



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Africa
Country (ies):	Lesotho
Project Title:	Strengthening capacity for climate change adaptation through support to Integrated Watershed Management
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/LES/049/LDF
GEF ID:	5124
GEF Focal Area(s):	Least Developed Country Fund
Project Executing Partners:	The Ministry of Forestry , Range and Soil Conservation ¹ (MFRSC), Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS), Ministry of Energy and Meteorology (MEM), Ministry of Water (MoW), Ministry of Local Government, Department of Environment (DOE) and National University of Lesotho (NUL))
Project Duration:	48 Months

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	27 Feb 2015
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	1 Nov 2015
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE²:	31 Oct 2019
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ³	31 Oct 2020
Actual Implementation End Date⁴:	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	3,592,694
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁵:	8,437,000

¹ Formerly known as Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation

² as per FPMIS

³ In case of a project extension.

⁴ Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	1,894,590
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁶	5,435,542

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	14 June 2019
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	June 2018
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	October 2018
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).	Yes
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁷	Yes

Ratings

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

Status

Implementation Status <i>(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):</i>	3 rd PIR
--	---------------------

⁵ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

⁶ 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.

⁷ 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	Lekholoane Ignatius Lekholoane	Lekholoane.lekholoane@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Selvaraju Ramasamy	Selvaraju.Ramasamy@fao.org
Budget Holder	Lewis Hove	Lewis. Hove@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Kuena Morebotsane	Kuena.Morebotsane@fao.org

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁸	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹⁰
Objective(s):						
Outcome 1.1 Strengthened technical capacity in MFLR, MAFS MNR, MLGC, DMA and NUL at national and district levels and community representatives on climate change adaptation and integrated watershed management	Number and type of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to reduce risks of and response to climate variability	Limited training programmes organized at the watershed scale (score of 1 for indicator 2.2.2 of AMAT tool)	Implementation of training packages at the national and district levels (score of 3 substantial training for practical applications)	The national and district level staff are capable of implementing the adaptation projects and programmes	District Technical Teams (DTT) from the three districts are adequately equipped and are competently leading implementation of the interventions SLM/W, Diversified Livelihood strategies leveraging IWM approach. They are being supported by District Technical Coordinators (DTCs), Community Mobilisers and technical backstopping from relevant headquarter Departments.	S
Outcome 2.1 Improved data, tools and methods for assessment of impact of climate change on land suitability and land use, vulnerability and risk at the national/district level implemented focusing on most vulnerable watersheds	Risk and vulnerability assessment conducted. Updated risk and vulnerability assessment Relevant risk information disseminated to	No comprehensive data bases available for use for policy and operational decisions and are not systematically disseminated	Data base in place.	Government agencies share the data to users and data sets are effectively used for decision making. Comprehensive database	Vulnerability and land suitability assessment interpreted and decoded for use and mainstreaming into regular project activities. District level trainings and engagements are in this respect scheduled for July 2019	MS

⁸ 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.

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

¹⁰ 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)**.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁸	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹⁰
	stakeholders			available for use At least 30 national level staff trained.		
Outcome 3.1 Sustainable land and water management (SLM/W) practices (soil erosion control, soil and water conservation, water harvesting, run-off reduction, vegetative cover, range resource management) successfully adopted in selected watershed and catchments. (Total beneficiaries - 1200 households and 4800 individuals and total area covered will be 2400 hectares).	Percent target groups adopting adaptation technologies by type (refer AMAT indicators 3.1.1.1 & 3.1.1.2)	There are very few households that have the capacity to reduce the impacts to some extent (only those having off-farm employment).	At least 25% of the selected communities are capable of implementing the SLMW practices	The SLM/W practices are successfully demonstrated in all selected 24 communities (at least 75% have adopted SLM/W practices).	Communities adopting site specific SLM/W technologies are 27 in total (8 in Thaba-Tseka, 8 in Mafeteng and 11 in Quthing) Unlike when the project started when communities worked voluntarily they recently show reluctance to work on communal assets without cash incentives. Provision of lunch does not seem to appease the situation. Water harvesting targets per household are low in Quthing, Thaba-Tseka and slightly in Mafeteng. This has somewhat reduced momentum for implementing communally owned initiatives hence the need to review the project incentive structure.	MS
Outcome 4.1 Diversified livelihood strategies and small scale and household level income generating activities successfully demonstrated and adopted by 24 target communities. Benefiting 750 and households (3000 individuals). Area covered under this investment 375	Households and communities have more secure access to livelihood assets % increase per capita income of farm households due to adaptation measures applied	2 – Poor access to livelihood assets No or limited income from diversified livelihood activities. The baseline income is very low due to low levels of yield	40% of the selected communities are capable of increasing their income by 20% during the third year.	At least 60% of the selected communities increase their household income by 40% (3 – 4) moderate to secure access to livelihood	The project has made strides in reaching communities with mainly crop related livelihood interventions including keyhole gardens, shadenet structures, crop seeds for CA production and mainly replacement fruits trees for dead trees due to drought in 2018. The reach has been to all the 27 communities. Concerning livestock based livelihoods Mafeteng and Quthing have received 2280 Boschveld chickens; Thaba-Tseka	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁸	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹⁰
hectares).		(~450 kg/ha)		assets (AMAT tool)	has introduced rabbit production to 12 individuals and construction of modern rabbit hutches was demonstrated. Piggery production planned for Quthing and Mafeteng have not been delivered to the 4 groups due to supply side constraints.	
Outcome 5.1: Stakeholders and communities aware of improved SLM/W practices, livelihood diversification and household level income generating practices through wide dissemination	<p>Number of publications based on field experiences to be used for recommendations</p> <p>Strengthened capacity to transfer appropriate adaptation technologies (refer the indicator 3.2.2 of AMAT tool)</p> <p>Indicator tracking table populated quarterly</p>	<p>There are few examples available based on the FAO TCP project completed in 2011.</p> <p>AMAT score of 1 (no capacity)</p> <p>Generic data available and provided in annex, but not specific to the watersheds</p>	<p>A communication strategy established and adopted by all stakeholders</p> <p>Moderate capacity achieved (AMAT score</p> <p>A systematic tracking of indicators. of 2)</p>	<p>Communication materials relevant to all successful SLM/WM practices and case studies documented and widely communicated</p> <p>The implementing partners are capable of transferring the technology to the beneficiaries</p> <p>A systematic tracking of indicators.</p>	<p>The project has adopted the communication strategy and has developed a street banner, a poster and calendars (desk and wall) with relevant adaptation messaging in English and Sesotho as strategy had recommended.</p> <p>Project results, experiences and lessons learned were shared with key stakeholders through meetings, radio and national TV, print media (FAO Newsletter), periodic reports and special events (e.g. information Units within MAFS and MFRSC covered and broadcast on the national TV and radio graduation and launching ceremonies of the Privates Service Providers under the Savings and Internal Lending Communities (SILC) for the three project sites.)</p> <p>The project activities are monitored continually by field based Community Mobilisers with DTCs and district based government staff. Outcomes of the monitoring efforts are shared through periodic meetings and reports. Midterm AMAT tool was populated to track</p>	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁸	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹⁰
					progress of the project performance against determined indicators.	

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹¹

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1.1: Strengthened technical capacity in MFLR, MAFS MNR, MLGC, DMA and NUL at national and district levels and community representatives on climate change adaptation and integrated watershed management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the impact of trainings offered to DTTs towards improved performance of the project Facilitate training on gender mainstreaming for DTTs 	National Technical Advisor & National Project Coordinator National Technical Advisor	October 2019 August / October 2019
Outcome 2.1 Improved data, tools and methods for assessment of impact of climate change on land suitability and land use, vulnerability and risk at the national/district level implemented focusing on most vulnerable watersheds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of backstopping mission to provide guidance and way forward for this component 	LTO	July – December 2019
Outcome 3.1 Sustainable land and water management (SLM/W) practices (soil erosion control, soil and water conservation, water harvesting, run-off reduction, vegetative cover, range resource management) successfully adopted in selected watershed and catchments. (Total beneficiaries - 1200 households and 4800 individuals and total area covered will be 2400 hectares).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scale up water harvesting activities in Mafeteng and Quthing communities. Motivate communities to implement adaptive SLM/W practices. Cash for work compensation has been proposed for SLM/W activities implemented in the districts. 	MFRSC, DPU	July –December 2019
Outcome 5.1: Stakeholders and communities aware of improved SLM/W practices, livelihood diversification and household level income generating practices through wide dissemination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disseminate information on diversified livelihoods and income generating activities to communities through extension services Conduct field demonstrations and study tours as per workplan 2019 Organise print media and videographer to capture project activities 	District Technical Coordinators and their government counterparts National Technical Advisor	July – December 2019

¹¹ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

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	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1.1 National level MFLR, MAFS, MNR, MLGC, DMA and National University of Lesotho (NUL) staff and district level forestry and natural resources staff trained on climate change adaptation, integrated watershed management and community mobilization (60 national + 90 districts staff).	Q2 Y3 Q1-2 Y4	No Data in 1 st PIR report	4 workshops done for 70 national and district level staff on climate change issues, risk and vulnerability assessment, IWM and SLM/W;	52 District Technical Team members (26 males and 26 females) IWM, diversified livelihood strategies, community engagement and climate change adaptation in the agricultural sector; Environmental law and early warning systems.			81%	The project targeted to train 150 national (60) and district level (90) staff but has so far reached a total of 122. Full reach of district level staff is disrupted by transfer of staff and vacancy factor in the targeted districts.
Output 1.1.2 Training to the local representatives from community based organizations (CBOs) on good practice examples of sustainable land and water management, water	Q2-4 Y3 Q1-2 Y4	No Data in 1 st PIR report	About 10 community based /farmer groups train SLM/W	The project trained 444 (180 males and 264 females) community members on SLM/W practices,			80%	

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.

harvesting, diversified livelihood strategies and range resources management (at least 24 farmer groups (1200 farm households) and 20 representatives in each of the three livelihood zones (60 representatives) and 20 representatives in each of the 3 livelihood zones (60 representatives) will be trained).			<i>practices and livelihood strategies.</i>	Livelihood strategies, food preservation and improved nutrition				
Output 2.1.1 Livelihood and land use (crop, livestock, agro-forestry) data base developed for most vulnerable watersheds (database will be established in Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation and linked to potential users at the national level) and relevant staff trained (at least 30 core staff)	Q2 Y3	No Data in 1 st PIR report	Letter of agreement signed with service provider	Baseline data on Livelihood and land use data was shared by Institute of Natural Resources (INR) and partners and 2 workshops were done for 36 District staff.			89%	
Output 2.1.2 Vulnerabilities and risks (current and future) assessed for the selected watersheds in 3 livelihood zones and spatial information on vulnerability available (at Disaster Management Authority) to facilitate adaptation planning by the Government and relevant staff trained (total 30 staff – 10 staff from each district).	Q2-4 Y3 Q1-2 Y4	No Data in 1 st PIR report	Socio-economic risk and vulnerability database developed.	Assessment report on vulnerabilities and risks (current and future) have been shared internally to facilitate training district level staff.			64%	Training has been scheduled for first week July 2019.
Output 3.1.1: Adaptive land use and sustainable land and water management practices implemented. (1200 households and 1200 hectares)	Q2-4 Y3 Q1-2 Y4	No Data in 1 st PIR report	500 Households	SLM/W interventions implemented comprise agro-forestry techniques (truncheons); soil and water conservation techniques (agronomic – CA,			70%	Communities show reluctance to work on communal assets voluntarily as opposed to when the project started. As a result SLM/W adaptation activities are lagging behind against the set targets.

				mulching) and conservation structures infiltration ditches. 20 communities are involved in the 3 sites.				
Output 3.1.2: Improved water harvesting structures at the household level implemented (150 households)	Q2-4 Y3; Q1-2 Y4	No Data in 1 st PIR report	27 x water harvesting tanks completed, 8 under construction.	37 tanks have so far been installed for households in the 3 areas			24%	There has been a slight increase by 6% from the last review period and 76% remains to be reached. However, the number of roof tanks feasible in Thaba-Tseka is only 10 units because thatched roofs predominates over corrugated structures roofs. The target for this district has to be revised in line with the assessed potential
Output 3.1.3: Improved vegetative cover and range resource management measures adopted to improve productive use of marginal lands (600 households and 2400 individuals and cover a total area of 1200 hectares)	Q2-4 Y3; Q1-2 Y4	No Data in 1 st PIR report	2 x wetlands protected 20 Ha since 2016 15 Ha brush controlled of invasive species Invader (brush) control in 23.53 Ha (i.e.5.63Ha in Thaba-Tseka and 17.9Ha in Quthing) and Reseeding <i>Eragrostis curvula</i> in 2.5 Ha at Ha Robi, Quthing	805 households in the three project sites were involved SLM/W adaptation practices. 23.38 Ha rangelands were rested and invasive plants uprooted; 142 metres of stonelines 240 metres of Fire belts were constructed to prevent destructive rangeland fires.			60%	There has been a challenge to provide accurate measurements by use of measuring wheels and tapes. Handheld GPSs have been procured to improve on the quality of captured data. Mafeteng adopts shorter (9 months) pasture rest compared to 3 years in Thaba-Tseka because of limited rangelands.

Output 4.1.1: Community participation ensured and introductory sessions conducted and small-scale household level income generating activities introduced to 750 households	Q4 Y4 Q2 Y2	No Data in 1 st PIR report	Currently there 17 groups formed (3, Mafeteng, 4 Quthing and 10 Thaba-Tseka /15 household per group 255) and 3 households involved in beekeeping in Quthing.	Households are engaged in Keyhole, trench and mobile gardens, shadenet production, double purpose poultry, rabbitry and later on piggery production. 36 Savings and Internal Lending Communities (SILC) groups with 597 members saved USD6, 800 in a year.			75%	Beekeeping is one of the income generating activities but has not performed very well to be considered profitable.
Output 4.1.2: Field demonstration of locally relevant multi-purpose agro-forestry to protect livelihood systems implemented and adopted (375 hectares)	Q4 Y4	No Data in 1 st PIR report	None conducted	No appropriate fodder species have been identified for Lesotho unless in theory.			0%	Tree species for multi-purpose agro-forestry suitable Lesotho climate except for Lucerne tree very hard to find. Hence achieving this output is not feasible and should be dropped.
Output 5.1.1 A communication strategy established in close collaboration with the MFRSC, MAFS, MNR, Ministry of Local Government and Chieftainship (MLGC) and NUL and implemented	Q2Y2	No Data in 1 st PIR report	Communication strategy has been developed	The project community strategy and action plan were accomplished			95%	Relevant elements of the strategy have been incorporated in the 2019 workplan and budget. The remaining work has to do with dissemination of the project results and share lessons learned with key stakeholders and to create more awareness.
Output 5.2.1 Systematic collection of field based data to monitor project outcome indicators at all levels and evaluation conducted	Q2-4 Y3	Socio-indicators derived from baseline survey. Letter of agreement signed with		Project outputs and outcomes indicators were monitored midterm using the LDCF Adaptation and Monitoring Tool (AMAT). Questionnaire has been designed for household survey to			80%	Improvement of field based data shall be achieved by developing an Indicator Performance Tracking Table for different activities.

		biophysical service provider.		<p>determine benefits from the project. Data will be collected in a participatory manner.</p> <p>AWP/B 2019 has been prepared and approved. PPRs and PIRs shall follow.</p> <p>Monthly Project team and Internal programme meetings are being conducted.</p>				
--	--	-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

Brief summary of the main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):

Max 200 words:

- The project trained 63 District level staff and 444 local communities in integrated watershed management; diversified livelihoods strategies; Village saving schemes; Farmer Field Schools approach; resource conservation measures and nutrition education.
- 36 Savings and Internal Lending Communities (SILC) were formed with 597 members (448 females and 149 males) and raised LSL98 000 (~USD6, 800).
- The project midterm review (MTR) was done in October 2018. It assessed the project's progress towards project results and expected outcomes and had six recommendations: prioritizing community needs; developing a gender strategy; collation of baseline data; identification and address project risks; develop a sustainability strategy and request for no-cost extension.
- Adaptive SLM/W practices implemented were improvement of vegetative cover ; protection of wetlands covering 23.17Ha; strengthening of 8 grazing associations with 201 members (90 males and 111 females) and installation of conservation structures (gabions, swales and stone lines to reduce run off) and conservation agriculture covering more than 400 farmers .
- Diversified livelihood strategies covered keyhole gardens, protected shadenet production; fruit trees; demonstrations of high value vegetables such as garlic and mushrooms. Nutrition education and assessments were also conducted. Short cycle livestock covered 2280 Boschveld chickens distributed; rabbit production in Thaba-Tseka and completing half of the number of pig styes in Mafeteng and Quthing.
- Project information was shared internally and externally. Monitoring project activities was enhanced through reporting and meetings.

The major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?

Max 200 words:

- **Transfer of Line Ministries staff:** impacts negatively on the project performance especially when such have been trained and actively involved in the implementation of project.
- **Progress of communally owned and managed assets:** seem to have more challenges compared to individuals or household run interventions.
- **Inappropriately targeted beneficiaries:** lack passion to maintain focus on their work compared to those who are supported already engaged in the work.
- **Vandalism and trespassing** in the form of theft of produce, equipment, invasion of rested rangelands during the night (dark) by livestock owners pose threats to project interventions.
- **More often local suppliers** lack capacity to supply inputs meeting high quality standards required by FAO.
- **Erratic weather patterns notably drought** disrupt rainfall-dependent adaptive practices such as recovery of rested rangelands; performance of crops and livestock.
- **Conservation Agriculture** does not perform well for most communities and its adoption is very low.
- Responding to some of these challenges, the project has: sensitized the Project Steering Committee especially Head of Departments about the negative impact of staff transfers on the project; engaged with groups and their leadership structures to resolve conflicts and law enforcement agencies for acts of vandalism and trespassing. Motivated beneficiaries with low morale with follow up training and regular visits; Successful CA farmers serve as good change agents for peer to peer learning by sharing their success stories and showcasing their products to others. Where local suppliers lack capacity to deliver requisite goods/services foreign suppliers are engaged.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating¹⁶	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating¹⁷	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	<i>The project has raised adequate awareness on climate change and variability and capacitated District staff and communities to competently implement adaptive SLM/W, ICM, Livelihoods practices.</i>
Budget Holder	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	<i>Substantial progress has been made in the last 12 months. The Mid-Term Review highlighted key weakness and short comings in project implementation. Corrective actions were duly implemented and the project implementation has since gathered the required momentum. There is also a notable progress in the attainment of the expected results.</i>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁸	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	<i>The components of the project related to implementation of field level activities (outcome 3 and 4) are highly valued in the context of reducing vulnerability and enhancing adaptive capacity. The institutional strengthening and vulnerability analysis related aspects under the outcome 1 and 2 contributed to strengthen adaptation practices.</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.

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.

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

¹⁸ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

GEF Funding Liaison Officer	<i>Moderately Satisfactory</i>	<i>Moderately Satisfactory</i>	<i>The project had to request for a no-cost extension due to some delays in implementation. Entering the last full year of implementation, there has to be serious consideration of how the work and results will be carried forward beyond the project.</i>
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	--

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 valid¹⁹. If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low to Medium	Overall, the risk rating at the project submission is still valid.

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
<i>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.</i>

	Risk	Risk rating²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
--	-------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------	--	--

¹⁹ **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.

²⁰ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

	Risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
<i>Risks identified during the PIF preparation and verified during the project preparation (PPG)</i>					
1	Institutional conflicts over ownership of the project	L	The project formulation process has secured the understanding and commitment to establish a Steering Committee of key relevant line Ministries (i.e. MFLR and MAFS and local government), Meteorological Services, Disaster Management Authority at both national and district levels in order to ensure effective coordination and participatory decision-making.	This has really not occurred	
2	Highly fragile environment for intensifying crop and livestock production	M	Building resilience of local ecosystem and ensuring stability in yields with little or no expansion on cropland or rangeland and optimal use of chemicals and fertilizer. Reducing vulnerability through reliance on improved farming practices, improved natural resources management including erosion control, micro-scale water control, pasture and fodder management, agroforestry and diversification of livelihood options.		
3	Conflicts in the management of communally owned resources	M	Participatory approach in decision-making and building community consensus at the initial stage including some training on conflict management of common resources.	Trespassing has occurred on rested rangelands and security agencies and community leaders were engaged to resolve disputes.	

²¹ 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 rating ²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
4	Sustainability/ institutionalization of technical assistance related to data base development and management and capacity development activities	L	The concerned ministries and institutions were consulted and a thorough assessment was done to identify the host institution for data collection and management especially related to the land use and vulnerability and risk assessment. The capacity development activities under component 1 and 2 are designed based on the needs assessment and participants will be identified in close consultation with the respective ministries. The training resources will be integrated into the regular training activities.		
<i>New risks identified in the course of project implementation</i>					
5	Lack of gender sensitive interventions and replicable approaches	M	Development of a gender sensitive guidance and mainstreaming of gender issues throughout the implementation of the project.	Project shall engage a Gender expert to mainstream gender issues	
6	The nature of adaptive SLM/W and diversified livelihood strategies / interventions are not relevant to location and are not responsive to communities' felt needs	M	Prioritisation of community felt needs Match interventions to the local biophysical environment.	2019 Workplan has prioritized community needs.	

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
M	L	FY2019 rating has improved from the previous year, effecting a positive change because the Midterm review highlighted the project risks which caused delays in implementing the project and suggested corrective actions, most of which the project team acknowledged and addressed.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²²

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	No	N/A
Project Outputs	Yes	Output 3.1.1. : Adaptive land use and sustainable land and water management practices implemented. For these to be realised the project cannot longer rely on volunteerism but has to compensate people for SLM/W activities done due to reluctance and socio-economic hardships including unemployment that communities are currently faced with.

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	<p>Original NTE: October 31, 2019 Revised NTE: October 31, 2020</p> <p>Justification: Slow implementation of key project deliverables notably sustainable land and water management practices and diversified livelihood strategies.</p>

²² 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 Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)?

Was a gender analysis undertaken or an equivalent socio-economic assessment? Please briefly indicate the gender differences.

Socio-economic baseline assessments conducted in all the three project sites did consider gender issues. Sampling procedures included female-headed households by 42%, 42% and 32% corresponding to Thaba-Tseka, Mafeteng and Quthing respectively.

Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data? How is the project tracking gender impacts and results?

Training sessions, participation in adaptive SLM/W and diversified livelihoods and reporting cater for gender-segregated data. The project do track gender impacts, for instance, out of the 36 SILC groups formed, there are 597 members, made of up 75% women and 25% men.

Does the project staff have gender expertise? No, project staff does not have gender expertise but have participated in two gender awareness trainings: First, in March 2018 focusing on Training of FAO Stakeholders Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse among FAO Beneficiaries and in July 2018 on gender mainstreaming training for FAO Lesotho staff.

On the other hand, the Midterm review team established weaknesses in mainstreaming gender issues and recommended (#2) the development of a gender strategy. The project team acknowledges this and has initiated a process to engage a Gender Expert, who has suggested a gender guideline instead of a strategy to mainstream gender issues in the project.

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 issue of indigenous people is not relevant to Lesotho's context, the culture is cohesive, with Basotho comprising over 99 percent of the country's population, the remainder being of Asian or European origin.

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))

If your project had a stakeholder engagement plan, specify whether any new stakeholders have been identified/engaged: No new stakeholders were engaged.

If a stakeholder engagement plan was not requested for your project at CEO endorsement stage, please

– **Not applicable, the plan was submitted at the project CEO endorsement.**

- list all stakeholders engaged in the project;
- Briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.

8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

- Please tell us the story of your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihood and how it is contributing to achieve the expected global environmental benefits

The project improved people's livelihood by honing their knowledge and skills through trainings which focused on felt needs, good practice examples, hands-on learning and demonstrations. It enhanced their awareness on ICM approach, climate change impacts and adaptation measures. Communities implemented adaptive practices on sustainable land and water management such as rangeland rehabilitation through resting, protected wetlands and constructed water harvesting structures. They acknowledged re-appearance of flora and fauna on rested rangelands and protected wetlands; protection of assets; fields, homes, graveyards, etc. from soil erosion due to improved vegetative cover; benefited from ecosystems services through livestock fodder, thatch grass, ground water recharge and water flow from springs. Diversified livelihoods earned them honey from bees, nutritious vegetables from keyhole gardens, dried and preserved surplus produce for the offseason use. Income generation bolstered household income up to LSL98, 000 for 36 groups within 12 months cycle through formation of village saving and loan schemes. Please provide the links to publications, video materials, etc.

- 1) PDF URL: <http://www.fao.org/3/ca1593en/ca1593en.pdf> (pages 7 & 8);
- 2) <http://newslib.lena.org.ls/newsroom/default.php?function=textSend&id=98671>; 3) 2019 Wall and Desk calendars; 4) A poster and street banner.

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²³	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
1. GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	937,000	817,000	-	937,000
2. Recipient Country Government	Government of Lesotho	In-kind	7,500,000	2,253,542	-	7,500,000
		TOTAL	8,437,000	5,435,542	-	8,437,000

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

²³ 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.