Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

Table of contents

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Africa
Country (ies):	Angola
Project Title:	Sustainable Land Management in Target Landscapes in Angola´s Southwestern Region
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/ANG/055/GFF
GEF ID:	9798
GEF Focal Area(s):	Land Degradation
Project Executing Partners:	• Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Environment (MCTA) • National Directorate of Environment and Climate Change (DNAAC), • Center for Tropical Ecology and Climate Change (CETAC) • Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MINAGRIP)
Project Duration (years):	4 years
Project coordinates:	(Huambo and Benguela areas) *https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1qHJeri5clIz1hBsrIJKx-LcoZEX1QKdYHOFYUsIHEYk/edit?usp=sharing*

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	24 January 2020
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01 June 2020
Project Implementation End Date/NTE[1]:	01 June 2024
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) [2]	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	2,639,726
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc[3]:	15,000,000

[1] As per FPMIS
[2] If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF CU.
[3] This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)4:	1,028,161
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022[5]	1,925,000

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

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

M&E Milestones

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	7-9 February 2022
Expected Mid-term Review date[6]:	October 2022
Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):	N/A
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date[7]:	January 2024
Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	Yes (see Annex)

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	Low risk

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	César Pakissi	cesar.pakissi@fao.org
Budget Holder	Gherda Barreto	Gherda.Barreto@fao.org

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

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

Lead Technical Officer	Abram J. Bicksler and Matieu Henry	Abram.bicksler@fao.org Matieu.Henry@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Pierre Bégat	pierre.begat@fao.org

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

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

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators[8]	Baseline	Mid-term Target[9]	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress[10] since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating[11]
Reverse negative land degradation trends in	Improved national capacity for carrying out AEZ	3a) Capacity developed of CETAC's staff members, including women, to conduct the work of the AEZ Unit [related to outputs 1.2 and the job shadowing activities, and output 1.5 on the broader institutional training and networking.]	0 demonstrations / No decision support system (DSS) support mechanisms for SLM in place, but at GEF CEO Endorsement stage, 'The Wider Landscape' has been proposed as the project's broad target, designed to cover approx. 6.1 million hectares in Huambo and Benguela, and it contains 3 demo landscapes	1 demonstration / The AEZ support mechanism for integrating SLM across the Wider Landscape, which covers 6.1 million ha, is being established through the project, with the AEZ system fully functional, yielding knowledge products for the	Various demonstration results / The AEZ support mechanism is fully consolidated and includes 3 demo landscapes, with 10 SLM plans delivered, and the continued integration of SML across the Wider Landscapes, with 6.1 million ha, as well as in the 3 demo landscapes, through FFSs/APFs, as well as through	AEZ Unit was created at CETAC and four (4) of CETAC´s staff members, including two (2) women have been contracted to the work of the AEZ unit	S

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

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

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

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

selected landscapes in Central Angola by combining sustainable and rational approaches to planning, decision-making and land-use management with participatory approaches to build the capacity of local stakeholders				integration of SLM practices across the landscape, including in the demo landscapes being established.	targeted capacity building of extension services.		
		3b) post-project management modality worked out				The management modality for work post-project is being designed with CETAC and MCTA	MS
	Improved national capacity for monitoring land degradation at national scale	3c) Number of partnerships developed				25 partnerships were developed	HS
		3d) Services of the AEZ Unit delivered for other projects / initiatives				Two projects are supported with the AEZ services from the AEZ Unit	S
	Improved national capacity for generating products of spatial analysis in formats useful for SLM	3e) Number of people trained in the AEC Chipipa in collaboration with the ICE-SLM project, among them % of women who meet same qualifications criteria as men for selection				281 people were identified to be trained in the AEC Chippa in collaboration with the ICE-SLM project	MS
		3f) Number and profile of the users of the AEZ system (gender disaggregated, if possible, to anonymously collect data on it)				The AEZ system is being built	MU
	Selected rural communities, supported by SLM-trained extension workers through active AP/FFSs,	4a) Reduction of marked land degradation by around 50% compared to the reference year (2015) for land				The degree of land degradation is being assessed to be monitored	MU

		where agriculture is currently practiced;					
		4b) Restoration of 50% of ecosystems currently degraded by unsustainable land use practices;				801 hectares currently degraded by unsustainable land use practices were identified to be restored	HS
	AP/FFSs collaborate to promote agroecological approaches, including participatory land use decision-making,	4c) 30% increase of soil organic carbon content (SOC) in all land classes and halving (0.4%) the current rate of deforestation throughout the country;				The % of organic carbon in soils is yet to be assessed	U
		4d) Reinforcing information, education and awareness-raising on good land-use practices including those linked to sustainable agriculture-conservation for 80% of rural households;				33% of rural households in target areas of the project are more informed and have received awareness-raising on good land-use practices and agriculture-conservation	s
	At least 400,000 ha of multi-use demo-landscapes for SLM	4e) Reduction of 25% of livestock in areas with a strong tradition of livestock production;	0 ha	Approx. 400,000 ha of demo landscapes, where improved practices are in the process of being applied	Approx. 400,000 ha of demo landscapes, where improved practices apply	the program for capacity on SLM practices has been designed	HS
		4f) Reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by 50%.				An agroecological capacitation program were designed to generalize applications of tools and practices that contribute to reduce gas emissions	S
	Increased availability of funding for, and investments in, land restoration / rehabilitation in Angola	*Increase in overall investment (both public and private funds) mobilized for SLM*	$4.8 million, (2016/2017 GoA expenditure with SLM – to be confirmed/updated at inception)	In average, $5.0 million per year from various sources, or at least a 5% increase vis-a-vis a	In average, $5.3 million per year, or at least a 10% increase vis a vis a baseline, in case the baseline is updated.	A study of agroeconomics is being developed to identify the real necessity of investment and the potential mechanisms for financing and investment for SLM	MU

				baseline, in case the baseline is updated.			

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Improved national capacity for carrying out AEZ	Designing the strategic CETAC development plan including AEZ and SLM activities as strategic goal	MCTA and CETAC whit technical support of FAO	2022
	Contract adequate staff members for CETAC	MCTA and CETAC	2023
	Integrate mor staff member to AEZ UNIT	UM ZAEC	2023
	Training more CETAC staff on AEZ process	AEZ UNT	2023
Improved national capacity for generating products of spatial analysis in formats useful for SLM	Sign a data share agreement with all identified stakeholders for improving the national capacity to product and interpret the AEZ outputs at all levels	MCTA and CETAC whit technical support of FAO	2022
	Share essential data for AEZ process	CETAC	2022
	Contract a service provider for designing a AEZ system web service	UM ZAEC	2022
	Provide a AEZ system from a webservice for general users	UM ZAEC /CETAC	2022
Increased availability of funding for, and investments in, land restoration / rehabilitation in Angola	Purchase a soil lab to access the indices of land degradation	UM ZAEC	2022
	Carry out a study to access land degradations cost in target area	UM ZAEC /International and national agroeconomist consultant	2022
	identify a potential mechanism to finance land restoration and rehabilitation in Angola	UM ZAEC /International and national agroeconomist consultant	2022

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs[12]	Indicators		Annual Target	Main achievements[13] (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance[14] in delivering outputs
-	(as per the Logical Framework)		(as per the annual Work Plan)	-	-
Outcome 1- Improved national capacity for: (i) carrying out AEZ, (ii) monitoring land degradation at national scale and (iii) generating products of spatial analysis in formats useful for SLM					
- - - - -	Indicator #4) Benchmarks for the establishment of the AEZ Unit within CETAC:	Recruit Technical GIS Specialists	Technical GIS Specialists are recruited		Complete
		Procure hardware and software for AEZ	Most of the hardware and software installed at AEZ Unit in CETAC		In progress. Procurement underway to deliver the least hardware
			Prepare strategy for technical implementation of the AEZ Unit	AEZ Unit teams is working in CETAC,	Completed

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

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

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

		Equip local soil laboratory	An inventory of CETAC's soil lab has been produced		Completed
	-	-	This activity has been put on stand-by given the lack of institutional ownership observed so far and also the questionable capacity for sustaining the operations of the soil lab.		in progress. Procurement underway
- - **Outputs 1.1) AEZ Unit:** A service-oriented national data analysis and technical unit dedicated to agroecological zoning (AEZ), and LDN-related geospatial analysis is created at CETAC	-	Rescue historical data archived abroad	The institution with historical data archived was identified		in progress
	-		3 people from CETAC are trained and included on AEZ Unit teams, 2 women were included		Completed
	4a) Maintenance of an AEZ Unit, i.e. a team of professionals working on AEZ, including women	Develop data collection plan	Several steps are being taken to identify relevant geospatial data and which will result in a report.		in progress
	-		The approach of Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands (LADA) was selected as the technical evaluation tool to describe the baseline of monitoring indicators for ZAE and LDN and to provide the basic information for enabling activities under Component 2		Completed
- -	-		The assessment of LADA has been used as the instrument for developing the LC legend		in progress
	-		The LC legend for Chipipa, Alto Hama and Chongoroi are designed		Completed
	4b) Maintenance of the Project's Wider Landscape as the AEZ Unit' geographical scope	Define a scope of AEZ and LDN monitoring	One target community were changed on the Project wider Landscape AEZ unit geographical scope. See https://www.dropbox.com/s/1kzeqobudzlvfg2/Annex%201.%20Justification%20for%20change%20in%20target%20commune%20-%20ZAEC.pdf?dl=0		Completed
-	4c) Post-project management modality worked out		-	The management modality for the post-project period has been discussed by relevant stakeholders in preparation for, and in the aftermath of, the MRT.	Completed
-	Indicator #5) *Benchmarks for the capacity of the AEZ Unit within CETAC to provide AEZ services*				
-	-		Assist the establishment of Data-Sharing Agreements with key national institutions	The key national institution with relevant data was identified. The draft for Data Sharing Agreement was designed	in progress

Output 1.2) AEZ Services: CETAC is progressively capacitated to (i) serve as a hub for AEZ experts, including by leveraging at least 2 strategic partnerships, and (ii) maintain the provision of AEZ services to at least 3 national entities/clients beyond t	5a) Capacity developed of CETAC's staff members, including women, to conduct the work of the AEZ Unit *[related to outputs 1.2 and the job shadowing activities, and output 1.5 on the broader institutional training and networking.]*	Assist CETAC in collecting data from data-sharing institutions when necessary	Ongoing- waiting for signing of Data Sharing Agreement between identified institution and CETAC	in progress
		Implement the modules of the stakeholder training program related to AEZ, environmental monitoring with special emphasis on land degradation and LDN and planning for SLM	75 staff from different institutions (including CETAC), of which 18 (24%) are women, have received specific training and have increased their level of knowledge and technical capacity to integrate data into AEZ processes	in progress
-	5b) Extent of the Unit's ability to function in a nationwide network hub for professionals engaged in AEZ related subjects	Create and maintain a network of professionals involved in AEZ and environmental monitoring at national level	Substantial progress has been achieved in preparing the groundwork for institutional partnerships (both for data sharing and training).	in progress
-	*Indicator #6) AEZ Unit's capacity to effectively monitor land degradation parameters, ecosystem services and other agro-ecological data*			
-	-	Develop the methodological approach for field data collection, data harmonization and integration	A LADA-Local were developed as methodological approach for field data collection	Completed
-	-	Collect field data on regular basis for updating DSS platform for Huambo and Benguela	A field data collection has started on Chipipa and Chongoroi	in progress
Output 1.3) LDN monitoring: AEZ Unit provides services on monitoring of land degradation and of ecosystem services within an area of 6.1 M ha i.e. the project's Wider Landscape	**6a)** Functioning and coverage of the AEZ Unit monitoring system	Develop the AEZ geospatial database (tabular and vector)	The AEZ geospatial database was developed	Completed
-	-	Prepare the land cover maps for Huambo and Benguela provinces	Preliminary analysis of approx. 35.000 ha (corresponding to the 3 target communes) regarding LDN indicators has been carried out	in progress

-	-	Prepare datasets for LDN monitoring (national and sub-national)	The LC legend for Chipipa, Alto Hama and Chongoroi are designed to be a dataset for LDN monitoring	in progress
-	-	Undertake geospatial analysis for the Land Resource Information System of the DSS platform at provincial level (Huambo and Benguela)	The ToR for hiring a geospatial analyst is awaiting approval	in progress
-			25 national institutions were identified to establish partnerships. See annex 7	Completed
-	6b) Number of partnerships for the networked sharing and monitoring of AEZ and LDN-relevant data developed with national institutions (including INAMET, IGCA and GSA) and academia (FCA and IIA)	At least 3 partnerships secured, of which at least 1 is with academia	Four (4) partnerships were established with academia under MESCTI - FAO accord	Completed
-	-		Progress with the DSAs has stalled. A change of strategy has been adopted in which MCTA will support CETAC in signing the DSAs with target institutions	in progress
-	-	Recruit ICT Programmer Analyst for the development of WebGIS (DSS) / LRIMS	The ToR for hiring an ICT Programmer analyst is awaiting approval	in progress
-	-	Design the WebGIS DSS platform	n/a to reporting period	n/a to reporting period
-	-	Develop the WebGIS DSS platform	n/a to reporting period	n/a to reporting period
Output 1.4) AEZ System: The AEZ-based fine-scale WebGIS decision support system (DSS) for SLM, LD and ecosystem services monitoring is developed, covering 6.1 M ha (the Wider Landscape), providing relevant products, and creating a framework for the project's national up-scaling	**Indicator #7) Development of the Web GIS DSS of the CETAC's AEZ Unit**	Develop the user surveys' functionalities	n/a to reporting period	n/a to reporting period

-	-	Implement training program for the operationalization of the DSS Web platform	n/a to reporting period	n/a to reporting period
-	-	Collect field data for DSS platform for Huambo and Benguela	n/a to reporting period	n/a to reporting period
-	Train project agro-ecologists in using and teaching about the use of DSS Web platform	The project agro-ecologists are trained and prepared to provide training on the use of DSS Web platform	n/a to reporting period	n/a to reporting period
Output 1.5) A two-way hub is set up for (i) collecting AEZ data and (ii) generating AEZ products through WebGIS DSS platform	Design a training program on: 1) data collection techniques 2) using products of WebGIS DSS and other related topics	Definition of objectives and types of beneficiaries for the training program	n/a to reporting period	n/a to reporting period
-	Implement a training program dedicated to: 1) data collection techniques 2) using products of WebGIS DSS and other related topics	Train 60 selected beneficiaries who include municipal technical officers, FFS Master Trainers and FFS facilitators from Chongoroi, Chipipa and Alto Hama	n/a to reporting period	n/a to reporting period
Outcome 2.0) Selected rural communities, supported by SLM-trained extension workers through active AP/FFSs, collaborate to promote agroecological approaches, including participatory land use decision-making, in at least 400,000 ha of multi-use demo-landscapes				
	Indicator #9) Local SLM plans developed with the project's assistance in the three municipalities targeted by the project, evidenced by:			
-	9a) Number of plans developed	Design and apply LADA-Local to target sectors in the Communes of Alto Hama, Chipipa and Chongorói	9a) 10 sectors at Chipipa have been accessed by LADA-Local and aggregated to be in 3 zones with community plans of SLM	In progress

Output 2.1) SLM plans: Community-level land-use plans integrating AEZ and SLM are prepared through a participatory approach (GreeNTD) in three municipalities as part of a nested approach to landscape-level management		Produce AEZ products on a fine scale with a proposal for the allocation of land use optimized for SLM for three municipalities	AEZ products are produced on a fine scale for allocating land use optimized for SLM on Chipipa	In progress
-	9b) Number of people involved in preparation of the plans, of which how many are women	Recruit international expert in GreeNTD	The hiring process for contracting expert in participatory planning has begun	In progress
-	-	Recruit national expert in GreeNTD	The hiring process for contracting an expert in participatory planning has begun	In progress
-		Carry out the GreeNTD process at the local level in the target communities.	9b) 420 people are identified to be involved in preparation of plans	In progress
-	9c) Number of communities involved in development of plans	Plan and develop the framework for cooperation with EDAs and other relevant extension initiatives to develop the plans for carrying out training and agroecological trials to test SLM solutions in demonstration landscapes.	9c) Ten (10) communities are involved in development of plans	In progress
	Indicator #10) Qualitative assessments of integration of the SLM plans with decision making in the three municipalities targeted by the project, evidenced by:			
-	**10a)** Levels of integration of SLM into the activities of the AP/FFSs	Carry out experiences and practical demonstrations of SLM solutions and techniques in the AEC for extensionists/facilitators, in target communities through FFS/APF and other extension services	Two (2) technical notes were designed to conduct experiences and practical demonstrations of SLM on Intervention Zone (IZ) I and II on Chippa commune	In Progress
Output 2.2) A network of AP/FFSs (Agro-Pastoral and Farmer Field Schools) in three municipalities is supported in implementing SLM plans and promoting SLM practices	-		SLM activities began to be integrated on FFs in two interventions zone at Chipipa	In progress

-	10b) The extent to which SLM plans inform land-use allocation and management		Regularly report positive or negative feedback from agro-ecological experiences to the AEC at Chipipa, which in turn will transmit these data to the AEZ Unit at CETAC.	n/a to reporting period	n/a to reporting period
Output 2.3) A broad training program focused on SLM and the use of AEZ products for supporting decision-making at community-level is institutionalized and delivered	*Indicator #11) SLM training program implemented:*				
-	11a) Number and type of community stakeholders trained, including a minimum number of women	Prepare training programs	A training program is prepared for Chipipa commune		In progress
-		Provide training program for Provincial and Municipal technicians	The Provincial and Municipal technicians to be trained are identified		In progress
-	11b) Effectiveness of SLM community training and capacity building interventions, as assessed by participants through survey(s), which will be gender disaggregated as applicable		Provide training program for EDA technicians, FFS Master Trainers / facilitators and technicians from other extension services	n/a to reporting period	n/a to reporting period
Outcome 3.0) Increased availability of funding for, and investments in, land restoration / rehabilitation in Angola					
Output 3.1- Economic analyses on the cost of land degradation in Huambo and Benguela Provinces are carried out and disseminated among key decision makers to bring financial leverage and	*Indicator #13) Degree and coverage of assessment of economic cost of LD*		Conduct study on the costs of soil degradation for the main rural economic sectors of Huambo and Benguela Provinces	General information has been accessed to design a study on the cost of soil degradation	In progress

scale to the actions needed for restoring/rehabilitating land in central Angola				
-	-	Produce report on the costs of soil degradation for rural economic activities	To be started	to be started
-	**Indicator #14***) Number of professionals from MCTA, MINAGRIF, MINTURI and relevant NGOs trained in lobbying and advocacy for SLM funding, including a minimum number of women*	Develop mechanism to monitor / update information on the costs / benefits of soil degradation / recovery.	n/a to reporting period	n/a to reporting period
-		Disseminate conclusions from the study to key decision-makers through works to highlight the importance of LD, SLM (its mainstreaming and finance)	n/a to reporting period	n/a to reporting period
Output 3.2- Mainstream and innovative finance options for SLM are assessed, explored/probed, and enabling action is undertaken to operationalize them in the targeted municipalities with fundraising campaigns are organized, and projects are formulated to mobilize funds	*Indicator #15) Number of professionals from relevant entities (in MCTA, MINAGRIF, MINTURI and relevant NGOs) trained in fundraising and resource mobilization for SLM in, including a minimum number of women*		n/a to reporting period	n/a to reporting period
-	*Indicator #16) Number of supported projects to pilot and adjust the funding mechanisms for SLM*	Explore and identify sources of financing for SLM.	n/a to reporting period	n/a to reporting period
-	*Indicator #17) Increases in public funds mobilized for SLM (state budget earmarked for SLM)*		n/a to reporting period	n/a to reporting period
	Indicator #18) *Operational status of a trust fund for community based SLM projects is in place with solid governance*	Develop trust fund	n/a to reporting period	n/a to reporting period

	mechanisms and institutional support			
Output 3.3) Community-based SLM finance, public-private partnerships and targeted matching grants are designed and implemented to channel funds from various funding sources	Indicator #19) *Number of SLM community-based projects to have received financial technical assistance or funding through the trust fund* ***(which includes financial technical assistance****)*	Develop SLM Financing mechanisms to channel funds from trust fund to community-level projects	n/a to reporting period	n/a to reporting period
	Indicator #20) *Number of local stakeholders benefitting from finance options for SLM, including a minimum number of female memberships*	Support the design of SLM-related projects/initiatives and finance their implementation through the Trust Fund	n/a to reporting period	n/a to reporting period

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

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

The major key achievements during the reporting period are the following:

1. Implementation of the training program for stakeholders in Agro-Ecological Zoning and in GIS / Remote Sensing applied to Natural Resources.

The program has been implemented for both training cycles. The respective reports can be consulted through the following link: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/payopnokfgc4yuu/AACGbWMZtlFpOQuHXDMGEl1ua?dl=0

2. Partnership for the establishment of data sharing agreements. For most of the target institutions:

• the data to be shared has been identified;
• preliminary versions of the agreements were discussed;
• the scheduling of dates for signature and effective sharing is still pending in account of MCTA and CETAC non-definition about who will sign with other institutions.

3. Selection of Target Sectors within the three target communes for Implementation of project activities

As a follow up of the training on SDG indicator 15.3.1, field missions were carried out in the target communes to identify 'hot' and 'bright spots' of land degradation and also specific initiatives that could be monitored vis-à-vis Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) and Sustainable Land Management (GST) indicators. This exploration had the objective of providing a basis for selecting intervention sectors and respective FFSs and communities. The selection of target sectors began, and the LADA-Local assessment was conducted on Chipipa commune. The reports of these field missions and LADA-Local assessment are accessible here: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/4tdw76hb81q27l6/AABm8whYnM6TTpZx0GV_ycLja?dl=0

4. Establishment of an Ecological Perimeter at the Chipipa Agro-Ecological Center

Experimental activities were started at the Chipipa Agroecological Center to create a community seed bank to support training activities and the installation of agroecological production systems of an "Ecological Perimeter". This perimeter, to be established within the boundaries of the Chipipa Agro-Ecological Center, will be developed through FFSs and co-managed by the farmers from

the communities surrounding the AEC, the PMUs of FAO projects ZAEC, CETAC, CAE, the MCTA's ICE-SLM Project Coordination Unit and a representative from MINAGRIP IDA/EDA.

5. Training program focused on SLM and the use of AEZ products for supporting decision-making at community-level.

Two (2) technical notes and two (2) different capacitation programs were developed for carrying out a SLM training on seven (7) administrative sectors at Chippa. In those sectors, 420 farmers from 14 FFs were identified to be capacitated. The sectors in account of their similarity, proximity and sharing of natural resource were aggregated on two (2) Intervention Zone to be supported on SLM practices

6. Delivery of essential technical training activities for the project team

Two workshops were carried out by FAO's Geospatial Unit from the Land and Water Division (NSL) and the Asian Institute of Technology (AIT):

1. *Introduction to Agroecological Zoning: Framework for Agricultural Development and Land Use Planning* (October 11 - 15)
2. *Agroecological Zoning using* Python (October 25 – 29)

The beneficiaries of these workshops were, to a large extent, consultants of the ZAEC project. These workshops were complemented by a specific training on:

3. Monitoring the SDG LDN National Indicator 15.3.1 Using SEPAL (October 18-21)

Targeting the project team and also the National LDN Technical Group, this workshop was also delivered by FAO's Geospatial Unit. This training activity kick-started the local preparation of field activities to support LDN monitoring in the three target communes. The training took place virtually with the observation, analysis and interpretation of results being carried out through field activities between October 18 and November 5 in the Communes of Chipipa, Alto Hama and Chongoroi (mentioned above under #3).

These virtual workshops were complemented by another one on Land Cover Mapping and LC Legend Development. These workshops were crucial for developing the internal capacity of the project team and to successfully advance with the implementation of Component 1 consistently with the methodological approaches that FAO has developed/adopted in these domains. Because of this, they were an important milestone for the development of the AEZ Unit. The report of these trainings can be consulted here: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/ungggu4u6935tf/AACLuvssZ0Spmu1KsQ6vYGeua?dl=0

7.

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

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

	FY2022 Development Objective rating[15]	FY2022 Implementation Progress rating[16]	Comments/reasons[17] justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	**S**	**MS**	*Ratings/Comments* *Till this report period we can rate the development objective as satisfactory because according to the action developed in field the community on target area of the project began to understand the goal of SLM and how it will change their livelihoods, increase the benefices of the natural resources, and contribute to the sustainability*
Budget Holder	**S**	**MS**	*Ratings/comments* The reported results have been rated as satisfactory. They are showing positive activities held, particularly on Training recipient, Data-Sharing, Research, and monitoring support to community.
GEF Operational Focal Point[18]	**S**	**S**	The ZAEC project activities are Satisfactory according to the Development objectives (DO); More engagement from CETAC, stakeholders, Project management Unit and Field are needed to improve the results. I recommend the ZAEC project management unit to put all its efforts as always in order to speed up the implementation process. of project components. I recommend the management unit of ZAEC project Continue to regularly implement the Steering Committee meetings. Bring more approach between project activities and community, traditional authorities, woman's NGOs, University students. And strength or reinforce the work with Local administration officers in a way to keep government at local level more involved. Promote more capacity building and project activities on the media's, TV Interviews, Radios, Instagram, Facebook, also true community meetings etc. to inform the society of project existence and objectives and expected outputs. Continue to involve Civil Society Organization as partners to support the project activities.

[15] **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.
For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

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

[17] Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

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

Lead Technical Officer[19]	**S**	**MS**	The project activities are overall satisfactory according to the Development Objective (DO) – see section 2. Implementation Progress (IP) is moderately satisfactory – see section 3. It seems that some of the bottlenecks to be overcome include better support from the FAO Angola and HQ teams for procurement and contracts in addition to greater support from the government (CETAC) counterparts, especially related to the AEZ Center at CETAC and capacitation
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	**S**	**MS**	*Despite some barriers that need to be overcome in the next reporting period (e.g. delayed procurement), the project is contributing satisfactorily to the development objective. In the next reporting period, increased support from FAO Angola to expedite procurement processes as well as from government partners to carry out ongoing activities (e.g. signature and operationalization of data-sharing agreements) will be required. The MTR will also be expected to provide recommendations to increase efficiency and foster delivery in the second half of project implementation. The execution of funding-related activities under Outputs 3.2 and 3.3 should start soon as expected benefits may take time to materialize.*

[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)

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

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

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

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

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.
No grievance has been received

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

6. Risks

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

nº	Type of risk	Risk rating[21]	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Municipal, provincial and national authorities involved by the process may not realize the project's importance, thus not being sufficiently motivated to effectively "own" the project and work towards a common vision. Lack of effective and timely cooperation between different stakeholders / entities, hindering the delivery of expected results.	High	Yes	Effective communication strategies must be deployed from the outset to ensure that relevant stakeholders realize the strategic importance of the project for Angola's long-term sustainable development. Structured partnerships promote project ownership and also foresee communication flows that promote a sense of inclusion among stakeholders.	A link has been established with the relevant stakeholders and the focal points are designed to follow the project actions. Monthly and trimestral reports are shared with MCTA and all PSC members. The PSC works also as an important space to discuss project implementation.	The risks were well identified and the PMU have address them carefully to minimize their impact and achieve the best results.

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

2	The proposed fit of the AEZ Unit at CETAC fails to work as it should due to the difficulty of CETAC's management model in hosting an independent technical unit. This would disturb the capacitation strategy set in place, putting at the risk the capacity of the project to reach its objectives and the project's long-term sustainability.	Low	Yes	The PSC would intervene to assess the situation and propose mitigation measures to resolve potential tensions within CETAC's management.	The AEZ Unit is working and some CETAC´s staff are integrated into the capacity's programs.	As above.
3	Remote locations causing problems with personnel, logistics, maintenance, etc.	Low	Yes	The selection of communities sought to minimize this risk by using ease of access as one of the factors for the final shortlist. Local professionals and those of the AEZ Unit are supported on the ground by the municipal administrations and respective infrastructure in the targeted project areas.	Target communities were selected based on, *inter alia*, ease of access.	As above.
4	New practices might clash with local cultures, resulting in slow adaptation of actions (gender, new forms of management, more effective management, alternative use of resources...)	Low	Yes	The project addresses this risk by joint planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation in order to create project ownership from the start. Only practices with high social acceptance that meet stakeholders' needs and cultural habits will be promoted by the AP/FFSs. The GreeNTD methodology will take cultural differences into consideration and will seek to find common ground through the negotiated agreements.	The Lada-Assessment, and GreeNTD methodology are being applied and useful to understand culture differences and find common ground through the negotiated agreements	As above.
5	Degradation of ecosystem due to droughts and climate shocks. Extreme climatic or environmental conditions may prevent the	High	Yes	Project-level emergency actions are discussed and planned with participatory methods as part of the SLM plans, which will consider different environmental scenarios, including the occurrence of extreme events. Appropriate linking with on-going emergency / post-emergency initiatives will improve responses to those risks.	The SLM plans and the capacitation on SLM methodology are taking in account drought and climate risks in target zones.	As above.

	implementation of the SLM plans as expected.					
6	Difficulty in successfully integrating the proposed synergetic activities of this project with those of the other relevant projects because cross-sectoral and institutional collaboration is more of an exception than the rule.	Low	Yes	Involvement and mobilization of local administrations and the management teams of other projects. Implementation arrangements will include strategies to minimize and mitigate this risk. In addition, during the PPG stage, a concerted effort was carried out in terms of: (i) identifying and listing relevant baseline and related initiatives, as well as opportunities for technical integration with relevant projects; (ii) conducting a thorough Capacity Needs Assessment; (iv) involving stakeholders and documenting; (iv) reassessing the presence of indigenous people in project demo landscapes, which showed to be 'not confirmed' – and hence with a decreased socio-environmental risk; (v) applied all due diligence and safeguards till the project could then be classified as E&S compliant and 'low risk'.	Local administrations are mobilized and involved in the project interventions. The implementation strategies are applied to minimize the risk of droughts and climate shocks. (i) the IC-SLM project was identified as a relevant initiative to coordinate with in Chipipa (ii) the needs of capacities were assessed and two capacity-building programs on SLM practices, and water and seed management were designed for different stakeholders (iii) no indigenous people were identified in target project zones	As above.
7	The project's core contributions are not sufficiently linked to and integrated with existing initiatives and projects (AEZ system and products, SLM plans, capacitation, financial mechanisms). The project contributions may end up being poorly integrated and underused, rendering the project one more isolated initiative without far-reaching or long-lasting impact.	Low	Yes	The PSC and PMU will systematically work towards the maximization of synergies and linkages with other projects and with the Angolan administrative and planning system to make sure that the projects outputs build on and built on (i.e. put to use) by other initiatives. Pro-active efforts towards stakeholder engagement will be applied during implementation, not least also building from the sound baseline of information contained in the CNA and in other PPG studies, all of which are duly reflected in the content of the FAO GEF PRODOC.	During PSC meetings, information was shared on other similar and complementary initiatives to elicit synergies and linkages. The PMU has been liaising with other projects and the ZAEC outputs (e.g. GIS tools) have been capitalized upon by other projects.	As above.

8	The existence of many actors involved in land management renders SLM and planning initiatives administratively complex and difficult to address in an organized way. Too many actors and institutions claim to be excluded from project related decision-making, resulting in their unwillingness to collaborate or facilitate the proposed processes, putting the achievement of project outcomes at risk	Moderate	Yesk.	The project will address this risk though well-structured and inclusive project management, making sure that all relevant actors are at least informed of the project's implementation steps and processes prior to their occurrence and as they take place. Part of this strategy may be implemented though the national AEZ outreach online platform by including a webpage with updated information on the planned project interventions, making them accessible to any interested stakeholder.	The relevant actors at national and local levels are identified and frequently informed of the project implementation. The online platform is to be launched at CETAC webpage to make all information accessible.	As above.

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

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

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

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

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented during this Fiscal Year
Recommendation 1:	Not applicable
Recommendation 2:	Not applicable
Recommendation 3:	Not applicable
Recommendation 4:	Not applicable

Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe	**Not yet**

8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines[22]. Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories. And, provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework			
Components and cost	The budget by component was adjusted on account of minor changes to team contracts and to be aligned with arrangements on operational implementation https://www.dropbox.com/s/u487cxb9tkormpi/Acta%20da%202%C2%AA%20Plenaria%20CSIP-%20Bengue.pdf?dl=0	27/07/2021	PSC
Institutional and implementation arrangements	The PMU introduced three new technical positions at UT ZAEC due to the necessity to guarantee all the results and deliverables under component 1 as predicted by the framework https://www.dropbox.com/s/ff9i1yksvi3n19q/Acta%20da%201%20%C2%AA%20Plenaria%20CSIP%5B17%5D.pdf?dl=0	28/07/2021	PSC
Financial management	The budget for an LoA was changed to capacity building program due to incapacity of potential institutions to provide the services to be delivered by LoA https://www.dropbox.com/s/traoof5sfovgvqp/Or%C3%A7amento%20com%20uma%20compara%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20entre%20a%20vers%C3%A3o%20inicial%20e%20a%20proposta.xlsx?dl=0	28/07/2021	PSC
Implementation schedule			
Executing Entity			
Executing Entity Category			
Minor project objective change			
Safeguards			
Risk analysis	Risk analysis was changed due to the global disruptions caused by COVID		
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%			
Co-financing			
Location of project activity	A slight adjustment to the project's geographical scope was introduced. See https://www.dropbox.com/s/1kzeqobudzlvfg2/Annex%201.%20Justification%20for%20change%20in%20target%20commune%20-%20ZAEC.pdf?dl=0	**07/02/2022**	PSC
Other			

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

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

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

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government Institutions			
Institute for Agronomic Research	Training	One module about relevant soil data for AEZ was developed with technical support of IIA, during the training on AEZ	
UAN - Agostinho Neto University	Training recipient Data-Sharing	Six (6) researchers and teachers were capacitated on SIG and remote sensing. Three (3) students were trained on agroecological zoning. The data to be shared were identified and the accord to be signed was technically discussed	According to the Project Steering Committee PSC decision on second meeting the data sharing agreement will be signed with CETAC
José Eduardo dos Santos University Faculty of Agricultural Sciences	Training recipient Data-Sharing	Nine (9) researchers and teachers were capacitated on SIG and remote sensing. Eight (8) students were trained on agroecological zoning. The data to be shared were identified and the accord to be signed was technically discussed	A program is being designed to include at least five monitors on graduation or post-graduation stages, on the ZAEC field activities. Those activities will be monitored with field data collection during the LADA-Assessment and agroecological training

ISCED Huíla - Higher Institute of Education Sciences Huila	Training recipient Data-Sharing Research and monitoring support to community	Five (5) researchers and teachers were capacitated on SIG and remote sensing. Three (3) students were trained on agroecological zoning. No data were identified as relevant to be shared	A program is being designed to include at least five monitors on graduation or post-graduation stage, on the ZAEC field activities.
ISCED-Huambo -Higher Institute of Education Sciences	Training recipient Data-Sharing Research and monitoring support to community	Eight (8) researchers and teachers were capacitated on SIG and remote sensing. One (1) student was trained on agroecological zoning. No data were identified as relevant to be shared	A program is being designed to include at least five monitors on graduation or post-graduation stage, on the ZAEC field activities.
ITAH-Technical Institute of Agronomy of Huambo	Training recipient	Three (3) teachers were capacitated on SIG and remote sensing	
Provincial Cabinet for Agriculture - Huambo	Training recipient	To be capacitated on SLM program	
Provincial Cabinet for Agriculture - Benguela	Training recipient	To be capacitated on SLM program	
Municipal Administration of Londuimbale	Training recipient	To be capacitated on SLM program	
Municipal Administration of Chongoroi	Training recipient	To be capacitated on SLM program	
IDA- Institute for Agrarian Development - Huambo	Training recipient	To be capacitated on SLM program	
IDA-Institute for Agrarian Development - Benguela	Training recipient	One technician was capacitated on SIG and remote sensing	
IGCA - Geodesic and Cadastral Institute of Angola	Data-Sharing	The data to be shared was and the agreement to be signed was technically discussed	According to the SPC decision during the second meeting, the data sharing agreement will be signed with CETAC
INAMET - National Institute of Meteorology and Geophysics	Training recipient Data-Sharing	four (4) technicians were capacitated on SIG and remote sensing; The data to be shared	According to the SPC decision on second meeting the data sharing agreement will be signed with CETAC

		were identified and the accord to be signed was technically discussed	
INRH -National Institute of Water Resources	Training recipient Data-Sharing	Three (3) technicians were capacitated on SIG and remote sensing; The data to be shared were identified and the accord to be signed was technically discussed	According to the SPC decision during the second meeting the data sharing agreement will be signed with CETAC
Institute of Geology	Training recipient Data-Sharing	One (1) technician was capacitated on SIG and remote sensing; The data to be shared were identified and the accord to be signed was technically discussed	According to the SPC decision during the second meeting the data sharing agreement will be signed with CETAC
CETAC -Center for Tropical Ecology and Climate Change	Training recipient Data-Sharing	Four (4) technicians were capacitated on SIG and remote sensing Three (3) technicians were trained on agroecological zoning	CETAC is being capacitated to be the central institution on AEZ processes. It is being supported by ZAEC to sign a data share agreement with all relevant stakeholders
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
DW - Development Workshop	Stakeholders for eventual synergy to discuss community SLM land plan and for monitoring fielding activities	The area, approach, and scope of interventions in community were identified	To be involved, if necessary, on GreeNTD process
World Vision	Stakeholders for eventual synergy to discuss community SLM land plan and for monitoring fielding activities	The area, approach and scope of interventions in community were identified	To be involved, if necessary, on GreeNTD process
ADRA - Action for Rural Development and Environment	Stakeholders for eventual synergy to discuss community SLM land plan and for monitoring fielding activities	The area, approach, and scope of interventions in community were identified	To be involved, if necessary, on GreeNTD process

Private sector entities			
ISPT -Higher Polytechnic Institute of Tundavala	Training recipient Data-Sharing	Four (4) researchers and teachers were capacitated on SIG and remote sensing. Three (3) students were trained on agroecological zoning. The data to be shared were identified and the accord to be signed was technically discussed	According to the SPC decision on second meeting the data sharing agreement will be signed with CETAC
Others[1]			
FFS-Farmer Field Schools; ECAS	Principal beneficiary in all project actions	The principal needs were identified to train the members of FFS on AEZ output and SLM processes	The FFS members recognize their land degradation actions
SASSCAL - Southern African Science Centre for Climate Change and Adaptive Land Management	Data-Sharing	The data to be share were identified and the accord to be signed was technically discussed	According to the SPC decision on second meeting the data share agreement will be signed with CETAC
New stakeholders identified/engaged			

10. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) during this reporting period.

Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	Yes	The gender socioeconomic analyses are being accessed with LADA-Local approach
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	The project in its approach has used a methodology to identify and take account of all opportunities to promote gender equality and women' empowerment. A specific action was designed to increase the sustainable activity of women on agroecology and agribusiness. Twenty women on rural community have been identified to be capacitated on agroecology and agribusiness
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
a) Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Yes	By using the AEZ product's and SLM trainings the project is increasing womens' access to natural resources
b) Improving womens' participation and decision making	Yes	With the GreeNTD approach the women are being integrated on building the community Land management plan
c) Generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	The SLM practices and access to financial mechanisms will generate socio-economic impacts and real benefits/services for women
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	During the implementation of the project tools are being applied to M&E to collect disaggregated data on gender
Staff with gender expertise		Project Coordinator
Any other good practices on gender		Seed banking could be listed here; solar pumps might also help with women's time burdens; taking a high view of NRM to preserve and protect

		watersheds should also benefit water availability and reduce womens' time burdens

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval during this reporting period.

Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.	Yes, the project has a knowledge management strategy. The relevant good practices that can be learned and shared with from project are: (how can you collect and document these activities below?) • The number and diversity of stakeholders involved on AEZ capacitation program • The national and international dialog established on AEZ processes • The interaction with other FAO projects on going • The tools used and the involvement with the community on identifications of LD and LDN practices
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	Yes, it has. The communication strategy is implemented at all levels. • With MCTA during this year a monthly report was provided. • The PPRs are shared with all SCP members once available • The actions of AEZ and SLM process are shared at the national level including government and university institutions • In the three-project target zone, the local governments and communities' leaders are informed about project activities • The CETAC virtual platform was identified as a dissemination site for regular publication of project activities and results
Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.	Three human-interested stories related to SLM were recorded and can be assessed here https://www.dropbox.com/sh/p2cvo6j4jp9qvf9/AAB4lgIQd59XkckpbOIPam6Na?dl=0
Please provide links to related website, social media account	A social media and website are to be created
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets,	

video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details	Catia Marinheiro Catia.marinheiro@fao.org +244948545878

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

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

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing[1]	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval (USD)	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (Confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National Government	**MCTA, GABAC**	**Public Investment**	8 000 000,00	1 000 000,00		8 000 000,00
Local Government	**MCTA, CETAC**	**In-kind**	1 500 000,00	375 000,00		1 500 000,00
Local Government	**MCTA, CETAC**	**Public Investment**	500 000,00	125 000,00		500 000,00
National Government	**MINAGRIF**	**Public Investment**	4 500 000,00	125 000,00		4 500 000,00
Agency	**FAO**	**In-kind**	500 000,00	300 000,00		500 000,00
		TOTAL	15 000 000,00	1 925 000,00		15 000 000,00

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

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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

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

Annex: revised GEF Core Indicators

As required, the original GEF6 Results Framework was translated into the GEF7 Results Framework architecture and updated prior to the MTR.

GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet

Core Indicator 1	**Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use**						***(Hectares)***
			Hectares (1.1+1.2)				
			Expected		Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 1.1	Terrestrial protected areas newly created						
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares				
			Expected		Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
		(select)					
		(select)					
		Sum					
Indicator 1.2	Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness						
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares	METT Score			
				Baseline		Achieved	
					Endorsement	MTR	TE
		(select)					
		(select)					
		Sum					
Core Indicator 2	**Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use**						***(Hectares)***
			Hectares (2.1+2.2)				
			Expected		Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	*TE*	
Indicator 2.1	Marine protected areas newly created						
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares				
			Expected		Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
		(select)					
		(select)					
		Sum					
Indicator 2.2	Marine protected areas under improved management effectiveness						
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares	METT Score			
				Baseline		Achieved	
				PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		(select)					
		(select)					
		Sum					
Core Indicator 3	**Area of land restored**						***(Hectares)***
			Hectares (3.1+3.2+3.3+3.4)				
			Expected		Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	

Indicator 3.1	Area of degraded agricultural land restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 3.2	Area of forest and forest land restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 3.3	Area of natural grass and shrublands restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 3.4	Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 4	**Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)**					***(Hectares)***
		Hectares (4.1+4.2+4.3+4.4)				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
		n/a	400,000	*801*		
Indicator 4.1	Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 4.2	Area of landscapes that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations					
Third party certification(s):		Hectares				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 4.3	Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			n/a	*400,000*	*801*	
Indicator 4.4	Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided					
Include documentation that justifies HCVF		Hectares				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Core Indicator 5	**Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity**					***(Hectares)***

Indicator 5.1	Number of fisheries that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations					
Third party certification(s):			Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 5.2	Number of large marine ecosystems (LMEs) with reduced pollution and hypoxial					
			Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 5.3	Amount of Marine Litter Avoided					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 6	**Greenhouse gas emission mitigated**					***(Metric tons of CO_2e)***
			Expected metric tons of CO_2e (6.1+6.2)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
	Expected CO2e (direct)					
	Expected CO2e (indirect)					
Indicator 6.1	Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector					
			Expected metric tons of CO_2e			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
	Expected CO2e (direct)					
	Expected CO2e (indirect)					
	Anticipated start year of accounting					
	Duration of accounting					
Indicator 6.2	Emissions avoided Outside AFOLU					
			Expected metric tons of CO_2e			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
	Expected CO2e (direct)					
	Expected CO2e (indirect)					
	Anticipated start year of accounting					
	Duration of accounting					
Indicator 6.3	Energy saved					
			MJ			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 6.4	Increase in installed renewable energy capacity per technology					
		Technology	Capacity (MW)			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		(select)				
		(select)				
Core Indicator 7	**Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management**					***(Number)***
Indicator 7.1	Level of Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Program (TDA/SAP) formulation and implementation					
			Rating (scale 1-4)			

		Shared water ecosystem	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 7.2	Level of Regional Legal Agreements and Regional Management Institutions to support its implementation					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 7.3	Level of National/Local reforms and active participation of Inter-Ministerial Committees					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 7.4	Level of engagement in IWLEARN through participation and delivery of key products					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			Rating		Rating	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 8	**Globally over-exploited marine fisheries Moved to more sustainable levels**					***(Metric Tons)***
Fishery Details			Metric Tons			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 9	**Reduction, disposal/destruction, phase out, elimination and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste in the environment and in processes, materials and products**					***(Metric Tons)***
			Metric Tons (9.1+9.2+9.3)			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	PIF stage	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.1	Solid and liquid Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) removed or disposed (POPs type)					
POPs type			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
(select)	(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)	(select)				
Indicator 9.2	Quantity of mercury reduced					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.3	Hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFC) Reduced/Phased out					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.4	Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste					
			Number of Countries			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.5	Number of low-chemical/non-chemical systems implemented particularly in food production, manufacturing and cities					
		Technology	Number			

			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.6	Quantity of POPs/Mercury containing materials and products directly avoided					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	PIF stage	Endorsement
Core Indicator 10	**Reduction, avoidance of emissions of POPs to air from point and non-point sources**					***(grams of toxic equivalent gTEQ)***
Indicator 10.1	Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control emissions of POPs to air					
			Number of Countries			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 10.2	Number of emission control technologies/practices implemented					
			Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 11	**Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment**					***(Number)***
			Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		Female	*n/a*			
		Male	*n/a*			
		Total	*n/a*			