



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2022 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	4
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	9
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	12
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	15
6. RISKS	17
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION (ONLY FOR PROJECTS THAT HAVE CONDUCTED AN MTR)	19
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	20
9. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT	21
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	22
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	23
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	24
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	25

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Canary Current Large Marine Ecosystem
Country (ies):	Cabo Verde, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Mauritania, Morocco and Senegal
Project Title:	Towards sustainable management of the Canary Current Large Marine Ecosystem (CCLME) – initial support to SAP implementation
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/INT/985/GFF
GEF ID:	9940
GEF Focal Area(s):	International Waters
Project Executing Partners:	The Fishery Committee for the Eastern Atlantic (CECAF)
Project Duration (years):	18 Months
Project coordinates:	<i>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</i>

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	06 September 2019
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	1 st January 2020
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	30 th June 2021
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ²	30 th June 2023

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	1 826 000 USD
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc³:	6 600 000 USD
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)⁴:	525,012 USD
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022⁵	1,165,368 USD

¹ As per FPMIS

² If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF CU.

³ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

⁴ For DEX projects, the GEF Coordination Unit will confirm the final amount with the Finance Division in HQ. For OPIM projects, the disbursement amount should be provided by Execution Partners.

⁵ Please refer to the section 12 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

M&E Milestones

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	4 th -5 th November 2021
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	N/A
Actual Mid-term review date:	N/A
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	March 2023
Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage	N/A

Overall ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	<i>S</i>
Overall implementation progress rating:	<i>S</i>
Overall risk rating:	<i>Low</i>

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	<i>Low</i>
---	------------

Status

Implementation Status :	2 nd PIR
--------------------------------	---------------------

Project Contacts

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

⁶ The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2nd PIR, around half-point between EOD and NTE. The MTR report in English should be submitted to the GEF Secretariat within 4 years of the CEO Endorsement date.

⁷ The Terminal Evaluation date should be discussed with OED 6 months before the project's NTE date.

2. Progress towards Achieving Project Objective(s) (Development Objective)

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

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating ¹¹
To create the conditions for the effective implementation of the Strategic Action Program (SAP) of the Canary Current Large Marine Ecosystem.	Outcome 1.1: 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	The project has organized CCLME national consultative meetings to identify national priority activities to be synergized, review governance frameworks of a multi-sectoral consortium with proposal recommendations on mechanism for partnership, collaboration for SAP implementation in six partners countries (Morocco, Cabo Verde, The Gambia, Guinea, Guinea Bissau and Senegal) out of seven.	(S)

⁸ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic Co-benefits as well.

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

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating ¹¹
	<p>Outcome 2.1: 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>In the context of the collaboration with the EAF-Nansen, one transboundary ecosystem survey has been undertaken on demersal species exploited in the CCLME region and one transboundary survey is planned to assess the small pelagic resources before the end of 2022.</p> <p>The project has supported the international symposium on "Small pelagic fish in the face of intensified fishing and climate change" in CCLME area organized in May 2022 in Mauritania by supporting scientific participants to present their work in the climate change impact on small pelagic resources.</p> <p>The project website has been launched and information from the above international symposium has been added to facilitate dissemination of expert information.</p>	<p>(S)</p>

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating ¹¹
	Outcome 2.2: 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	In order to support the operationalization of the management framework, 14 scientists of the CCLME region were trained and have participated in the 2022 demersal survey.	(MS)
		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	Draft content of training materials on EAF is under development in collaboration with EAF-Nansen Program and the West Africa Coastal Fisheries Initiative for fishing communities in CCLME area.	(MU)
	Outcome 3.1: 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 product shared.	The website of CCLME project is launched and the knowledge has been started to be shared. https://www.fao.org/in-action/canary-current-lme/en/ Small pelagic symposium documentation, and communication material (Presentations, reports, ToR, and pictures) stored and shared on SharePoint (here)	(MS)

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating ¹¹
						<p>Provided communication support to the demersal working groups of CECAF, held from 4th to 9th in Senegal.</p> <p>Provided communication support for the consultation workshop for the development of the management plan for the sardinella fishery in Senegal, on 7 and 8 June 2022.</p>	
		Performance rating in PIRs and final evaluation report.	0	Satisfactory rating (at least)	Satisfactory (S) overall rating (at least)	Global performance rating in this PIR is moderate satisfactory given the activities realized in only six months to meet the outcomes in a context of a still relatively late exit from the Covid-19 pandemic.	(MS)

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 2.2:	Reinforce contacts and synergies with FAO units developing and promoting EAF and Capacity Development, as well as with other projects with similar or associated goals and activities, to accelerate the transfer of knowledge and the exchange of experiences	The Regional Coordinator of the project CCLME	Being done at this moment.
Outcome 3.1:	Finalize the communication strategy and tools for knowledge management, including further updates to the project website	Communication Officer	By end of July 2022
	Finalising the mapping of existing science communication platforms and opportunities for communication at regional level.	Communication Officer	By end of July 2022
	Recruit a consultant to draft the gender strategy for the CCLME	Communication Officer with support of the Regional Coordinator of the project CCLME	By the end of September 2022
	Recruit a consultant to develop a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system/plan for the full SAP implementation programme.	Communication Officer with support of the Regional Coordinator of the project CCLME	By end of October 2022

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as per the Implementation Plan/Annual Workplan)

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
Outcome 1.1				
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 agreed.	Formulation of final recommendations on the type of consortium and partnership agreement	National Consultations to formulate recommendations on the multisectoral consortium and partnership agreement organized in six countries of CCLME	Final recommendations not yet agreed to. However, the national consultation process has been completed for all but one country (Mauritania), and the agreement should be possible to achieve during the next reporting period.
Output 1.1.2	A multi-sectoral financing strategy involving national public and private agencies, bilateral and multilateral donors pledging financial support for full implementation of SAP is established.	Develop a SAP financing strategy for donors' engagement for future funding for the CCLME	Not yet achieved for this output during this period	The development of SAP financing strategy is delayed because it will be based on the partnership agreement (consortium) under development among the country partners of CCLME (cf. above).
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).	Finalize the National Action Plans (NAPs), in each of the seven countries, based on the priorities identified in the SAP	National priorities activities, of SAP have been reviewed and identified during the CCLME national consultancy in six countries	NAPs not yet finalized. However, the national consultancies created the conditions to quickly develop the National Action Plans (NAP) planned for the seven CCLME Countries

¹² Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

¹³ Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Workplan. Please be concise (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁴ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

<u>Outcome 2.1</u>				
<u>Output 2.1.1</u>	Improved Information on transboundary fisheries resources, ecosystems and vulnerable species and habitats.	Data analysis and prioritization of future scientific activities to address knowledge gaps	In collaboration with the EAF-Nansen Project, the surveys to collect data in CCLME area were carried out on demersal resources stock from 24 February to 5 May 2022	A delay is observed in the revival of the ecosystem working group to identify scientific knowledge gaps. This working Group will be finalized and hold its first meeting in September.
<u>Output 2.1.2</u>	Awareness-raised and information shared between the scientific community and stakeholders in the region through existing and new platforms.	Make available and disseminate all scientific and technical reports on the project activities on the CCLME website	A mapping of scientific communication platforms and communication opportunities is drafted	Mapping needs to be finalized and validated by partners/stakeholders
<u>Outcome 2.2</u>				
<u>Output 2.2.1</u>	Support CCLME countries to enable the implementation of the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) in support of transboundary fisheries management.	Analysis of existing management plans for consistency with a EAF and exchange of best practices from the implementation of national management plans	No achievement during this period	A national consultant needs to be recruited in each CCLME country to carry out the synthesis of the fisheries management plans and their compatibility with the EAF. Efforts are being made to catch up on the delay.
<u>Output 2.2.2</u>	Capacity development programme designed for fishing communities, with a particular focus on promoting gender equality.	Develop training program for fishing communities to apply EAF, co-management practices or MPA monitoring	Draft contents for the training programmes on EAF and Co-management prepared.	The draft contents of three training modules with regards to EAF, co-management and MPA monitoring for CCLME fishery communities have not yet been completed, but efforts are being made to catch up on the delay.
<u>Outcome 3.1</u>				
<u>Output 3.1.1</u>	A communication strategy and tools for knowledge management updated and implemented.	Implement a communication strategy and knowledge management tools	The website has been updated and new articles and documents published, as well announcement of new relevant events	No variance. Outputs are on track.

<u>Output 3.1.2</u>	A gender strategy developed for SAP implementation.	Develop a gender strategy for future SAP implementation	No achievement during this period	The delivery is delayed. A consultant is being recruited to develop the gender strategy and should be in place before end of September.
<u>Output 3.1.3</u>	Project monitoring and evaluation system in operation and providing routine information on progress in meeting output and outcome targets.	Prepare semi-annual progress reports, including targets for outputs and outcomes	Project progress reports have been prepared and submitted on-schedule.	No variance. Output is on track
<u>Output 3.1.4</u>	Independent final evaluation conducted.	Conduct the final evaluation	Not yet applicable during this period	Not yet applicable during this period

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcome of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR.

Progress

From November 4 to 5, 2021, the project organized the launching workshop and steering committee in order to validate the 2022 annual action plan of the CCLME MSP project. It conducted CCLME country national consultations in 6 out of 7 countries to identify national priority activities to be synergized and to review governance frameworks and partnership models (Consortium) for cross-sectoral collaboration and coordination in the effective implementation of the CCLME Strategic Action Program (SAP) at the national and regional levels.

Researchers from the CCLME countries participated in a scientific campaign organized by the EAF-Nansen Project on demersal resources in the CCLME area. The project supported the organization of the international symposium on "Small pelagic fishes in the face of fishing intensification and climate change" in the CCLME area, organized in May 2022 in Mauritania, by supporting the scientific participants to present their work on the impact of climate change on the small pelagic resources in the CCLME area.

Challenges

The main challenge is the catching up of the delay in the implementation of the activities of component 2 compared to the other components of the Project. We are therefore strengthening collaborations and synergies with FAO units that develop and promote EAF approach and capacity building, to improve knowledge on the understanding of the state of the CCLME, including fish stocks, vulnerable species and habitats, ecosystem functioning and the effects of climate change on the resources and fishing communities.

Outcome of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR

With the gradual lifting of travel and physical meeting restrictions related to the Covid-19 pandemic, and given the project activities that have already been realized, the current rating for the Project Development Objective and Implementation Progress is Satisfactory and rating for risks to the project is now low.

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.

	FY2022 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2022 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	<i>With the gradual lifting of travel and physical meeting restrictions related to the Covid-19 pandemic, the project has been able to conduct national consultations in 6 out of 7 partner countries in a short period of time to prioritize national activities and to make recommendations for the establishment of the CCLME Consortium. The project has co-organized the international symposium on "Small pelagic fishes in the face of fishing intensification and climate change" in the CCLME area, organized in May 2022 in Mauritania. The website of CCLME project is launched and the knowledge has been started to be shared.</i>
Budget Holder	S	S	<i>Despite a marked delay in the start of the project, due mostly to the restrictions on movement to contain the Covid-19 pandemic, during the last semester there was a significant recovery of the backlog. Stakeholder and national ownership and buy-in are the most crucial element when the goal is to achieve improvements in management of shared resources, including the overall ecosystem services provided by the Ocean and Coastal areas in the CCLME region, and the activities during this semester managed to reinforce and consolidate this ownership and buy-in. Also several of the more technical activities have advanced, supporting a quick recovery of the delay in the next period of the project.</i>

¹⁵ **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁶ **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁷ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸			Comments and ratings from OFPs were not received within the set deadline for PIR final submission
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	S	S	<i>The project is moving ahead well in the foreseen activities under components 1 and 3. However, the project is strengthening collaborations and synergies with FAO units that promote EAF approach and capacity building, as well as data and information collection and analysis, to improve knowledge on fish stocks, vulnerable species and habitats, ecosystem functioning and the effects of climate change on the resources and fishing communities in CCLME area. The next phase of the project will continue progress with the activities envisioned under components 1 and 3 and increase the focus on progressing with activities under component 2.</i>
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MS	MS	<i>With COVID-19 pandemic having eased in the past year, the project has made some progress under components 1 and 3. It is important to keep in mind that this medium-sized project was intended as a bridge (to not lose momentum) towards full implementation of the SAP with a multi-sectoral financing strategy seen as a key outcome of the project – leading to the preparation of a full programme proposal for submission in GEF-8.</i>

¹⁸ In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

¹⁹ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made complying with the approved ESM plan. 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. Add new ESS risks if any risks have emerged during this FY.

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

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

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²⁰ . 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.

²⁰ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation (including COVID-19 related risks). The last column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in the project, as relevant.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Inadequate representation of stakeholders	Low	Y	Involvement and consultations with stakeholders at country level through the National Inter-Ministerial Committees	Confirmation of focal point and technical co-ordinator 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	Y	Communicate at local and national level, the importance of CCLME's goods and services in poverty reduction and economic growth efforts	Some progress was achieved, mostly in the framework of the national consultations	Last semester has seen a large effort on mitigating this risk, and the strong involvement of local authorities and stakeholders already obtained will further reduce it.

²¹ Risk ratings means a rating of accesses the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives.

Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
3	Climate change induced extreme environmental variability, storms, coastal erosion and flooding become priority issues for governments and distract stakeholders from the project	Low	Y	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	Good communications showing that the final project will also target these issues, namely through the implementation of EAF, that are being undertaken, will also reduce this risk
4	COVID - 19 pandemic limits the ability of the Programme to deliver its planned work	Low	N	Alternative ways of delivering activities to be sought and work plan have been revised accordingly	By decision of the Steering Committee, the project activities have been reviewed and adapted to consider the delay created by the covid-19 pandemic.	Project implementation in last semester has shown that it is possible to recover quickly, and the activities carried out during this reporting period are set to allow a swift implementation of the activities.

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

FY2021 rating	FY2022 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Moderate	Low	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 project countries and with other partners of the project. But the project steering committee is working to make up for the delay caused by the Covid-19 pandemic and to speed up the achievement the expected results of the project.

7. Follow-up on Mid-term review or supervision mission (only for projects that have conducted an MTR)

If the project had an MTR or a supervision mission, please report on how the recommendations were implemented during this fiscal year as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

Not applicable.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
Recommendation 1:	NA
Recommendation 2:	NA
Recommendation 3:	NA
Recommendation 4:	NA
Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe	NA

8. Minor project 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 GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines²². Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories. And, provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework	No change, but implementation of the project is delayed.		
Components and cost	No change		
Institutional and implementation arrangements	No change		
Financial management	No change		
Implementation schedule	No change, but implementation of the project is delayed.		
Executing Entity	No change		
Executing Entity Category	No change		
Minor project objective change	No change		
Safeguards	No change		
Risk analysis	No change		
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	No change		
Co-financing	No change		
Location of project activity	No change		
Other			

²² Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

9. Stakeholder Engagement

Please report on progress and results and challenges on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan) included at CEO Endorsement/Approval during this reporting period.

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government Institutions			
National Fisheries Management institutions and National Marine and Coastal Management institutions in seven countries of CCLME	Focal point & national technical coordinator to Support the implementation of the CCLME project at national level	Contribute to the mobilization of stakeholders and facilitate national consultations for the establishment of the CCLME Consortium	no particular challenge
Fisheries and marine scientific research institutions or centers in seven countries of CCLME	Support improvement of information on transboundary fisheries resources, ecosystems and vulnerable species and habitats.	Active participation to the EAF-Nansen Project scientific surveys to collect data on demersal fish stock in CCLME area	no particular challenge
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
PRCM	Assistance through strengthening partnerships between institutions and harmonizing marine and conservation policies in CCLME sub-region	Organization of the 10th Regional Coastal Marine Forum in West Africa held in April 2022 with the participation of CCLME	no particular challenge

10. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) <u>during this reporting period.</u>		
Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	Not yet	A gender strategy to promote gender equality and women empowerment to be implemented during SAP implementation will be developed by the project
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	No	
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):	No	
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	No	
b) improving women's participation and decision making	No	
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	No	
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	No	
Staff with gender expertise	No	
Any other good practices on gender	No	

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Participating and documenting meetings (Reports, pictures)</i> • <i>Sharing through WhatsApp groups, Mailing lists, collaborative platforms (Google doc, Google photos, SharePoint), and project website</i>
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	<i>The updated communication strategy will focus more on innovative tools, and take into account the stakeholder's engagement and knowledge management tactics</i>
Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.	<i>Products non applicable</i>
Please provide links to related website, social media account	https://www.fao.org/in-action/cclme/fr/ https://www.fao.org/in-action/canary-current-lme/en/
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. https://www.fao.org/in-action/canary-current-lme/news/detail-events/en/c/1532238/ 2. https://www.fao.org/gambia/news/detail-events/en/c/1505683/ 3. https://www.fao.org/in-action/canary-current-lme/news/detail-events/en/c/1506376/ 4. https://www.fao.org/in-action/canary-current-lme/news/detail-events/en/c/1506378/ 5. https://www.fao.org/in-action/canary-current-lme/news/detail-events/en/c/1506372/
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details	Ibrahim Aboubacar HAMA Ibrahim.aboubacarhama@fao.org +2217741235 @ihamacom (Twitter)

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples and local communities involved in the project (as per the approved Project Document)? If yes, please briefly explain.

Not applicable.

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²³	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	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	20,860	NA	48,000
Recipient Government	Government of Guinea	In-kind	195,000	20,860	NA	195,000
Recipient Government	Government of Guinea-Bissau	In-kind	39,000	20,860	NA	39,000
Recipient Government	Government of Mauritania	In-kind	568,000	19,860	NA	568,000
Recipient Government	Government of Morocco	In-kind	2,240,000	20,860	NA	2,240,000
Recipient Government	Government of Senegal	In-kind	1,430,000	57,208	NA	1,430,000
Recipient Government	Government of The Gambia	In-kind	70,000	20,860	NA	70,000
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	310,000	984,000	NA	1,524,000
NGO	PRCM	In-kind	500,000	0	NA	500,000
Donor Agency	Spanish Institute of Oceanography	In-kind	1,200,000	289,696	NA	1,200,000
TOTAL			6,600,000	1,165,368		7,814,000

²³ 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 Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
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. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project’s components and activities is in compliance with the project’s approved implementation plan.	
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.

Risk rating. It should assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:	
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.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, 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 moderate risk.
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 low risks.