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PIMS 4313 - Project Title: SPWA- Participatory Biodiversity Conservation and Low Carbon Development in Pilot Ecovillages in Senegal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Focal Area | Biodiversity |
| Lead RTA |  Mirey Atallah |
| Lead Country(ies) | (SEN) Senegal |
| Revised Planned Closing Date | 29-Sep-2016 |
| Overall Risk rating |  |
| Overall DO rating |  |
| Overall IP rating |  |
| GEF grant amount disbursed so far | 1,031,659 |

Project Summary

Through a barrier-removal approach, the project will be delivered and structured around 5 main components / key outcomes as follows (refer to project framework in Part I for more detail):

Outcome 1) Improved governance framework for the management of biological resources and energy in Ecovillages: GEF funds will to adapt the Ecovillage model in Senegal model in order to generate global environmental benefits through: (i) the design of a strategy and the adoption of the appropriate policies, laws and regulations; (iii) a capacity building program to enhance the levels of competences of communities, local governments and other stakeholders in natural resources management, biodiversity conservation and the energy sector; and (ii) a replication plan to ensure the upscaling of benefits global of the Ecovillage model.

Outcome 2) Establishment of demonstration activities in the Ecovillages adjacent to three important protected areas in Senegal: GEF funds will support the creation of seven pilot Community Nature Reserves (CNR) covering at least 50,000 hectares to be chosen for their high ecological value. For greater project efficiency, the demonstration activities will be oriented to meet the needs of the country’s seven eco-geographical zones, in habitats that preserve high diversity and high densities of each zone’s indigenous species. Potential natural habitats that could be targeted include the Niayes, the Djoudj National park in the Senegal River Delta, the large animal reserves of the Ferlo, the manatee ponds and bayous of the Senegal River, the National Parks of Niokolo-Koba and Delta du Saloum, and the Groundnut Basin. Feasibility studies to be carried out during the project development stage will select target sites in each of these eco-geographical zones (indicatively 5 villages per eco-geographic zone). Activities to be implemented include the development of management plans, the assignment and training of ecoguards, conservation activities and the engineering of sustainable use management systems, etc. Additionally, co-management schemes will be developed in 3 PAs to allow increased involvement of local populations in the sustainable use of PA resources and conservation of biodiversity within the PAs through their participation in the PA enforcement system. Alternative revenues will be generated through the development of viable economic alternatives and sustainable financing mechanisms, including ecotourism, conservation agriculture, intensive livestock breeding etc. In addition to community activities within the ecological perimeter, the project will promote home gardens and the cultivation of market crops enclosed by live hedges of Jatropha. The project preparatory phase will help assess the feasibility of proposed activities.

Outcome 3) Reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in key end-uses and strategy towards energy self-sufficiency: GEF funds will support the identification, production and promotion of low-carbon energy such as improved cooking stoves, agrofuel (Jatropha) and “energy hubs” in the selected ecovillages. Derived outcomes under Outcome 3 will include: (3.1) Transformation of domestic cooking practices reduces GHG emissions as well as the pressure on woody species used for firewood in surrounding landscapes; (3.2) Alternative sources of sustainable energy put in place and adopted by the population; (3.3) Production, development and promotion of use of locally produced agrofuel from Jatropha curcas.

Outcome 4) Strengthening capacities for carbon sequestration, integrated ecosystem management and nature-based climate change adaptation in ecosystems of territories adjacent to Ecovillages: This component of the project will be heavily co-financed and GEF funds will be used only catalytically to ensure the yielding of global benefits through the proposed activities. Under this

Outcome, the project will help develop and test PES schemes within the pilot Ecovillages. This will include (i) the development of plant nurseries (21 million plants targeted), (ii) the regeneration of mangroves (4 million propagules targeted) covering an area of 400 ha in the vicinity of the Saloum Delta Biosphere Reserve, (iii) the systematic collection and composting of domestic wastes for the promotion of organic agriculture.

Outcome 5) Participatory monitoring & evaluation of the project’s performance: The project will be systematically monitored in order to uptake lessons and upscale its main achievements at various levels. To this end, the project will promote the valorization of local knowledge in participatory conservation of biodiversity, as well as in the mitigation of and adaptation to climate change.

14. Globally, the Ecovillages program is a powerful lever for the adaptation of the rural milieu to different crises in food security, energy, the environment and financing. Global environment benefits that will arise from the effective establishment of the ecovillages include the direct and indirect protection of globally significant species such as the manatees (Trichechus senegalensis), the endangered chimpanzees (Pan troglodytes), the African wild dog (Lycaon pictus), the African elephant (Loxodonta africana) and the lion (Panthera leo). Through the creation of CNRs in habitats such as the Niayes, the project will support the conservation of key endemic plant species. By indirectly supporting the management of PAs through interventions in the buffer zones, the project will also generate global benefits through the continuing provision of genetic resources, wild plant and animal resources, and ecosystem services such as watershed protection, flood control and regeneration of degraded soils. Moreover, reduced levels of deforestation and degradation in PAs will translate into additional carbon sequestration, besides what is already targeted under Outcome 4. Finally, the project will reduce GHG emission by avoiding the use of petrol product for key energy service in Senegal’s rural households. The use of Jatropha oil as an agrofuel and improved cooking stoves will translate into alternatives that offer benefits from a socio-economic and a global environmental standpoint.

UNDP-GEF Technical Advisor’s Comments

Explanation for change to Overall DO Rating or Overall IP Rating:

n/a

Is this the terminal PIR that will serve as the final project report?

n/a

If the mid-term review (MTR) OR the terminal evaluation (TE) was started but not completed this reporting period, please explain how these are progressing and note if any delays are expected:

n/a

If the mid-term review (MTR) OR the terminal evaluation (TE) was completed this reporting period, or if this is the final APR/PIR, please address the following points here:

n/a

UNDP Country Office’s Comments

If the mid-term review (MTR) OR the terminal evaluation (TE) was started but not completed this reporting period, please explain how these are progressing and note if any delays are expected:

If the mid-term review (MTR) OR the terminal evaluation (TE) was completed this reporting period, or if this is the final APR/PIR, please address the following points here:

Dates of Project Steering Committee/Board meetings during reporting period:

January 2013

PROGRESS TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

| **Description** | **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Target Level at end of project** | **Level at 30 June 2009** | **Level at 30 June 2010** | **Level at 30 June 2011** | **Level at 30 June 2012** | **Level at 30 June 2013** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To remove barriers to an integrated approach to sustainable natural resource management, biodiversity conservation and low carbon development in rural areas of Senegal through the Ecovillage model. | 1. Carbon footprint (using Bilan Carbone method to calculate GHG emissions/ sequestration) from energy and land use at the level of village lands (“terroir villageois”) (Indicator 9, below, is sub-set of this same Indicator) | Bilan Carbone baseline data exists for some test rural villages. [METHODOLOGICAL NOTE added in 2013:] At PRODOC preparation stage (PPG), the Bilan Carbone had been applied in full for 4 prospective ecovillages: (i) Teyel in Haute Casamance; (ii) Loumbol Samba Abdoul in the Ferlo; (iii) Diadeum 3 in the Delta du Fleuve Sénégal; and (iv) Massarinko in the Delta du Saloum. Of these, only (ii) Loumbol and (iv) Massarinko ended up being finally selected as project sites. Through informed extrapolation and based on the results of the Bilan Carbone and other studies, a proxy baseline of for the GHG balance (i.e. emissions minus sequestration) was established in for a total of 4 out of 10 project sites, all of which are net emitters: Yearly GHG emission / carbon sequestration balance (tCO2): [2] Toubel Baly 3,786 [4] Ndick 2,973 [7] Massarinko 6,345 [10] Thiasky 2,973 PPG technical reports also showed that the most important contributors to the net emissions in prospective ecovillages were the agricultural and livestock sectors, coupled with land use change. | 1a) At start of project, the baseline and “business-as-usual” (BAU) development scenario for comparison will be established (10 pilot villages). 1b) By project end, the application Bilan Carbone for 10 pilot Ecovillages shows that these villages have embarked on a low carbon development path: net emissions are at least 30% lower than the BAU development scenario. [NOTE on logframe revision: indicator revised to introduce clarity.] |  |  |  | The baseline level of 03 ecovillages is known | 1a) Project start target has been achieved for 11 ecovillages. The baseline is set. 1b) We will inform on the achievement of the EOP target in due course (not due now). Else, the MTR will help review and independently vet the methodology. Achieving the project start target is the basis for achieving the end of project target and for defining the intervention strategy at the village level for what the climate change mitigation components of the project are concerned. Results for the baseline (1a) can be summarised as follows (tCO2/year): [1] Lompoul 14,636 [2] Toubel Baly -1,974 [3] Kack 4,048 [4] Ndick 24,290 [5] Darsalam 19,449 [6] Dindefelo 9,464 [7] Massarinko 4,872 [8] Mbam 24,290 [9] Mbackombel 4,048 [10] Thiasky 14,524 [11] Kouar 10,129 See complete summary table and graph at: [https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/97932458/Bilan.jpg] [https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/97932458/Graph.jpg] Even though the numbers produced differ quite significantly from those obtained at PRODOC stage as the interim baseline, we believe that the current baseline is much more accurate and thorough. Here is why: The current baseline values were produced as a result of a participatory application of an established methodology on GHG emissions / carbon sequestration at the level of the terroir. At least 10 core ecovillages , one additional ecovillage and various polarised ecovillages were concerned. The study proved quite onerous and time consuming due to the need to also take into account the polarised villages. However, it was worth the effort. The methodology seeks to involve the local management committees in the entire process as a means to raise awareness on carbon issues. The main GHG emission and carbon sequestration sectors were identified in meetings and discussions with local management committees. The contribution of each sector to local development was assessed; so were their emissions / sequestration values; The ways of rationalising the emissions are discussed so as to retain solutions that seem most relevant and most appropriate to the locality. The methodology Bilan Carbon at the terroir level, developed by ADEME (French Agency for Development and Energy Management, France) was used to calculate the carbon balance and TARAM (Tools for Afforestation / Reforestation Approved Methodologies) tool developed by the World Bank, for the determination of carbon stored in a 30-year horizon. An effort to synthesize diagnostic studies at the national and local levels has informed most of the key factors for optimal use of these tools. It was implemented by two national consultants: Dr. Maguette Cairo and Sheikh Dr. Dieng, specialists in carbon and forest inventories. During this period, the project supported the training of local agents in monitoring and evaluation and in the assessment of the carbon footprint. In addition to the teams of agents we had the active participation of technical staff from the Directorate of Water Resources and Forests (Eaux et Forets). We all benefitted from their field knowledge, including ANEV field staff who were trained on the go. The heart of the project strategy for leading villages on a low carbon development path actually builds on mostly on the carbon benefits that may be obtained, in the long run, from avoided deforestation, in particular through the establishment of new Community Natural Reserves (CNRs) in areas that would otherwise be deforested. Considering the protection of 15,800 ha of new and extended CNRs, the Ecovillages project is then estimated to reduce emissions of 31,729 tCO2/yr, that is 2 tCO2/ha/yr. Secondly, strategy build on the reduction in GHG emissions from e.g. firewood burning, when suitable and viable alternatives can be adopted. Thirdly, the strategy also builds on the adoption of a low carbon path in the villages\' transition to modern forms of energy that can support their livelihoods\' development, e.g. by using jathorpha to power essential engines, rather than diesel. Through a combination of various strategies, the goal is to ensure that most ecovillages become net GHG sinks rather than emitters. Setting a baseline and estimating a (BAU) development scenario with respect to the carbon balance for comparison is important. The BAU scenario changes significantly from village to village, due to the different ecological and energy supply conditions that they have, coupled with their land-use and land use change patterns. |
|  | 2. Number of Environmental Management Plans (EMPs) adopted by pilot sites | No plans are yet developed | At least 8 plans for project sites have been successfully developed and adopted (endorsed) by communities At least two plans are under implementation |  |  |  | Baseline studies have been conducted in 06 ecovillages | Approaching the target and likely to surpass it, given that EMPs have been prepared for as many as 21 ecovillages, including the 10 core ones. Baseline studies have been conducted in 21 ecovillages, among them the 10 pilot ecovillages that serve as project sites, and management plans are in the process of being prepared. More specifically, the socio-economic chapters of the plans have been widely validated by the local communities. What is missing is the integration of METT and Bilan Carbon in them. Thereafter, the package of studies and plans will be submitted to the Ecovillages\' Scientific Committee and the Project\'s Steering Committee. |
|  | 3. GEF Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT): METT scores for existing and new CNRs show improvements in management and biodiversity conservation effectiveness | Baseline scores for 7 out of 8 CNRs (from PPG METT application in Aug 2010): [1] Diokoul Diawrigne 64 [2] Bounguien CNR 72 [3] Kak proposed CNR 33 [4] Mbawal proposed CNR 51 [5] Mansadala CNR 73 [6] Dindefelo CNR t.b.d. [7] Mansarinko CNR 73 [8] Gnargou Comm Forest 74 | METT scores for all 8 project CNRs (2 new, 4 extended, 2 existing) show increases of at least 10% from baseline over 5 years and 20% for sites with starting score < 60% |  |  |  | METT analysis of 03 ecovillages is available | Progress made in establishing a baseline in all 10 villages. No changes to the baseline and also no progress due to be reported at this stage. The tool to inform this indicator will be applied three times during the project\\\\\\\'s lifetime: at GEF CEO Endorsement (baseline); prior and in preparation to the MRT (to be validated by it); and at project end, i.e. prior and in preparation to the TE (also to be validated by it). |
| Improved governance framework and capacity for the effective incorporation of biodiversity conservation and low carbon, adaptive development into the National Ecovillage Strategy | 4. Inter-Ministerial Protocol established between Ministry of Ecovillages (MEBRLAP/ ANEV) and Ministry of Environment (MENP/ DPN; DEFCCS) | No existing working relationship or agreements | 4a) Signed and implemented inter-Ministerial protocol 4b) Effective working relationships at all levels, local to national |  |  |  | The draft agreements with the Directorate of Water and Forestry and the Directorate of National Parks have been signed and are being implemented | Target achieved for 4a and approaching for 4b. The agreements with the Directorate of Water and Forestry and the Directorate of 12 others partners have been signed and are being implemented. The National Ecovillages\' Programme with strategy of implementation is finalized and approved by all key stakeholders in February 2013. The National Ecovillages\' Programme establishes a framework for ANEV to engage with a suite of partners at various level, not just locally and nationally, but also internationally. |
|  | 5. Improved competence levels and standards of the institutions responsible for EVs (ANEV, DPN, DEF, GENSEN) measured by increased scores of the Capacity Development Scorecard Average scores for all thematic areas (1 to 5 – see below) and levels of capacity (systemic, institutional and individual) for both PA management and energy efficiency market transformation. Capacity thematic areas: (1) Capacity to conceptualize and develop sectoral and cross-sectoral policy and regulatory frameworks (2) Capacity to formulate, operationalise and implement sectoral and cross-sectoral programmes and projects (3) Capacity to mobilize and manage partnerships, including with the civil society and the private sector (4) Technical skills related specifically to the requirements of the [focal area] and associated Conventions (5) Capacity to monitor, evaluate and report at the sector and project levels | Average scores for all thematic areas and capacity levels of capacity for both PA management and energy efficiency market transformation: ANEV 62% DEFC 66% GENSEN 76% DPN 65% (see PRODOC Annex 3 for a complete and disaggregated analysis) | Average scores for all thematic areas and levels of capacity for both PA management and energy efficiency market transformation increase by at least 10% for each of the target institutions. |  |  |  | The project has trained a total of 70 technical agents, 28 ecoguards and 28 rural communities' agents including devolved technical services' officers (Water and Forestry, CADL, SRP, Water and forestry Commissioners, Agriculture and Breeding), Rural Councils officers (Land and Environment Committees) and village ecoguards in biophysical and socioeconomic environment assessment techniques as well as in techniques of elaboration of ecological management plan of village terroirs. Training of one young person in each of the six villages in solar panels and electric installation maintenance | No changes to the baseline and also no progress due to be reported at this stage. The tool to inform this indicator will be applied three times during the project\'s lifetime: at GEF CEO Endorsement (baseline); prior and in preparation to the MRT (to be validated by it); and at project end, i.e. prior and in preparation to the TE (also to be validated by it). However, we report important progress in achieving the capacity building target embedded in the indicator. The project has trained a total of 50 technical agents, 30 ecoguards and 90 rural communities\' agents including: - officers of decentralised technical services , namely of Water and Forestry, CADL, SRP, Water and forestry Commissioners, Agriculture and Livestock; - Rural Councils officers, in particular those responsible for the Land and Environmental Committees, and - Village ecoguards and women in biophysical and socioeconomic environment assessment techniques as well as in techniques of for preparing ecological management plan for village terroirs. - Training of one young person in each of the six villages in solar panels and electric installation maintenance. |
| Integrated land use, natural resource management and biodiversity conservation provide social benefits in pilot Ecovillages and contribute to global BD benefits in CNRs and adjacent PAs | 6. New CNRs (2); extensions of existing CNRs (4) and existing CNRs (2) functioning to conserve global biodiversity within their boundaries and in adjacent PAs | Nationally: 21 CNRs, 27 UPs, (total 441,000 ha) designated\* Among project sites: 6 CNRs tallying 147,013 ha (\* See Table B in Section One of the METT for a non-exhaustive list of Community Natural Reserve and Pastoral Units in Annex 2.) | Among project sites at least 15,000 ha of new and extended Community Nature Reserves established and functioning to conserve biodiversity, increasing total conservation area targeted by the project to 162,813 ha Evidence of effective management is provided by increases in METT scores for all CNRs |  |  |  | Setting up of 04 CNRs: 01 in Kak (5,000 ha), 01 in Ndick (2,000 ha), 01 in Thiasky (50 ha) and 01 in Mbacombel (30 ha) Extension of 02 CNRs: 500 ha in the CNR of Lompoul and 7,000 ha in that of Dindéfelo Consolidation of CNRs: Mbouguiel, Community Forest of Mbam, Missira, Némabah, Dassilamé Socé, Ndiop, Koar, Manssadala, Gandon, Notto, Darou Khoudoss, Loumboul Samba Abdoul and Malandou | Target achieved and surpassed by far with > 52,000 ha of new CNRs added by the project. During the reporting period, the project has helped establish/expand 3 new CNRs: - 02 CNRs in Mbam (3,000 ha) - Extension of 01 CNRs: 7,000 ha in Dindéfelo. The above adds in a cumulative manner to achievements in the previous reporting period. To date, the impact of CNR creation amounts to the following total areas as CNRs: [1] Lompoul 2,000 ha [2] Toubel Baly 128,576 ha [3] Kack 49,400 ha [4] Ndick 300 ha [5] Darsalam 3,000 ha [6] Dindefelo 13,200 ha [7] Massarinko 935 ha [8] Mbam 1,077 ha [9] Mbackombel 500 ha [10] Thiasky 200 ha TOTAL 199,188 ha See complete summary table at: [https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/97932458/CNR.jpg] TOTAL new CNRs created with project assistance is 52,175 ha. and this show that, in terms of CNR and with the issues that data on surface The survey (inventaire) of the flora and of the woody grass vegetation is being finalised to support the CNR establishment and management. As an alternative to poaching of wildlife in AP/CNRs , 300 units of family poultry with powerful breeds including 320 guineas(pintades) and 1500 chickens are available to households and groups of women by CIVD. 500 beehives introduced into the RNC for benefit of villagers\' ecoguards. 120 ha CNR planted with local species. |
|  | 7. New Ecological Perimeters established and providing village needs through sustainable management (wood fuel/ timber; endemic species for CNR rehabilitation, medicinal plants, bamboo) | Nationally, only 4 or 5 EPs existed in 2009 (the concept is quite new) Among project sites: 2 established in project villages with <50ha | Approaching the target, though exact surface area measurements are still to be carried out. Creation of 08 operational ecological perimeters areas in Thiasky, Mbam, Massarinko, Koar, Sintian, Bantancountou, Dassilamé, and Dindéfélo. Among the 10 pilot ecovillages, a total of 6 are now serviced by an ecological perimeter. The total area needs to be measured. In addition, we report that: - 9 micro-projects intensification of production / income generation financed. - 20 ha of village woodlands are now established. |  |  |  | Creation of 02 operational ecological areas in Dar Salam and Ndick | Approaching the target, though exact surface area measurements are still to be carried out. Creation of 08 operational ecological perimeters areas in Thiasky, Mbam, Massarinko, Koar, Sintian, Bantancountou, Dassilamé, and Dindéfélo. Among the 10 pilot ecovillages, a total of 6 are now serviced by an ecological perimeter. The total area needs to be measured. In addition, we report that: - 9 micro-projects intensification of production / income generation financed. - 20 ha of village woodlands are now established. |
|  | 8. BD Indicators in selected CNR/ PA: Dindefelo: (8a) ha of chimpanzee habitat protected / managed (8b) PNNK/ Ferlo migration corridor conservation/ management | 8a) Dindefelo 13,000 ha chimpanzee habitat (Wula-Nafa project) 8b) PNNK/ Ferlo Migration corridor exists on maps; little information on animal numbers / movements | Dindefelo Additional 7,000 ha chimpanzee habitat protected and managed as CNR (extension towards Guinea border) PNNK/ Ferlo Monitoring data on large mammal migration available to improve conservation and management of corridor |  |  |  | 7,000 ha added to the Chimpanzees Forest | Target achieved for (8a) Dindefelo, but not yet in (8b) PKNNK/Ferlo 7,000 ha added to the Chimpanzees Forest. Progress in operationalising the PNNK/ Ferlo Migration corridor, especially in terms of wildlife monitoring data, will require a strong involvement of the Directorate of Parks and Reserves and this is still being worked on. On a related activity, we report progress in another site: The RNC Mbam is extended to the rural community of Djilor to form an ecological corridor of 1,500 ha including a marine protected area community serving as a biological corridor for conservation of manatees, dolphin and sea turtles in Saloum Delta Biosphere Reserve |
| Reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and increase in use of renewable and efficient energy alternatives in pilot Ecovillages | 9. Carbon footprint (using Bilan Carbone method to calculate GHG emissions/ sequestration) from energy sector at the level of village lands (“terroir villageois”) (sub-set of Indicator 1) | Bilan Carbone exist for some test rural villages; baseline needs to be established for all 10 project pilot villages at start of implementation | The carbon footprint for energy sector in 10 pilot ecovillages are at least 30% lower than the “business-as-usual” development scenario (based on the Bilan Carbone methodology) [NOTE on logframe revision: formulatin of indicator target revised to introduce clarity.] |  |  |  | The baseline level of 03 ecovillages is known | Approaching the target, but more careful calculations may need to be carried out. We assess that for 2 ecovillages (Kack and Tiasky) we have a net positive yearly balance for avoided emissions of 9.98 and 9.62 tC02 respectively, which represents between ~320-330% of the BAU emissions for the residential sector (energy production). For 7 other core villages, if only the residential sector is considered, there are no displaced emissions above the baseline. We need however to ponder if and how suppressed demand methodology should apply and refine the calculus. However, we can inform we are progress in reducing the carbon footprint of the energy generation sector in several villages as follows: 1 cold room installed in Mbacombel 6 mini solar power installed 2 Village Bakery running on biogas installed 6 muti-functional platforms (mills and grain huller installed) About the Cold Room Innovation: The radiative cooling works through an inverse greenhouse effect. The radiative cooling technology is developed by the French company/innovation venture Iterrae. See website [www.iterrae.org] Iterrae launched a research program on the radiative cooling in the Niayes, Senegal in partnership with ANEV. The solution is now operational and allows the storage and preservation of cereals, fruits and vegetables. The initiative Les Greniers du Sahel (name given to the type of silo that 100% autonomous, with a versatile device developed using radiative cooling) has consolidated it. It is a new source of energy, renewable, clean and inexhaustible to ensure the preservation of produce. The world \'s first prototype was actually developed at Mbackombel. See site: [http://www.greniersdusahel.com/?p=316] Soon it will also be installed in Lompoul, with the support of the project, which enabled the partnership between ITERRAE and Senegalese institutions, including ANEV, Ecole Polytechnique de Thies (ETP ), the Lycée Technique André Petavain de Saint Louis. This will also further develop the prototype. An entire Research Department on radiative cooling will be set up at Ecole Polytechnique de Thies (ETP). The Fondation Prince Albert II de Monaco partners ITERRAE intends to finance the deployment of stores in ecovillages Niayes in particular. See site [www.fpa2.com] About the village bakeries: The bakeries use a mix of fuels, according to need and availability, but mostly on biogas, butane gas or firewood. The management is entrusted to women, who also recover sludge from the biodigestor to fertilize fields. About the multifunctional platforms: Multifunctional platforms also use a mix of fuels. They are designed to run on Jatropha oil, but for now with the low level of production they are workin on Diesel on an interim basis. However, experiments with solar mills are being tested. |
|  | 10. Percentage of households in project EVs with an improved cook stove | Baseline for all Project villages to be established at start of implementation | At least 75% of all households in the 10 pilot Ecovillages use improved cook stoves |  |  |  | 110 fuel-efficient stoves granted to households are being used Training and equipment of X village groups for the dissemination of banco fuel-efficient stoves | Target achievement is now at 34%. Target was surpassed for 4 out of 10 ecovillages, but not overall. [1] Lompoul 8% [2] Toubel Baly 100% [3] Kack 110% [4] Ndick 100% [5] Darsalam 100% [6] Dindefelo 83% [7] Massarinko 55% [8] Mbam 10% [9] Mbackombel 86% [10] Thiasky 23% Overall 34% We can report that 1,300 improved cook stoves of banco or metal with ceramic insert installed by households are being used in at least 21 ecovillages. We provided training and equipment to 21 teams in ecovillages for the dissemination of improved cook stoves. 50 biodigesters for cooking gas and lighting kitchens installed. The effluents produced are used to fertilize vegetable plots |
|  | 11. Quantity of Jatropha oil produced locally in project Evs | 0 litres | 10,000 litres / year of Jatropha oil is produced locally in the project Evs |  |  |  | Linear planting of jatropha over 3 km and its cultivation on a surface area of 02 ha for oil production purpose | Target not achieved, but there is progress towards it. Linear planting of jatropha over 10 km and its cultivation on a surface area of 20 ha for oil production purposes |
| Increased biocarbon sequestration in Ecovillage community-managed lands (terroirs villageois) | 12. Number of tons of CO2 sequestered in living hedges | 12a) 0 km on new living hedges planted 12b) 0 tCO2 sequestered per year in living hedges | 20km living hedges (40,000 trees) in 10 EVs (12a), giving C sequestration of 55 tCO2 per village/ year – that is at least (12b) (Project total: 200km hedges (400,000 trees); 550 tCO2 sequestered per year) |  |  |  | Villages are producing young plants in developed plant nurseries towards the planting of a 5 km hedgerow | Target achieved by 2.5% for sub-indicator #12a, but not yet possible to inform the sub-indicator #12b. 5 km living hedges planted and villages are producing young plants in developed plant nurseries towards the planting of 5 more kilometers hedgerow in 2013 rainy season. Production of 750,000 forest and fruit plants (110 ha ) in 12 nursery for 2013 rainy season to increased biocarbon sequestration in Ecovillage (terroirs villageois) |
|  | 13. Number of tons of CO2 sequestered in bamboo plantations | 0 tons | 20,000 bamboo plants in each of 4 project EVs, giving sequestration of at least 27 tCO2 per year per village (Project total: 80,000 bamboo plants; 108 tCO2 sequestered/ year) |  |  |  | Arrangements are maid, in line with the PNNK commissioner for the collection of 20,000 young plants of bamboo for the purpose of reforestation at the rainy season. As part of the Ecovillage Project co-financing, the training of two experts (01 from ANEV, 01 from the PGIES) in China on Forestry and Bambo Valuation between 11 and 31 July is fully paid by INBAR | Target achieved at ~60% in terms of bamboo seedlings (not plants) and at 50% in terms of number of pilot ecovillages. Arrangements are made with the PNNK Conservateur for the collection of an additional 30,000 bamboo seedlings (summing a cumulative total of 50,000 seedlings) for the purpose of reforestation at 2013 rainy season. At least 2 ecovillages will benefit (Dindefelo and Darsalam. A new CNR with 150 hectares of bamboo regeneration is established in Dindefelo. 400,000 seedlings ronier (Borassus) planted in Ngargou CNR and Mbam village land |
|  | 14. Number of tons of CO2 sequestered in mangroves | 0 tons | 250 ha (2.5M propagules) of mangroves planted in each of 2 project EVs; giving sequestration of 750 tCO2 sequestered / village/ year) (Project total: 500 ha (5M propagules) mangroves; 1,500 tCO2 sequestered/ year) |  |  |  | The collection of young plants and propagulums (Rizophora and Avicennia) towards the reforestation of 350 ha of mangrove is under way | Not yet possible to inform the achievement of the target in terms of tCO2 sequestered/ year. We can however report that: 100 hectares of mangroves planted and the collection of young plants and propagules (Rizophora and Avicennia) towards the reforestation of 350 ha of mangrove is under way. The project has initiated the creation of a community marine protected area of 1200 hectares mangrove in Mbam EV in collaboration with rural council , WWF and Directory of Community Marine Areas |
|  | 15. Number of hectares of soil improved through Biochar amendment | 0 ha | 10 ha soil improved in test plots (1 Ecovillage) |  |  |  | Training sessions for women groups in composting techniques are being organized. The enrichment of a 1.5 ha market gardening parcel in Mbackombel is actual | Target achieved by 50%. In collaboration with National Institute of Pedology (INP), 5 tons of biochar are being tested to improve soil fertility. The project tests mixture of vegetal biomass and cow dung to improve production of biogas and fertilizer, in collaboration with Institute of Environmental Sciences (ISE) and the National Biogas Programme (PNB) |

RATINGS OF PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

|  |
| --- |
| DO Rating: Please review the Development Objective Progress page of this APR/PIR and then answer the questions below. A DO rating will be generated based on your answers. |
| 1 Please rate the cumulative progress being made toward achieving the end-of-project targets as reported in the project results framework in the DO page of this APR/PIR |
| 2 Please rate the likelihood that the project will deliver environmental and social benefits for an extended period after project completion? |
| 3 Please rate the likelihood that social or political risks may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes |
| **Project Manager/Coordinator: Is the person managing the day to day operations of the project.** |
| MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects where appropriate. |
| Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum. |
| 1. | Explain why you gave a specific rating. |
| 2. | Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. |
| 3. | Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress. |
| 4. | Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU. |
| Overall 2009 Rating  |  |
| Overall 2010 Rating  |  |
| Overall 2011 Rating  |  |
| Overall 2012 Rating  | Satisfactory |
| 2013 Rating | Satisfactory |
| Comments | The political support for ecovillages program remains strong and encourages the project which is the central pillar of National Agency Ecovillage to proceed. For example, the President of the Republic after visiting Dar Salam ecovillage; said he understood now perfectly the concept as a powerful lever for the adaptation of the rural milieu to different crises in food security, energy and environment. So since then, he has promised to transform several villages in ecovillages. This is the case of the 15 villages that may be affected by the mining of phosphates Matam and religious villages of Medina Gounass and Malika. Partnerships are materialized on the ground. Several development projects are based their intervention on the ecovillage strategy and comptabilent villages in the Ecovillage Network. Implementation of planned activities is going well: environmental management plans territories baseline study on ecovillages, green areas, nurseries, solar installations, anaerobic biodigester and improved stoves, promoting livelihoods already achieved through the intensification of crop and livestock production is being. |
| **UNDP Country Office Programme Officer: Is the UNDP programme officer in the UNDP country office who provides oversight and supervision support to the project.** |
| MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.  |
| Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.  |
| 1. | Explain why you gave a specific rating, for example, if your rating differs from the rating provided by the project manager please explain why. |
| 2. | Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. |
| 3. | Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress.  |
| 4. | Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU.  |
| Overall 2009 Rating  |  |
| Overall 2010 Rating  |  |
| Overall 2011 Rating  | (-) No rating submitted or requested for this year |
| Overall 2012 Rating  | (S) Satisfactory |
| 2013 Rating | (S) Satisfactory |
| Comments | Good progress toward project overall delivery and results achievement. In just two years of implementation, the project has completed the entire baseline situation analysis for performance monitoring throughout all the expected outcomes indicators. In addition, Communtiy based organisation for concerned actors dedication and committment to achieving the socioeconomic, ecological, and environmental targets is completed in all concerned Ecovillages to be established. Sustainable development activities along with sustainable use of biological ressources in village territories adjacent to Protected Areas including Community Natural Reserves for Biodiversity Conservation are under progress. Adaptation to adverse impacts of Climate Change activites and Mitigation as well through ecological develpement and use of solar and improved stoves are also in progress. Overall, implementation of sustainable land use managmenent activites along with global environment conservation activities are being implemented by the projet. |
| **Project Implementing Partner: Is the representative of the executing agency (in GEF terminology). This would be Government (for NEX/NIM execution) or NGO (for CSO Execution) or an official from the Executing Agency (for example UNOPS).**  |
| RECOMMENDED but NOT MANDATORY for projects under implementation in one country and regional projects.  |
| Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.  |
| 1. | Explain why you gave a specific rating. |
| 2. | Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. |
| 3. | Provide recommendations for next steps. |
| **Project Implementing Partner** |
| Overall 2009 Rating  |  |
| Overall 2010 Rating  |  |
| Overall 2011 Rating  |  |
| Overall 2012 Rating  |  |
| 2013 Rating |  |
| Comments |  |
| **GEF Operational Focal point: Is the government representative in the country designed as the GEF operation focal point.** |
| HIGHLY RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects. |
| Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.  |
| 1. | Explain why you gave a specific rating. |
| 2. | Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. |
| 3. | Provide recommendations for next steps.  |
| **GEF Operational Focal point** |
| Overall 2009 Rating  |  |
| Overall 2010 Rating  |  |
| Overall 2011 Rating  |  |
| Overall 2012 Rating  |  |
| 2013 Rating |  |
| Comments |  |
| **Other Partners: For jointly implemented projects, a representative of the other Agency working with UNDP on project implementation (for example UNEP or the World Bank).** |
| RECOMMENDED but NOT MANDATORY for jointly implemented projects. |
| Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.  |
| 1. | Explain why you gave a specific rating. |
| 2. | Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. |
| 3. | Provide recommendations for next steps.  |
| **Other Partners** |
| Overall 2009 Rating  |  |
| Overall 2010 Rating  |  |
| Overall 2011 Rating  |  |
| Overall 2012 Rating  |  |
| 2013 Rating |  |
| Comments |  |
| **UNDP Technical Adviser: Is the UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser.**  |
| MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for all projects. |
| Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.  |
| 1. | Explain why you gave a specific rating (do not repeat the project objective). |
| 2. | Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. |
| 3. | Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress.  |
| 4. | Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU.  |
| **UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser** |
| Overall 2009 Rating  |  |
| Overall 2010 Rating  |  |
| Overall 2011 Rating  |  |
| Overall 2012 Rating  | (S) Satisfactory |
| 2013 Rating | (S) Satisfactory |
| Comments | This Ecosystem and Biodiversity (EBD) RTA has played a key role in the development of this project, together with the RTA then responsible for the climate change mitigation focal area (now the EITT cluster – or Energy, Infrastructure, Transport and Technology). The project is part of the GEF\'s Strategic Programme for West Africa, launched in 2008. It was initially agreed between the GEF and the government that the WB would develop the project. However, in 2009 the Bank indicated to the government and the GEF that the project no longer fit within the CAS priorities. The government then approached UNDP to develop the Ecovillages project idea into an eligible GEF proposal. The PRODOC was signed in Oct 2011 with a fully and well translated version available in French. The project was instrumental in helping the \'Ecovillages Programme\' of the newly established ANEV take off in Senegal, with clear targets and metrics for at least 10 pilot ecovillages, which were selected as representative of the countries\' landscapes and in the vicinity of important protected areas or ecological complexes. This RTA handed over the lead supervision to another RTA in Jan 2012, given a re-arrangement of responsibilities within the UNDP-GEF team. However, in Jun 2013, this other RTA colleague left the team, so this RTA is now again responsible for supporting the project from the side of UNDP-GEF\'s Ecosystems and Biodiversity Cluster (EBD). This RTA is well impressed with the general level progress made by the project between 2011 and now. The project\'s progress towards its objective is rated S, even though this RTA is not totally acquainted with the reports that the project has produced so far. This is the second PIR produced by the project. It has spent 34% of its grant and it is about to reaching its mid-term and peak implementation stage. The level of cumulative expenditure vis-a-vis the project duration is adequate. The S rating means that, after approximately 2 years of nominal implementation, the project has made some progress with the four aspects embedded in the expected outcomes: (1) governance framework (2) demo EBD activities; (3) GHG emission reductions; and (4) Carbon sequestration. The project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings. A visible shortcoming is though that project should become better at communication results and sharing products. The fact that neither ANEV nor the project have a web-presence is somewhat disappointing. This is one priority activity in the PRODOC with funds allocated. Also, the project does not seem to have produced an Inception Report and this is a requirement. We note that the project wishes to be active in 21 villages, but this proposed change, which can have a significant impact on the scope, strategy, funding and indicators – as well as it creates risks – is not discussed in any document. Maps of these villages and studies on them are not available and the justification has not been presented. On the more positive side, the project managed to retain most of its co-financing and to engage various partners in implementation on the ground. More recently e.g. IFAD became interested in the project. This was in the news. See: [http://www.ipsnews.net/2012/07/eco-villages-breathe-new-life-into-rural-senegal/] The partnerships with International Network for Bamboo and Rattan (INBAR) and Schneider Electric seem interesting, but we lack overall a documentation of what the project is doing. We would have liked to see the NGO GEN-SEN (Global Ecovillages Network - Senegal) more involved and collaborating with ANEV, especially for what the accreditation of individual ecovillages is concerned. The project is low risk and the project is showing that it has the ability to handle risk well. In the meantime, this RTA would like to specifically comment the following vis-a-vis the outcomes: 1) The project has made progress in strategising the dissemination of the ecovillages model in Senegal and developed a number of tools for it. However, this needs to be properly documented and the made available through web-presence. The project claims to have set the baseline, but we note that this is not the case for what the Bilan Carbone is concerned. Baseline reports should be made available. 2) Component 2 is crucial to the extent that the carbon sequestration component depends on changes in land use at the village level. The conservation and management of adjacent forested areas and species\' repository play a key role in it. The establishment of new Community Natural Reserves (CNRs) seems to progress well. The same applies to management planning, although the process followed and the validation of the plan is not clear to us. However, we would very much like to see what the project is actually doing to enforce the management plans (the Environmental Management Plans or EMPs). 3) On the reduction of GHG, the project reports progress, but it does not seem able to quantify it properly. By mid-term, Tracking Tools showing the metrics on GHG reductions will need to be presented. It is important that the project masters the methodologies applied during the project preparation stage. The even for simple reporting on GHG reductions vis-a-vis project indicators – and without the aid of Bilan Carbone methodology – the project needs to collect, process and manage a large amounts of data. It is important that systems are set in place to improve monitoring of the GHG reduction aspect. 4) The carbon sequestration complements the reduction of GHG one and relates closely to the conservation one, given that the bulk of the climate change mitigation benefits would come from REDD like activities, where the establishment and management of CNRs plays the most important role. It is important that progress in those components is concomitant, balanced and coordinated. Although the conservation activities are not planned under Component 4, reporting on GHG emissions and sequestration from “terroir villageois” and CNRs will be done under Component 4. Finally, the project has a 5th Outcome, but it focuses mostly on the project\'s overall M&E. This RTA would in addition like to see a MTR initiated after the approval of the PIR and commits to assist with TOR and suggestions to and examples of action plans. An inception report is still missing and should be produced before December 2013 as a priority task. The inception report is a requirement as per the PRODOC. The report should as a minimum contain the following topics: • Project strategy summarised • Project Inception Update • Report on changes in the project environment since the project was submitted / approved • Any changes made in the project activities, outputs and indicators and timeframe in the inception stage • Updates on key issues / recommendations • Activity Workplan for Year 1 with detailed budget • Terms of Reference for key positions • Revised Logical Framework • UNDP “Atlas” Budget • ATLAS Risk Management (updated from PRODOC) With respect to progress in achieving the project\'s development objectives, the following can be noted on the indicators in the DO tab, which count 18 with sub-indicators included: Target achieved and surpassed Indicator # [6] (on Expansion of the PA system through Community Natural Reserves or CNR) Target achieved Indicator # [4a] (on Interministerial partnerships) Indicator # [8a] (on Ecological indicators Dindefelo) Approaching target Indicator # [4b] (on Other Partnerships) Indicator # [7] (on Ecological perimeters) Indicator # [10] (on Adoption of improved cook stoves in ecovillages\' households) Indicator # [13] (on CO2 sequestered in bamboo plantations) Target partially achieved (50% or less) Indicator # [15] (on Biochar) Target not achieved, but progress made. Indicator # [1] (on Application of Bilan Carbon at terroir level to establish the carbon balance in project sites) Indicator # [2] (on Environmental Management Plans or EMPs) Target not achieved and little or no progress registered Indicator # [8b] (on Ecological indicators PKNNK/Ferlo) Indicator # [11] (on Jatropha oil production) Indicator # [12a] (on New living hedges planted) Indicator # [12b] (on CO2 sequestered per year in living hedges ) Not possible to assess indicator Indicator # [9] (on Energy sector carbon footprint in ecovillages) Indicator # [14] (on CO2 sequestered in mangroves) Indicator measurement not due, but progress made Indicator # [3] (on METT) Indicator # [5] (on Cap Dev Scorecard) In sum, progress was made for 8 out of 18 indicators, ranging from targets achieved (surpassed for one) to partial achievement by <50%. This is less half of all indicators, so stronger progress is However, highly important indicators, such as Indicator # 1 on the application of Bilan Carbon 9 and #2 on the EMPs have seen no progress. Also it is not possible to report on 2 other equally important indicators (namely #9 and #14), which relate to the climate change mitigation metrics. Given that the project is in its second year, more would have been expected. This is a sign of a shortfall that needs to be addressed in the next reporting period. Finally, the scorecards are important, but it is even more important to make progress in the activities that will lead to improved scores in PA management capacity, in PA mgt effectiveness and capacity. The scorecards are but for measuring the results; they are not the goal in themselves. The MTR should be conducted in 2014. The project should also consider the engagement of a qualified one or more technical assistants with international exposure and experience to assist the team and ANEV with the things that are difficult (M&E, carbon methodologies, PA planning and ecological monitoring). Besides the standard issues that will be listed in the TOR for the evaluation (quality of M&E, assessment of outcomes, quality of UNDP implementation and national entity execution) this RTA would like to see the following two issues taken into consideration in the MTR: (i) adequacy of financial oversight; (ii) project’s overall success in addressing biodiversity threat drivers, as well as climate change mitigation methodologies. |
| 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

|  |
| --- |
| IP rating: Please review the Implementation Progress page of this APR/PIR and then answer the questions below. An overall IP rating will be generated based on your answers.  |
| 1 Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this APR/PIR)? |
| 2 Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?)  |
| 3 Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively?  |
| 4 Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the APR/PIR last year?  |
| 5 Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation |
| **Project Manager/Coordinator: Is the person managing the day to day operations of the project.** |
| MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects where appropriate. |
| Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum. |
| 1. | Explain why you gave a specific rating. |
| 2. | Summarize annual progress and address timelines of projec output/activity completion in relation to annual workplans. |
| 3. | Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation. |
| **Overall 2009 Rating**  |  |
| **Overall 2010 Rating**  |  |
| **Overall 2011 Rating**  |  |
| **Overall 2012 Rating**  | (S) Satisfactory |
| **2013 Rating** | (S) Satisfactory |
| **Comments** | The implementation of activities in the second half of 2012 was very successful. For the first half of 2013, a number of 38 activities are planned with a production of more than 80%. This very significant level covers all components except the component relating to the improvement of carbon sequestration which esentiel happens during the rainy season. Although this level of efficiency is satisfactory, however, it hides some difficulties in meeting deadlines for completion. Indeed, apart from acquisitions, works and studies are riding on the fiscal year 2012 and 2013, due to procurement procedures, particularly in mobilizing co-financing of the agency. It is clear from this analysis that should focus on the timeliness of completion of the work further. The project team cares. To monitor the actions of risk mitigation: • In respect of 2012, 25 activities for the mitigation of risks to the achievement of project objectives. • At the end of the implementation of the PTA in 2012, the implementation rate of these activities is estimated at nearly 70%. This means that most of the mitigations measures have been implemented. • Activities unrealized focus on risk mitigation related to the management and expansion of protected areas. The project team is therefore satisfied with the conduct of activities |
| **UNDP Country Office Programme Officer: Is the UNDP programme officer in the UNDP country office who provides oversight and supervision support to the project.** |
| **MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.**  |
| **Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. The QORs and delivery data in the ERBM portfolio project monitoring report should inform your rating. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.**  |
| **1.** | **Explain why you gave a specific rating. If your rating differs from the rating provided by the project manager please explain why.** |
| **2.** | **Summarize annual progress and address timeliness of project output/activity completion in relation to annual workplans.** |
| **3.** | **Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation.**  |
| **Overall 2009 Rating**  |  |
| **Overall 2010 Rating**  |  |
| **Overall 2011 Rating**  | (-) No rating submitted or requested for this year |
| **Overall 2012 Rating**  | (S) Satisfactory |
| **2013 Rating** | (S) Satisfactory |
| **Comments** | In 2012, 37 activities were carried out out of 38, 4 activities partially realized and 1 unrealized bringing the average rate of technical execution of 2011 AWP to 86.8%. This significant level is very mainly driven by the components of project management, biodiversity conservation and promotion of renewable energies. Indeed, with the start of the project in the last quarter of the year the focus was on the acquisition of equipment for the Management Unit of the Project and the achievement of operational activities such acquisition hub solar, achieving biodigester, the development of ecological perimeters, the development of vegetable plots and reforestation (Jatropha and Acacia milifera). In addition to these results, it should be noted that the components of good governance and improving the level of carbon sequestration in the soil implementation rates below the average implementation rate of AWP. Performance against these are mainly related to the non-implementation of environmental management plan, monitoring systems and acquiring small amounts of biogenic. In 2013, most of the planned activities are in progress. The rate of technical performance in the second quarter of 2013 is 70%. This level is mainly driven by the components on improving governance, biodiversity conservation and promotion of renewable energies. In addition to these results, it should be noted that the emphasis should be putted on the determination of carbon sequestration increase and mitigation in Community Natural Reserves and Villages Territories as well along with Biodiversity conservation where the vegetation species monitoring is in progress throughout all project selected sites. The land use management plans are completed and approved in 2 selected sites out of 4. |
| **Project Implementing Partner: Is the representative of the executing agency (in GEF terminology). This would be Government (for NEX/NIM execution) or NGO (for CSO Execution) or an official from the Executing Agency (for example UNOPS).**  |
| **RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects.** |
| **Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.** |
| **1.** | **Explain why you gave a specific rating.** |
| **2.** | **Note trends, both positive and negative.** |
| **3.** | **Provide recommendations for next steps.**  |
| **Overall 2009 Rating** | (-) No rating submitted or requested for this year |
| **Overall 2010 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2011 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2012 Rating** |  |
| **2013 Rating** | (-) No rating submitted or requested for this year |
| **Comments** |  |
| **GEF Operational Focal point: Is the government representative in the country designed as the GEF operation focal point.** |
| **MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.**  |
| **Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.** |
| **1.** | **Explain why you gave a specific rating.** |
| **2.** | **Note trends, both positive and negative.** |
| **3.** | **Provide recommendations for next steps.**  |
| **Overall 2009 Rating**  | (-) No rating submitted or requested for this year |
| **Overall 2010 Rating**  |  |
| **Overall 2011 Rating**  |  |
| **Overall 2012 Rating**  |  |
| **2013 Rating** | (-) No rating submitted or requested for this year |
| **Comments** |  |
| **Other Partners: For jointly implemented projects, a representative of the other Agency working with UNDP on project implementation (for example UNEP or the World Bank).** |
| **RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for jointly implemented projects.**  |
| **Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.**  |
| **1.** | **Explain why you gave a specific rating.** |
| **2.** | **Note trends, both positive and negative.** |
| **3.** | **Provide recommendations for next steps.**  |
| **Overall 2009 Rating**  | (-) No rating submitted or requested for this year |
| **Overall 2010 Rating**  |  |
| **Overall 2011 Rating**  |  |
| **Overall 2012 Rating**  |  |
| **2013 Rating** | (-) No rating submitted or requested for this year |
| **Comments** |  |
| **UNDP Technical Adviser: Is the UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser.** |
| **MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for ALL projects.** |
| **Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. The QORs and delivery data in the ERBM portfolio project monitoring report should inform your rating. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.**  |
| **1.** | **Explain why you gave a specific rating. If your rating differs from the rating provided by the UNDP Country Office Programme Officer and/or the Project Manager please explain why.** |
| **2.** | **Summarize annual progress and address timelines of project output/activity completion in relation to annual workplans.** |
| **3.** | **Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation.** |
| **UNDP Technical Adviser** |
| **Overall 2009 Rating**  |  |
| **Overall 2010 Rating**  |  |
| **Overall 2011 Rating**  |  |
| **Overall 2012 Rating**  | (S) Satisfactory |
| **2013 Rating** | (S) Satisfactory |
| **Comments** | The project counts on a dedicated and competent project manager and team and is well anchored on the ground. Implementation is progressing well and is rated Satisfactory. The project displays adequately levels of delivery against the plan. Adjustments are introduced in a timely manner without disruption. The planning process follows a well established methodology and calendar. The internal information flows and established templates allow for planning, implementation and reporting to achieve results without too many hiccups. The communication element leaves to be desired and needs to be addressed in the next reporting period. Overall cumulative delivery by Jun 2013 is 34%. This is fine given the point reached by the project in its lifetime, but it could be improved. It is a sign of strong delivery. Figures for delivery against the plan for the 2012 financial year (Jan-Dec) are 83.9% against an ASL/cash limit of $705,081. For the 2013 financial year (Jan-Sep) the current ASL/cash limit is $849,000 and disbursement/total utilized is $783,363 – amounting to a delivery of 92.3%. This will require ASL adjustments very soon. The project strategy, its achievements and the pace of implementation all seem adequate. The project is fostering the type of change that takes time to be achieved. Yet, progress seems rapid. For the period under review, the following can be highlighted: \* Under Outcome 1 (Governance frameworks), the project made good progress on the Ecovillages\' National Strategy. The typology of villages is also an interesting result, though this RTA would like to hear more about its utility. The capacity building efforts targeting the local level are also commendable, although it would be relevant to focus as well on the capacity uptake. (2); (3); and (4) \* There was also steady progress under Outcome 2 (Demo EBD activities), where community-based land management is actual through the creation of 8 CNRs, 2 community forests and expansion of 2 existing ones is a remarkable achievement that needs to be highlighted. The project should also stress what it is doing to support to local forest management structures. The project claims that income is rising, but we do not see metrics to confirm this. The M&E system, supposedly focusing on BD benefits is being established. It is an necessary and requires due dissemination and testing. \* Under Outcome 3 (GHG emission reductions), the project shows progress (solar, jathropha, improved stoves and biodigerstors, but it is not clear what this represents in terms of reduced or avoided GHG emissions. \* Under Outcome 4 (Carbon sequestration), the project mentions extensive reforestation efforts and some experiments with biochar. However there is limited progress in measuring sequestered carbon. Else, implementation is generally progressing well. Risk is low, well managed and regularly monitored. Actions are carried out in a cost-effective manner. The project team is small, but the local base co-supported by partners impressive. |
| **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 presented as 'good practice'.** |
| **Satisfactory (S)** | **Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only 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.** |

PROGRESS IN PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

|  |
| --- |
| **Outcome 1- Key Outputs this Reporting Period: Improved governance framework and capacity for the effective incorporation of biodiversity conservation and low carbon, adaptive development into the National Ecovillage Strategy** |
| The National Ecovillage Strategy and Programme has been validated The socioeconomic baseline of 21 villages is available The baseline level of 10 ecovillages center and 66 polarized villages is known The ecological management plans of 21 village terroirs are available A typology of villages in Senegal in 4 grades is established, for their ranking in the process of ecovillage transformation A model of community organization is adopted to promote good governance in ecovillages Capacity building of technical services agents, rural advisers and ecoguards in diagnosis, planning and elaboration technique of management plans and maintenance of electric and solar-powered installations is actual |
| **Outcome 2- Key Outputs this Reporting Period: Integrated land use, natural resource management and biodiversity conservation provide social benefits in pilot Ecovillages and contribute to global BD benefits in CNRs and adjacent PAs** |
| Community-based land management is actual through the creation of 8 CNRs, 2 community forest and extension of 2 existing ones. People\'s incomes are rising in ecovillages through market gardening development in ecological areas, putting in of multifunctional platforms, aquaculture and poultry farming development, promotion of hives, and financing of microprojects. The introduction of water-saving techniques (drip irrigation, Irrigasc system, solar-powered pump), breed improvement (artificial insemination, introduction of a prepotent cock), cold room for fruits and vegetables conservation and composting allow reducing human pressure on PAs and CNRs. A monitoring and evaluation system is being elaborated. |
| **Outcome 3- Key Outputs this Reporting Period: Reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and increase in use of renewable and efficient energy alternatives in pilot Ecovillages** |
| The distribution of 1300 metal fuel-efficient stoves, training of village groups in manufacture of banco stoves, and putting in of 50 biodigesters for demonstration purposes are fostering practice changes and as a result enable the reduction of GHG emission and pressure on forest resources. About 250 households out of a population of nearly 2,815 inhabitants spread over 06 villages are using solar power for lighting and mobile phone battery charging. 2 village Bakery running on biogas installed Promotion of Jatropha oil production in situ through a linear (10km) and and massive (20 ha) planting of Jatropha |
| **Outcome 4- Key Outputs this Reporting Period: Increased biocarbon sequestration in Ecovillage community-managed lands (terroirs villageois)** |
| 750 000 plants produced in 23 plant nurseries of 18 villages intended for the planting of 10 km of Acacia mellifera and 25 km of forest is actual. Preparations for the reforestation campaign 2013 with the objective of planting an additional 350 ha of mangrove, 30,000 bamboo seedlings, 400,000 seedlings ronier (palmyra) are in progress. Improvement of sustainable land management through the mastery of enrichment and composting techniques and biochar allow the increase of soil sequestration capacity of carbon, in collaboration with National Institute of Pedology (INP), Linear planting of jatropha over 10 km and its cultivation on a surface area of 20 ha for oil production purpose |

Adjustments

Adjustments to Project Milestones, Project Strategy and Risk Management.

Key Project Milestones

Have significant delays occurred in the project start, inception workshop, Mid-term Review, Terminal Evaluation or project duration?

No

If yes, were these changes reported in a previous APR/PIR?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Key project milestone** | **Scope of delay (in months)** | **Briefly describe change or reason for change** | **Briefly describe the implications or consequences this has had on project implementation** |
| Project Start (i.e. project document signature date) |  |  |  |
| Inception Workshop |  |  |  |
| Mid-term Review |  |  |  |
| Terminal Evaluation |  |  |  |
| Project Duration (i.e. project extension) |  |  |  |

Adjustments to Project Strategy

Has the project made any changes to its strategy (i.e. logframe/results framework) since the Project Document was signed?

Yes

If yes, were these changes reported in a previous APR/PIR?

No

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Change Made to** | **Yes/No** | **Briefly describe the change and the reason for that change** |
| Project Objective |  |  |
| Project Outcomes |  |  |
| Project Outputs/Activities | Yes | At activity level adjustments are made on a year to year basis. Project sites and targets remain the same.  |

Risk Management

List number of critical risks as noted in the ATLAS risk log and briefly describe actions undertaken this reporting period to address each critical risk.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **# of Critical Risks (type/description)** | **Risk management measures undertaken this reporting period** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Adjustments general comments:

The major adjustement concerned the inclusion of 21 ecovillages centers is already set. Any other village is considered polarized by these villages center. Indeed, the consistency in the management of different ecosystems and existing biological interconnections with other natural areas in the same village lands as well as the historical relationship between these villages on the rights of access to natural resources mutually recognized , implies that each centers ecovillage polarize other villages. These villages are taken into account by the co-financing and activities of the agency.

Finance: cumulative from project start to June 30 2013

DISBURSEMENT OF GEF GRANT FUNDS

How much of the total GEF grant as noted in Project Document plus any project preparation grant has been spent so far? (e.g. PPG + MSP or FSP amount. Do not break down by PPG or project budget.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  Estimated cumulative total disbursement as of 30 June 2013. (i.e.CDR information up to 20 June 2013) | 1031659.00 |
| Add any comments on GEF Grant Funds | GEF Grant: PPG $120,000.00 (2010-2011) FSP $2,880,000.00 (started in 2011) TOTAL $3,000,000.00 PPG delivery is 99% and FSP is 32%. In TOTAL delivery in project year 2 is 34%. |

DISBURSEMENT OF CO-FINANCING

How much of the total Co-financing as noted in Project Document has been spent so far? Co-financing is the amount committed in the project document for which co-financing letters are available

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Estimated cumulative total co-financing disbursed as of 30 June this year. Please breakdown by donor. | 4255066.00 |
| Add any comments on co-financing including other types and amounts of additional co-financing such as in-kind, private sector, grants, credits and loans. | Cofinancing as per PRODOC 1) KINOME $200,000 2) Association Echoway $75,000 3) Gambloux Agro-Bio Tech, Phytotechnie Tropicale et Horticulture, Université de Liège, Belgium $368,750 4) Senegal Ecovillage Microfinance Fund (SEM-Fund) and EREV (EarthRights EcoVillage Institute) $1,620,000 5) International Network for Bamboo and Rattan - INBAR $200,000 6) PRO-NATURA International $300,000 7) Société Pour la Promotion de l\'Accès a l\'Énergie et a l\'Eau Dans le Département de Foundiougne - SOPREF $230,000 8) UNDP Senegal $1,350,000 9) ANEV $6,000,000 10) PERACOD / GTZ $183,150 11) Green Senegal $500,000 12) Plateforme Multifonctionnelle $1,000,000 13) ASER - Senegalese Rural Electrification Agency $1,000,000 14) Schneider Electric SAS $150,000 Total $13,176,900 The current tracking of co-financing shows that 95% of the co-financing will likely realise by project end (non-realisation relates to Kinomé and possibly Gambloux), though not all co-financiers have disbursed so far. Disbursements of the planned co-financing is currently at approx. 24% of the realised co-financing. The break-down of disbursed co-financing is as follows: 4) Senegal Ecovillage Microfinance Fund (SEM-Fund) and EREV (EarthRights EcoVillage Institute) $400,000 6) PRO-NATURA Internationa $6,000 8) UNDP Senegal $330,918 9) ANEV $2,000,000 10) PERACOD / GTZ $12,000 11) Green Senegal $5,000 12) Plateforme Multifonctionnelle $100,000 13) ASER - Senegalese Rural Electrification Agency $100,000 14) Schneider Electric SAS $120,000 Total $3,073,918 |

ADDITIONAL LEVERAGED RESOURCES

These additional resources can be from the same donors or new donors.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Estimated cumulative leveraged resources as of 30 June 2013 |  |
| Add any comments on Leveraged Resources. |  |

Other Financial Instruments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Does the project provide funds to other Financial Instruments? |  |
| If yes, please discuss developments that occurred this reporting period only. | Co-financing for National Biogas program $200 000 |

Communications and KM

Tell the Story of Your Project and What has been Achieved this Reporting Period

1)Participatory carbon emission assessment in a local territory This initiative comes under the framework of the UNDP/GEF Ecovillage Project implementation It aims at assessing in a participatory way the baseline as to carbon emission/sequestration at the territory level. The initiative involves 11 villages throughout the various ecogeographic regions of Senegal. The objective is to reduce carbon emission in territories while satisfying development needs. The methodology followed involves local management committees in the management of the whole process as a sensitization tool to carbon emission issues. The main emission/sequestration-related sectors are identified during meetings/discussions with local management committees. The contribution of each sector to local development is assessed in relation to the value of its carbon emission. Means to achieve sound carbon emissions are discussed and more appropriate and adapted solutions for the village are then approved and included in the project\'s annual work plan. The Territorial Carbon Balance developed by ADEME (French agency for Power development and control) used TARAM (Tools for Afforestation-Reforestation Approved Methodology) in the carbon balance assessment. TARAM has been developed by the World Bank to determine the amount of stored carbon within a period of 30 years ahead (which is the maximum duration of an MDP project). The summary of national and local surveys and diagnoses has allowed to inform most of key factors enabling the sound use of these tools. Lessons learned Complex and theoretical issues like carbon sequestration and emission could be understood by local people. Adapted mitigation activities could be identified by local people and translated in technical programs. The concept \"carbon sober territories\" could be implemented in a practical way while assuring the social and economic development of territories. In the Ecovillage of Kouar, the importance of carbon emission in agriculture has led to the collective awareness that the use of high quantities of stakes in banana plantations will result in the extinction of species targeted for staking and in the end to the disappearance of the forest. As a mitigation measure, the management committee has planned to set up a parcel where high growth rate species like Eucalyptus could be grown towards stake production. The UNDP/GEF Ecovillage Project has included the planning and the planting of a 2-ha Eucalyptus parcel in its Annual Work Plan. However, further research will be directed towards technologies using synthetic fibers. 2)Change in cooking methods and natural resources conservation The UNDP/GEF Ecovillage Project has gathered women living in its area of interest (20 villages and approximately 400 households) into small organizations and trained them in banco-made fuel-efficient stoves manufacturing. Women have also benefit from moulds provided by the project. Women organizations have asked each household to make a contribution of FCFA1,500 (US $3) for the production of banco-made fuel efficient stoves. Therefore, almost all households use banco-made fuel-efficient stoves; and about 50 digesters have been built thanks to the project implementation. Impacts Economic impacts Fuel-efficient stoves not only allow households to save up to FCFA50,000 (US$100) a year in the use of fuel wood, but also generate income: sales of stoves bring a yield of FCFA500 per household to both women organizations and Village Development Funds. Social impacts The use of fuel-efficient stoves has many advantages for women as regards public health: respiratory tract and eye-related diseases could be avoided. Moreover women and girls save time which can be devoted to training and capacity building. Environmental impacts The use of fuel-efficient stoves has a considerable impact on environment: considering an average consumption of fuel wood of 10 kg per household per day (PROGEDE, 2012), and the fact that fuel-efficient stoves lower fuel wood consumption by 40 %, the avoided cut of trees thanks to the use of these stoves is 4\*350\*365 = 511,000 kg of fuel wood per year. The avoided cut of tree thanks to the cumulative use of biogaz and fuel-efficient stoves amounts to 10\*50\*365=182,500 kg of fuel wood per year. So, an estimated total of 693,500 kg of fuel wood is saved in the project\'s area of interest. Assuming that 01 stere is equivalent to 0,65 m3, which is equivalent to 450 kg of dry wood, we can say that the annual wood consumption in cubic meter will amount to: 693,500\*0.65/450 = 1000 m3. Considering a forest estimated at 4.25 m3 wood per ha (according to the findings of the inventory conducted in 2012 by IREF),the project avoided deforestation surface area in 2012 with 50 digesters and 350 improved cook stoves, is 1000/4.25 i.e. 235 ha .

Adaptive Management this Reporting Period

The major adjustement concerned the inclusion of 21 ecovillages centers is already set. Any other village is considered polarized by these villages center. Indeed, the consistency in the management of different ecosystems and existing biological interconnections with other natural areas in the same village lands as well as the historical relationship between these villages on the rights of access to natural resources mutually recognized , implies that each centers ecovillage polarize other villages. These villages (66) are taken into account by the co-financing and activities of the agency.

Lessons Learned

3) Lessons Learned: 1 . Complex and theoretical concepts such as carbon can be very well understood at the grassroots level . 2 . Mitigation activities can be identified by appropriate people and translated into technical programs. 3 . The project has demonstrated that the concept of \"low carbon terroirs\" can be implemented in a practical way while ensuring the socio -economic development of the territories. For example, in the Ecovillage Kouar the heavy contribution of the agricultural sector to CO2 emissions has led to a collective awareness and that thining of forests to produce sapplings for the re-planting will lead to forest degradation long term, in particular species have high targeted value for sappling. The Management Committee of the ecovillage retained as mitigation measure , the establishment of a parcel of planting fast-growing species (Eucalyptus) for the production of hedges. UNDP / GEF / Ecovillage project has included in its 2014 workplan the plantation of an Eucalyptus plot of 2 ha for the production of hedges of bananas. Similarly, further discussions will be held to find technologies staking synthetic fibers. 4 . other : Low cost solar- powered electrification System Has Become a Reality in ecovillages . That in addition to an autonomous cold room model for conservation farming products is Being Developed Being Local materials are used in rural construction. Local governance enhanced through a better organization has allowed the promoting the payment of ecosystem services (PES).

PARTNERSHIPS

Civil Society Organisations/NGOs

Through the partnerships with NGOs and the Civil Society, the project has made available to rural people technologies such as the Low Pressure Drip Irrigation System (thanks the the NGO Green Senegal) and intensive subsistence crops farming techniques (thanks to the NGO Jardin Tropical du Sénégal). In addition, villagers are trained in aforementioned techniques and technologies, as well as in mill management techniques. The partnership with NGOs has sped up access of local people to water purification, Training in Jatropha oil production, fuel-efficient stoves, but also and especially to microcredit, with the financing of over mircroprojects by the Senegalese Microfinance Fund (Senegalese NGO).

Indigenous Peoples

The project has made deliberate surface areas towards community-based natural resource management and has established consensus rules for their sustainable management with the help of local people, through rural communities and councilors\' intervention. With the support of local actors, the project has also initiated actions fostering good local governance, but on top of that it has managed to bring people to accept to pay for ecosystem services like water and electricity

Private Sector

The partnership with the private sector has enabled to access to low-cost innovative technologies in electrification and water mastering. For instance, Schneider Electric has enabled the access to electricity to villages and organized technical training for local people and therefore provided them with new working opportunities (green jobs).

 Concerning water supply, the private sector has proposed some solutions enabling access to safe drinking water and water production. In this respect, the pillow tank technology and the water production system using the atmospheric water generator (AWG), are tested and their introduction is under way.

GEF Small Grants Programme

Microfinance Project, access to biodigesters for local people will be faster and pressure on forest resources will be lowered. Land degradation

Other Partners

Several other development projects, other government departments, regional councils, regional development agencies

PROGRESS IN ADDRESSING GENDER EQUALITY

Has a gender or social needs assessment been carried out?

No

If a gender or social assessment has been carried out what where the findings?

Does this project specifically target women or girls as direct beneficiaries?

Yes

Have there been any changes in specifically targeting women or girls as direct beneficiaries this reporting period?

Yes

If yes, please explain:

Women are the main users of wood energy, it is clear that any action to reduce CO2 emissions in the household of Senegal Ecovillage must apply first to the women.

 With the introduction of fuel-efficient stoves, solar furnaces, millet mills, household chores are being lightened and working hours are being reduced since there is no need to search for cow pat or fuel wood.

 Further productions have been recorded thanks to the development of small market gardening areas equipped with a drip irrigation system and farmed by women.

 Admittedly it is too early to talk about the project impact, but the fact remains that the exterior signs lead us to expect better conditions for beneficiaries: time saved thanks to various equipment introduced, allow women to start economic activities (market gardening and farming products marketing) and thus improve substantially their income.Women are usually the most mobilized in reforestation.

 Most of the micro-project funding is directed towards women.

 Through the deliberation of ecological areas, the project has granted land and water access to women. Moreover, the project is promoting affirmative actions through breed improvement among species reared by women (small ruminants, poultry farming) and the financing of women groups\' microprojects. As a proof of its actions towards women, the President of Women Group of Mbackombel will travel to Canada in September to help the project raising larger fund in order to finance more women groups.

Please discuss any of the points above further or provide any other information on the project's work on gender equality undertaken this reporting period

Some points to consider: impact of project on daily workload of women, # of jobs created for women, impact of project on time spent by women in household activities, impact of project on primary school enrolment for girls/boys, increase in women's income etc. Be as specific as possible and provide real numbers (e.g. 100 women farmers participating in sustainable livelihoods programme).

ENVIRONMENTAL OR SOCIAL GRIEVANCE

What environmental or social issue was the grievance related to?

What is the current status of the grievance?

How would you rate the significance of the grievance?

Please describe the on-going or resolved grievance noting who was involved, what action was taken to resolve the grievance, how much time it took, and what you learned from managing the grievance process (maximum 500 words). If more than one grievance was addressed this reporting period, please explain the other grievance (s) here: