****

**WWF GEF Project Progress Report**

**Project Information:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  |
| WWF GEF Project Number: |  |
| GEF ID: |  |
| **Project Report information and Dates:** | |
| Report Author(s): |  |
| Report Completion Date: |  |
| Grant Agreement Date: |  |
| Activity Start Date\* |  |
| Expected Mid-Term Review Date: |  |
| Expected Closing Date: |  |

**\***Should match annual work plan and budget

**Project Report Contacts:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Contact Person** | **Name, Title** | **E-mail** |
| Project Manager: |  |  |
| Project Finance & Administration: |  |  |
| Project Monitoring & Evaluation: |  |  |
| Other (Safeguards, Technical Officers, and other project team members): |  |  |

**Self-Ratings:\***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Rating** |
| Development Objective Rating: |  |
| Implementation Progress Rating: |  |
| Risk Rating: |  |

\*Refer to annex 1

**Supporting Documents:[[1]](#footnote-2)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **File Type** | **Location and Description of Document** |
| Project Results Framework (for annual reports): \* | Part III of report. |
| Annual Work Plan Tracking Document (for annual reports): \* | Part III of report. |
| Other: |  |
| Other: |  |

Instructions:

**Objective:** The WWF GEF Project Progress Report (PPR) is a **required report** designed to help GEF-funded projects meet both WWF and Global Environment Facility (GEF) requirements. This document allows the WWF GEF Project Agency to:

* Track project progress against the results framework and work plans;
* Assess implementation of environmental and social safeguards;
* Provide backstopping and troubleshooting/support as needed;
* Complete individual Project Implementation Reports (PIRs), which are submitted to the GEF Sec.

**Reporting Frequency:** The WWF GEF Project Progress Report must be submitted to the WWF GEF Project Agency on a semi-annual basis (every six months) as specified in the WWF GEF project grant agreement. The end of the year report should be cumulative for the full project year, but should **primarily emphasize the final six months of the project year**.

**Supporting Documentation:** When applicable, two documents are required to be inserted as Part III of the annual PPR for submission to the GEF Secretariat. They are: 1) Annually completed Results Framework, and 2) Annual Work Plan Tracking Document.

Additional documents that provide supporting information or that were produced during the reporting period should be included in the annex of this report. Supporting documents could include: any additional monitoring and evaluation documents, safeguards related documents, gender related documents, documents relating to stakeholder consultation or engagement, project maps and photos, tables, communication/media pieces, surveys or field reports, and others.

**Best Practice:** It is recommended that project teams hold a participatory **Reflection and Adaptive Management workshop or meeting** 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.

**Submission:** Please delete the grey-highlighted text in each box and replace with your entry prior to submission. Please submit the WWF GEF Project Progress Report and all additional documentation to the WWF GEF Project Manager or as otherwise instructed. Please direct any questions on the report to Amelia Kissick, WWF Senior Program Officer of Adaptive Management at [Amelia.kissick@wwfus.org](mailto:Amelia.kissick@wwfus.org) .

# Executive Summary

|  |
| --- |
| After completing Parts I and II of the report, please fill out the Executive Summary. Please provide a summary of the key challenges and successes during the reporting period. Recommended length: one page or less. |

# 

# Part I: Project Technical Progress Report

*Recommended length: approximately 5-6 pages for the mid-year report, 7 pages for annual report.*

### Summary of Expenditure and Implementation

*The following table should report the expenditures and implementation of activities for each component as a percentage of the proposed annual work plan.*

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

### Outcomes and Impacts Achieved

|  |
| --- |
| **Succinctly describe the major progress made during this reporting period towards achieving the project objective and outcomes listed in the ProDoc and according to data collected for the Results Framework. Briefly include any notable impacts to the GEF Global Environmental Benefits, as reflected in the GEF Core and Sub-Indicators**. If possible, organize this information by component. If it is too early for the project to have achieved any major results, [[4]](#footnote-5) please explain how progress against the work plans is likely to lead to the desired outcomes or impacts. Note: This is not where one lists the activities completed during the reporting period – please give this detail in the work plan tracking matrix, to be attached as an annex.  **Briefly and specifically state what role the executing agency and executing partners played in bringing about the results**. You may refer to the theory of change (results chains) to describe how the results are progressing as expected. Note any exceptional achievements such as scaling up or replication of results.  **Please note any major positive or negative effects on beneficiaries**[[5]](#footnote-6) and where possible, quantify the number of project beneficiaries with data disaggregated by gender.  **Please note progress against GEF 7 Core Indicators.**  **Recommended length**: maximum 1.5 pages for six-month report, maximum 2 pages for annual report. |

### Effective Implementation of Work Plans and Budgets

|  |
| --- |
| **Provide a brief summary of progress against the project annual work plan for each component**. Provide 2-3 major activities accomplished during this reporting period to highlight progress. Please note if activities have been carried over from other reporting periods. Note: this is not a list of activities implemented (that is for work plan tracking document in annex), but rather a high-level summary of major progress against the work plan per component.  **Please explain whether you were able to implement the work plan according to schedule** and if not, why not. Highlight any areas that are well behind schedule and explain the main reasons for divergence from the initial planning as well as what was done to get back on schedule.  **Please explain the reasons for any major over- or under-spends and any shifts in budget.**[[6]](#footnote-7) Explain any important consequences and remedial actions that will be taken.  **Please describe how the project has complied with WWF’s Environment and Social Safeguards policies and Procedures.**  **Recommended length**: max. 1.5 pages for mid-year report, maximum 2 pages for annual report. |

### Gender Equality and Mainstreaming

Please provide the completion dates for: the gender assessment or analysis and gender mainstreaming strategy/action plan (GEF-7). **\_\_\_\_ /\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_**

|  |
| --- |
| If either the assessment or resulting strategy/action plan have not yet been completed but are required as part of this project, please provide an explanation for the delay as well as a timeframe and plan for completing them.  **Provide a brief description of how the project gender mainstreaming activities, as described in the Prodoc, have been implemented during this reporting period.** Supporting data may include progress towards achieving gender-related targets in the Results Framework, those tracked in the annual work plan, and/or activities in the gender strategy/action plan.  **Describe the *main challenges encountered and successes achieved***in mainstreaming gender equality, promoting women’s empowerment, or implementing activities related to gender in the project.  **Recommended length:** half page. |

### Stakeholder Engagement

|  |
| --- |
| **Provide a brief description of how the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (if GEF7), as described in the Prodoc, has been implemented during this reporting period; or generally describe the stakeholder engagement (if GEF 5 or 6).**  **Please describe the main challenges encountered and successes achieved**  Recommended length: max. half page. |

### Challenges and Strengths Affecting Project Performance

|  |
| --- |
| **Briefly describe the internal and external[[7]](#footnote-8) challenges and/or strengths to the project that enabled or hindered performance during the reporting period.** Be specific—mention partner contributions and if they were able to increase/multiply/leverage additional funds or project impact. Please note if there are any issues with compliance to WWF and GEF policies as a result of these challenges. If there are significant challenges or opportunities coming up in the next 6-12 months, identify them and their potential impact on the project.  If identified challenges require adaptive management measures, please describe below under Section G. (Adaptive Management) and/or Part II Section C. (Action Plan to address sub-optimal ratings) if needed.  Recommended length: maximum 1 page. |

### Adaptive Management

|  |
| --- |
| **Describe any major adaptations/changes the team has made and/or will need[[8]](#footnote-9) in terms of objectives, strategies and financial management based on lessons learned.** Focus on how and why the strategy is adopted, actions and investments, so readers can see evidence of a thoughtful analytical process.[[9]](#footnote-10) Analysing and revising results chains can be helpful for adaptive management. This section should be consistent with Part II, section F of this report. Note: Do not report here on minor changes at the activity level unless they have major impacts. I**f any changes are being proposed, please highlight them** in the work plan for no-objection.  Recommended length: half page. |

### Sharing of Lessons Learned

|  |
| --- |
| **Describe key lessons learned that are important to share with others.** Please use this opportunity to reflect on what has worked and not worked with the project and how that has compared with expectations and assumptions at the planning stage. These lessons should relate to the project theory of change and may relate to the strategies or approaches used, internal capacity and coordination, experiences with partners and stakeholders, policy engagement, replication, the project context, understanding of (and responses to) potential climate change impacts, or any other issue. Many of the lessons may relate to Section F on challenges and strengths or Section G on adaptive management. Note: **It is important that the lessons tell a story;** a bullet point such as: “It is important to involve government” does not provide enough information to be helpful in understanding the lessons learned.  Explain if and how these lessons are being shared with others.  Recommended length: 1 page. |

# Part II: Project Ratings

\*\*Part II of this report is only required with annual submissions of the PPR.

### Project Objective:

|  |
| --- |
| Please provide the Project Objective, as approved in the Results Framework of the Project Document (Prodoc). Please refer to the results framework for sections -C. |

### Overall Project Development Objective Rating (Likelihood meeting objectives/outcomes)

Using the GEF Rating Guide (see Annex 1) and the latest Results Framework, please provide a self-rating based on the achievement of the Project Objective(s) and Outcome indicator targets as written in the Results Framework.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 1 Rating** | **Year 2 Rating** | **Year 3 Rating****[[10]](#footnote-11)** | **Brief Narrative Justification** |
|  |  |  |  |

### Action Plan to Address Sub-optimal Development Objective Ratings

For sub-optimal performing projects (e.g. projects with a rating of Moderately Satisfactory - MS, Moderately Unsatisfactory- MU, Unsatisfactory- U, and Highly Unsatisfactory - HU ratings), please provide the specific actions that will be taken to improve on each of the objective and outcomes that have failed to achieve 80% of the indicator targets. List who will perform these actions and by when. Please note the linkages between any specific actions in the work plans that will help achieve the expected outcomes or objective(s) in the Results Framework. Finally, if there are any changes to project activities, ensure necessary safeguards related documents are prepared.

| **Objective/Outcome underperforming** | **Action(s) to be taken** | **Responsible person(s)** | **Due Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Overall Project Implementation Progress Ratings

Please refer to the approved Work Plan for the project year when answering sections D and E.

Using the GEF Rating Guide (see Annex 1), please provide a self-rating for the overall success in achieving the project work plan.

| **Y1 Rating** | **Y2 Rating** | **Y3 Rating[[11]](#footnote-12)** | **Brief Narrative Justification** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |

### Action Plan to Address Sub-optimal Implementation Progress Ratings

For sub-optimal performing projects (e.g. projects with a rating of Moderately Satisfactory - MS, Moderately Unsatisfactory- MU, Unsatisfactory- U and Highly Unsatisfactory - HU ratings), please provide the specific actions that will be taken to improve the project components that have failed to achieve an average of 80% of activity targets. List who will perform these actions and by when.

| **Outcome/Output underperforming** | **Action(s) to be taken** | **Responsible person(s)** | **Due Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Adjustments to Project Strategy or Timeline:

|  |
| --- |
| Based on the above ratings, please provide justification for any adjustments made to the project Annual Work Plan or Results Framework. Please include revised documents with changes highlighted in Part II of this progress report. Note: Any major adjustments to the objectives, strategies, or financial management should also be noted in the Adaptive Management section of the PPR (Part I, section G). [[12]](#footnote-13) |

### Annual Risk Ratings

In the table below, please list and rate any major risks[[13]](#footnote-14) to the success of the project. Teams should analyze and identify assumptions[[14]](#footnote-15) from the project theory of change (results chains), particularly those that have the highest possibility of failing to hold or materialize, to determine these risks. Risks predetermined in the prodoc should also be considered. Examples of risks include issues relating to capacity/work load, sequencing/scheduling, shift in government leadership, new government policies, lack of scientific data, climate change, natural disasters and others. See Annex I for more details on how to determine the risk rating. Mitigation measures must be taken with respect to risks that receive a “**Substantial”** or “**High”** rating, and noted in Part II, section I of this report.

**Project Risk Summary Table[[15]](#footnote-16)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Individual Risk Description** | **Internal/External[[16]](#footnote-17)** | **Risk Rating** | **Notes** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Project Overall Risk Rating Summary Table (Low, Medium, Substantial or High):

Please provide an overall risk rating, based on individual risks identified above. See Annex I for Risk Rating scale and guidance.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Y1 Rating** | **Y2 Rating** | **Y3 Rating[[17]](#footnote-18)** | **Rating justification and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period** |
|  |  |  |  |

### Action plan to address “Substantial” or “High” risks

If “Substantial” or “High” risks are reported in the project risk summary above, please complete the following table. The table should describe the individual risks mentioned as well as a planned action to mitigate those risks with the person(s) responsible and completion date. If a risk mitigation plan was submitted for a previous reporting period, please provide below an updated table detailing progress or results.

| **Substantial or High Risk Description** | **Action(s) to be taken** | **Responsible person(s)** | **Due Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

# Part III: Results Framework and Annual Work Plan Tracking

*Insert into the body of this report the updated Results Framework (including GEF Core and sub-indicators when relevant), and the updated annual work plan tracking document. In addition to the baseline measurement, the Core and Sub-indicators are required at the mid-term and close. The Results Framework should be submitted with annual project progress reports (not mid-year reports). If there is an annual work plan tracking document that is available to share for the mid-year report, please include it here. If not, please submit for the annual report.*

**Annex I:** **WWF - Global Environmental Facility Rating Scales and Guidance**

Every year, the WWF GEF Agency reports to the GEF Secretariat on the status of projects under implementation, which includes submission of annual ratings for Development Objective, Implementation Progress and Risk. These ratings should be reported in the Annual (12-month) Project Progress Report (PPR).  It is important to note that while the rating scales provided allow an objective calculation for the project rating, flexibility may be granted to adjust for a fair rating. The WWF GEF Agency will then submit the project ratings to the GEF Secretariat in the Project Implementation Report (PIR) and Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). Below are the scales and guiding examples for determining these annual ratings.

**Development Objective Rating**

The project Development Objective (DO) rating is quantified by analyzing the percent achievement of annual indicators in the project Results Framework (RF) and comparing the average achievement of those indicators against the DO rating scale below. In addition, it may be considered whether the project is on track to meeting targets that are measured at later intervals (e.g. indicators measured at midterm and project close, rather than annually. See below for the rating scale and an example of how this is calculated. Please note that for all indicators in the RF where achievement is below 80%, an action plan is requested in the PPR.  This will be discussed with the WWF GEF Agency for a no-objection following their review of the PPR.

**Development Objective Rating Scale\***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **% Achievement of Results Framework targets (averaged)** |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | 100 |
| Satisfactory (S)\* | 80 – 99 |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | 70 – 79 |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | 60 – 69 |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | 50 – 59 |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | 49 and below |

\*Note that remedial action is needed for all indicator-targets not achieving 80% (Satisfactory).

**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 |
| Outcome 2.2 | Indicator 6 | # protected areas | n/a | n/a | -- |
| Component 3 | | | | | |
| Outcome 3.1 | Indicator 7 | # strategies | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Outcome 3.2 | Indicator 8 | Ratio m/f | 1:1 | 1:1 | 100 |
|  | Indicator 9 | # cases filed | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Average of total | | | | | 68.2% |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **% Achievement of Results Framework targets (averaged)** |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | 100 |
| Satisfactory (S) | 80 – 99 |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | 70 – 79 |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | 60 – 69 |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | 50 – 59 |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | 49 and below |

Rating determined is Moderately Unsatisfactory.  An action plan is required for indicators 7 and 9. The rating and action plan will be discussed with the WWF GEF Agency following their review of the PPR.

**Implementation Progress Rating**

The project Implementation Progress (IP) rating is quantified by analyzing the percent achievement of targets in the annual workplan and comparing their average achievement against the IP rating scale provided below.  See below for the rating scale and an example of how this is calculated. Please note that while the Project Progress Report (PPR) will request that workplan targets be averaged by component, the IP rating will be based on a total average of all workplan targets. For all components where the average achievement of workplan targets is below 80%, an action plan is requested in the PPR. This will be discussed with the WWF GEF Agency for a no-objection following their review of the PPR.

**Implementation Progress Rating Scale**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **% Achievement of annual workplan targets (averaged)** |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | 90 – 100 |
| Satisfactory (S)\* | 80 – 89 |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | 65 – 79 |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | 50 – 64 |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | 40 – 59 |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | 39 and below |

\* Note that remedial action is needed for all components averaging less than 80% (Satisfactory) achievement of indicator targets.

**Guiding Example: How to calculate IP rating from work plan tracking**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 | Events | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| Activity 2.1.2 | Visits | 2 | 2 | 100 |
| Average Component 2 | | | | 100 |
| Component 3 | | | | |
| Activity 3.1.1 | Trips | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Activity 3.1.2 | Trainings | 4 | 3 | 75 |
| Activity 3.1.3 | Report | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| Average Component 3 | | | | 58.3 |
| Average of total workplan | | | | 82.78 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **% Achievement of annual workplan targets (averaged)** |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | 90 – 100 |
| Satisfactory (S) | 80 – 89 |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | 65 – 79 |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | 50 – 64 |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | 40 – 59 |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | 39 and below |

Rating determined is Satisfactory. Action plan is required in PPR for Component 3. The rating and action plan will be discussed with the WWF GEF Agency following their review of the PPR.

**Risk Rating**

Risk can be thought of as an uncertain event or condition, which if it occurs, could have a negative impact on the project (e.g. the political situation deteriorates, which affects the potential passing of a policy, etc).  Assumptions are statements that we believe to be true in the face of uncertainty. The project strategies that are designed to affect change are based on assumptions, which is why projects have a ‘theory’ of change. Assumptions are related to risks, since if those assumptions fail to hold, it means the risk occurred and may have a negative impact on the success of the project (e.g. awareness raising events do not lead to the desired behavior change as expected, etc.).  Once the team has reflected on individual risks or assumptions that could have a high potential impact on the project, they will list these in the PPR and rate them based on the scale below, using their best available knowledge. An average rating will be based on the individual ratings and submitted with the PPR. See below for the rating scale and an example of how this is calculated. Please note that all individual risks that are considered Substantial or High should be accompanied by an action plan in the PPR to prepare for and address those risks.  This will be discussed with the WWF GEF Agency for a no-objection following their review of the PPR.

**Risk Rating Scale**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Definition** |
| 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 the risk rating**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Description** | **External/Internal** | **Rating** | **Notes** |
| Lack of government support for zoning | External | Substantial\* | Main supporter is at district level. National level has no support and therefore may not be able to pass national policy as hoped. |
| Turnover - Change of ministry and district focal and institutional heads | External | Modest | Training and engaging new focal persons about the project is time consuming and project activities are likely to be delayed. |
| Bad weather affecting access to remote areas | External | Modest | If access is not possible, project activities will be delayed or cancelled. |
| Prolonged strike and blockade | External | High\* | This may redirect government attention, restrict access to project sites, and make getting necessary supplies difficult, which may delay or stop workplan activities. |
| Total average risk: | | Substantial |  |

Rating determined is Substantial. Action plan is required in PPR for the risks with ‘\*’. The rating and action plan will be discussed with the WWF GEF Agency following their review of the PPR.

1. Documents with “\*” should be included in Part III of the report as applicable. All other supporting documents should be annexed. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Percent of total spent per component as compared to the budget approved in the annual work plan and budget. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Percent completion of activity targets in the annual work plan of the reporting period. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Results include 1) impacts, which are linked to project objective, 2)outcomes that are linked to reduced threats, drivers/barriers and opportunities, and 3) Outputs, which are direct results of activities (typically not described in this section). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Beneficiaries are defined as those who receive direct or indirect benefits from the project (e.g. trained government staff, community members that receive cooking stoves, etc.) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Any shifting of budget from one component to another that exceeds 5% of the originally proposed budget in the prodoc should receive a no-objection from WWF GEF Agency. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Internal strengths or challenges are those under direct control of the project, such as management processes, stakeholder engagement, capacity, donor support, etc.). External includes those that are outside of the direct control of the project and could include stakeholder behaviour, environmental changes, politics or policy change, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Please ensure that for any new activities that safeguards related documents are prepared. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. The changes that you describe should be a result of analyses and might link closely to the challenges and strengths identified above. In other words, this analysis will provide an explanation as to how the team will overcome challenges, leverage strengths, and/or correct false assumptions in the theory of change. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Please add or delete columns depending on the duration of the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Please add or delete columns depending on the duration of the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. Any shifting of budget from one component to another that exceeds 5% of the originally proposed budget in the prodoc should receive a no-objection from WWF GEF Agency. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. Risk are potential effects of uncertainty on project results. The uncertainty is tied to the project assumptions (see below). Risks could include climate change, social/environmental/political issues, or risks that are internal to the project, such as capacity/staffing issues. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. Assumptions are statements that we believe to be true in the face of uncertainty. and result in a hypothesis and associated risk. The project theory of change is based on assumptions, but some have higher risk than others. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. Please add rows as necessary. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. 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 and leadership and would need to be mitigated or avoided when possible. Both risks can be managed through the project, by way of management, strategies and activities. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. Please add or delete columns depending on the duration of the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)