



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2021 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Global
Country (ies):	Global
Project Title:	Global capacity-building towards enhanced transparency in the AFOLU sector (CBIT-AFOLU)
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP /GLO/880/CBT
GEF ID:	9864
GEF Focal Area(s):	Climate Change
Project Executing Partners:	FAO
Project Duration:	3 years
Project coordinates: (Ctrl+Click here)	41.8821529, 12.4866651

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	23 October 2018
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01-Jan-2019
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	31-Dec-2021
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	30 June 2022
Actual Implementation End Date³:	

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 1,776,484
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	USD 3,000,000
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2021 (USD m):	USD 1.175.821

¹ As per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

³ Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

⁴ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2021⁵	USD 2,600,000
--	---------------

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	24 May 2021
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	N/A
Actual Mid-term review date:	
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022)⁷:	No
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date:	June 2022
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022):	Yes
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁸	Yes

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	HS	The project achieved the main objectives foreseen, adapting to the COVID-19 Pandemic. It delivers a series of strong and important ETF-enhanced global products and directly supports more countries than expected in addressing their main capacity needs. The coordination with several transparency actors has been enhanced making it possible to support additional countries with ad hoc trainings and to develop supplementary products, which will bring benefits and information to the overall transparency community.
Overall implementation progress rating:	S	The implementation of the project has been satisfactory, with an appropriate use of resources. Due to the COVID-19 outbreak, the implementation

⁵ Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

⁶ The MTR should take place about halfpoint between EOD and NTE – this is the expected date

⁷ Please note that the FAO GEF Coordination Unit should be contacted six months prior to the expected MTR date

⁸ Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

		suffered a delay of several in-country and regional capacity-building activities and consequently only 65 percent of the budgeted funds were spent. On the other hand, the critical health situation required the project team to identify new modalities to foster networks and knowledge exchange among peers that required a wider number of human resources. A large part of the remaining funds will be committed in the Q4 Y3, mainly translating and disseminating widely the products of the project.
Overall risk rating:	Medium	<p>The main moderate risks, dictated also by COVID-19, were properly mitigated through close communication and follow up with countries' focal points, thus all countries have been engaged, workplans were formulated and activities planned.</p> <p>Some additional challenges have been identified but at this stage of advancement of the project, they do not put the achievement of the activities or outcomes at risk.</p>

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Mirella Salvatore	Mirella.salvatore@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Martial Bernoux	Martial.Bernoux@fao.org
Budget Holder	Natalia Alekseeva	Natalia.Alekseeva@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Yurie Naito	Yurie.Naito@fao.org

2. Progress Towards Achieving Project Objectives and Outcomes (DO)

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ¹¹
Objective(s): strengthen developing country technical and institutional capacity, through coordinated dissemination of knowledge, to meet enhanced transparency framework requirements when implementing priority actions for achieving their respective nationally determined contributions in the Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use sector.						
Component 1 - Supporting developing countries to strengthen their capacity to establish and sustain the institutional arrangements required to respond to ETF requirements and improve decision-making processes						
Outcome 1.1 - 'ETF-enhanced' IA Global Products	Number of enhanced tools	0	0	3	3	HS
Outcome 1.2 - Enhanced institutional and knowledge management capacity	Number of countries	0	4	6	6	HS
Component 2 - Building developing countries' technical capacity to establish robust systems to measure, report and verify emissions and to monitor and evaluate adaptation actions, in the agriculture sectors in accordance with ETF.						
Outcome 2.1 - 'ETF-enhanced' MRV and M&E Global Products	Number of tools	0	3	14	14	HS
Outcome 2.2 - Enhanced MRV and M&E technical capacity	Number of countries	0	4	6	26	HS
Component 2 - Building developing countries' technical capacity to establish robust systems to measure, report and verify emissions and to monitor and evaluate adaptation actions, in the agriculture sectors in accordance with ETF.						
Outcome 3.1 - Knowledge sharing	Number of practitioners	0	100	300	1000	HS
Outcome 3.2 - Coordination efforts	Number of stakeholders	0	50	100	600	HS

⁹ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

¹⁰ 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.

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

3. Progress in Generating Project Outputs (Implementation Progress, IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as planned in the Annual Work Plan)

Outputs ¹²	Expected completion date ¹³	Achievements at each PIR ¹⁴		Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁵ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR		
Output 1.1.1 - 'ETF-ready' IA Products	Q4 Y1	4 products have been identified and reviewed. 3 have been enhanced in term of ETF requirement: 2 in collaboration with USA EPA and GIZ PATPA respectively.	The AFOLU Data Template has been developed and tested in several countries. In order to serve the FAO-led National CBIT projects which cover also the other sectors the templates are under development also for the other sectors	100%	
Output 1.1.2 - Integration of feedback for developing 'ETF-enhanced' IA Global Products	Q3 Y2	5 countries included in their workplan to review the 'ETF-ready' IA. A survey on tools in use was launched in March 2020 to collect initial feedback.	Country feedback included in the final IA products	100%	
Output 1.2.1 - Capacity building on the 'ETF-ready' IA Products	Q4 Y3	The desk review of country capacity gaps and needs was discussed with 5 country counterparts to prioritize their needs. The capacity building activities were carried out through online bilateral discussions. To build the community of transparency practitioners, we joined the forces with the PATPA. Government officials from 15 Asian countries and 31 Anglophone African country are part of the <i>ad-hoc</i> MS Teams	A specific online webinar has been organized to present the results of the work done to produce the new EPA templates on IA.	85%	Several in-person events where planned that could not be delivered due to the COVID outbreak. Most of them have been delivered in Q4 Y2 and Q1/Q2 Y3 as virtual activities and more have been planned in the coming months due to the persistent pandemic.

¹² Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

¹³ As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹⁴ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁵ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

Outputs ¹²	Expected completion date ¹³	Achievements at each PIR ¹⁴		Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁵ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR		
		discussion groups. The people involved are mainly from Ministry of Agriculture and/or Forestry and data providers in charge of the AFOLU sector of the GHGI or defining mitigation policies in agriculture and land use sectors for the NDC enhancement. In this phase we are testing if the technology is leading to an in-depth involvement. For the pilot countries, a dedicated D-group on Transparency in AFOLU is planned to be set-up as result of the lessons learned from this exercise.			
Output 1.2.2 - Country-level awareness raised amongst non-AFOLU policy makers	Q1 Y2	The <i>ad-hoc</i> MS Teams discussion groups are bringing together the AFOLU experts indicated above with PATPA focal points, mainly from the Ministry of Environment. The discussion leads to highlight and raise awareness on the major challenges of the AFOLU sector, in terms of institutional arrangements.	An event in collaboration with PATPA was organized on “Enhancing data collection and institutional arrangements in the AFOLU sector” that raised the awareness of 44 participants (43% F and 57% M) from 18 Asian countries. The project is also raising awareness about transparency of non-state actors, such as academia and youth groups.	100%	
Output 2.1.1 - ‘ETF-enhanced’ MRV Global Products	Q1 Y3	Out of 10 tools reviewed, 8 products have been selected for improvement, based on the interest raised by our pilot countries and additional requests received through other CBIT implementing agencies and ICAT countries. Two tools have been revised and improved with the support of the FAO TAG. FAO contributed to review a crucial UNFCCC product. A detailed	Around 10 tools were reviewed and, based on the results, two were revised and nine new products were designed to overcome the knowledge gaps.	100%	

Outputs ¹²	Expected completion date ¹³	Achievements at each PIR ¹⁴		Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁵ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR		
		assessment report will be delivered by Q4 Y2 for wider dissemination that would help other countries identify the most suitable product to overcome their gaps and needs.			
Output 2.1.2 - 'ETF-enhanced' M&E Global Products	Q4 Y2	Out of 7 tools reviewed, 3 products have been prioritized with the support of the NAP-Ag team. In particular, the M&E training package that contains 8 modules addressing the MPGs under several aspects.	The eight modules of the M&E of adaptation training package and the five domains of the Self-evaluation and holistic assessment of climate resilience of farmers and pastoralists (SHARP) and the five modules of the Modelling System of Agricultural Impacts of Climate Changes (MOSAICC) were consistently reviewed to guide on their application in the context of the BTR-adaptation compilation.	100%	
Output 2.2.1 - Capacity building on 'ETF-ready' MRV Products for feedback	Q3 Y2	During the first semester of Y2, several bilateral calls were carried out with the country focal points and government officials to raise awareness on ETF requirements, MPGs, AFOLU-related challenges and tools to address the gaps in mitigation. A virtual training of technical tools has been carried out and lessons learned have been derived to design future training if the COVID situation persists.	Three technical webinars on MPGs and related products were delivered and around 60 practitioners were trained (50% F and 50% M) with 10 countries participating, on average. The in-country QA review process with UNFCCC was performed in around 10 countries, with an average of 10-15 experts participating. As an alternative support mechanism following the pandemic, several ad-hoc trainings were also launched to	100%	Most of these capacity building activities were foreseen with in-country/regional workshops that would have been more effective when a training on technical tools is required. The events formerly postponed to Q4 Y2 or Q1/Q2 Y3 were finally delivered online.

Outputs ¹²	Expected completion date ¹³	Achievements at each PIR ¹⁴		Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁵ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR		
			address specific country needs in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Madagascar • Sudan • PNG • Guinea • Argentina • Mongolia • Cambodia 		
Output 2.2.2 - Capacity building on 'ETF-ready' M&E Products for feedback	Q2 Y2	During the first quarter of Q2, several bilateral calls were carried out with the country focal points and government officials to raise awareness on ETF requirements, MPGs, AFOLU-related challenges and tools to address the gaps in adaptation. A virtual training of technical tools has been carried out.	Two dedicated trainings were carried out in Mozambique and Senegal for testing respectively the M&E training package and SHARP for addressing the BTR-adaptation requirements. The first was held during 4 sessions in May/June 2020 and attended by 42 participants. The second was held in November 2020 and attended by 43 participants. A webinar on Reporting on adaptation in the agriculture and land use sectors under the Paris Agreement: Loss and Damage Assessment will be held on 29 th of June.	100%	See above
Output 3.1.1 - Dissemination of 'ETF-enhanced' Global Products	Q4 Y3	The communication strategy has been prepared and around 5 platforms and networks identified to scale up the dissemination.	The PATPA Knowledge portal, PCCB Network, MRV Group of Friends, CBIT Coordination Platform were used as the main platforms for disseminating the global	100%	

Outputs ¹²	Expected completion date ¹³	Achievements at each PIR ¹⁴		Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁵ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR		
			products. In addition, the project boosted the development of the FAO Enhanced Transparency Framework website, where activities and products of the project are promoted, mainly through the use of the Network and its newsletter.		
Output 3.1.2 - Champion Groups country-specific sharing experiences	Q4 Y3	Initial planning for sharing experience has been designed.	Experts from Sudan, Zimbabwe, Madagascar, Ghana, Mongolia and Cambodia shared their experiences in addressing transparency in events where the CBIT-AFOLU project team was leading or co-organizing.	75%	
Output 3.2.1 - Cross-agency cooperation scaled up	Q4 Y3	Due to the COVID outbreak, the cross-agency cooperation was scaled up involving more transparency capacity building actors as listed in the comment section.	We reached out to all the main transparency initiatives and capacity building providers to organize specific country or regional activities.	100%	
Output 3.2.2 - Joint events to promote multi-stakeholder coordination	Q4 Y3	The planning of 4 joint events is ongoing with regular calls among the partner institutions.	Six events with PATPA covering the Francophone and Anglophone Africa clusters and the Asia Regional group were co-organized: 1 in-country training with UNDP GSP in Togo 1 technical review with ICAT in Argentina	100%	

Outputs ¹²	Expected completion date ¹³	Achievements at each PIR ¹⁴		Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁵ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR		
			<p>4 one-to-one mentoring session (4 months guiding calls) in Madagascar under the CBIT project led by CI, Sudan, PNG and Guinea.</p> <p>7 high-level side events: COP25, SB50, Africa Climate Week 2020, All Climate Week 2021, Global NDC Conference</p>		

4. Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on Project Implementation

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

Despite the difficulties encountered due to the pandemic, the CBIT AFOLU project has been carrying out planned activities such as the delivery of Institutional Arrangements, MRV and M&E ETF-enhanced global products; and implementing capacity building activities.

The main progress achieved in the fiscal year 2020/2021 are:

- *Country Involvement*

The CBIT-AFOLU project reached out to beneficiaries in all pilot countries, CBIT national projects and a significant number of other countries. Activities included organizing and co-organizing training events and workshops in collaboration with partner organizations and initiatives (see below).

Five additional countries to the thirteen pilot countries requested support from the project in addressing specific technical gaps. Country-tailored capacity building support is being delivered through bilateral calls which additionally makes it possible to further test the global products.

- *Global products:*

The global products for Institutional Arrangements, such as the Consultative Group of Experts toolbox on institutional arrangements, AgriSurvey, the Livestock Activity Data Guidance, the BUR Process Guidance Tool, the US EPA IA templates have been reviewed. The US EPA IA templates have been revised to address the ETF considerations; and an event to disseminate them was carried out. The BTR Guidance and Roadmap tool has been developed in collaboration with the PATPA, based on considerations on the BUR Process Guidance Tool. “Addressing data challenges in agriculture for the ETF” report and the AFOLU Data template has been developed based on comments from the AgriSurvey modules. Country testing already occurred and feedback were incorporated in order to deliver the ETF-enhanced products.

MRV products, such as the [UNFCCC Quality Assurance Templates](#), the IPCC software’s upgraded AFOLU section, the Ex-ante Carbon Tool (Ex-Act), the Global Livestock Environmental Assessment Model (GLEAM), the Oeko NDC Accounting Rules, GACMO, the ICAT Guidelines on Agriculture and Forestry, and CGE training materials on GHG inventory ([uncertainty, key categories analysis](#)) have been reviewed. The UNFCCC Quality Assurance Templates, and the IPCC software’s upgraded AFOLU section have been revised accordingly. New products have been designed from scratch and largely implemented. These include e-learning courses on [preparing a greenhouse gas inventory under the Enhanced Transparency Framework](#), uncertainties with a focus on the land use sector, and on estimating enteric fermentation at Tier 2; AFOLU MRV Guidance,

the Land representation tool, the AFOLU GHG Navigator, the NDC-Ag Navigator and NDC tracking tool for AFOLU. Around three already completed, eight are under development, of which two will be launched in Q4 Y3, and 5 in Q1 Y4.

M&E-related products have been reviewed, namely the Self-evaluation and holistic assessment of climate resilience of farmers and pastoralists ([SHARP](#)), [M&E of adaptation training package](#), Modelling System for Agricultural Impacts of Climate Change ([MOSAICC](#)), and Tracking Adaptation in Agricultural Sectors ([TAAS](#)), [Loss and damage assessment](#), Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis ([RIMA](#)), Tracking Adaptation and Measuring Development ([TAMD](#)) and exploring linkages between Nature-based solutions and the ETF. The modules of the M&E of adaptation training package were consistently improved to guide countries in compiling the BTR-adaptation; and in using existing national M&E systems to inform the MPGs. The training package was translated in Spanish and French and will be online in September 2021. The SHARP was made ETF-ready by reviewing all five domains (environment, social, agricultural, economic and governance) of the household survey to reshape the assessments in the context of the climate hazards and risks faced by the target group. MOSAICC was also reviewed to align it with the PA article 7 principles of the Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA), to ensure that it is gender-responsive. The implementation procedures of five modules (Crop, Hydrology, Climate, Forestry, Economy) were adjusted accordingly.

Since June 2021, the project has started to work on the engagement academia and youth groups in a set of awareness-raising activities and dialogues around transparency.

- *Country/regional training*

21 in-country and virtual training events (PATPA FRANCOPHONE x 2, PATPA ASIA x 4, EXACT trainings X 3, webinars X 3, Zaragoza, QA x 2, M&E, SHARP, mentoring X 6) involved around 1000 participants from Morocco, Togo, Cote d'Ivoire (EXACT Training), Algeria, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroun, Comoros, Ivory Coast, Djibouti, Gabon, Guinea, Lebanon, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Mozambique (M&E training Package), Mauritania, Niger, Central African Republic, DRC, Congo, Rwanda, Senegal, Chad, Togo, Tunisia (PATPA FR workshop + training), Nigeria, Ghana, Egypt, Turkey, Argentina, Algeria, Brazil, South Africa, Morocco, Colombia, Zimbabwe (Zaragoza), Senegal (SHARP), and Afghanistan .

These included regional trainings carried out with partners, mainly UNFCCC, IPCC, PATPA, ICAT, UNEP and UNDP, which allowed the project to cover almost all developing countries. The trainings exposed more than 200 participants to ETF-related topics tackling the challenges of the AFOLU sector: from the use of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines to the estimation of emissions, baseline and targets; from institutional arrangements to the lack of data.

- *Coordination*

The project further strengthened the collaboration with several transparency capacity-building actors, namely PATPA/GIZ, UNDP, IPCC, ICAT, UNFCCC, PCCB Network, US EPA and UNEP-DTU. Indeed, the prolonged COVID-19 pandemic did not allow for the organization of in-person events in the second half of Y2 and first half of Y3. The project has therefore continued to apply its strategy of deploying support and activities at a distance and successfully co-organized seven events fully dedicated to the AFOLU sector, namely six with PATPA and one with the UNFCCC and IPCC.

The project activities were presented at the inaugural event of the PCCB Network and to the introductory meeting for the UN Agencies of the renovated ETF Coordination Unit at UNFCCC. Several discussions occurred regarding the inclusion of some AFOLU ETF-enhanced products in the ICAT/UNFCCC blended learning course. The project led some exchanges with the above-listed transparency actors to identify the possibility to create a joint event to emphasize the value added of agencies coordination through countries testimonials. The project is continuously under discussion UNFCCC and the PCCB Network to identify the most effective opportunities. The project is also part of the activities and events in collaboration with the Capacity Building for Transparency (CB4T) under the UK presidency COP26 Catalyst 4 Climate Action (C4CA).

The project has established a productive collaboration with the recently approved IKI funded Scaling up Climate Ambition on Land Use and Agriculture through Nationally Determined Contributions and National Adaptation Plans (SCALA), in Senegal, Colombia (and Mongolia). SCALA, a five year program, jointly implemented by FAO and UNDP, has a component on capacity building for improving/developing MRV and M&E systems at national and/or sectoral level for monitoring and reporting under the UNFCCC, CBD, SFDRR and SDGs with regard to mitigation and/or adaptation in land-use and agriculture.

The global CBIT-AFOLU team is actively present in all ongoing FAO-led national CBIT-AFOLU projects in Asia, to ensure coordination and technical support, with dedicated experts based on the country needs.

- *Events*

The project activities and support were presented at several high-level events, such as @ SBSTA 50, Transparency Day of the PCCB Second Capacity Building Hub @ COP25, all Climate Weeks 2021, and around five major transparency events. The project will be present at the Asia LEDS Partnership Forum, pre-COP26 and COP26.

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

The major challenges experienced during this reporting period were the following:

- *Country involvement and requests for support*

As the pandemic affected in-person workshops worldwide and the panorama of online gatherings got increasingly crowded, the active involvement of country experts in the virtual events proved to be a real challenge. In this complex situation, the

project learnt new ways of engaging with countries. For example, along with the regional and other events involving many countries (see above), it deployed an innovative process of mentoring single countries on specific technical topics. The latter ranged from support on applying Tier 1 and Tier 2 methodologies to the GHG inventory, to NDC enhancement, to data archiving. Indeed, also in this reporting period, the project continued to receive a steady amount of requests for specific support from a number of countries. In the context of the NDC enhancement, many countries realized that agriculture and land use could have a significant impact on raising their ambition. At the same time, they understood the importance of improving their MRV system for this sector - in particular collecting data, estimating emissions, baseline and targets, formulating mitigation and adaptation policies and relevant indicators to be able to track their progress on the BTR.

In addition, more of our Transparency partners rely on our technical competency and request trainings on ETF-ready products to address countries' concerns in the sector that is found to be one of the weakest.

This project now has a solid foundation to scale up and support a larger number of countries, not only by disseminating the global products but also by offering targeted support. A second phase of the project could help more countries address ETF requirements. This calls for a significant stepping up of national technical capacities in order to meet the 2024 deadline to submit the first BTR.

- *COVID-19*

Without any doubt, the pandemic continued to represent a real challenge to the success of project activities during this reporting period. Ensuring sufficient engagement and group discussions proved arduous in the absence of face-to-face interaction. Knowledge sharing and coordination among countries from different parts of the world remained difficult due to time differences and the limitations intrinsic to the online modalities, especially with large events and involving many countries. In most cases the project was able to overcome these challenges by splitting the attendees into smaller groups (breakout groups) or organizing bilateral sessions, as previously described. This contributed greatly to build trust and collaboration between the project team and the country beneficiaries.

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.

	FY2021 Development Objective rating¹⁶	FY2021 Implementati on Progress rating¹⁷	Comments/reasons¹⁸ justifying the ratings for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	HS	S	The project is fully achieving the main objectives to produce a series of ETF-enhanced global products and support more countries than expected in addressing their main capacity needs through the products' use. The coordination with several transparency actors is enhanced allowing the project to support additional countries and to develop supplementary products. Project implementation faced delays in several in-country and regional capacity-building activities due to the COVID-19 outbreak, reducing the amount of resources spent. On the other hand, the critical situation pushed the project to identify new modalities to foster networks and knowledge exchange among peers.
Budget Holder	HS	HS	The project implemented the activities with an appropriate use of resources. Despite COVID-19, 65 percent of the budgeted funds have been spent. A large part of the remaining funds will be committed in the Q4 Y3.
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	HS	S	The project is fully meeting its objectives/goals as foreseen. It has successfully adapted to the COVID-19 Pandemic, with strong and important deliverables, and by supporting more countries than expected. This work has brought benefits and information to the overall Transparency community.
GEF Operational Focal Point	n/a	n/a	<i>Optional Ratings/comments</i>
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	HS	S	The project achieved its objectives and targets despite the global pandemic. Indeed, the project has been working on increasing the number of countries, and expanding partnerships with new organizations.

¹⁶ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁷ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁸ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

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

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

This section of the PIR describes the progress made towards complying with the approved ESM plan, when appropriate. 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 add recommendations to improve the implementation of the ESM plan, when needed.

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
ESS 7: Decent Work				
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate if the initial Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid; if not, what is the new classification and explain.

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

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²⁰ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	Still valid

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.

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

6. Risks**Risk ratings**

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

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

	Risk	Risk rating²¹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions²²	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Lack of engagement of 10 out of the identified 20 pilot country candidates and balanced distribution among the topics of interest	Medium	Use of already established networks and expansion of the country selection pool to include the top 50 ranked countries. Survey and prioritization according to the baseline to ensure the balanced distribution.	Bilateral discussions with country stakeholders helped to build the trust and ensure the engagement	
2	Lack of political will to support the project activities and instable interest due to government change	High	Awareness raising among decision makers combined with a strong stakeholder involvement plan, ensuring continuity in case of government change.		
3	Lack of coordination among concerned ministries and local government authorities	Medium	Clear project institutional arrangements that specify roles and responsibilities of those concerned set out by the national guidelines to be supported by the project.	An inclusive process of different actors in the discussions of main challenges is helping to increase the coordination.	
4	Limited cooperation on data and information sharing among stakeholders	Medium	An MoU with the key stakeholders to collect and hand over required data and information.	Clear understanding of data requirements and timeline facilitate the process of MoU formulation	
5	Inability for the government to fund the ETF-related activities beyond the project cycle	Medium	Use North-South cooperation and coordination events as an outreach channel for potential investments; utilize resources available with baseline projects.		

²¹ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²² If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period”.

	Risk	Risk rating ²¹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²²	Notes from the Project Task Force
6	Gender mainstreaming hindered by resistance from local and national stakeholders	Low	Clear initial communication on gender equality as one of the key monitoring element for tracking progress of the project.		
7	Transparency related work loses momentum, as the Paris Agreement is not successful.	Medium	Put an emphasis on the socioeconomic benefits of transparency work that go beyond the lifetime of the Paris Agreement (no-regrets approach)	In addition, transparency is seen as a means for accountability to access climate finance	
8	New risk COVID-19 pandemic continues to limit the possibility to deliver face-to-face trainings	Medium	Alternative modalities of stakeholder involvement are put into place	Several modalities have been already tested and evaluated with country counterparts	

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

FY2020 rating	FY2021 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Medium	Medium	The main medium risks, dictated also by COVID-19, were properly mitigated through close communication and follow up with countries' focal points, thus all countries were engaged, workplans were formulated and activities planned. Some additional challenges have been identified but at this stage of advancement of the project they do not put the achievement of the activities or outcomes at risk.

7. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Only for projects that had the Mid-term review (or supervision mission)

If the project had a MTR review or a supervision mission, please report on how the MTR recommendations were implemented as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented
Recommendation 1:	
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation 4:	

Adjustments to the project strategy.

Please note that changes to outputs, baselines, indicators or targets cannot be made without official approval from PSC and PTF members, including the FLO. These changes will follow the recommendations of the MTR or the supervision mission.

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

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

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

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	<p>Original NTE: 31 Dec 2021 Revised NTE: 30 June 2022</p> <p>Justification: The Project Steering Committee, noting the remaining project funds originally dedicated to funding travel costs and relevant in-person activities, agreed that the extension of the project to June 30, 2022 on a no-cost basis would lead to the successful completion of the project. This would generate both on-the-ground results and progress in global collaboration processes linked to the enhanced transparency framework. The PSC therefore supported the extension request.</p>

8. Stakeholders Engagement

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

Throughout its implementation, the project continued to promote engagement with national stakeholders to strengthen linkages between knowledge generation, policy decisions and changes on the ground. A dialogue among key national-level stakeholders (decision-makers, practitioners, researchers, etc.) was often the objective of the activities and workshops linked to institutional arrangements that the project implemented. These were meant to stimulate the internal discussion on knowledge gaps, research needs, findings and implications for implementation of mitigation actions.

The project intends to continue to engage with, and reach out to, new stakeholders through the use of participatory methodologies and tools such as those implemented under the Transparency Network (which now includes the D-group Community of Practice). Engagement models include:

- An in-depth mapping of key national stakeholders, their priorities, their roles, power relations and their needs in order to develop engagement strategies and ensure wide dissemination of the 'ETF-enhanced' Global Products;
- The appointment, in each country, of a dialogue team composed of a national focal point (high level decision maker in the Ministry in charge of UNFCCC responsibility) and technical advisors;
- A process of national level consultations aimed at involving all stakeholders in discussing information needs, tools and progress made;
- A series of bilateral exchanges that also aim at further stimulating cross-country dialogue and the sharing of experiences and lessons learned during regional events.

A detailed database with country stakeholders' information has been developed and maintained to ensure an inclusive process and wider dissemination of activities/products/opportunities.

There have been a number of regional exchanges were delivered on MS Teams and/or Zoom, in collaboration with the PATPA and other partners. The discussion groups contributed to stimulating the exchange of technical information on country needs and addressing knowledge gaps. They also offered the project ideas for ad-hoc webinars and further dissemination activities.

9. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)

The project provides gender-disaggregated reporting for capacity-development activities, such as training events. During the 2019 events, male participation was higher than female, and was around 55-58% depending on the geographical region. In 2020, during the COVID-19 outbreak, with more than 50% of women government participants the trainings highlighted how flexible work arrangements under the current crisis and virtual outreach approaches can encourage women's engagement in trainings.

The project is expected to contribute to gender equality by improving women's participation and decision-making.

Members of the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) have been requested to consider gender-related issues in the formulation of technical products. For example, the adaptation specialists are addressing gender among the issues that might be associated with differential climate-related impacts or vulnerabilities, and how such issues might be reflected in adaptation-related M&E.

From a management point of view, the PMU, the TAG and the Project Steering Committee of the project present approximately an equal distribution between male and female.

For FAO personnel it is mandatory to undertake the online course titled Gender Equality, UN Coherence and You. The aim of this course is to raise awareness of gender issues and dynamics and to ensure that the staff achieves a consistent level of knowledge. This course will contribute to a common understanding of terminology, core principles and effective approaches that will help agencies work together on gender programming and on empowerment of girls and women and the realization of girls' and women's rights.

10. Knowledge Management Activities

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

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.

The knowledge management strategy of the project is designed to share knowledge, best practices and lessons learned with member countries, investors, partners and development practitioners to improve the agriculture and land use sectors. The project envisages to promote innovative exchange of knowledge and experiences between and among countries through existing networks and dedicated practitioners discussion groups.

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

- two dedicated specialists in communications, country engagement and knowledge management contracted

The project has a communication strategy that includes:

- the continued development of the [Enhanced Transparency Framework](#) website in English, French and Spanish that consolidates FAO efforts on Transparency including the global and national CBIT-AFOLU projects. Additional features include a dedicated and regularly updated “Tools and resources” page; as well as “Working together” and “Countries” pages which gather country activities and joint activities with partners..
- the creation of a [dedicated page](#) under the CBIT Coordination Platform and the use of the library to disseminate the ETF-enhanced global products; and on the [FAO GEF website](#).
- the preparation of communication and multimedia products, including a new visual identity, short video clips; a webinar series; and social media cards and tweets for various social media platforms (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn and YouTube);
- the preparation of publications including four guides to using key tools in the context of the ETF; webinar reports; results of a survey on the adoption of Tier 2 methodology for enteric fermentation; case studies on Madagascar and Mozambique; an article on how the project is supporting Sudan in their GHG inventory; brochures on the project and on the transparency network, a brochure for Youth on climate transparency in the agriculture sectors, etc.;
- the ongoing development of the [Transparency network](#) including monthly newsletters reaching over 420 targeted users, a dedicated discussion forum and a [LinkedIn group](#). An [online roster of transparency professionals](#) has been a major deliverable in this period;
- participation in global transparency campaigns such as the [Data4betterclimateaction](#) campaign and activities related to Pre-COP26 and COP26 (in particular participating in the Transparency focus group), the identification of several newsletters and online platforms where articles/notices about project activities, webinars, discussion groups, etc. have been published;
- the organization of at least two joint regional workshops each year, online seminars, technical trainings with UNFCCC.

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. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.

How Sudan is developing its capacity for meeting the Paris Agreement’s reporting requirements (An interview with Ms Rehab Ahmed Hassan, Sudan GHG team manager)

<http://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/transparency/countries/sudan-capacity-development-paris-agreement-interview/en/>

We would like to thank our national team from the University of Antananarivo, and our partners FAO and Conservation International, for helping Madagascar in enhancing the capacity to address the enhanced transparency framework requirements. Working together with academic institutions in this process has allowed us to strengthen our domestic capacities in responding to the UNFCCC reporting requirements and retain the technical and institutional knowledge for future reporting cycles. In a broader context, this activity gave us the opportunity to build and explore the link between science and policy for ensuring a more informed decision-making process in address climate change.”

Mrs Minister of the Environment and Sustainable Development, Madagascar

Please provide links to publications, leaflets, video materials, related website, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.

FAO Enhanced Transparency Framework website

<http://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/transparency-framework/en/>

Transparency in agriculture and land use sectors network

<http://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/transparency/network/en/>

Online Roster of Transparency Practitioners

<http://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/transparency/network/en/>

Transparency network LinkedIn group

<https://www.linkedin.com/groups/8991801/>

Transparency network newsletters

<http://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/transparency/network/newsletters>

FAO Global CBIT-AFOLU project on the CBIT Coordination Platform and FAO GEF platform

<https://www.cbitplatform.org/index.php/projects/global-cbit-afolu>

<http://www.fao.org/gef/projects/detail/en/c/1105975/>

Webinar series: Addressing transparency in agriculture and land use sectors

<http://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/transparency/webinars/en/?>

Video: Global Coordination for Enhanced Transparency under the Paris Agreement

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UN9fKNddnw4>

Article: How Sudan is developing its capacity for meeting the Paris Agreement's reporting requirements

<http://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/transparency/countries/sudan-capacity-development-paris-agreement-interview/en/>

Publications:

- [Results of the survey on the adoption of Tier 2 methodology for enteric fermentation](#)
- [SHARP and the ETF](#)
- [M&E of Adaptation training package and the ETF](#)
- [FAO's Damage and Loss Assessment methodology to monitor the Sendai Framework's Indicator C2 and the ETF](#)
- [MOSAICC and the ETF](#)

Does the project have a communication and/or knowledge management focal point? If yes, please provide their names and email addresses

Denise Melvin: Denise.Melvin@fao.org

Sousan Torabi Parizi: Sousan.Torabiparizi@fao.org

11. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

The project does not have a direct implication with any population of indigenous people as these are commonly defined. The project's activities could have indirect effects on the management of natural resources, which are closely associated with the traditional lifestyles of various communities (e.g., semi-transhumant herders; forest-dependent communities).

12. Innovative Approaches

Please provide a brief description of an innovative²³ approach in the project / programme, describe the type (e.g. technological, financial, institutional, policy, business model) and explain why it stands out as an innovation.

The innovativeness of the CBIT-AFOLU project lies in the global applicability of ETF-enhanced products reinforced by lessons learned from country application and in the multiple coordination efforts established to ensure to provide sectoral support coherent with an economy-wide vision provided at country level by other transparency implementers. These modalities are already increasing a more conscious understanding of the challenges and opportunities of the AFOLU sector that could drive up ambition and quantification of support requested in future NDC cycles.

Through the coordination of the global with FAO-led national CBIT-AFOLU projects, the project will learn how to enable scientific innovation through cooperation with Government and local technical and research institutions.

The project proposes and disseminates innovative methodologies for upgrading data collection processes with the wider application of remote sensing data, GIS, app-based data collection platforms and cloud-based data storage and transfer services where appropriate. The lessons learned would be used to raise awareness of institutional stakeholders in pilot countries of the need for enhanced investment and technology transfer in local institutions to improve knowledge management information systems for measuring and monitoring mitigation/adaptation actions and to facilitate replication.

The use of discussion groups and community of transparency practitioners would help to share knowledge and access to the best practices and methodologies among peers.

13. Possible impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the project

Please indicate any implication of the Covid-19 pandemic on the activities and progress of the project. Highlight the adaptive measures taken to continue with the project implementation.

- Are the outcomes/outputs still achievable within the project period.
- Will the timing of the project MTR or TE be affected/delayed?
- What is the impact of COVID-19 on project beneficiaries, personnel, etc.
- Are there good practices and lessons learned to be shared?

Since 2020, most of the project's capacity building activities (in particular in-country training events) have had to be delivered online because travel was no longer possible. Nonetheless, the project is still meeting its objectives in terms of building country capacity and indeed in some cases there have been benefits to delivering the training virtually. These include cost savings from reduced travel expenses and the increased participation of women government staff members in the trainings (most likely due to the possibility for more flexible arrangements).

In terms of lessons learned for delivering virtual training, a model in which a dedicated team worked over a period of several months - with weekly meetings, detailed meeting notes, assignments and follow up in between meetings – proved to be successful. Indeed, the project is developing a series of case studies which highlight successful capacity building activities delivered virtually.

²³ Innovation is defined as *doing something new or different in a specific context that adds value*

The delivery of tools and other knowledge products (such as publications) has not been severely impacted by the Covid pandemic.

Face to face meetings for networking purposes, and involving larger groups from different countries, have been suspended due to Covid. These have been replaced by virtual events often run with partners such as PATPA.

While virtual events cannot match face to face events for networking, the project has tried to compensate for this by creating the “Transparency in agriculture and other land use network”. The network has over 400 members who keep in touch through the Discussion group, newsletter and LinkedIn group. Engagement from members has been somewhat limited although more will be done to reactivate the discussions in particular.

The FAO-HQ project team is in regular contact with the pilot countries and the FAO-led National CBIT projects and Covid has not adversely affected the work due to frequent communications and clear planning by the project lead.

14. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁴	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2021	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
International organization UNFA/GLO/616/UND	UNDP Administered Trust Funds	In-kind	1,000,000 USD	800,000 USD		1,000,000 USD
Bilateral Partner/Donor GCP/GLO/802/GER	Germany	In-kind	500,000 USD	300,000 USD		500,000 USD
Bilateral Partner/Donor GCP/GLO/890/GER	Germany	In-kind	500,000 USD	500,000 USD		500,000 USD
Bilateral Partner/Donor GCP/GLO/966/GER	Germany	In-kind	1,000,000 USD	1,000,000 USD		1,000,000 USD
TOTAL			3,000,000 USD	2,600,000 USD		3,000,000 USD

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

²⁴ Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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