



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2023 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 31st March 2023

Table of contents

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 1. | BASIC PROJECT DATA | 2 |
| 2. | PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE) | 4 |
| 3. | IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP) | 9 |
| 4. | SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS | 16 |
| 5. | ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS) | 20 |
| 6. | RISKS..... | 21 |
| 7. | FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION | 28 |
| 8. | MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS..... | 30 |
| 9. | STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT | 31 |
| 10. | GENDER MAINSTREAMING..... | 34 |
| 11. | KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES | 36 |
| 12. | INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT..... | 39 |
| 13. | CO-FINANCING TABLE | 40 |

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

| | |
|---|---|
| Region: | Global |
| Country (ies): | Co financing collects lessons from primarily: Africa (Burkina Faso, Senegal, Ethiopia, South Africa, Morocco), Asia (India), Latin América (Brazil) |
| Project Title: | AVACLIM: Agroecology, ensuring food security and sustainable livelihoods while mitigating climate change and restoring land in dryland regions |
| FAO Project Symbol: | GCP/GLO/927/GFF |
| GEF ID: | 9993 |
| GEF Focal Area(s): | CCM 2 – Programme 4 LD 4 – Programme 5 |
| Project Executing Partners: | Centre for Actions and International Realisations (CARI) |
| Initial project duration (years): | 36 months |
| Project coordinates: <i>This section should be completed ONLY by:</i> <i>a) Projects with 1st PIR;</i> <i>b) In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.</i> | / |

Project Dates

| | |
|---|------------|
| GEF CEO Endorsement Date: | 6-Sep-2019 |
| Project Implementation Start Date/EOD : | 1-Oct-19 |
| Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹: | 31-Mar-23 |
| Revised project implementation End date (if approved) ² | N/A |

Funding

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| GEF Grant Amount (USD): | GEF TF: USD 1,137,215 |
| Total Co-financing amount (USD)³: | TOTAL Co-financing: USD 8,148,245 |
| Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD): | USD 1,132,073 |
| Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)⁴: | USD 871,095 |
| Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023⁵ | USD 5,168,626 |

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.

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: | 10-Jan-2022 |
| Expected Mid-term Review date ⁶ : | |
| Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed): | December 2022 |
| Expected Terminal Evaluation Date ⁷ : | 10 August 2023 |
| Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex) | NO |

Overall ratings

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative): | <i>Satisfactory</i> |
| Overall implementation progress rating: | <i>Satisfactory</i> |
| Overall risk rating: | <i>Low</i> |

ESS risk classification

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----|
| Current ESS Risk classification: | Low |
|----------------------------------|-----|

Status

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

Project Contacts

| Contact | Name, Title, Division/Institution | E-mail |
|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Project Coordinator (PC) | Jérôme Enjalbert, CARI | agroecologie@cariassociation.org |
| Budget Holder (BH) | Ronnie Brathwaite, FAO | Ronnie.Brathwaite@fao.org |
| GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP) | N/A | N/A |
| Lead Technical Officer (LTO) | Martial Bernoux, FAO | Martial.Bernoux@fao.org |
| GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO) | Maude Veyret-Picot, FAO/GEF | Maude.VeyretPicot@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 ⁹ | End-of-project Target | Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level at 30 June 2023 | Progress rating ¹¹ |
| Objective(s): Project Objective: Policy-makers and stakeholders are able to prioritise and implement agroecological systems in drylands as a means to sustain productivity of | Component 1: Building partnerships for experience sharing and capacity building of agroecology practitioners at the landscape and local levels with international connections among the project participants | | | | | | |
| | Outcome 1: Actionable knowledge on agroecology implementation is assumed and adopted by agroecology practitioners across the drylands | i) Number of practitioners involved in the Community of Practice | Agroecology initiatives are implemented in isolation in the targeted countries because of limited opportunities for knowledge sharing. | i) 2000 participants to events and users of the collaborative tools, including 40% of women | Total = 163 organizations. Senegal 36; Burkina Faso 38; Morocco 43; Ethiopia 39; South Africa 26; India 39; Brazil 22. The calculation is based on the list of COP members contained in the COP facilitation strategies. During the project, it appeared that the percentage target of women in the COP wasn’t relevant since the participants are mainly organization | S | |
| | | ii) Number of agroecological initiatives shared | | ii) At least 35 agroecology initiatives are shared (each initiative can have one, several or a combination of innovations) | A total of 45 initiatives have been characterized in cards, which present their characteristics and show the | HS | |

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).

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| agro-ecosystems in support of food security, agricultural livelihoods, and reduce environmental degradation and GHG emissions. | | | | | | diversity of agroecological initiatives. They have all been posted on the CARI website and on the FAO database for dissemination of their content. They can be downloaded from the project website: https://avaclim.org/fiches-initiatives/ . database for dissemination of their contents. They can be downloaded in the project website : https://avaclim.org/fiches-initiatives/ | |
| | Component 2: Assessment of existing initiatives for evidence-based decision-making at the national, local and landscape levels | | | | | | |
| | Outcome 2: <i>Knowledge and understanding of the impacts of agroecological systems and success factors of agroecological initiatives are consolidated through a scientifically harmonized protocol</i> | i) Number of functional and accessible tools for multidimensional assessment of agroecology initiatives developed | Because of limited availability of validated knowledge on the impacts and success factors of agroecology, agroecology remains often a theoretical and ideological option. | i) one functional and accessible tool for multidimensional assessment of agroecology initiatives drafted | i) one functional and accessible tool for multidimensional assessment of agroecology initiatives developed and validated | Achieved : a multi-criteria evaluation method was developed and endorsed by the project's international consortium. It was then implemented in the seven project countries. Based on feedback from partners and comments collected at an international scientific seminar, the method was adapted to become more operational and easier to use for future users. In addition, a digital application has been developed to facilitate the calculation of certain indicators. This application and the methodological guide to the method are currently being finalized for wider distribution. | S |
| | | ii) Number of initiatives assessed | | ii) at least 7 initiatives assessed | ii) at least 14 initiatives assessed | Achieved : All 14 initiatives have been evaluated and reported on | S |
| | | iii) Number of knowledge products developed | | iii) at least one knowledge product developed | iii) at least 8 knowledge products developed | The following knowledge products have been developed and communicated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vademecum • Scientific Workshop Report • 3 action sheets (1 for steps 1 to 3 and 2 for step 4) • Tools step 1 (8 tools, 1A1 to 1C2); • Tools step 2 (3 tools, from 2.1 to 2.3) ; • Step 3 tools (3 tools, 3.1 to 3.3); • Step 4 tools (2 tools: 4.1 and 4.2). • Assessment Tool Methodology Guide; | S |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">National summariesGlobal report and synthesis | |
| Component 3: Advocacy for informed decision-making | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 3: <i>Evidence-based decision-making on agroecology is strengthened and systematized at international, national, local and landscape levels</i> | i) Number of advocacy opportunities created (including meetings, communication tools, radio emission) | There is no transformation of knowledge on the effects of the quantitative effects of agroecology into messages for decision-makers at the national or at the local levels in the targeted country. | i) the advocacy strategy is being drafted | i) at least 9 events, and 10 advocacy documents and tools | - 7 national advocacy workshops, 2 international advocacy meetings and 1 international advocacy seminar (DA22). The international advocacy strategy is finalized and national strategies are being finalized with partners. - All countries have prepared a position paper. 3 international position papers have been written in the framework of the D'A/AVACLIM dynamics | S | |
| | ii) Number of international organisation (e.g. UNCCD, UNFCCC, WB, ADB, FAO) within which the relevant department(s) endorse the advocacy messages generated under the project | | ii) none | ii) at least 3 international organisations have endorsed advocacy messages | - The project has not yet generated specific advocacy messages, which should have been based on the knowledge generated by the AVACLIM assessment tool. However, the Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS) has endorsed the dynamics of Desertif'Action and its messages on agroecology, as seen in 8 fact sheets produced by the organization, and in the Summit position papers that also contain the OSS logo. The UNCCD agreed to host an open dialogue session on agroecology during COP15 in Abidjan, which was organized by AVACLIM. In addition, the UNCCD co-funded the Desert Summit 2022 and one of its representatives participated in the event. - The fact sheets are available at: https://desertif-actions.org/en/homepage/desertifactions-2022/preparatory-phase/ - These facts can be taken as an endorsement of the content of AVACLIM in a broad sense. | S | |
| Component 4: Communication, learning, knowledge management and adaptive management | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| | Outcome 4: <i>Knowledge on the impact and the success factors of agroecology made publicly available</i> | i) Number of M&E systems developed and implemented | The availability of communication tools on evidence-based information on the benefits of agroecology is very low. | i) one M&E system developed and under implementation | i) one M&E system developed and implemented | A monitoring and evaluation strategy was produced and validated by the steering committee. This strategy is accompanied by an activity monitoring table and a procedures manual. | S |
| | | ii) Number of evidence-based communication tools and events on the benefits of agroecology developed and disseminated | | ii) at least 1 printed tool (one article in addition to all project presentation tools), 2 digital tools (project website and first digital newsletter) | ii) at least 4 printed tools, 4 digital tools, 8 documentaries, 8 press conferences; and participation to at least 4 scientific conferences | <p>Printed tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A brochure presenting the project was produced and printed for specific events. Two briefing notes were written. <p>Printed tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 7 posters (one for each country) - 1 international brochure - 1 international leaflet - 2 national leaflets (India and Senegal) <p>Digital tool: 1 website / 1 newsletter / RS / 1 digital evaluation tools: Facebook and Twitter (#Avaclim); Whatsapp (Project Group) / FAO and CARI databases related to AE and desertification. Agroecology data hub: the 45 initiatives are uploaded.</p> <p>Documentaries : 1 film per country has been finalized; 1 international film was finalized</p> <p>Press conferences: Press conferences were held in all countries except Ethiopia, where a TV and radio program were preferred instead.</p> <p>Participation in scientific conferences :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sustainability Research and Innovation Congress (SRI 2022): June 20-24; - Science Day at COP15 UNCCD (May 14) - World Water Forum (March 22-27) - ESA, Potsdam; - SOCLA (Costa Rica, online) - ALASRU (Mexico, December) | S |

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

| Outcome | Action(s) to be taken | By whom? | By when? |
|---------|-----------------------|----------|----------|
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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 avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR) | Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| Component 1: Building partnerships for experience sharing and capacity building of agroecology practitioners at the landscape and local levels with international connections among the project participants | | | | |
| Outcome 1: Actionable knowledge on agroecology implementation is assumed and adopted by agroecology practitioners across the drylands | | | | |
| Output 1.1 An agroecology global database with i) successful agroecological innovations in dryland areas, and ii) quantitative, qualitative and spatial data on projects | I.1.1: two databases are incremented by a minimum of 35 "fact-sheets" (minimum 5 per country) and complementary documents related to these initiatives | 0 (more factsheets has been prepared than expected) | I.1.1: No additional achievement during this reporting period. | More fact-sheet than expected were prepared on the proposal of local partners and initiative holder in order to disseminate more knowledge on successful initiatives. |
| Output 1.2 Capacity development through knowledge exchange events to | I.1. 2: A national seminar to share experiences in agroecology is organized in each of the 7 countries of intervention and allow the participation of 20 participants (per country) | 1 seminar | I.1. 2: A total of 7 national seminars were organized (one in each country), gathering the Community of Practice members. No additional achievement during this reporting period. | No change |

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.

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| disseminate agroecological innovations in participating countries | I.1.3: Two field visits are organized for 20 people (per visit) | National Knowledge exchange are organized in 7 countries | I.1.3: During the reporting period, all country partners (except ISD, Ethiopia) could organize knowledge exchange activities (webinars and field visits). | The international experience sharing activities had to be cancelled due to the COVID travel restrictions. It was decided during the 7 th Steering Committee meeting that they shall be replaced by national field visits for the community of practice members, and 3 International Webinars. |
| Output 1.3 A dynamic community of practice on agroecology | I.1.4: At least one Community of Practice is supported by country of intervention, to promote the dissemination of relevant practices and national dynamic, among others through the collaborative tools designed by CARI (forum, database etc.) | The 7 CoP that were created remain supported and active. | I.1.4: One community of practice was supported and established in each country (total of 7), and they all developed their own national facilitation strategy in 2021. During this reporting period, the project partners in each country kept on facilitating their Communities of Practice accordingly, notably using WhatsApp groups and mailing lists, and preparing/disseminating communication documents. | 7 national strategies define the facilitation of the CoP to be established by each partner. Tools to support the Community of Practice (CoP) were also developed and used (a WhatsApp group is used by several CoPs). |
| Component 2: Assessment of existing initiatives for evidence-based decision-making at the national, local and landscape levels | | | | |
| Outcome 2 : <i>Knowledge and understanding of the impacts of agroecological systems and success factors of agroecological initiatives are consolidated through a scientifically harmonized protocol</i> | | | | |
| Output 2.1 A multicriteria assessment tool to measure the impacts of agroecological systems and success factors of agroecological initiatives developed and validated using | I.2.1: A set of criteria and general indicators is proposed for all countries, as well as optional criteria and indicators to define according to the country | 1 set of criteria and indicators | I.2.1: Completed – the set of criteria and indicators have been proposed. Countries adapted the methodology to their local context and used the methodology and related tools. No additional achievement during this reporting period. | No change |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| a participative approach | | | | |
| Output 2.2: Training sessions and user-guide to use and disseminate the multicriteria assessment tool | <p>I.2.2: A methodological framework for evaluating the initiatives is designed</p> <p>I.2.3: A specific methodological protocol is designed per country</p> | <p>1 methodology is designed</p> <p>7 country partners received training and support</p> <p>7 national protocols are designed</p> | <p>I.2.2: During this reporting period, CARI team started fine-tuning the evaluation methodology on the basis of users' feedbacks. Furthermore, a digital tool and a methodological guide were developed to ensure the methodology dissemination.</p> <p>The evaluation officer from CARI kept on providing advice and guidance on the use of the AVACLIM methodology (data collection, indicators calculation, analysis etc.)</p> <p>I.2.3: No additional achievement during this reporting period.</p> | <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> |
| Output 2.3 Country-based and global evidence-based references on impacts and success factors of agroecology | <p>I.2.4: At least two initiatives per country are identified, one of which, at least, is led by the partner</p> <p>I.2.5: Priority axes requiring a knowledge strengthening are identified</p> <p>I.2.6: Biophysical and socio-economic data are collected following the methodological protocol, with the support of trainees in each country of intervention and under the supervision of scientists</p> | <p>2 initiatives identified per country</p> <p>Identification of at least one axes per country</p> <p>Data collected finalized in 14 initiatives</p> | <p>I.2.4: Completed: No additional achievement during this reporting period.</p> <p>I.2.5: Completed. No additional achievement during this reporting period.</p> <p>I.2.6: Completed: No additional achievement during this reporting period.</p> | <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>I.2.6: All data could be collected, except some specific data in Ethiopia, due to security reasons (local unrest). It was decided to abandon the collection of the remaining data, without affecting the quality of the report.</p> |

2023 Project Implementation Report

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| | <p>I.2.7: A national seminar is organized per country of intervention to report and discuss the results</p> <p>I.2.8: For each country, an evaluation report and a synthesis are written</p> <p>I.2.9: A global report and synthesis are written (in French and English)</p> <p>I.2.10: An international seminar is organized, gathering at least 20 people and allowing to identify the contents of international advocacy</p> | <p>1 seminar per country</p> <p>7 reports for step 1 to 4</p> <p>7 national synthesis and a global synthesis report</p> <p>N/A</p> | <p>I.2.7: All country partners, except ISD (Ethiopia) were able to organize a national seminar to present and discuss the results of the evaluation.</p> <p>I.2.8: All reports were finalized by local partners.</p> <p>I.2.9 During the reporting period, all national synthesis were finalized, as well as a global report</p> <p>I.2.10: The international scientific seminar was organized in Montpellier, from January 11th to 12th</p> | <p>The Ethiopian partner couldn't organize the local seminar due to time constraints: the finalization of the data collection was delayed because of local security context, which affected the report finalization.</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> |
| Component 3: Advocacy for informed decision-making | | | | |
| Outcome 3: <i>Evidence-based decision-making on agroecology is strengthened and systematized at international, national, local and landscape levels</i> | | | | |
| Output 3.1 A common but differentiated advocacy strategy developed by CSOs | <p>I.3.1: A strategy for international advocacy is in writing</p> <p>I.3.2: 7 national strategies are in writing</p> <p>I.3.3: A document summing up the all messages conveyed by national and international advocacy actors is produced</p> <p>I.3.4: At least 10 positions documents and/or flyers and other advocacy materials are produced (including one per country) based on the advocacy strategy</p> | <p>1 international advocacy strategy</p> <p>1 national advocacy strategy per Country</p> <p>1 document is finalized</p> <p>10 position papers</p> | <p>I.3.1: Completed: No additional achievement during this reporting period.</p> <p>I.3.2: Completed: No additional achievement during this reporting period.</p> <p>I.3.3: Completed: No additional achievement during this reporting period.</p> <p>I.3.4: Each partner has produced a position paper, 3 position papers have been produced in the framework of the Desertif'Actions/AVACLIM dynamics, as well as a policy brief, and a document listing 10 main recommendations of the project.</p> | <p>I.3.1: No change</p> <p>I.3.2: No change</p> <p>I.3.3: No change</p> <p>I.3.4: No change</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Output 3.2 Dynamic network to establish the dialogue amongst different stakeholders on agroecology through the implementation of the advocacy strategy | I.3.5: 7 national advocacy seminars (one per country) are organized and gather public authorities, donors, and international institutions | 1 national advocacy seminar per Country | I.3.5: Completed, all national partners organized a national advocacy workshop, inviting a wide variety of actors | I.3.5: No change |
| | I.3.6: At least one collective intervention is organized for advocacy during international events | 1 collective intervention | I.3.6: AVACLIM partners participated to: - the UNCCD COP15 in Abidjan, and organized one specific side event "Agroecology: a way to achieve prosperity by 2030 ?". - The Sustainability Research and Innovation Congress (SRI2022) in Pretoria, in June 2022 presenting a session named " ("Agroecology the game changer lever for SGDs: case studies from African Drylands" | 1 more collective intervention has been organized thanks to the mobilization of the scientific consortium of the project and some national partners: the SRI2022 in Pretoria was a good opportunity to discuss about the AVACLIM methodology with a scientific audience. |
| | I.3.7: An international seminar on the relevance for agroecology to face the climate change in drylands gathers projects' partners, international institutions, and different country representative | N/A (the seminar was initially Planned for October 2022) | I.3.7: The international event Desertification about agroecology was successfully organized in Montpellier, France, in October 2022, and gathered an important delegation of AVACLIM partners | No change |
| Component 4: Communication, learning, knowledge management and adaptive management | | | | |
| Outcome 4: <i>Knowledge on the impact and the success factors of agroecology made publicly available</i> | | | | |
| Output 4.1 Project monitoring and evaluation for learning and adaptive management | I.4.1: Tools for the monitoring and evaluation exist | N/A the monitoring and evaluation tools Have been developed in the previous FY and are currently being used. | I.4.1: Completed. No additional achievement during this reporting period | No change |
| | I.4.2: The project governance system works | 2 steering committees to be implemented during the FY; | I.4.2: 2 steering committees have been organized during this FY. Planning, facilitation, management, monitoring, implementation, and | No change |

2023 Project Implementation Report

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| | <p>I.4.3: The project schedule is respected</p> <p>I.4.4: All partners participate in the plenary assemblies of the project: launch assembly, mid-term assembly and closing assembly</p> <p>I.4.5: Members of the steering committee participate in all the project steering committees</p> <p>I.4.6: An internal evaluation is carried out at the mid-term and at the end of the project</p> | <p>Progress reports are submitted on time</p> <p>One end-of-project assembly</p> <p>Attendance of all involved organizations</p> <p>One Final evaluation is submitted</p> | <p>narrative/financial reporting of activities have been undertaken as per the project document. 10 steering committees have been organized with attendance of its members.</p> <p>I.4.3: Achieved, project progress reports were submitted on time</p> <p>I.4.4: achieved: the end-of-project assembly was successfully organized in Montpellier, France, In October 13th. All partners participated in this meeting</p> <p>I.4.5: Globally the participation rate of the steering committee members was 73%/</p> <p>I.4.6: The final evaluation has been carried out by private consultants (Natascia Palmieri and Piroshini Trikawalagoda and its results were presented to the project partners during the end-of-project assembly</p> | <p>I.4.3: No change</p> <p>I.4.4: No change: All partners participated in the kick-off workshop. All partners participated in the mid-term online workshop; All partners participated in the closing workshop</p> <p>I.4.5: The members of the steering committee all participate in each steering committee. It was planned to hold face-to-face steering committee meetings at least once a year. The context of the pandemic did not allow these meetings to take place.</p> <p>I.4.6: No change.</p> |
| Output 4.2 Knowledge management and dissemination of project's products and lessons learned | I.4.7: A website and Facebook page are active | Regular updates and news on the Social medias; | I.4.7: The Avaclim website is active (publications are regularly posted). We have not created a Facebook page, preferring WhatsApp for exchanges between the different actors involved and the information channel of the CARI Twitter account to relay news. There is a hashtag #Avaclim | No change. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|------------|
| in an adapted format for a wider audience | | | systematically used on the Facebook and Twitter accounts of the country partners, CARI and the FFEM. | |
| | I.4.8: A poster and a presentation leaflet per country, a poster and a presentation leaflet for the international use are produced | One poster per country, to be displayed at UNCCD COP | I.4.8: There is also a presentation leaflet for the international level. A poster by country, presenting the 2 local initiatives, was published (in French and English) and presented at the COP15 of the UNCCD. | No change. |
| | I.4.9: At least one film per country (testimonies) and one global film are produced on the initiatives evaluated and the results achieved (short version: transversal teaser) | - 7 national scripts and 1 international script - 6 Version 1 of the national documentaries; - 1 Version 0 of the international Documentary | I.4.9: The 7 national films and their trailers have been finalized. The multi-country video has been finalized. | No change. |
| | I.4.10: News are sent regularly I.4.11: Articles and press releases are produced | Regular news are released on the social media and websites. | I.4.10 and I.4.11: AVACLIM and Cari Website are frequently updated with news from AVACLIM project. One newsletter (FR/EN) has been sent, and the other will be published soon. | No change. |
| | I.4.12: At least one scientific article in an international journal of rank A and one article in an international minor journal are written | One article submitted in a Rank A international journal; | I.4.12: One scientific article was validated in March 2023 by a rank A journal (International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability). A second article was submitted to the Italian Journal of Agronomy, in the process of validation on 31/03/2023. | No change. |

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)

Component 1:

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the planned international study tours to a French-speaking and an English-speaking country could not be conducted. It was therefore decided to conduct planned studies tours at the national level in order to support the exchanges of the COP members. The activities could then be implemented in each country, except for Ethiopia. Indeed, the Ethiopian partner deemed it impossible to sign this new agreement because it implied a pre-financing of the activities.

The activities carried out as part of this exchange of experience are varied and have allowed each partner to respond to the specific needs of their community of practice. Examples include the following activities:

- Webinars: 3 webinars were held:
- Experience-sharing tours and workshops.

Component 2:

During this FY all partners finalized two reports for each initiative: one for steps 1 to 3, and a second for step 4. Based on these reports, the overall analysis and synthesis documents were drafted: (i) A synthesis document of the country evaluation; (ii) A global evaluation report; (iii) A synthesis of the global evaluation report.

One of the objectives in developing the AVACLIM evaluation method was to make the method accessible to agro-ecology practitioners, so that they could use it in future projects. Given the complexity of the method (and in particular of step 4) and the tools used during the project, it was decided to develop two distinct elements: (i) A methodological guide presenting the method in its entirety; (ii) A digital application to simplify the information and calculation of the indicators and criteria of step 4. The application and the methodological guide, developed by CARI in conjunction with the project's international scientific consortium, will be disseminated and used beyond the AVACLIM project.

With the finalization of the reports on the evaluation of the agro-ecological initiatives, the country partners were finally able to organize the scientific workshops for the restitution of the results. All country partners have implemented this activity, except the Ethiopian partners due to the unrest in the country.

In addition, from January 11 to 12, 2023 was held a major event at the end of the AVACLIM project: the AVACLIM review workshop. These days were an opportunity to bring together up to 60 people from 11 different countries around the AVACLIM project and the evaluation methodologies of agroecology.

Component 3:

In October 2022, CARI and BothENDS produced a **policy brief** entitled "How donors can accelerate the agroecological transition: Recommendations from the AVACLIM Project". This document, finalized at the beginning of October 2022, was widely disseminated on social networks, as well as during the Désertif'Actions 2022 Summit. Each country also finalized a **position paper** tailored to its context and advocacy objectives, drawing as much as possible on the results of the AVACLIM project.

All partners organized a national advocacy workshops, which were one of the core activities of the national advocacy strategies as they aimed to bring together the community of practice actors and other actors identified as advocacy "targets" with a view to disseminating the learning and arguments in favor of agroecology developed under the project.

From October 5 to 8, 2022 the international summit Désertif'Actions 2022 (DA22) took place in Montpellier, organized with the partnership of the AVACLIM project and with the main theme of Agroecology. A strong delegation of AVACLIM partners was able to participate, with generally 2 representatives from each country (one scientist and one CSO representative). A total of 270 participants from 39 countries took part in the DA22 summit and its various highlights (press drawing competition, plenary lectures and a public festival of earth and seeds).

Component 4:

During the second half of 2022, 7 national videos as well as the AVACLIM "multi-country" video were finalized with the service provider OREC Média and distributed to the project partners. In addition, the project partners had the opportunity to organize a press conference, aimed at disseminating the results of the activities to a wider audience. Partners have generally chosen to hold this conference in conjunction with the scientific feedback workshop and/or the advocacy workshop.

Regarding project coordination and governance, we can highlight the following elements during this FY :

- Organization of the 9th and 10th steering committee meetings of the project;
- Organization of the project closing workshop, on January 13, 2023 in Montpellier, and gathering a total of 32 people, including 14 women.
- Conduction of the project final evaluation by a team of consultants.
- Conduction of 2 Coordination missions :
 - Mission of the Coordinator Jérôme Enjalbert in Ethiopia, from July 4 to 8, 2022 ;
 - Mission of the Administrative and Financial Manager of CARI in Ethiopia, from February 23 to March 7, 2023.

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 | Considering the relative complexity of this multi-stakeholder and multi-country project, as well as a difficult international health context, the OD and PI review continues to show a positive result regarding project coordination. In connection with the local partners of the civil society and the scientists as well as with the steering committee, the coordination of the project remains satisfactory since, despite some delays, the majority of the objectives have been achieved. It should be noted that CARI had to mobilize a new coordinator in February 2022 upon the departure of the previous one. This change of staff in a critical position for the project did not have any impact on the implementation of activities and relations with partners. |
| Budget Holder | S | S | The project achieved most of its major global environmental objectives even the complexity of the activities were very high. The project also yielded satisfactory global environmental benefits which are expected to be adopted by other relevant stakeholders. Due to movement and travel restrictions imposed by COVID-19 pandemic there were some minor shortcomings. |
| GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸ | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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

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

¹⁷ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

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

| | | | |
|--|----------|----------|---|
| Lead Technical Officer¹⁹ | S | S | Despite the challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic and the diversity and number of stakeholders, the project was able to deliver most of the objectives initially planned, or adequate to the situation. |
| GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO) | S | S | <p>The project concluded successfully with all main objectives and expected results achieved. The project further strengthened and enhanced a CSO-academia-research community network of actors. The challenges faced were resolved in due course, keeping the focus on results-delivery.</p> <p>A lot of time and energy, and resources, were committed and invested in the development of an assessment tool under component 2. However, the complexity of the tool may jeopardize its sustainability and scaling. The partnership reflected on this question and addressed it in its exit strategy.</p> <p>At project closure of this global normative and capacity building investment, it is hoped that participating countries (and other dryland countries) will actively use the products produced, the learning and partnerships to further scale agroecology, and contribute to a true transformation of the agriculture sector in their fragile agro-ecosystems.</p> |

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.

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 | <i>The classification of environmental and social risks is still valid because the project activities have not fundamentally changed since the beginning of the project and the last PIR. Therefore, the project has not triggered, and is not expected to trigger, any of the social and environmental safeguards of the FAO.</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. |
|---|
| Nothing to report. |

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

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified 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.

| | 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 | Project partners do not agree on roles and responsibilities, and distribution of the grants | Impact: High Likelihood: Low | | (i) Involvement of project partners in every step of the project design. (ii) Validation in the project proposal of role and budget distribution by all project stakeholders. (iii) During the project inception phase, in-depth discussions about the roles and responsibilities and timelines and delivery mechanisms. | (i) All partners were fully involved in all stages of the project design. (ii) Budget has been precisely described in the partnership agreement and presented in each Annual Working Plan and Budget . (iii) There have been a clear description and presentation of the roles and responsibilities of the partners. In addition to the clarifications made at the beginning of the project, other meetings were needed to clarify the role of the national scientific referent and the role of the Component 2 consortium in implementing and monitoring the evaluation of the agroecological initiatives. | Partners have been effectively involved which contributed to the good implementation of the project. |

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.

| | 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 |
|---|--|---|------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 2 | Project partners (e.g. FFEM, IRD) do not cash the estimated co-financing (<i>impossibility to implement the entirety of complementary interventions</i>) | Impact: High Likelihood: Low | Y | (i) Signature of the co-financing letters. (ii) Involvement of partners in each step of the project and they are aligned with the project's intervention logic and delivery mechanisms. | (i) All the co-financing letters were signed without any problems. (ii) The co-financing partners are always involved in the project, especially through frequent meetings, steering committees and continuous mail exchanges. FFEM has also contributed more than expected in the expenditures of the project because of the delay in the LoA signature. | FFEM and GEF representatives have been very active supporting the implementation of the project. |
| 3 | Some of the partner NGOs at the national level are not able to initiate a country-wide, dynamic experience-sharing process on agroecology (<i>Output 1.3 unsuccessful</i>) | Impact: Medium Likelihood: Low | Y | (i) Selection of partners with existing agroecology networks. (ii) Capacities development activities of national NGOs by CARI and EMG. | (i) Partners are all involved in at least one network promoting agroecology . These include international networks (mainly Drynet) and national networks of farmers' organizations, specific movements for the promotion of agroecology, or institutional dialogue processes on agricultural and environmental policies. (ii) EMG with the support of the Avaclim coordinator, has supported partners in the preparation of the national workshops (agenda, participants review, facilitation book). CoP Members have been identified and the communities are currently collaborating together at national level. | Local partners have provided a valuable support for the implementation of the project. |

| | 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 |
|--|--|--|------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | The political situation in one or more partnering countries does not allow the smooth and constructive roll-out of activities (<i>negative impact on the availability and involvement of the national government stakeholders</i>) | Impact: medium Likelihood: Medium | Y | (i) Taking into account periods of political transitions in the planning of interventions (seminars and workshops). (ii) Rigorous planning of advocacy interventions. (iii) Our implementing partners are mostly NGOs that are generally less impacted by political instabilities. | (i) Events and missions are organized in collaboration with local partner in order to cope with local context. In some cases adjustments had to be done : for example the film shooting in Burkina Faso had to be undertaken by a local sub-contractor as it was not possible for OREC MEDIA to go there for security reasons. Delays have also been caused by political unrests in Ethiopia, preventing local team to access some of the initiatives. (ii) The pandemic is limiting the planning of advocacy activities in partner's countries. The project adapts to this new situation and continues to move forward while respecting national policies and events . (iii) All implementing partners are NGOs and therefore not directly impacted by political instabilities. | Guidance of the Steering Committee has been crucial to overcome the problems caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and political unrest. |

| | 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 |
|--|--|---|------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | Despite positive and significant results obtained at all levels on the effects of agroecology, stakeholder groups targeted by the awareness raising and advocacy campaigns do not show interest in this approach and/or do not take them into account (<i>global project objective not achieved</i>) | Impact: High Likelihood: Low | Y | Advocacy strategies build on successes, failures and lessons learned from other advocacy interventions by CARI and his partners. | National and international strategies, as well as other advocacy material were developed by identifying different targets and messages, taking into account the specificity of each context, as well as the potential difficulties in getting the messages across. So far both the international and national experiences are showing good interest from targeted stakeholders of different level. Local partners facing difficulties also benefited from the experience and feedbacks of other AVACLIM partners. | The material developed has been effective to raise awareness. |

| | 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 |
|--|---|---|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | Prolonged droughts, heat waves or other extreme events occur and prevent the timely implementation of the data collection campaign (<i>unreliable results because of data gaps</i>) | Impact: Medium Likelihood: Low | Y | (i) Evaluation, during the international workshops, of the climate sensitivities of the pre-selected indicators and measurement methods. This criterion will be taken into account when integrating the indicators into the assessment tool. (ii) Second verification of this sensitivity to local climate risks during the national workshop. | (i) and (ii) The indicators and their collection method were designed in the middle of the COVID-19 pandemic period but the health restrictions that can prevent the implementation of the assessment are the responsibility of governments. It is not relevant to assess the influence of the pandemic on the selected indicators and criteria since the most problematic and global consequence could be the impossibility of carrying out the evaluation in the field (lockdown or evaluators/initiative holders' infection by the virus). During this PIR period, the data collection campaign has been delayed by political unrest in Ethiopia, which prevent the data collection team to access one of the initiatives from time to time. However most of the data could be collected and remaining information was abandoned without affecting the quality of the evaluation report. | Although the COVID-19 pandemic and the political unrest hamper the data collection; a satisfactory amount of data was collected. |

| | 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 |
|--|---|--|------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | Collaboration between the very diverse panel of project partners is unproductive because of barriers in languages, opinions or approaches (<i>inefficient knowledge sharing and collaborative work aiming to support drylands approach</i>) | Impact : Medium Likelihood : Medium | Y | (i) NGOs play a role of facilitator between scientists and practitioners to ensure smooth and productive collaboration. (ii) Project objective will be reminded as often as required. (iii) Translators will be appointed as often as necessary. (iv) Maximisation of collaboration between French- and English-speaking countries throughout the project implementation phase. | (i) The partner NGO plays its role of facilitator between the scientists (national and of the scientific referents of the consortium) and the practitioners of agroecology. (ii) CARI team reminds to the AVACLIM team as often as possible the global objective of the project to keep a common guideline. (iii) The project coordination team speaks French, English, and the scientific referent in Brazil speaks Portuguese. We appointed interpreters for workshop and translated working documents as much as possible (in Portuguese too) . (iv) A series of events have been organized to bring together all these actors at the international level (open calls, webinars etc.). Participatory communication, facilitation tools and international online seminars according to the time differences in each country are organised. | The implementation partner has been effective in overcoming the language difficulties. |

| | 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 |
|--|---|--|------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | COVID-19 crisis can prevent the smooth project activities implementation due to national health restrictions (lockdown, curfew) or evaluators and initiative holder's infection | Impact: Moderate Likelihood: Moderate | N | (i) Adapt all project activities (until the end of the project) to the current situation. (ii) To be as close as possible to the partners in order to know their needs, obstacles and difficulties related to the pandemic that they face. Provide a technical and logistical support. | (i) From the beginning of the pandemic, the coordination team adapted the ongoing activities in a proactive way and measures were taken to avoid delays . Since the beginning of this PIR period, COVID related travel restrictions were generally lighter, or even waived, and allowed project activities, including international missions, to take place. (ii) Strong relationship have been maintained between the coordination team and local partners. The new evaluation officer from CARI has also been ensuring a close monitoring of the partners needs regarding the evaluation activity. | Partners have carefully implemented field activities to avoid further delays but always prioritizing the health security of their staff. |

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

| FY2021 rating | FY2022 rating | Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period |
|---------------|---------------|--|
| Low | Low | No new risks have been identified since the previous PIR and existing risks do not compromise the achievement of the project objectives. |

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

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

| MTR or supervision mission recommendations | Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u> |
|---|--|
| RECOMMENDATION ON COMPONENT 1 : | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Facilitate exchanges within the CoPs (exchange visits, etc.). Validate associated budget reallocations. (ii) Encourage co-production within the CoPs in connection with C3 (events, intellectual production...) to strengthen cohesion (iii) For monitoring and evaluation purposes: Describe the CoPs to better explain the effect of the project: objectives, trajectory, number of practitioners... to allow at the end of the project to evaluate if the needs identified by the CoP have been covered in the framework of Avaclim | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) It was decided to implement open calls and webinars in order to enhance COP knowledge exchanges activities. Two pen call have been organized (one about evaluation activity, and the second about knowledge exchange among COP). Budget has been reallocated from the international field visit to national field visit. All partners (except ISD, Ethiopia) organized some national knowledge exchange activities with their CoP members, as well as external stakeholders. (ii) CoP members were involved in the organization of the national advocacy workshops, that were organized in each country. (iii) As part of the final report, each national partners included a chapter describing the implementation of the CoP facilitation strategy in their country. |
| RECOMMENDATION ON COMPONENT 2 : | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) No trade-offs: having both evaluation results <u>and</u> a functional tool that is accessible and replicable are important (ii) Evaluation results have to be compiled / consolidated despite differences in initiatives. => Use the national workshops to identify key elements to be drawn from each assessment and how to assemble them to meet advocacy needs (iii) Strengthen C2 - C3 communication so that the results of the evaluations can be progressively valorized by C3 without waiting for the production of the evaluation report (iv) Quickly define a precise schedule for the realization of evaluations, the feedback of field experiences, their consolidation and the translation of the multi-criteria evaluation method in an accessible form (practical guide?) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Evaluation results will be available as planned. Considering the complexity of the evaluation tool CARI team developed a methodological guide, as well as a digital tool for the use of the AVACLIM methodology. (ii) National and international synthesis document have been developed. (iii) It was decided to start developing advocacy messages and related communication on the basis of available data from evaluations steps 1 to 3. A policy brief has been developed with Both Ends. The Evaluation results and advocacy messages were presented during : Desertif'Actions22, an international scientific seminar, national scientific restitution workshops, national advocacy workshops and several scientific events. (iv) A precise schedule has been proposed by the evaluation team during Steering Committee n°7 and was then updated periodically in order to take into account any additional information or event. |

| RECOMMENDATION ON COMPONENT 3 : | |
|--|--|
| <p>(i) Focus the advocacy objectives by prioritizing issues common to different countries and at the international level (time remaining short => don't lose focus)</p> <p>(ii) Understand the targets in a comprehensive way (assembly of national and state advocacy issues)</p> <p>(iii) Build the messages by progressively enhancing the achievements :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the initiatives identified and documented (already available) : - the results - even partial - from the initiatives' evaluation work (without waiting for the evaluations to be finalized) - needs to identify the priority evaluation criteria in relation to the common issues identified, in order to monitor the progress of the evaluations on these criteria - Results from other projects <p>(iv) Articulate Avaclim's advocacy strategy with the advocacy dynamics of the networks to which Avaclim's partners belong (Drynet, IFOAM...) = DA dynamics</p> | <p>(i) Regarding international advocacy, the advocacy team decided to focus on a limited number of thematic (that are part of the UNCCD COP15) in order to develop the policy brief : Draught, Land degradation and food security;</p> <p>(ii) A close collaboration was implemented between the advocacy team and national partners in order to help them implementing their strategy coping with local specificities. National partners were assisted in the development of a position paper and the organization of their national advocacy workshop</p> <p>(iii) The latest advocacy documents (policy review, 10 recommendations, position papers) have been developed taking into account all available results, without waiting for the final results of the evaluation. The contributions made to the UNCCD COP15, as well as the learnings that were disseminated in the side events, were also made taking into account this recommendation.</p> <p>(iv) A permanent link was ensured with the partners of the various networks linked to AVACLIM, and this link has been further strengthened in recent months with the participation of partners in the COP15, and in the Désertif'Actions dynamic. Concerning the latter, as well as the international scientific seminar, most of the countries have elaborated contributions to participate in it, and an important delegation of partners (CSOs and scientists) of the AVACLIM project was invited and financed through the project.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize</p> | <p>As it was recommended in the project Final Evaluation, the CARI together with the international scientific consortium developed an exit strategy for the evaluation tool. It was thus decided the following actions :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of a methodological guide, with and adapted methodology, based on users' feedbacks as well as results of the international scientific seminar group-discussions. • Development of a digital tool in order to facilitate the calculation of the indicators. • Financing the digital tools maintenance and hosting for a few years after closure of the project, allowing some additional updates; • Enhancing the use of the AVACLIM methodology in other projects and experiences and consider what type of synergies can be established, particularly with FAO's TAPE. |
|--|---|

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 Guidelines²². 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 | In response to the health issue, retrocession of funds allocated to international experience sharing activities, for activities at national level, conducted by country partners under the responsibility of EMG | December 2021 | Steering committee |
| 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) | Implementation of "Open calls" to enhance the link between the partners of AVACLIM. Selected topics are : the application and adaptations of the evaluation stages, the modalities of animation and perpetuation of the CoPs, the regional and international articulation of advocacy actions, and the sharing of videos and filming experience. | December 2021 | Steering committee. |

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

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

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

| Stakeholder name | Role in project execution | Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement | Challenges on stakeholder engagement |
|--|---|---|---|
| Government Institutions | | | |
| National governments including decision makers | None | Government institutions are indirectly part of the priority targets identified by the project's international advocacy strategy, as they are stakeholders in organizations such as the UNCCD or the European Union (priority 1 in the international strategy). A certain number of results were obtained during this fiscal year, in particular through their mobilization during the project events. The following collaborations can be mentioned in particular: | -- |
| Relevant sectoral ministries at the decentralised level such as Ministry of Agriculture | none | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participation in the AVACLIM international scientific seminar of a representative of the French Ministry of Agriculture and Alimentation. - Participation of representatives from the UNCCD and several local administrations (Montpellier, Arusha etc.) in the Desertification 22 Summit. | - |
| Non-Government organizations (NGOs) | | | |
| CARI | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project overall coordination - Specific coordination of Components 3 and 4 | Good progress in the implementation of the project milestones, including the delivery of progress reports and the organization of project management meetings (general assembly, steering committees etc.). Some coordination mission could be organized in Ethiopia (by the coordinator and finance officer). | Reduction in the number of international coordination missions due to travel restrictions (COVID) |
| EMG | Implementation of Component 1; | Good supervision of the implementation of activities related to Component 1, including | Reduction in the number of international coordination missions |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | responsible for the implementation of the project interventions in South Africa. | the support of local partners in the animation of communities of practice. Successful implementation of the partners' knowledge exchange activities. Satisfactory results in the implementation of the national activities of the project, as well as in the international activities (Désertif'Actions 22 Summit and International scientific seminar and end-of-project workshop) | due to travel restrictions (COVID) |
| Both ENDS | - Technical support for the development and implementation of Component 3 related activities. | Active participation in the preparation of the AVACLIM Policy Brief: "How donors can accelerate the agroecological transition: Recommendations from the AVACLIM Project" | |
| Agrisud – Fondation Norsys | Responsible for the implementation of the project interventions in Morocco. | Satisfactory results in the implementation of the national activities of the project, as well as in the international activities (Désertif'Actions 22 Summit and International scientific seminar and end-of-project workshop) | |
| ARFA | Responsible for the implementation of the project interventions in Burkina Faso | Satisfactory results in the implementation of the national activities of the project, as well as in the international activities (Désertif'Actions 22 Summit and International scientific seminar and end-of-project workshop) | The security situation in the country complicates the implementation of some activities, since travel is limited |
| CAATINGA | Responsible for the implementation of the project interventions in Brazil | Satisfactory results in the implementation of the national activities of the project, as well as in the international activities (Désertif'Actions 22 Summit and International scientific seminar and end-of-project workshop) | |
| ENDA Pronat | Responsible for the implementation of the project interventions in Senegal | Satisfactory results in the implementation of the national activities of the project, as well as in the international activities (Désertif'Actions 22 Summit and International scientific seminar and end-of-project workshop) | |
| GBS | Responsible for the implementation of the project interventions in India | Satisfactory results in the implementation of the national activities of the project, as well as in the international activities (Désertif'Actions 22 Summit and | The organization has encountered difficulties in mobilizing its community of practice due to the geographic distance between |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| | | International scientific seminar and end-of-project workshop) | initiatives and travel restrictions (COVID) |
| ISD | - Responsible for the implementation of the project interventions in Ethiopia | Satisfactory results in the implementation of the national activities of the project, as well as in the international activities (Désertif'Actions 22 Summit and International scientific seminar and end-of-project workshop) | The security situation in the country complicates the implementation of some activities, since travel is limited. |
| Others[1] | | | |
| IRD | - Responsible for establishing and leading a consortium (with CIRAD and Montpellier SupAGRO) for the implementation of Component 2 | Support to the realization of the activities of Component 2, as well as the preparation of the international scientific seminar. | |
| Members of the scientific consortium | - Ensuring that reliable data is collected and that the methodology implemented is replicable | - Good participation in the preparation of the international scientific seminar. - Participation in the collaborative development of the AVACLIM methodology and related tools. | Reduction in the number of international coordination missions due to travel restrictions (COVID) |
| International institutions and donor organisations | - Administrative and technical monitoring of the project. | | |
| NGOs and Community based organizations | Participation in communities of practice, as well as in characterization and evaluation activities of initiatives | Good overall collaboration of participants in the Communities of Practice, who were involved in the development of advocacy strategies, but also in various knowledge sharing activities. | |

[1] They can include, among others, community-based organizations (CBOs), Indigenous Peoples organizations, women's groups, private sector companies, farmers, universities, research institutions, and all major groups as identified, for example, in Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and many times again since then.

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 | Project documents are providing a contextual description of local and general gender related issues and providing guidance to address them during the project course. It therefore considers the gender issue as often as possible in the description of the activities. |
| Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment? | Yes | Although the project is not directly targeting women, youths, and vulnerable populations it has been mainstreaming gender from its beginning in different ways: Gender sensitivity was one of the selection criteria for the initiatives to be characterized and evaluated by the project. Consequently, many successful initiatives that are gender sensitive are promoted under the advocacy and awareness-raising interventions. This puts gender equality at the forefront of all agroecological innovations to be promoted by the project. In all activities of the project, such as training sessions and workshop, equal participation of men and women is seek. |
| Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage): | - | In addition, the project implements advocacy activities to promote the development of agroecology – which is gender sensitive- that favors the integration and empowerment of women, youth and vulnerable populations. It is therefore understood that it will have an indirect impact on local and international policies in favor of these populations. |
| a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources | Yes | Finally, strong women participation is promoted in all the documentation produced under the AVACLIM project interventions as a key factor of success for agroecological systems. |
| b) improving women's participation and decision making | Yes | |
| c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women | Yes | |
| M&E system with gender-disaggregated data? | Yes | The set of indicators selected under the multi-criteria assessment tool on the effects of agroecology initiatives is gender sensitive in such a way that it enables to distinguish social, economic and environmental benefits raised for women and for men. Following are some examples of indicators with gender-disaggregated data : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 31- Participation in community spaces dedicated to the governance of common goods (both men, women and youth) • 85-Existence of platforms for the horizontal creation and transfer of knowledge and good practices (with gender perspective) |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-----|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 28-Participation in knowledge and skills sharing networks (both men, women and youth) • 41- Empowerment index (based on the five areas of empowerment listed as sub-criteria below) • 42- Estimated level of empowerment |
| Staff with gender expertise | Yes | Coordinator addressed gender mainstreaming issues in World Bank Funded irrigation development projects in Ethiopia. |
| Any other good practices on gender | Yes | <p>All partners have a different approach and practices about gender mainstreaming, which is linked to their local context.</p> <p>The Brazilian partners (both the NGO: CAATINGA and the scientific referent: UFRPE) have the most advanced gender expertise among the project implementing partners and we're trying to enhance its dissemination among other project partners. For example, the project is planning to implement a specific webinar with CAATINGA, about "feminism and agroecology" within summer 2022, mobilizing partners with relevant experience in gender mainstreaming and others with few expertise. The objective is to share experience, knowledge, and good practices about this issue.</p> |

11. Knowledge Management Activities

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

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>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> | <p>AVACLIM project doesn't have a knowledge management strategy. However, it focuses on generating knowledge from the exiting agroecology initiatives, at national and international level. It is collecting and documenting good practices by ways of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - national and international workshops aiming to share experience and knowledge on project related topics. - regular open calls amongst all project partners - Data collection and analysis <p>Following are some good practices that have been documented and reported into fact-sheets :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vermicomposting in Ethiopia : https://avaclim.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/2_Avaclim_Factsheet_Ethiopia_Maruf-Soil-Fertility-Improvement_EN_final-1.pdf - Professionalization of small family-owned fruit production companies grouped within a Cooperative in Morocco : https://avaclim.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Avaclim_Factsheet_Maroc-1_Tifawine_VF_CARI.pdf - Recovery of the Caatinga with the traditional collective pastoral communities that live directly from the resources of the Caatinga, in Brazil : https://avaclim.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Avaclim_Factsheet_Recaatingamento_EN_VF.pdf - Creation of a legislative and regulatory framework favorable to the development of organic agriculture, notably through a participatory guarantee system in Burkina Faso : https://avaclim.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/CNABio_Factsheet_FR_VF.pdf - Empowering marginalized rural populations by restoring land and increasing their resilience, in India: https://avaclim.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Avaclim_Factsheet_RanukaVF.pdf - promotion of the collection and manufacture of compost from slaughterhouse waste to feed the poor soils of the surrounding market gardening areas, in Senegal: https://avaclim.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Avaclim_Factsheet_Se%CC%81ne%CC%81gal_Niayes_FR.pdf - Demonstrate sustainable development through indigenous knowledge and agroecology to achieve a holistic and self-sustaining agricultural ecosystem, in South Africa: https://avaclim.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Avaclim_Factsheet_Cold-Mountain_EN_final.pdf <p>With regards to the scientific work, the project focuses on the accessibility of information. We therefore produce operational guidelines and functional tools for presenting the evaluation prototype as well as notes describing how agroecology and an evaluation is understood in the framework of the project.</p> |
| <p>Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.</p> | <p>The project has a global communication strategy designed in 2020 and 2021 that is being implemented in each of the seven countries. The international strategy defines the common targets based on the project objectives. It defines the messages to share with each project partners and highlights the events and media to share specific information (steering committee, follow-up meetings with component leaders etc.). National communication action plans precise the audience, their needs, the specific messages, and required tools to mobilize to target them.</p> <p>During this FY, some relevant communication successes were achieved, including :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development and implementation of additional communication tools specifically adapted to the support of communities of practice on a national scale. A diagnosis was carried out at the end of |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>2021 and each country identified its needs (for example : brochures in local languages, radio broadcasting, workbook etc.);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organization of two open calls, virtual oral exchanges to share experiences and knowledge between countries. Selected topics for the first discussions were: “the application and adaptations of the evaluation stages” and “the modalities of animation and perpetuation of the CoPs” • Preparation of the international movie script as well as all seven national movie script. Video shooting was also undertaken in six countries (the last one being organize for early July). |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>In order to illustrate the positive impacts of the project on the living conditions of the beneficiaries, it is proposed to address here an example of an agroecological initiative characterized and evaluated by the CAATINGA partners in Brazil: the social techniques of water storage. This initiative has also been filmed as part of the documentary illustrating the Brazilian experience of the AVACLIM Project.</p> <p>Since 2000, thanks to ASA (Articulation in the Brazilian Semi-arid), which brings together thousands of civil society organizations, a vast process of transformation has begun, with social mobilization, training, and implementation of social technologies, including those for storing water for human consumption and food production, which have promoted autonomy and improved the quality of life of family farmers in this region. Many families who used to travel long distances in search of water, almost always unsuitable for human use, now have tanks on their properties. They also have technologies that help with food production, soil and agrobiodiversity management and conservation. This set of technologies, combined with a process of collective knowledge building, has increased their capacity to coexist with semi-arid conditions and to cope with climate change.</p> <p>The main technologies implemented in the region are 16,000-liter cement cisterns (drinking water); cisterns for drying certain cereals; small dams (to store water for small animals); underground dam (built in shallow or alluvial areas, rivers and streams that form in winter) ; stone tank (cauldron for community use); folk water pump (also for community use, using old wells that are no longer in use) and barrier trench (narrower and deeper, for personal family use, such as washing clothes and dishes and also for food production).</p> <p>In AVACLIM documentary (Brazil) Sebastiao Alves Da Silva, a farmer from the area testifies to the beneficial impacts of the implementation of these techniques: “Before this technology, we had to walk a long way to collect water, which could be of poor quality This technique has changed our family's life, both economically and environmentally. It has allowed us to have a more dignified life, by allowing us to have access to water [for consumption and production] throughout the year. “</p> <p>José Moacir Dos Santos, from the IRPAA (Regional Institute for Appropriate Small Farming) adds « before the construction of the cisterns, the women had to collect water from a spring or a well several kilometers from their homes. Since the implementation of the cistern technique, they have been able to devote themselves to studies, or to develop their own economic activities, such as the production and sale of the fruits of the caatinga.”</p> |
| <p>Please provide links to related website, social media account</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AVACLIM Website : www.avaclim.org - CARI Twitter account publishing regular information about AVACLIM activities : https://twitter.com/CARI_ONG - AVACLIM Whatsapp group subscription link : https://chat.whatsapp.com/G2KevDgtwwc7ue1uH5uAO6 |
| <p>Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials,</p> | <p>Some recent tweets published by AVACLIM partners about the project activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AVACLIM international scientific seminar and movie display evening: https://twitter.com/CARI_ONG/status/1613221924309504028?cxt=HHwWuMC45d-yqOMsAAAA |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - International Webinar : ""Water of life: exploring how agroecological communities in Morocco work together to optimise productivity": https://twitter.com/CARI_ORG/status/1605159380994953218 - West African agroecology forum in Senegal (Enda Pronat) : https://twitter.com/PronatEnda/status/1602354136510504963?cxt=HHwWhoCx8Z6m2rwsAAAA - Dissemination of AVACLIM policy brief by Both Ends : https://twitter.com/both_ends/status/1585566922170580993?cxt=HHwWgoCyueGtilEsAAAA - First day of the Desertif' Actions 2022 summit : https://twitter.com/CARI_ORG/status/1577802554762792961?cxt=HHwWgsC4pYzEveUrAAAA <p>Video youtube:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - English version of the AVACLIM videos : https://youtube.com/playlist?list=PL7YmjCheVa-SVVoTNY25IPIYwxAOOfkmFV - Multicountry film: https://youtu.be/JBvf2P-TXYM - Open dialogue Session at UNCCD COP15 with two speakers of AVACLIM Project: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vlmd87peuQk - Side event AVACLIM at UNCCD COP 15 "agroecology, a way to achieve prosperity by 2030" : https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RcwauXqPvHA <p>News on AVACLIM Website during this FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Webinar about agroecology and feminism: https://avaclim.org/beau-succes-pour-le-webinaire-agroecologie-et-feminisme/ - End_of_project events : https://avaclim.org/evenements-de-fin-de-projet/ - AVACLIM videos publication : https://avaclim.org/les-films-avaclim/ <p>Other Publications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interview of Patrice Burger about AVACLIM and the UNCCD COP15: https://www.ffem.fr/fr/actualites/patrice-burger-lagroecologie-doit-etre-mise-lagenda-pour-devenir-un-outil-preconise-par |
| <p>Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details</p> | <p>The project communication focal point is: Ms Cécile Bénazet - leader of the AVACLIM Communication Component: communication@cariassociation.org</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.

The AVACLIM project is not intended to implement activities specifically involving indigenous peoples since no *on-the-ground* development interventions are bound to take place in the context of the AVACLIM project (it builds upon existing initiatives).

However, due to the nature of its activities, the project necessarily requires a certain level of involvement of rural communities, with which the national partners are used to collaborating. In fact, the agroecological initiatives that have been identified, characterized, and evaluated are individual and collective initiatives that are generally part of rural and possibly indigenous communities,

Moreover, the initiatives that have been selected often contain aspects inherent to traditional knowledge, whether technical (soil fertility improvement, traditional pest management, production and conservation of traditional seeds, or more social (resource management etc.).

In addition, AVACLIM's agroecological initiative assessment tool considers the conservation of community groups' cultures and traditions as a specific criteria as they are expected to be important factors for the success and sustainability of agroecology.

13. Co-Financing Table

| Sources of Co-financing ²³ | Name of Co-financer | Type of Co-financing | Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval | Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023 | Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team) | Expected total disbursement by the end of the project |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------|--|--|--|---|
| French Government | Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial (FFEM) | Public | 1,100,000 | 1,280,546 USD | 1,280,546 USD | 1,280,546 USD |
| Research Institute | Institut de Recherche et de Développement (IRD) | Public | 280,000 | 325,958 USD | 325,958 USD | 325,958 USD |
| Research Institute | SoCA Project (Beyond Climate, soil C sequestration to sustain family farming in the Tropics) | Public | 779,800 | 907,791 USD | 907,791 USD | 907,791 USD |
| Research Institute | SeCURE Soil Ecological function Restoration Project : to enhance agrosystem services in rainfed rice cropping systems in agroecological transition | Public | 237,000 | 275,899 USD | 275,899 USD | 275,899 USD |
| Research Institute | DSCaTT Agricultural Intensification and Soil Carbon Sequestration in Tropical and Temperate Farming Systems Dynamic of Soil Carbon Sequestration in Agricultural Systems | Public | 1,000,000 | 1,164,133 USD | 1,164,133 USD | 1,164,133 USD |
| Non-Governmental Organization | Centre d'Actions et de Réalisations Internationales (CARI) | Private | 70,560 | 77,084 USD | 77,084 USD | 77,084 USD |
| United Nations | The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) | Public | 700,000 | 1,137,215 USD | 1,137,215 USD | 1,137,215 USD |
| TOTAL | | | 4,167,360 USD | 5,168,626 USD | 5,168,626 USD | 5,168,626 USD |

²³ Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

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

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

| Development Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives. | |
|--|---|
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice” |
| Satisfactory (S) | Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Project is expected to achieve 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 |
|-----------------------------------|----------|-----------|-------------|---|
| Araripe, Ceará, Brazil | -7.21337 | -40.137 | 3407248 | Initiative: Ecoaripe |
| Juazeiro, Bahia, Brazil | -9.41167 | -40.49861 | 3397154 | Initiative: Recaatingamento |
| Jenipapo, Ceará, Brazil | -3.55171 | -39.18565 | 3397420 | Initiative: Fatima Maria Dos Santos Farm |
| Enjeitado, Piauí, Brazil | -3.71861 | -42.46583 | 3410592 | Initiative: Sabiã Agroecological Development Center, family farming |
| Borborema, Paraíba, Brazil | -6.80333 | -35.58 | 3405048 | Initiative: Mission of Family-based Agriculture and Agroecology |
| Province du Zondoma, Burkina Faso | 13.18333 | -2.36667 | 2597270 | Initiative: Off-season market gardening |
| Baoudoumbouin, Burkina Faso | 13.05354 | -2.63336 | 2362802 | "Initiative: Community management of the forest of |
| Ouagadougou, Burkina faso | 12.36566 | -1.53388 | 2357048 | Baoudoumbouin" |
| Guiè, Dapelogo, Burkina | 12.79567 | -1.60792 | 2360116 | Initiative: National Council of Organic Agriculture |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|--|
| Village de Filly, Oula, Burkina Faso | 13.483231 | -2.329152 | | Initiative: Sahelian Bocage |
| Barga, Yatenga, Burkina Faso | 13.79332 | -2.25502 | 2362772 | Initiative: Sahelian Bocage |
| Pissila, Sanmatenga, Burkina Faso | 13.16417 | -0.8225 | 2356467 | Initiative: Sahelian Bocage |
| Tougo, Zondoma, Burkina Faso | 13.207289 | -2.122379 | | Initiative: Sahelian Bocage |
| Fada N'gourma, Burkina Faso | 12.06157 | 0.35843 | 2360886 | Initiative: Sahelian Bocage |
| Dore Bafano, Ethiopia | 7.035066 | 38.361672 | | Initiative: Bioprotect |
| Guder, Ethiopia | 8.966418 | 37.758915 | | Initiative: Udo Wotatie Village |
| Mēlē, Ethiopia | 5.88333 | 37.43333 | 331130 | Initiative: Maruf Vermicomposting |
| Tehuledere, Ethiopia | 11.31667 | 39.75 | 327810 | Initiative: Shele Mella Cotton Cooperative |
| Konaba, Ethiopia | 13.974515 | 39.864975 | | Initiative: Revival of indigenous seeds at Borusellasi |
| Kolār, Karnataka, India | 13.13768 | 78.12999 | 1266305 | Initiative: Innovative trench gardening in the arid region |
| Dharwad, Karnataka, India | 15.46005 | 75.00778 | 1272818 | Initiative: Agriculture Man Ecology (AME) Foundation |
| Magadi, Karnataka, India | 12.97681 | 75.80802 | 10903521 | Initiative: Agriculture Man Ecology (AME) Foundation |
| Dharmapuri, Tamil Nadu, India | 12.1277 | 78.15794 | 1272847 | Initiative: Agriculture Man Ecology (AME) Foundation |
| Pennagaram, Tamil Nadu, India | 12.71801 | 79.40125 | 11442011 | Initiative: Agriculture Man Ecology (AME) Foundation |

| | | | | |
|---|----------|-----------|----------|---|
| Chittoor, Andhra Pradesh, India | 3.21055 | 79.0956 | 1274033 | Initiative: Agriculture Man Ecology (AME) Foundation |
| Gorantla, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh, India | 16.5039 | 80.16753 | 10769897 | Initiative: Renuka Bio Farms |
| Banswara, Rajasthan, India | 23.54109 | 74.4425 | 1277214 | Initiative: Mission of Rythu Sadhikara Samstha (RySS) |
| Dungarpur, Rajasthan, India | 23.84306 | 73.71466 | 1272201 | Initiative: Voluntary Association of Agricultural General Development |
| Wardha, Maharashtra, India | 20.73933 | 78.59784 | 1252942 | Initiative: Voluntary Association of Agricultural General Development |
| Ghassate, marocco | 31.16992 | -6.86179 | 6546041 | Initiative: Dharamitra |
| Ain Johara, Morocco | 34.1017 | -6.354476 | | Initiative: Amélioration durable des performances du secteur agricole au profit des populations locales dans les zones de montagne, piémont et plateaux de la commune de Ghassate |
| Tiflet, Morocco | 33.89469 | -6.30649 | 2528659 | Initiative: Mission de la Coopérative Zirâa al Hayate |
| Shoul, Morocco | 33.9196 | -6.61588 | 6545709 | Initiative: Mission de la Coopérative Zirâa al Hayate |
| Palmeraie de Skoura, Morocco | 31.07808 | -6.57311 | 2532624 | Initiative: Mission de la Coopérative Zirâa al Hayate |
| Asni, Morocco | 31.24653 | -7.9789 | 2557019 | Initiative: Mission de la coopérative Al Mohammedia |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|------------|---------|---|
| Mzouda, Morocco | 31.22083 | -8.59257 | 2541498 | Initiative: Mission de la Coopérative de Tifawine |
| Tataguine, Senegal | 14.45 | -16.63333 | 2244914 | Initiative: Mission d'AFEMAC |
| Sangalkam, Senegal | 14.78023 | -17.22761 | 2246274 | Initiative: The union of communities of Tattaguine |
| Katob, Senegal | 13.81667 | -14.08333 | 2250701 | Initiative: The Federation of Vegetable Producers of the Niayes Zone of Niayes (FPMN) |
| Ndiob Sine, Senegal | 14.546045 | -16.253736 | | Initiative: Diampoulo Diallo, an innovative operation |
| N'Guelakh, Senegal | 15.968231 | -16.372427 | | Initiative: Nbiob, une commune résiliente |
| Nieuwoudtville, South Africa | -31.37656 | 19.1122 | 3363675 | Initiative: Guélack Farm |
| Port Elizabeth, South Africa | -33.89909 | 25.60341 | 971441 | Initiative: The Heiveld Cooperative |
| Umkhanyakude, South Africa | -27.62236 | 32.32945 | 8347388 | Initiative: Phakamani Siyephambili |
| Zululand District, South Africa | -27.81139 | 31.29426 | 8347367 | Initiative: Biowatch |
| Bryanston, Sandton, South Africa | -26.05211 | 28.02805 | 1015304 | Initiative: Biowatch |
| Overstrand Municipality, South Africa | -34.47129 | 19.37165 | 8347498 | Initiative: Bryanston Market Participatory Guarantee System |
| Araripe, Ceará, Brazil | -7.21337 | -40.137 | 3407248 | Initiative: Cold Mountain Farm Cooperative |

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