



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2023 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	8
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	9
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	11
6. RISKS	13
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	16
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	17
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	18
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	19
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	20
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	21
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	22

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Asia and the Pacific
Country (ies):	Philippines
Project Title:	Enhancing Biodiversity, Maintaining Ecosystem Flows, Enhancing Carbon Stocks through Sustainable Land Management and the Restoration of Degraded Forestlands
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/PHI/065/GFF
GEF ID:	9554
GEF Focal Area(s):	Multi Focal Area
Project Executing Partners:	Department of Environment and Natural Resources – Forest Management Bureau (DENR-FMB)
Initial project duration (years):	Five (5)
Project coordinates: <i>This section should be completed ONLY by:</i> a) Projects with 1st PIR; b) In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.	<i>[Projects in a) and b) categories should indicate YES here and provide the geocoded data in Annex 2]</i>

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	23 September 2020
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	1 st November 2021
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	31 December 2025
Revised project implementation End date (if approved) ²	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	\$ 2,639,726
Total Co-financing amount (USD)³:	\$ 16,809,650
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	\$ 460,002
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)⁴:	\$ 65,395
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023⁵	\$ 0

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:	No PSC Meeting has been conducted yet
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	July 2024
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	N/A
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	October 2025
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage	N/A

Overall ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	<i>Moderately Unsatisfactory</i>
Overall implementation progress rating:	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>
Overall risk rating:	<i>Low</i>

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	Moderate
---	----------

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	Ryan Vita, Forestry and Biodiversity Portfolio Coordinator, FAO Philippines	Ryan.Vita@fao.org
Budget Holder (BH)	Lionel Dabbadie, FAO Representative in the Philippines, FAO Philippines	Lionel.Dabbadie@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)	Atty. Analiza Rebueta-The Undersecretary for Finance, Information Systems and Climate Change, Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Republic of the Philippines	annateh@denr.gov.ph

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

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

Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Illias Animon, Forestry Officer, FAO RAP	Illias.Animon@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO	Lianchawii Chhakchhuak, Technical Advisor – GEF, FAO OCB	Lianchawii.Chhakchhuak@fao.org

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

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

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

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
To deliver multiple and integrated environmental, livelihood and development benefits through the promotion of the cost effective and sustainable restoration of the biological and productive capacities of degraded	Outcome 1: Environmental, livelihood and development initiatives are effectively mainstreamed into Government support for forest restoration	# of government restoration programs that have formally adopted new technical guidelines on different restoration strategies	To be determined	1	3 (ENGP, Forest Management Project (FMP), and the Community-Based Forest Management-Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CBFM-CARP))	0	MU
		# of technical people with increased knowledge gained from trainings on the technical guidelines for restoration strategies	To be determined	100 (50 women, 50 men) members of national institutions trained 50 (25 women, 25 men) members of civil society trained	200 (100 women, 100 men) members of national institutions trained 100 (50 women, 50 men) members of civil society trained	0	MU

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

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

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

¹¹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory** (HS), **Satisfactory** (S), **Moderately Satisfactory** (MS), **Moderately Unsatisfactory** (MU), **Unsatisfactory** (U), and **Highly Unsatisfactory** (HU). Refer to Annex 1.

forest land ecosystems		# of draft policy recommendations/ briefs developed and under discussion on incentives systems in support of restoration	To be determined	1	2	0	MU
	Outcome 2: Diverse and sustainable restoration practices are effectively applied, contributing to the generation of multiple environmental and social benefits	# of enhanced-landscape level restoration management plans prioritising restoration initiatives and proposing diverse restoration approaches based on landscape-wide and site-specific considerations, harmonized with local and regional development and land use plans, forest management plans and PA management plans	To be determined	2 (drafts)	2	0	MU
		# Site specific restoration plans based, including a long-term financing plans, under implementation	To be determined	20	40	0	MU
		# communities or POs with enough technical and financial resources to implement the restoration plans	To be determined	20	40	0	MU
	Outcome 3	% of key stakeholders from Government agencies, CSO and beneficiary communities with increased awareness of restoration options delivering multiple benefits	To be determined	25	75	0	MU

		# of sites that show implementation of activities that they learnt from other sites	To be determined	5	10	0	MU
		# of forest restoration modules added to the Forest Farmer Field School Manual	To be determined	1	2	0	MU
		# national FLR M&E system that incorporates lessons from project M&E system	To be determined	1	1	0	MU

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
1	Hiring of National Project Management Unit Consultant; and Revision and Finalization of Updated Project Work and Budget Plan	Operational Partner in coordination with Budget Holder Unit	3 rd Quarter of 2023
2	Hiring of National Project Management Unit Consultant; and Revision and Finalization of Updated Project Work and Budget Plan	Operational Partner in coordination with Budget Holder Unit	3 rd Quarter of 2023
3	Hiring of National Project Management Unit Consultant; and Revision and Finalization of Updated Project Work and Budget Plan	Operational Partner in coordination with Budget Holder Unit	3 rd Quarter of 2023

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
<u>Outcome 1.1</u>	The reporting period was purely utilized to finalize and complete all institutional arrangements and relevant documents. The annual work plans and targets are still being finalized with the OP.			
<u>Output 1.1.1</u>				
<u>Output 1.1.2</u>				
<u>Outcome 2.1</u>				
<u>Output 2.1.1</u>				
<u>Output 2.1.2</u>				
<u>Output 2.1.3</u>				
<u>Outcome 3.1</u>				
<u>Output 3.1.1</u>				
<u>Output 3.1.2</u>				

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.

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

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

The reporting period was purely utilized to finalize and complete all institutional arrangements and relevant documents, thus, no project activities have been started yet. The project has just completed the first transfer of funds to DENR-FMB as Operational Partner (OP) which will be used for the hiring of the Project Manager and other members of the Project Management Unit. They will be the one to work with FAO on the annual work plan and budget for presentation in the Project Inception Workshop and approval by the PSC. However, with the completion of all the preparatory work and the transfer of funds, the project is expected to start achieving its target outcomes and outputs through the start of the implementation of the project activities. Specifically, the main preparatory activities completed under the project are the following:

- The Special Authority for the DENR Secretary to negotiate and sign the Project Document Agreement was signed and issued by the Philippine President on 19 April 2021
- The Project Document Agreement was countersigned by the DENR Secretary on 02 September 2021
- The Operational Partners Agreement (OPA) was countersigned by the FMB Director on 23 November 2021 (Note: The countersigned OPA does not include a bank account since current policies of the OP only allows them to open a bank account once an agreement has already been finalized and signed)
- Bank Account Details of the OP was formally communicated to FAO on 11 February 2022
- OPA Amendment No.001 to integrate the OP's bank account details was countersigned on 09 September 2022
- Levelling Off Meeting to discuss the project's administrative and financial policies and procedures was conducted on 29 September 2022
- Workshop to guide the OP on the preparation of their first request for funds was conducted on 17 October 2022
- The First Request for Funds was submitted by the OP to FAO on 03 May 2023
- The transfer of the first tranche of project funds to the OP's bank account was completed on 19 June 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	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	With the finalization of all the institutional arrangements and the initial transfer of funds to the OP, the project is still expected to achieve its development objectives. However, since the project will only be starting the implementation of its different components and activities, an Unsatisfactory rating was provided on its implementation progress.
Budget Holder	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	<i>Ratings/comments</i>
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸	N/A	N/A	Implementation of project activities have not yet been started
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	The delay in initiating the project might have impacts on some planned project activities which need to be assessed against desirability, viability and achievability; then implementation need to be expedited
GEF Technical Officer(GTO)	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Owing to the delayed start of the project, a thorough review of the project document will be necessary, and the NTE and other key milestones of the project revised, including the workplan. The Inception Workshop will be an opportunity to consult relevant stakeholders and the project team for any adjustments on the PRODOC that may be required. During this preparatory phase, the FPIC has to be conducted.

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.

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

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

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

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

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
	The reporting period was purely utilized to finalize and complete all institutional arrangements and relevant documents. The ESM Plan will be reviewed and discussed with the OP at the start of the next PIR period.			
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
ESS 7: Decent Work				
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate:

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²⁰ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Moderate risk	The original rating is still valid; ESM Plan needs updating at the inception phase.

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

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

6. Risks

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

	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	Changes or reductions in Government priorities in relation to reforestation and restoration	Substantial	Y	<p>The reporting period was purely utilized to finalize and complete all institutional arrangements and relevant documents. The identified project risks in the Project Document will be reviewed and be discussed and new potential project risks with the OP at the start of the next PIR period.</p>		
2	Continued mistrust between actors in relation to conservation and development goals	Substantial	Y			

²¹ Risk ratings means a rating of 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
3	Long gestation periods for alternative livelihoods to mature and yield benefits which can undermine the restoration initiatives and weaken community participation	High	Y			
4	Incentives for watershed protection and carbon capture fail to materialize as expected	High	Y			
5	Lack of clear land and resource tenure, overlapping jurisdictions and conflicting land claims	Moderate	Y			
6	Renewal of existing or expiring tenure instruments, such as CBFMA.	Moderate	Y			

	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
7	Delayed process of obtaining FPIC as it involves several steps both at the national, regional and local levels. A number of projects before were either delayed or unable to proceed altogether because of their failure to obtain FPIC	High	Y			
8	Current and future climate change impacts threaten the sustainability of FLR investments	Substantial	Y			

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

FY2022 rating	FY2023 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
N/A	Low	Although the identified risks to the project can have moderate to high impact the implementation of the project and the achievement of its objective, these risks have low to moderate chance of occurring and can be addressed by the identified mitigation actions. The project will ensure that mitigation actions are in place to address any identified or new risks

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 1:	N/A
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation.....	
Recommendation.....	
Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize	

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	No minor amendments have been made to the project design yet since the reporting period was purely utilized to finalize and complete all institutional arrangements and relevant documents.		
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management			
Implementation schedule			
Executing Entity			
Executing Entity Category			
Minor project objective change			
Safeguards			
Risk analysis			
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%			
Co-financing			
Location of project activity			
Other minor project amendment (define)			

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	Type of partnership	Progress and results on Stakeholders’ Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government institutions			
	No stakeholder engagement activities have been conducted yet since the reporting period was purely utilized to finalize and complete all institutional arrangements and relevant documents.		
NGOs²³			
Private sector entities			
Others²⁴			
New stakeholders identified			

²³ Non-government organizations

²⁴ 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) <u>during this reporting period.</u>		
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.		The gender action plan has not yet been implemented yet since the reporting period was purely utilized to finalize and complete all institutional arrangements and relevant documents.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women’s empowerment?		
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources		
b) improving women’s participation and decision making		
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women		
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?		<i>Please provide progress on gender sensitive indicators of the project results framework.</i>
Staff with gender expertise		
Any other good practices on gender		

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval, <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.	No knowledge management activities have been conducted yet since the reporting period was purely utilized to finalize and complete all institutional arrangements and relevant documents.
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year .	
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.	
Please provide links to related website, social media account	
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point’s name and contact details	

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

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

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

Do indigenous peoples and or local communities have an active participation in the project activities? If yes, briefly describe how.

Yes, local communities will be involved in the conduct of forest restoration activities in the two (2) identified project areas, specifically indigenous communities will be involved in the project area in Eastern Mindanao. However, no local consultation activities have been conducted yet since the reporting period was purely utilized to finalize and complete all institutional arrangements and relevant documents.

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁵	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ²⁶	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
Government	DENR	In-kind	15,778,061	NA		
Government	BSWM	In-kind	531,588	NA		
GEF agency	FAO	In-kind	500,000	NA		
		TOTAL				

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

No project activities have been conducted yet since the reporting period was purely utilized to finalize and complete all institutional arrangements and relevant documents.

²⁵Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

²⁶Grant, Loan, Equity Investment, Guarantee, In-Kind, Public Investment, Other (please refer to the *Guidelines on co-financing* for definitions

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_FI_GN_01_Cofinancing_Guidelines_2018.pdf

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
Pantabangan–Carranglan Watershed Forest Reserve (PCWFR)	15° 50' 42" N <u>In Decimals Degrees</u> <u>15.845</u>	121° 9' 53" E <u>In Decimals Degrees</u> <u>121.164722</u>	PCWFR	Located in the upper reaches of the Pampanga River between the Sierra Madre and Caraballo Mountains within the political boundaries of the Municipalities of Pantabangan and Carranglan in Nueva Ecija
Simulao Watershed, Agusan River Basin	7° 56'18.50" to 8°18'35.21" N <u>In Decimals Degrees</u> <u>7.938472 to 8.309781</u>	125° 53'23.34" to 126° 18'25" E <u>In Decimals Degrees</u> <u>125.889817 to 126.306944</u>	SWARB	Located in the Agusan River Basin within the political boundaries of the Municipalities of Bunawan, Trento, and Sta. Josefa, Agusan del Sur, the Municipality of Lingig and City of Bislig, Surigao del Sur, and portion of the Municipality of Boston, Davao Oriental and Monkayo, Compostela Valley

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