1- Identification

1.1 Project details

GEF ID	5208	SMA IPMR ID	N/A
Project Short Title	R2R Palau	Grant ID	S1-32GFL-000621
		Umoja WBS	GFL-11207-14AC0003-SB-006480

Project Title	Advancing sustainable resource management to improve livelihoods and protect biodiversity in Palau

Project Type	Full Sized Project (FSP)	Duration months	*Planned*	48
Parent Programme if child project			*Age*	82.0 months
GEF Focal Area(s)	Biodiversity and Land Degradation	Completion Date	*Planned -original PCA*	31-Aug-20
Project Scope	National		*Revised - Current PCA*	2023-09-31
Region	Asia Pacific	Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval		28-Apr-16
Countries	Palau	UNEP Project Approval Date (on Decision Sheet)		15-Sep-16
GEF financing amount	USD 3,747,706	Start of Implementation (PCA entering into force)		15-Sep-16
Co-financing amount	USD 15,800,000	Date of First Disbursement		25-Oct-16
		Date of Inception Workshop, if available		1-Mar-18
Total disbursement as of 30 June	USD 3,493,820	Midterm undertaken?		Yes
Total expenditure as of 30 June	USD 2,965,197	Actual Mid-term Date, if taken		1-Mar-22
		Expected Mid-Term Date, if not taken		
		Expected Terminal Evaluation Date		1-Aug-23
		Expected Financial Closure Date		30-Sep-24

1.2 EA: Project description

The GEF-5 project will support Palau's two linked national efforts to protect biodiversity and sustainably natural resources: the Protected Areas Network (PAN) and the Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Initiative, as well as support coordination between the two efforts and other cross-sector issues that transcend boundaries and sectors. The Project Objective is to effectively and sustainably use biodiversity and maintain ecosystem goods and services in Palau by building institutional capacity to integrate the Palau Protected Area Network (PAN) with the Sustainable Land Management (SLM) initiative, and fostering a ridge-to-reef approach across and within these initiatives. This Project is implemented through the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, and the Environment (formerly known as the Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment & Tourism) along with 9 project partners (3 government, 4 semi-government, and 2 NGO), namely; Belau National Museum, Bureau of Agriculture, Bureau of Tourism, Environmental Quality Protection Board, Protected Areas Network Fund, Protected Areas Network Office, Palau Conservation Society, Palau International Coral Reef Center.

This project is composed of three components. Starting at the site level, Component 1 will improve the design and implementation of the PAN. Moving to the landscape level (e.g. watersheds), Component 2 will implement priority sections of the SLM Policy to minimize wide impacts from land use. Moving to the national level, Component 3 will ensure integrated coordination and streamlining across PAN and SLM, mainstreaming of cross-sector issues into PAN and SLM, mainstreaming of biodiversity values into national level development plans, and project management.

1.3 Project Contact

Division(s) Implementing the project	Ecosystems Division	Executing Agency(ies)	Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, & the Environment (MAFE)
Name of co-implementing Agency		Names of Other Project Partners	Belau National Museum, Bureau of Agriculture, Bureau of Tourism, Environmental Quality Protection Board, Protected Areas Network Fund, Protected Areas Network Office, Palau Conservation Society, Palau International Coral Reef Center
TM: UNEP Portfolio Manager(s)	Ersin Esen	EA: Manager/Representative	Dolmii Remeliik
TM: UNEP Task Manager(s)	Sangjin Lee	EA: Project Manager	Dolmii Remeliik
TM: UNEP Budget/Finance Officer	Rachel Kagiri	EA: Finance Manager	Rica Ngirmang
TM: UNEP Support/Assistant	Peerayot Sidonrusmee	EA: Communications lead, if relevant	

2- OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

TM: UNEP Current Subprogramme(s)	Nature Action	TM: UNEP previous Subprogramme(s)	Healthy and Productive Ecosystems

2.1 UNEP PoW & UN

TM: PoW Indicator(s)

(iii) Number of countries and national, regional and subnational authorities and entities that incorporate, with UNEP support, biodiversity and ecosystem-based approaches into development and sectoral plans, policies and processes for the sustainable management and/or restoration of terrestrial, freshwater and marine areas; (iv) Increase in territory of land- and seascapes that is under improved ecosystem conservation and restoration; (v) Positive shift in public opinion, attitudes and actions in support of biodiversity and ecosystem approaches

EA: UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages

The UNDAF 2013-2017, which supports Palau, includes within Outcome Area 1: Environmental management, climate change and disaster risk management, the following Regional Outcome 1.1: "By 2017 the most vulnerable communities across the PICTs are more resilient and select government agencies, civil society organizations and communities have enhanced capacity to apply integrated approaches to environmental management, climate change adaptation/mitigation, and disaster risk management." By promoting Ridge to Reef approaches to environmental management with wide stakeholder participation, the proposed project will directly support Outcome 1 and its outputs. The Project specifically incorporates objectives from the UNDAF into its outcomes.

EA: Link to relevant SDG Goals

1, 2, 3, 8, 12, 13, 15

EA: Link to relevant SDG Targets

1.1, 3.1, 4.1, 6.2, 11

Sub Indicators

TM: GEF core or sub indicators targeted by the project as defined at CEO Endorsement/Approval, as well as results

Indicators	Targets - Expected value			Materialised to date
	Mid-term	End-of-project	Total Target	
1.1: Terrestrial protected areas newly created	N/A	50		4,068 ha

2.2. GEF Core or S

⌄ 3.1: Area of degraded agricultural lands under resto	N/A	494		624
⌄ 4.1: Area of landscapes under improved managemer	N/A	103		102,600
⌄ 6.2: Greenhouse gas emission mitigated outside the	N/A	15,766		126,928 ha/18,389,921 tco2
⌄ 11: People benefitting from GEF-financed investmer	N/A	1,910		1,303
⌄				

Implementation Status 2023 1st PIR

2.3 Implementation status & Risk

	PIR #	Rating towards outcomes (DO) (section 3.1)	Rating towards outputs (IP) (section 3.2)	Risk rating (section 4.2)
FY 2023	6th PIR	MS	MS	L
FY 2022	5th PIR	MS	MS	M
FY 2021	4th PIR	MS	MS	M
FY 2020	3rd PIR	MS	MS	M
FY 2019	2nd PIR	MS	MS	M
FY 2018	1st PIR	MS	MS	S
FY 2017				
FY 2016				
FY 2015				

EA: Summary of status
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

The project has progressed significantly since slowdowns associated with Covid and staff turnover. The Palau PAN is effectively protecting key resources and leading to improvements in endangered and endemic species. Links between protected areas and sustainable land management are stronger along the spectrum from planning to mapping, with reduced negative impacts on key habitats. National capacity and state capacity are stronger for both protected area management and sustainable land management.

2.4 Co-finance

EA: Planned Co-finance	15,800,00	**EA:** Actual to date:	16,673,209

EA: Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges.

Tourism is slowly recovering, with an subsequent uptick in Green Fees received. The PAN Endowment Fund has also been performing well, allowing for drawdowns of enough to continue funding the PAN Network. Partners also receive grants from diverse sources, which were reported prior to start of the GEF6 project so as not to allow any double-counting.

EA: Date of project steering committee meeting

No meetings for this PIR period

2.5. Stakeholder

EA: Stakeholder engagement
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

Stakeholders linked with PAN and Sustainable Land Management have been heavily engaged with the project, with particular close engagement with Conservation Officers, Protected Areas Coordinators, Rangers, and the scientific community. Expansion of the focus to include sustainable land management and sustainable forest management means that a wide segment of the public has also been involved in the project through Best Practices (e.g. such as in agriculture, forestry, or water protection), or via land use planning.

2.6. Gender

TM: Does the project have a gender action plan?

No

EA: Gender mainstreaming
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

The Project and its partners follow a National Gender Mainstreaming Policy, which requires collection of gender disaggregated data and adoption of an inclusive lens for planning and analysis. Project outcomes have been at times targeted to meet the needs of specific genders - for instance with investment into women's food production areas. Benefits appear to be accuring equally to both genders, and there have been no reported conflicts.

2.7. ESSM

TM: Was the project classified as moderate/high risk at CEO Endorsement/Approval Stage?

No

TM: Have any new social and/or environmental risks been identified during the reporting period?

No

TM: If yes, what specific safeguard risks were identified in the SRIF/ESERN?

TM: If yes, please describe the new risks, or changes

TM & EA: Has the project received complaints related to social and/or environmental impacts (actual or potential) during the reporting period?

No

TM & EA: If yes, please describe the complaint(s) or grievance(s) in detail including

EA: Environmental and social safeguards management
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

A project coordination unit provides oversight on environmental and social safeguards, following established national policies such as the National Climate Change Policy, NBSAP, Sustainable Forest Policy, and Gender Mainstreaming Policy. Project partners were then required to align their plans to these national safeguards and policies.

...rning

EA: Knowledge activities and products
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

The project partners with various organizations and other projects integrate the tools, best practices and information into various websites and outreach events to promote these products and build awareness and capacity for their implementation. Materials are shared in printed form, digital form, and via partnership with the GEF6 website.

2.8. KM/Lea

EA: Main learning during the period

Please attach a copy of any products

Lessons learned include the importance of aligning indicators during project development, and using a partnership approach to measuring and estimating impact. This leads to more sustainable results.

2.9. Stories

EA: Stories to be shared
(section to be shared with communication division/ GEF communication)

Palau is pleased to report that its Protected Areas Network now covers all of the nation's known endangered species and good percentages of Important Bird Areas and Important Forest Areas. The PAN is completely decentralized and operated by States with community involvement, which means these outcomes are shared widely. Palau is also pleased to report that given multiple initiatives and projects, the endangered status of the Micronesian Megapode fell from CR (Critically Endangered) to VU (Vulnerable), a testatment to combined outputs of protected areas, land management, and forest management among all partners.

3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE

3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes (Development Objectives)

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	EA: Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	TM: Progress rating
Objective							
To effectively and sustainably use biodiversity and maintain ecosystem goods and services in Palau by building institutional capacity to integrate the Palau Protected Area Network (PAN) with the Sustainable Land Management (SLM) initiative, and fostering a ridge-to-reef approach across and within these initiatives	1. Extent, type, or size of threats from Climate Change, Habitat degradation / loss, IAS, and Over / Illegal harvesting; Population size / spatial range of biodiversity.	Climate change: Bleaching can affect up to 80% of Palau's reefs; 100% of atoll, beach, and strand vegetation at risk of being lost. Habitat degradation/loss: Siltation rate at 150 km2/year; Forest loss unknown; Fires impact 100% of terrestrial conservation areas. IAS: Only one species of Fabaceae currently targeted for control at a rate of 1 tree per day or less; Macaques present but not established on Babeldaob and Koror. Over/Illegal Harvesting: Loss of mangroves at 0.04%/year; Dugongs and	Exact targets determined during Inception Phase. Indicator species determined as part of METT. Preliminary targets: 1 – 100% of bleaching resistant sites in the RISL and 50% of bleaching resistant sites elsewhere protected in MPAs 2- Siltation rate in Airai Bay reduced by 10% (135 km2/yr) 3 – 30% of terrestrial conservation areas free of fires Declining threat scores from start to finish; Increasing or stable populations / geographic extent of populations	Exact targets determined at Mid-Project Workshop, with research conducted beforehand. Preliminary targets: 1 – At least 2 IAS with active management 2 – Macaques do not spread to Babeldaob 3 – Mangrove loss declines by 25% to 0.03%/yr 4 – Declining trends in dugongs and pigeons begin showing a plateau 5 – Fish catch improves Declining threat scores from start to finish Increasing or stable populations / geographic extent of populations	100%	Koror State updated its RISL Management Plan to incorporate climate resilience and set aside three additional marine protected areas as adaptation and resilience sites, including areas important for propogating sea cucumbers and giant clams. Koror's resilient reefs in Ngermid Bay are protected as part of the RISL World Heritage Site. 20% of all of Palau's reefs, and 46% of all outer reef (which is more resilient to bleaching) were protected nationwide. The siltation rate in Airai continues to increase due to development pressures combined with increased extreme weather due to Airai. NGO, Government, and State Protected Areas Partners developed a Fire Response Network and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and have been actively preventing and fighting forest fires. As a result, between 2012 and 2019 fire indicators decreased: 1) Fewer fires inside PA (between 2 and 7 down from a high of 30); 2) Lower total percent of all fires were in Pas; 3) Less total burned area in PAs (around 2000 sq.m from 600,000 sq.m); and 4) Lower % of Burned Areas in PAs (nearing 0%). Overall, less than 30% of PAs experience forest fires. The Ministry institutionalized invasive species programs in its organizational chart. As a result, active control is now underway for multiple IAS species including Fruit Flies, Coconut Rhinoceros Beetles, Mikania vines, Merremia vines, and Fabaceae trees, rats, mosquitos. Active surveillance is underway to prevent the spread of Macaques which are only present in the wild in Angaur. Biosecurity is in place at the border to prevent the entry of priority species such as Brown Tree Snakes. Mangroves are now protected via Water Quality Regulations. Total mangrove has increased from 42 sq.km in 2011 to 50 sq.km in 2019. Micronesian Pigeon population has stabilized and increased slightly from around 0.2 birds/minute to 0.25 birds/minute. Dugongs continue to be under threat, as their main habitat (seagrass is declining). They are fully protected and many of their habitats are now protected by zoning. Populations of commercially important fish have improved across the board, using all indicators: 1) increased biomass, 2) increased size, 3) increased SPR, 4) low	S
	2. GEF METT Threat Scores (Objective 1, Section II)	GEF METT Threat Scores (out of undesired max of 159): RISL – 59; Northern Reefs – 41; Ngeremeskang – 83; Ngardok – 53	GEF METT Threat Sco	GEF METT Threat Scores reduced by at least 25%	90%	RISL Threat METT: 59 --> 48 (19%) Northern Reefs: 41 --> 36 (12%) Ngeremeskang: 83 --> 54 (35%) Ngardok: 53 --> 46 (13%) Total 236 --> 184 (22%) Threats were reduced due to improved enforcement, IAS management, planning and improved regulatory frameworks, and best practices for tourists in all cases. However global threats due to climate change and marine debris and global economic slowdowns introduced new threats.	S
	3. GEF METT Assessment Form Scores (Objective 1, Section II)	GEF METT Assessment form score (out of desired 112): RISL – 77; Northern Reefs – 61; Ngeremeskang – 46; Ngardok – 68	GEF METT Assessment form scores increased by at least 10%	GEF METT Assessment form scores increased by at least 30%	95%	RISL Management METT: 77 --> 84 (9%; already near maximum) Northern Reefs Management METT: 61 --> 79 (30%) Ngeremeskang: 46 --> 77 (40%) Ngardok: 68 --> 83 (22%, already near maximum) Total 252 --> 323 (28%) Sites were ushered in to the PAN Network and thus benefitting from planning, addition of staff, training, increased budgets and cross-border cooperation	MS
Outcome 1							
1.1 Improved Design, Evaluation, and Implementation of the PAN leads to increased engagement by states, improved coverage of sites, species, and ecosystem functions, and increased conservation effectiveness. 1.2: PAN management capacity (engagement, training, and financial) and coordination improved across sectors and across governance levels and results in benefits across genders and for marginalized populations in outlying states.	1.1.1 Number of states engaged in PAN	PAN activities ongoing in piecemeal way without coordination; 15 states engaged in PAN	PAN Strategy includes guidelines for state PAN activities. 16 states engaging with PAN.	Majority of PAN Activities are in line with National PAN Strategy and SLM Strategy; 16 states with PAN sites	100%	All 16 States now have a PAN Site, and there are 39 total PAN Sites (29 Marine Protected Areas and 10 Terrestrial Conservation Areas). Their Management Plans are required to be 100% in line with the PAN Strategy and they must align with the National SLM Policy (e.g. for wildfire, forest restoration, watershed protection, etc.).	S

	Indicator	Baseline		Target	%	Achievement	Rating
	1.1.2 Existence of METT	Draft marine, terrestrial, and socioeconomic METT developed, but not finalized. Little quantitative understanding of PAME.	Standardized PAN METT identified and implemented.	METT finalized, implemented, and utilized for adaptive management in 4 new PAN sites and 5 existing PAN sites. METT provides evidence that PAME is increasing.	100%	A localized METT has been finalized consisting of 6 protocols: 1. Marine monitoring protocol (PICRC), which includes thresholds for health based on coral cover, coral genus diversity, fish size and SPR, and biomass 2. Forest bird monitoring protocol (BNM), which includes thresholds for healthy diversity 3. Shorebird monitoring protocol (BNM) 4. Forest Inventory and Analysis (BOE) 5. Socio-economic Assessment (PICRC) 6. Protected Areas Management Effectiveness (PAME) (PAN), which includes scoring based on desired thresholds. The PAME was completed in 2015 and is being repeated now. All 6 METT protocols are implemented as appropriate for the site, but there are gaps in utilization for adaptive management. All 39 PAN Sites use these. The PAME also pulls data from the ecological protocols to produce a single measure of overall protected areas effectiveness. During the project period localized tools were also aligned with SDG indicators.	S
	1.1.3. Extent of PAN coverage (same measure as GEF METT (Objective 1, Section I))	Coverage of all ecosystem types are unknown.	Baseline established when METT finalized.	PAN is expanded to include at least on representation of all key ecosystems. At least 1 site is added to PAN or has a changed management regime to maximize refugia or resiliency to climate change. At least one site provides benefits for women or marginalized populations	100%	Representation: The PAN follows ecosystem-based planning principles and captures at least 1 key ecosystem from ridge to reef. There are sites with 1) Upland forest, 2) Limestone forest, 3) Streams, 4) Atoll forest, 5) Savanna, 6) Mangrove, 7) Beach, 8) Seagrass bed, 9) Coral reef (channels, Spawning & Aggregation Sites, L1outer reef, inner reef, and patch reefs), 10) Mudflat, 11) Swamp forest, 12) Wetland/Marsh, and 13) Marine lakes. New sites: Meriir was added to PAN specifically as a long-term resilient sea turtle nesting site; and 3 sites in Ngatpang were added for coral, seagrass, and mangrove conservation specifically to reduce vulnerabilities from climate change. Benefits for women and marginalized people: Ngatpang's sites were added specifically to benefit women gleaners and the nearby rural communities who rely on these resources. Meriir benefits an outlying, underserved population in the Southwest Islands.	S
	1.1.4. Total hectares of marine and terrestrial area projected	21 PAN Sites in 13 states; 23,000 hectares marine PAN sites and 4200 hectares terrestrial PAN Sites	2 new or expanded PAN sites.	25 PAN sites; PAN coverage expanded by 95,000 hectare marine and 6,300 hectares terrestrial (138,000 marine and 10,500 terrestrial, total)	80%	39 PAN Sites TOTAL OF: 4,068 hectares of terrestrial land in the PAN (includes mangrove). PAN is working with Peleliu to nominate the Forest of Hope (2.7 hectares) to the PAN. Altogether Palau has over 10,260 hectares of terrestrial conservation area in legislated, community-based, or traditionally-decreed protected areas, or 25% of total land. 121,400 hectares of marine (including estuary). PAN is working with Peleliu to nominate the Lkes Sandflats Important Bird Area (311 hectares), Blil a Aol (Milkfish) Aquaculture Pond (6.3 hectares), and Techakl mangrove (10 hectares); and with Koror to nominate Ngederrak Reef (580 hectares). Altogether Palau has over 195,900 hectares of nearshore marine (above 100 meters depth) conservation area in legislated, community-based, or traditionally-decreed protected areas, or 68% of total nearshore marine area. By EQPB regulation, all riparian areas on 60 feet of both sides of all permanent streams are now protected, equivalent to 1,460 hectares of new terrestrial conservation area.	MS
	1.1.5. Percentage of endemic and endangered species covered by PAN	Current baseline unknown - many ecosystems and species are protected, but gaps are unknown	List of key ecosystems and map of locations developed. List of endangered species developed. List of recorded endemic species developed. Baseline estimates for existing protection of species are developed.	Combined, PAN sites and protect 100% of endangered megafauna and trees and an increasing percentage (by year) of endangered microfauna and flora. Combined, PAN sites protect at least 1 known occurrence of each recorded endemic species, or coverage of known endemic species increases significantly from start to end of project.	100%	The 2015 PAN Status report notes that 100% of Palau's endangered megafauna are covered in PAN sites. A proposed list of endangered and threatened species has been developed and regulations are in development. All of the IUCN Red Listed species are known to occur in at least 1 PAN site or protected area: - Dugong – Northern Reefs - Whales – Palau National Marine Sanctuary (PNMS) - Dolphins – Northern Reefs - Sea Turtles – Ngeruangel, Ngerukewid, Merir, Helen - Bigeye Tuna – PNMS - Bumphead Parrotfish, Napoleon Wrasse, Coral Grouper, Parrotfish, Seahorses, Sharks, and Rays – Northern Reefs, Helen Reef, Ngeruangel, Ngerukewid - Giant Clams – Ngemai, Ngederrak - Acropora coral – Ilyakl beluu, Ngelukes - Sheath-tailed bat – Ngerderrar, OSCA, Ngardok - Fruit Bats – All 10 terrestrial PAN sites - Skink – Ngeremeskang, Ngardok - Megapode – Mesekelat, Ngardok, Ngeremeskang - Pigeon and other forest birds – all 10 terrestrial PAN sites Maps of endangered trees and Important Forest Areas were developed to identify locations of threatened and endemic terrestrial plants. Approximately 30% of endangered trees are protected in conservation areas. However, with conservation zoning (as part of land use planning), that rises to around 70%. About 25% of Important Forest Areas are protected by terrestrial conservation areas, but with zoning, that rises also to 70%. 100% of endemic birds are covered in Palau's terrestrial PAN sites.	MS

	Indicator	Baseline	Mid-term target	End target	%	Status / Narrative	Rating
	1.2.1. Stakeholder management capacity	Management capacity is limited.		Increasing stakeholder management capacity; Number of conservation staff increases; Number of individuals receiving training increases;	100%	Prior to Covid (which contracted the economy including funding available for conservation staff), 81 State Stakeholder staff (Conservation Officers, Rangers) and 14 National Government/NGO staff were directly funded by PAN. Koror State had an additional 53 Rangers paid outside of PAN, and other states had an additional 15-20 employees paid with non-PAN funds. Due to Covid, staffing decreased. The number of stakeholders receiving training is approximately 100 individuals receiving regular training on topics such as communications, wildfire prevention and response, watershed management and restoration, enforcement, invasive species, work planning. Trainings are held 6+ times per year. Training programs have reached around 95% of system-wide Rangers, higher than prior to the project. Bringing in off-island expertise to augment local expertise to reach more local stakeholders. Per the 2015 PAN Site Status report, staffing was Fair to Good (with no sites ranked as poor). National Scorecard on National and State Management Capacity continues to show gradual improvement. National Stakeholders increased their score from 22 to 38 (out of 45) between 2018 and 2023; and the State average score increased from 15 to 42 (out of 60). These scores measure a wide variety of capacity including training, resourcing, authorities, and support.	MS
	1.2.2. Public perception of PAN/MPAs (% support)	Inconsistent support and understanding of PAN at state and community levels; levels of support and reach unknown. States to be targeted (and total stakeholder population) to be determined during Inception Phase. Baseline level of % support, number of people currently active to be determined during Inception Phase.	Initial results of public perception surveys show increasing trend in support	At least 80% of stakeholder population in 8 states exposed to new PAN information. % of public supporting PAN/MPAs increased from baseline to finish.	100%	Every State has received outreach on PAN via national and state events, plus PAN outreach was integrated with Presidential State Visits ensuring high-level visibility and reaching the majority of adults in each State. PAN has hosted multiple conferences including a Traditional Leadership Forum, reaching 300+ persons each time. PAN's community events reaching the public are regular (1x month). Per the 2019 SOE, and summarizing socioeconomic assessments across sites in the PAN it appears that support for PAN is high, with 78% of all respondents aware of PAN and 87% aware of their own state's protected areas. PICRC did a comprehensive survey on PAN perceptions of 1,234 people, finding that more than 75% of the population supported PAN sites. For terrestrial conservation areas, 48-60% of respondents said that their conservation areas provided STRONG livelihood, economic, and environmental benefits, and another 32-41 said they provided moderate benefits. There were concerns about cultural benefits and equity. Perceptions of marine protected areas was even stronger, with 48-67% saying their MPAs provided strong benefits in all areas, with no areas of high concern. The 2015 PAN Status report found that PAN Sites are also performing well with regards to Socioeconomic PAME scores and Stakeholder Engagement (Figure 19). More than 50% of sites are performing adequately or better in these areas. The majority of PAN sites are reporting adequate or better public involvement, awareness, representation in decisionmaking, participation in planning, education and outreach, and feedback mechanisms.	S
	1.2.3. Number of conflicts between PAN and SLM	Zero (0) Palau-based crowd sourced data and documentation of PAN/SLM conflicts.		Conflicts between PAN and SLM reduced.	100%	There have been no reported conflicts between SLM and PAN. The Sustainable Land Management process, particularly land use planning, has uncovered even stronger support for conservation, with 41% of the entire country's land zoned for non-exhaustive use (conservation, watershed protection, and historic preservation zoning).	S
	1.2.4. Status of revenue assessment	PAN depends heavily on Green Fee; long-term sustainability could be impacted by global economic fluctuations. Of 21 sites, over 80% (17) are reliant on Green Fee for over 90% of budget.	At least 1 state shows increased resiliency to economic fluctuations (indicators to be determined by METT, e.g. Staff turnover, % of management plan implemented)	Financial sustainability of PAN is improved; Funding portfolio is increasingly diversified in at least 3 sites. Exclusive reliance on Green Fee reduced (only 13 sites reliant on Green Fee for majority of budget; Green Fee provides less than 70% of budget). Dollar amount raised from conservation from diversified streams increases yearly. (Ngchesar,	100%	Financial sustainability improved for 9 states through a variety of techniques including Investments, Eco-tourism, and Grants. - 4 States now have a fully operational IPP program investing their funds (Melekeok, Aimeliik, Ngardmau, Ngarchelong). - 4 states have eco-tourism plans designed to increase sustainability through diversification (Melekeok, Aimeliik, Ngardmau, Ngiwal) - 5 additional states have income from visitor fees (Ngarchelong, Airai, Ngeremlengui, Koror, and Peleliu). - Several states have successfully accessed grant funds (directly or through partners) for their PAN Site (Hatohobei, Aimeliik, Ngardmau, Ngarchelong, Ngeremlengui). Only 6 states: Ngchesar, Ngiwal, Ngatpang, Ngaraard, Kayangel, Angaur are exclusively reliant on the Green Fee (reduced from 13). Due to Covid and low eco-tourism, the other states are still receiving more than 70% of their income from the Green Fee. The total amount of money coming in from diversified sources is showing an upward trend.	S
	1.2.5. GEF METT (Objective 1, Section III) Financial Sustainability Scores raised on meeting agendas	GEF METT Financial Sustainability Score Total = 30% out of desired 100%. (Component 1, Legal frameworks score = 38%; Component 2, Business planning = 36%; Component 3, PA Revenue Generation = 17%)	Total GEF METT Financial Sustainability Score improves by at least 20%.	Total GEF METT Financial Sustainability Score improves by at least 50% (For a final score of at least 45).	100%	Legal frameworks scorecard = 73% Business Planning scorecard = 68% PA Revenue Generation = 42% Total score = 62% Overall the project improved by double (62% from 30%).	S

Outcome 2

	Indicator	Baseline	Target (mid)	Target (end)	%	Description	Rating
2.1 Improved and effective planning, alignment, and coordination of the Palau SLM Policy	2.1.1. Existence of National SLM Action Plan	Zero (no National SLM Action Plan exists)	National SLM Action Plan drafted and agreed.		100%	Palau SLM Action Plan, entitled "State-Driven Sustainable Land Management: Igniting Prosperity & Sustainable Development in Palau 2021-2031" was completed in 2021 and updated in 2023. The SLM Action Plan operationalizes the high-level policy guidance found in the Palau SLM Policy. Actions for this 10-year period are aimed at building capacity for mainstreaming of National policies into State land use plans, as well as incorporation of climate change, water management, agriculture, stormwater, and sustainable tourism into state land plans.	S
	2.1.2. Number of actions implemented from National SLM Action Plan			Number of actions from National SLM Action Plan increases (yearly)	100%	This plan has been implemented in partnership with the GEF6 project. The number of actions implemented has increased annually since 2021 when the plan was completed, going from 3 actions implemented regularly to 11 actions implemented on an ongoing basis. In 2021, the primary actions included: 1) a gap analysis of state laws; 2) the creation of an inter-state coordination body; and 3) development of best practices. Since then, the majority of activities have been implemented in some way: 1) Gap analysis leading to development of new state laws mandating land use planning; 2) Planning Commissions organized in all 10 states on Babeldaob plus Peleliu, plus 4 other planning unites; 3) Ongoing capacity building; 4) Continuation of the Joint Coordination Body; 5) Creation of numerous communications platforms (online, in person meetings, and email listservs); 6) Training on zoning and Climate-resilient land use planning; 6) Forestry land restoration guidelines created and used; 7) Land restoration projects undertaken; 8) Expansion of climate-smart agriculture (such as livestock and cover crops); 9) Special management zone planning; 10) Green Boots land-based tourism guidelines; and 11) Introduction of Nature-based solutions.	MS
	2.1.3. Number of public mandates requiring PAN/SLM linkages; Degree of alignment between PAN and SLM documents	Baseline is zero for Public Mandates	MNRET issues written mandate that PAN and SLM are to be integrated. Assessment report on the coordination process completed.	Degree of alignment (number of sections that match in each document; number of conflicts) increases yearly.	100%	National PAN Management Plan standards require PAN sites to align with the National SLM Policy, Climate Change Policy, Sustainable Forest Management Policy, and NBSAP, ensuring alignment between PAN sites and overall land management. All 10 states on Babeldoab plus Koror and Peleliu (total of 11) have passed state legislation mandating a State Master Plan and Land Use Plan that incorporates multiple sectors, including protected areas and other economic development areas. 1 state (Melekeok) has started the mainstreaming process to ensure that their PAN Site Plan is aligned to their state Master Plan. They identified redundancies and gaps and are resolving any conflicts.	MS
	2.1.4. GEF METT (Objective 2, Part V, #6) Score for Policy and Regulatory Frameworks	GEF METT Score baseline is 9 (out of desired 24)	GEF METT Score improves by at least 20%.	GEF METT Score improves by at least 66% (to at least 15 out of 24).	100%	The score is 18 out of 15 due to significant improvement in the legal frameworks for fisheries and tourism during the project time period. There were also improvements in biosecurity, which impacts agriculture and forestry. Some gaps do remain for agriculture and fisheries, and with enforcement and monitoring of enforcement.	MS
2.2. Increased implementation of the SLM Policy in the key sectors of land use planning, land uses, and tourism development.	2.2.1. Number of violations in forests	Reported violations for forests unknown; to be determined during Inception Phase. 100% of terrestrial conservation areas negatively impacted by fires; Baseline for all other indicators to be determined during Inception Phase or by METT.	At least 1 PAN Site with no fires for 1 year;	Number of reported terrestrial violations (including fire) declines yearly;	100%	In 2022 there were no fires in terrestrial PAN sites, and the few fires that did break out were outside PAN sites. The PAN network and Division of Forestry have implemented a Wildfire Prevention Program. See online fire map through 2020: https://arcg.is/1OPzaq The number of fires declined from highs in 2015-2016: 2022: 14 2021: 177 (although lowest percent of land burned since 2012). 2020: 103 2019: 102 2018: 140 2017: 123 2016: 319 2015: 299 2014: 70 2013: 159 2012: 73	S
	2.2.2. Number of trained tourism professionals with terrestrial expertise		At least 1 cohort trained in Terrestrial conservation (12 people);	Number of trained terrestrial experts increases yearly (minimum of 36);	100%	The number of people trained and the diversity of topics covered has steadily increased, although Covid did lead to a slowdown in number of people trained. - 70 state and PAN employees have been trained in terrestrial biodiversity through PAN. - A cohort of 6 people were trained in eco-tourism via a Study tour in Japan and additional state staff have been trained in customer management and eco-tourism in Aimeliik, Ngatpang, Ngardmau, and Ngaraard via a co-financed Babeldaob Island Community-Based Eco-Tour Program (BCET). - 12 Individuals were trained in aspects and land use planning and zoning, including management of special management zones and short-term vacation rentals. - Staff from Ngardok, Aimeliik, Ngardmau, and Ngiwal received training via eco-tourism planning. - Koror State continues to offer its Tour Guide Training Certification Program, and all new Tour Guides operating in Koror must pass. The training program includes best practices for Rock Island terrestrial and beach habitats. - The Bureau of Tourism offers a Tour Operators License Program that requires all operators to be re-licensed annually. It offers a manual and covers multiple topics, including a) Green Fins (best practices for marine), b) Green Boots (best practices on land); c) Sunscreen regulations; d) Pandemic safety; e) Boat safety; f) Plastic minimization; g) Palau Business Pledge.	S

	2.2.3. Number of non-Koror tourist opportunities		At least 1 state with increased revenue from non- Koror tourism.	Desirability of non-Koror tourism (dollars spent, number of visitors) increases yearly	100%	Every state between Kayangel and Angaur has an accessible tourism site, and the number of developed tourism products on Babeladoab has increased significantly with new trails, waterfalls, cultural sites, beach parks, and mangrove walks, in addition to local food experiences and aquaculture tours. Even in Koror there are now non-marine tourism sites. TOTAL Products: 41 Kayangel: 1 (beach/homestay) Ngarchelong: 3 (todai, badrulchau, mangrove walk) Ngaraard: 4 (Ngerutechei, Kuabes, Obakelderau, Stone paths) Ngardmau: 1 (Waterfall) Ngiwal: 2 (Beach, Cultural sites) Ngeremlengui: 6 (Ngerutechei, Hodai, Pineapple farm, Fighter plane, beach, Waterfall) Melekeok: 3 (Ngardok, Bai, Beach) Ngatpang: 3 (Ngimis, Aquaculture farm, Waterfall) Ngchesar: 3 (Waterfall, Cultural Sites, Tabrengesang) Aimeliik: 4 (Ngerderrar, Terraces, Malsol's tomb, Bai) Airai: 4 (Bai, Aquaculture facility, Japanese headquarters, Local food experience) Peleliu: 7 (Japanese WWII sites, US WWII sites, Forest of Hope/Lookout, Ngermelt, beaches, Japanese Peace Monument, Museum) Angaur: 1 However, because of the global downturn in tourism and border closure due to Covid, actual number of tourists and revenues generated are far below normal.	MS
	2.2.4. Type and extent of negative environmental impacts			4 states have stable or decreasing environmental impact from tourism	100%	Koror has implemented numerous measures to reduce impacts from tourism including requiring life jackets/prohibiting fins in jellyfish lake, enforcing reef-safe sunscreen regulations, enforcing "no plastic" requirements, instituting sign-ups for certain Rock Islands (in line with capacity asssessments), improving trails to reduce erosion, and creating new non-marine tourism products. Ngardmau improved the steep part of its trail to the Taki Waterfall to reduce erosion from hikers and installed boardwalks in wetland areas to minimize damage to the adjacent forest and reduce erosion and habitat destruction. Ngardmau also replanted areas that had been previously occupied by abandoned tourism structures like huts and zipline towers as they moved towards a more eco-tourism model. Ngchesar improved a trail to the Mesekelat waterfall to include paving in high-erosion areas, bridges over streams, and boardwalks over muddy areas prone to sedimentation. Melekeok installed boardwalks in wetland areas and installed signage to increase awareness of biodiversity and reduce breakage and poaching of native orchids. Peleliu improved a trail in the Forest of Hope to keep visitors on the trail and out of sensitive areas, avoided altering the pathway with any cement, installed signage to avoid transporting invasive species, and installed signage to increase awareness of biodiversity and cultural links.	MS
	2.2.5. Number of dollars generated by non-Koror tourism			4 states have increasing revenue generation from tourism	100%	Overall the impact of Covid means that tourism dollars are lower than before, but since the project started several states outside of Koror have been able to successfully raise income through eco-tourism, including 1) Ngarchelong – cultural sites and sportsfishing/diving, 2) Ngardmau – waterfall, 3) Ngchesar – waterfall, 4) Melekeok – Ngardok Trail, cultural sites, and beach, 5) Peleliu – WWII sites plus biodiversity sites, 6) Ngeremlengui – Bird Sanctuary. There is no definitive data on revenues collected.	MS
	2.2.6. Number of land use plans	3 states with incomplete land use plans;		4 states with full land use plans	100%	11 States have full land use plans (Kayangel, 9 States on Babeldaob, plus Peleliu). Koror has an old land use plan that it is updating. In addition, there are numerous Best Practices and Action Plans for specific sites and situations, such as forest restoration of bare and eroding areas, a new Forest Action Plan for high value forests, Watershed rehabilitation and protection plans, and climate-resilient subdivision and housing development that uses native plant landscaping.	S

	Indicator	Baseline	Mid-term	Target	%	Narrative		Rating
	2.2.7. Water quality	Exact baseline for biochemical parameters to be established during Inception Phase	Baseline biochemical indicator status established	Stable or improving water quality tests in 100% of states with land use plans or utilizing best practices	100%	Water quality has increased in rural states with land use planning and using best practices both to decrease sedimentation and to treat water. Since 2010 the proportion of samples with fecal coliform has decreased steadily. Turbidity (NTU) has also declined steadily. Those states that fail compliance tests are correlated with poor land quality. A study of States draining into Ngeremeduu Bay found that Ngardmau's water system average NTU was 1.26, lower than Aimeliik's average of 6.2 NTU. Aimeliik has more unpaved roads, more bare land, more agriculture, and repeated fires. Ngardmau has more forest and has invested in fire prevention, with the result of improved water quality.		MS
	2.2.8. Farm productivity; Area of reforestation /rehabilitation			At least 1 farm maintains or increases productivity (dollars, output, or levels of effort) using Best Agricultural Practices; Area of reforestation or forest rehabilitation increased from start to end	100%	Covid spurred growth in local agricultural production. There has been explosive growth in new farms, most of which are helped to establish by the Bureau of Agriculture and thus follow best practices such as contour cropping, integrated pest management, and cultivation of traditional crops using traditional knowledge. The Bureau of Agriculture finally established a baseline value for production: 500,000 kg of local foods and vegetables produced per year. Based on financial estimates, in the past decade the reliance on imported food has fallen from 85% to 80%.		S
	2.2.9.9. Perceptions of food security	Exact baseline for socioeconomic parameters to be established during Inception Phase	Baseline socioeconomic indicator status established	Responses to socioeconomic surveys show increasing positive perceptions of food security from start to finish of project	100%	A socioeconomic survey on food security was not completed. However, 100% of State Master Plans have included food security goals and objectives, and the national development plan includes increasing food security through local agriculture and fisheries mainstreamed throughout. The Pandemic made it very clear that Palau is food insecure. A national campaign was launched to grow support and awareness for food security (#Keled A Ngercheled: Our Food is Our Responsibility). MAFE formed a cross-Ministry Task Force to tackle issues highlighted in a National Food Systems Pathway document.		MS
	2.2.10. Number and types of "hotspots" protected		"Hotspots" identified	Number of unprotected "hotspots" increases from start to finish	100%	Altogether Palau has 67 protected areas, up from 60 at the start of the project. 39 of these are in PAN. Together they cover 68% of nearshore marine areas, 33% of mangroves, 16% of streams, 100% of freshwater lakes, and 25% of terrestrial area. All of Palau's freshwater lakes are protected, 35% of Important Bird Areas are protected, and 100% of all riparian areas are protected, either through laws or water quality regulations. Partners have created maps to show "hotspots" based on: - Important Forest Areas - Important Bird Areas (IBA) - Locations of endangered trees - Locations of nesting turtles - Locations with high populations of endangered Megapodes - High coral diversity - High Live Coral Cover - Spawning Aggregations - Unique biodiversity or natural features - Cultural sites - Climate resilient sites These were then targeted to ensure that at least one or more sites were protected. Since the project started, new community-based protected areas have been created to include: - Peleliu Lkes Sandflat (IBA) - Ngeremlengui Ngeremeskang (Important Forests and Endangered Trees) - Peleliu Blil at Aol Milkfish pond (cultural site) - Kayangel Ngeriungs (IBA and Megapodes) - Sonsorol Fanna Island (IBA) - Peleliu Forest of Hope (Important Forest, Endangered trees, and cultural sites) - Peleliu Techakl mangrove (climate resilience) - Sonsorol Meriir – Nesting turtles Representatives of all of these 11 hotspot habitats are protected in one or more protected area (whether legislated, community-based, or declared by traditional law). The PAN is working to protect these community-based sites formally in the PAN, but these are protected through community protection regimes. Only 1 state with a hotspot – Angaur due to presence of megapodes – is not protected in any way, although megapodes are protected elsewhere.		MS
Outcome 3								
3.1: Effective coordination role by the Office of Environmental Response and Coordination (OERC) (or designated government agency) for this Project and environmental actions in Palau, including through facilitating information-sharing and two-way learning and thereby ensuring benefit sharing among a wide population.	3.1.1.MNRET Capacity (# staff, expertise, partnerships)	MNRET is currently the agency responsible for Coordinating implementation of environmental policy, but the agency lacks capacity to oversee implementation of multiple national environmental policies.	MNRET needs assessment completed; Strategic plan updated;	Capacity of MNRET significantly increased (# staff, levels of expertise).	80%	MAFE completed a Needs Assessment and updated its organizational Strategic Plan. The global economic slowdown and Covid led to a contraction in Palau's economy and staffing shortages throughout the country. The number of staff at MAFE has declined from around 120 in 2020 (not counting Biosecurity staff) to around 60 in 2022 and rising to 71 in 2023. In 2021 an estimated 66% of listed positions were empty; these are being slowly filled. Recently the Ministry has onboarded new staff with college degrees and graduate degrees and accessed technical expertise from bilateral partners, raising capacity in key areas such as project management, veterinary science, livestock husbandry, mangrove/forest management, grantwriting, communications, fisheries, aquaculture, and more. A National Scorecard on the ability of national government to manage holistically across landscape/seascape found raised capacity from 16 to 50 (out of 63) from the start to the end of the project.		MU

	Indicator	Baseline	Target	End of Project Target	%	Comments	Rating
	3.1.2. Convention reporting	Agency is understaffed and behind on many MEA convention outputs.	Staffing needs identified; Qualified staff hired and trained	Overall convention reporting performance (number of reports submitted, on-time performance) increases. Number of partners assisting with convention reporting and project reporting increases from start to finish of project.	100%	According to a SPREP 2020 State of the Environment Report, Palau was responsible for reporting to 12 MEA conventions. In 2020, Palau was up to date on 50% of those reports (SDG VNR, CBD, CITES, Ramsar, UNFCCC, UNCCD). It was behind on: CMS/Bonn, World Heritage, Basel, Stockholm, Waigani, Noumea. Those reports that MAFE was responsible for were updated on time (CMS was updated in 2017 but still needs to make up for past missing reports).	MU
	3.1.3. Number of mechanisms created or used for information sharing			At least 1 new information sharing mechanism created and used; Number and type of documents increased significantly from start to end of project; # downloads increases yearly; Geographic reach increases from start to finish of project;	100%	2 new information sharing platforms are being used, and 1 existing one has updated information: 1. New Palau Biodiversity Project (GEF6) website stores documents or links to other locations such as SPREP and the Palau Climate Change Portal. 2. The Palau Environment Data Portal (hosted by SPREP) stores documents (an outcome of the INFORM project). 3. The Palau Government website is updated more regularly with MAFE documents.	MS
	3.1.4. Number and type of organizations and individuals participating in two-way learning and information sharing	Knowledge sharing between agencies and across sectors is inconsistent. Current mechanisms include infrequent Conservation Consortium meetings and emailed document reviews	Number of two-way learning opportunities increased across at least 4 topics (sustainable agriculture, animal waste, earth moving, water resources)	At least 80% of stakeholders participating in two-way learning and information sharing.	100%	Partners consistently offer training workshops at least every month. PAN itself offers workshops 6x year, and Partners offer public events approximately 1x month. Audiences targeted vary significantly based on topic, to include: 1) Rangers, 2) Coordinators, 3) Technical Agency and NGO staff, 4) Leadership forums, 5) Public forums, 6) Traditional leadership forums, 7) youth, 8) Elderly. Gender mainstreaming and Public outreach is integrated into all grant applications through the NEPC's coordination process. BOA offers regular extension services on sustainable agriculture, training around 100 farmers per year (together with partners such as Taiwan Technical Farm, NGOs, and Cooperatives). BOA has also done regular extension on dry-litter piggeries and EQPB inspects piggeries, conducting outreach on permit conditions and best practices for animal waste. New facilities to support chicken and egg farming include integrated waste management systems (with manure, mulching, composting, and biogas systems reducing the amount of animal waste entering the environment to almost zero). EQPB runs workshops annually on earthmoving regulations, and offered several special workshops when it updated its earthmoving regulations. The Bureau of Environment holds trainings regularly for foresters to learn best practices for reforestation to maintain water quality. BOE also conducted training on water quality and quantity. Post-Covid the majority of these trainings are now in-person, allowing for two-way learning.	MS
3.2: Effective national and state coordination of PAN, SLM and associated cross-sector issues	3.2.1. Number of documents undergoing PAN/SLM/Cross-sector review	Baseline is zero	Coordination review process and checklist or criteria to review areas of alignment created, agreed, and under use.	By the end of project, at least 90% of documents produced in Palau (plans, policies, strategies, SOPs, regulations) by one of the members of the GEF 5 Project Steering Committee or related stakeholder goes through a coordination Review	100%	The NEPC developed a coordinated grant review process, but it was struggling to implement in a formal manner. Instead, partners were consistently relying on a participatory process involving high consultation (e.g. reaching 30-40 people or 80%+ of experts in any given field). A sampling of recently produced documents indicates that 100% of them were produced through a participatory process with input from PAN and SLM stakeholders. These include: 1. National Environmental Management Strategy (50+ reviewers from 11 sectors including land, water, biodiversity, urban) 2. GEF8 Concept Note (Food and tourism sectors) 3. 14 State Master Plans (200 planning team members representing all sectors of society)	MS
	3.2.2. Number of competing objectives addressed and resolved			By the end of project, at least 90% of documents produced in Palau (plans, policies, strategies, SOPs, regulations) by one of the members of the GEF 5 Project Steering Committee or related stakeholder goes through a coordination Review and shows positive alignment with PAN/SLM/Cross-Sector issues and has no competing objectives.	100%	Cross-sector review has not found any competing objectives, but rather reduces redundancies to improve cost-effectiveness and fills in gaps. For instance, stakeholder participation in the Palau Development Plan aligned housing and tourism in terms of cultural goals and filled in gaps in biodiversity projection in the agriculture and fisheries sector plans.	MU
	3.2.3. Number of cross-sector violations (e.g. earth moving), species plans, and threats			Number of earthmoving Violations decreased from start to finish of project. Number of cross-sector species management activities increased from start to finish. Number and extent of cross-sector threats decline	100%	EQPB's Earthmoving Permit violation rate at the start of the project was 15%. In recent years the rate has been 3-4%. Active cross-sector species management is in place for the most endangered species: 1. Hawksbill Sea Turtles (enforcement and confiscation of products, outreach, cultural inventories) 2. Micronesian Megapodes (surveys, eradications, transplacement) 3. Parkia parvifolia Tree (monitoring, planting and propagation, protection)	MS

Outcome 4

3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs (Implementation Progress)

Output	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2022 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2023 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	EA: Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	TM: Progress rating
Under Comp 1					
1.1.1. IMPROVED DESIGN: A national PAN Management Strategy and Action Plan is developed and endorsed by 2017; and the National and associated State Plans 1) align with SLM in the 4 core areas and with regional projects such as R2R, 2) engage all 16 states, and 3) cover gaps and ensure representative coverage of sites, species and ecosystem functions, and 4) address the applicability of national, regional, and global goals and benefit-sharing	September 2023 (Sonsorol); March 2024 (Melekeok, Ngatpang, Ngiwal); October 2023 (Forest protocol writeup).	80%	90%	PAN Office reverted to an institutional strategy rather than a network strategy after feedback from stakeholders indicated it would be more appropriate, however they are also targeting specific hotspots so it retains a Network relevance. The PAN Strategy includes an Action Plan and is being implemented, and was endorsed by MAFE's Minister. The Strategy aligns with the 4 core area, has ensure there are no gaps, and through the Green Fee implements a benefit-sharing model between national government and state governments. As of 2022, 8 PAN Site Management Plans had been updated to reflect new information in the PAN Strategy and other emerging SLM documents, and 4 more are being updated. As of 2022, all PAN MPAs had been assessed for baseline ecological and socioeconomic surveys, in partnership with PICRC. The Forest Inventory Assessment is 95% complete for forested PAN Sites, with data available and analysis is ongoing. Ongoing outreach about effective management was continual. Taxonomic assessments were conducted by PICRC and BNM, however there are still gaps in the consolidation reports and gap analysis.	MS
1.1.2. IMPROVED EVALUATION: Management Effectiveness Tracking Tools (METT): agree on a set of 3 harmonized national and state level PAN site monitoring and evaluation tools and protocols (1 marine, 1 terrestrial, 1 socio-economic) which are aligned with METT, with full trial and evaluation of Palau's METT tool in at least 9 PAN sites by the end of the project.	October 2023 (Forest protocol writeup); September 2023 (PAME); Analysis for a score by December.	90%	95%	Partners have localized 6+ sets of monitoring and evaluation protocols: marine, forest bird, shorebird, forest inventory, PAME, and socioeconomic, and were working on a mangrove protocol as well. All tools have been trialed, and every PAN site has been tested for at least 2 tools depending on its characteristics. At least one baseline report was produced for each protocol. The Forest Inventory Protocol underlying data but the protocol needs the last piece of writing and putting all pieces together, but is in use (e.g. data collection sheets are done). Rangers have been trained in marine and terrestrial protocols for regular data collection. The existing 39 PAN sites have all been mapped. The PAN Status Report in 2015 reported on the PAME, which estimated the level of effective management based on all protocols; it is being repeated now to allow for detection of change over time. Community-based monitoring is ongoing in the Northern Reefs to measure the species and size of all fish caught. According to data analysis, fishermen in the Northern Reefs haveshifted towards more pelagic fish and larger fish (both desirable).	S
1.1.3. Output 1.1.3: IMPROVED IMPLEMENTATION: At least 4 PAN sites meet a minimum METT score, and at least 5 other sites show improving trends toward effective conservation (e.g. reduction in over/illegal harvesting) by the end of the project and total area protected	Completed	100%	100%	8 PAN Sites have been through updated management planning to incorporate results of baseline assessments and 4 more are being updated. Far more than 5 new sites were added to PAN - from the start of the project to the end 18 new sites became PAN Sites, with several more under nomination. Because the PAME is only now being repeated, it is not yet possible to show a single improving METT score. However, several sites are showing improving conditions: 1. Ngeremeskang Bird Sanctuary – increased pigeon population 2. Ngardok Nature Reserve – increased forest health, stable water quality, decreasing invasive species 3. Northern Reefs – Increased fish biomass, SPR, sizes 4. Ngardmau Ngermasech – Increased invertebrate population and Taki - decreased bare area and decreased fires 5. Ngchesar Mesekelat – Increased forest health, stable water quality, decreased bare area 6. Koror Ngerumekaol – increased invertebrates 7. Ngeremlengui Bkulengriil – Increased invertebrates 8. Ngardmau Ileaklbeluu – Increased coral cover 9. Kayangel – Ngeruangel – Increased population structure (increased herbivory)	S
1.2.1. IMPROVED ENGAGEMENT: An outreach program reaching at least 80% of stakeholders in 8 states results in communities that are measurably more aware and supportive of PAN and increasing active participation in management of PAN sites.	September 2023 (Final Communications Strategy)	85%	99%	Stakeholders in 12 States were engaged via socioeconomic surveys, which feature two-way learning in addition to validated data collection. Communications about PAN are continual, targeted to appropriate stakeholders. In the last year public events have started again after Covid, and thus partners have been conducting regular public engagement about PAN sites. PICRC reaches nearly 100% of elementary school children annually to discuss marine conservation. eBird continues, and another crowdsourced database (iNaturalist) is also actively in use. The entire MOE Science curriculum was revamped for Freshman Science during the project period to include new information about conservation and Palau's environment and launched in 2019. PICRC and MOE have a MOU for PICRC to deliver marine conservation content, and they feature Palau-specific biodiversity and island ecosystem topics in their curriculum. Socioeconomic surveys show consistently high awareness of PAN (78%-92%). PICRC did a comprehensive survey on PAN perceptions of 1,234 people, finding that more than 75% of the population supported PAN sites. In a 2020 MAFE survey, 62% of respondents had participated in terrestrial conservation activities. BNM continues to publish an annual State of the Birds report using crowdsourced and Ranger-collected eBird data. PAN has a YouTube Channel: https://www.youtube.com/@PalauPAN and put out recent videos about PAN's sustainable finance mechanism: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XfuMgjmmbFw and PAN's environmental benefits: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hKOfcknovRY. An updated PAN Communications Plan has been drafted and is already under implementation while it seeks final review.	MS
1.2.2. IMPROVED TRAINING: The number of trained, certified PAN Staff increases by at least 15 and benefits some marginalized populations in outlying states	Completed	75%	100%	At least 70 individual PAN Rangers have been trained, most attending repeated and diverse training seminars and workshops. PAN has an MOU with the Ministry of Justice to deliver combined enforcement training through a Policy Academy Certification Course. 25 individuals were certified through this course. PAN staff at MAFE received specific training for relevant topics. Rangers from outlying states have benefitted from trainings, both through delivery on-site and by supporting their attendance in Koror. PCC offers a ecological monitoring course, developed in partnership with PICRC, and is attended by PAN Rangers. PAN Coordinators are receiving training in the PAME so they can complete it in their own states. Regular training includes project management, work planning, etc.	S

1.2.3. IMPROVED FINANCING: PAN revenue generation assessment from local and non-local sources at project inception (baseline) and project end show diversified financial support at the national and state levels and alignment with regional programs such as the Micronesia Challenge, and benefits are shared widely with gender and environmental safeguards in place	September 2023 (Final Communications Strategy to include SFM)	90%	99%	PAN Sustainable Financing Plan (SFP) was assessed and updated to include options for diversifying PAN income, and to align with the Micronesia Challenge which has ecosystem-wide targets and thus requires sustainable land management (SLM) as well. The Investment Partnership Program (IPP) was developed to help State Governments diversify income and being implemented in 4 states, and new income streams were incorporated into eco-tourism plans. The PAN Communications Plan currently being updated with SFP will also include the new Micronesia Challenge targets. SFP endorsed by PAN Board. Gender and social safeguards were incorporated into planning, such as targeting women food producers for market development. Youth are being targeted via a PAN Ambassadors Program. Environmental safeguards are in place via Management Plan and PAN Network criteria.		MS
Under Comp 2						
2.1.1. IMPROVED PLANNING: A National SLM Action Plan that incorporates ecosystem-based management (such as R2R), includes updated sustainable financing information and goals, addresses cross-sector issues such as SFM and Climate Change, considers benefits across genders and marginalized communities, and aligns with the PAN designed and agreed	30-Dec-23	80%	100%	The SLM Action Plan was completed in 2021 and updated in 2023 to incorporate emerging knowledge about Nature-Based Solutions as a climate adaptation. It operationalizes the National SLM Policy and focuses the first 10 years worth of actions on institutional capacity building and enabling conditions, in addition to capitalizing on activities with momentum such as climate-resilient forestry. The Action Plan includes a section on sustainable finance and analyzes innovative funding mechanisms. Climate change is integrated throughout, both as an underlying risk principle as well as targeting specific mitigation and adaptation actions. The Plan includes principles and actions to align with SFM and PAN and to ensure equitable gender and social benefits.		MS
2.1.2 IMPROVED COORDINATION: A national coordinating mechanism and body for SLM with representatives from at least 6 sectors and levels of government is operational and includes associated capacity building and resourcing to ensure its function	Completed	75%	100%	The National Environmental Protection Board (NEPC) continues to act as the umbrella cross-sector advisory body for all environmental management (https://sites.google.com/view/nepcpalau). It is comprised of the heads of all environmental agencies (10+ agencies) plus representatives from other ministries, with MAFE as the Chair. The NEPC implements a grant review process to ensure that large projects meet stakeholder needs. The NEPC creates subcommittees as needed, or relies on its Secretariat to ensure that smaller projects and policies are participatory in nature. Participatory approaches are employed exclusively for land planning, which reaches across multiple sectors and which must involve national to state coordination. Through the GEF6 project, States have developed a Joint Coordination Body which acts to align land use plans across ecosystems and borders, with MAFE as the Secretariat. New members to commissions have received training in projects, facilitation, and other topics as needed. Palau launched a multi-ministry coordination body to work towards Food Security called the #KeledANgercheled Task Force; and MAFE acts as the Secretariat and "Champion"/Chair for that body. Finally, MAFE's updated Strategic Plan and associated Organizational Chart institutionalized an Office of Strategic Support Services with the purpose of coordinating activities across sectors. A Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) strategy was completed using such participatory and coordinated methods, as was a 2023-2030 National Environmental Management Strategy, which had input from over 50 stakeholders. The NEPC Secretariat ensured that an updated Sustainable Financing Plan (covered both PAN's protected areas as well as new Micronesia Challenge indicators that require sustainable land management) was developed using a participatory process.		MS
2.2.1. INCREASED LAND USE PLANNING: State SLM Plans for at least 4 states are developed, tested, and implemented	Completed	75%	100%	Together with the GEF6 project, land use plans have been completed for 9 of 10 states on Babeldaob plus Kayangel and Peleliu (11). The plans implement the national Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Policy which is itself in line with the National Planning Act (Title 31). 1 of these state land use plans has been endorsed by the Governor and forwarded to the State Legislature for adoption. All 10 states on Babeldaob plus Peleliu now have legislated and authorized Planning Commissions to implement these land use plans and their zoning codes. All states have gone to their communities and leadership for approval and have incorporated feedback. Most states have started implementing aspects of their master plans through small grants (especially in tourism product development and food security). Many are preparing/training their Commissions and State permitting offices to begin following zoning rules and regulations. Airai and Ngiwal also have updated Watershed Management Plans. 4 states have eco-tourism plans that include sustainable land managment, especially to minimize tourist impacts.		MS
2.2.2. IMPROVED LAND USE: Best Practices for multiple land uses are identified, tested, promoted; and capacity to implement them is built, particularly among vulnerable populations such as women and foreign farmers	Completed	85%	100%	Best Practices have been developed with training on multiple topics: 1) Agriculture Best Practices are ongoing and institutionalized at BOA. These include farmer trainings on best practices for a) vegetable crops, such as cover crops, rotations, integrated pest management, contour plowing, and more; b) fruit trees, particularly methods for pest management; c) root crops/taro, such as rehabilitation of waterways, saltwater-resistant taro, and upland taro with cover; and d) livestock such as dry-litter piggeries and chicken husbandry. BOA reaches around 100 farmers per year. Targeted training and translation was conducted with foreign farmers, particularly with the assistance of technical and bilateral partners, to reach a marginalized community. A unique taro project specifically targeted training for women, with over 200 women farmers being trained in climate resilient taro production practices that blend traditional knowledge with new climate projections. 2) Water Best Practices, such as reforestation, riparian protection, and stream restoration. BOE trains 20 community members or resource managers per year. 3) Reforestation, Erosion, SFM have been taught through partners such as Ebiil and by the production of guidance manuals to ensure native plant propagation, minimization of erosion, and reduction of invasive species. Community members trained varies and ranges from 10-50 per year. The project produced a Reforestation Manual. 4) A large investment into Fire Prevention and Wildfire response led to the development of a detailed protocol and reduction in overall fires. There are also updated maps of fires and good knowledge of fire breaks, green belts, safety protocols, and fire hotspot management. All Rangers have been trained (around 70). 5) Together with GEF6 and community planning teams, partners have mapped rare species, cultural features, or other significant sites. Around 200 state planners have good capacity to understand and use these maps. 6) The Bureau of Tourism and its partners have developed numerous tourism products, including a detailed manual that helps interpret Palau's regulations and adopted Best Practices like Green Fins, Green Boots, and Palau Pledge. All Tour Operators in Palau must stay up to date and to implement these best practices in order to be re-licensed annually. 7) Rather than adopt a single demonstration site the Ministry is now pursuing multiple demonstration sites to access multiple populations. Melekeok's Ngardok is a demonstration site for eco-tourism and sustainable forestry. Ngardmau is a demonstration site for land rehabilitation. BOA works with the Taiwan Technical Mission and together their facilities are demonstration farms for crops and livestock.		S

2.2.3. SUSTAINABLE TOURISM: Improved national level tourism planning and state level implementation of tourism leads to benefits realized across genders and socioeconomic levels	Completed	90%	100%	Palau has improved tourism planning significantly at both the national and state levels, with input from the private sector and NGOs. During the project the following have been achieved: 1. Development of a Responsible Tourism Policy Framework to guide the entire country's approach to tourism. It adopted a high-value low-impact model for the country using niche marketing that promotes Palau's uniqueness. The Policy is being updated to reflect the global downturn in tourism and the need to decentralize and share more of the benefits with communities. Product development outside of Koror remains a priority. 2. The Bureau of Tourism developed an organizational strategy to guide its implementation of these sustainable practices. 3. The Bureau of Tourism has promulgated and enforces a set of laws and regulations on sustainable tourism, including legislation on Responsible Tourism and Education, an update to immigration laws to require a pledge for good environmental behavior and cultural stewardship, and laws and regulations governing Tour Operators, Tour Guides, Boat Operators, Plastic Reduction, Reef-safe Sunscreen, and Pandemic Safety. 4. New laws were mainstreamed into licensing requirements. BOT also developed a manual to guide training and learning on these new regulations. Tour Operators must be relicensed every year and thus must stay up to date with new regulations. BOT offers training. 5. A concurrent effort based out of a local NGO is working to raise awareness of the Palau Pledge by seeking voluntary commitments by local businesses to even more stringent environmental standards, and rewarding well-behaved eco-tourists. 6. Koror State conducted a Capacity Assessment to determine carrying capacity. It found that its current levels of visitation have some tourist impact, and thus are not advocating for any more marine tourism. Instead they have expanded their variety of non-marine tourism products available, including those that celebrate terrestrial biodiversity (such as parks and trails on land). 7. Post-Covid the country commissioned an international tourism study to better understand trends. Through this it has also developed a short-term strategy for tourism development as part of the Palau Development Plan. Led by the Palau Government, it incorporated wide community and stakeholder feedback, again committing to low-impact tourism and decentralization away from Koror with shared benefits. The output includes a plan for improving infrastructure. 8. PVA and its partners have invested heavily in site assessments outside of Koror, working to create new products and to promote them as part of tourism packages. PVA also promotes local products and holds regular market opportunities for local artisans and food producers to sell locally-produced sustainable products. PVA is implementing a nationwide payment system called "AliiPass" that standardizes payments and enables marginalized people to benefit from modern payment systems. 9. BOT and pilot Tour Operators adopted best practices like Green Fins (for marine) and Green Boots (for land) to ensure sustainable practices by visitors. 10. PAN invested in eco-tour plans for 4 states. NGO and bilateral partners also invested in eco-tour development for states through the BCET. These state plans assessed capacity needs and targeted capacity and training in addition to product development. Koror has new plans targeting tourists in the RISL, Ngarchelong and Kayangel have new master plans that address tourism in the Northern Reefs, Melekeok, Aimeliik, Ngardmau, and Ngiwal have a new eco-tourism plans, and all other states have master plans that address land and marine tourism needs.	S

Under Comp 3

3.1.1. Improved capacity of MNRET to act as the National coordinating body for Palau's environmental sector	Completed	100%	100%	A Capacity Needs assessment was completed. MAFE went through organizational restructuring, creating an Office of Strategic Support Services to help implement projects. Partnerships also help align indicators and improve management of projects both inside and outside the Ministry. New staff were brought on to improve implementation. MAFE's improved capacity can be seen in its implementation of GEF6, which is schedule to end on time.	S
3.1.2. MNRET effectively implementing, reporting, and evaluating Project	Completed	90%	100%	MAFE has caught up with reporting. It has effectively stewarded most partners to completion of their deliverables.	MS
3.1.3. Two-way peer learning approach fostered through participation in regional initiatives (Micronesia Challenge, Ridge to Reef, Integrated Water Resource Management, etc.) and uses multiple forms of communication and media to share lessons from the project	Completed	90%	100%	Peer to peer learning was advanced through the project, such as via annual PAN Conferences and leadership forums in country as well as networking among Pacific islands. In 2022 for instance peers from around the Pacific gathered to learn from each other ways to prevent and manage invasive alien species. In 2023 the project sponsored 12 people from Palau to travel to Hilo, Hawaii to learn from peers in a functioning Zoning Office and Commission to see how they implement their land use plans and zoning regulations. The Micronesia Challenge recently updated its indicators to include sustainable land management, and employed numerous peer to peer learning opportunities to learn about existing research and viable indicators. Multi-Stakeholder forums were used to hold the 3rd National Environment Symposium in 2021 and subsequent Conservation Consortium meetings multiple times per year. This same model continues to be implemented with emerging issues, such as Nature-based Solutions (NbS) for climate change adaptation and mitigation. Knowledge products have taken many forms, such as printed Best Practices for agriculture, in-person workshops on enforcement, and videos about PAN. Most are linked online on the Palau Biodiversity Project (GEF6) website on appropriate pages (e.g. "National Policies" or "Best Practices") so they are no longer seen as only "Project" documents but rather "Palau" documents. Both PICRC and the museum have published journal articles on outcomes of the project (such as status of birds and coral reefs).	MS
3.2.1. Enable effective Cross-sectoral coordination of PAN and SLM Policies	Completed	90%	100%	EQPB updated regulations to reflect SLM concepts, including Wastewater, Earthmoving, Marine and Freshwater Quality, and EA/EIS Requirements Regulations. The EA/EIS regulations explicitly state the need for cumulative assessment and mentions biodiversity. PAN has developed training modules for Rangers to implement key aspects of SLM, such as monitoring, fire response, erosion control, and reforestation/restoration. Legislation for State Planning Commissions also addressed cross-boundary needs, linking the need to manage land holistically. Melekeok completed updates to its master plan and Ngardok nature reserve plan, plus created new Eco-tourism plans. The State then cross-referenced between the plans to ensure that protected areas goals were captured appropriately in master plans and vice versa. Land use plans used protected areas in a base map and as a suitability criteria for development recommendations, thus cross-sector coordination has been built into tools used for SLM. MAFE created a new Bureau of Environment and placed the PAN Program and its Forestry, and Species (endangered species, endemic species, and invasive species) programs under it to enable better management of eco-systems inside and outside protected areas. MAFE also created the Office of Strategic Support Services to enable coordination among fisheries, agriculture, and environment sectors. The NEPC also continues to hold and implement its mandate of coordination across all environment sectors.	MS
3.2.2. Streamline forest management across sectors, government levels, and within watershed with at least 1/3 of native forest under protection and sustainable management (2,100 ha in PAN sites and an additional 6,000 ha in SFM catchments)	Completed	90%	100%	Palau developed a Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) Policy and up dated its Forest Action Plan, which is being implemented in partnership between national government, state governments, and NGOs. A Forest Monitoring protocol was developed and is being employed. Best Practice documents were developed to guide forest restoration. BOA, Melekeok, and BNM have a partnership to support seedlings for reforestation, which is also supported by NGOs like Ebiil Society and by community organizations and States. Multiple States have nurseries and BOA continues to support nursery production for both restoration and combined food security/land rehabilitation efforts. As a result of these many combined efforts, land use planning efforts resulted in large swaths of forested land being set aside for non-exhaustive use, either as conservation zones, watershed protection zones, or for historic preservation. 3,376 hectares of terrestrial land in Babeldaob's watersheds are protected in PAN (9% of the island). A total of 42,700 hectares of Babeldaob is protected in state legislated, community-based, or traditionally-decreed conservation areas on Babeldaob (12%). Nationwide a total of 102,600 hectares of land is protected (including Koror's Rock Islands), or 25% of all of Palau's total land. Through State Planning Commissions and land use planning, an additional 11,335 ha Babeldaob Forest, 205 ha Peleliu Limestone Forest, 128 ha Outer Island Atoll Forest, and nationwide 4,992 hectares of mangrove have been allocated for non-exhaustive use (conservation zones, watershed zones, or historic preservation zones), for a total of 16,661 hectares of NEW upland, limestone, atoll, and mangrove forest set aside for non-exhaustive sustainable forest management. Palau has an estimted 356,700 hectares of forest, so the total amount protected (102,600 + 16,661 = 120,000 hectares) is equivalent to 33% of all forested land.	S

3.2.3. A national biosecurity policy agreed upon with legislation drafted and with at least 2 invasive alien species (IAS) risk reduction or eradications achieved that demonstrates a harmonized approach by PAN and SLM	Completed	90%	100%	MAFE institutionalized the Invasive Species Program and the National Invasive Species Committee (NISC) Coordinator in its Organizational Chart, which had previously been an ad hoc committee based on project funding. Palau developed an overarching Policy Statement for invasive species, ranking all invasive species actions among biosecurity (prevention), control, and eradication (https://sites.google.com/view/gef6palau/gef6-key-sectors/invasive-species/proposed-ias-priorities). Regulations to implement the comprehensive 2014 Biosecurity Law continue to be refined, including LMOs. A MOU was drafted to enable cross-Ministry actions. The national policy includes rankings of the top biosecurity threats (targeted for prevention) and the top control and eradication threats, and Black and White lists were updated. These were incorporated into an Early Detection and Rapid Response Policy Framework and action plan and an Inter-Island Biosecurity Framework (with training). The NISSAP was updated and is under continual implementation by MAFE and its partners. Eradication strategies for rodents on key high biodiversity small islands were agreed. Control and Risk Reduction for Coconut Rhinoceros Beetles and Fruit Flies are also under continual implementation. Research and training to fill a gap in responding ot marine invasions is also underway. The policies apply island-wide and thus integrate actions in PAN sites as well as outside of protected areas. Rangers as well as Resource Managers have received numerous invasive species trainings for prevention and control in protected areas and outside them.	MS
3.2.4. At least 4 states have SLM and PAN plans aligned with climate change adaptation plans, with at least one modelling a gender-inclusive approach to climate change adaptation	Completed	100%	100%	MAFE partnered with the Office of Climate Change to conduct Vulnerability & Adaptation (V&A) Assessments of states doing land use planning, and as a result several states updated their master plans and land use plans to incorporate climate change. The V&A tools included questions to facilitate a gender-balanced approach. Ngarchelong, Ngaraard, Ngiwal, Ngeremlengui, and Peleliu upated their land use plans to include Special Management Zones to reflect the need for special management in the face of sea level rise or storm risks. The Bureau of Agriculture, together with other partners and ADB, is also implementing a project to expand upland taro, an effort targeted to ensure climate-resilient food security among vulnerable women. Palau is updating its Climate Change Policy and integrating input from these state partners into the national policy. The PAN Management Plan	S
Under Comp 4					
Under Comp 5					

The Task Manager will decide on the relevant level of disaggregation (i.e. either at the output or activity level).

4 Risk Rating

4.1 Table A. Project management Risk

Please refer to the Risk Help Sheet for more details on rating

Risk Factor	EA's Rating	TM's Rating
1 Management structure - Roles and responsibilities	Substantial: Unstable Management Structure or Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.	Substantial: Unstable Management Structure or Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.
2 Governance structure - Oversight	Substantial: Steering Committee and/or other project bodies do not convene regularly or Limited membership and participation in decision-making processes or SC guidance/input provided to project is inadequate. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.	Substantial: Steering Committee and/or other project bodies do not convene regularly or Limited membership and participation in decision-making processes or SC guidance/input provided to project is inadequate. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.
3 Implementation schedule	Substantial: Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall timetableor Measures taken are not always adequate and weak adaptive management. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the	Substantial: Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall timetableor Measures taken are not always adequate and weak adaptive management. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.
4 Budget	Low : Activities are progressing within planned budgetand Balanced budget utilisation including PMC. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Activities are progressing within planned budgetand Balanced budget utilisation including PMC. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
5 Financial Management	Low : Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted forand Audit reports provided regularly and confirm correct use of funds. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted forand Audit reports provided regularly and confirm correct use of funds. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
6 Reporting	Substantial: Reports are complete and accurate but often delayedOr Reports lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.	Substantial: Reports are complete and accurate but often delayedOr Reports lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.
7 Capacity to deliver	Substantial: Weaknesses persist and have been identifiedOr Capacity gaps require longer time to address and are continuously being addressed. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery	Substantial: Weaknesses persist and have been identifiedOr Capacity gaps require longer time to address and are continuously being addressed. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery

If any of the risk factors is rated a Moderate or higher, please include it in Table B below

4.2 Table B. Risk-log

Implementation Status (Current PIR) | 1st PIR |

Insert ALL the risks identified either at CEO endorsement (inc. safeguards screening), previous/current PIRs, and MTRs. Use the last line to propose a suggested consolidated rating.

Risk	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	PIR 6	Δ	Justification
Risk 1: Timely delivery of activities to ensure progress to achieving targets. A no-cost extension is likely needed to complete the delivery of outputs. Targets also need to be assessed for achievability based on progress and relevance	All outcomes & outputs					S	L	L	=	The 3rd no-cost extension was granted allowing the project to be implemented until March 2024 (due to an unexpected change in project manager). Given this extension, the remainder of activities were completed or nearly completed. All remaining activities and deliverables are on track to be finished.

Risk	Outcomes & outputs									Comment
Risk 2: Progress is not as expected and may impede our ability to assess as well as show improvements on the GEF core Indicators.	All outcomes & outputs					S	M	L	↓	Progress is now as expected with indicators being achieved.
Risk 3: MNRET has good stakeholder engagement but coordination is necessary to reduce consultation fatigue. COVID-19 has reduced the ability to host large stakeholder meetings and therefore smaller, multiple meetings have to be held which impacts timely delivery.	All outcomes & outputs					L	L	L	=	Partners continue to meet. To avoid fatigue, the project has decentralized and States now hold many of their own meetings and develop plans on their own.
Risk 4: Need to utilize the PCU more actively regarding the environmental and social safeguards.	All outcomes & outputs					L	M	L	↓	The PCU transitioned to a new project manager who has been coordinating partners to complete the project. Environment and Social safeguards were developed through the GEF6 project, which the project manager follows. The Project Steering Committee is scheduled to meet in July.
Risk 5: This is taken into consideration when implemented by implementing partners, but EA needs to ensure the overall sustainability of the progress of work under each component and output so that as many as possible are sustained beyond the project.	All outcomes & outputs					L	L	L	=	Sustainability has been achieved for many of the project outputs, having been institutionalized in PAN or MAFE, or being incorporated into State plans through Planning Commissions.
Risk 6: Currently, COVID-19 is impacting the implementation of activities. This project year is also an election year with the expectation of change in administration next year. Therefore, the political atmosphere is a potential risk to the project.	All outcomes & outputs					M	L	L	=	Covid did impact many activities and staffing remains low, however, the project has been able to catch up through partnerships. The strong partnership aspect of the project, with high participatory input, combined with decentralization means that the political atmosphere poses less of a risk than before.
Risk 7: The current year of the project is election year for Palau. There is still political support for the project, but a potential risk for being used as part of political platform. The project manager and the EA takes that into consideration when conducting activities to ensure that it does not get used for such purposes	All outcomes & outputs					L	L	Not Applicable	↓	Elections have not used the project as a political platform.
Risk 8: Potential administration changes next year could further delay implementation	All outcomes & outputs					L	L	Not Applicable	↓	The current administration is stable for at least two years and continues to be supportive of the project because of its links to food security and tourism.
Risk 9: Political will changes and support declines	All outcomes & outputs	M	L	M		L	L	L	=	There is strong support for Best Practices and PAN given the importance to communities.
Risk 10: Limited Pool of available talent for many new positions leaves them unfilled	All outcomes & outputs	M	M	M		M	M	L	↓	While this remains an issue, hiring has been strong. At least 10 positions in MAFE have been filled in the past year.
Risk 11: Long-term funding sources reliant on tourism, which is inherently variable	All outcomes & outputs	H	M	S		H	M	M	=	The project has successfully diversified funding or capacity to raise funding.

Risk										
Risk 12: METT takes longer to finish than anticipated	All outcomes & outputs	M	M	M		L	L	Not Applicable	=	The METT has been completed.
Risk 13: Internet access limited	All outcomes & outputs	H	L	L		M	L	Not Applicable	↓	Broadband access is available to all project partners and this is no longer a risk.
Consolidated project risk		M	M	M		M	L		↓	This section focuses on the variation. The overall rating is discussed in section 2.3.

4.3 Table C. Outstanding Moderate, Significant, and High risks

List here only risks from Table *A and B* above that have a risk rating of **M or** *higher* in the **current** *PIR*

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIR-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	Additional mitigation measures for the next periods		
			What	**When**	**By whom**
Risk 4: Need to utilize the PCU more actively regarding the environmental and social safeguards.	Convene the Steering Committee and orient the PMU to environmental and social safeguards	IPP established in 4 States and diversification in tourism products by type and location so as to appeal to wider audiences as tourism returns.	Convene remaining partners and Steering Committee to review Safeguards	August 2023 to engage the SC, with follow-up meetings in August and September 2023 with any other partners to ensure safeguards are followed.	Project Manager, SC and Partners
Risk 11: Long-term funding sources reliant on tourism, which is inherently variable	Continuing the Investment Partnership Program with State governments to support the PAN program	IPP established in 5 States and diversification in tourism products by type and location so as to appeal to wider audiences as tourism returns.	Work with State Governments to build their capacity to write grants and develop more efficient budgets for income.	August and September 2024 (a one-time push to implement small grants prior to the close of the project).	Project Manager
Risk (Table A-1): Unstable management structure due to unexpected turnover of PMU staff in the past year	Orientation for new PMU	This project was assigned to the Ministry's Special Projects staff that has been successfully implementing a GEF6-funded project, with a new Project Manager and Financial Officer onboarded and oriented and with access to a Technical Advisor.	Communications (meetings and digital) with other implementing partners to ensure final delivery of project activities	August 2023, so that all partners are aware of the change in PMU and are supportive.	Project Manager and Partners
Risk (Table A-2): The Steering Committee has not been organized regularly and has not met during this reporting period and not since the change in PMU	Engagement with SC	The Steering Committee has been engaged more regularly via email, and the Chair (Minister) is briefed regularly, however a full SC meeting has not been held.	Convene Steering Committee meeting, and continue to brief the Chair	August 2023, with re-orientation for members and continued engagement with the Chair	Project Manager and SC
Risk (Table A-3): Delays in implementation and changing context means the Work Plan needs to be updated as some parts are not relevant.	Pursuit of No-Cost-Extension and update of Work Plan	Project has been granted a NCE until March 2024 and Work Plan was modified and approved	Orient SC to Work Plan and continue implementation to completion of all deliverables	August 2023 - March 2024	Project Manager and Partners

Risk (Table A-6): Reports have not been submitted in time since the change of PMU staff	Orientation for new PMU	Project Manager oriented and new PMU team working to complete all reports, including measuring of indicators and tracking of finace and co-finance	Delivery of reports on time and active engagement in final reports such as TE	August 2023 - March 2025	Project Manager and PMU team
Risk (Table A-7): Capacity to deliver was hampered by change in PMU staffing	Orientation for new PMU	New Project Manager was assigned and new PMU assigned with financial and technical capacity	Engage partners with existing project management capacity for final deliverable of remaining activities	August 2023 - December 2023	Project Manager and Partners

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

Project Minor Amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines.
Please tick each category for which a change occurred in the fiscal year of reporting and provide a description of the change that occurred in the textbox. You may attach supporting document as appropriate.

5.1 Table A: Listing of all Minor Amendment (TM)

Minor amendments	Changes	Minor amendments
Results framework	No	Implementation Schedule has been changed due to the 3rd No Cost Extension (NCE) approval with the new technical completion date of Sept. 2023.
Components and cost	No	
Institutional and implementation arrangements	No	
Financial management	No	
Implementation schedule	Explain in table B	
Executing Entity	No	
Executing Entity Category	No	
Minor project objective change	No	
Safeguards	No	
Risk analysis	No	
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	No	
Co-financing	No	
Location of project activity	No	
Other	No	

5.2 Table B: History of project revisions and/or extensions (TM)

Version	Type	Signed/Approved by UNEP	Entry Into Force (last signiture Date)	Agreement Expiry Date	Main changes introduced in this revision
Original Legal Instrument					
Amendment 1	Revision				
Extension 1	Extension	28-Apr-21	4-May-21	30-Sep-22	No major changes were occurred in the technical perspective.
Extension 2	Extension	22-Jun-22	23-Jun-22	30-Sep-23	No major changes were occurred in the technical perspective.
Extension 3	Extension	18-May-23	23-May-23	31-Mar-24	No major changes were occurred in the technical perspective. However, due to unexpected turnover of Project Manager, the completion date for the project has

GEO Location Information:

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as OpenStreetMap (https://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=4/21.84/82.79) or GeoNames(http://www.geonames.org/) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: https://coordinates-converter.com Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking here(https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx)

Location Name Required field		Latitude Required field	Longitude Required field	Geo Name ID Required field if the location is not an exact site	Location Description Optional text field	Activity Description Optional text field	
Republic of Palau		134.621	7.503	Palau			

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate. *

[Annex any linked geospatial file]