**WWF GEF Agency**

**Annual Project Progress Report**

**Title (GEF ID)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1. General****Information** | **Agency Approval Date** |  |
| **Fiscal Year** |  |
| **Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, Final PIR)** |  |
| **2. Current Year Ratings** | **Overall DO rating** |  |
| **Overall IP rating** |   |
| **Overall Risk rating** |  |
| **3. Key dates** | **Actual Implementation Start Date** |  |
| **Expected Mid-Term Review Date** |  |
| **Expected Closing Date** |  |
| **Expected Financial Closure/TE Report Date** |  |
| **4. Budget** | **Total Project Budget** |  |
| **Total GEF Budget Spent (USD) for given project year** |  |
| **Materialized Co-finance** |  |

**Project Report information:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Report Author(s)** |  |
| **Report Completion Date** |  |
| **Reporting Period** |  |

**Project Contact information:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Position** | **Name** | **E-mail** |
| Project Manager |  |  |
| M&E Officer |  |  |
| F&A Officer |  |  |

**Instructions:**

Please **submit the PPR** to the Project Manager with the following annexed documents:

* Completed Results Framework
* Annual Work Plan and Budget Tracking (for project year)
* Any supporting documents: meeting minutes, stakeholder consultation, photos, maps, reports, etc.

Report period is for full 12 months of project year, but should primarily emphasize the most recent 06 months. It is recommended that project teams hold a participatory **Reflection and Adaptive Management exercise** prior to filling out the Annual PPR. Ideally, this workshop should be attended by the Executing Agency, the PMU, and key partners for their input on project progress and challenges. During this time, a review of the Results Framework and project theory of change should be conducted to allow for adaptive management solutions. The feedback from this exercise as well as any input from beneficiaries should feed into this report, including discussions around Free Informed Prior Consent (as applicable with affected parties, including indigenous peoples) and grievances received through project level grievance redress mechanisms. You may erase gray text with submission of the report. Please limit the report to 8 pages.

1. **GEF Project Implementation Report**

For submission to GEF Secretariat

### Ratings

Fill in all ratings based on the Rating Scale provided in Annex I. For Project Implementation and Project Development ratings that are rated Moderately Satisfactory and below, please provide an action plan in Part III of the PPR. For Risks, please fill out the risk table in Part III below, and provide an action plan for any “Substantial” and “High” risks.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Year 3** | **Year 4** | **Year 5** | **Year 6** | **Year X** |
| **Project Implementation**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Project Development** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Risks** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Justification for Current Year Ratings:**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### Outcomes and Impacts Achieved

|  |
| --- |
| Describe the key outcomes and impacts achieved during the previous 12 months, using the AWP&B and Results Framework as a reference. Please note any major positive or negative effects on beneficiaries. Organize by component and project objective. |

### Summary of Major Challenges and Strengths

|  |
| --- |
| Describe the major challenges and strengths that hindered or enabled performance for the project year.  |

### Progress, Challenges, and Outcomes of Stakeholder Engagement

### (Based on Stakeholder Engagement Plan included at CEO Endorsement)

|  |
| --- |
| Summarize progress, challenges, and/or outcomes of stakeholder engagement, including strategies taken to ensure gender and social inclusion.Summarize for previous reporting periods (~2 paragraphs):For project year: |

### Information on Progress on Gender-Responsive Measures

### (As documented at CEO Endorsement in the Gender Action Plan or Equivalent)

|  |
| --- |
| Please provide the completion dates for: the gender assessment or analysis and gender mainstreaming strategy/action plan (GEF-7).\_\_ /\_\_ / \_\_\_\_. Summarize progress, challenges, and/or outcomes of gender-responsive measures.Summarize for previous reporting periods (~2 paragraphs):For project year: |

### Knowledge Activities / Products

### (When Applicable, as Outlined in Knowledge Management approved at CEO Endorsement)

|  |
| --- |
|  Summarize knowledge activities/products (including links) developed during previous reporting periods.List knowledge activities/products (including links) developed during this project year.  |

**II. Additional Information for Project Year**

### Summary of Expenditure and Implementation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Component** | **% Expenditure for Project Year[[1]](#footnote-2)** | **% Implementation for Project Year[[2]](#footnote-3)** |
| 1 |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |

### Implementation of Workplan and Budget

|  |
| --- |
| Please explain whether the workplan was implemented to schedule and justify any changes. Describe any major over or underspends or shifts in budget. Note if/how the project was able to document and comply with Environmental and Social Safeguards when implementing the work plan.  |

### Lessons Learned

|  |
| --- |
| Describe key lessons that the project team learned and believe are important to share. Reflect on what has worked and not worked in relation to the project theory of change. |

### Adaptive Management

|  |
| --- |
| Describe changes made or needed to project components, outcomes and/or strategies, or whether any changes are planned for the next project year.  |

**III. Action Plans for Suboptimal Ratings**

For any ratings identified as Moderately Satisfactory or below in Part I A above, please provide an action plan. Risk mitigation plans are only required for “Substantial” or “High” risks.

### Action Plan for Suboptimal Project Implementation Rating

|  |
| --- |
| Please provide the specific actions that will be taken to improve on each of the objective and outcomes, including who/when these actions will be taken. Ensure these actions are integrated into the following years work plan.  |

### Action Plan for Suboptimal Project Development Rating

|  |
| --- |
| Please provide the specific actions that will be taken to advance delayed activities in the work plan.  |

### Project Risk Identification and Risk Mitigation Plans

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Individual Risk Description** | **Internal/ External[[3]](#footnote-4)** | **Risk Rating** | **Mitigation Plan (if “Substantial” or “High” risk)** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Annex I: Rating Scale**

### Development Objective Rating

The project Development Objective (DO) rating is quantified by analyzing progress against the Results Framework according to the rating scale below.

***DO Rating scale***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **% Achievement of Results Framework targets (average)** |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | 100%  |
| Satisfactory (S) | 80 – 99 |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | 60 – 79 |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | 40 – 59 |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | 20 – 39 |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Below 20% |

***Guiding Example: How to calculate DO Rating from Results Framework***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective/Component/****Outcome** | **Indicator** | **Unit** | **Target Y1** | **Achieved Y1** | **Percent achieved Y1** |
| Project Objective | Indicator 1 | # policies | 5 | 4 | 80 |
|  | Indicator 2 | # ha | 1,000,000 | 900,354 | 90 |
| Component 1 |
|  Outcome 1.1 | Indicator 3 | # beneficiaries | 500 | 410 | 82 |
|  Outcome 1.2 | Indicator 4 | # sites | 10 | 12 | 100 |
| Component 2 |
|  Outcome 2.1 | Indicator 5 | % score | 80% | 75% | 93.75 |
| Average of total | 89.15 |

Note: Please average the achievement of all of the indicators together.

### Implementation Progress Rating

The project Implementation Progress (IP) rating is based on progress against the annual workplan, based on the rating scale provided below.

***IP Rating scale***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Rating | % Achievement of annual workplan targets (average) |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | 100 |
| Satisfactory (S) | 80 – 99 |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | 60 – 79 |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | 40 – 59 |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | 20 – 39 |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Below 20% |

***Guiding Example: How to calculate IP Rating from AWP&B***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Activities Y1** | **Unit** | **Target** | **Achieved** | **Percent Achieved** |
| Component 1 |
|  Activity 1.1.1 | Sites | 5 | 4 | 80 |
|  Activity 1.1.2 | Households | 120 | 122 | 100 |
| Average Component 1 | 90 |
| Component 2 |
|  Activity 2.1.1 | Plans | 6 | 5 | 83 |
|  Activity 2.1.2 | Reports | 2 | 2 | 100 |
|  Activity 2.1.3 | Proposals | 10 | 7 | 70 |
| Average Component 2 | 84.3 |
| Component 3 |
|  Activity 3.1.1 | Trips | 2 | 0 | 0 |
|  Activity 3.1.2 | Trainings | 4 | 3 | 75 |
| Average Component 3 | 37.5 |
| Average achievement of all activities in workplan | 72.57 |

Note: Please average achievement of all of the activities together, not the individual components.

### Risks

Examine whether the project faces substantial risks in terms of the sustainability of project results

***Risk Rating Scale***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Rating |  |
| 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, and/or the project may face substantial risks. |
| Modest Risk (M) | There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks. |
| Low Risk (L) | There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks.  |

***Guiding example: How to determine Risk Rating from Risk Analysis in PPR***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Description** | **Risk Rating** | **Notes** |
| Elections – change of leadership lead to not holding up to commitments | Substantial | If there is a party change, the MOU protected area designation may be thrown out. From our research, the party change is highly likely. See mitigation plan. |
| The newly established coordination mechanism does not meet regularly, and coordination fails | Modest | There is a history of newly established mechanisms not having the intended effects – which is partially due to limited resources and partially due to lack of buy-in. See mitigation plan. |
| The new equipment given to rangers will fail at some point and there will be no expert or replacement parts available to fix. | Substantial | Focal person of the lead ministry is engaged in multiple work. So has given very least priority to the project, wanted to take the position as PCC coordinator, however, has least concern in project implementation. |

After assessing each individual risk according to the risk rating scale, the overall risk is identified as Substantial given that two of the three risks are Substantial, and one is Moderate. This rating is qualitative in nature and considered the best estimate.

1. *Percent of total spent per component as compared to the budget approved in Annual Workplan and Budget.* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. *Average achievement (%) of activity (or output) targets in the Annual Workplan and Budget.* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Internal risks (e.g. capacity of staff, institutional arrangement, etc) are under direct control of project teams, whereas external risks (e.g. political issues, natural disasters, etc.) are outside the direct control of the project teams, but there still may be actions to mitigate impact. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)