



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 January to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	West Africa (RAF)
Country:	The Gambia
Project Title:	Adapting Agriculture to Climate Change in The Gambia
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP /GAM/033/LDF
GEF ID:	5782
GEF Focal Area(s):	Least Developed Country Fund
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Agriculture (MOA), Department of Agriculture (DOA), Department of Livestock Services (DLS), National Agriculture Research Institute (NARI), National Environment Agency (NEA), Department of Water Resources (DWR), National Disaster Management Agency (NDMA), Women's Bureau
Project Duration:	4 years

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	27 May 2016
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	31 December 2016
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	30 November 2020
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	N/A
Actual Implementation End Date³:	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 6,288,356
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	USD 36,830,000
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	USD 1,621,646

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

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

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

Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	28,280,000
--	------------

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	Thursday 14 th February 2019
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	September 2019 (ToR, cleared by the LTO and sent to Chief Technical Advisor)
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	September 2019
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	N/A
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	Yes (to be submitted after the mid-term review)

Ratings

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

Status

Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	3 rd 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 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	Fafanding S. Fatajo	Fafanding.fatajo@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Rurangwa, Eugene (FAOSFW)	Eugene.Rurangwa@fao.org
Budget Holder	Louise Agathe Yacine Tine	LouiseAgatheYacine.Tine@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Boerstler Fritjof (CBC)	Fritjof.Boerstler@fao.org

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Objective(s): The overall objective of the project is to promote sustainable and diversified livelihood strategies for reducing the impacts of climate variability and change in agriculture and livestock sector						
Outcome 1.1 Strengthened adaptive capacity of institutions and mainstreamed climate change adaptation priorities into sectoral policies and plans	<p>-No. and type of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to minimize exposure to climate variability</p> <p>-Adaptation actions implemented in national/sub-regional development frameworks (no. and type)</p> <p>-NEA Laboratory services strengthened to support project implementation</p>	<p>-Capacity of the government agencies and local stakeholders is inadequate to respond to impacts of climate variability and change in agriculture sector. No specific capacity developed initiatives taken up</p> <p>-Climate change mainstreaming in agriculture sector lacks technical support to mainstreaming, NAPs support started late 2015 but agriculture sector mainstreaming is weak</p> <p>- A laboratory exists in NEA, but focuses on pesticide residues and chemicals only</p>		<p>-5 MOA, 40 DOA, 35 DLS, 20 NARI, 16 FTS, 150 regional staff (in 3 regions) and 150 entrepreneurs from 10 districts have increased capacity on climate change adaptation</p> <p>-Climate change priorities are integrated into 4 national policies/strategies and plans and technical support provided to facilitate NAPs processes in agriculture sector and 30 MOA staff trained on mainstreaming</p> <p>-The existing laboratory upgraded with new instruments and at least 6 staff trained on operation and maintenance and are capable of monitoring the impacts of adaptation</p>	<p>ToT (11 female & 5 male) including gender analysis, in-services training for Regional/ District DLS and NSS staff; as well as entrepreneurship training, including record keeping, basic business planning were conducted</p> <p>The NEA laboratory was assessed, report written and procurement of the lab equipment are at advanced stage</p>	MS
Outcome 2.1 Increased knowledge and understanding of vulnerability and risk assessment tools, agro-climatic monitoring and climate information services for food Security	-Type and scope of monitoring systems in place	- There is no systematic risk and vulnerability assessment conducted for 3rd national communication due to lack of data and information		Improved data, tools and methods such as climate, biophysical and socioeconomic variable and analysis for vulnerability and risk assessments and at least 5 DWR staff trained to monitor and analyze the risks	National and regional level consultations to mainstream climate change adaptation priorities into national policies, plans and program as well as training on gender	MS

⁷ 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.

⁸ 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.

⁹ 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) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
by national and local level institutions	-Relevant risk information disseminated to stakeholders	- There is no inter-agency cooperation in place to process, interpret and communicate weather and climate information to users in multiple sectors		-Multi-disciplinary technical group strengthened and disseminating relevant risk information to target groups (3000 HH in 10 districts)	main streaming and topics addressing gender inequalities in agriculture and natural resources conducted. The rest of this activity will be conducted in quarter 3-4	
Outcome 3.1 Integrated climate resilient strategies for diversified livelihoods strengthened/introduced and sources of income improved for vulnerable households and communities	-Households and communities have more secure access to livelihood assets (Score)- Disaggregated by gender	-There are community gardens being implemented through MDG1c and Songhai model, but constrained by some practical issues		Secure access (Score 4) to livelihood assets by 2500hhs through community gardens, 250hhs with knowledge on value addition, 50 households with honey production and 30 poultry producers associations of which 70% are women	Foundation work for fencing the gardens completed; boreholes drilled in 3 gardens and 50 households were trained in modern honey production, processing and marketing skills.	MS
Outcome 3.2 Strengthened climate-resilient livelihoods of target populations by promoting sustainable crop intensification and innovative crop improvement and management practices	-Climate resilient agricultural practices introduced to promote food security (type and level)	- The research station trials focus only on crop improvement of major cereals and not on drought tolerant traditional crop species that have more potential in-terms of tolerance to drought		-Drought tolerant crop varieties of <i>findi</i> , cassava, sweet potato, dual purpose cowpea introduced in all 10 districts directly benefiting 1500 households (500 HH benefit from <i>findi</i> , 500 HH benefit from sweet potato, 500 HH benefit from cassava)	High yielding-early maturing drought tolerant crop varieties of Findi, cassava, sweet potatoes, dual purpose cowpea, rice and groundnut were produced by NARI and distributed to farmers. Cassava, sweet potatoes and Findi were given to all the 10 women gardens/communities and which is more than 2000 farmers	S
Outcome 4.1 Improved management of rangelands and increased access to livelihood assets to sustain sources of income by livestock dependent communities	-Climate resilient agricultural (livestock) practices introduced to promote food security (type and level)	-The rangelands are degraded and over grazed due to non- availability of proper management alternatives -There is no cattle tracks and lack of local conventions/ regulations with regard to grazing affects the rangeland productivity		10 deferred grazing areas established and reseeded with multi-purpose grass/legume species, 10 intensive feed gardens established in each district, 6 livestock water points established, demarcation of cattle tracks in place benefiting 1000 HH	Identification and measurement of cattle tracks conducted, sites of rangeland and watering point identified	MS

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	<p>-Number of communities benefit from establishment of deferred grazing areas</p> <p>-Number of rangeland management community is functioning effectively and efficiently using the resources</p> <p>-Number of intensive feed gardens developed and operational with community participation</p> <p>-Number of surface watering points created and number of livestock herders benefitted</p> <p>-Area covered under demarcation and marking of cattle tracts to increase cattle access</p>	<p>-There are very few successful models of deferred grazing sites exists</p> <p>-There are few borehole water points developed, but not focused on less expensive water harvesting</p> <p>- surface ponds to provide water for livestock during the rainy season</p> <p>Very limited sites with demarcation and marking of cattle tracts in LRR-N, URR-N and NBR</p>		<p>-10 deferred grazing areas established and reseeded with multi-purpose grass/legume species, 10 intensive feed gardens established (one in each district)</p> <p>-6 livestock water points established, demarcation of cattle tracks in place in 10 sites</p> <p>-Benefiting 1000 HH.</p>		
<p>Outcome 5.1 Project implemented with a results based management framework and best practices and lessons learned disseminated widely</p>	<p>-M & E system developed and implemented effectively</p> <p>- Agreed M & E plan at the start of the project</p> <p>-Agreed M & E plan at the start of the project</p> <p>-AMAT tool available and followed during the monitoring</p> <p>-Targets and baselines clearly defined</p> <p>Number and typology of</p>	<p>Baseline projects and programs are established, but these projects and programs lacks climate change adaptation perspective</p> <p>-There is no comprehensive document elaborating good practices for adapting agriculture to climate change</p>		<p>Very well structured baselines, evaluation of project at the end against the established baselines</p> <p>-A well-structured M & E system in place and implemented as per the M & E plan</p> <p>-At least 15 good practices examples consolidated and cost benefit analysis</p>	<p>Baseline of the project was conducted by the use of an assessment tool called Self-evaluation and Holistic Assessment of climate Resilience of farmers and Pastoralists (HARP); however the M & E is weak due to over loading and over stretching of the personnel</p>	MS

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	good practices integrated and disseminated for wider adoption and replication			conducted and shared widely for replication/upscaling		

Action plan to address MS rating¹⁰

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1.1 Strengthened adaptive capacity of institutions and mainstreamed climate change adaptation priorities into sectoral policies and plans	The fast track the delivery of NEA laboratory equipment	FAOGM and the contractor	Before end of September 2019
Outcome 2.1 Increased knowledge and understanding of vulnerability and risk assessment tools, agro-climatic monitoring and climate information services for food Security by national and local level institutions	Engage the focal person at the Department of Water Resources once more and see if he could live up to expectation	AACCP of FAOGM	Before end of August 2019
Outcome 3.1 Integrated climate resilient strategies for diversified livelihoods strengthened/ introduced and sources of income improved for vulnerable households and communities	Meeting and frank discussion with the contractor on fast construction of the chain links (fencing)	AACCP and Engineering Unit of FAOGM	Before mid-September August 2019
Outcome 4.1 Improved management of rangelands and increased access to livelihood assets to sustain sources of income by livestock dependent communities	Encourage Department of Livestock Service (DLS) and Regional governors to fast track the consultative development of the convention for rangeland, livestock tracks and watering points	FAO/DLS/ regional governors	Before end of December 2019
Outcome 5.1 Project implemented with a results based management framework and best practices and lessons learned disseminated widely	To recruit an M & E Officer for the project, ToR are already in place	AACCP/FAOGM HR	Before end of September 2019

¹⁰ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³			Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR		
Output 1.1.1: Technical capacity of institutions at all levels (national, regional, district and local) focusing on adaptation in agriculture sector strengthened	Q3 Y3			-ToT for front line extension workers on vegetable food processing and preservation -training of stakeholders institutions on mainstreaming climate change in the ANR sector program -ToT for the extension workers on timely seed selection techniques, marketing and marketing channel management	65%	The challenge was long processing of the LOA, that was overcome and the reports are all uploaded into FAO FPMIS
Output 1.1.2: Quality –Control laboratory at NEA strengthened to monitor and analyse the impacts of adaptation practices on the Natural resource and environment	Q4 Y3			Report of the assessment of the lab submitted and procurement process of the lab equipment and materials started through international bidding and contract awarded	65%	The challenge was to identify an international expert in laboratory assessment.
Output 1.1.3 National adaptation Planning (NAPs) in Agriculture sector facilitated and climate change concerns mainstreamed in to National Agriculture policy, strategies and programs	Q1Y3			Started and is going on well with cost sharing with Nap-Ag	25%	The personnel at DWR are frequently out of the country affecting the implementation of the activities
Output 2.1.1 Improved database Tools and methods for vulnerability and risk assessment, agro climatic monitoring for	Q4Y2			About 40% of the activity conducted	40%	The personnel at DWR are frequently out of the country which delayed the implementation

¹¹ 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.

¹² As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹³ 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)

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

food security developed at national and local level and staff trained						
Output 2.1.2: National framework for climate services (NFCS) supported and weather and climate forecasting customized for agriculture sector and capacity enhanced	Q4Y4			Setting up user interface done and training conducted, but establishment of infrastructure is yet to be done; hopefully will in place before end of Q4	30%	The personnel at DWR are frequently out of the country and that negatively delay the implementation
Output 3.1.1: Location specific livelihood diversification and income generation models improved and implemented	Q4Y4			About 40% conducted, but fencing is yet to be done. However foundation for the fences were done, but the fencing materials are yet to arrive in the country	40%	Very slow process in the FAO procurement
Output 3.2.1: Drought tolerant crop seeds produced, demonstrated at field level with strengthened value addition and marketing	Q4Y4			Field demonstration conducted and attended by more 100 farmers, 75% of whom were women. Seeds distributed to the farmers for demonstration and procurement of postharvest machines started	45%	Back-forth in the process of the LoA
Output 3.2.2: Additional area brought under cropping by developing tidal irrigation and ensuring value addition and market linkages	Q4Y4			Started the process, but postpone due to overlapping with another FAO Project's activity. Cost share with Agriculture for Economic Growth Project at FAO	20%	Two projects at FAO doing the same activity in the same project region
Output 4.1.1: Rangelands improved by promoting differed grazing areas and re-seeding of multipurpose grass and legume species	Q4Y4			Establishment of rangeland management committees, identification of grazing areas completed, drafting of the convention done and all the site are marked for demarcation	35%	Long process as for the districts to agree as to where the track would be and ranges since these involve an area of about 8 km across villages
Output 4.1.2: Provision of Livestock watering points and improved demarcation of cattle tracks	Q4Y4			-All the sites with regards to watering points and cattle tracks are now done, - All the sites measured -Specification for permanent poles for the tracks also done - Local convention drafted	35%	The districts to agree as to where the watering points and tracks would be despite of clear guide line and consultations
Output 5.1.1 monitoring and evaluation system designed, implemented at all levels and project related good practices and lessons learned documented and disseminated	Q4Y4			About 45% of the targets met	45%	Annual project planning has been done accordingly

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:

First and foremost, all the activities being implemented are based on the approved work plan and budget. The baseline assessment for the project was conducted by the use of an assessment tool called Self-evaluation and Holistic Assessment of Climate Resilience of Farmers and Pastoralists (SHARP) between 2017 and 2018. The results of the assessment will be used as baseline and in order to measure progress against relevant indicators and targets. The ToT applied by the project to date includes a gender analysis, in-services training for Regional/ District DLS and NSS staff; as well as entrepreneurship training, including record keeping and basic business planning. The NEA laboratory was successfully assessed, a report was written and procurement of the lab equipment has almost been completed. National and regional level consultations to mainstream climate change adaptation priorities into national policies, plans and program as well as training on gender mainstreaming and topics addressing gender inequalities in agriculture and natural resources were also held. Foundation work for fencing the gardens were completed; boreholes were drilled in 3 gardens and 50 households were trained in modern honey production, processing and marketing. High yielding-early maturing drought tolerant crop varieties of Findi, cassava, sweet potatoes, dual purpose cowpea, rice and groundnut were produced by NARI and have been distributed to more than 2000 farmers (75% of whom are women farmers) in 2019 for large scale production. Sites of rangeland and watering points were identified, moreover the identification and measurement of cattle tracks were conducted.

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

Max 200 words:

The only major challenge for the project in the reporting year was delays in the procurement of equipment and materials. Procurement process of fencing materials for the 10 community gardens took more than 16 months and this delay has negative consequences on the project delivery. The cost of fencing materials alone is quite high and the delay has related consequence as most of the other activities depend entirely on the fencing/security of the women vegetable gardens.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	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	The activities are being implemented through consultants as opposed to implementation through LoA due to the need of strengthening IP capacities to fulfill LOA requirement. This is more efficient and enables to achieve the set target on time. No major changes since the last the last reporting period
Budget Holder	MS	S	There is a need to speed up implementation of the project considering the delay in the recruitment and starting of the project. As for now only 1/3 of the budget has been disbursed while less than one year is remaining as the NTE is set on May 2020. However the project has recorded an important move and the current activities shows that a promising delivery in the coming months. Possibility of request of project extension is being considered.
Lead Technical Officer¹⁷	MS	S	LTO is always inform of the project activities. There is a need to accelerate the implementation of the activities to meet the project NTE. Or initiate a request for project no cost extension.

¹⁵ **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.

¹⁶ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁷ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MU	MS	<p>Although the project has picked up pace in its implementation, the overall progress and delivery rates are still slower/lower than expected (especially in view of the project's upcoming completion date). It is therefore highly unlikely that the project will reach current targets within current timeframe. A project extension needs to be explored but can only be confirmed by the upcoming mid-term review.</p> <p>Unfortunately, FLO recommendations from last PIR were not taken into consideration:</p> <p>a) inclusion of mid-term targets at outcome level allowing a more effective monitoring of achievements against targets, b) supervision mission by the LTO, and c) fee workplan to ensure that all necessary technical backstopping needs for the project are covered. The latter could be in particular relevant for Outcome 2 – climate assessment tools and approaches.</p> <p>It will be important to link the results of the baseline survey (SHARP) with project indicators and targets to effectively measure results.</p>
------------------------------------	-----------	-----------	---

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 valid ¹⁸ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low (Category C project are considered to have minimal or no adverse impacts. Specific environmentally related reports are not necessary.)	No change has been made and there is no intention so far for any changes.

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.

¹⁸ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

Risk 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 ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Impacts of increasing climate variability may increase to the extent that even if the project implements activities to improve livelihood diversification at local level, it may not be enough to make a difference. The diversification and intensification strategies may also lead to emergence of new threats such as pest and disease infestations	Low to medium	The project is implementing a suitable approach to diversification, intensification in crop production and better livestock management that underpins fundamental scientific principles and participatory methods and mechanisms that enable stakeholders to adopt suitable measures	Appropriate measures have been designed and the stakeholders are very much aware of them	- demonstration of new approaches, technologies and practices in all the intervention communities; - Training relevant staff and stakeholders on sustainability issues and more sensitization activities
2	Insufficient institutional support and political commitments	Low	The proposed project is strongly supported by the Ministry of Agriculture (MOA), and the GEF focal point in The Gambia. Direct linkages to existing and planned baseline project/development activities implemented by the Government, FAO and other partners will provide a strong foundation to mitigate this risk.	N/A	N/A
3	The availability of credible and timely data to inform targeting of beneficiaries	Medium	Efforts will be undertaken to collate data from recently completed or ongoing nationwide surveys (Integrated household survey, Country status report). Collaborative arrangements with initiatives such as Food Security Monitoring System (FSMS) will be established to collate additional data and also for validation.	Strengthening the data collection and generation as well as the M and E system	N/A

¹⁹ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²⁰ 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 rating¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
4	Inadequate capacity at national, local and community level to support diversification and intensification; livestock and rangeland management is just emerging and may be difficult to operationalize effectively	Low to Medium	The project will specifically target capacity development at national, regional and local community levels to strengthen the work of climate change adaptation. It will build on practices and principles already tested through the Food Security through Commercialization of Agriculture (FSCA) and the Gambia Livestock and Horticulture Development Project (LHDP).	The project is rigorously training the IPs at national and local levels	N/A
5	Work progresses in a compartmentalized fashion and there is little integration into the government departments.	Medium	The project preparation team has discussed these aspects with the Government counterparts and it was agreed that the interventions will clearly link to the ongoing Government and donor funded programmes. The Component 1 focuses on mainstreaming of climate change adaptation into policies and plans and which will be carried out through a consultative process by engaging all relevant Government Ministries and Departments. The component also supports NAPs processes.	N/A	N/A

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
Low to medium	Low to medium	The project overall risk rating is low to medium and there is no substantial changes foreseen

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²¹

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

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. The project was about 8 delay and this consequently has negative impact on the project activities; and more so the midterm evaluation. I think due to the late start, it will fair to have the midterm in quarter 1 2020

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	<p>Original NTE: May 2020 Revised NTE: To be reviewed during upcoming evaluation.</p> <p>Justification: N/A</p>

²¹ 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.

5. Gender Mainstreaming

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?

The project did not have a gender-responsive plan from the inception. However, a gender sensitive analysis was conducted as part of the SHARP survey, in addition, a gender expert was recruited by NAP-Ag and will provide support to the LDCF project through a cost sharing arrangement. The expert already reviewed the project document with a “gender lens” and important gender sensitive activities were proposed to the project by the expert such as Training for food technology and horticulture experts by gender, Training on gender main streaming and topics addressing gender inequalities in agriculture and natural resources including land tenure, access to credit, technologies and household dynamics, Community level workshops/ meetings/trainings on household level livelihoods (beekeeping etc.), value addition & marketing and linking to financial institutions by gender, Training at National Level (ToT) including gender analysis, and compilation of gender and climate vulnerability and capacity assessment tools which are currently used in the country and training on the tools. The proposed activities were endorsed by the PSC in their last meeting.

Please briefly indicate the gender differences

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

The project M & E system with gender-disaggregated data is being developed and the FAOGM is also in the process of getting an international M & E expert who will come to strengthening the M & E system with regards to gender disaggregation.

Yes, the M & E system has gender-disaggregated data and all the activities are being implemented on the basis of gender disaggregation.

Does the project staff have gender expertise? All the project staff have taken the FAO online course on gender and are gender conscious.

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*;
- improving women’s participation and decision making; and *Yes*
- generating socio-economic benefits or services for women; *Yes*

Result (Output) areas; 1.1.1; 1.1.3; 2.1.1; 2.1.2; 3.1.1; 3.2.1; 3.2.2; 4.1.1; 4.1.2 and 5.1.1 all contribute to gender equality related to the above mentioned.

Women in The Gambia are mainly responsible for the care of the family at household level. The household division of labour between women and men is not equal, allocation and sharing of farming implement and farm land area not equal, and they bear the greatest part of household poverty and food insecurity due to gender inequalities. There is big difference in accessing productive resources, finances mainly because of collateral which women do not have, information because most women are not educated and information technology. Provision of drought tolerant cassava, hungry rice and dual purpose cowpea (result area 3.2.1) and Location specific livelihood diversification and income generation (result area 3.1.1) all are making great contribution to income generation for women and enhance food security by providing women access to resources.

Training women group on modern beekeeping, marketing, body cream and soap making from bee wax will increase their income and reduce the money they spend on those items.

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

N/A

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: *Note: The document had no stakeholder engagement plan*

If a stakeholder engagement plan was not requested for your project at CEO endorsement stage, please list all stakeholders engaged in the project. –

The stakeholders involved in the project are : Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, Department of Livestock Services, Department of Forestry, Department of Fisheries, Department of Water Resources, Ministry of Environment Parks and Wildlife, Ministry of Fisheries and Water Resources, Ministry of Local Government Lands and traditional Rulers, Department of Parks and Wildlife Management, Women’s Bureau, Ministry of Women and Social Welfare, National Agricultural Research Institute, National Select Committee on agriculture and Rural Development, Regional Governors, District Chiefs, NGOs such as United Purpose and Action Aid international, The Gambia, CBOs such as National Livestock Owners’ Association, NACUFAG, Farmers’ Platform and National Beekeepers’ Association

briefly describe stakeholders’ engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.

- Though there was no stakeholder engagement plan; the stakeholders were involved from the project preparation stage, validation of the project documents as well as launching of the project. They were part of the project annual retreat and participated very actively in the consultative preparation and validation of the annual work plan and budget. The project conducts regular project Steering Meetings, consultations with communities as well as trainings.

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

All the activities that the project is implementing have already made positive impact on the lives and livelihoods of the participating farmers, particularly the women farmers. Such activities are:

- ✓ Diversification of farmers' farming activities and source of income generation to increase their household income
- ✓ Modern beekeeping (the fully story is available in the FAO GMRS),
- ✓ Honey-wax **soap** making (diversification of income sources) – the demand of local communities is already exceeding the current supply,
- ✓ Honey-wax **body cream** making (diversification of income sources),
- ✓ Cultivation of early maturing crop varieties, such as **groundnut, hungry rice, rice, cowpea, sweet potatoes** (national average is 14Mt/ha, the project beneficiaries are getting 28Mt/ha), and high yielding cassava
- Please provide the links to publications, video materials, etc. FAOGM website and GEF AACCP WhatsApp Group

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²²	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019- \$28,280,000	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
FAO/GAFSP (FASDEP-TA)	GAFSP	In-kind	USD 1,400,000	Non due to delay in land development		USD 1,400,000
MOA/FASDEP	GAFSP	In-kind	USD 14,880,000	Non due to delay in land development		USD 14,880,000
MOA/WAAP	WB	In-kind	USD 12,000,000	Non due to delay in land development		USD 12,000,000
MOA/H9200	AdB	In-kind	USD 8,550,000	Non due to delay in land development		USD 8,550,000
Agriculture for Economic Growth	EU	In-kind		Non due to delay in land development		USD 1,000,000
		TOTAL	USD 36,830,000	\$28,280,000		USD37,830,000

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

No significant changes, though some projects are phasing out, but new ones are as well coming up

²² 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.