



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).....	8
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	10
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	14
6. RISKS	16
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	23
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	24
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	25
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	26
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	27
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	28
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	29

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Sub-regional office of Asia and the Pacific
Country (ies):	VANUATU
Project Title:	Ecosystem Restoration and Sustainable Land Management in Tongoa Island (ERSLM)
FAO Project Symbol:	GFF/VAN/003/GFF
GEF ID:	10046
GEF Focal Area(s):	Land degradation
Project Executing Partners:	Department of Forestry Department of Environmental Protection and Conservation
Project Duration (years):	3
Project coordinates:	<i>Provided separately</i>

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	06 January 2021
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	18 May 2021
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	19-May-2024
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ²	NA

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	867,580
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc³:	1,260,000
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)⁴:	83,454
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022⁵	250,000

¹ As per FPMIS

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

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

⁴ 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.

⁵ 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

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	10 August 2021
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	N/A
Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):	N/A
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	November 2023
Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	<i>[It is mandatory for projects to update the TTs or Core Indicators (CI) before Mid-Term or Terminal Evaluation stage. For projects that have a planned MTR or TE in the next fiscal year, please indicate YES here and provide the updated TTs or CIs as Annex.]</i>

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

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

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Ricardo J.Dominguez Llosa	Ricardo.dominguezllosa@fao.org
Budget Holder	Xiangjun Yao	xiangjun.yao@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Raushan Kumar	raushan.kumar@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Lianchawii Chhakchhuak	lianchawii.chhakchhuak@fao.org

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

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

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

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

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.							
Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating ¹¹
1. Strengthening local enabling environment for ecosystem restoration and sustainable land management	<p>Outcome 1 1.1 Enhanced local level capacities for ecosystem restoration and sustainable land management</p> <p>1.1.1 Existing nurseries in the island strengthened to include indigenous tree species and diverse fruits/vegetables that are climate</p>	<p>Capacity development score</p> <p>Variety of plants in nursery enhanced (number of plant species increased in nurseries)</p>	<p>2.7</p> <p>One nursery producing Whitewood and Sandalwood seedlings</p>	<p>4</p> <p>3 nurseries producing seedlings of Nagai, Natapoa, Whitewood, Sandalwood and Mahogany</p>	<p>4</p> <p>3 nurseries producing seedlings of Nagai, Natapoa, Whitewood, Sandalwood and Mahogany</p>	<p>10% of activities conducted</p>	MS

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

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

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

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

	<p>resilient and suited to the local +-conditions</p> <p>1.1.2 Training programme on climate smart agriculture practices/techniques and agroforestry practices targeting community members through an institutional mechanism</p>	<p>Number of community members trained</p>	0	140 (30% women)	140 (30% women)	100%	
2. Community-based ecosystem restoration and sustainable land management	<p>Outcome 2 2.1 At least 900 ha brought under sustainable land management (including 300 ha restored)</p>	<p>Number of hectares brought under SLM and number of hectares restored</p>	0	120ha	900ha	300ha	MS
	<p>2.1.1 Preparation of sustainable land management and restoration plan</p>	<p>SLM and restoration plan</p>	0	1	1	0	
	<p>2.1.2 Sustainable land management and restoration plan implemented</p>	<p>- Climate smart agriculture implemented across at least 400 ha</p>	0	100 ha	300 ha	300 ha	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 25 agroforestry plots established (covering 200 ha) - Degraded land enhanced with forest and fruit tree planting (covering 300 ha) - At least two local products targeted for improved value-addition and strengthening of the market linkages --(potentially increasing the income of the targeted households from VT 6000/yr to VT 12,000/yr) 	0	5 plots (20 ha)	25 plots (covering 200 ha)	20 plots identified covering 100 ha	
			0	0	300 ha	150 ha identified	
			0	0	2	3 product identified:Cash crop:Taro Food Crop:Taro and Nangai Industrial for mats:Pandanus	
			VT 6.000/year	0	VT 12000/yr	0	
3. Monitoring, evaluation and lessons dissemination	<p>Outcome 3 3.1 Adaptive management ensured, and key lessons shared</p> <p>3.1.1 Project progress continually monitored and final evaluation conducted</p>	<p>M&E system is in place</p> <p>Lessons learned and disseminated</p> <p>Annual, bi-annual and final evaluation reports</p>	<p>No system in place</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>Implementation of project based on adaptive results based-management</p> <p>PIRs and PPRs submitted</p>	<p>GEF Core Indicators Final Evaluation</p> <p>Final evaluation</p>		MU

	3.1.2 Project achievement and results recorded and disseminated	Conduct of final workshop		0	1		
		Lessons learnt document	0	0	1		

Action Plan to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
1.1 Enhanced local level capacities for ecosystem restoration and sustainable land management	Village Community Committee established at each project site Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology	Chief Technical Assistant National Project Coordinator Local Conservation Specialist National Operations Finance Assistant	October 2022
At least 900 ha brought under sustainable land management (including 300 ha restored)	LOA signed with DOForestry LOA signed with DARD	CTA NPC LCS NOFA Gov Partners	October 2022
3.1 Adaptive management ensured, and key lessons shared	Project Task Force Project steering Committee	CTA NPC LCS NOFA Gov Partners	September 2022

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
Outcome 1.1 <i>Enhanced local level capacities for ecosystem restoration and sustainable land management</i>	Capacity development score	2,7 (score)		
Output 1.1.1 Existing nurseries in the island strengthened to include indigenous tree species and diverse fruits/vegetables that are climate resilient and suited to the local +-conditions	Variety of plants in nursery enhanced (number of plant species increased in nurseries)	One nursery producing Whitewood and Sandalwood seedlings	Work in one has started and 2 nurseries have been identified. Due to COVID 19 lockdown it was not possible to conduct any activities and related expenditure	
Output 1.1.2 Training programme on climate smart agriculture practices/techniques and agroforestry practices targeting community members through an institutional mechanism	Number of community members trained	140 (30% women)	A total of 200 HH (920 people ,465 Men and 455 Women) aware and sensitized in Forest Landscape Restoration and in Farm Field School approach	
Outcome 2.1 <i>At least 900 ha brought under</i>	Number of hectares brought under SLM and number of hectares restored	0	0	

¹² Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

¹³ Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Workplan. Please be concise (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

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

<i>sustainable land management (including 300 ha restored</i>				
Output 2.1.1 Preparation of sustainable land management and restoration plan	SLM and restoration plan	0		
Output 2.1.2 Sustainable land management and restoration plan implemented	Number of hectares brought under climate smart agriculture Number of agroforestry plots established Number of hectares restored utilizing forest and fruit trees Number of value chains targeted for value addition and strengthening 140 households increase their income from sale of agricultural products	0 0 0 0 VT6000	PMU has located a total of 100 hectares (20 plots) that must be restored and included under Smart agriculture PMU has conducted Free Prior Informed Consent of local communities to build 14 agroforestry nurseries 0	
Outcome 3.1 Adaptive management ensured and key lessons shared	M&E system is in place Lessons learned and disseminated	No system in Place		
Output 3.1.1 Project progress continually monitored and final evaluation conducted	Annual, bi-annual and final evaluation reports	0	Six monthly project report, PIR	
Output 3.1.2 Project achievement and results recorded and disseminated	Conduct of final workshop Lessons learnt document	0 0	Workshop reports PSC BTOR	

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.

Project PMU was established on October 2021.

Due to COVID 19 lockdown, most of the activities planned for 2021 could not be completed. Hence, some of these activities have been postponed to 2022 .

Planned activities for the year 2021 are as follow:

- Recruitment of following officers was **completed in 2021**
 - The National Project Coordinator: in June 2021 the national project coordinator was recruited to coordinate the project.
 - The National Finance and Administration Officer: in October 2021 the finance an administration officer was h recruited In November 2021, the Local Conservation Specialist (LCS) was recruited to support the implementation of the project on the ground.
- **To be conducted in 2022:** Nurseries strengthening – the GEF 6 project team is working on the activities and budget that will include visiting the existing nurseries to see the possible strengthening activities and materials.
- **To be conducted in 2022:** Travel
 - The inception workshop mission to Tongoa is postponed to February 2022. Mission can't be finalized due Lockdown declaration.
 - The LCS travelling to Port Vila at the office for induction with the GEF6 team is also postponed for 2022.
- **Completed in 2021:** Training & Meetings
 - National Inception Workshop – On the 10th of August 2021, the first national inception workshop of the GEF 6 project had taken place in Port Vila.
 - The first National Project Steering Committee (PSC) meeting had taken place at the same date 10th of August 2021. During the meeting, the following agenda had been approved:
 - Responsibilities for the GEF 6 project
 - Annual Workplan
 - Budget of USD 157,510
 - Payment of the equipment for the project
 - Recruitment of the project team
 - Preparation the Letters of Agreement (LoA)
 - Inception workshop for Tongoa
 - All extra activities and discussion points to be captured in the implementation of the project activities

- Inception Workshop in Tongoa – the inception workshop on the Island of Tongoa had been approved by the PSC, due to administrative problems in Apia, PSC was held in February 2022.

Project Equipment – Laptops and furniture purchased for LCS office based in SHEFA Area administrator office

Project activities stopped between 6 March and 15 June due to COVID lockdown in Vanuatu and the project team had to work from home. .

By end of June of 2022 A total of 200 HH (920 people ,465 M and 455 W) were sensitized in Forest Landscape Restoration and in Farm Field School approach
New National Project Coordinator on duty since 1st September 2022.

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.

	FY2022 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2022 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	MS	MS	<i>My evaluation is based on the development of the activities. Compound disaster, La Nina, and COVID breakdown has also affected the development of activities this PIR (2021-2022) PMU hopes to be able to comply with what was agreed at the 1st PSC and 2nd to be held on September 15, 2022.</i>
Budget Holder	MS	MS	<i>In spite of several challenges, project has managed to achieve initial institutional arrangement targets of establishing and organizing itself.</i>
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸	MS	MS	<i>Despite COVID lockdown, as a PFO we are happy with the progress of the project. The PMU has worked continuously and once again we are grateful for the presence in the field of the figures of the LCS that has allowed consultations and awareness-raising to continue, both in this and in the other GEF project. The work of the CTA and its backstopping and fundraising work and support to the team and capacity building</i>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	MS	MS	<i>The project implementation started in May 2021, first steering committee meeting in August and then setting up PMU in October 2021 show good institutional arrangements established in place for the implementation but the</i>

¹⁵ **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.

For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

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

¹⁷ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

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

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

			<i>COVID 19 outbreak in Vanuatu and pacific region resulted the disruption of business-as-usual scenario. It is expected that project implementation will pick up soon we return to near normalcy.</i>
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MS	MS	<i>Initial project activities were undertaken - steering committee was held with critical decisions taken; key project team members were recruited and the project office was set up. Trainings on climate resilient agricultural approaches were conducted; plots have been identified for agroforestry and sustainable land management activities and local products identified for value-addition. These activities were undertaken in close consultation with the local communities, incl the traditional chiefs of the Tongoa Islands. A Free, Prior and Informed Consent report has also been drafted and a traditional knowledge inventory is being prepared. COVID 19 related restrictions significantly slowed down the project - activities that could not be completed in 2021 are being conducted in 2022.</i>

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
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				
	NA			
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
	NA			
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
	NA			
ESS 7: Decent Work				
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				
	La Nina brought high precipitations and long rainy season affecting project activities			

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.

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²⁰ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low risk	COVID Outbreak and new mutations needs to be taken into account.

<i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i>
NA

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

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified 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 ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Lack of coordination and communication/information sharing between the key institutional stakeholders.	H	Y	<p>All key stakeholders have been involved from the very beginning of the project preparation process and a working group for the project implementation will be established under the project steering committee. A communication strategy will also be developed and regular meetings and presentation of project results in different phases of the project implementation will be organized.</p> <p>The project's steering committee will also comprise of senior Staff from the executing government departments ensuring constant involvement and coordination.</p>	<p>PMU has involved all key stakeholders from the beginning of the project preparation process and the PSC has been established which acts as a project implementation working group under the project steering committee. A communication strategy has also begun to be developed and monthly meetings with partners have been organized</p>	<p>PMU is ensuring that all stakeholders of project are being consulted and their opinions are heard.</p>

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
2	Unclear responsibilities and lack of commitment from project stakeholders at national and specifically at island level.	H	Y	<p>Involvement of all the different responsible institutions as well as their clearly defined and prescribed responsibilities were discussed and agreed upon during the project preparation phase.</p> <p>Moreover, the project's steering committee and coordination unit will constantly monitor the institutional stakeholders' fulfillment of their respective responsibilities.</p>	<p>The involvement of all the different responsible institutions, as well as their responsibilities were clearly defined and prescribed, discussed and agreed upon during the launch workshop and first PSC.</p> <p>In addition, the steering committee and the coordination unit of the project have carried out constant monitoring of the fulfillment of the responsibilities of the institutional actors.</p>	<p>PMU is collaborating with all stakeholders and ensuring their functions supported and delivered in the interest of project.</p>

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
3	Lack of interest from local communities in getting involved and taking ownership over the project activities.	H	Y	<p>Local communities and their representatives have been involved and consulted from the beginning of the project preparation process. Their perspectives and concerns have been taken into account in the design of the project and awareness raising activities are being carried out during the launch phase of the project to communicate the socio-economic benefits of project implementation. The communities have expressed their interest, enthusiasm and willingness to participate in the project activities. In addition, a cost-sharing approach has been encouraged during project implementation, as it is expected that beneficiaries who invest part of their time/resources in project activities will develop a strong sense of ownership and interest in continuing the efforts. beyond the useful life of the project.</p>	<p>The communities have expressed their interest, enthusiasm and willingness to participate in the project activities. In addition, a cost-sharing approach has been encouraged during project implementation, as it is expected that beneficiaries who invest part of their time/resources in project activities will develop a strong sense of ownership and interest in continuing the efforts. beyond the useful life of the project.</p>	<p>Active awareness and communication as well as support from the project, helped communities to come forward and take interest in project ownership.</p>

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹		Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
4	Climate change affected extreme weather events throughout the project timeframe, and natural changes in the ecosystems and associated species and significant alteration of the project's baseline conditions related to forestry and agroforestry	H	Y	<p>Crop, plant and tree species used for forest/land restoration and agroforestry have been selected based on local site suitability (strong preference for indigenous tree species), resilience to the most likely impacts of climate change (eg pest outbreak). and diseases, changes in precipitation, etc.) and in the known patterns of climatic events.</p> <p>A monitoring and forecasting mechanism for possible extreme events has been established, defining early response mechanisms in agreement with the institutions responsible for such contingencies, in particular the National Disaster Management Office (NDMO).</p>	Ongoing		BH comment: Project activities are designed to bring more resilience and adaptation towards climate change impacts. This is an ongoing process which will bring sustainability in future.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹		Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
5	Reduced financial support from co-financiers due to limited overall funding availability resulting from the COVID-19-related economic downturn, and/or the reorientation of available funding to actions directly related to COVID-19.	M	Y	If there are negative changes in co-financing, in consultation with the government, seek alternative options for and ensure continuity of resource allocation to ongoing initiatives in project target areas	Ongoing	Ongoing	
6	Closure of offices, transport etc. will delay launch of project and its implementation.	M	Y	This risk has occurred with the breakdown of the COVID in the country, with different closures of ports and airports. For 6 months the island has been isolated by plane and ship. PMU continued to work with the LCS who live in Tongoa, and has facilitated Operational Advances for the development of awareness activities in the 16 communities. It has been provided with a router and office elements	Ongoing	Ongoing	

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
Moderate	Moderate	COVID 19 Outbreak La Nina 2 Tropical Low Pressions 8 Earthquakes

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 Guidelines²². Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories. And, provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework	NA	NA	
Components and cost	NA	NA	
Institutional and implementation arrangements	NA	NA	
Financial management	NA	NA	
Implementation schedule	NA	NA	
Executing Entity	NA	NA	
Executing Entity Category	NA	NA	
Minor project objective change	NA	NA	
Safeguards	NA	NA	
Risk analysis	NA	NA	
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	NA	NA	
Co-financing	NA	NA	
Location of project activity	NA	NA	
Other	NA	NA	

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

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

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

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government Institutions			
MALFFB.DOFOR	CO-EXECUTOR	The project works in close consultation with all the listed stakeholders.	There are no challenges faced with any of the listed stakeholders
MALFFB.DARD	CO-EXECUTOR		
MOCC.DEPC	CO-EXECUTOR		
SHEFA Province	CO-EXECUTOR		
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
Private sector entities			
Others[1]			
Local chief and elders	project partner	5 consultative meetings have been held with the traditional chiefs who are consulted on the project activities	No challenges faced
New stakeholders identified/engaged			

10. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) during this reporting period.		
Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	YES	KOBO TOOL BOX Questionnaire: KoBoToolbox is a suite of tools for field data collection for use in challenging environments. This software is free and open source. Most of its users are people working in humanitarian crises, as well as aid professionals and researchers working in developing countries.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	YES	The project has differentiated, speaking of women and girls creating inclusive awareness The project has worked hard on the Empowerment of Mothers and Young Women
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	YES	Project Empowering Women through Farmer Field Schools 40% of women have participated in all the activities
b) improving women's participation and decision making	YES	Project Empowering Women through Farmer Field Schools
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	YES	Kobo tool analysis to be undertaken by September
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	YES	Yes. BTOR and Monthly Reports
Staff with gender expertise	YES	Yes CTA, NPC and LCS have a good expertise in Gender
Any other good practices on gender	YES	Giving access and control over decision making Gender sensitive indicators; HHHEAD,

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.	One activity that is being documented and considered good practice is the Farmer Field School approach implemented in the project. Some of the project activities are also captured in the following: KOBOTOOLBox Gender questionnaire Mission reports Monthly Reports
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	in The communication strategy is yet to be drafted.
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.	More communication materials are expected to be available by November 2022
Please provide links to related website, social media account	NA
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	NA
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details	Ricardo.dominguezllosa@fao.org

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

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

- The project has held at least 5 meetings with the traditional Chiefs of the Island of Tongoa. The FPIC is in draft and will be signed in November 2022.
- The project LCS is the secretary of the Council of Traditional Chiefs.
- All meetings are held in Bislama and translated into the local dialect if necessary.
- Through the FFS approach, an inventory of traditional knowledge (KK) has begun.
- In the Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology, there are questions to know, as a baseline, the state of traditional knowledge, as well as mitigation measures before the arrival of tropical cyclones

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²³	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National Government	MALFFB	In kind	500,000	200,000		500,000
National Government	MOCC	In Kind	300,000	25,000		300,000
Provincial Government	SHEFA Province	In kind	60,000	20,000		60,000
National Government	Ministry of Tourism, Trade, Industry, Commerce and Ni Vanuatu Business	IN KIND	100,000	0		100,000
GEF AGENCY	FAO (TCP)	GRANT	150,000	0		
GEF AGENCY	FAO	IN KIND	150,000	0		
		TOTAL		250,000		1,260,000

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

By the moment and as explained above, due late start of project and COVID outbreak, PMU have planned to held a Stakeholder meeting

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

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve 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. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project’s components and activities is in compliance with the project’s approved implementation plan.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

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