



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2021 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Asia Pacific
Country (ies):	Myanmar
Project Title:	Sustainable crop land and forest management in priority Agro-ecosystem in Myanmar
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP /MYA/017/GFF
GEF ID:	5123
GEF Focal Area(s):	CC, LD, SFM
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Irrigation (MOALI) and Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation (MONREC)
Project Duration:	60 months + 1 yr NCE + (May 2016 – May 2022)
Project coordinates: (Ctrl+Click here)	<i>Kyaukpadaung (CDZ) - N 20° 50' 29" E 95° 7' 36"</i> <i>Nyaung-U (CDZ) - N 21° 12' 2" E 94° 54' 29"</i> <i>Mindat (Chin) - N 21° 22' 0" E 93° 59' 0"</i> <i>Kanpetlet (Chin) - N 21° 12' 12" E 94° 1' 50"</i> <i>Labutta (Delta) - N 16° 8' 58" E 94° 45' 32"</i> <i>PMO-Nay Pyi Taw - N 19°49'25.5" E 96°07'58.7"</i>

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	6 April 2015
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	1 July 2016
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	30 June 2021 original
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	31 May 2022
Actual Implementation End Date³:	

¹ As per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

³ Actual date at which project implementation ends - only for projects that have ended.

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	6,183,031
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	13,611,707
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2021 (USD m):	4,998,124
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2021⁵	4,500,000

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee Meeting:	2 Oct 2020 (8 th PSC meeting)
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	February - March 2019
Actual Mid-term review date:	March – April 2019
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022)⁷:	No
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date:	1 February 2022
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022):	Yes
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁸	No

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	S
--	---

⁴ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

⁵ Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

⁶ The MTR should take place about halfpoint between EOD and NTE – this is the expected date

⁷ Please note that the FAO GEF Coordination Unit should be contacted six months prior to the expected MTR date

⁸ Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

Overall implementation progress rating:	MS
Overall risk rating:	High

Status

Implementation Status <i>(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):</i>	Final
--	-------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Mr. Xavier Bouan	Xavier.Bouan@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Mr. Ferrand Pierre (FAORAP), Agricultural Officer RADPP	Pierre.Ferrand@fao.org
Budget Holder	Mr Somsak Pipoppinyo FAOR Myanmar(ai)	Pipoppinyo, Somsak (FAORAP) <Somsak.Pipoppinyo@fao.org>
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Sameer Karki, Technical Officer, TCIDD	Sameer.Karki@fao.org

Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ¹¹
Objective Direct and indirect lifetime greenhouse gas emissions avoided and carbon captured from forest and non-forest interventions from this project as reported in GEF SFM REDD+ Tracking Tool	Land cover delivering global environmental benefits in the project target area as reported in the GEF LD tracking tool	0 hectares of vegetative cover	NR	80,000 hectares of vegetative cover delivering GEB	This is being addressed by promoting CSA and SFM techniques and updating land use plans to fully integrate CSA, SLM, and SFM on 3,000 ha of CF, & ESFM 50,000 ha and CSA 10,285 ha	S
	Spatial coverage of integrated natural resource management practices in wider landscapes as reported by GEF LD tracking tool	0 hectares agricultural land 0 ha forests	NR	20,000 ha of agricultural lands 60,000 ha forests	Developing LULC maps and associated mapping products for the four pilot townships (Two sites in Central Dry zone, one site in Delta Region and one site in Chin) were completed to support evidence based land use planning. Land degradation	S

⁹ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

¹⁰ 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.

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

					hotspots/erosion area were identified in CDZ and Labutta to support evidence-based land use planning. (Estimated area is 14,200 ha in Nyaung-U and 4,300 ha Kyaukpadaung) (Proposed additional 400 ha PFE in Dry Zone).	
	Direct and indirect lifetime greenhouse gas emissions avoided and carbon captured from forest and non-forest interventions from this project as reported in GEF SFM	0	NR	<p>Direct (tons of CO₂-eq): Non-forest: 0.66 million Forest: 1.91 million</p> <p>Indirect lifetime (tons of CO₂-eq): Non-forest: 2.46 million Forest: 12.29 million</p>	CSA and SFM techniques are being promoted through FFS and CBFM/CF approaches to address this and required training was conducted. Area expansion under CSA and SFM practices is in progress. (updated figure will be imported into Ex-ACT tool in 2022.)	S
Outcome 1: Strengthened institutional, policy and regulatory frameworks	An enhanced enabling environment with in the forest sector for SFM strengthened as reported in GEF SFM REDD+ tracking Tool	Forest Sector Policy/ Regulation SFM Framework Score: 3	NR	Forest Sector Policy/ Regulation SFM Framework Score: 5	Revised Forest Law has been enacted and revised Forest Rules has been prepared with the stakeholders consultation and still in process of finalization. The project personnel have been participating in the monthly consultation meeting led by CSOs' representatives. All has been stopped after Coup and are now pending	MS
	Agriculture policy enhancement score as reported in GEF LD tracking tool	Agriculture policy enhancement score of 2	NR	Agriculture policy enhancement score of 3	An Agriculture Development Strategy (ADS) has been released by government with the aim of being integrated and strategic document to implement the agriculture.	S

					The project has been making efforts to implement the ADS. (Score 3)	
	Updated strategies for SFM and CSA finalized and adopted	Updated SFM Strategy: 0 Updated CSA Strategy: 0	NR	Updated SFM Strategy: 1 Updated CSA Strategy: 1	Development of SFM strategy is completed. (ESFM handbooks (PM and IM and CF strategic action plan were developed.) Myanmar CSA Strategy has been developed and released by the Government (MoALI). The project has also developed a CSA Implementation Strategy for the project.	S
	Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management (LD3)	Framework strengthening INRM Score: 1 Integrated land management plans: 0	NR	Framework strengthening INRM Score: 5 Integrated land management plans: 3 (one at each pilot site)	As per MTR, all plan INRM should be understood as an overall land use plan which has been developed for 3 out of 5 townships. The LUP development has been put on hold since Coup on Feb 1 st	MS
	Township-wide land use plans updated and adopted to fully integrate CSA, SLM, and SFM	5 (one for each pilot site) present but needs to be updated	NR	Number of updated township-wide land use plans: 5 (one for each pilot site)	-Land use planning Methodology and Guidebook documents developed for the five pilot project areas. -Supporting maps for developing LUP have been developed for five townships.	S
Outcome 2: Models for Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) practices demonstrated and enhancing carbon	Conservation and enhancement of carbon in non-forest lands (agriculture) as reported in GEF CC Mitigation Tracking	Conservation and enhancement of carbon in non-forest	NR	Conservation and enhancement of carbon in non-forest lands (agriculture): 20,000 ha	23985.3 hectares of land planted using CSA techniques. (Delta: 11,074.9 ha, CDZ:10,953.5 ha: upland /hill 1956.9 ha) please note that the data collection of Chin	S

storage in three priority agro-ecosystems	Tool (Objective 5: LULUCF)	lands (agriculture): 0 ha			state was not done fully for last season because of the current situation. Moreover, this figure should increase drastically in the coming monsoon from the pilot townships as well as from the new 40 FFSs established in 20 new townships.	
	Good CC mitigation management practices developed and adopted for agriculture as reported in GEF CC Mitigation Tracking Tool (Objective 5: LULUCF)	#2: developing prescriptions for sustainable management	NR	Over 80% of area in project certified	CSA/ Good CC mitigation practices developed/ promoted through FFS and academic/ training programs at various levels. CSA/FFS curricula and handbooks have been developed and are being used widely. (Note: No certification system yet in place)	S
	Number of farm households adopting CSA practices that support SLM and climate change mitigation	Number of CSA farm households: To be determined at Project Inception	NR	Number of CSA farm 3,500 farm households	Total 25,923 (i.e. 2,744 households covered through FFS and additional 23,179 households) adopted CSA practices in five pilot townships.	HS
	Number of annual national CSA/SLM knowledge exchange seminars established and supported by GouM	0 national CSA/SLM knowledge exchange seminars	NR	1 annual (4 completed during project) national CSA/SLM knowledge exchange seminar established	Four workshops were completed. First workshop, held on 24 September 2018 and second workshop held on 29 Aug 2019. Third workshop held on 22 January 2021 virtually. Fourth workshop organized in June 2021 focusing on sustainability among key stakeholders but without FAO due to the UNCT	S

					guidelines on engagement with de facto authorities .	
	Number of FFS and number of participating members	FFS established: 0 FFS participating members: Male: 0 Female: 0	NR	FFS established: 50 FFS participating household - 3500	96 FFS established. (Target exceeded based on needs and to capture the diversifications within the three agro-ecological zones.) FFS participating household- 2,744 i.e. Male: 1,914 (70%) and Female: 830 (30%). Other farmers impacted by FFS and adopted CSA techniques: 23,179 households i.e. 40% women and 60% men.	HS
Outcome 3. Models for sustainable forest management practices demonstrated and enhancing carbon storage in three priority ecosystems	Carbon stored in forest ecosystems and emissions avoided from deforestation and forest degradation from this project as reported in GEF SFM REDD+ Tracking Tool	Carbon stored in forest ecosystems and emissions avoided from deforestation and forest degradation from this project as reported in GEF SFM REDD+ Tracking Tool	NR	Conservation & enhancement of carbon in forests - Area: 60,000 ha Tonnes of CO ₂ eq: 12.29 million	Promoting SFM and SLM techniques have been initiated through establishment of 3,000 ha of Community Forest, agro-forestry, 50,000 ha ESFM and land use planning and capacity building. (estimated 11.70 million tonnes of CO ₂). This ESFM and LUP has been put on hold since Coup on Feb 1 st	MS

	Good forest management practices applied in existing forests as reported in GEF SFM REDD+ Tracking Tool	Good forest management practices applied in existing forests as reported in GEF SFM REDD+ Tracking Tool	NR	Area covered by forest management plans (50,000 ha) and community-based forest conservation (10,000 ha):	Revision of three District Forest Management Plans and establishment of 21 Community Forests (CF Model Forests) with 1,140 ha coverage in three agroecosystems to promote SFM techniques completed. Implementation of those plans remain uncertain after Coup since many FD staff are on Civil Disobedience movement and not present at work.	MS
	Enhanced institutional capacity to account for GHG emission reduction and increase in carbon stocks as reported in GEF SFM REDD+ Tracking Tool	Enhanced institutional capacity to account for GHG emission reduction and increase in carbon stocks as reported in GEF SFM REDD+ Tracking Tool	NR	National carbon stock monitoring systems in place (area covered): # 6: monitoring information database publicly available	Appraisal of GHG gas emissions from forests covered by ESFM DFMPs is in progress in collaboration with UNREDD+ and NFI project. This will provide the baseline data for monitoring changes in carbon stock through enhanced institutional strengthening, capacity building of forest staff and communities, and prescribed management operations under ESFM. Since NFI project has been stopped after Coup it is uncertain how the appraisal will be done	MS
	Number of SFM Model management plans adopted and operational	Number of SFM Model management plans adopted and operational	NR	SFM model management plans adopted and operational: 3 (one for each pilot site)	Endorsement of EDFMPs by MONREC minister and ready for implementation in three districts. Those plans are on hold since the coup	MS

	Number of Community-based forestry support units established at MONREC	Number of Community-based forestry support units established at MONREC	NR	Community-based forestry support units established at MONREC: 1	Application of CF strategic action plan, awareness raising and capacity building of CF-unit staff, CFDWG/CFRWG and networks of CFUGs, consolidation of CF data-base/info management system, and revision of SOP for CF are in progress and guidelines for agroforestry and PLUP are completed. Review and upgrade of the curriculum of Myanmar Forest School completed. Ecosystem-based SFM curriculum has been completed under LoA with UFES and ready to be implemented as soon as situation allows.	S
	Number of ecosystem based community forestry initiatives operational and actively monitoring/delivering	Number of ecosystem based community forestry initiatives operational and actively monitoring/delivering	NR	Ecosystem based community forestry initiatives operational: 9 (minimum of 3 per pilot site)	Operationalization of 21 CF initiatives in all pilot area with direct support from SLM is in progress to make them Eco system-based CF. this is done by service providers (MERN and CNFWG) but on hold since Coup	MS
Outcome 4. SLM, SFM, and CSA knowledge management, training, and practices scaling up nationally	CSA knowledge centre established, fully functional and supporting national replication of project generated outputs	CSA knowledge centre: 0	NR	CSA knowledge center: 1	A National CSA Center was established at YAU in 2018 and continuing functioning and longer term sustainability plan is under development	HS

	Number of annual participants in national in-service CSA/SLM extension officer training program	0 participants	NR	100 participants	101 Government Extension Officers/Staff from MoALI and Lecturers/ Assistant Lecturers/ teachers from YAU and State Agricultural Institute trained on CSA techniques.	HS
	CSA/SLM supportive FFS established by GoM outside of project areas	FFS established outside of project areas: 0	NR	FFS established outside of project areas: 50	Implementation of 40 new FFS in 20 new Townships, outside the project pilot townships has already started with support of AVSI Foundation (for Delta/coastal Zone in Ayeyarwaddy Region) and Cesvi Myanmar (for Dry Zone: Mandalay and Magway Regions) as service providers.	S
	Number of annual participants in project established national ecosystem-based forestry management training	Central Forestry Development and Training Centre: 0 Forestry School: 0	NR	Central Forestry Development and Training Center: 100 Forestry School: 50	Consultations have been made with the Central Forestry Development and Training Centre and 27 senior forest officers have been trained by ECCDI on ESFM concepts. Revision of curriculum for Myanmar Forest School is completed and pilot delivery of upgraded curricula with a total of 83 (2 nd year) and 73 (1 st year) students at MFS had been completed. Discussion with FD for institutionalization of ecosystem-based curriculum is initiated but waiting for political situation to improve.	S

	Number of ecosystem based community forestry initiatives established by GoM outside of project area	Ecosystem based community forestry initiatives outside of project area: 0	NR	Ecosystem based community forestry initiatives outside of project area: 10	Establishment of Ecosystem based CF in two additional townships, i.e., Bogalay and Pya-Pon in Delta Region is in progress. This activity is in progress under LoA with MERN, but delayed due to the COVID-19 and the current political situation.	S
--	---	---	----	--	---	---

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1: Strengthened institutional, policy and regulatory frameworks	Disseminate last report on legal framework which was finalised after Coup and activate last legal framework recommendations as much as possible under new the context Revise land Law Resume LUP	FAO /SLM GVT FAO	When political situation is settled
Outcome 3. Models for sustainable forest management practices demonstrated and enhancing carbon storage in three priority ecosystems	-Resume all activities as per work plan included in the 11 months .The No Cost Extension will allow to provide NCE to ongoing LoAs -Recruit HQ already identified consultant to redraft EDFMP and roll out in pilot areas -Rely on CSOs to develop and strengthen CF /CFE and find synergies with other partners to ensure their sustainability	FAO-SLM	-When the political situation improve and when/if the UNCT guidelines for engagement allows it. -August 2021.

3. Progress in Generating Project Outputs (Implementation Progress, IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as planned in the Annual Work Plan)

Outputs ¹²	Expected completion date ¹³	Achievements at each PIR ¹⁴					Implement status (cumulative)	Comments Describe any variance ¹⁵ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR (Final)			
Output 1.1. Package of CSA and SFM regulatory and policy modifications for cropland and forest management	Q4Y3	10%	30%	30 %	20%		90%	Completed but could not be endorsed in a final workshop due to Coup.
Output 1.2 Support implementation of the legal and institutional frameworks for sustainable forest management	Q2Y5	10%	20%	30%	20%		80%	Revision of new Forest rules was completed but could not be endorsed due to Coup. No change on forest law.
Output 1.3 Support implementation of the legal and institutional frameworks for climate smart agriculture	Q2Y5	10%	20%	30%	30%		90%	
Output 1.4: Training and capacity building on legal and regulatory aspects of SLM, SFM and CSA	Q2Y5	30%	10%	30%	10%		80%	Review of curriculum including CSA and SFM has been cancelled as university and forestry schools were closed due to COVID then to Coup.
Output 1.5: Pilot district and township level Land Use Advisory Committees pilot regulations for land-use planning integrating SFM, CSA	Q2Y5	20%	20%	30%	10%		80%	Local stake holder committee could be formed in all pilot areas but virtual GIS land use planning training could be done only in Delta and not in other areas due to Coup.
Output 1.6: Pilot digital land-use mapping process in priority districts	Q2Y5	10%	20%	30%	20%		80%	LUP Workshops could not be conducted but all deskwork prepared waiting for situation to improve.

Output 2.1 CSA support program established within key institutions and demonstrated at priority agro-ecosystems	Q4Y4	50%	30%	10%	10%		100%	
Output 2.2 Township level agricultural extension service plans for climate smart agriculture/ improved cropland	Q2Y5	20%	20%	30%	30%		100%	
Output2.3 National farmer field school curriculum developed	Q2Y2	100%	Completed	completed			100%	
Output 2.4 Model farmer field schools established in three priority agro-ecosystems	Q2Y5	60%	30%	10%			100%	
Output 2.5 Early adopter farmers piloting CSA practices and delivering lessons within three priority agro-systems	Q4Y5	0%	30%	50%	20%		100%	
Output3.1 National ecosystem-based SFM capacity building program established	Q2Y5	0%	30%	50%	5%		85%	The establishment process slowed down due to COVID-19 and the ongoing political crisis.
Output3.2 Three District Forest Management Plans Revised and ecosystem-based SFM objectives incorporated	Q2Y6	15%	35%	35%	5%		90%	Revision of three DFMPs and incorporation of ESFM objectives delayed due to COVID-19 and the ongoing political crisis.
Output3.3 Community based forestry implementation strategy and handbook completed	Q2Y5	10%	60%	30%	0		100%	The CF implementation strategy is being adopted by FD since early 2021 despite COVID-19 restrictions and the ongoing political crisis.
Output 3.4: Community-based forestry capacity building and technical support program operationalized	Q2Y6	15%	35%	35%	5%		90%	Operationalization of CF capacity building& technical support program slowed down

¹² Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

¹³ As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹⁴ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁵ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

								since early 2020 due to COVID-19 and the ongoing political crisis after Feb 2021.
Output 3.5: Twenty community-based forestry demonstrations established and delivering SLM/SFM/CC benefits in three priority ecosystems	Q2Y6	15%	35%	35%	5%		90%	Establishment of 21 CFs (against the original target of 20) completed but delivering SLM/SFM/CC benefits slowed down due to COVID-19 and the ongoing political crisis.
Output 4.1 Support program established for scaling up SFM practices	Q2Y6	20%	20%	20%	5%		65%	FAO SLM follow UNCT rules of non-engagement with de Facto authorities. No possibilities to engage with Forest Department at union level or district level Furthermore Only one FD office in 1 township remain operational out of 5
Output 4.2 Support program established for scaling-up CSA practices	Q2Y6	20%	20%	20%	30%		90%	FAO SLM follow UNCT rules of non-engagement with de Facto authorities and DOA and only direct communication with famers is permitted

4. Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on Project Implementation

Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):

The achievements for most of the outcomes/objectives have been rated as "satisfactory." However some are also now rated as "moderately satisfactory" due to the impact and restrictions created not only by the COVID 19 in the period of June -December 2020 but also due to new the political situation and crisis which emerged after February 1 st 2021 Coup which correspond to the second half of this PIR . In October 2020, the PSC has agreed on a NCE of 11 months to cope with the delays due to COVID-19. This NCE is now becoming even more importantly necessary to resume all pending activities when the political situation stabilize. The following activities which were accomplished during this period are detailed below.

Component 1 (Institutional, Policy and Regulatory Frameworks and Land Use Planning):

- Land use planning methodology (draft) and land use planning guideline for Central Dry Zone Chin & Delta has been completed. Developed the support maps to conduct the township level land use planning workshops still to be conducted. Digital mapping of the VFV land in CDZ has been conducting with OneMap Myanmar project and respective Department of Agricultural Land Management and Statistics. Four virtual trainings on the collection and management of the CF database and one GIS mapping and data collection for LUP were conducted during this period. Discussion to expand the village tract level participatory land use planning in central dry zone with OneMap Myanmar project has been initiated to create a chance to the local community to involve in planning process of sustainable land management. Kwinmaps for two townships were digitized using special scanner allowing a better LUP process in future
- Legal framework report on CSA/SFM/SLM was completed and has been cleared for publication. This will become an important tool when National Land Use Council (NLUC) resume its activities

Component 2 (Climate Smart Agriculture):

- The operationalization of national CSA center at YAU continued. The demonstration on CSA techniques at the National Climate Smart Agriculture Center were carried on. TSG met virtually on regular basis. FFS activities continued and TOT and farmer to farmer trainings were conducted in five townships of the project area. The home gardening program implemented in project villages in collaboration with the Department of Agriculture and respective service providers contributed to the CERP put in place to improve resilience of famer impacted with the COVID19 pandemic. A 3rd National Workshop on "Innovative Pathways to Climate Resilient Livelihoods" was virtually organized on 22 Jan 2021. Last workshop on sustainability of CSA Center has been completed for 17 June with main stakeholders but without FAO due to UNCT rules on non-engagement, however outcomes will be discussed separately.

Component 3 (Sustainable Forest Management):

- Operationalization of 21 CFs and expansion in number of CF in both pilot and outside of pilot townships are in progress. Recruitment of an International Consultant and a National Consultant for the revision of ecosystem-based sustainable forest management plans and development of ecosystem-based SFM implementation plan and training strategy has been approved but delayed . LoA with University of Forestry

and Environmental Science (UFES) on the development of ecosystem-based SFM and CBFM curriculum for Myanmar Forest School (MFS) was successfully closed. The ongoing LoAs on establishment and expansion of CF in pilot townships and operationalization of CF capacity building and technical support program at Forest Department had been extended till end of 2021 to compensate the time lost due to COVID-19 restrictions and the ongoing political crisis. SLM contributed to meetings and work on continuation of mangrove project led by the regional office (FAORAP).

- A new LoA with ECCDI for establishment of community forest-based enterprise (CFE) in pilot townships has been finalized, which is planned to commence as soon as COVID-19 travel restrictions and the ongoing political crisis are eased. Needs assessment and satisfaction survey of community forest user groups (CFUGs) in Delta region conducted in June 2021. SLM had contributed to the meeting with a private firm and ECCDI for implementation of a voluntary carbon credits project for mangroves areas. Initial funds will be allocated to expanding and strengthening the network of mangrove-centric CFs towards CFE. SLM will contribute to the project proposal with required baseline data on mangrove-centric CFs in Delta.

Component 4 (Knowledge Management):

- Three surveys on COVID19 impact assessment on Agricultural livelihood were completed as well as an assessment survey on home- gardening practices . Several communications tools such as the animation on concept of Agro-Forestry, the UN75 commemorating video, COVID-19 Human interest story (reached 5.7 mil Facebook users), World Soil Day videos (released on national TV channel and social media), and new SLM Project flyer were developed and disseminated widely.
- Two new LoAs were developed and signed with AVSI Foundation (for Delta/coastal Zone in Ayeyarwaddy Region) and Cesvi Myanmar (for Dry Zone: Mandalay and Magway Regions) as service providers, to implementation of a total of 40 new FFS in 20 new Townships, outside the project pilot townships. Additional FFS implementation is already started.

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?

Comment on problems encountered during implementation (i.e. non-execution, delays or implementation of unforeseen activities) and actions taken to resolve them.

- Project activities are very seriously impacted during this reporting period by COVID-19 since early 2020 and the ongoing political crisis which has emerged after the Coup d'état on 1 February 2021. This has led to a revision of the entire project workplan to be in line with UNCT guidelines for engagement or non-engagement with de facto authorities. The UNCT Guidelines have been confidentially share with GEF SEC
 - Staff movement has been limited. No field visit was allowed by UNDSS and staff of implementing partners and CSO had also to limit their own movements. Field officers remained at their duty station during entire period and could fill some gaps to some extent. Field officer in Chin was finally evacuated due to armed conflict and reassigned to work in CDZ in May.
 - Almost all trainings, workshops and events have been postponed with some meeting conducted virtually.
 - Operationalization of Community Forest development and activities was delayed first due to COVID-19 then to Coup.
 - A short-term consultancy of an international consultant to redraft DFMP for Myanmar could not happen in the reporting period. Consultant current work on analyzing forest management plan at global level was delayed by FAO HQ. Since the findings of this global review will be of prime importance for Myanmar it was decided to postpone by 5 months this consultancy which will now happen in the next reporting period.
 - Upscaling of area under CF to reach project target depends very much on how much can be accessible from VFV land and the continuation or not of the ongoing political crisis and COVID-19. CF has to be developed with minimum implication of FD which is a constraint as project has to follow UNCT guidelines for rules of engagement. However all preparatory work to form CF can still be done by CSO and endorsement will be done when political situation is eased
- Banking system has become an issue in Myanmar after Coup and is impacting on delivery of activities as withdrawal, or payment is becoming extremely difficult.
- The project has currently no NPC in MONREC and Moali. One resigned following the Coup and the other went on retirement. No replacement has been made so far by GVT

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.

	FY2021 Development Objective rating¹⁶	FY2021 Implementation Progress rating¹⁷	Comments/reasons¹⁸ justifying the ratings for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	MS	<i>The project activities have been affected and delivery impacted firstly due to the COVID 19 then by the political crisis after 1st February 2021. Component 2 on CSA is closing in a satisfactory manner but the NCE will be needed to catch up on several objectives under the C3 on forestry.</i>
Budget Holder	S	MS	The project activities delayed due to COVID-19 restriction since last year and again political crisis on 1 February 2021. However, overall component activities of project has made progress in satisfactory in line with MTR comments and recommendations, except some activities due to above challenges. Despite political situation is uncertain, remaining activities are to be delivered before NTE with appropriate coping strategy or political situation settled down, and project final evaluation is to be undertaken before NTE.
GEF Operational Focal Point			<i>Optional Ratings/comments</i>

¹⁶ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet.

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

¹⁷ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁸ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	S	MS	<i>Overall, the project has made some very good progress in the implementation of activities despite a very challenging time with the COVID19 pandemic and all related restrictions on travel and meeting organizations. Unfortunately, the degradation of the political situation and the coup on 1st of February has further impacted the project delivery and is likely to prevent the full implementation of all planned activities for the NCE period. In some cases, such as for component 1, legal frameworks have been prepared and are ready to be used once the political situation settles.</i>
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	MS	<i>The project has been affected by both the COVID19 related health and economic crisis, as well as from the ongoing political crisis in the country. Despite these, it is good to see some progress made during the reporting period. The project now needs to start preparing for its final evaluation – and given the challenging circumstances the project team and the wider FAO project task force that supports the project will need to think outside the box on institutionalization of its successes and ensure recording of its key lessons learnt so that the country as a whole can benefit from its learning.</i>

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

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

This section of the PIR describes the progress made towards complying with the approved ESM plan, when appropriate. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Please add recommendations to improve the implementation of the ESM plan, when needed.

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 Risk classification is still valid; if not, what is the new classification and explain.

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²⁰ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
low	yes

<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>

6. Risks

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
<i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. Please make sure that the table also includes the Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant.</i>

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

	Risk	Risk rating ²¹	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ²²	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	COVID -19 impact on project function and activities during reporting period.	Medium	Follow rules on managing COVID19 crisis Request made for NCE	Current loa obtained a NCE and new LOA developed	
2	Political crisis in reporting period	High	Revised workplan to follow UNCT guidelines on engagement.	Project workplan approved by FAO and UNCT New LoAs to work directly with CSO	

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

FY2020 rating	FY2021 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Medium	High	The crisis which has been created after the coup on February 1st is not yet ended / solved and the political situation remains very unstable and in a turmoil, impacting all activities and the sustainability of all achievements. However the project has already achieved several objectives and with another 11 months till NTE many activities will be completed on time when/if political situation ease.

²¹ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High

²² If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

7. Adjustments to Project Strategy – Only for projects that had the Mid-term review (or supervision mission)

If the project had a MTR review or a supervision mission, please report on how the MTR recommendations were implemented as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR Recommendation	Measures implemented
<p>Recommendation 1: Also directed at the FAO-GCU; to be acted on within the next three months, (if not brought to a conclusion within this period.) The Results Matrix must be changed, especially the land and emissions targets must be reduced to reasonable levels. At mid-term, the MTR team deems that “reasonably ambitious” targets would be about 10% of those shown at Objective and Outcomes level, but understands that they are a point of negotiation since they represent FAO’s commitment to GEF.</p>	<p>As per the recommendations of the Mid Term Review, the projected outcomes of the SLM project were revised to be achievable in the time frame and circumstances that the SLM project is operating</p>
<p>Sub Recommendation 1.1: The different forest land targets should be consolidated to one forest land target of around 6,000 ha/14,800 acres (with related emissions targets), including land under CBFM and forest land where there are proven changes brought about due to DFMP implementation.</p> <p>For clarity's sake, and if deemed useful, this target may be broken into area under CBFM and area under DFMP</p>	<p>(Unchanged) 50,000 hectares of forestlands under improved multi-functional management (there is 195,000ha reserve forest in the three districts covered by the program) providing; (Unchanged) 10,000 hectares of forest land with Forest user groups implementing SFM providing. (There is limited availability of land area coverage in project pilot townships unless substantial progress is made to access VFV land for additional Community Forestry. Approximately 6500ha of total target can be achieved with CFUG implementing SFM.)</p>

MTR Recommendation	Measures implemented
<p>Sub Recommendation 1.2 The different agricultural land targets should also be consolidated to one agricultural land target of 6,400 ha/15,800 acres (with related emissions targets) focusing on cropping land proved to have climate change mitigation practices in place, including agroforestry.</p> <p>Sub Recommendation 1.3 The SLM project, together with the FAO-GCU, should assess the consequential emissions reductions more carefully; while these probably also require reductions compared to the Results Matrix, given the delays in implementing the SFM/CBFM activities, it may be assessed that emissions reductions will be more substantial after the GEF funding comes to an end</p>	<p>Total 20,000 ha as against total original target of 64,000 ha</p> <p>The program documentation sets a target 40,000 hectares of rice in the delta area under improved management, an achievable target is 8,000 hectares</p> <p>The program documentation sets a target of 20,000 hectares of annuals under improved management in the Central Dry Zone, an achievable target is 8,000 hectares</p> <p>The program documentation sets a target of 4,000 hectares of upland and dry-zone degraded annual crop land (as per original plan)</p> <p>For CSA reduced from 240,000t to 164,400t</p> <p>For Forest (To consult with FD for revision of carbon emissions targets.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Direct (tons of CO2-eq): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-forest: 0.66 million (Reduced from 0.96 million) • Forest: 1.19 million (No Change) • Indirect lifetime (tons of CO2-eq): • Non-forest: 2.46 million (Reduced from 3.6 million) • Forest: 12.29 million (No Change) <p>Above figure for forest are based on average density 80 m³/ha, average net degradation of 5m³/ha /yr but will be evaluated after UN-REDD inventory (UN-REDD second field testing).</p> <p>EX-ACT Team from HQ will be directly involved in final evaluation of the project in February 2022.</p>

MTR Recommendation	Measures implemented
<p>Sub Recommendation 1.4 The different forestry-related plans—INRM, SFM, DFMP—must also be clarified and partly consolidated. The INRM plan should be understood as an overall land use plan at township level arising from the LULUCF mapping. There shouldn't be both an SFM plan and DFMP, but rather only the DFMP.</p>	<p>Ecosystem based District forest management plan is completed in Chin, CDZ and Delta regions and will be integrated into township LUP.</p>
<p>Recommendation 2: At output level, the project requires clarified, SMART indicators. Clarifying output indicators will also assist the PMU and counterparts to chart progress towards the (modified) outcome targets. If SMART indicators are not always possible, then at least the outputs should have clearer monitoring milestones than just percentage accomplishments</p>	<p>Revised Log frame with SMART indicators has been developed (see the revised log frame in the documents provided, MEAL plan p-30- 53)</p>

MTR Recommendation	Measures implemented
<p>Recommendation 3: (This set of recommendations relates to the overall approach of the project over the next two years). The MTR team would theoretically be in favor of a major reordering of components to emphasize integrated land management. Practically, this would require too much change for the relatively short time left of the project. Instead, the main recommendation here is to develop a strategy to integrate CSA and CBFM under the SLM umbrella.</p>	<p>With progress made under land use planning, CSA and CBFM are already being integrated under SLM umbrella.</p>
<p>Sub Recommendation 3.1 Use LULUCF township maps to discuss with key stakeholders where land and forest degradation “hotspots” are located;</p>	<p>Through LUP exercise, the project identified hotspots in degradation area in three townships.</p>
<p>Sub Recommendation 3.2 Ground-truthing of the “hotspots” should be done with township stakeholders (FD and DOA, possibly DZGD) and maximum involvement of local communities. PLUP in selected communities with supporting activities on climate change mitigation, especially including agroforestry;</p>	<p>Ground-truthing of the hotspots in 3 townships (Nyaung-U, Kyaukpadaung and Labutta) are completed.</p>
<p>Sub Recommendation 3.3 Ensure that there are a number of villages with overlap between CSA and CBFM, especially in the CDZ and Chin State where agroforestry approaches may be trialled</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agroforestry has been the major focus in two agro-ecological zones. • 5 villages (3 in CDZ and 2 in Chin state) have been overlapped for CSA and CBFM intervention so far and effort will be continued for further overlapping.
<p>Sub Recommendation 3.4 Promote multi-species and if possible, multi-storey, agroforestry approach in the “overlapped” villages (as started under CSA in Chin). This will be especially important where CF villages have annual cropping land in RF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion of multi-species, and multi-storey agroforestry has been initiated in 5 overlapping villages following the guideline by FD.

MTR Recommendation	Measures implemented
<p>Recommendation 4:</p> <p>A no cost extension of the SLM Project is strongly recommended. This will be better than “rushing” to spend the substantial SFM/CFM budget by mid-2021</p>	<p>11 months NCE approved in 8th PSC Meeting with new NTE 31 May 2022</p>
<p>Sub Recommendation 4.1</p> <p>The period of the no cost extension should be one year and emphasize implementation of the DFMPs, CBFM and agroforestry measures (the latter two in relation to Township land use plans); the extra time would also allow the courses at the forestry training institutions to be properly developed, tested and adjusted as needed</p>	<p>See above. NCE provided to Service providers to complete activities.</p>
<p>Sub Recommendation 4.2</p> <p>In order to strengthen integrated landscape restoration in the townships, and in recognition of the Forestry Master Plan CF targets, the project should as part of an integrated landscape restoration plan consider inclusion of all active CF-certified CFUGs in the project townships. Involving all active CFUGs would both broaden the scale of CBFM and catalyze possible learning between active CFUGs and between CFUGs and township FDs.</p>	<p>Strengthening an updating of CF database/info management system has been discussed with OneMap and ongoing</p>
<p>Recommendation 5:</p> <p>PMU urgently requires a centralized monitoring system to capture experiences, lessons learned and to develop a sound basis for models that may be scaled up within the agro-ecosystem zones;</p> <p>The PMU should have an intermittent M&E specialist to assist in setting up the system and provide backstopping</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An International M&E specialist has been engaged and a Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Plan (MEAL plan) has been developed with clear outcome and output target and indicators. • A national M&E specialist is implementing in the Log frame and MEAL plan.

MTR Recommendation	Measures implemented
<p>Sub Recommendation 5.1 The Knowledge Management Specialist should be involved with this activity; Aside from general monitoring of project progress, monitoring should emphasize particular areas of work, making use of periodic surveys as appropriate.</p>	<p>Monitoring tools have been developed and data collection and reporting is in progress.</p>
<p>Sub Recommendation 5.2 In-depth monitoring of the FFS farmer adoption results will be required from the coming cropping season onwards. Effective upscaling will require more data as to which practices are adopted and to what extent. Such valuable monitoring results will be the basis for replication and upscaling activities under knowledge management.</p>	<p>Monitoring tools have been developed and data collection and reporting is in progress. With details on beneficiaries , CSA practices, and area coverage</p>
<p>Recommendation 6: PMU shall institute the use of FPIC in all land and forest-related activities in the Chin State. This shall include in particular the CF and PLUP activities. The results of FPIC should be in written form.</p>	<p>In the ongoing PLUP exercise, FPIC has been applied</p>
<p>Recommendation 7: The FFS results need to be up scaled and replicated by various means, but which to do the replication should not promote the FFS itself as the primary vehicle. Instead, other methods that fit better with the government's extension system must be sought and written up in a brief strategy paper.</p>	<p>Township agriculture extension plan has been developed for 5 pilot townships where various approaches/methods such as demonstrations, trainings, awareness creations through publications, seed multiplication etc. have been proposed to upscale the FFS findings by the District/Township DOA offices. A total of 40 FFS in 20 township outside of the project area is under implementation .</p>

Adjustments to the project strategy.

Please note that changes to outputs, baselines, indicators or targets cannot be made without official approval from PSC and PTF members, including the FLO. These changes will follow the recommendations of the MTR or the supervision mission.

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outputs	No	
Project Indicators/Targets	No	

According to UNCT engagement principle, the project cannot engage and work with government at National and sub-national level as it is still sensitive issue for all UN agencies. Project has adjusted its work plan to be in line with UNCT guidelines. However a number of activities are ongoing with Service providers and through LoAs and are continuing under the revised workplan.

Those activities are implemented directly with farmers and communities (either FFS, CFUG, of land management committees for PLUP etc). Desk work (such as preparation of training manual, online platform, review ecosystem district forest management plan and development of possible training when situation allows etc) are being implemented. The project has reduced its team structure with no more staff for component 2 as it is completed and only 1 staff for component 1 remain as legal framework work is also completed/paused and only LUP activities are ongoing. SLM Project is also going to work on its exit strategy and possible synergies with other donors, programme, projects as it is now entering last year of implementation

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, mid-term review, final evaluation or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	<p>Original NTE: 30 June 2021 Revised NTE: 31 May 2022</p> <p>The Revised NTE and NCE has been one of the MTR's recommendations. It was approved by 8th PSC also fully justified by the new delays caused by COVID-19 crisis. The project will need to adjust with any further delays caused by recent COUP</p>

8. Stakeholders Engagement

The project has been consulting and engaging a number of stakeholders at various steps such as need identification, validation workshops, various formal and informal information sharing workshops/meetings, project steering committee meetings, task force meetings, technical support group meetings, trainings and implementation of the project interventions and Mid Term Review. Followings are the key stakeholders engaged in the project interventions at various levels at different stages with their key contributions.

- **Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Irrigation (MoALI), Ministry of Natural Resources, and Environment Conservation (MONREC):** MoALI and MONREC are the two lead government institutions involved in the implementation of the project. MoALI and MONREC have nominated a National Project Coordinator each to coordinate the project activities.
- **Department of Agriculture (DOA) and Forest Department (FD):** The project is being executed in collaboration with the DoA from MoALI and FD from MONREC and they have coordinating role and are Co-Chairs of the Project Steering Committee. Their extension staff in each of the pilot sites are directly involved in training, project activities implementation (FFS and CF), technology transfer and monitoring activities.
- **Department of Agricultural Research (DAR):** DAR is involved in the supply of quality seeds and technical advice.
- **Yezin Agricultural University (YAU):** The project supports YAU for the establishment and operationalization of a National CSA-Center to serve as a focal point for the advancement and free transparent sharing of knowledge, monitoring of impacts, and adoption of CSA/SLM practices in Myanmar.
- **Department of Agricultural Land Management and Statistic (DALMS) –** under the MOALI the DALMS department contribute in mapping process for LULC and Land Use Planning in project area.
- **Dry Zone Greening Department (DZGD) -** Under MONREC the DZDG department participated for technical guidance and supervision on the project implementation as PSC member.
- **Environmental Conservation Department (ECD) -** ECD also contributed as a membership of PSC and as a GEF focal department.
- **University of Forestry and Environmental Science (UFES) -** UFES involved in curriculum development for Myanmar Forestry School.
- **Civil Society Organizations:** MERN, RECOFTC, CFNWG, ECCDI, AVSI, CESVI and COLDA were involved as service providers in fulfilling project's various outputs and outcomes.
- **International Development Organizations:** OneMap, UNREDD+, ICRAF, UNEP, JICA, ADB, UNDP, IRRI, LIFT, Mercy Corps, CARE, Helvetas etc. have been consulted for exchange of the ideas and possible collaboration.

Engagement with all government stakeholders has been considerably reduced since Coup on February 1, 2021 following the new UNCT rules on engagement or non-engagement for projects with de-facto authorities.

9. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As gender equality is central to FAO's work to achieving sustainable agriculture, food security and nutrition, gender analysis was undertaken, and gender mainstreaming has been considering at every stages of the project implementation. - Achieving gender equality in FAO's work is one of the mandatory training that all FAO staffs need to complete. Therefore, all the project staff have somehow gender expertise which is useful for considering gender mainstreaming in every project level implementation stages. The SLM project has assigned gender focal point at project level as well. - M&E and MEAL plan have gender-disaggregated data. During the reporting period, a total of 2,744 farmers i.e. 1914 male (70%) and 830 females (30%) continued participating in 96 FFS activities in five pilot townships and have adopted CSA techniques on various crops. - Additional 10,060 small farmers i.e. 6,571 male (65%) and 3,489 females (35%) were trained/learned through Farmer to Farmer training and adopted CSA techniques on various crops in five pilot townships. Similarly, a total of 259 participants i.e. 233 male (90%) and 26 female (10%) received TOT training in five project townships organised by DoA and were mobilized as Trainers for farmer to farmer training programme in the villages. - Additionally, a total of 2,049 beneficiaries 1468 male (72%) and 581 female (28%) received supports of seeds, other inputs, and training for Home Gardening programme in five pilot townships. - Three assessments regarding the impact of COVID-19 on rural farmers were conducted during the reporting period. A total of 679 smallholder farmers i.e. 438 male (65%) and 241 females (35%) in five project townships were participated in the surveys. - A total of 404 community forestry user group members in five pilot townships have been trained on different aspect of CF, of which about 20% are women. Such capacity-building training and livelihood support activities related to community-based forest management are continuing and number of women participating in workshops, training and awareness-raising activities is increasing.

10. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval

The project has a knowledge management strategy. The project has been collecting good practices by conducting field visits and consulting with local farmers. The good practices shared by the project are Climate Smart Agriculture practices including agroforestry, mulching, making composts, IMO, Fish Amino Acid, SRI, homemade pesticide and Participatory land use planning (PLUP). The strategy is mainly focus on identifying of good practices, documenting good practices and awareness rising the good practices.

The project has a communication strategy in-built in the Knowledge Management Strategy. The communication strategy included sharing the knowledge to target audience with the key message by using social platform, media and other communication materials. The project developed the success stories, animation video on the concept of Agroforestry, and dissemination of good practices in national CSA Centre Facebook page and SLM Myanmar website.

The project has been able to produce several success stories on the impact of project interventions on improving people's livelihoods and addressing the consequences of climate change. To take an example, farmers are very interested in growing Elephant Foot Yam together with coffee and avocado as an agroforestry approach. Moreover, they showed their interest in establishment of community forestry for their livelihood improvements. The links to publications, video materials, related website and some success stories are presented below.

Website and social platform

<http://www.slmmyanmar.info/>

<https://www.facebook.com/NCSAcenter/>

Videos

[Animation on the concept of agroforestry](#)

[Land use land cover activities, SLM-GEF Project](#)

[World Soil Day Activities video](#)

[Growing crops under agroforestry system with Shaw-Phyu in Kyaukpadaung, Mandalay](#)

News/Articles

[Myanmar's farmers battle climate and health uncertainty](#)

[Three ways drones help us better manage our land and protect our planet](#)

[FAO SLM-GEF project commemorated World Soil Day 2020](#)

[Rapid assessment on impact of COVID-19 on rural farmers](#)

[Growing Shaw-Phyu plant by learning from nearby demo plot, the lady farmer from Kyaukpadaung township](#)

[Understanding the benefits of soil mulching](#)

[Farmers willing to use climate-smart agriculture techniques including system of rice intensification in wider scale in Labutta](#)

[Participatory Land Use Planning \(PLUP\)](#)

Documents

[Proceedings of the National Workshop on Green Ecology in Myanmar](#)

[Participatory Land Use Planning at Village Tract Level: Step by Step guidelines](#)

[Impact of COVID19 on agriculture in SLM Project townships : Harvest and Market Survey 2021](#)

Curriculum for the Training Course on Sustainable Land Management, Law and Policy Framework ([English version](#), [Myanmar version](#))

[Project News: Sustainable Land Management, April to August 2020 - Issue #1](#)

[Project News: Sustainable Land Management, September to December 2020 - Issue #2](#)

[The usage of unmanned aerial vehicle technology in participatory land use planning and mapping](#)

[Guidebook for township land-use planning: Central Dry Zone](#)

Implementation Manual (District forest management plan) ([English version](#), [Myanmar version](#))

Planning Manual (District forest management plan) ([English version](#), [Myanmar version](#))

District Forest Management Plan (Mindat District, Chin) ([English version](#), [Myanmar version](#))

District Forest Management Plan (Mingyan District, Mandalay) ([English version](#), [Myanmar version](#))

District Forest Management Plan (Labutta District, Ayeyarwaddy) ([English version](#), [Myanmar version](#))

[Rapid assessment on the impact of COVID-19 on rural farmers](#)

Growing Shaw-Phyu plant by learning from nearby demo plot, the lady farmer from Kyaukpadaung township ([English version](#), [Myanmar version](#))

[The usage of unmanned aerial vehicle technology in participatory land use planning and mapping](#)

[Farmers willing to use climate-smart agriculture techniques including system of rice intensification in wider scale in Labutta](#)

[Indigenous Micro Organism \(IMO\)](#) (Myanmar version)

[Fish Amino Acid](#) (Myanmar version)

[Proceedings of the National Workshop on Promoting Climate Smart Agriculture in Myanmar](#)

[Ecosystem-based Sustainable Forest Management Implementation Manual](#)

[Ecosystem-based Sustainable Forest Management Planning Manual](#)

[Guidebook : township land use planning central dry zone](#)

[Report on the Pilot Implementation of Participatory Land Use Planning \(PLUP\) in Chin State](#)

Introductory Community Forestry Curriculum ([English version](#), [Myanmar version](#))

[Standard operating procedures for CF](#)

[Community forestry instructions \(Myanmar version\)](#) (15 ethnic languages are also available)

[Community forestry strategic action plan](#)

CSA handbook for Academic level ([English version](#), [Myanmar version](#))

FFS handbook for Central Dry Zone ([English version](#), [Myanmar version](#))

FFS handbook for Coastal/delta zone ([English version](#), [Myanmar version](#))

FFS handbook for Upland/hill ([English version](#), [Myanmar version](#))

CSA curriculum for Extension Agent ([English version](#), [Myanmar version](#))

CSA curriculum for ToT ([English version](#), [Myanmar version](#))

CSA curriculum for Degree level ([English version](#), [Myanmar version](#))

CSA curriculum for Diploma level ([English version](#), [Myanmar version](#))

FFS curriculum for Upland ([English version](#), [Myanmar version](#))

FFS curriculum for Delta ([English version](#), [Myanmar version](#))

FFS curriculum for Central Dry Zone ([English version](#), [Myanmar version](#))

Maps

[Community forestry establishment status in pilot districts](#)

[Future land use planning of Dahatsee village tract](#)

[Ecosystem-based sustainable forest management district forest management plan](#)

[SLM project area map](#)

[Future land use planning of Than Bo village tract](#)

[Current land use map and future land use map of Khwee Rein village from Chin](#)

[Future land use planning of Baing Daing Chaung village tract](#)

[Land use land cover map of Nyaung U township](#)

[Land capability map in Nyaung U and Kyaukpadaung township](#)

[Land use land cover map of Labutta township](#)

[Land use land cover map of Kyaukpadaung township](#)

[Forest Situation in Approximate VFV Land Nyaung U](#)

[Example of proposed forest conservation inside approximate VFV Land](#)

The project has a knowledge management focal point. The contact person information is as follow:
Soe Moe Naing
Knowledge Management Specialist
Soemoe.naing@fao.org

11. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.

- The project activities in the field cover a large number of indigenous people through various types of training/awareness programmes and implementation of Farmer Field School (FFS) and community forestry initiatives. Chin Ethnic (Mun, Dai, Yindu Dai, Kaan and Uppu clans) and community is in majority in two pilot Townships of Chin State (Mindat and Kanpetlet) under Upland/hills agro-ecological zone. Similarly, the Labutta Township (Coastal/Delta Zone) is resided by Burma and Karen ethnicity as the majority of the population. Accordingly, the project includes representatives from all the ethnic communities as beneficiaries under various interventions. FPIC is part of the process of PLUP as step one and two of PLUP piloting. In addition forest Rules Consultation process of C1-A activities (Institutional, legal and regulatory framework for SLM, CSA and SFM) was taking into account in obtaining free, prior and informed consent with the indigenous communities. An extensive consultation with indigenous community and CSOs on Forest Rules completed in northern and southern Chin State.

12. Innovative Approaches

Please provide a brief description of an innovative²³ approach in the project / programme, describe the type (e.g. technological, financial, institutional, policy, business model) and explain why it stands out as an innovation.

- Piloting of participatory land use planning (PLUP) is implemented at the village tract level, which is considered the smallest planning unit for development initiatives in Myanmar.
- PLUP is an activity under the sub-component “Program for improved land use management and planning to inform institutional and regulatory improvements” of SLM-GEF project, which aims to build the capacity of farming and forestry stakeholders to mitigate/adapt climate change and improve their land conditions through adoption of climate-smart agriculture (CSA), sustainable forest management (SFM) and sustainable land management (SLM) policies and practices.
- Capacity of local level government staff, NGOs, and CSOs in the area of land-based planning process improved as they are equipped with specific technical skills and experience, such as spatial allocation of resources, GIS mapping and drone image data collection, negotiation on boundary delineation, interpretation of Remote Sensing data, sustainable use of forest and land resources, setting up land management rules and land use agreement.
- In the PLUP, the project used participatory rural appraisal approach combining with satellite based spatial mapping technique and drone methodology not only to collect the ground data but also to persuade the process by community using modernized techniques. Based on the experience of the PLUP, the project developed participatory land use planning guidelines to expand in the other village tracts level of the pilot areas.

²³ Innovation is defined as *doing something new or different in a specific context that adds value*

13. Possible impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the project

Please indicate any implication of the Covid-19 pandemic on the activities and progress of the project. Highlight the adaptative measures taken to continue with the project implementation.

- The very first case of COVID19 was identified in March 2020. The first wave extends from March to June/July 2020. The Ministry of Health (MoH) imposed travel restrictions and forced people to stay at home as much as possible to prevent further spread. The efforts of MoH paid off with COVID19 cases seemingly under control in July and first half of August 2020. However, the second wave start in later August till December 2020/January 2021. All of the project activities that involved travels, in-person meetings, trainings and events have been postponed or shifted to virtual one during the first and second wave of COVID19 in Myanmar. With the ease of COVID19 restrictions in January 2021, the project resumed trainings and meetings in small group at Nay Pyi Taw and respective field offices. However, The February 1st Coup occurred admit of the impacts of COVID19 are still continuing in 2021.
- The Coup impacted every sector in all possible ways. As a result, COVID19 testing capacity has reduced significantly for at least February to May, the whole country is in Chaos when many people reacting to the Coup by protesting, strikes and rallies. Additionally, UN adjusted its engagement policy with de facto authorities and implementation strategies were revisited again. The project activities that involved communication with Government Counterparts were impacted/postponed to be in line with new engagement policy and COVID19 restrictions. In early June 2021, as the new De facto authorities consolidating power, COVID19 testing capacity increased again and more people were tested positive with COVID19 and possible Third wave has begun in mid-June 2021. Despite the momentum of implementation has been decreased, the project is continuing with both small group in-person and virtual meetings, training and events.

14. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁴	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2021	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National Government	MOALI	In-Kind	5,000,000	3,000,000		5,000,000
National Government	MONREC	In-Kind	2,000,000	1,500,000		2,000,000
GEF Agency	FAO	In-Kind	2,194,000	0		2,194,000
Multilateral Aid Agency	LIFT	In-Kind	4,417,707	0		
		TOTAL	13,611,707	4,500,000		
		TOTAL				

Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement

The project started after LIFT project ended in pilot areas.

²⁴ Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **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 – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **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.