



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

Sustainable Land Management in target landscapes in Angola's southwestern region (FSP) -
GCP/ANG/055/GFF

Reported Period: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	11
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	19
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	23
6. RISKS	25
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	28
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	30
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	31
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	35
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	37
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	39
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	40

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Africa
Country (ies):	Angola
Project Title:	Sustainable Land Management in Target Landscapes in Angola's Southwester Region
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/ANG/055/GEF
GEF ID:	9798
GEF Focal Area(s):	Land Degradation
Project Executing Partners:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of Environment (MINAMB) • National Directorate of Environment and Climate Change (DNAAC), • Center for Tropical Ecology and Climate Change (CETAC) • Ministry of Agriculture and Forest (MINAGRIF)
Initial project duration (years):	4 years
Project coordinates: <i>This section should be completed ONLY by:</i> a) Projects with 1st PIR; b) In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.	N/A

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	24 January 2020
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01 June 2020
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	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 (USD)³:	15,000,000
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	USD 1,691,580

¹ As per FPMIS

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

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

Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)⁴:	USD 1,491,852
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023⁵	USD 11,625,000

⁴ The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

⁵ Please refer to the Section 13 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	7-9 February 2022
Expected Mid-term Review date ⁶ :	October 2022
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	31 August 2023
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date ⁷ :	April 2024
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	YES <i>See annex 3</i>

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

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

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	César Pakissi	cesar.pakissi@fao.org
Budget Holder (BH)	Gherda Barreto	Gherda.Barreto@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)	Julio Ingles Joao Ferreira	chandalajif@ yahoo.com
Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Ronnie Brathwaite, and Matieu Henry	Ronnie.Brathwaite@fao.org Matieu.Henry@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	Pierre Bégat	Pierre.begat@fao.org

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

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

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

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

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
Reverse negative land degradation trends in selected landscapes in Central Angola by combining sustainable and rational approaches to planning,	Outcome 1						
	(i) 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	1 demonstration / The AEZ support mechanism for integrating SLM across the Wider Landscape, which covers 6.1 million ha, is being	Various demonstration results / The AEZ support mechanism is fully consolidated and includes 3 demo landscapes, with 10 SLM plans delivered, and	The national capacity to carry out AEZ is being improved. AEZ Unit is fully working at CETAC, 3 demo landscapes are being monitored and 6 SLM plans are delivered for Chipipa and Chongoroi	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). Refer to Annex 1.

<p>decision-making and land-use management with participatory approaches to build the capacity of local stakeholders</p>			<p>broad target, designed to cover approx. 6.1 million hectares in Huambo and Benguela, and it contains 3 demo landscapes</p>	<p>established through the project, with the AEZ system fully functional, yielding knowledge products for the integration of SLM practices across the landscape, including in the demo landscapes (Chipipa, Alto Hama and Chongoroi) being established.</p>	<p>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 targeted capacity building of extension services.</p>		
	<p>(ii) Improved national capacity for monitoring land degradation at national scale</p>	<p>3b) post-project management modality worked out</p>	<p>0 ha</p>	<p>Approx. 400,000 ha of demo landscapes, where improved practices are in the process of being applied</p>	<p>Approx. 400,000 ha of demo landscapes, where improved practices apply</p>	<p>The national capacity to monitor land degradation is improved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 357 200 ha of landscapes of Chipipa, Chongoroi and Alto Hama are being monitored. • 38 737 ha aggregated from Chipipa, Chongoroi and Alto Hama has been evaluated as improved area during 2021. • The AEZ Unit management modality for work post-project on CETAC is being designed with MINAMB. • Sustainability guidelines for the AEZ Unit post-project are being defined aligned with MINAMB to be co-managed by CETAC and included on next budget and National Workplan 	<p>HS</p>

2023 Project Implementation Report

		3c) Number of partnerships developed				25 partnerships were developed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24 institutions as trainer recipients on GIS, remoting sense, AEZ, and SLM • 22 engaged to share data. 	HS
		3d) Services of the AEZ Unit delivered for other projects / initiatives				4 projects are supported with the AEZ services from the AEZ Unit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the Operationalization of the SADC Regional Agricultural Policy (STOSAR)"- GCP/SFS/004/EC • United States Forest Service (USFS) - Forests Training in Geospatial Technologies for Sustainable Forest Management • Faculty of agriculture science was supported with AEZ products to design the Tchandangombe Project that is an SLM initiative. • Angola initiative of "Integrated landscape management to reduce land degradation and increase community resilience in the Miombo-Mopane arid forests was supported to training stakeholders on GIS tools. • IC-SLM-project form MINAMB, supported with products to design SLM plans and activities on Agroecological Centre of Chipipa 	HS
(iii) 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 trained (60% are women) in Chipipa in collaboration with the ICE-SLM (GCP UTF/ANG/068/ANG)project	HS
		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 and the people from FFS trained on Chipipa are available to interpret some products	MS
Outcomes							

2023 Project Implementation Report

	2) Selected rural communities, supported by SLM-trained extension workers through active AP/FFSs,	8a) Reduction of marked land degradation by around 50% compared to the reference year (2015) for land where agriculture is currently practiced;				In average 37.5% of degraded Land are under management to be recovered <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 801 ha at Chipipa • 385.77 ha at Chongoroi • Alto Hama is to be started. 	S
		8b) Restoration of 50% of ecosystems currently degraded by unsustainable land use practices;				restoration of degraded ecosystems has been started. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 45% of land degradation at Ngunga-Chipipa is being restored under sustainable land management practices mostly with agroforest and natural resource management. • 30 % of land degradation at Chitata, Cambandi and Uvombo is being restored under sustainable land management practices related to reducing the cattle and the grazing pressure on agricultural land 	S
	AP/FFSs collaborate to promote agroecological approaches, including participatory land use decision-making	8c) 30% increase of soil organic carbon content (SOC) in all land classes and halving (0.4%) the current rate of deforestation throughout the country;				To be accessed on following years marked land degraded are under sustainable land management at Chipipa and Chongoroi	S
		8d) Reinforcing information, education and awareness-raising on good land-use practices including those linked to sustainable agriculture-conservation for 80% of rural households;				69% 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	8e) Reduction of 25% of livestock in areas with a strong tradition of livestock production;				The training on SLM activities started at Uvombo - Chongoroi to reduce the livestock. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 33% of the degraded area under pasture effects is under exclusive management as an agricultural area in Cambandi and Chitata • 30% of the area degraded by grazing effects in Uvombo is identified to start training in SLM practices to reduce grazing pressure on land degradation. 	S

	8f) Reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by 50%.					To be measured on flowing years as an effect of the adopted SLM practices	S
	Outcomes 3						
3) Increased availability of funding for, and investments in, land restoration / rehabilitation in Angola	12) 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 baseline, in case the baseline is updated.	In average, \$5.3 million per year, or at least a 10% increase vis a vis a baseline, in case the baseline is updated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The government is being advised to increase available funds to invest on land restoration. An Integrated Land Use Planning has been designed to use as prototype doc with methodological approach to increase the investment on land restoration. A brief policy for Ngunga was designed to be used as fundamental tool to avoid more financial support to SLM activities 		MS
	Key target benchmark: Key-decision makers have a solid understanding of how to bring financial leverage and scale to SLM initiatives, resulting in the active mobilization and deployment of investment at both landscape and community level.						
	\$4.8 million per year (2016/2017 GoA expenditure with SLM - base year 2016 – to be confirmed/updated at inception)						

Measures taken to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings on Section 2

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
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	MINAMB, CTAC, INAMET, INRH, IGC, FCA, with technical support of FAO	2023
	Contract a service provider for designing a AEZ system web service	Unit project management	2023
	Provide a AEZ system from a webservice for general users.	UM ZAEC /CETAC	2023
Increased availability of funding for, and investments in, land restoration / rehabilitation in Angola	Identify national line budget to finance SLM initiatives	UM ZAEC/and local authorities	2023
	identify a potential mechanism to finance land restoration and rehabilitation in Angola	UM ZAEC /International and national agroeconomist consultant	2023
	support rural communities to submit proposals to different funding mechanisms on SLM	Unit project management, CETAC and MINAMB	2023

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
Outcome 1.0- 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	3a) Capacity developed of CETAC's staff members, including women, to conduct the work of the AEZ Unit	Capacitate all CETAC staff on AEZ	There is no adequate staff in CETAC to be capacitated. CETAC need recruit urgently technicians to join AEZ Unit	
	3b) Post-project management modality worked out	Support CETAC to design a development plan	The ToR were submitted at CETAC and to MINAMB the process is on standby	
	3c) Number of partnerships developed.	Maintain the partnerships established on previous years	The partnerships are maintained with 20 instructional stakeholders	
	3d) Services of the AEZ Unit delivered for other projects / initiatives.	Support at least 3 projects with AEZ unit services	4 projects and/initiatives are supported with the delivery services of the AEZ Unit	
	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	Train at least 140 people from 4 FFS	173 people were trained in Chipipa in collaboration with the ICE-SLM project. 60% are women	
	3f) Number and profile of the users of the AEZ system (gender disaggregated, if possible, to anonymously collect data on it)	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

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

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

<p>Output 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</p>	<p>4a) Maintenance of an AEZ Unit, i.e. a team of professionals working on AEZ, including women</p>	<p>Procure hardware and software for AEZ</p>	<p>AEZ unit equipped</p>	
		<p>Equip local soil laboratory</p>	<p>the local assessment determined that this activity was not feasible because the local partners already had sufficient capacity to meet this need through data sharing</p>	<p>N/A</p>
		<p>Prepare strategy for technical implementation of AEZ</p>	<p>The AEZ Unit is implemented and work at CETAC There's constrains on no permanent and adequate staff exist at CETAC</p>	<p>80 % in progress</p>
		<p>Develop data collection plan</p>	<p>Data collection plan is developed and been applied</p>	
		<p>Rescue historical data archived abroad</p>	<p>Historical data are rescued since 1990</p>	<p>In progress 60% completed</p>
<p>Output 1.2 Error! Reference source not found.</p>	<p>5a) Capacity developed of CETAC's staff members, including women, to conduct the work of the AEZ Unit</p>	<p>Assist the establishment of Data-Sharing Agreements with key national institutions</p>	<p>The templates were drafted and discussed with the partners. Pending MINAMB and CETAC decisions to sign</p>	<p>50 % completed</p>
		<p>Assist CETAC in collecting data from data-sharing institutions when necessary</p>	<p>The existent data on FCA were collected</p>	<p>In progress 10 % completed</p>
		<p>Develop a training program for interns and other capacitation beneficiaries (learning by doing)</p>	<p>118, people from different stakeholder were capacitated. 25 Percent of them were woman</p>	<p>In progress 75 % completed</p>
	<p>5b) Extent of the Unit's ability to function in a nationwide network hub for professionals engaged in AEZ related subjects.</p>	<p>Create and maintain a network of professionals involved in AEZ and environmental monitoring at national level</p>	<p>Many professionals on different subjects related to AEZ were identified and linked for corporate collaborations at a different level</p>	<p>In progress 70 % completed</p>
<p>Output 1.3) Error! Reference source not found.</p>		<p>Develop the methodological approach for field data collection, data harmonization and integration</p>	<p>Methodological approach developed. Data collected, harmonized, and integrated</p>	
		<p>Collect field data on regular basis for updating DSS platform for Huambo and Benguela</p>	<p>The data collection has been started</p>	<p>In progress Rolling base</p>
		<p>Develop the AEZ geospatial database (tabular and vector)</p>	<p>AEZ data base undermanagement Land cover classification system completed. Land cover mapping published.</p>	<p>In progress 70% completed</p>

	6a) Functioning and coverage of the AEZ Unit monitoring system	Prepare datasets for LDN monitoring (national and sub-national)	Datasets for monitoring LDN prepared. LDN indicator geospatial data prepared. LDN maps for Chongoroi, Alto Hama and Chipipa published	In progress 70% completed
		Undertake geospatial analysis for the Land Resource Information System of the DSS platform at provincial level (Huambo and Benguela)	Geospatial analyses were carried out at project sites	In progress Rolling base
	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)	establishes partnerships with national institution's	20 partnerships established, the data sharing process started with FCA and IGEO. Other data were identified at INAMET, IGCA and INRH.	In progress 50% completed
Output 1.4) Error! Reference source not found.	<i>Indicator #7) Development of the Web GIS DSS of the CETAC's AEZ Unit</i>	Recruit ICT Programmer Analyst for the development of WebGIS (DSS) / LRIMS	ToR were drafted and submitted to LTO for approval	In progress 20% completed
		Design the WebGIS DSS platform	Relevant data to support WebGIS platform were identified and collected	In progress 30% completed
Output 1.5) A two-way hub is set up for (i) collecting AEZ data and (ii) generating AEZ products through WebGIS DSS platform	Train project agro-ecologists in using and teaching about the use of DSS Web platform	Design a train program in using and teaching about the use of DSS to project agro-ecologist	For the following years. See the previous task	To be carried out
		train the project agro-ecologist to use and teaching about the use of DSS	For the following years. See the previous task	To be carried out
	Number of selected beneficiaries which include municipal technical officers, FFS Master Trainers and FFS facilitators from Chongoroi, Chipipa and Alto Hama trained	train selected beneficiaries to use DSS web platform	For the following years. See the previous task	To be carried out
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	8a) Reduction of marked land degradation by around 50% compared to the reference year (2015) for land where agriculture is currently practiced;	Recover marked land degradation at Alto Hama, Chipipa and Chongoroi	In average 37.5% of degraded Land are under management to be recovered <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 801 ha at Chipipa 385.77 ha at Chongoroi Alto Hama is to be started. 	In progress 75% completed
	8b) Restoration of 50% of ecosystems currently degraded by unsustainable land use practices;	Restore ecosystems using SLM practices on specifics and prototype area of project sites	Restoration of degraded ecosystems has been started. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 45% of land degradation at Ngunga-Chipipa is being restored under sustainable land management practices mostly with agroforest and natural resource management. 	In progress

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 30 % of land degradation at Chitata, Cambandi and Uvombo is being restored under sustainable land management practices related to reducing the cattle and the grazing pressure on agricultural land 	
	8c) 30% increase of soil organic carbon content (SOC) in all land classes and halving (0.4%) the current rate of deforestation throughout the country;	Measure the increase in soil organic carbon on project site under SLM management	To be accessed on following years marked land degraded are under sustainable land management at Chipipa and Chongoroi	To be carried out
	8d) Reinforcing information, education and awareness-raising on good land-use practices including those linked to sustainable agriculture-conservation for 80% of rural households;	Carry out different activities to reinforce awareness on land use practices_and agriculture-conservation	70% 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	In progress
	8e) Reduction of 25% of livestock in areas with a strong tradition of livestock production;	Intraduct agroecological practices to reduce livestock in Cambandi, Chitata and Uvombo as areas identified with a strong tradition of livestock	<p>The training on SLM activities started at Uvombo -Chongoroi to reduce the livestock.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 33% of the degraded area under pasture effects is under exclusive management as an agricultural area in Cambandi and Chitata 30% of degraded area by grazing effects in Uvombo is identified to start training in SLM practices to reduce grazing pressure on land degradation. 	In progress
	8f) Reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by 50%.	Define methodology to access the greenhouse gas emission in areas that adopted SLM practices	To be measured on flowing years as an effect of the adopted SLM practices	To be carried out
Output 2.1) Error! Reference source not found.	9a) Number of plans developed	<p>Design and apply LADA-Local to target sectors in the Communes of Alto Hama</p> <p>Produce AEZ products on a fine scale with a proposal for the allocation of land use optimized for SLM for three municipalities</p> <p>Carry out the GreeNTD process at local level in the target communities.</p>	<p>Lada-Local were applied to Chipipa and Chongoroi the report are available here</p> <p>AEZ products on fine scale available for specifics zones ate Chipipa and Chongoroi</p> <p>GreeNTD Process caried out at Chipipa and Chongoroi</p>	<p>In progress 67% completed</p> <p>In progress 67 % completed</p> <p>In progress</p>

	<p>9b) Number of people involved in preparation of the plans, of which how many are women</p> <p>9c) Number of communities involved in development of plans.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Develop SLM plans with different communist on project sites</p>	<p>623 people from EDA, local government and community involved on preparations of the plans. 123 from those people were women</p> <p>18 communities were involved on development of SLM plans for Chipipa and Chongoroi</p>	<p>67 % completed</p> <p>In progress</p> <p>67 % completed</p> <p>In progress</p>
<p>Output 2.2) Error! Reference source not found.</p>	<p>10a) Levels of integration of SLM into the activities of the AP/FFSs</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>The SLM solutions and techniques were carried out</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 FFS are implementing SLM techniques at Ngunga and Lomanda II • One agroecological perimeter is being established at Ngunga and Lomanda II • 5 AP/FFS at Chongoproi are adopting SLM approach to reduce livestock 	<p>In progress</p> <p>70% completed</p>
	<p>10b) The extent to which SLM plans inform land-use allocation and management.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>7 SLM plans (3 to Chipipa, 4 to Chongoroi) designed, discussed, and approved at provincial level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLM plan are being implemented at Chipapa and Chongoroi • AEC at Chipipa and the AEZ Unit at CETAC are regularly informed about agro-ecological experiences. • One Integrated Land Use plane designed to Chipipa • One plocé-brief submitted to MINAB for institucionalize and regulamente SLM activities 	<p>In progress</p> <p>75% completed</p>
<p>Output 2.3) Error! Reference source not found.</p>	<p>11a) Number and type of community stakeholders trained, including a minimum number of women</p>	<p>Prepare training programs</p>	<p>Train program on SLM, soil, forest agroecology and water management prepared for Chipipa and Chongoroi</p>	<p>In progress</p> <p>70% completed</p>
		<p>Provide training program for Provincial and Municipal technicians</p>	<p>383 people wich 75% are women are being trained on SLM, soil, forest</p>	<p>In progress</p> <p>60% completed.</p>

			agroecology and water management at Chipipa 175 people wich 60 % are women are being trained on SLM, soil, forest agroecology and water management at Chongoroi	Alto Hama is to be started
	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 101 technicians from EDA, FFS Master Trainers, Facilitators, community lieders and technicians from municipal administrations of Chipipa and Huambo were trained at Chipipa. • 50 technicians from EDA, FFS Master Trainers, Facilitators, community lieders and technicians from municipal administrations of Chongoroi are identified to be trained at Chipipa. 	in progress 50% completed
Outcome 3.0 <i>Error! Reference source not found.</i>	<i>Indicator #12) Increase in overall investment (both public and private funds) mobilized for SLM</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available international funds mechanisms are being identified to apply initiatives on SLM • budgets lines were identified on OGE to increase investment in SLM 	
	Key-decision makers have a solid understanding of how to bring financial leverage and scale to SLM initiatives, resulting in the active mobilization and deployment of investment at both landscape and community level.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The government is being advised to increase available funds to invest on land restoration. • An Integrated Land Use Planning has been designed to use as prototype doc with methodological approach to increase the investment on land restoration. • A brief policy for Ngunga was designed to be used as fundamental tool to avoid more financial support to SLM activities 	
Output 3.1) <i>Error! Reference source not found.</i>	Indicator #13) Degree and coverage of assessment of economic cost of LD	Conduct study on the costs of soil degradation for the main rural	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study on the cost of soil degradation to Chipipa at 	in progress 60% completed

		economic sector of Huambo and Benguela	Huambo and Chongoroi at Benguela were carried out		
		Produce report on the costs of soil degradation for rural economic activities	The costs of soil degradation for rural economic activities are reported to Chipipa and Chongoroi	In progress 70% completed	
		Develop mechanism to monitor / update information on the costs / benefits of soil degradation / recovery.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The indicator to monitor and update information on the costs-benefits of soil degradation and recovery are defined A data base is designed ad available at UT ZAE on CETAC to monitor those indicators 	100% completed	
		<i>Indicator #14) Number of professionals from MINAMB, MINAGRIF, MINTURI and relevant NGOs trained in lobbying and advocacy for SLM funding, including a minimum number of women.</i>	Disseminate conclusions from the study to key decision-makers through works to highlight the importance of LD, SLM (its mainstreaming and finance)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Related for the next period report 	To be done on the next report period
Output 3.2) Error! Reference source not found.	<i>Indicator #15) Number of professionals from relevant entities (in particular in MINAMB, MINAGRIF, MINTURI and relevant NGOs) trained in fundraising and resource mobilization for SLM in, including a minimum number of women</i>	Explore and identify sources of financing for SLM.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A police brief with conclusions about cost of land degradation were designed. Sources of finance for SLM at international, national, and local levels were explored and identified. The already available and new funding mechanisms appropriate for supporting SLM and NRM, including projects and initiatives that can be led by CETA were identified. But, CETAC need appropriate human resources and a strategic plan more flexible to the global environmental context to be eligible for those funds Pending, actual CETAC development plan does not allow functions of funding mechanisms 	Rolling base	
	<i>Indicator #16) Number of supported projects to pilot and adjust the funding mechanisms for SLM</i>	Institutionalize a fund mechanism at CETAC to support SLM initiatives			

<p>Output 3.3) Error! Reference source not found.</p>	<p><i>Indicator #17) Increases in public funds mobilized for SLM (state budget earmarked for SLM)</i></p> <p><i>Indicator #18) Operational status of a trust fund for community-based SLM projects is in place with solid governance mechanisms and institutional support</i></p> <p><i>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)</i></p> <p><i>Indicator #20) Number of local stakeholders benefitting from finance options for SLM, including a minimum number of female memberships</i></p>	<p>Support communities to apply to funding mechanisms for SLM</p> <p>Support and advise national public institutions to increase funds for SLM initiatives</p> <p>Develop trust fund</p> <p>Develop SLM Financing mechanisms to channel funds from trust fund to community-level projects</p> <p>Support the design of SLM-related projects/initiatives and finance their implementation through the Trust Fund</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One communities project submitted to two different funding mechanisms for SLM • Huambo and Chongoroi municipally administrations are being supported to identify budget lines and to increase funds for SLM activities • No progress has been achieved. This activitie is pending regards to the necessity of CETAC management development planning updating • No progress has been achieved. This activitie is pending regards to the necessity of CETAC management development planning updating • No progress has been achieved. This activitie is pending regards to the necessity of CETAC management development planning updating 	<p>In progress Rolling base</p>
--	--	---	--	-------------------------------------

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcomes of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR (max 400 words)

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

1. Produced and publishing of [land cover maps](#) for Alto Hama, Chipipa and Chongoroi.
2. Produced and publishing of [land degradation maps](#) for Alto Hama, Chipipa and Chongoroi.
3. Maintain the partnership for the establishment of data-sharing agreements. For the target institutions:
 - INAMET
 - INRH
 - IGEO
 - IGCA

4. 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 aimed to provide 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](#) and [Chongoroi](#) commune.

5. Training program focused on SLM and the use of AEZ products for supporting decision-making at the community level.
A capacitation program is being implemented in eleven (11) administrative sectors, seven (7) at Chipipa and four (4) at Chongoroi. In those sectors, 700 people from 17 FFSs, IDA and community leaders are being capacitated. The FFSs in those sectors are being trained and supplied with inputs to introduce SLM practices in their activities.
6. Establishment of two Ecological Perimeter one at Ngunga - Chipipa and other at Uvombo – Chongoroi

Agroecological activities with SLM approach from the WOCAT catalogue were started at Ngunga and Uvombo's Agroecological Perimeter. Most activities on those perimeters are related to creating a community seed bank to install agroecological production systems those activities are being developed through FFSs supplied by the project agroecologist team.

Related to Ecological Perimeter established at Ngunga – Chipipa:

- A [Integrated Land Use Plan](#) (ILUP) was drafted and shared as an Angola's case study on implementation of ILUP
- a [policy brief](#) was drafted and submitted to MINAMB for approval and to advocate for more dissemination of the SLM approach and to pave the way for agroecological transition in specific zones of Angola where the ecosystems need to be more protected.
- [A Tchandangombe Incitive](#), community pilot project, was drafted to support Ngunga and Lomanda II communities to apply on available financial mechanisms that finance SLM activities

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.

	FY2023 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	We rate the development objective as satisfactory because according to the actions developed, the communities in the target area of the project started to apply the SLM approach and agroecological practices mainly technics related to water, forest and soil management on agroecological perimeters.
Budget Holder	S	S	<p>1- The ZAEC Project achieved most of its major global environmental objectives, particularly the outcome 1, with minor shortcomings on outcomes 2 and 3; the project activities are rated as satisfactory.</p> <p>2- Despite some delays observed during project implementation due, particularly to the covid-19 pandemic and political issues, several progresses were noted in outcomes delivery. An extension of the project is expected to consolidate the achievements of delivery. The reported results have been rated as satisfactory.</p> <p>3- Capabilities and considerable training has been delivered, particularly on GIS, AEZ and SLM matters, across a range of organizations. The community was involved in most of agroecological initiatives implemented by the project. This result is rated as satisfactory.</p>

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

			<p>4- The project is without a CTA but has an efficient Project Coordination Unit and Project Task Force. Work planning, M&E and reporting is regular and thorough. The engagement of CETAC is recommended for sustainability and is expected that the PCU will be involved to achieve that.</p> <p>5- The project team is to be congratulated for its technical and intellectual capacity to achieve this satisfactory results</p>
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸	S	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ZAEC project activities are Satisfactory according to the Development objectives (DO); • The reported results have been rated as satisfactory. • They are showing positive activities held, particularly on SLM Training, and monitoring on monitoring of agroecological initiatives in the community. The project still have one year for his term, and we expect the GEF and partner support, for the extension of the this project in a way to allow to conclude the the component number (3) of the project due to Political, Economic, pandemic, changes context that affets and slowdown the project implementation speed. • Herein we need more involvement from some partners in which we shall discuss in the next meeting of the Steering committee of project.
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	S	S	The overall project implementation is satisfactory while further progress on the use of the data and information for piloting field-activities in targeted landscapes and proposal for scaling-up the results will have to be further strengthened
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	S	S	In the reporting period, the project delivered on most planned activities thanks to a proactive engagement of the Project Coordination Unit. The MTR was successfully conducted, the recommendations of which will need to be carefully examined by the PTF and discussed / approved at the next PSC meeting.

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

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

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

This section is under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made to comply 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. Please indicate if new 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:

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

<i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i>
No grievance has been received

²⁰ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit (Esm-unit@fao.org) should be contacted. The project shall prepare or amend an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) or other ESS instruments and management tools based on the new risk classification (please refer to page 13 <https://www.fao.org/3/cb9870en/cb9870en.pdf>)

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified during the 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	E&S	moderate	On <u>ethnicity and indigenous peoples</u> : At PIF stage, the project had been classified as 'moderate risk' from an E&S point of view, because of the likely presence of indigenous Khoe-San people in the areas that had been initially proposed as targeted landscapes – according to desk review carried out back then.	No further action is required	No further action is required. But, during the implementation in all stage the team on field are alert to identify a potential risk to be mitigated	The project team must be attentive for any change on the risk
2	ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage	Low	Those risks have been greatly diminished at PPG stage, given that the project's currently geographical focus is Central Angola, as prioritized by the GoA, and where presence of indigenous Khoe-San people is much less common.	No further action is required	No further action is required. But, during the implementation in all stage the team on field are alert to identify a potential risk to be mitigated	The project team must be attentive for any change on the risk
3	ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage	Low	furthermore, during the PPG, site level consultations were carried out in Alto Hama and Chongoroi. As a result, there is no confirmation on the presence of indigenous peoples in the above-mentioned demo landscapes targeted by the project.	No further action is required	No further action is required. But, during the implementation in all stage the team on field are alert to identify a potential risk to be mitigated	The project team must be attentive for any change on the risk
4	ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage	Low	Hence, even if the application of FPIC had been prescribed for the PPG stage, along with other socio-environmental safeguard measures, it proved not necessary.	No further action is required	No further action is required. But, during the implementation in all stage the team on field are alert to identify a potential risk to be mitigated	The project team must be attentive for any change on the risk

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.

5	ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage	Low	Social environmental risks linked to the likely presence of indigenous are considered 'low' at this stage.	No further action is required	No further action is required. But, during the implementation in all stage the team on field are alert to identify a potential risk to be mitigated	The project team must be attentive for any change on the risk
6	ESS 8: Gender Equality	moderate	<u>As for gender mainstreaming</u> , gender-based inequities are still prevalent in Angola across the entire national territory. Although gender equality has been given some attention in Angola – especially in the environment sector -- there is still an urgent need to increase women's engagement in various levels of the socio-economic life, especially in rural regions of Angola.	No further action is required	No further action is required. But, during the implementation in all stage the team on field are alert to identify a potential risk to be mitigated	The project team must be attentive for any change on the risk
7	ESS 8: Gender Equality	moderate	At the same, the focused stakeholder consultation processes carried out during the PPG, along with the brief analysis of the gender aspects that followed, pointed out to a tendency towards gender gaps being 'ironed-out' in various relevant stakeholder segments. These include in particular, local government, academia, private sector and 'resource partner/donor', where women are 32 to 50% of the stakeholder count.	No further action is required	No further action is required. But, during the implementation in all stage the team on field are alert to identify a potential risk to be mitigated	The project team must be attentive for any change on the risk
8	ESS 8: Gender Equality	moderate	In turn, women are under-represented in two crucial segments for the project, namely 'National Government Institution body' and 'Local community' (constituting 24% and 18% of stakeholder count respectively) – in spite of the concerted efforts towards explicitly engaging them. Incidentally, these two latter segments are the core the beneficiary groups.	No further action is required	No further action is required. But, during the implementation in all stage the team on field are alert to identify a potential risk to be mitigated	The project team must be attentive for any change on the risk
9	ESS 8: Gender Equality	Low	Therefore, much more is needed to ensure that the direct and indirect benefits of SLM are equitably shared, including in terms of division of labor, new professional opportunities and in the provision of a supportive environment for working mothers.	No further action is required	No further action is required. But, during the implementation in all stage the team on field are alert to identify a potential risk to be mitigated	The project team must be attentive for any change on the risk
10	New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY	moderate	COVID have been emerged after PRODOC design, so this kind of risk was not identified	OMS rules in all stage of implementation	The project team are frequently trained according to the OMS rules for when in field or in contact with stakeholder take actions for protect their selves an others	keep up the OMS rules

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

FY2022 rating	FY2023 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Low	Low	No new risk has emerged. COVID slowed down, and the PMU has kept up the WHO rules

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 ²²	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
Recommendation 1:	
Recommendation 2:	•
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation 4:	
Recommendation 5	
Recommendation 6	
Recommendation 7	
Recommendation 8	•
Recommendation 9	

<p>Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize</p>	<p>Yes the exit strategy consists of two ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The first one is to keep building the CETAC capacity to carry out similar activities that are now being carried out by AEZ-Unit. This alternative is highly dependent on the CETAC Management Capacity and strategy 2- The second, linked to the first, is to propose an alternative to scale up AEZ and SLM approach to the national level
--	--

²² The MTR is being finalized as of July 2023.

	<p>That strategy will allow CETAC to be established as an important node to support the decision maker and farmers to carry out an agroecological transition and adapt to the climate changes</p>
--	---

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 Guidelines²³. 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			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management			
Implementation schedule			
Executing Entity			
Executing Entity Category			
Minor project objective change			
Safeguards			
Risk analysis			
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%			
Co-financing			
Location of project activity			
Other minor project amendment (define)			

23 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 Data – sharing	One module about relevant soil data for AEZ were developed with technical support of IIA, during the train 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 in 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 share 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 in 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 stage, on the ZAEC field activities.
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) student were trained on	A program is being designed to include at least five monitors on graduation or post-graduation stage, on the ZAEC field activities.

		agroecological zoning No data were identified as relevant to be shared	
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 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.
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 were capacitated on SIG and remote sensing	
IGCA - Geodesic and Cadastral Institute of Angola	Data-Sharing	The data to be share were identified and the accord to be signed were technically discussed	According to the SPC decision on second meeting the data share 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 share were identified and the accord to be signed were technically discussed	According to the SPC decision on second meeting the data sharing agreement will be signed with CETAC

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

	monitoring fielding activities		
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) student were trained on agroecological zoning The data to be share were identified and the accord to be signed were technically discussed	According to the SPC decision on second meeting the data share agreement will be signed with CETAC
Others[1]			
FFS-Field farmers Schools	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 degradations 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 were 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 LADA-L assessment permits to understand of the socioeconomic status of the women and include them on the main activity of the project
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	The project in its approach has taken out a methodology to identify and consider all the opportunities to promote gender equality and women's empowerment. Specific action was designed to increase the sustainable activity of women in agroecology and agribusiness. 116 women in the rural community were capacitated on SLM activities 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	The agroecological perimeter that are being established on the project site permits gender equality on the access to land propriety, water and other natural resource management
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	In all project implementations step, substantially on the GreeNTD process, the women have been included to ensure their participation in the decision process
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	The women have access to all infrastructures that are being generated. The SLM practices are generating socio-economic impacts and real benefits for women. The pieces of training to access the financial mechanisms will generate socioeconomic impacts and increase the benefits for women
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	<i>According to the project results framework the progress on gender inclusion increased in 45 % on the following indicators 3a) and 3e)</i>
Staff with gender expertise	No	The project did not achieve gender expertise. But to address this, the PMU has been supporting CETAC to train interns in order to build capacity

		and underline some women with potential for roles on AEZ Unit established at CETAC	
Any other good practices on gender			

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval, <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.	<p>Yes, the project has a knowledge management strategy. The relevant good practices that can be learned and shared with the project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number and diversity of stakeholders involved. • The national and international dialogue was established. • The interaction with other FAO projects ongoing • The tools used and the involvement with the community in all implementation stages
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	<p>Yes, it has. The communication strategy is implemented at all levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With MINAMB during this year a monthly report was provided. • PPRs are frequently shared with all SCP members. • The actions of the AEZ and SLM process are divulgated at the national level include governs and university institutions. • On the three-project target zone, the local governments and community leaders are informed about project activities. • The CETAC virtual platform was identified as a site for regular publications 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.	Ussombo more than a tree
Please provide links to related website, social media account	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Launch the agroecological activities at Ngunga – Chipipa 2. Reinforce the dam at Ngunga agroecological perimeter 3. Restore the degraded land by erosion process 4. Harvesting legumes from agroecological practices on AEC- Chipipa 5. ZAEC project giving GIS support on pest risk analysis monitoring 6. ZAEC project giving support to IRCEA project to train FFs on soil biophysical characterization 7. ZAEC team, doing a transect to characterize the natural resources available on the agroecological perimeter at Chipipa

2023 Project Implementation Report

<p>Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.</p>	<p>8. ZAEC provides train on soil data collections</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. https://www.fao.org/publications/card/en/c/CC2293EN 2. https://www.fao.org/publications/card/en/c/cc2296en 3. https://www.fao.org/publications/card/en/c/cc2297en 4. https://www.fao.org/publications/card/en/c/CC2293EN 5. https://www.fao.org/3/cc3189en/cc3189en.pdf 6. https://www.fao.org/3/cc3832en/cc3832en.pdf 7. https://www.fao.org/3/cc3834en/cc3834en.pdf 8. https://www.fao.org/3/cc3836en/cc3836en.pdf 9. https://www.fao.org/publications/card/en/c/CB4764EN 10. https://www.fao.org/geospatial/news/detail/en/c/1644314/
<p>Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details</p>	<p>Catia Marinheiro Catia.marinheiro@fao.org +244948545878</p>

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

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

N/A

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing[1]	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing[2]	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval (Million USD)	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023 (Million USD)	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National Government						
OGE-PDN 2.4.1- Climate Change	MINAMB / GABAC and CETAC (public investment)	In-kind	8	7,125		8
CETAC			2	0,375		2
OGE-PDN 2.3.2 promote agricultural production	MINAGRIF (public investment)	In-kind	3,0	2,25		3
OGE-PDN 2.3.4 promote the sustainable use and management of forest resources	MINAGRIF (public investment)	In-kind	1,5	1,125		1,5
	MINAMB / CETAC (in-kind)	In-kind	0,5	0,375		0,5
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	0,5	0,375		0,5
Totals			15,5	11,625		15,5

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

N/A

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

Annex 2.

GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap](#) or [GeoNames](#) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#)

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location & Activity Description

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate.

Annex 3

Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage

Core Indicator 4	Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)			(Hectares)
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Area under improved land management	14,000	14,000	1.186,77 ha	
Indicator 4.3	Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems			Hectares
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Area under improved land management (Demonstrations of SLM and SFM best practices in forests, rangelands and croplands that provide carbon benefits on 14,000 ha of land)	14,000	14,000	1.186,77 ha	
Core Indicator 6	Greenhouse gas emission mitigated			(Metric tons of CO₂e)
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Expected CO ₂ e (direct)	7,400	7,400	3,065,414 ²⁴	
Core Indicator 11	Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment			(Number)
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Female		924	425	
Male		1,000	402	
Total		1,925	827	

²⁴ Some of these figures are very similar to those reported in other GEF LDN projects