Action Plans (NAPs).		0					%	
Output 2.1.1 Improved information on transboundary fisheries		0						

resources, ecosystems and vulnerable species and habitats							
Output 2.1.2.: Awareness-raised and information shared between the scientific community and stakeholders in the region through existing and new platforms	0						
Output 2.2.1: Support CCLME countries to enable the implementation of the ecosystem approach to fisheries in support of transboundary fisheries management	0						
Output 2.2.2: Capacity development programme designed for fishing communities with a particular focus in promoting gender equality	0						
Output 3.1.1: A communication strategy and tools for knowledge management updated and implemented.							
Output 3.1.2: A gender strategy developed for SAP							

<sup>12</sup> Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

<sup>13</sup> As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

<sup>14</sup> Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

<sup>15</sup> Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

implementation								
Output 3.1.3 Project monitoring and evaluation system in operation and providing routine information on progress in meeting output and outcome targets established		0						
Output 3.1.4 Independent final evaluation conducted		0						

#### 4. Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on Project Implementation

**Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):**

The project implemented only limited operational activities during this reporting period. Actions were taken to set up the regional coordination unit and to secure the office facilities in Dakar, Senegal. Steps were taken with each country to confirm Project Focal Points and Technical Focal points. A consultant was hired to support advancement of technical activities, and while preparatory actions have been initiated, limited progress towards achieving outcomes and outputs has been noted, mainly due to the Covid-19 situation in the seven participating countries.

**What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?**

The project has seen major delays due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and all activities were put on hold in this period given the restrictions enforced in the seven project countries. Vacancy announcements for RCU staff were published (CTA, communications officer and fisheries expert), with the selection process of the CTA finalized. However, the recruitment was put on hold considering that on a general note, field staff were not allowed to join their respective duty stations. Restructuring and changes in responsibilities within the fisheries and aquaculture division have also led to delays in designation of a new Lead Technical Officer.

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

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence and progress reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR.

For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

	<b>FY2021 Development Objective rating<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>FY2021 Implementation Progress rating<sup>17</sup></b>	<b>Comments/reasons<sup>18</sup> justifying the ratings for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>U</b>	The Covid-19 situation has impeded the project to move forward as anticipated.
<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>U</b>	The implementation of the project has been seriously hampered by the restrictions to movement and meetings that accompanied the Covid-19 pandemic worldwide. In the more recent period, with a relative relief of these restrictions, it was possible to appoint a project coordinator with good knowledge of the region, and the process for recruiting the remaining PMU staff has been restarted. As long as the covid-19-related restrictions continue to be eased, it is expected that the project implementation will recover some of the lost time. However, adaptations to the work plan and maybe some outputs may be necessary to ensure the project can be executed efficiently and the expected higher-level objectives are reached.
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>U</b>	<b>U</b>	Very limited progress has been achieved in the project period. The project was seriously impeded by the COVID-19 situation that has delayed the setting up of the project and implementation of activities. With the project coordinator in place and provided that COVID-19 restrictions are eased it is expected that the project will be picking up speed rapidly.

<sup>16</sup> **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet.

For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>17</sup> **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>18</sup> Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

<sup>19</sup> The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

<b>FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>U</b>	The start of the project coincided with the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, which affected many of the activities planned for 2020 – establishment of the RCU and project inception activities with countries.
--	----------	----------	--

## 5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

### Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

This section of the PIR describes the progress made towards complying with the approved ESM plan, when appropriate. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Please add recommendations to improve the implementation of the ESM plan, when needed.

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

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate if the initial Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid; if not, what is the new classification and explain.

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid <sup>20</sup> . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid.

<i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i>
No.

## 6. Risks

### Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
<p><i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the <b>Project Document</b> and reflects also <b>any new risks</b> identified in the course of project implementation. Please make sure that the table also includes the Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, <b>as relevant</b>.</i></p>

---

<sup>20</sup> **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.



	Risk	Risk rating <sup>21</sup>	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>22</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Inadequate representation of stakeholders	Low	Involvement and consultations with stakeholders at country level through the National Inter-Ministerial Committees	Confirmation of focal point and technical coordinator of CCLME 7 partner countries	
2	Countries priorities change associated with poverty or local conflict which lowers political will thereby diminishing effects of transboundary fisheries management based on EAF	Moderate	Communicate at local and national level, the importance of CCLME's goods and services in poverty reduction and economic growth efforts	No action yet undertaken	
3	Climate change induced extreme environmental variability, storms, coastal erosion and flooding become priority issues for governments and distract stakeholders from the project	Low	Country's needs to be taken into account for the mitigation of climate change impacts during the implementation of the SAP and over the longer term	No action yet undertaken	
4	COVID - 19 pandemic limits the ability of the Programme to deliver its planned work	Moderate	Alternative ways of delivering activities to be sought and work plan revised accordingly	To be discussed at inception meeting	

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

FY2020 rating	FY2021 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
N/A	Moderate	The project has seen major delays due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and all activities were put on hold given the restrictions enforced in the seven beneficiary countries and with other partners of the project. It is likely that COVID-19 restrictions will remain also in the future that may limit the possibility to implement some activities, or new ways of delivering results may need to be sought.

<sup>21</sup> GEF Risk ratings: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High

<sup>22</sup> If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation.

For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

**7. Adjustments to Project Strategy –  
Only for projects that had the Mid-term review (or supervision mission)**

If the project had a MTR review or a supervision mission, please report on how the MTR recommendations were implemented as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

**Not applicable.**

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented
Recommendation 1:	
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation 4:	

**Adjustments to the project strategy.**

Please note that changes to outputs, baselines, indicators or targets cannot be made without official approval from PSC and PTF members, including the FLO. These changes will follow the recommendations of the MTR or the supervision mission.

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outputs	No	No change, but implementation of the project is delayed.
Project Indicators/Targets	No	No change, but implementation of the project is delayed.

**Adjustments to Project Time Frame**

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, mid-term review, final evaluation or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
<b>Project extension</b>	<p>Original NTE: 30 June 2021                      Revised NTE: 30 June 2022</p> <p>Justification: The project has seen major delays due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and all activities were put on hold during this period.</p>

## 8. Stakeholders Engagement

**Please report on progress, challenges, and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable))**

Main stakeholders are the respective fisheries research and management institutions in the 7 CCLME countries as well as environmental ministries, At the regional level, CECAF, CSRP and the Abidjan convention are also main stakeholders. The project also works with the Regional Partnership for Coastal and Marine Conservation (PRCM) that is a coalition of stakeholders working on the problems of the West African coastline and covers the seven CCLME countries.. Stakeholder engagement events are expected to be further elaborated at the project inception meeting.

## 9. Gender Mainstreaming

**Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)**

It is planned that the project will develop a gender strategy (output 3.1.2) – as a foundation to facilitate the adoption of a more balanced gender representation in institutional and organizational structures in SAP implementation. This strategy will look at gender roles, proposing actions to be incorporated into the SAP for gender equality and women empowerment. The strategy will be developed by a gender expert in consultation with different SAP stakeholders and it will be validated at national (NICs) and regional (PSC) level for its implementation.

## 10. Knowledge Management Activities

**Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval**

Recruitment of a Communications Officer is underway. The Communication Officer will lead the development and implementation of the communication and KM strategy.

## 11. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

**Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.**

Not applicable.

## 12. Innovative Approaches

**Please provide a brief description of an innovative<sup>23</sup> approach in the project / programme, describe the type (e.g. technological, financial, institutional, policy, business model) and explain why it stands out as an innovation.**

NA – project activities are about to start.

## 13. Possible impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the project

**Please indicate any implication of the Covid-19 pandemic on the activities and progress of the project. Highlight the adaptative measures taken to continue with the project implementation.**

- Are the outcomes/outputs still achievable within the project period.
- Will the timing of the project MTR or TE be affected/delayed?
- What is the impact of COVID-19 on project beneficiaries, personnel, etc.
- Are there good practices and lessons learned to be shared?

The project became operationally active with the first expense incurred on 01 January 2020. But the project has seen major delays due to the Covid-19 pandemic, and all activities were put on hold in this period given the restrictions enforced in the seven beneficiary countries. Vacancy announcements for the project coordinator and other support staff were advertised. Given the delayed start of the project and the Covid-19 pandemic impact on the implementation of the work plan, a first extension of the project duration until June 2022 was requested. It is likely that a second extension may be needed to complete the foreseen tasks. This will be discussed at the inception meeting. This will delay the TE of the project.

---

<sup>23</sup> Innovation is defined as *doing something new or different in a specific context that adds value*

### 14. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>24</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2021	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Recipient Government	Government of Cabo Verde	In-kind	48,000	0	NA	48,000
Recipient Government	Government of Guinea	In-kind	195,000	0		195,000
Recipient Government	Government of Guinea-Bissau	In-kind	39,000	0		39,000
Recipient Government	Government of Mauritania	In-kind	568,000	0		568,000
Recipient Government	Government of Morocco	In-kind	2,240,000	0		2,240,000
Recipient Government	Government of Senegal	In-kind	1,430,000	54,000		1,430,000
Recipient Government	Government of The Gambia	In-kind	70,000	0		70,000
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	310,000	984,000		310,000
NGO	MAVA (PRCM)	In-kind	500,000	0		500,000
Donor Agency	Spanish Institute of Oceanography	In-kind	1,200,000	0		1,200,000
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>6,600,000</b>	<b>1,038,000</b>		<b>6,600,000</b>

<sup>24</sup> Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

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

## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

**Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** - Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”); **Satisfactory (S)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** - Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U)** - Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** - The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

**Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice”. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.