



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	WEST AFRICA
Country (ies):	Niger
Project Title:	Integrating climate resilience into agricultural and pastoral production for food security in vulnerable rural areas through the Farmers Field School approach
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/NER/043/LDF
GEF ID:	4702
GEF Focal Area(s):	Climate Change adaption
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Agriculture (MoA), Ministry of Livestock (MoL), Ministry of Environment, Urban Sanitation and Sustainable Development (MEUSSD)
Project Duration:	48 months (extension of 18 months not included)

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	28/07/2014
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	15/01/2015
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	14/01/2019
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	30/06/2020
Actual Implementation End Date³:	NA

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	3 870 700 USD
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	13 958 872 USD
Total GEF grant disbursement as	3 026 249 USD

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

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

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

of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	2,804,875 ⁶ USD

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	31/07/2018
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	01/02/2017
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	14/04/2018
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	Tbd
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁷	Yes

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	MS
Overall implementation progress rating:	S
Overall risk rating:	L

Status

Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	4th PIR
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

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

⁶ Exchange rate of 1,668,483,580 XOF, date: 9/4/2019, source: <https://www.xe.com/it/currencyconverter/convert>

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Saidou Djimrao, Dr, FAONE	Saidou.Djimrao@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Anne-sophie POISOT, Ms AGP	AnneSophie.Poisot@fao.org
Budget Holder	Attaher MAIGA, FAOR-NE	Attaher.Maiga@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Paola Palestini (TCI GEF Unit)	Paola.Palestini@fao.org

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁸	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹⁰
Objective(s):						
Outcome 1: An “operational enabling environment” is created for promoting adoption of CCA practices and technologies through creation of partnerships, execution and analysis of baseline surveys and compilation and pilot-testing of existing and proposed new technologies and methods.	Strengthened capacity of project managers and stakeholders to transfer tested and selected appropriate adaptation technologies and tools: Score 2. Moderate Capacity achieved (75%). 25% female [LDCF AMAT indicator 3.2.2]	No specific technologies and tools to improve resilience to climate change There are only fragmented and not systematized experience of project managers and stakeholders on adaptation technologies and tools within the five project regions. (Score 1. No capacity achieved < 50% correct). [LDCF AMAT indicator 3.2.2]	Strengthened capacity of project managers and stakeholders Score 2. Moderate Capacity achieved (50%). 25% female. [LDCF AMAT indicator 3.2.2]	Strengthened capacity of project managers and stakeholders Score 2. Moderate Capacity achieved (75%). 25% female. [LDCF AMAT indicator 3.2.2]	An enabling environment for adoption of CCA practices and technologies has been created through multiple activities implemented in collaboration with multiple partners. The project has established partnerships with 14 NGOs and national institutions in the 5 regions of the country. This makes it possible to have an atlas of projects and programs in the field of climate change adaptation in Niger, 5 reports of inventories of good practices in the field of climate change and the	MS

⁸ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

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

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁸	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹⁰
					implementation of 5 catalogues of plant and animal species and varieties. The project has organized 10 awareness campaigns on climate change adaptation. More than 400 local authorities and 120 managers were involved	
Outcome 2: Increased ecological, economic and social resilience of at least three productions systems in 15 Municipalities in two agro-ecological zones, through the adoption of improved, Field School-based CCA strategies, practices and a broader choice of adapted genetic material, leveraged/scaled up through interactions with PAC-CR and other partner programs	10% of the cropped surface of the municipalities supported by partner's programs (40,000 ha) integrate the approved CCA strategies, practices and adapted genetic materials	No cropped surface integrate CCA strategies, practices and adapted genetic materials	6% of the cropped surface supported by partner's programs	10% of the cropped surface of the Municipalities supported by partner's programs (40,000 ha) integrate the approved CCA strategies, practices and adapted genetic materials	Facilitators are better equipped to supervise the CEAP with the enrichment of their curriculum by introducing the modules on hazardous child labor and nutrition during their training. Capacity building also focused on the Village Savings and Credit Association (VSLA) process, where 77 facilitators and focal points were trained. Similarly, 32 members of 18 farmer organizations (31% women) are trained on gender and equity. Even though there were no previous APECs to be strengthened, the establishment of 191 new APECs and 2 diversity	MS
	100% of targeted groups (1,000 Field Schools/ 20,000 Households) are adopting at least 2 of the following types of new technologies (disaggregated by gender – 25% female /	Different projects conducted during the period 2010 – 2013 (e. g. IPPM, APRAO, RUWANMU) introduced 1350 Field Schools (of which 850 for vegetable crops and 500 for rice) benefiting	20% of targeted groups are adopting at least 1 of new technologies	100% of targeted groups (1,000 Field Schools/ 20,000 Households) are adopting at least 2 of the following types of new technologies (disaggregated by gender – 25% female / 75% male): a) Climate resilient crop		

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁸	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹⁰
	75% male): a) Climate resilient crop varieties (drought or flood resistant); b) Agronomic practices for flood and drought management in crop production systems (soil conservation and agro-forestry practices); c) Resilience evaluation tools; d) Weather-forecast decision-support tools. (LDCF AMAT 3.1.1 and 3112.	more than 27,000 farmers. Nevertheless the curricula do not take into consideration the adaptation practices for dealing with CC threats. The PFS are few and recently created.		varieties (drought or flood resistant); b) Agronomic practices for flood and drought management in crop production systems (soil conservation and agro-forestry practices); c) Resilience evaluation tools; d) Weather-forecast decision-support tools. (LDCF AMAT 3.1.1 and 3.1.1.2)	fields made it possible to supervise 10,787 learners, 44% of them women. There are more than 30% adoptions of technologies and innovations.	
Outcome 3: Increased institutional capacities and cross-sector coordination to the mainstream CCA strategies into policies, programs and planning of the agro-sylvo-pastoral sectors	15 targeted Municipalities, 4 Government Ministries and 1 Research Institution have increased adaptive capacity to reduce risks and respond to climate variability. [LDCF AMAT Indicator 2.2.1	Weak institutional capacity on mainstreaming CCA into policies and programs Targeted local and national institutions have limited adaptive capacity to reduce risks and respond to climate variability [LDCF AMAT Indicator 2.2.1]	Capacity of 10 additional Municipalities and 3 additional Government Ministry strengthened	15 targeted Municipalities, 4 Government Ministries and 1 Research Institution have increased adaptive capacity to reduce risks and respond to climate variability. [LDCF AMAT Indicator 2.2.1]	Assessments of capacities and gaps on CCA policy formulation (livestock, transport, health and water resources sectors) and on investment plan to support the inclusion of CCA, have been carried out through the National Council on Environment and Sustainable Development (CNEDD). Institutional capacity has been increased through the involvement of the extension agents of the Ministries of Agriculture, Livestock and Environment in the FFS training and through 3 national workshops organized to strengthen policymakers' capacity on CCA tools. Mechanisms and roles within the National Technical Commission on Climate Change and Variability (CTNCVC) has been	US

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁸	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹⁰
					<p>defined. Nevertheless, the relevant document as evidence on this activity lacks at the project level.</p> <p>The main result of this component concerns the up-scaling CCA through the FFS approach by the elaboration of a new project responding to request of the Government of technical assistance, under the World Bank “Projet d’appui à l’agriculture sensible aux risques climatiques” (PASEC). After two years of project design and agreement negotiation, the project implementation is currently ongoing.</p> <p>a capacity-building workshop for 35 decision-makers to integrate CCA in planning brought together actors from the regions of Dosso, Tahoua and Tillabéri</p>	
<p>Outcome4: Implementation of the project based on results-based management and easier application of lessons learned in future operations.</p>	<p>Direct sustainable effects of the project are completed</p>		<p>50% the direct effects of the project are completed</p>	<p>Direct sustainable effects of the project are completed</p>	<p>Four (4) PIR and six (6) PPR have been elaborated</p> <p>A mid-term evaluation has been completed</p> <p>A communication strategy has been elaborated and its application is ongoing</p>	<p>S</p>

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁸	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹⁰

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹¹

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<p>Outcome 1: An “operational enabling environment” is created for promoting adoption of CCA practices and technologies through creation of partnerships, execution and analysis of baseline surveys and compilation and pilot-testing of existing and proposed new technologies and methods.</p>	<p>Validate catalogs, good practices, varieties and cultivars documents</p> <p>Operationalize the results of studies</p>	<p>INRAN in collaboration with the project officers and others partners (Agrhyment, ICRISAT, DGA, CNEDD, etc.).</p> <p>Project team in collaboration with agreed POs and producers</p>	<p>2019-2020</p> <p>2019-2020</p>
<p>Outcome 2: Increased ecological, economic and social resilience of at least three productions systems in 15 Municipalities in two agro-ecological zones, through the adoption of improved, Field School-based CCA strategies, practices and a broader choice of adapted genetic material, leveraged/scaled up through interactions with PAC-CR and other partner programs</p>	<p>Set up 190 school fields during the 2019 winter cropping season and 60 dry season CEAP 2019-2020 (6250 producers reached)</p> <p>Conduct a study evaluating the adoption of technologies and innovations from trained producers.</p> <p>Organize inter-site exchanges of good practices and guided tours</p> <p>Accelerate the signature of the agreement with the DMN on the study of rainfall data for the last 30 years and development of past and current rainfall schedules</p> <p>Set up and operationalize the FLIA</p>	<p>Farmers' organizations, technical focal points in collaboration with the project team</p> <p>The project team with the collaboration of the actors of the monitoring and evaluation system of the field. PFR/PFC/facilitators/producers</p> <p>Project coordinator/ DMN/FAONE</p>	<p>2019-2020</p> <p>2019-2020</p> <p>2019-2020</p> <p>2019-2020</p>

¹¹ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

		Project team in collaboration with relevant partners.	2019-2020
Outcome 3: Increased institutional capacity and intersectoral coordination lead to the integration of climate change's adaptation strategies into agro-sylvo-pastoral policies, programs and planning.	Organize regional capacity-building workshops for policymakers on the integration of CCA into planning	Project Team in collaboration with partners	2019-2020
	Organize regional workshops to build the capacity of stakeholders and policy makers on resilience monitoring and evaluation tools	Project Team in collaboration with partners	2019-2020
Outcome 4: Direct effect 4: Implementation of the project based on results-based management and easier application of lessons learned in future operations.	Prepare technical reports on best practices and lessons learned in CEAP/CD for wide dissemination.	Project team in collaboration of FAONE communication Specialist	2019-2020

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹²	Expected completion date ¹³	Achievements at each PIR ¹⁴					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁵ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1: Areas of intervention, partners and identified partner communities and awareness raising around the project	Q3 Q4	<p>Five targeted regions and 15 communes were identified</p> <p>3 partnerships established and possibilities for joint work plans identified</p> <p>Updating process for the National Atlas- reviewed</p>	<p>2 additional partnerships in place</p>	<p>4 partnerships have been established with Three producers' Organizations to install 166 FFS in the five regions</p> <p>All the basic documents (TOR, technical methodology) related to regional atlas have been formulated. Discussion are ongoing with CNEDD to conclude and</p>	<p>6 partnerships have been established with producers' Organizations to install 250 FFS in the five regions.</p> <p>An atlas has been developed and validated</p> <p>6 awareness campaigns on CCA have been conducted through the</p>		100%	200 managers and 629 local authorities affected by awareness campaigns

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

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

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

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

		4 CCA awareness campaigns	1 additional sensitization campaigns on CCA	implement the LoA. 4 awaress campaigns on CCA have been conducted through the field mission (with the LTO) and recycling of the extension officers on the FFS approach	field mission (with the LTO) and recycling of the extension officers on the FFS approach 1 Exchanges of good practices with neighboring countries (Burkina Faso, Kenya). 5 regional catalogs have been developed and are in the process of being validated	150%	
1.2 Tools for selected socio-economic and community self-assessment surveys and surveys undertaken	Q3 Y4	A multi-stakeholder permanent working group based on Raaks analysis Community self-assessment surveys undertaken and tools tested in 15 Municipalities.	2 compilations of promising tools, materials and methods for adaptation to climate change. Inventory of knowledge and local practices established in 5 regions.	Various diagnostic tools using participatory methods have been explored, selected and used in 15 municipalities. Inventory of local knowledge/practices updated in the 5 regions	a permanent multi-stakeholder working group focused on RAAKS analysis is established by a ministerial order. Various diagnostic tools using participatory methods have been explored, selected and used in 15 municipalities. Inventory of local knowledge/practices updated in the 5 regions. A collection of good practices (special topics) was developed in collaboration with the working group.	90%	the validation of the catalogs and the revision of the CEAP guide is still pending.
Output 1.3: Piloting trials on the exploitation of an initial catalog of crop varieties and agricultural / pastoral practices	Q3 Y4	Joint research-farmer based field trials (action research) conducted in 6 sites (at least 1 per region)	Joint research-farmer field trials (action research) conducted in 31 sites (6 per region).	Joint Research-farmers (action research) field trials in 5 sites (one per region)	160 CEAPs evaluated. This assessment shows that 87% were considered good.	85%	

Output 1.4: Databases and catalogs developed or updated including region-specific plant and animal resources and potential best practices for climate resilient agriculture	Q3 Y2	Existing information on climate-resilient agronomic varieties, cultivars and breeds is collected and analyzed. 5 draft regional catalogues are updated with data gathered through Output 1.3.	Existing information on climate-resilient agronomic varieties, cultivars and breeds is collected and analyzed in 15 municipalities (5 regions). 5 drafts of the regional catalogs are prepared and updated with the data collected by the product 1.3.	Work remains to be done. It is a tool of scope and national interest that will allow the actors to have updated and important information in the planning and implementation of activities in support to the CCA. A LoA is outstanding formulation and signing with INRAN which is the main partner of this output	5 regional catalogs are prepared and updated with the data collected by 1.3	80%	validation and local language translation is in sight
Output 2.1: Facilitator training curricula for CEPs, PFS and FDF reviewed in the light of CCA and other cross-cutting themes such as gender and nutrition	Q1 Y4	training curricula for CEPs, PFS and FDF reviewed in the light of CCA,	training curricula for CEPs, PFS and FDF reviewed in the light of CCA and	training curricula for CEPs, PFS and FDF reviewed in the light of CCA	Training curricula for CEPs, PFS and FDF reviewed to include topics such as CCA and other cross-cutting themes such as governance, gender equity and nutrition; AVEC Approach.	100%	A collection of over one hundred special topics has been prepared; the curricula are reviewed each year. The 4 facilitator trainings (FFF) planned were carried out.
Output 2.2: Master trainers and facilitators CEP / PFS / DFF trained on ACC curriculum	Q3 Y4	25% 0 18 master trainers including 4 women (33%) have received extensive training	25% 0 18	25% 20% des adoptions 0	25% des sujets spéciaux ont été révisés. 10% des adoptions 0	100% 30% 100%	A collection of over one hundred special topics has been prepared. 18 master trainers including 4 women (33%) out of 10 planned have received extensive training on CEAP. 9 of these 18 Master Trainers received additional training on Diversity Fields Flora (DFF).

	on CEAP including 9 on the FDF.						
	75 facilitator technicians were trained, including	76 facilitators have been trained	74 facilitators were trained, including	77 new facilitators trained	100%	In total, 302 facilitators were trained, including 53 women	
	0	0	166 facilitators have been recycled	19 technical focal points have been trained in the CEAP approach; AVEC and nutrition.	76%	19 out of 25 planned technical points were trained on the CEAP approach; AVEC and nutrition.	
	40 new CEAP have been installed	130 new CEAP were installed.	58 new CEAP have been installed	191 new CEAPs have been installed.	42%	419 new CEAPs were installed (105%). No old CEAP has been strengthened because they are not operational.	
0	80 facilitators were recycled	0	166 facilitators recycled	81%	Exchanges of experiences are systematic during recycling training workshops.		

<p>2.3 Farmers / breeders trained in sustainable production and the implementation of new / adapted practices</p>	<p>Q3 Y4</p>	<p>956 producers have been trained 0</p>	<p>3108 producers have been trained 0</p>	<p>1386 producers have been trained 0</p>	<p>5337 producers have been trained 2 DFF have been settled at Gaya and Say and 1 simulated DFF in the commune of Kornaka.</p>	<p>77% 50%</p>	<p>Approximately 10,787 producers were trained on the CEAP approach including 4746 women (44%). Two Diversity Field Fora installed in Say and Gaya.</p>
<p>Output 2.4: Development and adoption of participatory decision support tools for climate change analysis to reduce risks to</p>	<p>Q3 Y4</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>5%</p>	<p>5%</p>	<p>The terms of reference have been developed. The agro-meteorological experts identified were not available to conduct the service. The partnership has been reconnected with DMN. A memorandum of understanding is being prepared.</p>
<p>Product 2.5: Producer organizations (POs) strengthened by the adoption of ACC practices.</p>	<p>Q3 Y4</p>	<p>Diagnostic and selection of POs to partner with in each of the five regions. 40 communities were sensitized 0 OP members were trained as CEAP facilitators</p>	<p>Diagnosis and selection of the 13 Producer Organizations with which to work in each of the five regions. 130 communities were sensitized 73 OP members were trained as CEAP facilitators 100% POs</p>	<p>Thirteen (13) OPs have been selected and reinforced through the training of local facilitators. 3 of these POs were selected to lead the CEAP. 58 communities were sensitized 71 OP members were trained as CEAP facilitators</p>	<p>5 POs including the three of the 2017-2018 budget year have been agreed to conduct CEAP winter season 2019 and dry season 2019-2020 32 members (including 10 women) from 13 POs received training on governance and gender equity. 191 communities were sensitized. 71 OP members were trained as CEAP facilitators. 100% POs</p>	<p>100% 100% 100%</p>	<p>The three POs of the 2017-2018 budget year were renewed for the year 2018-2019. Two new POs have been contracted for the 2019 winter season and dried 2019-2020 The 15 communes of intervention were sensitized through the 419 CEAP. 215 facilitators out of the 302 trained are members of farmers' organizations. All the selected farmers' organizations are</p>

		0%	0	100% POs			100%	participating in the implementation of the CEAPs through 71% of the trained facilitators.
		0		0	1 A roadmap for the operationalization of FLIA is developed		30%	A roadmap for the operationalization of FLIA is developed. 58 local facilitators and 19 technical focal points were trained on the AVEC / FLIA approach.
Output 2.6: Local Adaptation Investment Fund (FLIA) put in place (operational and financially sustainable)	Q3 Y4	0	0	0	0			The activities leading to the realization of this product have not been started because of the late recruitment of the expert.
Output 3.1: Development of Policy Briefs Based on Resilience Analyzes	Q2 Y4	0	0	0	0		0%	The activities leading to the realization of this product have not been started because of the late recruitment of the expert.
Output 3.2: Strengthened institutional capacity for integrating climate change adaptation into programs and policies based on the CEP approach.	Q3 Y4	0	0	0	0		0%	The activities leading to the realization of this product have not been started because of the late recruitment of the expert.
Product 3.3 CAC National Investment Plan focused on CEP	Q3 Y4	0	0	0				The activities leading to the realization of this product have not been started because of the late

developed for programs and policies related to agricultural and pastoral sectors								recruitment of the expert.
Product 4.1: System for the systematic collection of field data to monitor project outcome indicators made operational	Q3 Y4	<p>a launch workshop was organized</p> <p>A Monitoring and evaluation manual has been elaborated and validated on October 2016</p> <p>1 PIR and 1 PPR have been elaborated</p>	<p>100%</p> <p>1 PIR and 1 PPR have been elaborated</p>	<p>0</p> <p>1 PIR and 2 PPR have been elaborated</p>	<p>0</p> <p>1 PIR and 2 PPR have been elaborated</p> <p>M&E tools have been reviewed/elaborated</p> <p>166 winter CEAP and 31 CEAP of the dry season have been evaluated</p>		<p>100%</p> <p>83%</p>	<p>Implementation of the project monitoring and evaluation plan is underway</p>
Product 4.2: Output Mid-term and final evaluation	Q3 Y4			The Mid-term evaluation has been completed			50%	it remains the final evaluation because the project was extended by 18 months
Product 4.3: <u>Communication strategy developed</u>	Q3 Y4		4 Good practices identified and disseminated through different medias	A draft of the communications strategy has been developed, it remains to be finalized for implementation.	Several good practices have been identified and disseminated by the 160 CEAPs of the 2018 wintering campaign.		60%	

			A communication strategy has been developed. Its implementation is in progress.	A communication strategy has been developed. Its implementation is in progress.	A communication strategy has been developed. Its implementation is in progress.		60%	Two kakemonos on the field of diversity (DFF), a fact sheet on the approach CEAP and a film on the fields and diversity fair, t-shirts, caps, media covers, photo albums, exhibitions of images related to good practices, interviews and collection of testimony, are produced. A communication strategy has been developed. Its implementation is in progress.
--	--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	-----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

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

Max 200 words:

- Establishment of an atlas of projects and programs in the field of climate change adaptation in Niger,
- Inventory of good practices in the field of climate change in the five regions.
- Implementation of five (5) catalogues of plant and animal species and varieties.
- Analysis of the consideration of gender equity in project activities: 53 facilitators out of 302 (17, 54%) and 2745 out of 6207 (44%) of overwintering producers (2016-2018 women
- capacity building of 32 members (10 women) of POs are trained on gender and equity ;
- capacity building of 77 actors on the Village Savings and Credit Association (VSLA)
- regular reporting
- the development of the partnership with POs, deconcentrated technical services (STDs) and state institutions (INRAN, DMN, CNEDD) as well as the administrative and local authorities in the implementation of the project
- The two conducted evaluations which made it possible to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the implementation of the project.

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

Max 200 words:

- The delay in signing agreements with POs has led to the late implementation of inputs and experiments on less fertile land; because those initially affected being sown by the owners;
- The delay in the recruitment of certain experts and in the signing of memoranda of understanding with State institutions did not facilitate the implementation of certain activities;
- Insufficient support and supervision missions at all levels impacted the quality of the experiments and the regular filling of the logbook by most facilitators;
- The challenge of sustaining APEC given the scarcity of post-ECAP plans, inter-site exchange visits and commented visits

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating¹⁶	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating¹⁷	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	<i>Recruitment of experts (agro-economist, monitoring-evaluation and nutrition-gender) has helped to raise the level of execution of project activities. The signing of agreements with POs and the training and / or retraining of local facilitators have further strengthened producers' capacities for resilience to climate change. The operationalization of the monitoring and evaluation system has allowed for a fluid flow of information between the different actors.</i>
Budget Holder	MS	S	<i>The activities of the program, following the Mid-Term Evaluation, continued to progress, at a steady pace, with close monitoring of the Representation. The different protocols with the partner entities (Meteorology, INRAN,..) are signed and the planned activities are being finalized or in progress with these partners. Reflections will be conducted to close the project as best as possible, the end date comes in the middle of the next agricultural season. The program's achievements are already recognized by the partners who use the Champs Ecole approach and the master trainers as part of their own program.</i>

¹⁶ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

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

Lead Technical Officer¹⁸	MS	S	<p><i>Considering the delays registered in the previous phases and the weaknesses and recommendations came out from the mid-term evaluation, the project improved considerably during this year. Nevertheless, the second change of the project coordinator resulted in a new phase of challenges. The FFS training sessions are proceeding well, but the FFS implementation need to improve the monitoring and supervision and the M&E system is not yet in place as due. Other activities related to the Output 2.4 (Development and adoption of participatory decision support tools for climate change analysis to reduce risks), Output 2.6 (Local Adaptation Investment Fund – FLIA - put in place (operational and financially sustainable), and Outputs of the third component are still far behind or even void.</i></p> <p><i>It is critical that during the last project year the project team make all efforts to recover delays and improve performances as much as possible.</i></p>
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MS	S	<p><i>The mid –term review helped identify implementation bottlenecks and corrective actions. While there have been several operational issues hampering smooth implementation including changing twice the project coordinator, the project is on track with delivering its core objectives.</i></p>

¹⁸ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

3. Risks

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

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid¹⁹. If not, what is the new classification and explain.
L	Yes the Environmental and Social risk classification is still valid

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

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE

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

	Risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Limited partnership hinder the implementation of the project. project implementation	M	The project includes numerous activities to develop partnerships, including participatory assessments, workshops, multi-stakeholder consultations, joint outreach and institutional activities on mainstreaming FFS into policies and programs. Project activities will mainly take place at the local / community level, involving stakeholders and local institutions. Specific cooperation agreements and memoranda of understanding detailing responsibilities and defining joint work plans will be endorsed by the implementing partners.	The project implementation followed the mitigation actions and partnerships have been developed accordingly with the right way, except for a few cases.	

¹⁹ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

²⁰ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²¹ If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period”.

	Risk	Risk rating²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
2	Seed shortages due to shock due to climate variability, prolonged drought and / or pest or disease epidemics with risk of may result in project failure in crops / grasslands.	M	Pest and disease epidemics related to climate variability can cause crop / grassland failure. The project will address this risk by supporting the implementation of CCA measures as well as strengthening community-based field observation capabilities to monitor and reduce seed multiplication failures, particularly by supporting farmers on seed multiplication via the Diversity Field Fora approach.	Activities of Diversity Field Fora approach are underway through a collaboration with Bioversity International.	
3	Worsening security crisis in the country or in the neighbor countries (e.g. Nigeria, Mali) leads to insecurity and/or to a greater inflow of migratory herds and/or displaced populations	M	Conflict-sensitive programming will be integrated with the FFS to address the management and sharing of natural resources. Efforts will be made with stakeholders to establish grazing areas and secure mobility corridors to reduce the impact on natural resources in protected areas.	Although some tensions have been detected in recent months in some project areas, they have not been such as to trigger migration flows	
4	Lack of participation by direct beneficiaries.	L	Farmers and herders may be reluctant to participate in project activities. This risk is considered low because the FFS are widely distributed and well rooted in the territory. Awareness campaigns and workshops on the negative impacts of CC will be conducted involving stakeholders and local institutions. The bottom-up approach of the FFS will stimulate local participation. The direct benefits of adaptation will increase and stimulate the participation of the direct beneficiaries of the project.	Direct beneficiaries both farmers and herders have been strongly involved in the 5 regions of the project through the implementation of the FFS	
5	Certain project actions (e.g. provision of agro-meteorological information) are not implemented on a financially sustainable basis.	L	The project will seek the collaboration of key national actors such as the National Direction of Meteorology (DMN), ACMAD and AGRHYMET who will be fully involved in the project activities and will receive specific training sessions on the integration of climate information in the fields schools FFS and the dissemination and use of climate information. Activities will include cost-effective methods of gathering meteorological information such as collecting indigenous and local knowledge and perceptions of rainfall patterns, understanding the causes and consequences of climate change through rainy calendars.	Collaborations with the key partners to get meteorological information failed so far due to difficulties found to establish agreements with these partners. Currently the project is still trying to sign a LoA with the DMN.	
6	Local institutions are slow to agree on project initiatives.	L	Local services may be reluctant to participate due to the innovative nature of the project and / or the need to cooperate with a wide range of partners. Specific cooperation agreements and memoranda of understanding including responsibilities and joint work plans will be endorsed by implementing partners.	Although with the most of the partners the LoAs have been signed and collaborations are active, with some of them, such as the mentioned DMN it was not possible.	

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
L	L	No relevant changes from the previous classification

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²²

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	No	
Project Outputs	NO	

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

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

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	<p>Original NTE: 15/01/2019 Revised NTE: 30/06/2020</p> <p>Justification: improve the rating of key indicators such as number of local facilitators and FFS members, availability of the atlas of CCA projects and programs and the catalogue of better varieties, cultivars and local practices</p>

5. Gender Mainstreaming

²² Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

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

Was a gender analysis undertaken or an equivalent socio-economic assessment? Please briefly indicate the gender differences.
The project recruited a gender Specialist at the end of December 2018. A gender analysis is ongoing to make know the rating of women, young people and elderly people among facilitators and farmers. About 46% of the FFS are women.

- Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data? How is the project tracking gender impacts and results?

Gender is taken into account in all project activities: training, sensitization, CEAP learners and management committees.

- Does the project staff have gender expertise?

Yes : the project recruited a gender Specialist in the second quarter of the current year

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

- closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources; Yes:
the data are collected in the 31 CEAPs associated with the FdF4 and the analysis of these data is in progress.

improving women's participation and decision making; : In general, female producers represent 44% of learners in the FFS.
and or generating socio-economic benefits or services for women.: The benefits of women's participation in agropastoral school field activities can be summarized as strengthening social cohesion, developing leadership, mobilizing savings for financial participation in the FFS activities.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

If applies, 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

The Farmer Field School methodology is an inclusive approach in which all local people of the intervention area are involved in an undifferentiated way. All ethnic groups, all age categories and both gender are part of the learning process without any kind of discrimination towards minority groups and enhancing the differences among them. One of the main objective of the approach is to enhance social cohesion and pay a special attention toward the most vulnerable groups.

7. Stakeholders Engagement

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

If your project had a stakeholder engagement plan, specify whether any new stakeholders have been identified/engaged:

If a stakeholder, engagement plan was not requested for your project at CEO endorsement stage, please

- list all stakeholders engaged in the project;
- briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.

List of stakeholders	Category	Engagement mechanism
DGA	National entity (Ministry of agriculture and livestock)	Providing assistance in national staff and other national bodies mobilization in activities' implementation
MORIBEN	Farmer Organisation	Consultation and the implementation of FFS in Dosso and Tillaberi regions
SA'A - MARADI	Farmer Organisation	Participation in decision making and the implementation of FFS in Maradi and Zinder regions
FCMN NIYA	Farmer Organisation	Participation in decision making and the implementation of FFS in Tahoua region
CNEDD	National institution	Consultation
INRAN	Research institution	Consultation
FUBI-ZINDER	Farmer Organisation	Participation in decision making
FUCOPRI	Farmer Organisation	Participation in decision making
FUCAP	Farmer Organisation	Participation in decision making
FUMA-GASKIYA	Farmer Organisation	Participation in decision making
FUAD - MARHABA	Farmer Organisation	Participation in decision making
AREN	Farmer Organisation	Consultation
PLATEFORME PAYSANNE	Farmer Organisation	Consultation
ICRISAT	Research institution	Information

8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

- Please tell us the story of your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihood and how it is contributing to achieve the expected global environmental benefits

The in-depth training of master trainers (FP) in CEAP approach, communal and regional focal points in fields schools and fields of diversity has made it possible to reinforce the capacities of the local facilitators and producers in the organization, the operational diagnosis of the constraints and opportunities of the agro-pastoral farms with the aim of conducting innovative experiments. The result is a diversification of household livelihoods, improved agro-silvopastoral yields, human and animal health, increased social cohesion, increased participation and women's leadership.

- Please provide the links to publications, video materials, etc.

The regular meetings between the members of the PCU, the weekly events of the agropastoral school fields, the harmonized use of monitoring and evaluation tools, the organization of the joint missions with the partners contributed to the fluidity of the circulation of information between the actors. Also, the support of the communication specialist of FAONE, allowed to raise the visibility of the project (production and distribution of posters, t-shirts, caps, video films on CD, Kakemonos on CEAP and CD, media coverage of important events, television interviews, identification plates of project achievements, participation in the sub-regional exchange of experiences, etc.).

9. 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 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Allocation FEM/FPMA/SCCF	FEM/FPMA/SCCF		3 870 700 USD			
Cofinancement	PROMOVARE		9 729 085 USD			
	FAO Niger		1 149 787 USD			
	Délégation UE Niger		3 000 000 USD	1 501 732 200 XOF	1 501 732 200 XOF	
	PPAAO		80 000 USD	166 749 380 XOF	166 749 380 XOF	
Total cofinancement			13 958 872 USD	1 668 483 580 XOF	1 668 483 580 XOF	
		TOTAL	17 829 572 USD			

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

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

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