



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2022 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

Table of contents

1.	BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2.	PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	4
3.	IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	7
4.	SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	13
5.	ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	18
6.	RISKS	20
7.	FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	22
8.	MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	23
9.	STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	24
10.	GENDER MAINSTREAMING	25
11.	KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	26
12.	INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	28
13.	CO-FINANCING TABLE	29

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Global
Country (ies):	Global
Project Title:	Enabling Activities for Implementing UNCCD COP Drought Decisions
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/GLO/1006/GFF
GEF ID:	10671
GEF Focal Area(s):	Land degradation
Project Executing Partners:	FAO
Project Duration (years):	2.83 (34 months)
Project coordinates:	<i>Guidance on how to record project coordinates will be provided separately</i>

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	7 December 2020
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD:	8 February 2021
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	31 December 2023
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ²	

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	2 000 000
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc³:	12 140 000
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)⁴:	595 148
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022⁵	N/A

¹ As per FPMIS

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

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

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

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

M&E Milestones

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	2 January 2022
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	January 2023
Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):	N/A
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	June 2024
Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	Yes

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

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

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Maher Salman, Senior Land and Water Officer, Land and Water Division/FAO	Maher.salman@fao.org
Budget Holder	Lifeng Li, Director, Land and Water Division/FAO	Lifeng.li@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Maher Salman, Senior Land and Water Officer, Land and Water Division/FAO	maher.salman@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Hernan Gonzalez, Technical Officer, Office of Climate Change/FAO	hernan.gonzalez@fao.org

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

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

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

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

<i>Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.</i>							
Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress¹⁰ since project start level on 30 June 2022	Progress rating¹¹
Increased resilience of drought-affected communities through Integrated Drought Management approach	Outcome 1: Country parties are enabled to fulfil their participation in the IWG process and beyond	1. Number of relevant policy frameworks and implementation plans on drought preparedness analysed	0		31	Completed. The revision of submissions by country parties to IWG has been reviewed and compiled	HS
		2. Number of frameworks for the assessment of National Drought Plans developed	0		1	Completed. A framework for assessment of National Drought Plans is developed and made available to project stakeholders	HS
		3. Number of stakeholders (organizations) from the global drought community engaged	0		10	Completed. Dialogue and collaboration established with IWG members representing respective organizations, UNCCD Global mechanism, GEF, GCF, AF, WMO and multiple regional and national stakeholders to address multiple dimensions of drought management, in support of national implementation processes	HS
	Outcome 2: Parties increasingly utilizing upgraded Drought	1. Number of upgrading features developed for the Drought Toolbox	0	3	6	Ongoing. 3 additional features (datasets for monitoring and Early Warning, risk assessment, and gender-responsive tools)	S

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

⁹ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

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

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

	Toolbox in their drought planning and mitigation efforts				have been implemented in the Drought Toolbox		
	2. Number of capacity development programmes and peer-to-peer frameworks developed to improve countries' drought planning and mitigation capacities	0	2	4	Ongoing. Capacity development programmes on the use of the Drought Toolbox and of the FAO Drought Portal have been conducted	S	
	Outcome 3: National and institutional frameworks strengthened, and capacities built to support the implementation of national drought plans of the members of the Drought Initiative	1. Number of National Drought Plans aligned with relevant national policies	0		31	Ongoing. A multi-criteria framework is applied to National Drought Plans for assessment	HS
		2. Number of awareness raising events/products/HL meetings participated/organized to address the importance of effective drought planning at country level	0		10	Ongoing. 5 awareness raising actions conducted, including the organization of dedicated events on the occasion of global events (UNCCD CoP15, WWF9) and the production of online content to address the importance of drought planning	HS
	Outcome 4: Capacities and institutional frameworks for drought vulnerability assessment, monitoring, and reporting strengthened	1. Number of tools/products for resilience assessment/monitoring produced	0		8	Ongoing. Case studies (11) for proactive drought mitigation responses elaborated and a knowledge product on vulnerability and impact assessment produced	S
		2. Number of national databases for drought vulnerability produced	0		1	Ongoing. A methodology is under development for the definition of relevant global indicators to be compiled	S
		3. Number of capacity building needs assessment for drought-smart sustainable land and water management designed	0		1	Ongoing. A final assessment of capacity building needs in relevant fields is to be agreed upon with the implementing partners, been selected	S
		4. Number of monitoring and evaluation assessments conducted	0		2 (Mid-Term and Final evaluations)	Ongoing. Regular reporting of activities is produced to feed into mid-term and final evaluation, as per workplan	S

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
Outcome 1.1				
Output 1.1.1 Stock-taking of the existing policies, implementation and institutional frameworks, and partnerships, on drought preparedness and response of the Parties	1. Number of National Drought Plans submitted to IWG reviewed	31 National Drought Plans reviewed	31 National Drought Plans reviewed, and recommendations to enable implementation lined out	N/A
	2. Number of frameworks for the assessment of National Drought Plans developed	1 framework developed	A multi-criteria framework developed to be applied for the assessment of National Drought Plans	N/A
	3. Number of validation events conducted	1 validation event conducted	An event with project stakeholders took place for the validation of the multi-criteria framework	N/A
	4. Number of innovative financing mechanisms for drought mitigation analysed and developed	1 case study for innovative financing for drought mitigation analysed	Relevant case of innovative financing for drought mitigation analysed (Upper Tana Nairobi Water Fund, Kenya)	N/A
	5. Number of reporting to CoP bureau	1 reporting to CoP prepared	Reporting to CoP bureau prepared, including recommendation and decisions related to drought management at the CoP15	N/A
Output 1.1.2 Options identified for appropriate policy, advocacy, and implementation measures at all levels for addressing drought effectively under the Convention	1. Number of recommendations across scale for capacity building in integrated drought management	1 set of recommendation for building capacities at different scales in drought management presented	An analysis of knowledge gaps in integrated drought management carried out and a set of recommendation for capacity building at global, regional, national, and sub-national level drawn	N/A
	2. Number of case studies on policy, advocacy, and implementation measures for	11 case studies to illustrate policy, advocacy, and	11 case studies (Sahel, India, Brazil, Tunisia, Colombia, Mexico, Central America, Eastern Africa, Turkey, Kenya, West Africa) selected as	N/A

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

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

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

	drought planning and mitigation examined and illustrated	implementation measures for drought planning and mitigation analysed	relevant for drought planning and mitigation, and implemented policy and technical measures illustrated	
	3. Number of economic assessments on drought risks as a component of climate finance	1 economic assessment on drought risks prepared	Comprehensive review of financing mechanisms to address drought risks prepared	N/A
	4. Number of events to illustrate linkages between local drought impacts, vulnerability and risks within global assessment framework conducted	1 event (national, regional, global) on drought impacts, vulnerability and risks within global assessment framework participated/conducted	Contribution provided to in a regional event organized by the SADC to address local drought impacts, vulnerability, and risks, in light of global assessment approaches	N/A
	5. Number of case studies on policies, implementation and partnerships for impact, vulnerability and risk assessments developed	5 case studies on policies, implementation and partnerships for impact vulnerability and risk assessment developed	5 case studies identified for the analysis and illustration of policies, implementation and partnerships for impact vulnerability and risk assessment	N/A
	6. Number of case studies on land management and climate change synergies developed	5 case studies on land management and climate change synergies developed	5 case studies selected for the illustration of land management and climate change synergies for drought management	N/A
	7. Number of review workshop with IWG members conducted	1 review workshop with IWG members conducted	1 Regional review workshops with IWG members conducted for the identification of effective policy, advocacy, and implementation measures to address drought effectively under the Convention	N/A
	8. Number of reports on findings and recommendations to UNCCD CoP 15	2 reports to UNCCD CoP produced	2 reports produced (IWG report and IWG blue paper)	N/A
Output 1.1.3 Strategic drought preparedness and response partnerships strengthened	1. Number of economic instruments and financing mechanisms for drought risk reduction and preparedness reviewed	Main (3) global finance mechanisms reviewed to analyse effectiveness in drought risk reduction and preparedness	3 global finance (GEF, GCF, AF) mechanisms reviewed to analyze effective drought risk reduction and preparedness	N/A
	2. Consultations with IWG members organized/participated in	3 consultation meetings with IWG organized/participated in	Participated in 3 consultation meetings organized by IWG	

	3. Knowledge product on innovative financing, legal, policy and technical instruments	1 knowledge product including innovative financing, legal, policy and technical instruments prepared	Blue Paper on drought and a publication on drought financing produced and presented at CoP15, including options and recommendation for innovative finance resources and mechanisms	
	4. Compilation of case studies on national financing for drought risk mitigation	5 case studies to illustrate innovative financing for drought mitigation prepared	5 relevant cases of innovative financing for drought mitigation identified (Comoros, Argentina, Dominica Republic, Uzbekistan) and reported	
Outcome 2.1				
Output 2.1.1 Drought Toolbox scaled out and enhanced with datasets for monitoring and early warning, improved risk assessment and including gender-responsive tools for risk mitigation	1. Number of compendiums of best practices on the three pillars	A knowledge product on drought risk mitigation best practices (3 rd pillar of integrated drought management) produced	A second knowledge product, in a series of 3 to be produced, on drought risk mitigation produced	N/A
	2. Number of inventory and review of external drought-related tools and redesign of Toolbox accordingly	Drought Toolbox fully revisited	A comprehensive inventory of drought related tools is ongoing, including tools at different scales produced outside the framework of the Drought Initiative	N/A
	3. Number of upgrading features implemented in the Drought Toolbox	Additional features under each of the three pillars of the Drought Toolbox implemented	Review and elaboration of additional features is ongoing, to upgrade the current Drought Toolbox with datasets for monitoring and early warning, risk assessment, and gender-responsive tools. Ongoing activities with WOCAT on Drought Risk Mitigation. Monitoring and EWS software, and providing access to data is collaborated with UNEP-DHI	N/A
Output 2.1.2 Capacities of the member countries for the utilization of the enhanced Drought Toolbox developed (on early warning and monitoring systems, impact and vulnerability assessments and drought risk mitigation measures)	1. Number of gap analysis and need assessment framework for capacity-building on three pillars of drought conducted	1 analysis of knowledge gaps in the utilization of the Drought Toolbox is conducted at country level	An integrated analysis of existing knowledge gaps and assessment of needs to building capacities on the three pillars of drought management is ongoing	N/A
	2. Number of capacity-building programme on the Drought Toolbox organized/participated in	1 capacity development programme on the Drought Toolbox is carried out	Participation in a capacity building event to present the Drought Toolbox and the FAO Drought Portal to illustrate features to national technical experts carried out	N/A
Output 2.1.3 Community of practice on relevant drought topics established, and capacities	1. Number of e-learning platform for community of practice on drought	1 online learning platform for a community of practice in drought management	Concept for the development of an online learning platform for community of practice under elaboration	N/A

strengthened on the drought-smart land management		is designed and made available online		
	2. Number of development/maintenance/hosting/support platforms developed	1 support for the maintenance of the learning platform is elaborated and active	In parallel to the elaboration of the online learning platform, the maintenance support of the Toolbox is under elaboration	N/A
Outcome 3.1				
Output 3.1.1 National drought plans aligned with and integrated into existing relevant national frameworks, including the NAPs, through an integrated multi-sectoral approach	1. Number of training module on gender mainstreaming for drought management	1 training module on gender mainstreaming for drought management performed	Evaluations are ongoing for the selection of the partner for the conduction of activity	N/A
	2. Number of regional workshops on National Drought Plan and National Adaptation Plan integration	2 regional workshops on NDPs and NAPs organized	Selection of target regions ongoing, according to the outcomes of activities under Component 1	N/A
	3. Number of policy guidelines on institutional coordination mechanism	1 policy guidelines produced on institutional coordination for the implementation of NDPs	Guidelines under elaboration, to be aligned to the outcomes of activities under Component 1	N/A
	4. Number of multi-sectoral coordination mechanisms for National Drought Plan integration in selected countries	12 coordination mechanisms set up	The design of multi-sectoral mechanisms for NDP integration is ongoing, based on the outcomes of activities under component 1.	N/A
	5. Number of publications on best practices on National Drought Plan integration in selected countries	1 publication on best practices on NDPs integration released	Based on the outcomes of activities under Component 1, best practices on NDP integration are identified for selected countries	N/A
Output 3.1.2 Awareness raising at various venues (COP-15, CRIC meetings, and others) on the risk and impact mitigation effectiveness of the national drought plans	1. Number of dissemination campaign with online content production	1 event to represent field experiences through online content rolled out	1 awareness raising event to represent field experience on the risk and impact mitigation effectiveness of national drought plans conducted	N/A
	2. Number of exchange events/platforms for experience sharing organized	3 exchange events (online, hybrid, in-person) for experience sharing organized	Contribution provided to the Drought Day at the UNCCD CoP15, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 contribution to the High-level panel on the urgency of drought issue • 1 contribution provided to a session showcasing drought resilience policies 	

			As part of the WWF9 program, 1 session on sustainable finance for drought resilience organized	
	3. Number of high-level meetings on national drought policy (HMNDP-2023) organized	1 high-level contribution provided on national drought policy	Participation in the High-Level meeting on national drought policy and contribution provided towards the organization of the HMNDP 2023	
Outcome 4.1				N/A
Output 4.1.1 Guidance/tools/approaches for assessment, monitoring the resilience of vulnerable populations and ecosystems and reporting developed	1. Number of impact and vulnerability assessment methodologies mapped	1 comprehensive mapping of global biophysical indicators to assess drought vulnerability and build resilience constructed	Desk research is ongoing to gather comprehensive guidance, tools, and approaches for drought assessment and monitoring	N/A
	2. Number of assessments of drought-smart land management measures for drought risk mitigation conducted	1 assessment of drought-smart land management measures for drought risk carried out	Across-scale (Field/Watershed/Regional/National/Multinational-region/Multilateral-global) assessment of drought-smart land management measures for drought risk mitigation on going	
	3. Number of communication manuals for developing drought risk profile/vulnerability assessment	1 communication manual for drought risk profiling and vulnerability assessment	A concept of the manual is under elaboration, in line with outcomes of output 4.1.1	
	4. Number of comprehensive inventories of case studies of proactive drought mitigation response developed	1 comprehensive inventory collecting case studies of proactive drought mitigation responses prepared	11 case studies developed so far, to be complemented by other 12 case studies developed under activities conducted under Component 1	
	5. Number of knowledge product on drought vulnerability and impact assessment produced	1 knowledge product on drought vulnerability and impact assessment produced	A knowledge product on drought vulnerability and impact assessment produced	
	6. Number of workshops on drought vulnerability and impact assessment conducted	1 workshop on drought vulnerability and impact assessment conducted	Countries are selected based on the outcomes of activities under Component 1, and the organization of the workshop is on-going	
	7. Number of coordination frameworks for integrated and inter-sectoral collaboration facilitated	12 coordination frameworks facilitated	Based on the country selected under Component 1, relevant coordination frameworks are under design	

<p>Output 4.1.2 National databases (methods, metrics, and indicators) for the drought vulnerability indicator (level 3) developed, including past drought incidences and its impacts</p>	<p>1. Number of datasets of global impact indicators created</p>	<p>1 dataset of global drought impact indicators compiled</p>	<p>Desk research is ongoing to identify relevant drought vulnerability indicators</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Output 4.1.3 Capacity building needs assessment conducted and a capacity-building program for drought-smart Sustainable Land and Water Management developed</p>	<p>1. Number of gap analysis and need assessment frameworks for capacity-building on drought-smart Sustainable Land and Water Management developed</p>	<p>1 comprehensive gap analysis and need assessment developed to develop capacities in drought-smart sustainable land and water management</p>	<p>Identification and selection of quality and globally expert implementing partner is ongoing</p>	<p>N/A</p>
	<p>2. Number of capacity-building programmes on drought-smart Sustainable Land and Water Management developed</p>	<p>1 capacity-building programme on drought-smart sustainable land and water management carried out</p>	<p>Design of the capacity building program is ongoing, to be carried by the partner implementing activity 4.1.3.1</p>	
<p>Output 4.1.4 Project monitoring and final evaluation conducted</p>	<p>1. Number of Mid-term evaluations produced</p>	<p>1 mid-term evaluation produced</p>	<p>Reporting documents are gathered in preparation of the mid-term evaluation</p>	
	<p>2. Number of Final evaluations produced</p>	<p>1 final evaluation produced</p>	<p>Reporting documents and mid-term evaluation collected in preparation of the final evaluation</p>	

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

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

Project implementation started with the organization of the inception workshop, involving key partners such as IWG, UN agencies, research centres, etc. The inception workshop outlined the workplan by project outcomes and illustrated the planned activities, expected deliverables, involved partners, and implementation modalities. Reporting of the workshop was shared among participants, who agreed on the plan of activities.

The project implementation followed a balanced and harmonious coordination amongst expected outcomes and achieved considerable progress per each:

- Under Outcome 1: A multi-criteria assessment framework was developed and deployed to screen and evaluate the performance of validated National Drought Plans (NDPs) (31) against the required guidelines (model National Drought Plan) and international references. The multi-criteria assessment resulted in country-specific recommendations on the enhancement of NDPs to enable their implementation. The framework was presented to the project steering committee and its approach was validated by project partners, for application in the assessment of NDPs. Adding to the progress under the Outcome, the activities on financing drought risk and economics of preparedness have been launched. A report on the review of effective financing has been developed, which includes the synthesis of multi-level consultations and case studies and presents a relevant case of innovative financing for drought mitigation. The report has been endorsed by key implementing partners. Consultations amongst expert groups have been initiated to line out the work planning. To diversify the viewpoints of integrated, multidisciplinary, and multi-stakeholder mechanisms of drought risk financing, an event concept was developed, titled “Too small to economize, too big to compromise? Measuring the effectiveness of finance delivery for drought management at community level”. The event called for the intervention of stakeholders from financing institutes to grassroots actors. The event was accepted to be featured as special session in the World Water Forum 2022. Meetings were routinely organized and co-convened with IWG to allow the integration of recommendations and the follow-up of results. A comprehensive analysis of economic and financing measures for drought risk reduction has been published, analysing the effectiveness of existing approaches under the 3 main global finance mechanisms (GEF, GCF, AF). In addition, options for innovative finance resources and mechanisms are reported among the set of recommendations presented at the UNCCD

CoP15 (Blue Paper). Policy, advocacy and implementation tools for addressing drought have started to be analysed from multiple perspectives. Capacity development needs have been examined and outlined according to different levels, from global to sub-national, while relevant case studies (11) for effective drought planning and mitigation are collected and illustrated in the knowledge product on drought risk mitigation. The implementation of Outcome foresees no changes in the original project design. The likelihood of achieving the outcome is high.

- Under Outcome 2: Situational analysis of the current and desirable functions of the Drought Toolbox was conducted and discussed with stakeholders, leading to the definition of the comprehensive inventory of upgrading features to be included in the Toolbox. Collaboration with UNEP-DHI and WOCAT have been established to develop features under Pillar 1 (monitoring and early warning) and Pillar 3 (mitigation and preparedness), respectively, of Integrated Drought Management. UN to UN agreement was signed with the UNCCD to implement the activities of this Outcome. While the development of peer-to-peer learning platforms is currently under design, 2 capacity development events have been conducted to illustrate available features of the Drought Toolbox and of the FAO Drought Portal to technical stakeholders in selected countries. The implementation of Outcome foresees no changes in the original project design. The likelihood of achieving the outcome is high.
- Under Outcome 3: Based on the multi-criteria assessment of National Drought Plans, 12 countries were selected for case studies. The country selection was based on the performance of the National Drought Plans and geographical balance (2 countries per regions – 6 regions). 3 country tiers were created to enable the gradual roll-out of case study development. 6 countries representing 5 regions were selected in the first tier and full analysis of the missing aspects of National Drought Plans was conducted. Awareness raising events were organized as part of the dissemination campaign on the risk and impact mitigation effectiveness of NDPs including a contribution to the HL panel on the urgency of drought, a session on drought financing, and a participation in the HL meeting on drought policy, held at the UNCCD CoP15. The implementation of Outcome foresees no changes in the original project design. The likelihood of achieving the outcome is high.
- Under Outcome 4: Consultations on impact and vulnerability assessment were held with stakeholders to assess the existing knowledge resources. A Letter of Agreement was signed, in which the workplan, including communication materials to be developed, was agreed. An assessment of drought-smart sustainable land and water management measures for drought risk is ongoing, as included in the knowledge product on drought risk mitigation. The assessment is meant to guide the design of the related capacity development program. A Letter of Agreement has been signed for the compilation of the dataset of global drought vulnerability indicator. Reporting documents, meeting recordings and materials produced are regularly

collected and will feed into the reporting at mid-term and final stage. The implementation of Outcome foresees no changes in the original project design. The likelihood of achieving the outcome is high.

In overall, the delivered activities have significant contribution to the project objective of completing and implementing National Drought Plans according to the principles of Integrated Drought Management.

The project implementation is further facilitated through a gradual increase of partners and is received with high interest by stakeholders. The overall progress is steady with tangible results already delivered. The implementation is on schedule.

Development Objective (DO) Ratings, Implementation Progress (IP) Ratings and Overall Assessment

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence and progress reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR. For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

	FY2022 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2022 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	HS	HS	<i>Activities are carried out according to the indicated workplan</i>
Budget Holder	HS	HS	<i>Development and progress are rated satisfactory, according to the plan of work</i>
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸			<i>This is a global project with over 30 beneficiary governments through the IWG on Drought</i>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	HS	HS	<i>Implementation is in compliance with the approved plan</i>
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	HS	HS	<i>The proposed project is surpassing expectations in terms of quality and timeliness of delivery. Work with the Intergovernmental Working Group on Drought (IWG) on capacity building has been successfully completed. More than 30 party submissions on implementation plans and drought preparedness were revised/compiled, and a framework for the assessment of National Drought Plans is now available for stakeholders. Parties have also benefitted from technical support to align their National Drought plans with relevant national policies.</i>

¹⁵ **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.

For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

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

¹⁷ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

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

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

			<p><i>FAO's Drought Toolbox is being upgraded (see sections 2 and 3 for details) and the capacity building program to improve country capacity for drought planning and mitigation is under way. Similarly, a knowledge drought produce on drought vulnerability and impact assessment has been produced. A capacity needs assessment on drought-smart sustainale land and water management is being discussed with partners.</i></p> <p><i>The project is en route to complete its activities and achieve its results on time.</i></p>
--	--	--	---

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made complying with the approved ESM plan. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low**-risk projects. Add new ESS risks if any risks have emerged during this FY.

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

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

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²⁰ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	ESS risk classification is still valid and rated as Low

<i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i>
N/A

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

6. Risks

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Effective coordination and implementation constrained by the diversity and relevant number of stakeholders	L	N	Regular meetings and dialogues held	Ongoing	During the project inception meeting it was highlighted the need for regular engagement of all partners
2	Heavy workload of the project manager and team members, acting also as members of the FAO Adaptation Fund unit	M	N	Appropriate time and resources have been allocated to the Adaptation Fund unit	Completed	In agreement with management, appropriate resources were identified to ensure a smooth implementation of project activities

²¹ Risk ratings means a rating of accesses the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
3	Spreading of new pandemics/epidemiological risks that may hamper/postpone activities	M	N	Revert to online activities, as possible, and revisit the workplan accordingly	Meetings among stakeholders and project partners is ongoing through online modalities. Planning is adapted accordingly.	

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

FY2021 rating	FY2022 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Low	Low	

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

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

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
Recommendation 1:	N/A
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation 4:	

Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe	No Exit Strategy was elaborated at project inception. Since there have been no changes in the workplan and no additional risks have been identified in the current fiscal year, it is not deemed necessary.
--	---

8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines²². Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories and provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework	N/A		
Components and cost	N/A		
Institutional and implementation arrangements	N/A		
Financial management	N/A		
Implementation schedule	N/A		
Executing Entity	N/A		
Executing Entity Category	N/A		
Minor project objective change	N/A		
Safeguards	N/A		
Risk analysis	N/A		
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	N/A		
Co-financing	N/A		
Location of project activity	N/A		
Other	N/A		

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

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

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

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government Institutions			
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
Private sector entities			
Others [1]			
Global partners from the drought community (IWG, Global Mechanism of UNCCD)	Consultation role across activities	Dialogues established to improve existing knowledge and strengthen project outcomes through shared lessons	Covid-19 restrictions have partly limited exchanges, but online dialogues allowed overcoming the challenge
New stakeholders identified/engaged			
Imperial College of London	Execution of activities under Component 4	Letter of Agreement signed	N/A

10. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) during this reporting period.		
Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	N/A	
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Y	Design of gender responsive capacity building programs outlined across Components currently ongoing
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Y	Capacity development programs are under design to enhance knowledge and technical capacities of target women in drought risk mitigation
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Y	Improvements will stem from the enhanced capacity achieved through the capacity development programs
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	N/A	
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	N/A	
Staff with gender expertise	N/A	
Any other good practices on gender	N/A	

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
<p>Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far</p>	<p>Although a KM strategy is not included in the project, activities include a range of technical and outreach products, as well as online tools and capacity development programs, across components. The implementation of such activities will result in a comprehensive strategy to enhance knowledge and share valuable lessons</p>
<p>Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year</p>	<p>The project communication strategy is developed across activities within all the components. During the reporting period, a CN has been designed and shared with participants for the event on drought risk financing. The event report is under preparation. Similarly, outreach and communication products will be produced on the occasion of events, launching of publications and training</p>
<p>Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people’s livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.</p>	
<p>Please provide links to related website, social media account</p>	<p>https://www.unccd.int/land-and-life/drought/toolbox https://www.fao.org/land-water/water/drought/drought-portal/en/?page=4&ipp=10&tx_dynalist_pi1%5Bpar%5D=YToxOntzOjE6IkwIO3M6MToiNyI7fQ%3D%3D</p>
<p>Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web</p>	<p>https://www.fao.org/land-water/news-archive/news-detail/en/c/1477181/</p>
<p>Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details</p>	<p>Maher.salman@fao.org</p>

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

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

Indigenous people are not directly targeted by project activities. It can be expected that indigenous communities who live in drought-prone countries will benefit from the implementation of National Drought Plans formulated with the support of the current project.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives)
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits)
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project’s components and activities is in compliance with the project’s approved implementation plan.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Risk rating. It should assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:	
High Risk (H)	There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks
Moderate Risk (M)	There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.
Low Risk (L)	There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.