



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Asia and the Pacific
Country (ies):	Myanmar
Project Title:	Sustainable cropland and forest management in priority agro-ecosystems of 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

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
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	
Actual Implementation End Date³:	

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, 2019 (USD m):	3,181,964

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

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

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

Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	3,000,000
--	-----------

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	12 June 2019 (6 th PSC meeting)
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	February -March 2019
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	23 months after inception.
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	Yes

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	MS	Though overall rating for the project based on ratings from BH, LTO and Project manager is S, the project's overall rating is presented here as MS based on midterm review findings.
Overall implementation progress rating:	S	
Overall risk rating:	Medium	

Status

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

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 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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Mr Xavier Bouan	Xavier.Bouan@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Mr Ferrand Pierre (FAORAP) Senior Agricultural Officer RADPP	Pierre.Ferrand@fao.org
Budget Holder	Ms. Xiaojie Fan, FAOR, FAMYA	Xiaojie.Fan@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Sameer Karki, Technical Officer, TCIDD	Sameer.Karki@fao.org

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Objective(s):						
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	124,000 hectares of vegetative cover delivering GEB	Project interventions are in progress to cover larger land area through various interventions related to CSA, SLM and SFM however, measuring the exact land area is still underway and will be reported in next report.	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	64,000 ha of agricultural lands 6 million ha forests	Various interventions on CSA, SLM and SFM are in progress however, the exact area covered is yet to be measured and will be reported in next report.	S

⁷ 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.

⁸ 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.

⁹ 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).

	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: 0,96 million Forest: 1,91 million</p> <p>Indirect lifetime (tons of CO2-eq): Non-forest: 3,60 million Forest:12,25 million</p>	A large number of interventions on CSA, SLM and SFM are in progress however, the estimation of the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and carbon capture not yet been done and will be reported in next report.	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: sector policy/regulation framework have been formally proposed but not adopted	-Draft Forest Rules Consultation in Southern and Northern Chin State -SFM integrated in Forest Rules	Forest Sector Policy/ Regulation SFM Framework Score: #5: sector policy/regulation framework are enforced	-Forest law enacted -Forest rules consultation process ongoing -Ecosystem Base Forest District Management Plan piloting in three districts	S
	Agriculture policy enhancement score as reported in GEF LD tracking tool	Agriculture policy enhancement score of 2	-Capacity building of stakeholders in agricultural policies (ADS,FLL, NLUP, etc)	Agriculture policy enhancement score of 3	CSA component is included in Agriculture Development Strategy which is already in place. National level capacity building on Legal and Regulatory Frameworks on CSA, SLM and SFM conducted and the regional level training has been planned for Aug 2019.	S

	Updated strategies for SFM and CSA finalized and adopted	Updated SFM Strategy: 0 Updated CSA Strategy: 0	-adoption of SFM and CSA in ADS and forest rules -Regional workshop (enabling framework for integrated Land Use management of SFM and CSA.	Updated SFM Strategy: 1 Updated CSA Strategy: 1	-Ecosystem Forest Base District Management Plan piloting. -Strategic action Plan for CF -SOP for CF	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)	Land use cover done for 2 townships Land use plan under development	S
	Township-wide land use plans updated and adopted to fully integrate CSA, SLM, and SFM		NR	Number of updated township-wide land use plans: 3 (one for each pilot site)	Ongoing PLUP demonstration in 2 townships	S
Outcome 2: : Models for Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) practices demonstrated and enhancing carbon storage in three priority agro-ecosystems	Conservation and enhancement of carbon in non-forest lands (agriculture) as reported in GEF CC Mitigation Tracking Tool (Objective 5: LULUCF)	Conservation and enhancement of carbon in non-forest lands (agriculture): 0 ha	NR	Conservation and enhancement of carbon in non-forest lands (agriculture): 64,000 ha	2200 ha of land already covered directly under FFS programme planted using CSA techniques and a larger area have been expanded this year under CSA and information on this is being collected. This will be reported in next report.	S

	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	#5: over 80% of area in project certified	Appropriate CSA techniques for different agro-ecological zones are being promoted/adopted for CC mitigation. FFS curricula and Handbooks have been developed and used for FFS programme to cover a large area under CSA. Certification of the project area not done yet and the possibility will be explored soon.	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 households: To be determined at Project Inception (3,500 farm households)	2551 households adopted CSA practices	HS
	Number of annual national CSA/SLM knowledge exchange seminars established and supported by GoM	0 national CSA/SLM knowledge exchange seminars	NR	1 annual (5 completed during project) national CSA/SLM knowledge exchange seminar established	first Workshop, held on 24 Sep, 2018 and second is planned for 29 Aug 2019	HS
	Number of FFS and number of participating members	FFS established: 0 FFS participating members: Male: 0 Female: 0	NR	FFS established: 50 FFS participating house hold - 3500 Male: 350 Female: 350	FFS established cumulatively; 96 plus 55 FFS repeated for second time. FFS participating house hold- 2551 Male: 1881 Female: 670	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 Tones of CO ₂ eq: 12,68 million	In progress: Total affected area will be available after revision of 3 district forest management plan is completed end of 2019.	S
	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: 60,000 ha Restoration/rehabilitation of degraded forests: 2,000 ha	Ongoing: The revised 3 DFMPs with ESFM will specify total affected area for implementation of ESFM	S
	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	Linkage with UNREDD+ Not Yet in place	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) Planning manual, implementation manual for ESFM	Ongoing: 3 SFM models for Mindat, Myingyan and Labutta are being developed. All of them will be adopted after field testing.	S
	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	Ongoing (CFNWG acts as CF support unit with SLM project supporting its capacity-building activities including development of CF strategic action plan, SoPs and 10 basic training on CF achieved	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)	Ongoing :20 CF application in progress , will be followed by support for operationalization and monitoring of CF initiatives in 2020 and onwards	S
Outcome 4. SLM, SFM, and CSA knowledge management, training, and practices scaling up nationally	CSA knowledge center established, fully functional and supporting national replication of project generated outputs	CSA knowledge center: 0	NR	CSA knowledge center: 1	CSA knowledge center 1 (A National CSA Center established at YAU)	HS
	Number of annual participants in national in-service CSA/SLM extension officer training program	0 participants	NR	100 participants	In progress (86 Government Extension Officers/staff trained on CSA techniques at pilot sites)	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	Discussion in progress with DOA for upscaling from Q3	S
	Number of annual participants in project established national ecosystem-based forestry management training	Central Forestry Development and Training Center: 0 Forestry School: 0 University of Forestry: 0	NR	Central Forestry Development and Training Center: 100 Forestry School: 50	LOA developed to support Myanmar Forestry school and CFDTC for 100 students	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	None can be done only after it has been tested in pilot townships	S
--	---	---	----	--	---	---

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹⁰

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Enhanced institutional capacity to account for GHG emission reduction and increase in carbon stocks as reported in GEF SFM REDD+ Tracking Tool	UNREDD in their next forest field measurement exercise will look at projects areas and provide required data	UNREDD Myanmar	Q1 2020
Number of ecosystem based community forestry initiatives established by GoM outside of project area	Linkage with CFNWG to support CB CF initiatives outside project area	CF unit supported by CFNWG+RECOFTC	2020

¹⁰ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1. <i>(please write output entry)</i> : Package of CSA and SFM regulatory and policy modifications for cropland and forest management	Q4Y3	10%	30%				40 %	
Output 1.2 Support implementation of the legal and institutional frameworks for sustainable forest management	Q2Y5	10%	20%				30%	
Output 1.3 Support implementation of the legal and institutional frameworks for climate smart agriculture ...	Q2Y5	10%	20%				30 %	
Output1.4: Training and capacity building on legal and regulatory aspects of SLM, SFM and CSA	Q2Y5	30%	10%				40%	
Output 1.5: Pilot district and township level Land Use Advisory Committees pilot regulations for land-use planning integrating SFM , CSA	Q2Y5	20%	20%				40%	
Output1.6: Pilot digital land-use mapping process in priority districts	Q2Y5	10%	20%				30%	
Output 2.1 CSA support program established within key institutions and demonstrated at priority agro-ecosystems.	Q4Y4	50%	30%				80%	-

¹¹ 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.

¹² As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹³ 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)

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

Output 2.2 Township level agricultural extension service plans for climate smart agriculture/ improved cropland management (CSA/ICM) practices developed.	Q2Y5	20%	20%				40%	
Output2.3 National farmer field school curriculum developed	Q2Y2	100%	Completed				100%	
Output 2.4 Model farmer field schools established in three priority agro-ecosystems	Q2Y5	60%	30%				90%	
Output 2.5 Early adopter farmers piloting CSA practices and delivering lessons within three priority agro-systems	Q2Y5	0%	30%				30%	
Output3.1 National ecosystem-based SFM capacity building program established	Q4Y4	0%	30%				30%	
Output3.2 Three District Forest Management Plans Revised and ecosystem-based SFM objectives incorporated	Q2Y6	15%	35%				50%	
Output3.3 Community based forestry implementation strategy and handbook completed	Q2Y6	10%	60%				70%	
Output 3.4: Community-based forestry capacity building and technical support program operationalized	Q2Y6	15%	35%				50%	
Output 3.5: Twenty community-based forestry demonstrations established and delivering SLM/SFM/CC benefits in three priority ecosystems	Q2Y6	15%	35%				50%	
Output 4.1 Support program established for scaling-up SFM practices	Q2Y6	20%	20%				40%	
Output 4.2 4.2: Support program established for scaling-up CSA practices	Q2Y5	20%	20%				40%	

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

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

Max 200 words:

1. Operation of National CSA Center continued at Yezin Agriculture University (YAU); second and third round of demonstration on CSA techniques conducted; Gas-chromatography (GC) installed at CSA Center; training on GC installation/software/application conducted and a "National CSA Workshop on Promoting CSA in Myanmar," organized which was attended by more than 100 participants.
2. Three events of ToT on CSA and FFS organized in three agro-ecological zones (Upland/hills: Mindat, Central Dry Zone: Nyaung-U and Delta/Coastal: Labutta) for representatives from DoAs, Service Providers and Lead Farmers.
3. 55 old FFSs continued and 25 new FFSs established in five pilot Townships in collaboration with DoA with support from COLDA (in Upland/hills zone), CESVI Myanmar (in Central Dry zone) and AVSI (in Coastal/Delta zone) as service providers.
4. The curriculum development/revision for YAU (BSc.Agri and Master degree), State Agricultural Institutes (Diploma in Agriculture), one month in-service training course and one week training course for MoALI staff members integrating CSA concept completed.
5. A one-week ToT on CSA organized jointly by FAO SLM-GEF Project and AVSI Foundation at CARTC from 8 Oct to 12 Oct 2018.
6. A training on "Capacity Development in Carbon Balance Appraisal of Projects and Policies: Ex-Ante Carbon Balance Tool (EX-ACT)" was organised jointly by FAO and CSA Center.
7. 11 handbooks/curricula regarding CSA and FFS have been developed, got approval from PWS and published on-line.
8. Training manual and critical report of SFM component were also developed in this year as followed.
9. Ecosystem-based forest management planning manual and ecosystem-based forest management implementation manual-ECCDI
10. Revised forest management plans (DFMPs) for 3 districts: Mindat, Myingyan and Labutta-ECCDI
11. TNA report (in Myanmar and English version) and ways forward (recommended action plan)-TNA
12. Training manuals for CF introductory training and CF implementation (RECOFTC)
13. CF Training materials (posters and pamphlets)- RECOFTC
14. CF Strategic Action Plan (in Myanmar and English versions)-CFNWG
15. CFI 2019 translated into 15 ethnic languages-CFNWG
16. CF database/information management system for M&E-CFNWG
17. CF-Standard Operational Procedures (in Myanmar version)-CFNWG
18. Guidelines for Agroforestry in CF in encroached Reserve Forest and participatory land use planning (PLUP)
19. MEAL design developed
20. Forest rules consultation process developed and TOT for assistant directors of state and forest division of FD - (LCG)
21. Forest rules consultation in North Chin -(LCG)
22. Preparation of regional workshop on legal framework- (LCG)

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

Max 200 words:

The project has done its Mid Term Review and experienced a lot of challenge in doing it. It is worth noticing SLM project was the first GEF project use a new format and process, which needed further guidance from GCU. Findings of the MTR team has generated comments from FAO which have necessitated to have a workshop bringing together BH-GCU-LTO-PSC-SLM and some project designer to discuss on comments and produce an acceptable matrix to all which would be use as the management response letter. The matrix has been accepted by the 6th PSC meeting and sent to OED

A project output of C1b is to provide an accurate LULC map to serve as the basis for stakeholders to draft a Land Use Plan for each of the 5 townships. The projects' attempt to link participatory land use planning at the village and village tract level (the 'bottom-up' component) with a township level land use land cover map (a 'top down' approach) takes place as detailed responsibilities and the institutional framework for land use planning at all levels is under formulation by the National Land Use Council. Guidance for the draft plans prepared by the project is based on statements in the National Land Use Policy. A key element of the policy is the requirement for planning to be a consultative multi stakeholders process that allows for effective representation of all those involved.

The target to establish Community Forest is much too high as long as Government has not solve the controversy on the law about Virgin, Fallow & Vacant (VFFV) land.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating ¹⁵	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating ¹⁶	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	<i>Mid Term Review has given a MS rating for period up to December 2018. The project reviewed all recommendations and started to apply them. It was further discuss in 6ht PSC and a management response letter to MTR recommendations prepared which are in line with proposed rating</i>
Budget Holder	S	S	<i>Project delivery by the time of reporting is about 60% . The project is on the right track and having a good momentum. All the activities are being implemented as planned and could be expected to accomplish timely. As the Budget Holder of the project, the overall rating for the project is satisfactory.</i>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁷	S	S	<i>The project team took the opportunity of the MTR findings to thoroughly discuss with government counterparts about project expected outcomes. It helped refining and adjusting project targets and increasing ownership over the project implementation. This target revision process will be conducted until the end of the year 2019 and it is worth noting the high level of involvement of the government counterparts. Overall, the project has made good progress and keeps increasing its delivery rate.</i>

¹⁵ **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. Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁶ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁷ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Moderately Satisfactory	Satisfactory	<p>In line with the findings of recently concluded midterm review, the overall progress of the project towards achieving Outcome level indicators, the project is considered <u>moderately satisfactory</u>. The project's progress on Outcomes and 4 are satisfactory but the progress in Outcomes 1 and 3 remain less than satisfactory – thus, the project need to give more emphasis on achievements of results under these Outcomes. Management responses to mid-term review recommendations, which have been endorsed by the project's Steering Committee, needs to be implemented effectively by the project over the next reporting period.</p>
------------------------------------	-------------------------	--------------	---

3. Risks

Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ¹⁸ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Medium	Yes

Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE					
The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant .					

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Political pressure may continue or increase to log forests at unsustainable rates going forward, maintaining or increasing forest degradation rates.	Medium	Support Forest law and development of forest rules Environmental Law and Rule also to be considered	Consultation for forest rules development ongoing	

¹⁸ **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.

¹⁹ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²⁰ 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".

	Risk	Risk rating¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
2	The capacity at local FUG level to support SFM is just emerging and may be difficult to operationalize effectively.	Medium	Development of ESFM	Piloting of ESFM in three townships by ECCDI	
3	Increased frequency or regularity of temperature extremes caused by CC may trigger shifts and movement in forest types across agro-ecosystems and/or disease and insect infestations.	Uncertain			
4	Increased frequency, or regularity of temperature extremes and changing rainfall patterns caused by climate change may necessitate changes in cropping pattern.	Medium			
5	Increased frequency, or regularity of temperature extremes and changing rainfall patterns caused by climate change may trigger disease, and/ or pest infestations in crops.	Medium			
6	There may not be sufficient incentive for communities to form and sustain FUGs.	Medium	CFNWG is working out on FUG to benefit from commercially valuable timber and introducing credit system with WB support	By CFNWG	
7	Government financing constraints may limit investments in SFM, and indeed place more pressure on forest resources.	Medium	Linkage with UNREDD will be establish and will help when completed in 2021 with PES	UNREDD+	
8	Government financing constraints may limit investment in SLM and extension services may be under resourced to implement the project	Medium	Negotiation with government dpt is under way to include upscaling of the good practices in their extension plan	Government , line dpts	

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Medium	Medium	

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²¹

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	No	As proposed by MTR recommendations and reviewed and approved in management response letter and matrix
Project Outputs	Yes	Target of land base reviewed and adjusted

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, evaluations 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	NO. Recent MTR suggested a one year project extension to achieve all objectives specifically on forestry but latest PSC in June 2019 agreed this will have to be decided in 2020 if a 1 year extension is still required

²¹ Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

5. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO

In the project activities, there are information about gender-disaggregated data. Moreover, Gender, age and disability disaggregated data are included in the new MEAL plan to be started from July 2019. Gender mainstreaming topic is added in all the training of trainers, FFS handbooks and FFS Curricula. In FFS beneficiary selection process, the gender mainstreaming is also considered.

Component 2 (Climate Smart Agriculture)

- 865 farmers i.e. 235 women (27%) and 630 men (73%), included as FFS Committee members in 30 villages of Upland/hill Zone of Chin State for the FFS implementation.
- There are 52 female (12%) and 398 male (88%) members (i.e. total 450 farmers) included in the FFS Committees in 15 villages of Delta/Coastal Zone for the FFS implementation.
- 1,236 farmers i.e. 383 women (31%) and 853 men (69%) are included as FFS Committee members in 20 villages of Central Dry Zone for the FFS implementation.
- A total of 47 participants (11 male and 36 female) from DoA, YAU, DAR, SAls (14 State Agriculture Institutes) and CARTC from Nay Pyi Taw and across the 7 States and 7 Regions attended a ToT on Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) at CARTC from 8 Oct to 12 Oct 2018.
- A total of 100 participants (i.e. 43 male and 57 female) attended the National Workshop on Climate Smart Agriculture held on 14 Sep 2018.
- 24 participants (i.e. 11 male and 13 female) attended EX-ACT training from 16 Oct to 19 Oct 2018.
- 8 staff members (3 male and 5 female) from DAR and YAU attended a Training of Trainer on the instalment and operation of gas chromatography.

Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)?

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

If applies, please describe the process and current status of on-going/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities

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 (also called Cho locally) 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 Bamar and Karen ethnicity as the majority of the population. Moreover, in Nyaung-U and Kyaukpadaung Townships of Central Dry Zone Bamar ethnic community is in majority. 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 ongoing forest Rules Consultation process of C1-A activities (Institutional, legal and regulatory framework for SLM, CSA and SFM) is 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 Chin State and such consultation in southern Chin State is ongoing in June 2019.

7. Stakeholders Engagement

Please report on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable))

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) and 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 Forestry 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.
- **International Development Organizations:** JICA, ADB, UNDP, IRRI, LIFT, Mercy Corps, CARE, Helvetas etc have been consulted for exchange of the ideas and possible collaboration.

8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

- The forest rule consultation workshop is conducted together with LCG to increase the public awareness for the government staffs, CSOs staffs and parliamentarians. Revision of district forest management plans according to the ecosystem-based forest management planning manual and implementation manuals. LULC Mapping in pilot sites are developing to be used in Land Use Planning in the related area for sustainable land management. At the same time, there are CSA ToT in different pilot sites and totally 96 FFS Training are conducted which can increase the CSA knowledge in pilot sites. CSA Center is also established and it's Facebook page and SLM Myanmar website from project are the communication channel to share the CSA and SFM knowledge to the community. Establishment of 20 CF in three pilot sites and implementation of ecosystem-based community forestry initiatives. Capacity building of CF unit members (Forestry Staffs), and development of national CF strategic action plan and guidelines. These activities will lead to strengthening the capacity of farming household and forestry stakeholders to adopt SFM and SLM Policies and practices to improve their land condition.
- 11 hand books/curricula regarding CSA and FFS have been developed. The following links are 11 hand books/curricula publication links which is passed by FAO PWS system and farmer field day events video link which is broadcast from Farmer Channel.

<http://www.fao.org/3/ca3662en/ca3662en.pdf> - (CSA handbook for academic level)

<http://www.fao.org/3/ca3656en/ca3656en.pdf> - (FFS handbook for central dry zone)

<http://www.fao.org/3/ca3815en/ca3815en.pdf> - (FFS handbook for coastal/delta zone)

<http://www.fao.org/3/ca3655en/ca3655en.pdf> - (FFS handbook for upland/hill)

<http://www.fao.org/3/ca3652en/ca3652en.pdf> - (FFS curriculum for Upland).

<http://www.fao.org/3/ca3654en/ca3654en.pdf> - (FFS curriculum for Delta).

<http://www.fao.org/3/ca3628en/ca3628en.pdf> - (FFS curriculum for Central Dry Zone).

<http://www.fao.org/3/ca3681en/ca3681en.pdf> - (CSA curriculum for Extension Agent).

<http://www.fao.org/3/ca3680en/ca3680en.pdf> - (CSA curriculum for ToT).

<http://www.fao.org/3/ca3676en/ca3676en.pdf> - (CSA curriculum for degree level).

<http://www.fao.org/3/ca3664en/ca3664en.pdf> - (CSA curriculum for diploma level).

<http://www.fao.org/3/ca3676my/ca3676my.pdf> - (CSA curriculum for degree level, Burmese version)

<http://www.fao.org/3/ca3654my/ca3654my.pdf> - (FFS curriculum for Delta, Burmese version)

<http://www.fao.org/3/CA3384EN/CA3384EN.pdf> - (SLM Project Flyer)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WYAB_OocwtE

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²²	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	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	2,000,000		
National Government	MONREC	In-Kind	2,000,000	1,000,000		
GEF Agency	FAO	In-Kind	2,194,000	0		
Multilateral Aid Agency	LIFT	In-Kind	4,417,707			
		TOTAL	13,611,707	3,000,000		

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

- Co financing from LIFT relates to two projects which ended before SLM started as stated in mid term review report (page 29).
- GEF agency amount is unknown

²² 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.