



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report **2023 – Revised Template**

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	9
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	13
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. STAKEHOLDERS' 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)
Initial project duration (years):	18 Months
Project coordinates: <i>This section should be completed ONLY by:</i> <i>a) Projects with 1st PIR;</i> <i>b) In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.</i>	N/A

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	31 st March 2024

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	1 826 000 USD
Total Co-financing amount (USD)³:	6 600 000 USD
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	1,159,587 USD
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)⁴:	927,005 USD
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023⁵	1,943,475 USD

¹ As per FPMIS

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

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

⁴ The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

⁵ Please refer to the Section 13 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	23 rd and 24 th November 2022
Expected Mid-term Review date ⁶ :	N/A
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	N/A
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date ⁷ :	November 2023
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	N/A

Overall ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	Satisfactory
Overall implementation progress rating:	Satisfactory
Overall risk rating:	Low

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	Low
----------------------------------	-----

Status

Implementation Status (1 st PIR, 2 nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	3 rd PIR
---	---------------------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	Aboubacar Sidibé Chief Technical Adviser Fisheries and Aquaculture Division-FAO	Aboubacar.Sidibe@fao.org
Budget Holder (BH)	Pedro de Barros Senior Fishery Resources Officer Fisheries and Aquaculture Division-FAO	Pedro.Barros@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)	Ariana Dottori GEF project implementation Support Specialist (Regional)	Ariana.Dottori@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.

Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Amber Himes-Cornell Fisheries Officer Fisheries and Aquaculture Division-FAO	Amber.HimesCornell@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	Kuena Morebotsane Technical Officer FAO GEF Unit	Kuena.Morebotsane@fao.org

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

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

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	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 multisectoral consortium and partnership agreement.	Recommendations about mechanism for partnership, collaboration for SAP implementation agreed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project has finalized CCLME national consultative meetings on Draft recommendations on mechanism for multi-sectoral consortium and partnership agreement for SAP implementation in seven partners countries (Morocco, Cabo-Verde, The Gambia, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Senegal & Mauritania). - Draft Recommendations are reviewed and amended from the second consultative meeting on multi-sectoral consortium and partnership agreement, and they will be submitted for endorsement. 	(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). Refer to Annex 1.

	<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The CCLME Ecosystem Analysis and Planning Working Group has been established and has undertaken an assessment and analysis of available scientific knowledge to identify gaps and /or scientific data and information on status of : (i) pelagic and demersal fish stocks and marine mammals and birds (with other vulnerable species); (ii) critical habitats and threatened biodiversity; and (iii) the quality of marine waters in the CCLME area. - A roadmap was finalized during the second meeting of the CCLME ecosystem working group for the ecosystem characterization and functioning including impacts of climate change in the CCLME region. - A transboundary ecosystem survey was undertaken on demersal species and small pelagic resources exploited in the CCLME in the context of the strategic collaboration with the EAF-Nansen Project. - The project website regularly disseminates technical and scientific information related to the activities of CCLME and its partners: https://www.fao.org/in-action/canary-current-lme/en/ 	<p>(S)</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--	---	------------

	<p>Outcome 2.2: Strengthened capacities to enable implementation of an ecosystem approach to fisheries (EAF) in the context of broader multisectoral ecosystem management goals.</p>	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In collaboration with EAF-Nansen Project, seven scientists (1 from each CCLME country) were trained on the use of the ecosystem approach to fisheries implementation monitoring tool - Analysis of existing management plans for coherence with an ecosystem approach to fisheries (EAF) and sharing of best practices from fisheries management plan implementation is under finalization to support operationalization of the management framework in seven CCLME countries 	(S)
		Number of training modules developed and tested at least in one of the CCLME countries	No specific training material on EAF, comanagement 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) comanagement and 3) MPA monitoring for CCLME fishery communities developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The training module on EAF is drafted in collaboration with EAF-Nansen Program and the West Africa Coastal Fisheries Initiative. - Training module content with regards to co-management and MPA is under development. 	(MS)

2023 Project Implementation Report

	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.	Two Knowledge products: - Genre Strategy and in action Plan in CCLME - Report of 1st & 2nd CCLME Ecosystem working Group) shared through the project's website.	(S)
		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 satisfactory given the activities executed in the last 12 months to meet the outcomes.	(S)

Measures taken to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings on Section 2

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 2.2:	Continue to reinforce contacts and synergies with EAF-Nansen Program and the West Africa Coastal Fisheries Initiative (CFI-WA) to accelerate the elaboration of training materials on EAF.	The Regional Coordinator of the project CCLME	By the end of October 2023

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 DO NOT repeat results re- ported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in de- livering outputs
<u>Outcome 1.1</u>	Management of the CCLME strengthened with the development of mechanisms for cooperation, partnerships and financing of the SAP.			
<u>Output 1.1.1</u>	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	The recommendations on the type of consortium and partnership agreement to support SAP implementation have been formulated.	None. Annual target was reached.
<u>Output 1.1.2</u>	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	SAP financing strategy elaboration is launched and ongoing	The development of the SAP financing strategy is started and well underway, but it is not complete yet. The delay was due to the need of ensuring the strategy reflected the type of consortium and the partnership agreement. The final recommendations for these were only complete recently.
<u>Output 1.1.3</u>	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).	Develop the regional operational plan and finalize the National Action Plans (NAPs), in each of the seven countries, based on the priorities identified in the SAP	The draft regional operational plan and National Action Plans (NAPs) are developed	The plans are not yet finalized, but the drafts have been produced and will be submitted to the CCLME country and partners for validation and finalization in July 2023.

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>	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.			
<u>Output 2.1.1</u>	Improved Information on trans-boundary fisheries resources, ecosystems and vulnerable species and habitats.	Data analysis and prioritization of future scientific activities to address knowledge gaps.	The CCLME Ecosystem Planning and Analysis Working Group has been revitalized to identify and prioritize the future scientific activities to address knowledge gaps in SAP implementation.	No variance. Outputs are on track.
<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.	Scientific communication platforms are identified to disseminate scientific and technical reports on the CCLME.	No variance. Outputs are on track.
<u>Outcome 2.2</u>	Strengthened capacities to enable implementation of an ecosystem approach to fisheries (EAF) in the context of broader multisectoral ecosystem management goals.			
<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.	The analysis of existing management plans for their consistency with the EAF is under finalization in each CCLME country.	No variance. Output is on track.
<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 content of training modules on EAF is available.	No variance. Output is on track.
<u>Outcome 3.1</u>	Effective and efficient results-based management and knowledge sharing.			
<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 communication strategy is updated and new articles and documents published, as well as announcement of new relevant events on CCLME website.	No variance. Output is on track.

<u>Output 3.1.2</u>	A gender strategy developed for SAP implementation.	Develop a gender strategy for future SAP implementation	The gender strategy for future SAP implementation is developed	No variance. Output is on track.
<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

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcomes of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR (max 400 words)

Progress

Despite its difficult start, the project made very significant progress in achieving its main outcomes between July 2022 and June 2023 by: finalizing the draft recommendations on the type of consortium agreement and launching the development of the financing strategy for the implementation of the CCLME Strategic Action Program (SAP); the regional operational plan and the national SAP implementation action plans for SAP implementation at the regional and national levels have been drafted and are expected to be finalized by the end of August 2023.

The CCLME Ecosystem Analysis and Planning Working Group has been re-established and revitalized with the assessment of scientific knowledge gaps and definition of future scientific research activities for the implementation of the SAP. Also, the communication strategy has been updated for a permanent communication with all stakeholders intervening in the CCLME area.

Challenges

The main challenge is the to keep ongoing the strengthening collaborations and synergies with other FAO units and projects (EAF-Nansen, CFI, etc.) other initiatives in CCLME region for 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.

Given the project activities that were carried out between July 2022 and June 2023, the current rating for the Project Development Objective and Implementation Progress is Satisfactory and rating for risks to the project is now low.

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

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.

	FY2023 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	<i>The project carried out key activities to achieve the expected results on the development of recommendations for the consortium agreement, the development of the CCLME gender strategy and its action plan, the revitalization of the CCLME ecosystem analysis and planning working group, assessment of the scientific knowledge gaps in CCLME area and the development of the future scientific research programme for the implementation of SAP. The project also launched the development of the SAP funding strategy. The communication strategy and tools are updated. The website of CCLME project is well functioning and the knowledge and other scientific et and technical reports continue to be shared.</i>
Budget Holder	S	S	<i>During the reporting period, the project managed to recover most of the delay accumulated during the Covid-19 pandemic period. With the work planned for the next period, marking an acceleration of implementation, it is reasonable to expect that all the most important outcomes will be achieved by the end of the implementation period.</i>
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸			N/A

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.

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

Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	S	S	<i>Despite a marked delay in the start of the project, the project has made significant progress in the last year and is on track to carry out all of the foreseen activities as indicated above by the project coordinator. The capacity building trainings, working groups and planning for future work to implement the SAP are particularly notable achievements.</i>
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	MS	MS	<i>The project has not yet delivered of some of the planned key activities and outputs, including the financing strategy and preparation of programme/project proposals.</i>

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

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

This section is under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made to comply 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. Please indicate if new 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				
	N/A			
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
	N/A			
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
	N/A			
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
	N/A			
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
	N/A			
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
	N/A			
ESS 7: Decent Work				
	N/A			
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
	N/A			
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
	N/A			
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				
	N/A			

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate:

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 (Esm-unit@fao.org) should be contacted. The project shall prepare or amend an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) or other ESS instruments and management tools based on the new risk classification (please refer to page 13 <https://www.fao.org/3/cb9870en/cb9870en.pdf>)

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified during the 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 coordinator of CCLME 7 partner countries	This risk is appreciably mitigated now
2	Countries priorities change associated with poverty or local conflict which lowers political will thereby diminishing effects of transboundary fisheries management based on EAF	Low	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 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	The project has managed to communicate to the major stakeholders that EAF-compliant management explicitly includes addressing the prevention and reaction to extreme events and other climate-related issues, and this risk was thus mostly mitigated

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

FY2022 rating	FY2023 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Low	Low	Project implementation has recovered quickly and the activities carried out during this reporting period have permitted to achieve some main expected results.

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.

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

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 was delayed.		
Components and cost	No change		
Institutional and implementation arrangements	No change		
Financial management	No change		
Implementation schedule	A no cost extension was requested and accepted, because the implementation of the project was delayed one year and half.	New NTE: 31 March 2024	GEF Unit
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 minor project amendment (define)			

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

9. Stakeholders' 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	Type of partnership	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	National Focal Points and Technical coordinators have contributed effectively to the mobilization and facilitation of national consultations. This resulted in a good level of engage for element for the national institutions in the overall CCLME process	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.	National fisheries and marine scientific research institutions or centers to have contributed to assessment of the scientific knowledge gaps in CCLME area and the development of the future scientific research programme for the implementation of SAP.	no particular challenge
NGOs²³			
PRCM	Strengthening partnerships between institutions and harmonizing marine and conservation policies in CCLME sub-region	Organization in hybrid format of the Scientific Symposium on the Conservation of Marine and Coastal Biodiversity in the North-West African Sub-Region in May 2023 with the participation of CCLME	no particular challenge

²³ Non-government organizations

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) during this reporting period.		
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.	Yes	A gender strategy to promote gender equality and women empowerment to be implemented during SAP implementation was 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):		
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	<i>Please provide progress on gender sensitive indicators of the project results framework.</i>
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, during this reporting period.	
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"> • Meetings documents (Reports, pictures) stored and shared on FAO SharePoint and project staff OneDrive • Knowledge shared also through CCLME national Stakeholder WhatsApp groups, Mailing lists, Google collaborative platforms (Google doc, Google Photos) and project website
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year .	<p>The updated communication strategy focuses on innovative tools, stakeholder engagement, and knowledge management tactics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new website is dynamic and user friendly • The Hashtag #CCLME is used by partners on social media posts. <p>Communication Assets, forms and document templates are branded.</p>
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.	Products no applicable
Please provide links to related website, social media account	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. Communication and stakeholder engagement strategy 2. Report of the 1st CCLME Planning and Ecosystemic Analysis Working Group 3. Second steering committee report 4. Gender strategy and action plan 5. CCLME scientific symposium call for paper
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details	<p>Ibrahim Aboubacar HAMA Ibrahim.aboubacarhama@fao.org +2217741235 @ihamacom (Twitter)</p>

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 ²⁴	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ²⁵	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023	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	20,410	NA	48,000
Recipient Government	Government of Guinea	In-kind	195,000	110,000	NA	195,000
Recipient Government	Government of Guinea-Bissau	In-kind	39,000	20,410	NA	39,000
Recipient Government	Government of Mauritania	In-kind	568,000	71,410	NA	568,000
Recipient Government	Government of Morocco	In-kind	2,240,000	221,410	NA	2,240,000
Recipient Government	Government of Senegal	In-kind	1,430,000	55,729	NA	1,430,000
Recipient Government	Government of The Gambia	In-kind	70,000	20,410	NA	70,000
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	310,000	984,000	NA	1,524,000
NGO	PRCM	In-kind	500,000	150,000	NA	500,000
Donor Agency	Spanish Institute of Oceanography	In-kind	1,200,000	289,696	NA	1,200,000
		TOTAL	6,600,000	1,943,475	-	7,814,000

²⁴Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

²⁵Grant, Loan, Equity Investment, Guarantee, In-Kind, Public Investment, Other (please refer to the *Guidelines on co-financing* for definitions)

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_FI_GN_01_Cofinancing_Guidelines_2018.pdf

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 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 will 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

Annex 2.**GEO LOCATION INFORMATION**

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap](#) or [GeoNames](#) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#)

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location & Activity Description

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