

## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

### 2022 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

## Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA .....	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE) .....	4
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	5
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS .....	9
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS) .....	14
6. RISKS .....	16
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION .....	18
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS .....	19
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	20
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING .....	23
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES .....	25
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT .....	30
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE .....	31

## 1. Basic Project Data

### General Information

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

### Project Dates

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	23 October 2018
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	01-Jan-2019
<b>Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	31-Dec-2021
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if approved) <sup>2</sup></b>	30 June 2022

### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	USD 1,776,484
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>3</sup>:</b>	USD 3,000,000
<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)<sup>4</sup>:</b>	USD 1,753,816
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022<sup>5</sup></b>	USD 3,000,000

<sup>1</sup> As per FPMIS

<sup>2</sup> If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF CU.

<sup>3</sup> This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

<sup>4</sup> For DEX projects, the GEF Coordination Unit will confirm the final amount with the Finance Division in HQ. For OPIM projects, the disbursement amount should be provided by Execution Partners.

<sup>5</sup> Please refer to the section 12 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

**M&E Milestones**

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:</b>	24 May 2021
<b>Expected Mid-term Review date<sup>6</sup>:</b>	n/a
<b>Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):</b>	n/a
<b>Expected Terminal Evaluation Date<sup>7</sup>:</b>	August 2022
<b>Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)</b>	Please see Annex 1

**Overall ratings**

<b>Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):</b>	HS
<b>Overall implementation progress rating:</b>	HS
<b>Overall risk rating:</b>	Medium

**ESS risk classification**

<b>Current ESS Risk classification:</b>	Low
---	-----

**Status**

<b>Implementation Status</b> (1 <sup>st</sup> PIR, 2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR, etc. Final PIR):	Final PIR
---	-----------

**Project Contacts**

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Mirella Salvatore	<a href="mailto:Mirella.Salvatore@fao.org">Mirella.Salvatore@fao.org</a>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Natalia Alekseeva (up to 9 May 2022) Eduardo Mansur	<a href="mailto:Eduardo.Mansur@fao.org">Eduardo.Mansur@fao.org</a>
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Martial Bernoux	<a href="mailto:Martial.Bernoux@fao.org">Martial.Bernoux@fao.org</a>
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	Yurie Naito	<a href="mailto:Yurie.Naito@fao.org">Yurie.Naito@fao.org</a>

<sup>6</sup> The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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.

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

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

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term Target <sup>9</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>10</sup> since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating <sup>11</sup>
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	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 2.1 - 'ETF-enhanced' MRV and M&E Global Products	Number of tools	0	3	14	18	HS
	Outcome 2.2 - Enhanced MRV and M&E technical capacity	Number of countries	0	4	6	36	HS
	Component 3: Sharing knowledge and improving coordination amongst global transparency practitioners to sustain and scale up institutional and technical capacity improvements in the AFOLU sector.						
	Outcome 3.1 - Knowledge sharing	Number of practitioners	0	100	300	600	HS
	Outcome 3.2 - Coordination efforts	Number of stakeholders	0	50	100	972	HS
		Number of countries	0	10	20	30	

<sup>8</sup> This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

<sup>9</sup> 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.

<sup>10</sup> Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic Co-benefits as well.

<sup>11</sup> 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).

### 3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements <sup>13</sup> (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> in delivering outputs
<b><u>Outcome 1.1</u></b>	Number of 'ETF-enhanced' IA Global Products	1	The BTR guidance and roadmap tool was launched in Oct 2021	=
<b><u>Output 1.1.1</u></b>	Number of tools reviewed Number of 'ETF-ready' IA Products	0 0	Existing tools were reviewed and the selected one adapted to the ETF in the previous years	-
<b><u>Output 1.1.2</u></b>	Number of comments and lessons learned.	3	10 comments were received by technical expert and government official.	Additional 7 comments were received
<b><u>Outcome 1.2</u></b>	Number of pilot and project countries with the capacity to use the 'ETF-enhanced' IA Global Products to set-up institutional arrangements.	2	The BTR guidance and roadmap tool above was tested in Senegal (pilot country), Cambodia and Mongolia (project countries). Additional 17 countries in Latin America and Caribbean were trained on this tool. The GHG data management tool was explained to Bangladesh, Cambodia, and PNG. In total 22 countries.	20 additional countries were trained
<b><u>Output 1.2.1</u></b>	Number of pilot and project country practitioners disaggregated by gender receiving training in use of 'ETF-ready' IA Products.	13	43 practitioners (27 M/16 F) from the above countries were trained on the BTR tool. Three additional events were carried out for launching the product with hands-on training session in which additional 206 practitioners were trained (47% F).	268 additional practitioners were trained

<sup>12</sup> Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

<sup>13</sup> 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)

<sup>14</sup> Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

Outcomes and Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements <sup>13</sup> (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> in delivering outputs
			32 government officials (42% F) were trained on the use of the GHG data management tool from all sectors. A total of 281 country practitioners were trained.	
<b><u>Output 1.2.2</u></b>	Number of policy makers and practitioners disaggregated by gender across sectors made aware of ETF institutional arrangements	8	More than 80 policy makers and practitioners from all sectors were directly exposed to the IA. Many of our events, e.g., PATPA regional workshops, UNFCCC climate weeks and COP, had a specific session dedicated in raising awareness on the importance of IA, as the pillar for achieving transparency.	72 additional policy makers and practitioners reached out
<b><u>Outcome 2.1</u></b>	Number of ' <i>ETF-enhanced</i> ' MRV and M&E Global Products	5	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. E-learning on Uncertainty and Tier 2 enteric fermentation</li> <li>2. LoGlc tool (land representation tool)</li> <li>3. NDC tracking tool</li> <li>4. Archiving guidance and check list</li> <li>5. Transparency Assessment Navigator, with the corresponding database</li> <li>6. Transparency under the Paris Agreement: A Pocket Guide for Young People and Beginners</li> <li>7. Based on the one-to-one mentoring, guidance on key category analysis</li> <li>8. QA/QC process were developed</li> </ol>	Four additional products developed, one tool (item 5), a pocket guide (item 6) and two instruction guidance (item 4 and 7).
<b><u>Output 2.1.1</u></b>	Number of tools reviewed Number of comments and feedback received and integrated	0 0	Existing tools were reviewed and comments received in previous years	
<b><u>Output 2.1.2</u></b>	Number of tools reviewed Number of comments and feedback received and integrated	0 0	Existing tools were reviewed and comments received in previous years	

Outcomes and Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements <sup>13</sup> (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> in delivering outputs
<b><u>Outcome 2.2</u></b>	Number of pilot and project countries that have the capacity to use ' <i>ETF-enhanced</i> ' MRV and M&E Global Products	2	In 12 countries, namely PNG, Cambodia, Mongolia, Sudan, Guinea, Senegal, Togo, Burkina Faso, Bangladesh, Costa Rica, Mexico, Nicaragua, capacity building activities on MRV and M&E were carried out	10 additional countries
<b><u>Output 2.2.1</u></b>	Number of pilot and project country practitioners, disaggregated by gender, receiving training in use of ' <i>ETF-ready</i> ' MRV Products	13	138 practitioners (35% F) were trained	125 additional persons trained on MRV
<b><u>Output 2.2.2</u></b>	Number of pilot and project country practitioners, disaggregated by gender, receiving training in use of ' <i>ETF-ready</i> ' M&E Products	3	25 participants (24 M/1 F) from in-person event in Cambodia. Two events on adaptation reporting exposed 294 practitioners (51% F) to M&E related tools. In total 319 practitioners have been trained	316 additional persons trained on M&E
<b><u>Outcome 3.1</u></b>	Number of agriculture experts & practitioners, disaggregated by gender, are aware of the <i>Global Products</i>	100	More than 600 practitioners were made aware of the global tools through the Transparency Network Newsletter, the FAO-led and UNFCCC-led LinkedIn groups on transparency	Additional 500 practitioners were reached out
<b><u>Output 3.1.1</u></b>	Number of platforms where the <i>Global Products</i> were disseminated	1	PATPA Knowledge Platform FAO Climate Change Knowledge hub CBIT global coordination platform	2 additional platforms
	Number of physical and virtual events	3	2 in-person and 11 virtual events	10+ events organized
<b><u>Output 3.1.2</u></b>	Participation of <i>Champion Groups</i> in knowledge-sharing events, with info on gender balance	3	13 practitioners were exposed as Champions in several events. Representatives from Cambodia and Mongolia were sharing their ETF experience at COP 26 (both female). Representative from Sudan, Nicaragua and PNG were exposed at the UNFCCC Climate Weeks (one male and two female). Two representatives from	10 additional champions

Outcomes and Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements <sup>13</sup> (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> in delivering outputs
			Zimbabwe (one male and one female) shared the experience on the ETF-related work with academia. Three youth representatives were interviewed (two females and one male). Representatives from Philippines, Malaysia, Madagascar described their experience in transitioning to ETF.	
<b><u>Outcome 3.2</u></b>	Number of stakeholders, disaggregated by gender, outreached through increased coordination	33	454 stakeholders outreached	421+ stakeholders
	Number of countries with non-FAO CBIT-project informed	7	35 non-FAO CBIT countries informed about the project activities	28 additional countries
<b><u>Output 3.2.1</u></b>	Scaling up of the coordination among agencies, with info on gender balance	30%	90% the collaboration with the transparency-related initiative reached out the maximum level with constant engagement.	
<b><u>Output 3.2.2</u></b>	Organization of initiatives/events to strengthen multi-stakeholder coordination	2	18 joint events organized Asia, MENA & LAC Climate weeks (UNFCCC, PATPA, ICAT, UNEP) COP26 (PATPA, C4AC, ICAT) PATPA Asian Regional Group event (April 2022) and PLACA event (June 2022) Two events in Asia and the Pacific on soil carbon and ETF (with IGES and Global Soil Partnership). 4 QA and review with UNFCCC 1 review with REDINGEI Active participation in the 3 sessions of the MRV/ETF Group of Friend	16+ compared to the target



## 4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcome of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR.

Despite the difficulties encountered due to the persisting pandemic, the CBIT AFOLU project continued to carry out planned capacity building activities and delivering Institutional Arrangements, MRV and M&E ETF-enhanced global products.

**The main progress achieved in the fiscal year 2021/2022 are:**

- *Country support:*

The CBIT-AFOLU project provided guidance and technical support to beneficiaries of five national CBIT projects (Cambodia, PNG, Mongolia, Bangladesh and Nicaragua). Reviewed, when requested, the formulation of four new national CBIT project (Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Salomon Islands and Vanuatu) and continued to assist a wide range of other countries. New activities were carried out to address capacity of non-state actors co-organizing training events and workshops in collaboration with Marondera University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology and involving educators and students of seven universities.

Country-tailored capacity building support in addressing specific technical gaps was provided to additional pilot countries: Guinea, Burkina Faso, Costa Rica, The Bahamas, Mexico, Togo and Panama.

17 countries that are a part of the Platform of Latin America and the Caribbean for Climate Action on Agriculture (PLACA) were trained on the ETF requirements and identified challenges and solutions towards the preparation of the BTR.

The project team led the design of the “Reducing emissions and zoonosis risk from poultry sector in Nepal through innovative manure management and valorization practices (RE-ZONE)” NAMA Support Project Outline, submitted and successfully accepted by the NAMA Facility. The project will leverage around 11.5 million euro for a transformational change in the poultry sector, fully aligned by the commitment of the country in the NDC.

- *Global products:*

Beyond the vast series of tools already included in the previous PIR, a number of new MRV products were published, including e-learning courses on [assessing uncertainties in the national greenhouse gas inventory with a focus on the land use sector](#), and on estimating enteric fermentation at Tier 2; the LoGlc Tool (a land representation tool), the Transparency Assessment Navigator, the NDC-Ag Navigator and NDC tracking tool, the Archiving Guidance and Check list, and the BTR guidance and Roadmap tool. Several of them are currently at revision or editorial stage and will be published beyond the project end. Additionally, translation of these into Spanish and French, in some case in Portuguese and Russian, will also be made available in July/August 2022 in response to the external regional groups’ interests.

From June 2021 onward, the project started a completely new agenda and start to engage with non-state actors, such as academia and youth groups through awareness-raising activities and dialogues around transparency with two specific events (see next paragraph). A fully fledged programme of capacity building was carried out with seven universities in Zimbabwe thanks to the support of the Marondera University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology (MUASt). Our engagement with youth delivered the “Transparency under the Paris Agreement: A pocket guide for youth and beginners” with the collaboration of YOUNGO (forthcoming in August 2022). Finally, a series of youth-led interviews and webinar series were carried out.

- *Events:*

In the reporting period, two in-person events in Cambodia and more than 20 virtual/hybrid events were delivered, which involved around 400 participants from more than 50 countries worldwide.

These events include three for Zimbabwe, two training webinars on adaptation reporting, the Asia Pacific Climate Week 2021, the Africa Climate Week 2021, the MENA Climate Week 2022, the LAC Climate Week 2022, (and getting ready again for the Africa event at the end of August 2022), one at the Asia LEDS Partnership Forum, three side events at COP26 with PATPA, C4CA, and Indonesia, two global events on youth and academia at the ACE and All4Climate sessions, two PATPA events for Francophone cluster and the Asian regional group, one for the PLACA group, two events in Asia and the Pacific with IGES and the Global Soil Partnership, other gatherings carried out with partners (UNFCCC, IPCC, ICAT, UNEP, MRV/ETF Group of friends), and two events for closing the project, which allowed the project to continue to cover almost all developing countries. The technical training exposed 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; from the adaptation reporting of risks and vulnerability to the metrics and the M&E system.

- *Coordination and synergies*

The project further strengthened the collaboration with most of transparency capacity-building actors, to lift up the transparency international agenda and support countries to address the requirements.

The project continued and reinforced the productive collaboration with the IKI funded project *Scaling up Climate Ambition on Land Use and Agriculture through Nationally Determined Contributions and National Adaptation Plans (SCALA)*, in Senegal, Ethiopia, Cambodia, 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 major challenges experienced during this reporting period were the following:**

- *Country involvement and requests for support*

As the pandemic continued to hamper the organization of in-person workshops worldwide, the active involvement of country experts in the project’s virtual events remained a relevant challenge. Despite this complex situation, the project managed to maintain a high interest in its activities through an innovative process of mentoring single countries on specific technical topics, oftentimes identified during larger

events organized previously. Support provided ranged from application of Tier 1 and Tier 2 methodologies to the GHG inventory, to NDC enhancement, to data archiving and file management, to QA/QC and verification. Indeed, also in this reporting period, the project continued to receive a considerable number of requests for specific support from several 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.

The project built with time a solid modality to scale up and support many countries, not only by disseminating the global products through the transparency website but also by offering targeted support, which may incentivize exchange of expertise across countries and mutual learning, while ensuring a very good dissemination of project made resources. This is in line with the 2024 demand to submit the first BTR, which urgently calls for a significant stepping up of national technical capacities. A second phase of the project could help a much larger number of countries to benefit from customized support in addressing ETF requirements and therefore the implementation rate of the related requirements.

- *COVID-19*

While the persistent pandemic continued to represent a real threat globally in the reporting period, project activities enjoyed a steady rate of implementation. Ensuring sufficient engagement and group discussions as well as knowledge sharing and coordination among countries from different parts of the world, remained arduous in the absence of face-to-face interaction also due to time and language differences and the limitations intrinsic to the online modalities. With time and thanks to the experience acquired, the project could overcome these challenges by 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.

	<b>FY2022 Development Objective rating<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>FY2022 Implementation Progress rating<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>Comments/reasons<sup>17</sup> justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>HS</b>	<b>HS</b>	The project fully achieved its main objectives of producing a series of ETF-enhanced global products and supported more countries than expected in addressing their main capacity needs through the products' use. The coordination with several transparency actors was enhanced allowing the project to support additional countries and develop supplementary products. Project implementation continued to suffer from the consequences of the COVID-19 outbreak which slowed down the organization of several capacity-building activities. On the other hand, the critical situation stimulated the project to continue with the implementation of the identified successful modalities to foster networks and knowledge exchange among peers that allowed to also increase the number of stakeholders outreach.
<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>HS</b>	<b>HS</b>	The project implemented the planned activities with an appropriate use of resources. COVID-19 limited the capacity to spend the full budget in the defined period and a 6-months extension was requested to ensure that 100 percent of the budgeted funds were spent.
<b>GEF Operational Focal Point<sup>18</sup></b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	

<sup>15</sup> **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.

<sup>16</sup> **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.

<sup>17</sup> Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

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

<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>HS</b>	<b>HS</b>	The project is fully meeting its objectives/goals as foreseen, adapting to the COVID-19 Pandemic, with important deliverables, influencing the international agenda and benefitting a large audience of experts, practitioners and policymakers. The greatest challenge to delivering the project timely - in the Covid-19 era - has been managed in such a way that new opportunities have been created, eventually ensuring a wider outreach than originally foreseen. The project management team has invested greatly in visibility and awareness raising, using mainstream media outlets, platforms but mainly with a massive coordination activity and partnerships. Despite the efforts, the project has been extended beyond its originally planned closing date, which allowed to extend the activities to additional countries and areas of work.
<b>FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	<b>HS</b>	<b>HS</b>	The project achieved its objectives and targets despite the global pandemic. Indeed, the budgetary savings and the wise use of technology allowed the project to increase the number of countries supported, and to expand partnerships with new organizations. The project's extensive engagement with academia and youth groups may be considered as a valuable additional achievement.

<sup>19</sup> 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)*

Please describe the progress made complying 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. Add new ESS risks if any 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
<b>ESS 1: Natural Resource Management</b>				
<b>ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats</b>				
<b>ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</b>				
<b>ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</b>				
<b>ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management</b>				
<b>ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement</b>				
<b>ESS 7: Decent Work</b>				
<b>ESS 8: Gender Equality</b>				
<b>ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage</b>				
<b>New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY</b>				

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

<b>Initial ESS Risk classification</b> (At project submission)	<b>Current ESS risk classification</b> Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid <sup>20</sup> . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	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.***

--

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

## 6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of 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 <sup>21</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the BH in consultation with PMU
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 <b>understanding</b> of data requirements and timeline facilitate the process of MoU formulation	

<sup>21</sup> Risk ratings means a rating of accesses the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.



	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>21</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the BH in consultation with PMU
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.		
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	COVID-19 pandemic continues to limit the possibility to deliver face-to-face trainings	Medium	No	Alternative modalities of stakeholder involvement are put into place	Several modalities were already tested and evaluated with country counterparts	

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

FY2021 rating	FY2022 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
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 were identified which however did not put the achievement of the activities or outcomes at risk.

## 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:	
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation 4:	

  

Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe	
---	--

## 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 Guidelines<sup>22</sup>. Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories. And, provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework			
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management			
Implementation schedule	<b>Project extension:</b> The Project Steering Committee, noting the remaining project funds originally dedicated to travel costs and relevant in-person activities, agreed on a no-cost extension of the project up to June 30, 2022	Original NTE: 31 Dec 2021  Revised NTE: 30 June 2022	PSC
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			

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

## 9. Stakeholders' Engagement

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

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
<b><i>Government Institutions (several ministries in the following countries)</i></b>			
Guinea	recipient	<p>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 continued to reach out to stakeholders using participatory methodologies and tools such as those implemented under the Transparency Network (D-group, Community of Practice). Engagement modalities included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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;</li> <li>The identification, 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;</li> <li>A process of national level consultations aimed at involving all stakeholders in discussing information needs, tools and progress made;</li> <li>A series of bilateral exchanges also aimed at further stimulating cross-country dialogue and the sharing of experiences and lessons learned.</li> </ul> <p>A detailed database with country stakeholders' information was developed and maintained to ensure an inclusive</p>	
Sudan	recipient		
Mozambique	recipient		
Papua New Guinea	recipient		
Cambodia	recipient		
Malawi	recipient		
Zimbabwe	recipient		
Argentina	recipient		
Philippines	recipient		
Ethiopia	recipient		
Angola	recipient		
Senegal	recipient		
Burkina Faso	recipient		
Bangladesh	recipient		
Costa Rica	recipient		
Nicaragua	recipient		
Panama	recipient		
The Bahamas	recipient		
Madagascar	recipient		
Togo	recipient		
Mexico	recipient		
Morocco	recipient		
Ivory Coast	Recipient		

		process and wider dissemination of activities, products and opportunities. 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.	
<b>Others[1]</b>			
Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI)	Partner in the implementation of capacity building activities in Burkina Faso	Under the umbrella of the NDC-Partnership, coordination with GGGI has been identified in order to support the country to progress on their capacity towards ETF	
Partnership in Transparency of the Paris Agreement (PATPA)	Partner in several events and product development	The collaboration with PATPA continued to bring excellent results in terms of raising awareness and capacity building.	Due to the pandemic, it was not possible to organize any of the regional groups in persons, limiting our impacts on peer-to-peer sharing
UNFCCC	Partner in several events and in the QA in-country review	Several QA in-country reviews were carried out helping countries to prepare their improvement plans to be carried out towards the formulation of the BTR	Due to the pandemic, it was not possible to organize these events in-person, except for few. These was a limitation on the results of the process
ICAT	Partner in several political dialogue events	Several side events at the Climate Weeks and COP were jointly organized to reach out high-level actors to boost transparency. The project coordinator is also part of their Advisory Committee.	
<b>New stakeholders identified/engaged</b>			
Marondera University of Agricultural Sciences	Partner in the youth and academia	A Letter of Agreement was developed with MUASt to boost the collaboration with 7 Zimbabwean University to	Due to the pandemic, the activities were conducted remotely with some concerns on

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

and Technology (MUASt)	activities in Zimbabwe	identify opportunities for contributing to ETF and build a new generation of transparency practitioners.	the ability of stakeholders' participation due to limited internet connection.
YOUNGO	Partner for the development of the Transparency pocket guide	YOUNGO will deliver and promote the message on the importance on transparency in several events to raise awareness among youth on the real value and the opportunity for future job opportunity.	

## 10. Gender Mainstreaming

**Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) during this reporting period.**

Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	No	
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	Members of the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) requested to consider gender-related issues in the formulation of technical products. Gender was therefore considered among the issues that might be associated with differential climate-related impacts or vulnerabilities, and reflected in adaptation-related M&E.
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	No	
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	The project contributed to gender equality by stimulating women's participation and decision-making. The majority of the project ETF champions are female.
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	No	
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	The project provides gender-disaggregated reporting for capacity-development activities, such as training events. During the 2019 events, male participation was higher than female, at around 55-58% depending on the geographical region. In 2020, during the COVID-19 outbreak, more than 50% government participants were women during the trainings which highlighted how flexible work arrangements under the current crisis and virtual outreach approaches can encourage women's

		engagement. Unfortunately, in few countries the gender participation was almost unbalanced.
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	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 contributes 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.
Any other good practices on gender	Yes	From a management point of view, the PMU, the TAG and the Project Steering Committee of the project presented approximately an equal distribution between male and female.



## 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.	<p>The knowledge management strategy of the project was 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 envisaged to promote innovative exchange of knowledge and experiences between and among countries through existing networks and dedicated practitioners discussion groups.</p>
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• two dedicated specialists in communications, country engagement and knowledge management supported production and dissemination of project results, products and knowledge.</li> </ul> <p>The project implemented a communication strategy that included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the continued development of the <a href="#">Enhanced Transparency Framework</a> website in English, French and Spanish that consolidated FAO efforts on Transparency including the global and national CBIT-AFOLU projects. Additional features included a dedicated and regularly updated “Tools and resources” page; as well as “Working together” and “Countries” pages which gathered respectively joint activities with partners and country activities. A news section was added to inform about upcoming events and their results, lessons learned from countries to address ETF requirements.</li> <li>• A dedicated page on <a href="#">Youth and Academia</a> was developed to inform about the activities with Non-State Actors (two dedicated events at ACE and Pre-COP, a fully structured programme with Zimbabwe, a series of interviews with youth actors)</li> <li>• the <a href="#">dedicated page</a> under the CBIT Coordination Platform was updated with events, while the use of the library to disseminate the ETF-enhanced global products was slowing down as the platform was down for a prolonged period; and on the <a href="#">FAO GEF website</a>.</li> <li>• the preparation of communication and multimedia products, including a new visual identity, short video clips; webinars; and social media cards and tweets for</li> </ul>

	<p>various social media platforms (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn and YouTube);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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; results of the survey on soil carbon, two publications with the COP26 Catalyst for Climate Action; case studies on Madagascar, Guinea, Mozambique, Papua New Guinea, Sudan, Cambodia, Zimbabwe; brochures on the project achievements and on the transparency network; a brochure for youth on climate transparency in the agriculture sectors and interviews with youth actors etc.;</li> <li>• the maintenance of the <a href="#">Transparency network</a>, including monthly newsletters reaching over 715 targeted users (36 percent F), a dedicated discussion forum and a <a href="#">LinkedIn group</a>. An online <a href="#">roster of transparency professionals</a> was a major deliverable in the previous period;</li> <li>• participation in global transparency campaigns such as the <a href="#">Data4betterclimateaction</a> and activities related to Pre-COP26 (<a href="#">All4Climate</a>) and COP26 (<a href="#">C4CA Transparency group</a>),</li> <li>• the identification of several newsletters and online platforms where articles/notices about project activities, webinars, discussion groups, etc. were published;</li> <li>• the organization of joint regional workshops, online seminars, technical trainings with UNFCCC.</li> </ul>	
<p>Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.</p>	<p>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)  <a href="http://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/transparency/countries/sudan-capacity-development-paris-agreement-interview/en/">http://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/transparency/countries/sudan-capacity-development-paris-agreement-interview/en/</a></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>	

	<p>Mrs Baomiavotse Vahinala Raharinirina, Minister of the Environment and Sustainable Development, Madagascar</p> <p><i>I would like to take this opportunity to thank FAO and the CBIT AFOLU project for the training, so that Guinea could be one of the countries to benefit from the initiative that will help us to improve our National Inventory System and Land Use chapter of the NGHGI.</i></p> <p>M. Karifa Kourouma, Direction National Changement Climatique, Ministry of Environment, Guinea.</p> <p><i>The project strives to contribute to both the short- and long-term efforts of Zimbabwe for the successful implementation of the Paris Agreement. We hope this approach can be replicated in other countries.</i></p> <p>Dr Esther Masvaya, Director of climate change and food security institute, MUAAT, Zimbabwe</p> <p>Papua New Guinea: Improving transparency reporting  <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3EWNNDGzr4A&amp;t=6s">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3EWNNDGzr4A&amp;t=6s</a></p>	
Please provide links to related website, social media account	<p>FAO Enhanced Transparency Framework website  <a href="http://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/transparency-framework/en/">http://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/transparency-framework/en/</a></p> <p>Transparency in agriculture and land use sectors network  <a href="http://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/transparency/network/en/">http://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/transparency/network/en/</a></p> <p>Online Roster of Transparency Practitioners  <a href="http://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/transparency/network/en/">http://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/transparency/network/en/</a></p> <p>Transparency network LinkedIn group  <a href="https://www.linkedin.com/groups/8991801/">https://www.linkedin.com/groups/8991801/</a></p> <p>Transparency network newsletters  <a href="http://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/transparency/network/newsletters">http://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/transparency/network/newsletters</a></p> <p>FAO Global CBIT-AFOLU project on the CBIT Coordination Platform and FAO GEF platform  <a href="https://www.cbitplatform.org/index.php/projects/global-cbit-afolu">https://www.cbitplatform.org/index.php/projects/global-cbit-afolu</a>  <a href="http://www.fao.org/gef/projects/detail/en/c/1105975/">http://www.fao.org/gef/projects/detail/en/c/1105975/</a></p> <p>Webinar series: Addressing transparency in agriculture and land use sectors  <a href="http://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/transparency/webinars/en/">http://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/transparency/webinars/en/</a></p>	

	<p>Video: Global Coordination for Enhanced Transparency under the Paris Agreement  <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UN9fKNddnw4">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UN9fKNddnw4</a></p> <p>Countries lessons learned from  <a href="https://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/transparency/countries/en/?">https://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/transparency/countries/en/?</a></p>	
<p>Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.</p>	<p>Leaflets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">SHARP and the ETF</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">M&amp;E of Adaptation training package and the ETF</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">FAO's Damage and Loss Assessment methodology to monitor the Sendai Framework's Indicator C2 and the ETF</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">MOSAICC and the ETF</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Building capacity worldwide to increase transparency</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Academia for Transparency in Zimbabwe</a></li> </ul> <p>Surveys:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Results of the survey on the adoption of Tier 2 methodology for enteric fermentation</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Global survey: Understanding countries' status and challenges for the estimation of carbon stock changes from mineral soils in national greenhouse gas inventories</a></li> </ul> <p>Publications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Action recommendation on capacity building for transparency</a></li> </ul> <p>Videos:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Papua New Guinea: Improving transparency reporting</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Global Coordination for Enhanced Transparency under the Paris Agreement</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">3rd Capacity-building Stories: Transparency [in AFOLU sectors] Network</a></li> </ul> <p>Case studies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Preparing <b>Cambodia</b> to address the Enhanced Transparency Framework requirements</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Guinea: Online support to building capacity for the land use, land use change and forestry (LULUCF) sector of the National Greenhouse Gas Inventory (FR)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Improving the methodology for the national greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory and GHG inventory system in <b>Madagascar</b> (FR)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Mozambique: Improving monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E) capacity for reporting on climate change adaptation &gt; versão em português</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Estimating land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) in <b>Argentina</b></a></li> <li>• <a href="#">How <b>Sudan</b> is developing its capacity for meeting the Paris Agreement's reporting requirements</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Papua New Guinea: Improving transparency reporting</a></li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Academia for climate transparency in Zimbabwe</a></li> </ul> <p>Interviews on Youth and Academia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How academia can support climate transparency: Insights from Zimbabwe (Dr Walter Svinurai) &gt; <a href="#">Read interview</a> (September 2021)</li> <li>• An interview with Ekaterina Bessonova from the Climate, Food and Farming, Global Research Alliance Development (CLIFF-GRADS) initiative &gt; <a href="#">Read interview</a> (November 2021)</li> <li>• #Youth4Transparency: Young People and Action for Climate Empowerment (Disha Sarkar, India) &gt; <a href="#">Read interview</a> (June 2022)</li> <li>• #Youth4Transparency: A word from a lead transparency negotiator (Yamikani Idriss, Malawi) &gt; <a href="#">Read interview</a> (August 2022)</li> </ul>
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details	<p>Denise Melvin: Denise.Melvin@fao.org  Sousan Torabi Parizi: Sousan.Torabiparizi@fao.org</p>

## 12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

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

*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.*

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).

### 13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>23</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	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	1,000,000 USD	1,000,000 USD	1,000,000 USD
Bilateral Partner/Donor GCP/GLO/802/GER	Germany	In-kind	500,000 USD	500,000 USD	500,000 USD	500,000 USD
Bilateral Partner/Donor GCP/GLO/890/GER	Germany	In-kind	500,000 USD	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	1,000,000 USD
		<b>TOTAL</b>	3,000,000 USD	3,000,000 USD	3,000,000 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**

<sup>23</sup> 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: Core Indicator 11 – Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

Results chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term target	Final target	Achieved
<i>Output 1.2.1:</i> Capacity building on the ' <i>ETF-ready</i> ' <i>IA Products</i> carried out to improve institutional arrangements in selected pilot and project countries and improvement feedback and lessons learned gathered.	Number of pilot and project country practitioners disaggregated by gender receiving training in use of ' <i>ETF-ready</i> ' <i>IA Products</i> .	None	20	40	320 45% F 55% M
<i>Output 1.2.2:</i> Country-level awareness raised amongst non-AFOLU policy makers and practitioners in selected pilot and project countries on the importance of mainstreaming institutional arrangements in the ETF processes.	Number of policy makers and practitioners disaggregated by gender across sectors made aware of ETF institutional arrangements	None	12	24	534 35% F 65% M
<i>Output 2.2.1:</i> Selected pilot and project country officials trained on using MRV tools and upgrading domestic GHG management information systems and infrastructure, in line with ETF requirements for the AFOLU sector.	Number of pilot and project country practitioners, disaggregated by gender, receiving training in use of ' <i>ETF-ready</i> ' <i>MRV Products</i>	None	20	40	270 38% F 62% M
<i>Output 2.2.2:</i> Capacity building delivered in selected pilot and project countries on M&E tool for monitoring the implementation and impacts of priority adaptation actions and tracking NDC progress.	Number of pilot and project country practitioners, disaggregated by gender, receiving training in use of ' <i>ETF-ready</i> ' <i>M&amp;E Products</i>	None	6	10	888 36% F 64% M
<u>Outcome 3.1</u> - Knowledge shared through existing platforms and networks	Number of agriculture experts & practitioners, disaggregated by gender, are aware of the <i>Global Products</i>	None	100	300	600 41% F 59% M
<i>Output 3.1.2:</i> Increased opportunity for the <i>Champion Groups</i> to share country-specific experiences on transparency-related issues in the agriculture sectors.	Participation of <i>Champion Groups</i> in knowledge-sharing events, with info on gender balance	None	4	8	11 72% F 28% M
<u>Outcome 3.2</u> - Coordination amongst agencies improved to ensure a coherent framework of discussion on transparency-related issues.	Number of stakeholders, disaggregated by gender, outreached through increased coordination	None	50	100	972 48% F 52% M
		Female	88	225	1,474 (41%)
		Male	88	225	2,121 (59%)
		<b>Total</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>3,595</b>



## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

<b>Development Objectives Rating.</b> A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>	Project is expected to achieve or exceed <b>all</b> its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”
<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	Project is expected to achieve <b>most</b> of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings
<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>	Project is expected to achieve <b>most</b> of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve <b>some</b> of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits
<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</b>	Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only <b>some</b> of its major global environmental objectives)
<b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b>	Project is expected <b>not</b> to achieve <b>most</b> of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits)
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</b>	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, <b>any</b> of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

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

<b>Risk rating.</b> It should 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:	
<b>High Risk (H)</b>	There is a probability of greater than <b>75%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
<b>Substantial Risk (S)</b>	There is a probability of between <b>51%</b> and <b>75%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks
<b>Moderate Risk (M)</b>	There is a probability of between <b>26%</b> and <b>50%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.
<b>Low Risk (L)</b>	There is a probability of up to <b>25%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.