



Project Implementation Report (PIR)

01/07/2022– 30/06/2023

Reviving High Quality Coffee to Stimulate Climate Adaptation in Smallholder Farming Communities

Table of Contents

A. Basic Data.....	2
B. Overall Ratings.....	3
C. Outcomes achievements and outputs delivery	4
D. Ratings and Overall Assessments	19
E. Adjustments	19
F. Implementation Progress	20
G. Critical Risk Management	21
H. Gender	22
I. Implementing the Stakeholder Engagement Plan.....	24
J. Environmental and Social Safeguards.....	25
K. Knowledge management	33
Annex - Ratings definitions	34

A. Basic Data

Project Information	
IUCN Project ID	P03474
GEF ID	GEF ID 10432
Title	Reviving high quality coffee to stimulate climate adaptation in smallholder farming communities
Country(ies)	Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) & Uganda
Regional Programme	Regional
Global Thematic Programme	Climate Change
Joint Agency (if relevant)	International Union for Conservation of Nature
Executing Agency(ies)	Nestlé-Nespresso (note with TechnoServe (TNS) as an implementer in DRC and Kyagalanyi Coffee Limited (KCL) as an implementer in Uganda)
Project Type	Medium Sized Project

Project Description
<p>The project <i>Reviving High Quality Coffee to Stimulate Climate Adaptation in Smallholder Farming Communities Opportunity</i> aims to increase incomes and improve resilience to climate change for smallholder coffee farming households in South Kivu, DRC and in the Masaka region of Uganda. With the advance of climate change and its impacts on DRC and Uganda's vulnerable rain-fed, agricultural sectors, it is imperative that coffee farming households (smallholder farmers) have the knowledge and resources to ensure their farms are resilient and can protect their livelihoods into the future.</p> <p>The goal of this GEF project is to reduce poverty and improve resilience to climate change for 3,500 smallholder coffee farming households in South Kivu, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), and for 2,200 smallholder coffee farming households in Masaka, Uganda. While the two interventions share the objectives and outcomes below, there are some small differences between the two sites: the DRC project has an additional focus on improving household nutrition, while the project in Uganda has an additional component supporting energy efficient cookstoves.</p> <p>The project was initiated by Nestlé-Nespresso and receives execution support from TechnoServe in DRC and Kyagalanyi Coffee Limited (KCL) in Uganda. The project has 3 Components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Component 1: Resilient agricultural livelihoods 2) Component 2: Equitably support smallholder coffee farming households through Nespresso's responsible sourcing approach 3) Component 3: Knowledge sharing <p>The Components support the following Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome 1.1: Increased climate resilience of coffee farming households in DRC and Uganda • Outcome 2.1: Enhanced capacity of women in the coffee supply chain to translate their participation into economic empowerment • Outcome 2.2: Direct access to the coffee supply chain through the AAA Sustainable Quality program supporting coffee farmers with the commitment for long term sourcing intention • Outcome 3.1: Information and learnings from the projects are shared to inform other programs and initiatives by relevant stakeholders

Project Contacts	
Task Manager (Implementing Agency)	Joshua Schneck
Global Thematic Lead (Implementing Agency)	Elena Mendoza
Project Manager (Executing Agency)	Andrew KOVARIK (TechnoServe – DRC)

	<p>Geert Jan Heusinkveld, sustainability manager, Kyagalanyi Coffee Ltd (KCL)</p> <p>Deo Kisali, Masaka scheme manager Kyagalanyi Coffee Ltd (KCL)</p> <p>Tanja Havemann, Project Coordinator, Nespresso</p>
--	--

B. Overall Ratings

Overall Development Outcomes Rating ¹	Satisfactory
Overall Implementation Rating ²	Moderately Satisfactory
Overall Risk Rating ³	Moderate

¹ This section will use the scale used by the GEF and outlined in Annex L of this document: 1) Highly satisfactory, 2) Satisfactory, 3) Moderately Satisfactory, 4) Moderately Unsatisfactory, 5) Unsatisfactory, 6) Highly Unsatisfactory

² Idem

³ This section will use the scale used by the GEF and outlined in the Annex of this document: 1) High Risk, 2) Substantial Risk, 3) Moderate Risk, 4) Low Risk

C. Outcomes achievements and outputs delivery

To date, the project has performed well, especially given climatic and operational challenges. Operational challenges included a late start in Uganda (with an inception workshop held in April 2023) due to a change in location and delayed contracting resulting in key planting seasons being missed. The project in DRC has been over-performing, but faced set backs due to severe landslides in the project area, in part likely attributable to climate change and unsustainable land management practices. Local engagement is strong, with both communities and government agencies showing a keen interest and appreciation for the work.

Additional detail on project-supported work in DRC:

The DRC project has been **over-delivering** according to objectives and targets. Since its **launch in June 2022**, the project increased climate resilience of coffee farming households through organization of monthly agronomy trainings within farmer field-based AAA Academies. With project support, AAA Agronomists recruited from the local communities and trained in adult-learning techniques deliver lessons every month to small, self-selected **Focal Farmer Groups (FFGs)** of roughly 25 farming households. Also noteworthy, nearly half of the AAA Agronomists are women. **Since July 2022, the project has trained 5,296 households⁴ and established 156 FFG demonstration plots in South Kivu.** The AAA Academy provides coffee farming households the skills and knowledge to apply regenerative agricultural practices that increase biodiversity, enrich soil health, improve watersheds, and enhance ecosystem services. The climate resilient trainings include topics such as composting, rejuvenation, IPM, erosion control and climate resilience.

In order to support Project output 1.3 concerning Improved land cover on smallholder coffee farms and surrounding landscapes, during the September 2022 training in DRC on Integrated Disease Management and Woodlot planting, each FFG was trained and planted 12-14 *Markhamia lutea* woodlot seedlings. *Markhamia* is a tree species native to eastern Congo and adapted to the local environment and soils, which was selected due its suitability for farmer needs. After the training on tree planting, 1,757 producers (555 women) received 31,951 *Markhamia* seedlings for planting on their own farms.

AAA Academy trainings also include modules on household decision making and gender roles using a safe spaces methodology. Farmer trainers guide the discussion around the roles of men and women in the household and the coffee supply chain in order to promote gender equality. A total of 4,853 producers attended the trainings supporting participants' ability to analyse how social norms and gender roles can disenfranchise women. Participants purport that the sessions have shed light on the factors of gender inequality in households, on the farm, and in the community – and the mechanisms for improvement.

For the training cohort launched in 2022, the project seeks to stimulate uptake in essential nutrition behaviors through a pilot training on household nutrition and kitchen gardens. After contextualizing the nutrition training modules for DRC, the Project began the introductory nutrition training module, *Household Nutrition and Balanced Diet* in April 2023. A total of 2,006 (1,102 women) producers attended the initial training. Additional trainings on nutrition and kitchen gardens will be conducted in July and August 2023.

Additional detail on project-supported work in Uganda:

The project started late in Uganda, **beginning March 1, 2023** and with an inception workshop held in April 2023. Nestlé-Nespresso requested a change from the original location near Mt Elgon to the Masaka region, due in part to change in demand for coffee grown in the different sites. In addition, the Masaka area involves fewer ESMS risks. Outputs / outcomes are expected to stay as originally modeled working at the Masaka site.

⁴ This is for all trainings, the definition of trained is that Households have attended at least half of the topics presented

Furthermore there were delays in contracting between the parties, which resulted in the Project missing the main planting window. The project has now started and has identified and recruited relevant resources, including staff, to begin executing the project interventions. KCL has also identified farmers, farmer groups, service providers for the stoves and nursery sites.

Please fill in the table below building on your result framework.

Objective 1: Resilient agricultural livelihoods							
Outcomes <i>(Copy and paste outcomes from Result Framework)</i>	Indicators	Baseline	Midterm Target	End of project Target	Periodic Result (01/07/2022-30/06/2023)	Result to Date (from project start)	Progress rating (HS, S,MS, MU,U, SU)
Outcome 1.1: Increased climate resilience of coffee farming households in DRC	NA	NA	NA	NA			MS
Outputs <i>(Copy and paste outputs from Result Framework)</i>	Indicators	Baseline	Midterm Target	End of project Target	Periodic Result (01/07/2022-30/06/2023)	Result to Date (from project start)	Implementation status (%)
Output 1.1. Coffee farming households have the skills and knowledge to apply regenerative, climate resilient, agriculture practices	Target 1.1: In DRC 3,500 coffee farming households are trained (at least 40% women) In Uganda 2'200 coffee farming households	0	NA	DRC: 3,500 coffee farming HH (40% women) UG: 2'200 coffee farming	DRC: C2021 Minova – 3,124 (48% women 48%) HH attended training C2022 Kalehe – 2,172 (56% women) HH attended Total – 5,296 HH trained Uganda (UG): KCL is finalising agreeing on the 30 model farms that are under the project and where the group trainings will be delivered. Linked to that are the farmers that will be part of the project.	DRC: C2021 Minova – 3,124 (48% women 48%) HH attended training C2022 Kalehe – 2,172 (56% women) HH attended Total – 5,296 HH trained Uganda: KCL is finalising agreeing on the 30 model farms that are under the project and where the group trainings will be delivered. Linked to	MS DRC: 151% UG: 0%

	are trained (at least 40% women)			g HH (40% women)		that are the farmers that will be part of the project.	
Output 1.2 Demonstration (demo) plots and model farms are implemented throughout the landscapes to promote climate resilient coffee production	Target 1.2 In DRC, 80 demo plots will be established In Uganda, 88 demo plots and 9 model farms will be established	0	NA	DRC: 80 demo plots UG: 88 demo plots, 9 model farms	DRC: 156 demo plots Uganda: KCL is finalising agreeing on the 30 model farms that are under the project. In the next 6 month report we should be able to share an update on the model farms and its locations. Regarding individual farm trainings & assessments, this is an ongoing exercise as part of our individual household trainings for RA verification and AAA TASQ assessment. In the next 6 month report we should be able to share an update based on the list of farmers that are under the project.	DRC: 156 demo plots Uganda: KCL is finalising agreeing on the 30 model farms that are under the project. In the next 6 month report we should be able to share an update on the model farms and its locations.	MS DRC: 195% UG: 0%
Output 1.3 Improved land cover on smallholder coffee farms and surrounding landscapes	Target 1.3 In DRC 2,000 coffee farming households receive training on nurseries for indigenous shade trees, including access to shade tree seedlings (including for on-farm woodlots to	0	NA	DRC: C2021 Minova 2,000 C2022 Kalehe 1,500 UG: 150 acres, 1'650 HH work on erosio	DRC: 4,057 (1,949 female) farmers were trained on climate change and shade tree nurseries for cohort 2021 1,789 households were trained on climate change and shade tree nurseries for cohort 2022 Uganda: KCL has started setting up 2 coffee nurseries / mother gardens in the Masaka area. Locations have been identified and rental agreements signed. KCL also has rejuvenated its existing Robusta mother garden in Nakanyonyi north of Kampala.	DRC: 4,057 (1,949 female) farmers were trained on climate change and shade tree nurseries for cohort 2021 1,789 households were trained on climate change and shade tree nurseries for cohort 2022 Uganda: KCL has started with setting up 2 coffee nurseries / mother gardens in the Masaka area. Locations have been identified and rental agreements signed. KCL also has rejuvenated its existing Robusta mother garden in Nakanyonyi north	MS DRC: 203% C2021 Minova 129% C2022 Kalehe

	<p>complement incomes) In DRC: 1,500 coffee farming households are provided a refresher agronomy course including shade tree production and management to complement an existing training</p> <p>In Uganda: reforestation of 150 acres in critical areas in the landscape, 1'650 coffee farming households improve erosion control on farms, 1'760 coffee farming households use farm environment improvement</p>			<p>n control , 1'760 HH use environmental tools, 2'200 energy saving stoves</p>	<p>The idea is to use cuttings from this mother garden for the nurseries in Masaka, UCDA approval permitting. We also look into buying cuttings in the Masaka region, from UCDA approved nurseries.</p> <p>With regard to managing erosion control on farms: famers will be identified from the total # of project farmers. In the next 6 month report we should be able to share an update based on the list of farmers that are under the project.</p> <p>Regarding the use of farm environment improvement tools: Service provider for the environmental tools concept development identified and contracted. Research and cocreation activities scheduled with KCL staff and farmers scheduled for late August – early September 2023.</p> <p>Regarding the construction of energy savings stoves: Stoves construction organisation identified. Staff / coffee youth team training in preparation, as well as the stove building offer for farmers. Total target to be adjusted considering increased cost of materials.</p>	<p>of Kampala. The idea is to use cuttings from this mother garden for the nurseries in Masaka, UCDA approval permitting. We also look into buying cuttings in the Masaka region, from UCDA approved nurseries.</p> <p>With regard to managing erosion control on farms: famers will be identified from the total nr of project farmers. In the next 6 month report we should be able to share an update based on the list of farmers that are under the project.</p> <p>Regarding the use of farm environment improvement tools: Service provider for the environmental tools concept development identified and contracted. Research and cocreation activities scheduled with KCL staff and farmers scheduled for late August – early September 2023.</p> <p>Regarding the construction of energy savings stoves: Stoves construction organisation identified. Staff / coffee youth team training in preparation, as well as the stove building offer for farmers. Total target to be adjusted considering increased cost of materials</p>	<p>UG: 0%</p>
--	---	--	--	---	--	--	--------------------------

	tools, 2'200 energy saving stoves are constructed						
Output 1.4 Uptake of essential nutritional behaviors amongst coffee farming households in the Kalehe territory of DRC	Target 1.4 1,500 coffee farming households in DRC (with a target of 40% women) – who have already participated in AAA Academy – participate in a 12-month training program that includes modules focused on improving household nutrition (intercropping, kitchen gardens, consumption of nutritious foods)	0	NA	DRC: 1,500 (HH, 40% women)	DRC: 2,006 producers (1,102 women or 55% women) Uganda: not applicable	DRC: 2,006 producers (1,102 women or 55% women) Uganda: not applicable	MS DRC: 147% UG: N/A
Narrative report							
DRC: The monthly AAA Academy trainings conducted at the Focal Farmer Group demonstration plots resulted in the full achievement of all training targets related to Targets 1.1 – 1.4 (trainings on regenerative agriculture and nutrition). The AAA Academy also provided the necessary training on woodlots and							

seedling distribution to complement income. Presently it is too early to measure outcomes related to adoption of climate resilient practices and improvements in household nutrition, as these trainings are still ongoing.

Uganda:

Project staff: KCL recruited a Project agronomy coordinator as well a Project gender coordinator responsible for the agronomy and gender project aspects respectively. They started in their jobs from early July 2023. The project is supported by the existing KCL field staff (TCAs) already in place in the Masaka scheme. Extra staff for the scheme will be considered in the new KCL FY to start from October 1. Overall project supervision is done by the Masaka scheme manager, the value chain manager and the sustainability manager.

Resilient agriculture livelihoods:

Group trainings: KCL started with identifying locations for model farms and linked to that the farmers. Farmers are selected mostly from the existing farmer database, KCL is currently finalising agreeing on the 30 model farms that are under the project and where the group trainings will be delivered. Linked to that are the farmers that will be part of the project.

Model farms: KCL is finalising agreeing on the 30 model farms that are under the project. In the next 6 month report we should be able to share an update on the model farms and its locations.

Individual trainings: This is an ongoing exercise as part of our individual household trainings for RA verification and AAA TASQ assessment. In the next 6 month report we should be able to share an update based on the list of farmers that are under the project.

Coffee nurseries: KCL has started with setting up 2 coffee nurseries / mother gardens in the Masaka area. Locations have been identified and rental agreements signed. KCL also has rejuvenated its existing Robusta mother garden in Nakanyonyi north of Kampala. The idea is to use cuttings from this mother garden for the nurseries in Masaka, Uganda Coffee Development Authority (UCDA) approval permitting. We also look into buying cuttings in the Masaka region, from UCDA approved nurseries.

Erosion control: Farmers will be identified from the total # of Project farmers. In the next 6 month report we should be able to share an update based on the list of farmers that are under the project.

Environmental tools: Service provider for the environmental tools concept development identified and contracted. Research and cocreation activities scheduled with KCL staff and farmers scheduled for late August – early September 2023.

Energy saving stoves: Stoves construction organisation identified. Staff / coffee youth team training in preparation, as well as the stove building offer for farmers. Total target to be adjusted considering increased cost of materials. Will be shared in due course.

Objective 2: Equitably support smallholder coffee farming households through Nespresso's responsible sourcing approach							
Outcomes (Copy and paste outcomes from Result Framework)	Indicators	Baseline	Midterm Target	End of project Target	Periodic Result (01/07/2022-30/06/2023)	Result to Date (from project start)	Progress rating (HS, S,MS,MU,U,SU)
Outcome 2.1: Enhanced capacity of women in the coffee supply chain to translate their participation into economic empowerment	Target 2.1: Coffee farming households are trained on gender issues (3'500 in DRC and 1'760 in UG) and have increased access to technical and financial resources to achieve gender empowerment (including 88 Village Savings and Loans – VSLAs established in Uganda)	0		DRC: 3,500 (40% women) UG: 88 VSLAs established, 1'760 HH participate in a gender program & use gender tools	DRC: C2021 – 2,842 (1,390 women) farmers C2022 – 2,498 households UG: team has been established and local change agents have been identified to start operations in October 2023	DRC: C2021 – 2,842 (1,390 women) farmers C2022 – 2,498 households UG: 0	MS DRC: 152% UG: 0%
Outcome 2.2: Direct access to the coffee supply chain through the AAA Sustainable Quality program supporting coffee farmers with the commitment for long term sourcing intention	Target 2.2: 2,000 farmers are part of the AAA program in DRC 2'200 farmers are part of the AAA program in Uganda	0		DRC: 2,000 UG: 2'200	DRC: 1,644 trained farmers (788 women) members of cooperatives supplying Nespresso UG: At the start of 2023 5,004 AAA farmers were part of the AAA value chain in Masaka. KCL aims to increase this to 6,000 by the end of 2023. The project focuses on 2,200	DRC: 1,644 trained farmers (788 women) members of cooperatives supplying Nespresso UG: At the start of 2023 5,004 AAA farmers were part of the AAA value chain in Masaka. KCL aims to increase this to	MS DRC: 82% UG: N/A (to be provided as project started in April 2023)

					out of these 6,000. All of these 6,000 farmers have access to the AAA Sustainable Quality program supporting coffee farmers with the commitment for long term sourcing.	6,000 by the end of 2023. The project focuses on 2,200 out of these 6,000. All of these 6,000 farmers have access to the AAA Sustainable Quality program supporting coffee farmers with the commitment for long term sourcing.	
Outputs <i>(Copy and paste outputs from Result Framework)</i>	Indicators	Baseline	Midterm Target	End of project Target	Periodic Result (01/07/2022-30/06/2023)	Result to Date (from project start)	Implementation status (%)
Output 2.1.1 Women and men have the knowledge, skills, attitudes and resources to enhance their economic resilience in coffee farming landscapes	Target 2.1.1: Women and men from 3,500 coffee farming households (target 40% women) participate in training programs that includes modules focused on gender equality in the coffee chain in DRC 88 VSLAs are established in UG, 1'760 HH participate in a gender program	0		DRC: 3,500 (40% women) UG: 88 VSLAs established, 1'760 HH participate in a gender program & use gender tools	DRC: C2021 – 2,842 (1,390 women) farmers C2022 – 2,498 households UG: team has been established and local change agents have been identified to start operations in October 2023	DRC: C2021 – 2,842 (1,390 women) farmers C2022 – 2,498 households UG: 0	MS DRC: 152% UG: 0%

	and use gender tools						
Output 2.2.1: Women and male farmers have access to the Nespresso supply chain, and have stable, long-term demand and receive premium prices for the coffee they produce	Target 2.2.1: 2,000 farmers in DRC project area are part of the Nespresso supply chain 2'200 farmers are part of the AAA program in Uganda	0		DRC: 2,000 farmers UG: 2'200	DRC: 1,644 trained farmers (788 women) members of cooperatives supplying Nespresso UG: At the start of 2023 5'004 AAA farmers were part of the AAA value chain in Masaka. KCL aims to increase this to 6'000 by the end of 2023. The project focuses on 2'200 out of these 6'000. All of these 6'000 farmers have access to the AAA Sustainable Quality program supporting coffee farmers with the commitment for long term sourcing intention. In the next report KCL will report in the number of farmers trained (group and individual).	DRC: 1,644 trained farmers (788 women) members of cooperatives supplying Nespresso UG: At the start of 2023 5'004 AAA farmers were part of the AAA value chain in Masaka. KCL aims to increase this to 6'000 by the end of 2023. The project focuses on 2'200 out of these 6'000. All of these 6'000 farmers have access to the AAA Sustainable Quality program supporting coffee farmers with the commitment for long term sourcing intention. In the next report KCL will report in the number of farmers trained (group and individual).	MS DRC: 82% UG: N/A (to be provided as project started in April 2023)
Narrative report							
DRC: The monthly AAA Academy trainings conducted within the Focal Farmer Group provided three gender safe space trainings to both the C2021 Minova and C2022 Kalehe Cohorts. The project assumes that these trainings will encourage behavior change in participants towards gender equality. Data taken from							

baseline will be compared against that from the completion of training to monitor changes coffee farm management, household decision making, food purchasing and production, and gender equality attitudes.

The project has aligned training in communities active with cooperatives or coffee washing stations that are currently supplying Nespresso or have the potential to supply Nespresso in the future. During the trainings, TechnoServe collected self-reported cooperative membership data that aligned 1,644 trained producers (788 women) with three cooperatives (AMANI, AMKA and CAPCKI) that supplied Nespresso during the 2023 season. For the 2022 season, Nespresso honored its commitment to premium payments by providing 3,528 coffee producers and staff with over \$87,000 in premium payments. **Premium payments averaged \$24.65/participant.**

Uganda:

Project staff: KCL recruited a project agronomy coordinator as well a project gender coordinator responsible for the agronomy and gender project aspects respectively. They started in their jobs from early July 2023. The project is supported by the existing KCL field staff (TCAs) already in place in the Masaka scheme. Extra staff for the scheme will be considered in the new KCL FY to start from October 1. Overall project supervision is done by the Masaka scheme manager, the value chain manager and the sustainability manager.

VSLAs established: KCL has started the identification of change agents (CAs) from the registered farmers. The CAs are the ones that will set up the gender groups and VSLAs and offer guidance and training to member households. Training sessions for the CAs are scheduled for late august – early September, followed by identification of interested individuals / groups to become part of the gender activities. In the next 6 month report we should be able to share an update on the number of VSLA established.

Objective 3: [Title]								
Outcomes (Copy and paste outcomes from Result Framework)	Indicators	Baseline	Midterm Target	End of project Target	Periodic Result (01/07/2022-30/06/2023)	Result to Date (from project start)	Progress rating (HS, S,MS, MU,U, SU)	
Outcome 3.1: Information and learnings from the projects are shared to inform other programs and							N/A (not started)	

initiatives by relevant stakeholders							
Outputs <i>(Copy and paste outputs from Result Framework)</i>	Indicators	Baseline	Midterm Target	End of project Target	Periodic Result (01/07/2022-30/06/2023)	Result to Date (from project start)	Implementation status (%)
Output 3.1. Knowledge products on project experiences and lessons learned are developed and shared		0		DRC: 1 case study UG: 1 case study	DRC: 1 story produced for the GEF website UG: 0	DRC: 1 story produced for the GEF website UG: 0	0% (N/A)
<p>Narrative report</p> <p>DRC: As a part of the July 1st, 2022 to June 30th, 2023 reporting period, the project had not begun the case study to develop knowledge products. Internally, TechnoServe has discussed the timeline and theme for the knowledge product. During the upcoming quarter, starting in July 2023, TechnoServe will develop the scope, data collection instruments, and begin data collection for the nutrition case study. TechnoServe expects that a near final draft of the study will be ready to share by the end of 2023.</p> <p>Uganda: This will be started in the second implementation year.</p>							

GEF Core Indicators

Please report on GEF core indicators that are relevant to your project using [guidance provided by GEF](#) on the implementation of the GEF-8 results measurement framework

Table 1. Eleven GEF Core Program Indicators

Indicator # As per GEF portal	Indicator	Baseline	Project Target	Progress to date (from project start)	Mean of Verification
1	<p>Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management</p> <p>This indicator will be reported as the aggregate total of the following Sub-Indicators.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial protected areas newly created • Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness 	NA	NA	NA	
2	<p>Marine protected areas created or under improved management</p> <p>This indicator will be reported as the aggregate total of the following Sub-Indicators.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine protected areas newly created • Marine protected areas under improved management effectiveness 	NA	NA	NA	
3	<p>Area of land and ecosystems under restoration</p> <p>This indicator will be reported as the aggregate total of the following Sub-Indicators.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of degraded agricultural lands under restoration • Area of forest and forest land under restoration • Area of natural grass and woodlands under restoration • Area of natural grass and woodlands under restoration 	NA	NA	NA	
4	<p>Area of landscapes under improved practices (excluding protected areas)</p> <p>This indicator will be reported as the aggregate total of the following Sub-Indicators.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity • Area of landscapes under third-party certification incorporating biodiversity considerations • Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems 	NA	NA	NA	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of High Conservation Value or other forest loss avoided • Terrestrial OECMs supported 				
5	<p>Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity</p> <p>This indicator will be reported as the aggregate total of the following Sub-Indicators.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fisheries under third-party certification incorporating biodiversity considerations • Large Marine Ecosystems with reduced pollution and hypoxia • Marine OECMs supported 	NA	NA	NA	
6	<p>Greenhouse gas emissions mitigated</p> <p>This indicator will be reported through the following Sub-Indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenhouse gas emission mitigated in the AFOLU sector • Greenhouse gas emission mitigated outside of the AFOLU sector • Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector (Direct) • Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector (Indirect) • Emissions avoided outside AFOLU sector (Direct) • Emissions avoided outside AFOLU sector (Indirect) • Energy saved • Increase in installed renewable energy capacity per technology 	NA	NA	NA	
7	<p>Shared water ecosystems under new or improved cooperative management</p> <p>This indicator will be reported through the following Sub-Indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of Regional Legal Agreements and Regional Management Institutions to support its implementation 	NA	NA	NA	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Program (TDA/SAP) formulation and implementation • Level of National/Local reforms and active participation of Inter-Ministerial Committees • Level of engagement in IW:LEARN through participation and delivery of key products 				
8	Globally over-exploited fisheries moved to more sustainable levels	NA	NA	NA	
9	Chemicals of global concern and their waste reduced This indicator will be reported through the following Sub-Indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solid and liquid Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) removed or disposed (POPs type) • Quantity of mercury reduced • Hydrochlorofluorocarbons reduced/phased out • Countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste • Low-chemical/non-chemical systems implemented, particularly in food production, manufacturing and cities • POPs/Mercury containing materials and products directly avoided • Highly Hazardous Pesticides eliminated • Avoided residual plastic waste 	NA	NA	NA	
10	Persistent organic pollutants to air reduced This indicator will be reported through the following Sub-Indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Countries with legislation and policy implemented to control emissions of POPs to air • Emission control technologies/practices implemented 	NA	NA	NA	

11	<p>People benefiting from GEF-financed investments This indicator will be reported as the aggregate total of the following Sub-Indicators.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Female • Male 	0	<p>DRC: 3,500 (40% women) UG: 2'200 (40% women)</p>	<p>C2021 Minova – 3,743 (1,822 women 49%) farmers attended training C2022 Kalehe – 2,518 (1,417 women 56%) farmers attended Total – 6,261 (3,239 women 52%) UG: XXX</p>	<p>Monthly training attendance scorecards.</p>
----	---	---	---	---	---

D. Ratings and Overall Assessments

Role	YEAR Development Objective Progress Rating ⁵	YEAR Implementation Progress Rating ⁶
Project Manager / Coordinator	Overall Assessment	Overall Assessment
	Moderately satisfactory	Moderately satisfactory
	Please provide justification for overall assessment	Please provide justification for overall assessment
	The project in DRC is performing highly satisfactory. The project in Uganda was late in starting – this was out of the control of the implementing agency.	The project in DRC is performing highly satisfactory. The project in Uganda was late in starting – this was out of the control of the implementing agency.
IUCN Global Thematic Programme (IA)	Overall Assessment	Overall Assessment
	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory
	Please provide justification for overall assessment	Please provide justification for overall assessment
	Despite the slow start in Uganda and natural disaster in DRC, project appears to be making good progress and is on track towards achieving development and environmental objectives	Despite the slow start in Uganda and natural disaster in DRC, project appears to be making good progress and is on track towards achieving objectives

E. Adjustments

Please provide comments on delays this reporting period in achieving any of the following key project milestones: inception workshop, mid-term review, terminal evaluation and/or project closure.

DRC:

There have been no delays in key project milestones. Note that the project actually commenced prior to the CEO Endorsement, as the co-funding had already been provided to the implementer (this was not the case for the project in Uganda, which was then impacted by delays).

Uganda:

There were extensive delays due to change of location, contracting and the missing of the planting season. The project started operation in 1 March 2023, and a project inception meeting was held early April. The period between March and this PIR reporting close was used for preparation including activities like staff recruitment/assignment and preparation, farmer identification, supplier/service provider identification and coffee nurseries locations identification and preparation.

This work forms the bases of further preparation and implementation. KCL is aiming to deliver the first results in the next 6 months including farmer group and individual trainings, model farms and its details, energy efficient stives and gender groups set up and trainings among other.

Project Minor 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 Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines.

⁵ This section will use the scale used by the GEF and outlined in Annex of this document: 1) Highly satisfactory, 2) Satisfactory, 3) Moderately Satisfactory, 4) Moderately Unsatisfactory, 5) Unsatisfactory, 6) Highly Unsatisfactory

⁶ Idem

Please tick each category for which a change occurred in the fiscal year of reporting and provide a description of the change that occurred in the textbox. You may attach supporting documents as appropriate within this PIR submission.

- Results framework
- Components and cost
- Institutional and implementation arrangements
- Financial management
- Implementation schedule
- Executing Entity
- Executing Entity Category
- Minor project objective change
- Safeguards
- Risk analysis
- Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%
- Co-financing
- Location of project activity
- Other

<i>Minor amendments</i>	<i>Change description</i>
DRC: Budget realignment against line item categories	DRC: A PSC approved shift in budgeted resources of \$103,617 from local travel and demo plot establishment to staff time for agronomists, farmer trainers, and global support staff on sustainable management (\$67k increase) and financial literacy and gender trainings (37k increase). No change in the total budget ceiling, and no change in project outputs, nor outcome resulted from this change
Uganda: change in implementation schedule	Uganda: the project had to be moved from Mt Elgon to Masaka. It took time to change the contract, and it resulted in missing planting / implementation windows. An inception meeting was held in April 2023.
Uganda: Location of project activity changed from Mt Elgon to Masaka region	Uganda: Nestlé-Nespresso requested a change from the original site location near Mt Elgon to the Masaka region, due in part to change in demand for coffee grown in the different sites. In addition, the Masaka area involves fewer ESMS risks.

F. Implementation Progress

Please insert graph below showing cumulative disbursements on quarterly and yearly basis since project launch

<i>Cumulative Disbursements</i>	
Cumulative general ledger delivery against total approved amount (in Project Document) - %	DRC: 55% Uganda: 0% (project started late)
Cumulative general ledger delivery against expected delivery as of this year - %	DRC: 104% of year 1 Budget 76% of Year 1 Budget, plus half of Year 2 budget

	Uganda: 0%
Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June 2023 (note: amount to be updated in later August)	DRC: USD \$310,322 Uganda: USD \$179,560

<i>Key Financing Amounts</i>	
PPG Amount	DRC: USD \$19,976 UG: USD 0
GEF Grant Amount	DRC: USD 566,766 (inclusive of above) UG: USD 615'541 (inclusive of above)
Planned Co-Financing	DRC: USD 15,541 UG (KCL): USD 150'000 NN: XXX
Co-Financing to date	DRC: USD 12,134 UG: ca. USD 75'000 NN: XXX

<i>Key Project Dates</i>	
PIF Approval Date	July 2, 2020
CEO Endorsement Date	June 16, 2022
Project Document Signature Date (Project start date)	June 16, 2022
Date of Inception workshop (Project launch)	DRC: July 29, 2022 Uganda: April 4, 2023
Expected date of mid-term review	DRC: July 31, 2023 Uganda: July 12, 2023
Actual date of mid-term review	August 2, 2023
Expected date of Terminal Evaluation	February 2025
Original planned closing date	October 31, 2024
Revised Planned closing date	Uganda: to be discussed

<i>Dates of Project Steering Committee / Board Meetings during reporting period (June to July)</i>	
Internal Kick-Off Call with DRC - June 29 th , 2022	
GEF/IUCN, Nespresso, TechnoServe Quarterly Update – December 5 th , 2022	
GEF (IUCN) Nespresso Steering Committee meeting (all parties) – April 4 th , 2023	
Inception meeting for Uganda – April 4 th , 2023	
Nespresso - GEF - TNS update (Quarterly update) – July 12 th , 2023	
Nespresso - GEF - KCL update (Quarterly update) – July 12 th , 2023	

G. Critical Risk Management

Please complete the table below (*Only risk with High or Medium rating / level should be recorded*) by using the information in the Project Risk register (excel file provided with PIR templates). If a project risk register has already been completed for the project, please provide any updates for High or Medium risk from this reporting period – e.g. changing in risk rating, risk owners or additional risk identified etc. in the table below.

Risk Category ⁷	Risk description	Rating / Level (H, M)	Mitigation measures undertaken in this reporting period	Risk Owner	Updates / Changes
Operational	Natural Disaster (Earthquake, landslides, etc)	M	Updated TNS DRC Security Plan	TNS Country Manager	None
Operational	Weather, pest & disease	M	KCL is working with UCDA to develop and distribute more resilient	KCL	None

⁷ IUCN risk categories: Strategic, Financial, People management, Operational, Legal/Compliance, Information systems, External

			varieties through this project		
--	--	--	--------------------------------	--	--

Project overall risk rating (Low, Moderate, Substantial or High). *Please see Annex – Ratings definition for guidance.*

2022 rating (H, S, M, L)	2023 rating (H, S, M, L)	Comments/reasons for the rating for 2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
NA	Moderate	DRC: Earthquake (volcanic activity), landslides as well as the 2023 elections scheduled for December 2023

H. Gender

Progress in advancing Gender equality and women’s empowerment

Please note that all projects approved since GEF 6 are required to carry out a gender analysis and provide gender-responsive measures to address differences, identified impacts and risks, and opportunities through a Gender Action Plan (GAP) or equivalent.

Does this project specifically target woman or girls as direct beneficiaries?
<p>DRC:</p> <p>The project targets women during all aspect of implementation of the AAA Academy. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selection of AAA Agronomist to have an equal representation of men and women trainers • Training of TechnoServe Agronomy staff on the KIT Catalysts for Gender Transformative Change (CGTC). As part of the KIT training, 13 agricultural trainers participated in a training session to empower them to begin to implement their Gender Action Learning Plans (GALPs). During the session, the GALPs were reviewed and adapted to the context and the coffee value chain. • Three AAA Academy Trainings on Gender Safe Spaces that included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Gender Safe Spaces 1: Exploring what it means to be male or female. ○ Gender Safe Spaces 2: Exploring the value of men's and women's work at the farm level and within the household. ○ Gender Safe Spaces 3: Exploring how we collaborate, communicate and make decisions. • A training on household nutrition was launched for the 2022 Cohort in April 2023 <p>UG:</p> <p>The project will provide additional training and support to women and girls. 1'760 Households are expected to participate in gender training programs, and to use gender tools. This program component also includes the establishment of 88 VSLAs, targeted to women.</p>
<p>In case a gender analysis was not undertaken during project preparation (PPG), has it been carried out in this reporting period? If yes, what were the main findings? If an analysis during project design had been undertaken, but further updates have been carried out during the reporting period, please indicate this below. Please also report on additional site level gender analyses if they were undertaken during this reporting period.</p>
<p>DRC:</p> <p>We have used the <i>Gender Analysis of Smallholder Coffee Sector in South Kivu, DRC Recommendations for Nespresso Activities in DRC</i> from October 2022 to design project activities. Implementation of project activities under Outcome 2.1 - Enhanced capacity of women in the coffee supply chain to translate their participation into economic empowerment is inline with these</p>

recommendations and has been successful in alignment with number of key recommendation from the report including:

1. Bridging the Gender Gap in Coffee Farming

1.1. **Sustain high female participation in agronomy training** by employing TNS gender practices in registration and retention that draw on experience of working with coffee farmers across various countries in Africa

1.2. **Strengthen gender transformative methods in the agronomy training** by increasing emphasis on women's decision-making power and role in joint planning in the farm business and incorporating new methods for facilitating dialogue between and among women and men. The training has included:

1.2.1. *Applying 'TNS Safe Spaces methodology'* that facilitates dialogue and learning between and among women and men through discussions in single- and mix-sex groups; and

Developing program staff capacity to ensure effective and sustainable implementation

4.1. **Build knowledge, skills and attitudes of staff** through a capacity development process that will enable them to perform their daily work in ways that supports gender equality and women's economic empowerment

Uganda: the project site was moved from Mt Elgon to Masaka. The implementer has engaged with local communities and is recruiting local change agents in the Masaka area to ensure successful implementation of this component.

Please describe progress in implementing the Gender Action Plan (GAP); you could also add the GAP in form of a GAP progress report as annex. Please also specify results achieved this reporting period through implementing gender-responsive measures.

Results reported can include site level results working with local communities as well as work to integrate gender considerations into national policies, strategies and planning. Please explain how the results reported addressed the different needs of men or women, changed norms, values and power structures, and/or contributed to transforming or challenging gender inequalities and discrimination.

DRC: The three gender safe spaces trainings provided to **4,853 (2,501 women) farmers** in the AAA Academy have increased emphasis on women's decision-making power and role in joint planning in the farm business and incorporating new methods for dialogue and learning between and among women and men through discussions in single-sex and co-ed groups.

Uganda: the program is just starting. Staff have recently been recruited and gender change agents in the community are being identified.

Please report on gender-sensitive indicators and sex-disaggregated targets as established in the results framework

DRC: 4,853 (2,501 women) farmers trained on gender issues and have increased access to technical and financial resources to achieve gender empowerment

All remaining sex disaggregated indicators can be found in the reporting tables above. Overall the project is overachieving the standard 40% female participation in agronomy training with overall participation across the two cohorts at over 50% female.

Uganda: 1'760 households trained on gender tools, 88 VSLAs established targeting women. Note that the project has just recently started so results are not yet available.

I. Implementing the Stakeholder Engagement Plan

The GEF Stakeholder Engagement Policy Guidelines⁸ requires that Agencies prepare a Stakeholder Engagement Plan to describe how Stakeholders will be engaged in the project, and means of engagement throughout the project/program cycle. Agencies should include information on progress, challenges and outcomes of stakeholder engagement in their annual Project Implementation Reports.

Either provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan and its respective progress report as annex or complete the below table by specifying the engagement strategies and achievements for the most important stakeholder groups. This can include demonstrating how different stakeholders were engaged in decisions on project governance (e.g. as member of the steering group), in the management or monitoring of the project or in programmatic activities. Forms of engagement include direct consultation or exchange with representative groups as well as indirect forms such as through media or other communication channels. Please also specify how the engagement is documented to provide evidence of such activities.

Please note that the data may be used for reporting to the GEF or IUCN web site, and for other internal and external knowledge and learning efforts. The global thematic programme involved should review and edit/elaborate on the information entered here. All projects must complete this section. Please enter N/A in cells that are not applicable to your project.

Information on progress, challenges and outcomes of Stakeholder Engagement
Civil society organisations
N/A
Local communities
Both TNS and KCL engage with local communities regularly in the context of the implementation of these projects.
Indigenous Peoples
N/A
Private sector
Both TNS and KCL engage with Nestlé-Nespresso. TNS engages with Olam as a coffee exporter in DRC. KCL is associated with Volcafe, a leading coffee trader.
Other relevant stakeholders as identified in the projects' Stakeholder Analysis
In April 2021 KCL compiled a draft stakeholder engagement plan for Uganda, based on the project location as initially agreed, being Mount Elgon.

⁸ Stakeholder Engagement Policy Guidelines (SD/GN/01), December 20, 2018

J. Environmental and Social Safeguards

This section of the PIR describes the progress made towards complying with the Environmental and Social Management Plans or other safeguard tools, when appropriate. Note that this only applies to projects classified as moderate or high risk, not to low risk projects.

For reporting progress on the implementation of ESMS plans or tools, please either provide the ESMP Monitoring Table as annex (see ESMP guidance note and template⁹) or complete the below table.

Progress of implementing the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) or other safeguard tools			
Environmental and Social Risks	Risks identified by ESMS Screening or during any update of ESMP since project start ¹⁰	Actions taken during this FY; explain in particular how you engaged with groups affected by the identified risks	Are the measures considered sufficient? Are there any outstanding issues relevant for next FY?
Adverse gender-related impacts	Gender-based violence (moderate)	<p>In both DRC & Uganda, the implementers implemented appropriate procedures to combat gender-based violence. Both KCL & TNS have implemented non-discrimination policies to meet Nespresso's requirements on this topic. In DRC, TNS has conducted three gender safe space trainings in the AAA Academies.</p> <p>In Uganda, KCL staff in the Nespresso cluster will take part in the Nespresso gender training. The first module of this training will take place in October 2023. KCL has also started to recruit project staff to commence the gender project activities including gender training and related activities for farmers.</p>	No outstanding issues.
Risks of affecting vulnerable groups	Coffee practices and supply to Nespresso aggravates economic situation of sharecroppers by reducing land available for sharecropping or increasing work demanded by concessionaire from sharecropper	<p>Farming households are engaged with to understand how they resource labour and comply with Nespresso sourcing requirements regarding forced labour (e.g., sharecroppers / concessionaries). The project works with existing farmers and does not intend to expand farming area.</p> <p>In DRC annual audits of wet mills are conducted to ensure compliance with Nespresso sourcing requirements concerning forced labor.</p>	No outstanding issues.
	Food security risks when shifting from food crops to coffee (low)	Farmers in both landscapes grow food crops as well as coffee. There is no widespread replacement of food crops by the project. In DRC, the project has a component on household nutrition where this is specifically targeted.	No outstanding issues.

⁹ https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/esms_esmp_guidance_note_and_template.docx

¹⁰ Add n/a if the respective risk issues has neither been identified during the ESMS screening nor in any update of the ESMP.

		In Uganda one of the practices promoted is intercropping (food crops in between rows of coffee) and shade trees. Matoke (banana), an important staple crop, is one of the most used shade trees in coffee farming in Masaka area.	
	Risk of discrimination against vulnerable farm households in terms of access to training and agronomic services	<p>Both projects focus their efforts on smallholder farmers – they are proactively targeted by this project.</p> <p>TechnoServe complete a Gender and Social Inclusion Strategy for DRC in 2021 with Nespresso and USAID funding. Under the strategy our approach is to Conduct targeted outreach that in all of our training programs in DRC. As such under GEF we promote equitable access to trainings through the following actions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek out women and other underrepresented groups • Promote the program in places where women and socially excluded groups meet, work, or congregate. Approach women and socially excluded groups while being mindful of their constraints • Promote the program using female organizations or informal groups • Ask men who are interested in the program to include women family members in the conversation. Explain how both men and women participating will help the household • Solicit input from both men and women about the best training times and locations 	No outstanding issues.
Risk of undermining human rights	Risk of unjustified preferential treatment when selecting sites (villages, washing stations etc.) and individual farmers to join the program (low risk)	Farmers are invited to participate in programs. This is done on an open basis and there is no preferential treatment. All farmers in the respective geographical area that are willing and interested to improve their coffee growing ability in order to be able to meet the high-quality requirements of Nespresso are able to access training and agronomical support..	No outstanding issues.
Community health, safety and security risks	Risk of fuelling conflicts between communities or social groups due to economic successes of selected individuals/households/communities (low)	In both sites, farming households are part of larger sustainable sourcing initiatives that aim to be present for the long-term. This provides an opportunity for all local farmers to engage as they wish. The risk of community violence due to favouritism is low.	No outstanding issues.

		In DRC, Coffee Washing Stations are required to maintain a complaints register and a committee of three cooperative member (1 staff and two coop members) are required to review all complaints. With Nespresso and USAID funding TechnoServe plans to strengthen the Redressal mechanism at coffee washing stations using external monitors in 2024.	
	Risk of violence and incidents affecting civilians associated with the project (e.g. farmers, participants of trainings) (moderate)	There is low risk of violence to civilians / farmers from the project. In DRC, security risks are constantly monitored through messaging from ISOS, weekly updates in staff meetings and regular updating of the DRC Country Security plan, office are closed and work is stopped when there is potential risk to staff. All staff also receive compulsory ISOS trainings on <i>Civil Unrest and Travel Risk Awareness</i>	No outstanding issues.
Labour and working conditions	Security risks for project workers (moderate)	There are low security risks for participation in the project. Note that while there may be violence in some areas of DRC due to armed conflict, this is not associated specifically with this project. In DRC, security risks are constantly monitored through messaging from ISOS, weekly updates in staff meetings and regular updating of the DRC Country Security plan, office are closed and work is stopped when there is potential risk to staff. All staff also receive compulsory ISOS trainings on <i>Civil Unrest and Travel Risk Awareness</i>	No outstanding issues.
	Risk of child labour (low)	Both projects monitor the issue of child labour. Implementing appropriate policies and actions is a condition of supplying Nespresso. In DRC, TNS implements a social responsibility training that covers issues surrounding child protection and farm labour. A poster is distributed to participants that encourages school attendance, and strongly discourages engagement of minors from farm work and dangerous practices. In Uganda KCL implements a project focusing on the topic of child labour aiming to strengthen farmers' capacity and livelihood strategies that support their children's development and education and do not involve child labour with focus on young workers between 14 and 18.	No outstanding issues.
Resource efficiency, pollution, wastes, chemicals	Risk of Agrochemical usage. Risk of pollution due to waste water management from coffee processing. Coffee pulp should correctly	In DRC, Nespresso is only purchasing organically certified coffee, incentivising resource efficiency through market linkages. Equally, the AAA Academy trainings are focused on regenerative agricultural techniques incorporating organic	No outstanding issues.

	managed and composted for resource efficiency	production practices. The use of chemicals is not encouraged in trainings and is extremely rare in South Kivu. To manage potential environmental risks and resource efficiency at coffee washing stations. TechnoServe business advisory staff under a USAID funded program provide annual trainings on sustainability under the regenerative AAA standard. Training to apply correct waste water and coffee pulp composting practices is provided. The application of the training is measured during annual TASQ audits at washing stations. In 2023 all stations correctly applied good waste water and coffee pulp composting practices.	
New risks emerged	DRC: landslides Uganda: climate change	In DRC: adverse weather & land management have resulted in landslides, which have displaced local communities. The project worked with other local stakeholders to support communities to mitigate (by improved land management) and address these issues. In Uganda some parts of the geater Masaka area have been affected by longer than average periods of drought and high temperatures. KCL has been working with communities and farmers on building resilience. This is also one of the important components of the current project.	No outstanding issues.
ESMS Standards¹¹	Required management measures/plans (when standard triggered)	Actions taken during this FY; explain in particular how you engaged with groups affected by the identified risks	Are the measures considered sufficient? Are there any outstanding issues relevant for next FY?
Involuntary Resettlement & Access Restrictions <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Resettlement Action Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Resettlement Policy Framework <input type="checkbox"/> Action Plan to Mitigate Impacts Access Restriction <input type="checkbox"/> Access Restrictions Mitigation Process Framework <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	N/A	N/A
Indigenous Peoples <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous Peoples Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: (Quick social scan to assess presence of indigenous Batwa (DRC) or Benet (Uganda) communities in project sites, their social status and issues or vulnerability and marginalization as well	Note that a quick scan was done at the onset of the project in DRC. GEF currently has 3 Academies where Batwa community members participate. The AAA Academy training informs producers of international best practices to ensure they meet required social responsibilities. TechnoServe also provides training to cooperatives and coffee washing stations conducting annual audits of washing	N/A

¹¹ Please check the respective box to indicate the decision at Screening stage: whether a standards has been triggered or not, or the decision was deferred to the implementation phase. If the latter, please explain the status of this decision.

	as whether there might be any potential risks to these groups caused by project activities)	stations to ensure that employees do not face discrimination. In 2023, all coffee washing stations passed these audits with no cases of discrimination for staff reported. In Uganda, the project site changed from Mt Elgon (where the Benet are present) to the Masaka area, where there are no indigenous communities.	
Cultural Heritage <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Chance Find Procedures <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	N/A	N/A
Biodiversity & Sustainable Use Natural Resources <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Pest Management Plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Development of a species guidance protocol.	N/A	N/A
Project Risk Category (as per ESMS Screening)		<input type="checkbox"/> Low Risk <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Moderate Risk <input type="checkbox"/> High Risk	
Have findings during implementation triggered any changes to the Project Risk Category ? If yes, explain the issues and the new rating.		No	
List all risk issues that are now rated as high risk (if any)		None	
Has a list of relevant host country regulations on environmental and social matters been established? What is the status of the project's compliance with the applicable laws and regulations?		<p>Both projects are aware of local host country regulations and abide by these. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ DRC: the implementer, TNS, maintains a good relationship with local government and has recently completed the framework agreement application process with the Ministry of Plan. The subsequent report from the Ministry of plan provided a favourable determination for our application. TNS follows & abides with all relevant local laws & regulations. <p>Specifically we are compliant with the following regulations on environmental and social matters from Constitution of the Third Republic of the Democratic Republic of Congo, adopted on 18 February 2006:</p> <p>Article 53 states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Every person has a right to a healthy environment, which is favourable to his/her full development. ▪ The environment must be protected. ▪ The state must look after the protection of the environment and the health of the people. <p>Article 123 of the Constitution makes provision for laws on, inter alia, the protection of the environment, the sustainable development of the natural resources of the country, and protection of vulnerable groups.</p>	

	<p>Article 203 allows for cooperative governance by central government and the provincial administrations "to protect the environment, natural sites and landscapes, and the conservation of such sites [as well as] the protection of vulnerable groups."</p> <p>Article 51 ensures the protection and promotion of vulnerable groups and all minorities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Uganda: KCL maintains a good relationship with government, including the Uganda Coffee Development Authority (UCDA) on appropriate planting material, as well as licensing of nurseries and warehouses.
<p>In case any changes of regulations have occurred since project design, have these changes been reflected in project implementation?</p>	<p>N/A</p>

In addition, please indicate whether any grievances as per IUCN and GEF ESS policies have been received during this reporting period. If yes, please answer the below questions and attach the grievance log as annex in order to describe status and progress of the case. The latter should also be done in case grievances had been received in earlier reporting period.

Explanation:

In DRC, TechnoServe maintains grievance policies and procedures in line with international best practice, given their relationship with international customers and donor agencies in the region. In Uganda, the project only recently started implementation due to contracting delays, and no grievances have been registered. Note that KCL receive grievances on a regular basis (approximately 10 per month) through their official HR & grievance process. These are promptly dealt with, and no specific grievances exist regarding this project.

Please explain the grievance
No grievance was received during this reporting period.
Please indicate how it is being/has been addressed
n/a

K. Knowledge Management

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

Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? How does the project collect, document and share good practices? Please list relevant good practices from this year that can be learned and shared from the project.

DRC: The project's third objective includes knowledge sharing. Under Target 3.1, one case study will be developed and shared on the DRC project participation.
As a part of the July 1st, 2022 to June 30th, 2023 reporting period, the project had not begun the case study to develop the knowledge product. Internally, TechnoServe has discussed the timeline and theme for the knowledge product. During the upcoming quarter, starting in July 2023, TechnoServe will develop the scope, data collection instruments, and begin data collection for the nutrition case study. TechnoServe expects that a near final draft of the study will be ready to share by the end of 2023.

KCL: This activity will begin later in the implementation phase.

Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.

DRC: The project does not have a communication strategy. During the reporting period, the project developed and shared a blog post for inclusion on GEF's newsletter. The blog centers on two coffee farmers who shared their story as an example of how high quality climate-resilient coffee farming is providing opportunities for sustainable development in DRC. The blog was also shared in the GEF monthly newsletter.

KCL: The project intends to communicate its initial results in Q1 2024, e.g., through a blog / article.

Communication material

Please provide a list of publications, project website, project page on the IUCN website, any other facebook, twitter, flickr or youtube account related to the project, as well as hyperlinks to any media coverage of the project, for example stories written by an outside source. Please upload any supporting files, including photos, videos, stories, and other documents.

GEF-published blog in the April 2023 GEF Newsletter, Climate-resilient coffee farming is changing lives in DRC:

<https://www.thegef.org/newsroom/feature-stories/climate-resilient-coffee-farming-changing-lives-drc>

Lessons learned

Please share any particular lessons learnt in the context of project implementation (e.g. successfully tested tools, unexpected positive or negative impacts) and/or lessons learnt regarding one of your key outcomes

N/A

Communicating impact

Tell us the story of the project focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's lives and biodiversity and how it contributed to the target(s) pledged through internal conventions (UNCCD LDN, UNFCCC NDCs, CBD NBSAPs, SDGs, etc) and/or national policies

(The text will be used for IUCN Corporate Communications, the IUCN-GEF web-site, and/or other internal and external knowledge and learning efforts)

Please also note you can share your success story and solution on the IUCN [PANORAMA web platform](#). This will allow for knowledge retention and dissemination of project outcomes and success factors.

N/A

What is the most significant change that has resulted from the project this reporting period?

N/A

Annex - Ratings definitions

Implementation Progress Ratings

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 presented 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.

Global Environment Objective/Development Objective Ratings

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.

Development/Adaptation Objective Ratings (For LDCF/SCCF/GCF Adaptation)

Highly Satisfactory (HS): Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major development/adaptation objectives, and yield substantial adaptation benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”.

Satisfactory (S): Project is expected to achieve most of its major development/adaptation objectives, and yield satisfactory adaptation benefits, with only minor shortcomings.

Marginally Satisfactory (MS): Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant development/adaptation objectives, but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major development objectives or yield some of the expected adaptation benefits.

Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU): Project is expected to achieve its major development/adaptation objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major adaptation objectives.

Unsatisfactory (U): Project is expected not to achieve most of its major development/adaptation objectives or to yield any satisfactory adaptation benefits.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major development/adaptation objectives with no worthwhile adaptation benefits.

Risk ratings

Risk ratings will assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project that may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risks 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 and/or the project may face substantial risks.

Modest 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 modest risks.

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 modest risks.

The table below illustrates how the risk categories used by GEF and IUCN align with one another.

GEF risk categories	IUCN risk categories
Climate	External
Environment & Social	Part of ESMS risk assessment
Political and Governance	External
Macro-economic	External
Strategies and policies	Strategic
Technical design of project or program	Operational
Institutional capacity for implementation and sustainability	Operational
Fiduciary: financial management and procurement	Finance
Stakeholder engagement	Part of ESMS risk assessment
Other	People management; Legal / Compliance; Information systems
Financial risks for NGI projects	N/A

The table below illustrates how the risk rating/level used by GEF and IUCN align with one another.

GEF risk rating / level	IUCN risk rating / level
High	High
Substantial	High
Moderate	Medium
Low	Low