



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review **2019 – Revised Template**

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Global
Country (ies):	Kenya, Niger, Burkina Faso, Uruguay and Kyrgyzstan
Project Title:	Participatory assessment of land degradation and sustainable land management in grassland and pastoral systems
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP /GLO/530/GFF
GEF ID:	5724
GEF Focal Area(s):	Land Degradation
Project Executing Partners:	International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)
Project Duration:	3 years

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	26 July 2016
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	April 2017
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE:	April 2020
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable)	N/A
Actual Implementation End Date:	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 2,639,726
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc:	USD 5,762,270

Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	USD 1,211,870
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019	USD 2,709,205

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	26 th July 2017. A subsequent Steering Committee meeting was delayed due to slow start in launching the project in at least 3 project countries. The next steering committee meeting is scheduled to take place in October 2019.
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	July 2019
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> or No
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> or No
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	N/A
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> or No <i>(Note: the project focuses solely on LD4 in the PMAT – adaptive management and SLM learning. The TT will be submitted after the mid term evaluation)</i>

Ratings

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

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Vivian Onyango, Project Coordinator and Policy Advisor, AGPME	Vivian.onyango@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Moctar Sacande, International Project Coordinator, FOA	Moctar.Sacande@fao.org
Budget Holder	Abram Bicksler, Agricultural Officer, AGPME	Abram.Bicksler@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Fritjof Boestler, Technical Officer, CBC	Fritjof.Boestler@fao.org

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating
Objective(s):						
Outcome 1: A participatory assessment and monitoring system for pastoral areas comprising of grasslands and rangelands, is developed and tested	Outcome Indicator 1.1: Standardized procedural and operational manual available	In spite of several tools existing to monitor and assess LD and SLM, none provides a coherent participatory process for assessing LD and SLM in rangelands and grasslands. There are also difficulties with replicability of existing tools.	An operational and procedural manual to monitor and assess LD and SLM based on framework of indicator domains is developed	The procedural and operational manual is developed and tested.	The procedural and operation manual is available for field testing and has been shared with key stakeholders and international partners, as well as within FAO different divisions. Testing of the manual has been completed in Kenya and is ongoing in Uruguay.	(MS) Marginally satisfactory

	<p>Outcome Indicator 1.2. Number of international and national consultations organized to discuss, test and revise the assessment and monitoring procedures</p>	<p>There is little common understanding and views on the global indicators by domain of assessment to be defined for monitoring and assessing LD in grasslands and rangelands</p>	<p>An international technical consortium of experts meets to identify, define and review a minimum number of global indicators by domain of assessment</p> <p>5 national level workshops organized to (I) Introduce the project objective and framework of global indicators by domain of assessment (II) identify key national and local resource people to support the assessment and (iii) assess relevant policy entry points</p>	<p>A second international consultation is organized with key relevant scientists, technicians, decision makers add key representatives from pastoral communities to present and discuss the final framework of global indicators and the finalized assessment and monitoring method.</p>	<p>A 2nd International consultation with the group of experts is scheduled to take place in September 2019. The meeting will review the initial results from piloting to refine the methodology and subsequently the procedural and operational manual.</p> <p>National level workshops to introduce the project have been realized in all the project countries paving way for subsequent activities.</p>	<p>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</p>
--	---	---	---	--	---	---------------------------------

	<p><u>Outcome Indicator 1.3: Level of involvement of local pastoral communities in defining and testing the domains of indicators, specific indicators and the assessment and monitoring of operational and procedural framework</u></p>	<p>The design of assessment and monitoring systems has been crafted by scientists, academics and extension workers with little to no space for input from local land users.</p>	<p>Participatory testing of the relevance and feasibility of the selected global indicators of conducted at field level in the 5 targeted pilot sites</p>	<p>The final version of the assessment and monitoring operational and procedural framework is done taking into account feedbacks received from local communities.</p>	<p>In Kenya local community inception workshops were held in July and August 2018 to validate domains of indicators, agree on assessment sites, mapping assessment sites and composing assessment teams. The local validation meeting was held in February 2019.</p> <p>Uruguay: local level consultations for the Southern pilot site was held in April 2019. The integrated assessment team for the site was also selected and agreed that field assessment will take place in Spring 2019.</p> <p>Burkina Faso & Niger: There are ongoing security concerns in the proposed pilot sites. Consultations are currently ongoing on whether or not to change the pilot sites</p>	<p>(MU) Marginally Unsatisfactory</p>
--	--	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------------

					<p>should security concerns persist.</p> <p>Kyrgyzstan: Field level consultations were held in June and July 2019.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<p>Outcome 2: National and international agro-sylvo-pastoral decision making processes benefit from the assessment and monitoring procedural and operational manual and the participatory national grassland and rangeland assessments.</p>	<p>Outcome Indicator 2.1: Number of action plans for mainstreaming SLM best practices</p>	<p>No action plans for mainstreaming SLM best practices available</p>	<p>Key policy mainstreaming entry points are identified during local assessment steps SLM best practices identified during field survey are compiled and discussed and an action plan to insert the assessment findings into the current strategies, policies and plans is developed for each pilot site.</p>	<p>A national workshop is organized in each country to present and discuss the action plan and identify SLM best practices and measures that are best fit to influence policy making regarding pastoral areas</p>	<p>Relevant policy entry points are being gathered through the participatory methodologies and through the validation processes of the results obtained in participant countries. This information is key to advising on relevant intervention measures and in identifying leverage and entry points. In Niger, Burkina Faso and Uruguay, the relevant policy entry points have already been identified in various stakeholder meetings.</p> <p>In Kenya following the conclusion of the piloting, AGP with co-financing will begin in-depth qualitative policy discussions on the project results with local and national stakeholders.</p> <p>In-depth policy consultations within</p>	<p>Satisfactory (S)</p>
--	--	---	--	---	--	-------------------------

					<p>the LDN framework have taken place through focused interviews aimed at better understanding of policies for grasslands management in the country and linking these with LDN framework at national and international level.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

	<p><u>Outcome indicator 2.2.: Recognition of the assessment and monitoring method in at least 2 relevant international fora</u></p>	<p>There is no standardized procedures for monitoring and assessing LD in grasslands and rangelands</p>		<p>The new standardized assessment and monitoring method for LD and SLM in grasslands and rangelands is recognized at least 2 international fora</p>	<p>A side-event is scheduled for the UNCCD COP 14 in September 2019 to present the methodology; making case for the need for participatory assessments in pastoral areas with a wider audience in support of LDN. This will also be supported by qualitative studies on participatory rangeland monitoring currently ongoing in Uruguay and soon to be started in Kenya</p>	<p>Satisfactory (S)</p>
--	---	---	--	--	---	-------------------------

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating
<p>Outcome 3: Project's outcome and output targets are monitored and evaluated, and lessons learned and best practices are captured and disseminated to facilitate future operations.</p>	<p>Outcome indicator 3.1: Fulfilment of planned M&E activities including establishing baseline values for all project indicators, yearly updating of indicators, a mid-term evaluation/review and a final project evaluation.</p> <p>Collection of best practices and lessons learned throughout the implementation of the project</p>	<p>No baseline</p>	<p>50% progress in achieving project outcomes</p>	<p>Project outcomes achieved and showing sustainability</p>	<p>Project monitoring system is in place and project staff are compiling information and results in the prepared document as they come in from the field assessments and validation processes.</p>	<p>Satisfactory (S)</p>

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<p>Outcome 1: A participatory assessment and monitoring system for pastoral areas comprising of grasslands and rangelands, is developed and tested</p>	<p>There are delays in field activities in Niger and Burkina Faso due to insecurity that have necessitated a need to change pilot sites in Burkina Faso.</p> <p>In Niger, consultations are ongoing with the government.</p>	<p>Project partners have unanimously agreed to change pilot sites in Burkina Faso while suggesting alternative sites. A formal request has been sent to the GEF Secretariat</p>	<p>As soon as possible (on receipt of clearance from GEFSec).</p>

¹ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs	Expected completion date	Achievements at each PIR					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1: A monitoring and assessment procedural and operational manual is developed	Q4 Y3	<i>Experts meeting held</i> <i>Draft procedural manual was developed and presented to the technical experts for reviews before field testing.</i>	<i>Draft procedural manual has now been tested in Kenya. Lessons learnt have been used to review the methodology and implementation in other countries.</i>				40%	Security challenges for field assessments in Niger and Burkina Faso will potentially affect testing and therefore timely inputs and conclusion of the methodology. Initial delivery was also hampered by the unimodal type of rainfall in Niger and Burkina Faso which provides only one window for assessment annually. While there has only been 10% increase in delivery from last PIR, delivery will be accelerated in next months as activities have already picked up pace in Kyrgyzstan and Uruguay. Niger and Burkina Faso will follow suit. .

<p>Output 1.2: The monitoring and assessment procedural and operational manual is tested at local level and the global indicators are further adapted while assessing policies.</p>	<p>Q4 Y3</p>	<p><i>National inception workshops have been held in Kenya and Uruguay to agree on pilot sites for testing the procedural and operational manual.</i></p>	<p><i>National inception workshops have been held in all the countries.</i></p> <p><i>Kenya completed its field testing and followed by a national validation workshop.</i></p> <p><i>Uruguay has completed local inception workshops in all the two pilot sites and is preparing for field assessments.</i></p> <p><i>Field testing will begin in June 2019 in Kyrgyzstan.</i></p> <p><i>Local inception meeting were held in Burkina Faso (March 2019) and in Niger (May</i></p>				<p>40%</p>	<p>Field assessments were scheduled to take place from August 2019 in Niger and Burkina Faso. However, there are current security concerns in the pilot areas in the two countries. Consultations are ongoing on the best way forward including possible change of pilot site.</p>
---	--------------	---	--	--	--	--	------------	--

			<i>2019). Field-testing is yet to start in these countries.</i>					
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

<p>Output 1.3: The assessment and monitoring method is refined and finalized based on lessons learned from the district/site tests</p>	<p>Q4 Y3</p>		<p><i>This activity is completed in Kenya and lessons learnt have been included in the methodology.</i></p> <p><i>Similar exercise will be done when pilot testing is completed in the other four countries.</i></p> <p><i>An integral policy document is currently being prepared, with special focus on Uruguay on how lessons learnt in the country can be communicated to influence global processes.</i></p>			<p>20%</p>	<p>This activity relies on completion on the preceding activities and will progress on their completion.</p>
--	--------------	--	---	--	--	------------	--

<p>Output 2.1: participatory national grassland and rangeland assessment results are linked to national and local decision-making processes</p>	<p>Q2 Y2</p>	<p><i>Framework for documenting SLM best practices has been developed</i></p>	<p><i>Validation process ongoing in Kenya following completion of PRAGA national validation workshop.</i></p> <p><i>Best practices are being collected from Kyrgyzstan and Uruguay in their ongoing field assessments. In Uruguay, linkages with land degradation neutrality (LDN) have been made through a data sharing agreement in a win-win process in which the project's field assessment exercise will be used as an opportunity to</i></p>				<p>20%</p>	
---	--------------	---	--	--	--	--	------------	--

			<i>ground truth the LDN data in the two project sites.</i>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<p>Output 2.2. Assessment and monitoring method shared with relevant international mechanisms in order to integrate/align with existing frameworks.</p>	<p>Q2 Y2</p>	<p><i>Literature review on international policy alignment started</i></p>	<p><i>In Uruguay, with co-financing by FAO technical and financial support was provided to the XII meeting of Natural Grassland Cattle Keepers of South America during their annual meeting. A presentation on the project methodology, potential contribution to the sustainable management of the Pampa biome and how to engage more during the project and sharing of information were discussed.</i></p> <p><i>A side-event to share the methodology with a wider audience is</i></p>				<p>40%</p>	
---	--------------	---	---	--	--	--	------------	--

			<p><i>scheduled to take place at UNCCD COP 14 in September 2019. The event is meant to showcase importance of and how participatory approaches through PRAGA can help improve LDN framework in rangelands and grasslands.</i></p> <p><i>The International Rangelands Congress, 2020 is earmarked as one of the key events for project outcomes to be shared. As the event will be held in Kenya, the project partner; IUCN has been actively participating in</i></p>					
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

			<p><i>the preparatory meetings for the event including preparation of agenda and speaker notes with aim of ensuring project ideas/achievements to be shared are well placed within specific sub-themes.</i></p> <p><i>Study to inform international policy alignment ongoing with over 20 qualitative interview already carried out.</i></p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<p>Output 3.1: A project monitoring system providing systematic information on progress towards the project outcome and output targets is set up and implemented</p>	<p>Q4 Y3</p>	<p><i>Work plan has been developed for Year 1 that guides performance</i></p>	<p><i>National workplans were developed for all participant countries and incorporate into global project implementation calendars.</i></p> <p><i>There are also quarterly reporting by executing partner; IUCN and 6 month reporting by FAO and annual donor reporting by FAO.</i></p>				<p>40%</p>	
--	--------------	---	---	--	--	--	------------	--

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs	Expected completion date	Achievements at each PIR					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 3.2 Mid-term and final evaluation/review conducted	Q4 Y4		<i>MTR was scheduled for June 2019. However, there has been delays from the FAO Office of Evaluation and processes will start in August 2019</i>				0%	

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs	Expected completion date	Achievements at each PIR					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 3.3: Project related best practices and lessons learned are documented and published	Q4 Y3	<i>Guideline documents are being developed.</i>	<i>Collection of information on best practices that will feed into a wider publication ongoing</i>				20%	

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

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

Max 200 words:

The principal focus of the last fiscal year was to create operational capacity in the participant countries, lay the foundations for the field assessments as described in the approved PRAGA procedural and operational manual and continue with policy discussions. Implementation is being approached on a country by country basis due to the complexities and needs of each context. In this sense, the project has made progress and most participating countries have conducted their local and national inception meetings, have created awareness on project objectives and outputs within the different layers of stakeholders and have either completed (Kenya), are conducting (Kyrgyzstan) or finalizing preparations (Uruguay, Burkina Faso, Niger) for the PRAGA field assessments and their associated local and national validation workshops.

Having completed the full cycle of the PRAGA methodology will lead to increased opportunities to validate lessons learned and share results and conclusions of the process as outlined in as outlined in Output 3.3 as well as introduce it in upcoming international fora as required by Outcome indicator 2.2. The project has applied to have the countries share their experiences with the methodology at the upcoming UNCCD COP14 as part of wider dissemination.

The PRAGA methodology is already attracting attention and various projects in Central Asia and regenerative agriculture groups in Uruguay have approached project staff to inquire about the methodology, the results being obtained, lessons learnt and how to incorporate it in upcoming projects.

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

Max 200 words:

The major challenges faced by project coordination and partners in the last year have been:

- Lack of capacity or organisational structure of project Operational Partner in certain countries. Although IUCN has offices and close partnerships with local allies in the participant African countries, it has no presence in Kyrgyzstan and as a result, there was a long delay in initiating the project in the country. The project task force thus recommended that FAO assumes project implementation in the country in the interest of time.
- The 'seasonality' of assessment processes gave small windows of opportunity to conduct the field assessments. The need for pre-assessment workshops and in-depth stakeholder consultation processes to select and validate global domains of indicators and select landscape for assessment meant that some countries missed their recommended field assessment dates and will be conducting their field assessments in September and October 2019. This is also due to the unimodal rainfalls in West Africa as assessments have to be timed just at onset of rains for ease in species identification in the Sahel as otherwise the rest of the seasons are very dry.
- Insecurity has increased in chosen pilot sites in Burkina Faso and Niger. The project partners are considering changing the assessment sites to relatively more secure areas to ensure safety of staff and practitioners (a corresponding communication has been shared with the GEF Sec and is attached to this PIR).

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	MS	MS	<i>The project has stayed true to its initially planned activities and outcomes. Much as there have been delays due to various reasons such as security reasons in the Sahel, it is on the right track to deliver.</i>
Budget Holder	MS	MS	<i>This project has the potential to contribute significantly to a harmonized approach for participatory assessment that will benefit many different stakeholders and pastoral environments. In spite of challenges, especially from insecurity, which is outside the control of the project or GEF, progress has been made and activities and outcomes are moving forward.</i>
Lead Technical Officer	S	S	<i>Inspite of a number of challenges regarding implementation of activities on the ground, the project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits. With the identification of only minor shortcomings, the project teams are now increasing the deliveries of the project components.</i>
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MS	MS	<i>The project has very successfully overcome several challenges in its implementation (see above). A major challenge that has not yet been solved is the proposed change of intervention sites (in Burkina Faso and most likely Niger) due to insecurity reasons which might cause further delays and hamper the project's envisaged completion date. FAO and partners sent a letter (request to change project sites, attached to this PIR) to the GEFSec awaiting a response. The mid-term evaluation was delayed, findings could therefore not be included in this PIR.</i>

3. Risks

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

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

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

Risk ratings

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

	Risk	Risk rating	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Political-institutional risk: Divergent priorities of projects partners with regards to pastoral land resources assessments	Low	Apart from active engagement with institutional partners, the participatory approach encourages local activities and awareness, which in turn foments interest on part of institutions.	Project staff continue to engage with institutional partners to understand their needs and expectations for project outcomes.	

	Risk	Risk rating	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Project Task Force
2	Low political will to put into practice new science, capacities and innovations.	Moderately low	Political will for land degradation monitoring is residual at best. However, by focusing on rangelands and grasslands productivity and making the case for improved management and investment, the project is providing innovative perspectives on the rangelands.	Without means or proposals for improved rangeland management and productivity, land degradation monitoring would be politically unsustainable. It is this SLM component of the project which allows for the engagement of political stakeholders and the sustainability of the proposed actions.	Project is building on ongoing initiatives in the countries.

	Risk	Risk rating	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Project Task Force
3	Climate contingency risk: Climate change impacts on land resources and pastoral management systems could mean that assessment results are quickly outdated	Moderately High	Monitoring and assessments are carried out to inform decision-making, and as long as the information from the field is considered valid, decisions can be adaptive to current climate situations.	Basing decisions on historical climate data could lead to poor decisions, but as long as the field data represents current field conditions, then decisions should be informed. If this is not the case, then new field data should be acquired.	This underscores the need to have in place monitoring protocol. The project aims to incorporate baselines from existing projects.

	Risk	Risk rating	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Project Task Force
	<p>Social risks: Reluctance to participate in the project activities by pastoralists</p>	Low	<p>Participation can be improved with pastoral communities by being transparent about project objectives, taking into consideration their opinions and thoughts and building relationships for the long-term.</p>	<p>PRAGA allows for several opportunities for community engagement and buy in. These include local level consultations on the project and methodology during which global domains of indicators are presented, participatory target landscape selection, participatory mapping, selection of best practices and validation workshop to reflect on assessment outcomes.</p>	<p>Participatory aspects are integral parts of the project. Shared learning on processes for negotiating local knowledge and scientific approaches in monitoring need to be captured.</p>

	Risk	Risk rating	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Project Task Force
	Coordination challenges due to complex project design as it spans several countries, multiple levels and engages multiple partners/actors simultaneously	Moderately High	Close links with project stakeholders, visits to countries and project pilot sites and close collaboration between FAO and IUCN.	Mitigation actions have been employed including FAO taking up direct implementation in Kyrgyzstan where activities were slow too start.	Horizontal communications continue to be used in the project.
	Security challenges in pilot sites in Niger and Burkina Faso.	Moderately high	Change of pilot sites has been requested for Burkina Faso in agreement by all project partners.	A response is pending from the GEFSec	

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Low	Low	Although the project has faced some challenges, mitigation actions have been proactively put in place and implemented. Overall the project is on target to achieve the objectives and outcomes with no change on deliverables.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²

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

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

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

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	<p>Original NTE: 29/02/2020 Revised NTE: 30/04/2020</p> <p>Justification: Due to slow start of the operational partner implementation agreement (OPA) the project task force proposes on a no-cost extension with the Operational Partner IUCN until the 20 of April 2020 in order to allow for more time and resources to realize the planned activities and objectives.</p>

² Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

5. Gender Mainstreaming

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

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

Was a gender analysis undertaken or an equivalent socio-economic assessment?

- No. However a gender sensitive approach is being applied throughout the testing of the methodology for example aggregation of participants by gender.

Please briefly indicate the gender differences.

- The project is using a participatory methodology in which involvement of local communities is aggregated by gender. The project is aware of marginalization facing pastoral women such as in decision making and also the heavy load of responsibilities they bear. Also, youth in pastoralist communities are also often sidelined in key decision making for example in using natural resources. Thus the project continues to take these into consideration by:

- Ensuring that during participatory processes, there is was sufficient representation of women.
- holding women only session for information gathering in cases where it was deemed necessary in communities where women do not participate actively in presence of men.
- Being aware of working schedules of women and how this affects their availability to participate in project activities
- Identifying of women among key community informers on decision making such as extent of land degradation, species, seasons, impacts of land degradation, etc

. Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data?

- Yes

How is the project tracking gender impacts and results?

- As this is a pilot project, we are documenting lessons learnt to feed into the methodology, reports and publications to inform next steps including upcoming projects.

Does the project staff have gender expertise?

- Yes, staff have worked extensively in gender issues including among pastoral communities and have applied these expertise in project design, implementation and evaluation in accordance with GEF Policy.

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

- Bringing women voices to decision making on access and control of natural resources
- Documenting women's local knowledge on impacts, definition and characterization of land degradation

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

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

The project did not conduct the detailed FAO Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) assessment as it involves cost and these were not budgeted in the project nor in the work plan. However, guidelines on inclusion of indigenous people continue to be closely incorporated when dealing with IPs, and project staff have ample experience working within IP communities on rangeland and livestock management issues.

7. Stakeholders Engagement

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

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

If a stakeholder engagement plan was not requested for your project at CEO endorsement stage, please - list all stakeholders engaged in the project;

International: * FAO * IUCN * UNCCD-Global Mechanism * Mountain Partnership Secretariat * Pastoralist Knowledge Hub * Great Green Wall for the Sahara and the Sahel Initiative*

Burkina Faso: *FAO-Burkina Faso* IUCN-Burkina Faso*General Directorate of pastoral resources management *Ministry of Environment* Action against Desertification * CILSS-Agrhymet

Kenya: *FAO-Kenya* Directorate of Livestock Production * National Drought Management Authority * Kenya Forestry Service * Water Resources Authority * University of Nairobi * Department of Resource Surveys and Remote Sensing * National Land Commission * Kenya Forestry Research Institute * Northern Rangeland Trust * Rangeland Association of Kenya * Joint Agriculture Sector intergovernmental Secretariat * Kenya Agricultural & Livestock Research Organization

Kyrgyzstan: *FAO-Kyrgyzstan* Department. of Pastures * State Agency for Environmental Protection and Forestry (SAEPF) * GIPROZEM * National Association of Pasture Users * Scientific Research Institute of Livestock * Community Investment and Development Agency * CAMP Alattoo Public Foundation.

Niger: *FAO-Niger* Ministry of Livestock * Ministry of Environment* CILSS-Agrhymet* Université Abdou Moumouni de Niamey* Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique du Niger (INRAN)*

Uruguay: * Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries * Ministry of Housing, Land Arrangement and Environment (MVOTMA) Alianza del Pastizal * INIA, Instituto Nacional de Investigación Agropecuaria * Board of Livestock Based on Natural Grasslands * RegenAg Uruguay/Savory Institute.

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

Apart from regular video conferences with FAO country representative offices, weekly meetings with Operational Partners IUCN, discussions and exchanges with country stakeholders, scientific experts and implementing organizations, the principal events conducted by the project are as follows:

International:

- International Rangelands & Grasslands Congress preparatory meeting: 10th of December 2018, Nairobi, Kenya. This is a preparatory meeting for the International Rangelands and Grasslands Congress to be held in Nairobi in 2020. The IUCN project coordinator participated in this meeting with the aim of ensuring assessment and monitoring protocols for rangelands and grasslands are sufficiently covered during the congress with the view of in the end getting a platform to share the project experience and disseminate the methodology to the mainly scientific community who will be attending the congress.
- 12th meeting of Natural Grassland Cattlemen of the Southern Cone of South America: 26th to 27th of October 2018, Montevideo, Uruguay
- Skype conversations with UNCCD-GM representatives on importance of participatory approaches in support of the land degradation neutrality.

Burkina Faso:

- Preliminary meeting with key representatives of participating institutions, 21-22 May 2018. This was aimed at presenting the project again to these key persons and institutions as there had been a delay in commencing activities in the country. In addition, during the consultations agreements were reached on the implementation plan, plan for the national inception workshop and stakeholder mapping.
- National Inception Workshop: August 2019. This was in line with Activity 1.1.2 of the project; organizing national level workshops and outcomes included introduction of the methodology to national stakeholders, key national and local resource people to support the assessment identified, agreement on assessment sites and period of assessment.

Niger:

- Preliminary meeting with key representatives of participating institutions, 22-23 May 2018. This was aimed at presenting the project again to these key persons and institutions as there had been a delay in commencing activities in the country. In addition, the consultations were meant to reach agreements on the implementation plan, plan for the national inception workshop and stakeholder mapping.
- National Inception Workshop: August 2018.

This was in line with Activity 1.1.2 of the project; organizing national level workshops was aimed at introducing the methodology to national stakeholders, identifying key national and local resource people to support the assessment, agree on assessment sites and period of assessment.

Kyrgyzstan:

* Preliminary Stakeholder and Planning workshop: 25th to 26th of March 2019, Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan. The workshop was a preparatory event to meet the national Service provider; Camp Alattoo, share the methodology and agree on work plan for Kyrgyzstan.

* PRAGA training workshop: 17th of May, At-Bashy District, Kyrgyzstan. As most of the national stakeholders were interacting with the PRAGA methodology for the 1st time, this was a detailed training to familiarize the key stakeholders with the methodology.

* National inception workshop: 20th of May 2019, Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan. The results were wider understanding of the methodology with a wider national audience, detailed conversations on adapting the methodology to local conditions and needs, confirmation of implementation agreement, endorsement of revised work plan and agreement on data storage and access.

* Local inception workshop: 25th of June 2019, Naryn, Kyrgyzstan. This was an initial consultation with local communities in which the global domains of indicators were presented and discussed, communities gained familiarity with the project and also the collaborative learning on the how herders viewed/assessed land degradation and sustainable land management.

Uruguay:

* Participatory selection of rangeland ecosystem health indicators workshop: 25th to 25th of July 2018, Punta del Este, Uruguay. During this activity, locally relevant indicators for the pilot site were discussed and selected as guided by the global domains of indicators.

* Technical expert meeting to establish baseline indicators and their sources: 6th of February 2019, Montevideo, Uruguay.

* Pilot site inception workshop: 3rd to 4th of April 2019, Aiguá and Pilot site inception workshop: 9th to 10th of May 2019, in INIA demonstration farm. These pilot site inception workshops were used for further stakeholder consultation on local indicators, best practices including sustainable land management and policy discussions .

Kenya:

* Local inception Workshop: 10th to 11th of July 2018, Isiolo, Kenya. The project was officially launched at local level and goals and objectives of the project were shared including creating a link between project outcome and activities and county level rangeland assessment, planning and management. During this meeting, field assessment was planned; boundaries for assessment established and agreements reached on who from the local community resource persons to be included in the assessment, establishment of appropriate local indicators and assessment questionnaires revised.

* Participatory mapping and indicator Workshop: 6th August 2018, Isiolo, Kenya. This activity was meant to capture local knowledge in land degradation management through community mental maps and overlaying with remote sensing maps as well as detailed discussions on local indicators.

* Local validation workshop: 20th to 22nd of February 2019. The local validation workshop was used to present and share the results of field assessment with local communities and government officials for validation.

* National validation workshop: 8th of April 2015, Nairobi, Kenya. Prior to this workshop, consultative meetings with national stakeholders were held to discuss progress on the baseline and data assessment. This workshop was attended by national agencies in charge of rangeland management, project partners, research organizations, academia and technical experts. The results of the assessment were presented and further discussions on policy realities at national level

8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

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

PRAGA is an assessment system that combines scientific approaches such as use of remotely sensed data with participatory processes encompassing local knowledge in assessing land degradation and capturing best practices.

It is not only ground-breaking for combining these perspectives into a comprehensive methodology on rangeland ecological and social trends and drivers, but it also cost-effective.

The assessment methodology has participatory aspects as its integral part and ensures co-learning between scientists and local communities, harnessing scientific knowledge with traditional knowledge. Through participatory exercises such as definition of land degradation or degraded landscape, selecting indicators for assessment, selection of assessment landscape and period, it becomes apparent how local communities manage their land based on their respective objectives. It is also informing for practitioners to understand why certain species are of importance to local communities. All these contribute to better understanding of rangeland and grasslands health from a user perspective hence with opportunity to make better informed decisions on management and investment. It also improves capabilities of pastoral and vulnerable populations who depend on rangelands by having their perspectives and opinions heard and being recognized as valid stakeholders.

For the global environmental benefits, land degradation is approximated to cause billions of dollars annually. To arrest land degradation, solid methodologies that allow for monitoring are needed. While large-scale approaches such as remote sensing can give a snapshot on the trends and state of the health of rangelands and grasslands, they often do not tell the whole story for example on species composition or forage capability. Field assessments such as those designed in PRAGA enable "ground-truthing" of remote sensing data.

The PRAGA assessment methodology has been designed to allow practitioners to identify these elements and establish participatory, stakeholder Baseline indicators to guide different levels of management decisions. The results and analysis also serve as a vital component for guiding and evaluating investments in rangeland restoration and productivity. The project has been exploring ways for take-up of such methodologies including in informing global frameworks such as land degradation neutrality in support of Sustainable Development Goal 15; life on land.

Please provide the links to publications, video materials, etc.

FAO - <http://www.fao.org/gef/projects/detail/en/c/1056825/>

FAO - 'Sustainable land management in pastoral areas' (currently under development)

IUCN - <https://www.iucn.org/theme/ecosystem-management/our-work/global-drylands-initiative/gdi-projects/participatory-assessment-land-degradation-and-sustainable-land-management-grassland-and-pastoral-systems-praga>

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Multi-partner support mechanism (FMM)	AGP	Cash	300,000	300,000		300,000
AGP through FAO Strategic Programme 3	AGP	Cash	0	40,000		50,000
FAO Forestry team	Collect Earth	In-kind	0	50,000		100,000

European Union	Action against Desertification (AAD)	In cash and in-kind	2,000,000	1,000,000		2,000,000
Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (MGAP-Uruguay) & Ministry of Household, Territorial Ordering and Environment (MVOTMA-Uruguay)	MGAP-Uruguay & MVOTMA-Uruguay	In-kind and in-cash	1,200,000	570,940		2,300,000
European Union	IUCN	In-kind	1,100,000	533,265.28		1,100,000

Mountain Partnership Secretariat	Mountain Partnership Secretariat	In-kind	500,000	50,000		500,000
Pastoralist Knowledge Hub	Pastoralist Knowledge Hub	In-kind	562,270	65,000		562,270
CAMP Alatoo Public Foundation	CAMP Alatoo Public Foundation	In-kind	0.00 USD	100,000		500,000
		TOTAL	5,662,270	2,709,205.28		6,312,270

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

The project is also benefitting from new co-financing partners who were not initially mapped during CEO endorsement and whose contribution have been valuable support to the project.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** - Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”); **Satisfactory (S)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** - Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U)** - Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** - The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice”. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.