



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review **2019 – Revised Template**

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Global
Country (ies):	Uganda, Indonesia, Peru (Tier 1); Nepal, Kenya (Tier 2)
Project Title:	Securing Tenure Rights for Forest Landscape-Dependent Communities: Linking science with policy to advance tenure security, sustainable forest management and people's livelihoods.
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/GLO/806/GFF
GEF ID:	5797
GEF Focal Area(s):	Land Degradation
Project Executing Partners:	CIFOR
Project Size (FSP/MSP):	MSP
Project Duration:	36 months

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	5 August 2014
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	8 October 2015
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	March 2017
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	7 April 2019
Actual Implementation End Date³:	7 April 2019

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	2,000,000
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	4,545,852
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	1,939,203

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

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

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

Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	6,389,983
--	-----------

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	06 September 2018
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	None
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	No
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	July 2019
Tracking tools required⁶	No
Tracking tools date	

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes:	S	
Overall implementation progress rating:	S	
Overall risk rating:	L	

Status

Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	3 rd PIR
--	---------------------

Project Contacts

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

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

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Anne M Larson Esther Mwangi	a.larson@cgiar.org e.mwangi@cgiar.org
Lead Technical Officer	Safia Aggarwal	Safia.aggarwal@fao.org
Budget Holder	Andrew Taber	Andrew.Taber@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Climate and Environment Division (CBC)	Hernan Gonzalez	hernan.gonzalez@fao.org

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 07 April 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Objective						
Outcome 1: Increased awareness by policy makers of impacts of and barriers to reform implementation across different socio-political and historical settings	Assessment of structures (institutions), processes and outcomes of tenure reforms, both globally from the literature and for study countries, including: -an analysis of the catalysts of reform and factors maintaining the reform implementation process over time -comparative assessment of approaches to	Limited understanding of the catalysts of tenure reform and barriers for implementation		At least 150 policy makers at national and sub-national levels in at least 3 countries aware of barriers to forest tenure reforms	188 policy makers at national and sub-national levels in at least 3 countries aware of barriers to and impacts of forest tenure reforms	HS

⁷ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

⁸ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

⁹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)**, **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 07 April 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	customary rights recognition for differentiated community stakeholders -analysis of differentiated outcomes of reforms					
Outcome 2: Increased awareness of ways to improve multi-actor collaboration, coordination and inclusiveness during reform implementation in target countries	Strategies designed to address constraints to and capitalize on opportunities for implementation of tenure reforms. These include strategies to improve: -the practices of implementing agencies -rights enforcement and conflict resolution -community representation and participation, including the role of customary authorities -addressing within and inter-community conflict and differentiation, especially the rights	Limited understanding of how constraints of tenure reform implementation can be addressed and how opportunities can be capitalized		Understanding among stakeholders of the existing constraints and how these can be addressed ·At least 150 officials, NGO practitioners and community representatives attend multi-stakeholder processes ·At least 150 policy makers and 60 NGO practitioners in target countries are aware of alternative scenarios of tenure security/ insecurity and of factors that drive the scenarios ·At least 30 relevant government officials and 15 NGO	1043 people total participants or >100%; Policy makers: 168 or >100%; NGO practitioners: 186 total or >100%; 100% (participating in S-S Exchange events)	HS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 07 April 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	of tenure for women and marginalized groups -multi-stakeholder consultation and collaboration -reform implementation in target countries			practitioners aware of and integrating options for supporting and strengthening multi-actor collaboration		
Outcome 3: Increased awareness of reform impacts on livelihoods and sustainability in target countries	Improved methods and frameworks for assessing tenure reform outcomes, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clarification of definitions and meanings of tenure security • the relation of security to livelihood options for differentiated community actors • the relation of tenure security to sustainable use and management 	Understanding of how tenure reform impacts on community livelihoods in short and long term is limited		Understanding of the impact of tenure reform on livelihoods is increased Methodologies and results from tenure reform outcome assessment is actively shared in the target countries and at the global level	100% Additional knowledge sharing carried out in Kenya.	S
Outcome 4: Enhanced awareness and increased application of good practice in reform implementation by policy makers, officials, customary authority etc.	Better targeted and effective outreach and knowledge sharing deploying a careful mix of multiple media and materials to include:	Tenure reform implementation is not based on lessons from past experiences or on good practices from elsewhere		Tenure reform implementation is based on a set of good practices derived from evidence: Information on tenure reform barriers &	100% Extensive information available and shared through outreach and engagement activities to facilitate	HS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 07 April 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • global review of impacts of tenure (security) on forest sustainability and livelihoods • synthesis of findings and lessons of global comparative research • national, regional and global forums/roundtables on tenure security • policy roundtables, stakeholder dialogues • policy briefs, info-briefs, pamphlets/newsletters in local, national and international languages • best practice manuals and handbooks for policy makers, officials etc. • e-learning tool on tenure and conflict resolution • e-network linking implementers 			<p>opportunities, lessons learned and good practices are available to policy makers, practitioners, community members and other stakeholders and are used by them</p> <p>Number of countries participating in FAOs voluntary guidelines on land tenure processes adopting good practice recommendations on tenure reform implementation</p>	<p>uptake of knowledge.</p> <p>Evaluation to assess impact is completed; Tools have been developed under outcome 5; VGGT has been part of trainings organized.</p>	

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 07 April 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • radio programs in local languages • website and project videos 					
<p>Outcome 5: Enhanced skills in reform implementation e.g. capabilities to evaluate, learn, adapt</p>	<p>Tools and approaches for equitable and effective reform implementation developed</p> <p>Forest dependent communities, policy makers and practitioners are trained in effective reform implementation</p>	Capacities of tenure reform stakeholders is often low		<p>Capacities of stakeholders is at a level that they can evaluate past experience, learn from that and adapt the implementation accordingly</p> <p>Various tools in addition to publications and briefs etc above are available to support tenure reform, (see Table 4 for detail):</p> <p>Stakeholders are able to use the tools (5.1.1) available to support them in tenure reform implementation</p> <p>Community members, especially women have</p>	<p>4 tools have been developed – PPA guide/manual for tenure security, brief on conflicts in collective forest tenure for Peru, illustrated handbooks on laws and policies for Indonesia, Peru and Uganda (100%)</p> <p>1225 stakeholders have received training (>100%)</p> <p>840 community member have</p>	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 07 April 2019	Progress rating ⁹
				<p>undergone skills training on legal literacy, collective organizing, conflict resolution and negotiation and leadership skills</p> <p>150 Policy makers and practitioners have received training (see Table 4 for detail)</p>	<p>received training, 42% of trainees were women (>100%)</p> <p>385 policy makers and practitioners have been trained (>100%)</p>	

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹⁰

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?

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

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹¹	End of project Targets	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³			Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
			1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR		
<p><u>EC/IFAD Output 1.1.1</u> <i>Assessment of structures (institutions), processes and outcomes of tenure reforms, both globally from the literature and for study countries, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>an analysis of the catalysts of reform and factors maintaining the reform implementation process over time</i> • <i>comparative assessment of approaches to customary rights recognition for differentiated community stakeholders</i> 	<p><i>3 different analyses /assessments</i></p> <p><i>The above clarified in April 2016 to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>3 country reviews (working papers)</i> • <i>2 journal articles</i> 	Y2, Y3	<p><i>Comparative review of reforms, 2016 (book chapter, available on line)</i> http://www.cifor.org/library/5905/comm-unity-rights-to-forests-in-the-tropics-progress-and-retreat-on-tenure-reforms/</p> <p><i>National working papers published: Peru 2017</i> http://www.cifor.org/library/6426/reclaiming-collective-rights-land-and-forest-tenure-reforms-in-peru-</p>	<p><i>National working paper for Uganda is currently under revision.</i></p> <p><i>1 Journal Article on tenure reforms in Nepal is being finalized.</i></p> <p><i>2 Conference papers:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Annual Meeting of the Association of Tropical Biology and Conservation, ATBC (Yucatan, July 2017): Collective Titling in Peru: Challenges and titling</i> 		<p><i>100%, based on:</i></p> <p><i>3 of 3 committed country level working papers published</i></p> <p><i>1 book chapter (available online)</i></p> <p><i>3 Journal article draft completed</i></p> <p><i>several conference papers presented</i></p>	<p><i>Results framework in Prodoc is not consistent across tables; we have tried to include all key outputs here and below.</i></p>

¹¹ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

¹² As per latest work plan (latest project revision) in April 2016 (Q2 Y1)

¹³ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible

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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> analysis of differentiated outcomes of reforms 		<p>1960-2016/ (in English and Spanish)</p> <p>Indonesia 2017 http://www.cifor.org/library/6402/overview-of-forest-tenure-reforms-in-indonesia/</p> <p>Uganda drafted and in revisions.</p> <p>Colombia (1) Historical analysis of collective tenure and (2) Scoping analysis on data and trends drafted: 2 briefs in process</p> <p>Nepal Scoping in process</p> <p>For comparative assessment on approaches to customary rights, see 1.1.2 below For analysis of outcomes of reforms, see 3.1.2 below</p>	<p>opportunities in the Amazon. https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/98d29f_0c9a8187df3c47e3baff99c37f079ab0.pdf</p>			
<p>GEF Output 1.1.2 At least two national-level policy roundtables in three countries to share information, elicit feedback and trigger</p>	At least 150 policy makers joined in a dialogue and shared	Policy forums and roundtables: Uganda (9 policy makers):	Policy forums and roundtables: Peru:		188 policy makers of 150 = >100%	Roundtable, policy forum and multistakeholder events are spread across outputs 1, 3 and 4;

<p>discussion on approaches for recognizing customary rights and on factors that catalyse and sustain reforms</p> <p>Development and dissemination of policy and infobriefs on approaches for recognizing customary rights and on factors that catalyse and sustain reforms</p>	<p>knowledge on forest tenure</p> <p>The above clarified in April 2016 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy Round Table event in 3 countries (multistakeholder forums) • Infobrief factors that catalyse and sustain reform • Policy brief on approaches for recognizing customary rights 	<p>Y1, Y2</p> <p>Y1</p> <p>Y3</p>	<p>National Multi-stakeholder Colloquium, Kampala, Uganda, December 3, 2015 (35 participants, 15 women, 20 men: 9 policy makers).</p> <p><i>Peru (total 24 policy makers):</i></p> <p>International Colloquium on Forest Tenure Reform, Lima, May 2016. (60 participants - 8 government representatives) (Reported under Output 3.1.2 in PPR as part of S-S Exchange)</p> <p>International Colloquium on Recognition of Collective Tenure Rights and Challenges of Tenure Security in Madre de Dios, Madre de Dios, May 2016. (102 participants - 16 government representatives) (Reported under Output 3.1.2 in PPR</p>	<p>- Subnational Feedback Workshop in Loreto Peru, November 22 2017; 13 Policymakers</p> <p>- Subnational Public Forum in Loreto Peru, November 21 2017, 7 policymakers</p> <p>Uganda:</p> <p>- Uganda multi-stakeholder forum under Uganda colloquium; 14 policy makers, 22 November 2017</p> <p>- Uganda Project Advisory Committee meetings in Kibale District (3 policy makers involved) ; Masindi (3 policy makers); Lamwo (2 policymakers); and National (1), 4 December 2017</p> <p>Indonesia:</p> <p>- Community workshop Lampung; 10 policy makers, 6 November 2017.</p> <p>- Community workshop in</p>		<p>Policy Roundtable event in 3 countries: (8 in Peru, 7 in Uganda, 2 in Indonesia) = >100%</p>	<p>events have been grouped here to address separate targets with separate events.</p>
---	---	-----------------------------------	---	--	--	--	--

		<p>as part of S-S Exchange)</p> <p><i>Roundtables/ workshops on findings from multistakeholder PPA processes:</i></p> <p><i>Uganda (total 39 policy makers):</i> District level PPA Feedback workshop - Lamwo District, January 22, 2016, 12 government participants; - Masindi District, January 20, 2016, 5 government participants; - Kibale District, January 19, 2016, 11 government participants; National PPA Feedback Workshop, Kampala, Uganda, April 27, 2016. 11 government participants.</p> <p><i>Indonesia (20 policy makers):</i> - National PPA Feedback workshop Jakarta, December, 2016. Total of 27</p>	<p>Maluku (24 August 2017), attended by 45 people including 35 people from villages study and HKm villages, and 10 people from government officials at district and province level (4 women and 41 men).</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

		<p>participants: government agency (20); practitioners (7) - Additional PPA feedback is combined with community feedback under 4.1.1 and not repeated here.</p> <p><i>Peru (total 27 policy makers):</i> - Subnational feedback workshop in Loreto (Iquitos, September, 2016 - 24 participants: 10 government; 8 practitioners; 6 indigenous peoples; 5 women, 19 men) - Subnational feedback workshop in Loreto (Sta. Clotilde, October, 2016 – 55 participants: 8 policymakers; 6 practitioners; 39 indigenous organizations; 12 women 43 men) - Sub-national feedback workshop in Madre de Dios (Puerto Maldonado, September 2, 2016 - 17 participants: 6</p>				
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

		<p>government representatives; 7 practitioners; 4 indigenous organizations; 10 women; 7 men) -Round table discussion during the National Forestry Conference (Lima, October 27, 2016 - 27 participants: 3 government representatives; 24 practitioners; 15 men 12 women)</p> <p>Comparative paper on reforms, 2016 (IUCN Conceptual paper) http://www.cifor.org/library/6386/recognition-and-respect-for-tenure-rights/</p> <p>Indonesia infobrief, 2016: http://www.cifor.org/library/6333/forest-tenure-reform-in-indonesia-when-what-why/</p> <p>Brief of approaches to recognizing</p>		<p>InfoBrief: Models for formalizing</p>	<p>Infobrief factors that catalyse and sustain reform Completed. 100%</p> <p>Policy brief on approaches for</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

			customary rights planned for Y3		customary and community forest lands: The need to integrate livelihoods into rights and forest conservation goals	recognizing customary rights Completed 100%	
<p><u>EC/IFAD Output 2.1.1</u> Strategies designed to address constraints to and capitalize on opportunities for implementation of tenure reforms. These include strategies to improve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the practices of implementing agencies rights enforcement and conflict resolution community representation and participation, including the role of customary authorities addressing within and inter-community conflict and differentiation, especially the rights of tenure for women and marginalized groups multi-stakeholder consultation and collaboration reform 	<p>6 strategies to improve: (moved to Output 3.1.1 in April 2016 revised workplan)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the practices of implementing agencies rights enforcement and conflict resolution community representation and participation, including the role of customary authorities addressing within and inter-community conflict and differentiation, especially the rights of tenure for women and marginalized groups multi- 	<p>Subnational strategy papers/ briefs developed from PPA processes in Peru, Indonesia, Uganda. Two are published for Indonesia:</p> <p>http://www.cifor.org/library/6399/secure?q=tenure-rights-in-maluku-indonesia-searching-for-common-action/</p> <p>http://www.cifor.org/library/6418/forest-tenure-reform-implementation-in-lampung-province-from-scenarios-to-action/</p> <p>Two for Peru are in press. Workshop report on PPA for Madre de Dios published on line: http://www.cifor.org/library/6199/escenarios-participativos-</p>	<p>Strategy papers developed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two technical reports were produced for Peru to synthesize relevant results from work in Loreto and Madre de Dios (https://www.cifor.org/qcs-tenure/publications/technical-reports/) Guideline for collection and analysis of qualitative data draft: Including NVIVO database 		<p>100% of the strategy documents completed</p> <p>Instruments and related trainings,</p>	<p>To harmonize outcomes, outputs and activities, this is now 3.1.1 in the current work plan (agreed at PSC July 2016).</p>	

implementation in target countries	stakeholder consultation and collaboration		sobre-la-seguridad-de-la-tenencia-comunal-de-la-tierra-en-la-region-de-madre-de-dios/			all surveys and PPA workshops completed in Tier 1 countries. 100%	
	• reform implementation in target countries	Y1	Three for Uganda are under review.			Prospective analysis completed in 3 Tier 1 countries, 1 IFAD country, and 1 Tier 2 country (Nepal).	The reform implementation survey was not explicitly mentioned in the prodoc results framework. This is required for understanding reform implementation.
	The following added in April 2016 to 3.1.1:	Y1, Y2	Instruments developed for all work: intra-hh, key informant and focus groups with men and women; for PPA; and for analysis of reform implementation surveys. (Trainings are reported under 3.1.1 and 5.1.2)	- Qualitative Analysis Report			
	• Instruments developed and enumerators trained	Y1, Y2		- Quantitative Analysis Report			
	• Surveys completed	Y2		- Statistical analysis of outcomes of reforms conducted on multiple variables at national level and comparatively (conflict)			
• At least 4-6 PPA workshops per country (2 per year)	Y3		Implementation and analysis of reform implementation surveys: Indonesia (28), Uganda (30), Peru (32) and Nepal (29) - In total 97 male and 22 female for 119 total government officials surveyed in 4 countries.	- Statistical analysis of outcomes results from HH survey for Peru		Comparative analysis 100%	
• Prospective analysis completed for 6 countries	Y3		PPA workshops are reported under 2.1.2 in this report as this became an important				
• At least 6 strategies published and shared among stakeholders							
• Comparative analysis							

			<p><i>GEF/FAO activity and not just IFAD: 8 in Uganda; 5 in Indonesia; 5 in Peru; 7 in Colombia (IFAD country). PPA completed in 7 subnational regions in 3 Tier 1 countries and in 4 regions in 1 Tier 2 IFAD country. (Reported under 3.1.2 in PPR)</i></p> <p><i>Comparative analysis: Preliminary analysis of reform implementation results presented at WB conference, 2017.</i></p>				
<p><u>GEF Output 2.1.2</u></p> <p>In-country platforms for key actors involved in the implementation of forest tenure reforms to support multi-actor discussion, consensus and development of strategies for improving collaboration, coordination and inclusiveness during reform implementation (including identifying</p>	<p>At least 150 officials, NGO practitioners and community representatives attend multi-stakeholder processes (moved to Output 3.1.2 in April 2016 revised workplan)</p>	<p><i>Multistakeholder processes and alternative scenarios targets:</i></p> <p>In Uganda, 98 people participated in three district level and one national level PPA workshops: Kibaale District, (November 2015): 26 participants being 15 men and 11 women;</p>	<p>No additional PPA in Tier 1 countries, still scheduled in Kenya</p>	<p><i>Kenya:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PPA in Kifili 15th-19th October 2018 (23 participants, of which 9 policy makers) - PPA for the Mt. Elgon forest region in Eldoret , 22nd to 26th October 2018 (35 participants, of which 17 policy makers) 	<p>1043 people total participants or >100%</p> <p>Policy makers: 168 or >100%</p> <p>NGOs practitioners: 186 total or >100%</p>	<p>To harmonize outcomes, outputs and activities, this is now 3.1.2 in the current work plan; the in-country platforms are shared IFAD activities; activities related to a global policy forum are under 4.1.1 (workplan approved PSC meeting 2016).</p> <p>Regarding FAO VGGT (see target), it was</p>	

<p>roles and responsibilities)</p>	<p>At least 150 policy makers and 60 NGO practitioners in target countries are aware of alternative scenarios of tenure security/ insecurity and of factors that drive the scenarios (moved to Output 3.1.2 in April 2016 revised workplan)</p> <p>The following added in April 2016 to clarify original GEF output 3.1.2 targets noted above):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multistakeholder platforms organized in each country including: workshops with community level actors, NGOs and civil society in each country 	<p>Y1, Y2</p> <p>Y1</p> <p>Y2</p>	<p>14 govt, 9 NGO and 3 others</p> <p>Masindi District (November 2015): 24 participants being 21 men and 3 women; 13 govt, 6 NGO, 5 others including community members and research and training institutions</p> <p>Lamwo District (November – December 2015): 26 participants being 22 men and 4 women; 14 govt, 3 private sector, 7 NGO, 2 others</p> <p>The national PPA workshop was organized in Kampala, January 2016: 22 participants being 14 men and 8 women; 10 govt, 5 NGOs, 2 research institutions, 5 others including media</p> <p>Women focused PPA workshops were conducted with 46 women total: Lamwo women only PPA workshop (June 2016); 15 participants being 5</p>	<p>- PPA for Mt Kenya area, 8th-12th December 2018 (19 participants, of which 8 policy makers)</p> <p><u>Nepal</u></p> <p>- PPA 1 in Chautara SangaChok Gadhi Municipality, Sindupalchowk district on 4 June 2018 (26 participants, of which 2 policy makers)</p> <p>- PPA 2 in Buddhabhumi Municipality, Sindupalchowk district 29 May 2018 (57 participants, of which 2 policy makers)</p>		<p>decided at PSC meeting in 2017 to seek specific country-level collaboration, especially Uganda due to country interest.</p>
------------------------------------	---	-----------------------------------	--	--	--	--

<p>Development and dissemination (in-country and global) of short, briefing papers on strategies for improving collaboration, coordination and inclusiveness during reform implementation (i.e. good practice)</p> <p>Development and dissemination of practitioner guide/handbook on good practice for improved collaboration, coordination and inclusiveness during reform implementation</p> <p>South-south cross country exchange to support lesson-learning, experience sharing and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Briefing Paper per country on strategies for improving collaboration, coordination and inclusiveness during reform implementation published • Practitioner guide/handbook on good practice for improved collaboration, coordination and inclusiveness during reform implementation • South-South exchange meeting organized 	<p>Y1</p>	<p>from the government and 9 from NGO/community organizations</p> <p>Masindi women only PPA, August 2016: 16 women being 9 govt, 2 NGO, 2 research organizations and 3 others including media</p> <p>Kibaale women only PPA, August 2016: 15 women being 6 govt, 3 businesses, 6 NGO</p> <p>Lamwo PPA with 10 Acholi chiefs: these are customary leaders</p> <p>In Indonesia, A total of 38 individuals at the province and district level were involved in five different PPA workshops: Ambon (November 2015, December 2015, January 2016) and in Lampung (November 2015 and February 2016), involving 24 government agents; 4 community representatives, 10 practitioners,</p>				
--	---	-----------	--	--	--	--	--

<p>distilling of successful strategies for enhancing collaboration targeted at policy makers and practitioners in project countries</p> <p>Global policy forum to encourage debate and feeding of options into global initiatives, including the Voluntary Guidelines on Land and Resource Tenure of the FAO</p>		<p>reaching 9 women and 29 men</p> <p>In Peru, 63 people participated in four regional level PPA workshops in the regions of Madre de Dios (March and April, 2016) and Loreto (April and May, 2016). In total, these activities involved: 35 government representatives; 14 indigenous-community organizations representatives; 10 NGOs and 4 Academia representatives reaching 47 men and 16 women in Peru.</p> <p>One national women-focused PPA workshop (November 28, 2016, Lima) was co-organized with the National Amazonian and Andean Women Indigenous Organization ONAMIAP. 38 women</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>At least 30 relevant government officials and 15 NGO practitioners aware of and integrating options for supporting and strengthening multi-actor collaboration (moved to Output 3.1.2)</p> <p>Number of countries participating in</p>	<p>representatives from 16 community-grassroots organizations (leaders and community members)</p> <p>National policy briefs based on PPA processes and recommendations are in preparation for Indonesia, Peru (in press), Uganda. Working Paper in preparation for Colombia</p> <p>Practitioner guide for reform implementation, including bureaucracy survey results: consultant contracted.</p>	<p><i>Policy brief for Uganda under revision</i></p> <p>Peru 2017 http://dx.doi.org/10.17528/cifor/006704</p> <p>Indonesia Advanced draft</p> <p>Additionally 3 sub-national briefs published for Uganda</p> <p>Practitioner guide being finalized.</p>	<p>Peru National Brief analysing results from the implementation survey published https://www.cifor.org/library/7122/</p> <p>Indonesia PPA National brief: What future direction for forest tenure reform implementation in Indonesia?: Perspectives of national-level stakeholders https://www.cifor.org/library/7283/</p> <p>Practitioner guide The guide for implementing tenure reform</p>	<p>One briefing paper per country: 67%</p> <p>Practitioner guide: 100%</p>	
--	---	---	--	---	--	--

	<p>FAOs voluntary guidelines on land tenure processes adopting good practice recommendations on tenure reform implementation (moved to Output 4.1.1)</p>	<p>Second South-South Exchange (April, 2016, Lima and Madre de Dios, Peru): Forest Ministry officials from Uganda and Indonesia and project partners from Uganda participated in high-level dialogue with SERFOR director from Peru. A total of 164 people participated in these events (75 women and 89 men), 24 policy makers. (1) International Colloquium in Lima (8 government representatives out of a total of 60 participants), co-sponsored by SERFOR and UNALM; (2) the Subnational Colloquium in Madre de Dios (16 government officials, out of a total of 104 participants), co-</p>			<p>S-S Exchange (30 officials and 15 NGO targets):</p> <p>100% if combined with S-S Exchange in 2017 (which included 7 invited govt officials, plus more attended sessions). In 2016, there were 164 total participants, 24 policy makers, at least 15 NGOs participated</p>	
--	--	---	--	--	---	--

		<p>sponsored by Regional Government and regional Indigenous Federation FENAMAD; (3) Field visit to Tres Islas community 42 people (16 women and 26 men). Report on public events is here: http://www.cifor.org/library/6197/south-south-exchange-on-tenure-reform/</p> <p>Global policy forum moved to 4.1.1</p>				
<p><i>EC/IFAD Output 3.1.1</i> <i>Improved methods and frameworks for assessing tenure reform outcomes, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>clarification of definitions and meanings of tenure security</i> • <i>the relation of security to livelihood options for differentiated community actors</i> • <i>the relation of tenure security to sustainable use and management</i> 	<p><i>Clear and effective methods to assess tenure reform outcomes are available;</i></p> <p><i>Understanding of tenure reform outcomes in the 6 countries (moved to Output 2.1.1 in April 2016 revised workplan)</i></p>	<p><i>Methods designed (see 2.1.1)</i></p> <p><i>Training on data-collection methods: Peru: 14 participants (6 men and 8 women), Indonesia 14 participants (6 men and 8 women), and Uganda 14 participants (7 men and 7 women).</i></p> <p><i>Community-level research conducted in 3 Tier 1 countries in 54 villages,</i></p>	<p><i>Completed for IFAD</i></p>		<p><i>100%</i></p> <p><i>Training: 19 male and 23 female 280%</i></p> <p><i>Focus groups: 54, 64 and 44 per country or 300%</i></p> <p><i>Key informants: 45, 55 and 43 interviews or 477%</i></p> <p><i>HH surveys:</i></p>	<p><i>To harmonize outcomes, outputs and activities, this is now 2.1.1 in the current work plan (workplan approved PSC meeting 2016).</i></p>

	<p>The above clarified in April 2016 (for 2.1.1) to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 15 male and female data collectors trained • At least 18 Focus Groups (FG) per country • At least 30 Key informant interview (KII) Surveys administered to at least 900 households • Country activity reports • Workshop with community level actors and NGOs and other civil society in each country 	Y1	including focus groups with men/ women, older/ younger villagers; key informant interviews; intra-hh surveys. By country:			380, 542 and 526 households or 160%
		Y1				
		Y1				
		Y2	UGANDA Total # of Household (HH) Surveys: 380 Survey Respondents: 697 (416 men, 281 women) # of KII: 45 interviews # of FG: 54			
		Y1, Y2	INDONESIA Total # of Household Surveys: 542 Survey Respondents: 513 men and 511 women # of KII: 55. total number of individual interviewed (50 men and 5 women) # of FG: 64 groups. Data collections at community level: - Instrument for HH, FG, KII completed (Aug'15) - Household Surveys, FGs and KIIs completed: Maluku (Sep-Oct'15); Lampung (Sep-			

		<p><i>Nov'15); Sanggau (January - February 2016)</i></p> <p><i>- FG and KII completed: Sulawesi (July 2016)</i></p> <p><i>PERU</i></p> <p><i>Total # of Household surveys: 526</i></p> <p><i>Survey Respondents: 512 men and 499 women</i></p> <p><i># of KII: 43 total number of interviews (60 men and 37 women)</i></p> <p><i># of FG: 44</i></p> <p><i>All data collected at the community level on 12 communities in Loreto (August - December, 2015), and 10 communities in Madre de Dios (August - October, 2015).</i></p> <p><i>Workshops reported throughout this report. See 4.1.1 for community workshops.</i></p> <p><i>In Colombia (IFAD country), a total of 74 people participated in 7</i></p>				
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

			<p>subnational level PPA workshops in the regions of Quibdo (November, 2016, February 2017) Valledupar (November, 2016; February 2017) Sta. Marta (December, 2016, January, 2017) Guaviare, (January 2017). In total these activities involved: 6 government representatives; 9 practitioners; 59 indigenous representatives reaching 55 men and 19 women.</p>					
<p>GEF Output 3.1.2 Dissemination of synthesis paper on reform outcomes and other knowledge products (such as policy briefs) at country and global level</p>	<p>Methodologies and results from tenure reform outcome assessment is actively shared in the target countries and at the global level (moved to Output 2.1.2 in April 2016 revised workplan)</p> <p>The following added in April</p>	Y3	<p>Peru: -Community research results reports produced for 22 villages (unpublished, for communities) -Region level outcome reports produced for Madre de Dios and Loreto (in press). -Survey results report for Madre de Dios: http://www.cifor.org/library/6199/escena-rios-participativos-</p>	<p>Peru: -Larson AM, Monterroso I y Cronkleton P. 2018. <i>Titulación colectiva en la Amazonía peruana: Una historia en tres actos</i>. Folleto. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR. -Cruz-Burga Z., Monterroso I, Larson AM, Valencia F y Saldaña J. 2018 El impacto de la formalización de los derechos sobre la</p>		100%	<p>Methods and results are being shared actively in many forums both nationally and globally (See also 4.1.1).</p>	<p>To harmonize outcomes, outputs and activities, this is now 2.1.2 in the current work plan (workplan approved PSC meeting 2016). Production of the synthesis paper is under 2.1.2 and other synthesis products under briefs in 4.1.1, dissemination activities are mainly under 4.1.1 (workplan approved PSC meeting 2016).</p>

	<p>2016 to 2.1.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy paper published on outcomes of reform (also briefs in 4.1.1) • Knowledge is actively shared at forums 	Y3	<p>sobre-la-seguridad-de-la-tenencia-comunal-de-la-tierra-en-la-region-de-madre-de-dios/</p> <p>-Invited presentation of results, SERFOR, Lima, April, 2017. 11 government officials, offices of international cooperation and of knowledge dissemination) and 1 indigenous organization leader</p> <p>Global: Comparative synthesis results presented in poster presentation at World Bank conference, 2017.</p> <p>Policy paper synthesis on outcomes of reform due Y3</p>	<p>tierra y el bosque: Perspectivas de comunidades en Madre de Dios y Loreto.</p> <p>Policy brief in advanced draft</p>		<p>Policy paper completed: 100%</p>	
<p>GEF Output 4.1.1 Better targeted and effective outreach and dissemination deploying a careful mix of multiple media and materials to include:</p>	<p>Information on tenure reform, its catalysts, barriers, opportunities, lessons learned and good</p>		<p>Project advisory committee meetings: INDONESIA PAC Meetings:</p>	<p>Project advisory committee meetings: PACs organized in Uganda and Indonesia. Additional district level PACs</p>	<p>Project advisory committee meetings: PACs were organized in Lima, Peru on 21</p>	<p>PAC meetings one per year for 3 years: 89%</p>	<p>All manuals and tools (except practitioner guide in 2.1.2 above (and in 3.1.2 in revised workplan) have moved to 5.1.1 (workplan</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • global review of impacts of tenure (security) on forest sustainability and livelihoods • synthesis of findings and lessons of global comparative research • national, regional and global forums/roundtables on tenure security • policy roundtables, stakeholder dialogues • policy briefs, info-briefs, pamphlets/newsletters in local, national and international languages • best practice manuals and handbooks for policy makers, officials etc. • e-learning tool on tenure and conflict resolution • e-network linking implementers • radio programs in local languages • website and project videos 	<p>practices are available to policy makers, practitioners, community members and other stakeholders and are used by them</p> <p>The following added in April 2016 to clarify the above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inception workshop in 3 Tier 1 countries (IFAD only, completed prior to October 2015) • Program advisory committee established and meeting held; at least 3 per year • Community level workshops: 1 per community (at least 30) • Multistakeholder forums at national (3) and subnational level (7) • Global meeting side event 	<p>Y1</p> <p>Y1, Y2, Y3</p> <p>Y1</p> <p>Y2</p> <p>Y3</p>	<p>PAC on 19 Feb 2016; 17 people (3 government officials, 14 practitioners) 8 women 9 men.</p> <p>PERU PAC Meetings: PAC Meeting, Puerto Maldonado, Madre de Dios May, 2016. 8 PAC members (3 government officials - 3 practitioners - 2 indigenous organization) 1 women/6 men PAC meeting, Lima, June 2017 (9 people: 2 government officials, 6 practitioners, 1 Indigenous women’s organization)</p> <p>UGANDA PAC Meetings 1 National PAC meeting organized in December 2015 in Kampala (6 participants) 2 One sub-national meeting in Lamwo District organized in October 2015.</p>	<p>organized in 3 districts in Uganda</p>	<p>November 2018 and in Kampala Uganda on 4 December 2018.</p>	<p>approved PSC meeting 2016).</p> <p>The list of achievements follows the items in the workplan (PSC meeting 2016).</p>
---	--	---	---	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy and research meetings attended and organized to engage regional and international processes (at least 2) 	Y3	<p>Community feedback workshops: INDONESIA Maluku: 15 August 2016 at Piru (West Seram); 28 participants (10 government officials, 14 communities, 4 practitioners); 7 women and 21 men Lampung: 3 August 2016 at Sekincau (West Lampung); 18 participants (2 policy makers, 11 community members, 5 practitioners) 6 women 12 men UGANDA: Feedback in 16 villages: 500 participants: 270 women and 230 men; about 30 village government leaders and the rest are villagers. 3 conducted in 2016, 13 in 2017. PERU: Feedback materials prepared (Planned in 22 communities</p>	<p>Community feedback workshops: <i>Peru:</i> - Loreto: 19 Community Feedback Workshops (July, 2017) 378 participants (165 women and 213 men) - Madre de Dios: 20 Community Feedback Workshops (July 2017) 212 participants (104 women and 108 men)</p>		<p>Community feedback workshops 57 out of 30 or >100%</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South-South exchange organized with participants from 6 countries 	Y2				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tenure café launched for live consultations 	Y2				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E-platform launched (for sharing experiences) 	Y3				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy briefs published on: barriers and opportunities for reform; tenure security; gender 	Y2				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one radio program per country and one project video 	Y3				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Website setup and web-based communication launched and maintained 	Y1				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publish blogs 						

		Y1, Y2, Y3	<p>between June and August, 2017); 22 Community reports prepared. Feedback is combined with training in 5.1.2.</p> <p>Multistakeholder forums at Subnational level: all workshops reported in 1.1.2 and 2.1.2 to correspond with policymaker and practitioner targets. (Target set in workplan for 7 subnational: in 2016, 3 completed in Uganda, 3 in Peru, 2 in Indonesia; some additional still planned in 2017) (These subnational workshops are reported under 4.1.1 in the PPR)</p> <p>Multistakeholder forums at National level: reported for 2015-2016 in 1.1.2. One per country per year for a total of 3</p>	<p>Multistakeholder forums at Subnational level: 4 additional organized: 2 in Indonesia and 2 in Peru during the July through December 2017 period</p> <p>Multistakeholder forums at National level: 1 national colloquium organized in Uganda (Kampala, 22 November 2017</p>	<p>Multistakeholder forums at subnational level Two subnational forums were organized in Nepal - Hetauda, Province 3 (2 July 2018). - Butwal, Province 5 (11 June 2018). <i>These were not reported in previous PIR</i></p> <p>Multistakeholder forums at national level One national level multistakeholder forum was</p>	<p>Multistakeholder forums at subnational level 14 out of 7: >100%</p> <p>Multistakeholder forums at national level 12 out of 9: > 100%</p>	
--	--	---------------	--	---	--	---	--

		<p>per country. Two per country completed.</p> <p>Engagement in other national processes: Lima, Peru. September – October, 2016. Coordination group promoted by the National Cadastre (DISPACR) office to promote exchange and collaboration among titling initiatives in Peru. Participants included UNDP – Joint Declaration of Intent, Ministry of Culture, MINAM, WWF, GIZ, SPDA.</p> <p>Global meeting side event and S-S Exchange with 6 countries: 20-24 Mar'17: World Bank Conference in Washington DC. Forestry and Land</p>	<p>Global meeting side event 1. Washington DC. Land and Poverty Conference, 19-23 March 2018: Land Governance in an Interconnected</p>	<p>organized in Jakarta, Indonesia on 24 July 2018.</p> <p>A final project workshop was held in Lima, Peru on 21 November 2018.</p> <p>A gender forum was held on 30th October in Kampala, Uganda.</p> <p>A forum with Parliament members/legislators was held on 5th December in Kampala, Uganda.</p> <p>One national level forum was organized in Kathmandu, Nepal on 9 August 2018.</p>	<p>Global meeting side event 100%</p>	
--	--	---	---	--	--	--

		<p>office government participants from 6 project countries. Presentations: Exploring Participatory Prospective Analysis: A collaborative, scenario-based approach for analyzing and anticipating the consequences of tenure reform implementation (NL); Implementing forest tenure reforms: Perspectives from forestry agencies (TH); Outcomes of land and forest tenure reform implementation in Indonesia (MRB). Collective titling in Peru: Challenges and Opportunities (IM); Gender in collective tenure regimes: Women's rights and forest tenure reforms (AML). CIFOR Policy Dialogue: Tenure Reform Implementation with 6 country officials.</p>	<p>World. In total 4 papers were presented during the conference: - Conflict in Collective Formalization Processes: Opportunities for Transformation? - Does Tenure Reform Influence Household Food Security? - Social Differentiation In Collective Tenure Regimes: Women Rights And Forest Tenure Reforms - Adoption of Sustainable Land And Forest Management Technologies: Outcome of Forest Tenure Reform in Developing Countries</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

			<p>CIFOR training event on tenure literacy. Link to events flyer: http://www.cifor.org/cifor-at-land-poverty-conference-2017/</p>				
			<p>Policy and research meetings attended and organized to engage regional and international processes (at least 2): 24-27 October 2016: IUFRO Regional Congress of Asia and Oceania in Beijing; Outcome on forest tenure reform in Indonesia (TH); Outcomes of land and forest tenure reform implementation in Indonesia (MRB) 17-13 August 2016: IUFRO Sustainable Forest Development in Malaysia; Mangrove forest rehabilitation: Lessons from</p>	<p>Policy and research meetings attended and organized to engage regional and international processes: Indonesia: - ILC Roundtable discussion on Land Related Global Agenda, organised at CIFOR Bogor on 17 April 2018 - RRI partners meeting: leveraging Tenure related work in Indonesia and support to coalition joint engagement, Bogor on 5 March 2018 Peru: - International Congress on Forest and Land Tenure Security on 12-15 June, in Lima, Peru</p>	<p>Policy and research meetings attended and organized to engage regional and international processes: - World Bank Land and Poverty Conference: Paper presentation and panel discussion titles “Formalization of collective tenure rights of native communities in Peru” (27 March 2019)</p>	<p>Policy and research meetings attended and organized to engage regional and international processes: Over 100%</p>	

		<p>Indonesia and Tanzania (TH) 14-18 Aug 2016: WB conference in Washington; Key constraints to exercising forest tenure rights by forest adjacent communities in global south (MRB); Women's rights within collective tenure regimes: Analyzing outcomes of forest tenure reforms (MRB). 11-15 Oct 2015: IUFRO Small-Scale and Community Forestry Conference in Australia; Combining Collective and Individual Tenure Rights in Smallholder Forestry: The Case of Community Forestry in Indonesia July 2016, Rome: COFO parallel event on Unfinished Agendas for Forests and Climate Change: "Local communities and smallholders and their organizations as the enabling actors</p>	<p>- A final project workshop is also planned in Lima in September 2018, to be held back to back with a 2-day international forum of the Rights and Resources Initiative. - Participate in Peru forums related to the tenure aspects of REDD+.</p> <p>Global - RRI <i>Strategy Meeting on Gender Justice in Community Lands and Forests</i>, May 22-24 - RRI partners and governance meetings, January 9-11, Washington, DC, 2018 - CGIAR collaborative platform on gender: Strengthening women's tenure rights - EC Infopoint lunchtime conference, 23rd February, Brussels. The presentation was titled: "Slow down, step back: Gender in</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>to address climate change". Presentation on behalf of the tenure team by Peter Cronkleton. 2-5 December, 2016: International Conference on Forest and Livelihoods (FLARE) meeting in Edinburgh in about 150 practitioners attended this conference. http://www.forestlivelihoods.org/flare-meeting-2016/ March 2017, New York. Participant in the panel "The Impacts of Commercialization in Agriculture and Forestry on Women's Decent Employment" NGO Committee on the Status of Women, NY (NGO CSW/NY). April, 2017. Latin America Studies Association Annual Conference, Lima, Peru: "The Evolving Struggle for Indigenous Territories in Latin</p>	<p>forest tenure reform implementation - Yale Forest Dialogue—Scoping dialogue on forest and land tenure reform, 27-28 February - the Expert Group Meeting, Building sustainable and resilient societies through the gender-responsive implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, 5-6 June</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

		<p>America”, Paper presentation: Indigenous Territories and Tenure security.</p> <p>RRI Engagement Member/partner of the Rights and Resources Initiative. Participate at the global level in the annual global scan (November 1-3, 2016) and planning meetings (January 11-14, 2016; January 9-12, 2017), including presenting results from the research to CIFOR partners and invited associates; in the Call for Action strategy (launch in Rome, March 9, 2016).</p> <p>IASC Engagement. Council member of the International Association for the Study of the Commons (association of researchers and practitioners) until December 2016. Currently RRI ambassador to the IASC; member of</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>academic committee of the 2019 Biennial Conference to be held in Lima, Peru). Papers, panels and practitioner labs engagement in July 2017 conference.</p> <p>Other policy/ research/ practitioner meetings (Presentations in national workshops organized by others):</p> <p><i>INDONESIA</i> 3 Nov'15: Unila Workshop in Lampung. Organized by University of Lampung: Alternatif penguatan tenur masyarakat (TH) 21-22 Oct'15: INAFOR conference in Bogor. Organized by FORDA; Constraints to exercising forest tenure rights by forest adjacent communities in Indonesia (MRB)</p> <p><i>PERU</i> February. 2017. Lima. Invited</p>				
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

		<p>presenters at Workshop to exchange experiences among titling initiatives in Peru: Constraints, lessons learned and good practices. Organized by GIZ.</p> <p>June 2016. Conference on Indigenous titling in Peru. Invited guests included SPDA, AIDSESEP. Organized by Catholic University (PUCP), Faculty of Sociology.</p> <p>May 26, 2017. Lima Peru. Co-conveners in the event "Indigenous women and rights to land" together with the National Indigenous Women Organization, Rights and Resources Initiative and International Land Coalition. Panel presentation: Indigenous women and current challenges in titling. Launch of gender brief (below).</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Tenure café (Y2) and e-platform (Y3)</p> <p>Policy briefs (in process) -barriers and opportunities for reform -tenure security -gender (Gender brief published in Peru) LINK: http://rightsandresources.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/Resumen-Pol%C3%ADtico-Derechos-Mujeres-Ind%C3%ADgenas-y-Proyectos-de-Titulaci%C3%B3n.pdf</p> <p>Radio programs: (at least one per country) Uganda: Two radio programs presenting findings from two PPA workshops in Kibale and Masindi</p>	<p>Tenure Café and e-platform Planned for August 2018</p> <p>Policy briefs 3 completed for Peru, 2 pending for Indonesia and Uganda</p> <p>Radio programs Completed for Uganda and Indonesia. Peru contracted, but not yet done</p>	<p>Tenure Café and e-platform Tenure café was cancelled. E-platform was replaced by a webinar in Peru.</p> <p>Policy briefs Implementing forest tenure reforms: Perspectives from Indonesia’s forestry agencies (pending publication)</p> <p>Understanding and protecting our forest tenure rights and privileges; A Guide to Training of Local Community Leaders in Uganda (pending publication)</p> <p>Radio programs completed in Peru (https://www.cifor.org/gcs-tenure/resources/features/peru/)</p>	<p>Tenure café and e-platform 50%</p> <p>Policy briefs 100% (Two for Peru, one for Uganda and one for Indonesia)</p> <p>Radio Programs 100%</p>	<p>E-platform was replaced with a webinar</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	---

			<p>Districts in Uganda; one newspaper article.</p> <p>Videos: (one project video) Tenure Talk Series http://www.cifor.org/gcs-tenure/resources/videos/ Peru: http://blog.cifor.org/42118/peru-la-problematica-de-la-tenencia-colectiva-desde-la-perspectiva-de-los-actores-regionales?fnl=es</p> <p>Website launched at: http://www.cifor.org/gcs-tenure/</p> <p>Blogs: see section 10 (3 per year target)</p> <p>Manuals and tools are under 5.1.1</p>	<p>Videos Videos completed</p> <p>Website Continuously updated</p> <p>15 blogs were published</p> <p>n.a.</p>	<p>Videos Two additional videos https://www.cifor.org/gcs-tenure/resources/videos/ https://www.cifor.org/gcs-tenure/resources/features/peru/</p> <p>Website Continuously updated</p> <p>Four blogs was published</p>	<p>Videos: 100%</p> <p>Website 100%</p> <p>Blogs 31 or > 100%</p>	
<p>GEF Output 5.1.1 Tools and approaches for equitable and effective reform implementation developed</p>	<p>Various tools are available to support tenure reform, including:</p>		<p>Factsheets: See comments.</p>			<p>n.a.</p>	<p>Fact sheets were eliminated/ combined with policy briefs under 4.1.1 (approved workplan PSC meeting 2016) and may also be</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Factsheets on impacts of tenure reform • Training manuals on conflict resolution • Illustrated handbook on relevant laws, policies and institutions targeted at different actors • Guide on integrating gender in tenure reform processes and implementation • Good practice guide and principles of inter-agency collaboration and multi-stakeholder engagement in reform planning and implementation <p>E-platform for lesson learning and experience sharing</p>		<p>Conflict resolution will be contracted in Y2 (see comments)</p>	<p>- Paper developed in place of manual, delivered at WB Conference: Conflict in collective land and forest formalization.</p>	<p>Conflict resolution Larson A.M., I. Monterroso, N.H. Vigil. 2019. Los conflictos en la tenencia forestal colectiva: Lecciones para Perú de un estudio comparativo. CIFOR Infobrief No. 252. Center for international Forestry Research https://www.cifor.org/library/7267/</p>	100%	<p>produced as part of training activities.</p> <p>Conflict resolution manual will be reduced to contribution to existing FAO manual (PSC meeting 2016); a review of current manuals to address gaps (PSC 2017)</p>
			<p>Handbook on laws, See comments. Guides/ factsheets on laws produced by country. Peru factsheet produced for community training materials. Indonesia: illustrated handbook is contracted.</p>	<p>- Illustrated handbooks on laws, policies and institutions (<i>Bahasa Indonesia, Lunyoro, and Kiswahili</i>), (<i>in Spanish in the form of two flyers</i>)</p>		100%	<p>Illustrated handbook on laws has been changed (PSC meeting 2017) to country-level guides or factsheets as needed due to the variation among countries (Indonesia, Uganda, due Q4 2017).</p>
		<p>Guide on integrating gender is contracted.</p>	<p>Guide on integrating gender is under development</p>	<p>Guide on integrating gender drafted</p>	<p>Guide on integrating gender completed</p>		

	<p>The following were added in April 2016 to above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPA guide for tenure security 		<p>Practitioner guide for reform implementation reported under 2.1.2</p> <p>E-platform moved to 4.1.1</p> <p>Additional manual: PPA manual/guide for tenure security in press (July)</p>	<p>Manual on PPA is published: https://www.cifor.org/library/6749/guide-for-co-elaboration-of-scenarios-building-shared-understanding-and-joint-action-for-reform-and-security-of-forest-tenure/</p>	<p>Additional: - Illustrated guide on steps for titling native communities in Peru (in print) - Illustrated guide of laws and policies in Uganda titled “Understanding and protecting our forest tenure rights and privileges: A guide for training local community members and leaders” Guide was translated into Lunyoro and Kiswahili.</p>	<p>n.a.</p> <p>n.a.</p>	<p>E-platform replaces e-network and e-learning tool in 4.1.1 (workplan approved PSC 2016)</p>
--	---	--	---	---	---	-------------------------	--

<p>GEF Output 5.1.2 Forest dependent communities, policy makers and practitioners are trained in effective reform implementation</p>	<p>Stakeholders are able to use the tools (5.1.1) available to support them in tenure reform implementation</p> <p>Community member, especially women have undergone skills training on legal literacy, collective organizing, conflict resolution and negotiation and leadership skills</p> <p>150 Policy makers and practitioners have received training on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diagnostic skills for pro-active assessment, monitoring and de- 	Y2-Y3	<p>COMMUNITY TRAINING</p> <p>PERU Community Training materials have been prepared around the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tenure reform: procedures and steps to formalize collective rights in Peru - REDD+ and indigenous communities - Community Forestry 	<p>COMMUNITY TRAINING</p> <p><i>Indonesia</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training Justice Gender and Forest Tenure (12-14 March 2018 in Central Sulawesi), - Training on Gender and forest tenure reform, Maluku, on 23-25 November 2017 at Osi Island, attended by 20 people (11 women and 9 men). - Legal literacy training on forest tenure reform, Maluku, on 24-25 August 2017, attended by 35 people 3 women and 32 men), including introduction to VGGT - Training on Gender and forest tenure reform, Lampung, on 9-11 November 2017, at Tri Budi Syukur Village 	<p>COMMUNITY TRAINING</p>	<p>Community members trained: 840 or >100%</p>	

	150 people trained total)			<p>Participants (242 women and 272 men)</p> <p>-Loreto: 319 Participants (147 women and 172 men)</p> <p>-Madre de Dios: 195 Participants (95 women 100 men)</p> <p>-Gender Training (November, 2017): 24 participants (11 women and 13 men) including 6 policy makers; 13 practitioners and 5 indigenous women</p> <p><i>Nepal:</i> PPA training titled "What rights for forest communities under the newly adopted federal structure of Nepal? in Chautara SangaChok Gadhi Municipality, Sindupalchowk district on 14-15 May 2018, and continued 1-3 June 2018. (Participants: 40; 25 men, 15 women)</p>			
--	---------------------------	--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>POLICY MAKERS AND PRACTITIONERS TRAININGS</p> <p>Training on tenure literacy at World Bank conference March, 2017, 23 people attending (6 government officials)</p> <p>Indonesia Orientation Training on Strengthening Forest Tenure Security Lampung (2-5 May 2017); for frontline forest tenure reform implementers; 30 participants (21 government officials, 9 practitioners) 8 women 22 men</p> <p>Tenure literacy training Nepal: conducted in Butwal (August 2016), (23 participants) including 9 government officials and 14 NGO actors.</p>	<p>POLICY MAKERS AND PRACTITIONERS TRAININGS</p> <p>Peru:</p> <p>-Gender Training in Peru (November, 2017): 24 participants (11 women and 13 men) including 6 policy makers; 13 practitioners and 5 indigenous women.</p> <p>Indonesia:</p> <p>-Training on Gender and forest tenure reform, Maluku, on 23-25 November 2017, at Osi Island, attended by 20 people (11 women and 9 men).</p> <p>-Legal literacy training on forest tenure reform, Maluku, on 24-25 August 2017, attended by 35 people 3 women and 32 men), including introduction to VGGT</p> <p>-Training on Gender and forest tenure</p>	<p>POLICY MAKERS AND PRACTITIONER TRAININGS</p> <p><u>Indonesia</u></p> <p>Training for implementing agency, on 5 – 6 July 2018: 27 stakeholders (10 Women and 17 Men), consisting 11 policy makers; 12 practitioners; 4 NGO.</p>	<p>Policy makers and practitioners trained:</p> <p>385 or >100%</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	--	---	--

				<p>reform, Lampung, on 9-11 November 2017, at Tri Budi Syukur Village Lampung Barat District, attended by 17 participants (8 women and 9 men)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legal literacy training of forest tenure reform, Lampung, on 6-7 November 2017, attended by (5 women and 26 men), including introduction to VGGT <p>Uganda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training of district level officials and NGOs practitioners on local collective rights, on 12-13 December, 2017. (15 men, 13 women). - Training of national level officials to raise awareness of forest policy, law and regulations on 15th December, 2017. (36 men, 10 women). 			
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

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

Max 200 words:

Main significant results:

- CIFOR published several dozen briefs, blogs, guides, flyers, posters, radio spots and videos targeted to key audiences in national languages. Specifically, our final publications have included cross-country analysis addressing conflict and models of reform for formalizing customary forests. National-level publications analyzed outcomes of reform from a gender perspective and implementer agents' perspective.
- The project's participatory research approach was a key aspect to engage stakeholders since the beginning of the project, to create spaces of dialogue among diverse stakeholders, and to raise awareness across all scales (international, national, subnational, and local) in topics related to land tenure, particularly with a focus on gender and native community's rights.
- Trust building and establishing continuity in the process facilitated incorporation of gender perspectives and awareness of the legal gaps and overlaps in the policy agenda.. According to stakeholders, produced outputs such as info briefs, manuals, and guidelines about methods have practical application, inform and clarify land tenure reform implementation steps.
- In Indonesia and Uganda, the participatory prospective analysis (PPA) emerged as a critical approach to multi-actor coordination, problem-solving and planning. In Indonesia policy makers and practitioners wish to see PPA scaled up.
- In Uganda, we were asked to propose ways of integrating gender into the collaborative forest management guidelines. At the district level, actions identified via PPA workshops are now being implemented such as increasing staffing levels in district environment departments and increasing the number of female staff implementing tenure interventions.
- Also in Uganda, CIFOR conducted a Gender Forum and a Forum with Parliament representatives. As a result of this, members of parliament in the natural resources committee want to escalate the policy implications of GCS-Tenure work to the entire Parliament body.
- In Peru, dialogue spaces have brought together stakeholders and raised awareness on outcomes and opportunities brought up by the analysis of perception of titling processes in the Amazon. The assessment was supported by spatial analysis of changes in forest conditions in one of the study regions. Discussions held during the closing event highlighted the need to implement forest regulations that address concerns around livelihoods, in particular subsistence needs.
- The partnership with academic actors has been an effective strategy to build research capacity and raise awareness in the academic sector and develop interest in land tenure topics within their institutions. This contributed to developing critical mass in land tenure thinking in Peru. The project created new interest in tenure issues among professors and students at UNALM and other universities, including professors from the University of Lima and Universidad Catolica.

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

Max 200 words:

The main challenge has been the level of project ambition. The project has taken a truly multifaceted approach to the topic of collective titling in each country, engaging virtually all relevant actors, and analyzing history, law, process, implementation and outcomes. While this has permitted CIFOR to develop an integrated understanding of

progress on, and challenges to, collective titling, it has also demanded, and continues to demand, a high level of commitment to bring about change. There is still much to be done.

The use of participatory tools and the deliberate engagement of stakeholders during the implementation of this research contributed to outcomes on building capacity, raising awareness, and contributing to change in practices. As the project concludes, an important challenge is to ensure other means of engagement with stakeholders that recognize CIFOR as a place to go for analysis to inform ongoing implementation reform processes beyond the scope of the project.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating ¹⁵	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating ¹⁶	Comments/reasons justifying the rating for FY2018 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	Progress of implementation has been good. Many activities were completed during this reporting period. A number of reports have been completed during the reporting period. A few reports were delayed some other were cancelled. Still the targets were largely met. Activities related to awareness and capacity development have been extensive and in some cases exceptionally positive.
Budget Holder	S	S	The project has been well implemented and significantly improved understanding of the benefits of tenure reform for forest governance and livelihoods. Accomplishments have included new research in project countries along with effective knowledge sharing to key stakeholders including policy makers, NGOs, researchers, forest communities and vulnerable populations with regards to tenure reform processes, impacts, and implications including for women. In addition, various trainings for the diverse stakeholders on improving legal literacy, incorporating women's concerns in tenure reform, and dispute resolution have been excellent contribution to the tenure reform processes in the project countries.

¹⁵ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

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

Lead Technical Officer¹⁷	S	S	Overall good implementation and impacts with regards to improving understanding of tenure reform related issues and implications for forest governance and livelihoods. Notable achievements include rigorous research in project countries; development of materials and effective communication (through policy briefs, videos, radio programs); multi-stakeholder workshops that promoted understanding of tenure reform process and implications among various stakeholders; and strengthening of knowledge and skills in country (Universities, NGOs, policy makers, communities) with regards to tenure reform processes, impacts, and implications including on women.
GEF-CBC Funding Liaison Officer, Climate and Environment Division (CBC)	S	S	The projects execution was consistent with the agreed implementation strategy and caught up with the limited delays of Project Year 1. Despite the geographical challenges of such a global intervention, the Project Management Unit and the Steering Committee adapted well to the execution related needs and to FAO's requirements.

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

3. Risks

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

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ¹⁸ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.

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

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
<p><i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant. The “Notes” column has one section for the BH and PMU and one for the LTO.</i></p>

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

	Risk	Risk rating¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Stakeholders will be supportive of the science, policy options and action generated by this initiative and will have sufficient will to put into practice new knowledge, capacities and innovations.	L	Stakeholders were actively engaged in project activities, and developed better understanding of tenure related challenges and possible interventions needed as a result of project activities. Also CIFOR actively engaged local partners in research and all project activities		
2	Slow uptake of policy recommendations by stakeholders; low political will to put into practice new science, capacities and innovations	M impact L likelihood	As above		
3	Complex project design as it spans several countries, multiple levels and engages multiple partners/actors simultaneously	M, M	The project made efforts to coordinate with various stakeholders and with PACs in country. Coordination across countries is being maintained primarily through co-principal investigators, project coordinators, and through the PSC.		
4	Risk of political instability or civil unrest that may lead to premature termination of research science and action	H, L	The project anticipated possible political instability due to elections in Uganda. However the elections and change of government was largely peaceful.		

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

²⁰ If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period”.

Risk Statement – (The Current situation with respect to the risk and Consequence of no action. How is it affecting or will it affect the project?)
 Action to take – action planned/taken to handle the risk
 Who – person(s) responsible for the action
 Date – date by which action needs to be or was completed

Risk number	Risk Statement		Action to Take to mitigate high or substantial risk.	Who	Date
	Current Situation with respect to the risk	Consequence of no action			
			1.	1.	

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

FY2017 rating	FY2018 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2017 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
	L	See comments above
		If a risk mitigation plan had been presented for a previous period please report on progress or results of its implementation

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

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

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Objective	No	
Project Outcomes	Yes	Targets have been adjusted in some cases and made more precise and measurable.
Project Outputs/Activities/Inputs	Yes	Outputs 2 and 3 have been reversed to better align with the overall activities. The current workplan has reduced confusion and improved consistency across outcomes, outputs, activities and targets.

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

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

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	<p>Original NTE: 8 Oct 2018 Revised NTE: 7 April 2019</p> <p>Justification: Two no cost extension were processed extending the project by 6 months. Initial delays were due to delayed approval and start of project. This led to problems of maintaining core staff throughout a much longer project period and in the progress of planned activities according to the original timeline. The additional time allowed for the completion of the remaining events and most of the outstanding publication commitments.</p>

²¹ Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

5. Gender Mainstreaming

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

Was a gender analysis undertaken or an equivalent socio-economic assessment? Please briefly indicate the gender differences.

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

Does the project staff have gender expertise?

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

- closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;
- improving women's participation and decision making; and or
- generating socio-economic benefits or services for women.

The project includes gender as a central part of the analysis. For the study of community-level impacts/ outcomes of reform: Community level surveys were conducted with both male and female household heads as intra-household surveys in order to capture gender differences in perspectives; key informant interviews were held specifically with women as well as men; and focus groups were conducted separately with men and women. For the Participatory Prospective Analysis: in Uganda and Peru, where the number of women participating in the PPA workshops was deemed to be too low, separate PPA processes were conducted with community women. The gendered results of these processes are documented in reports and publications that are still mostly in process. Analysis: Gender-differentiated results have been analyzed and presented in two international conferences, and a journal article is being produced. In Peru a joint brief was produced with RRI and the rural women's association ONAMIAP with analysis and recommendations on gender and collective titling: <http://rightsandresources.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/Resumen-Pol%C3%ADtico-Derechos-Mujeres-Ind%C3%ADgenas-y-Proyectos-de-Titulaci%C3%B3n.pdf>. Related activities are reported in Section 10.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

If applies, please describe the process and current status of on-going/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities

Yes. This project deals with local forest dependent communities in the project countries. Such communities include both indigenous and other local communities. Thus, all were engaged throughout the project through the PPAs, community feedback workshops, multistakeholder forums and trainings.

Indigenous federations (including those of women) were actively engaged in all activities particularly in Peru and Indonesia. Activities were conducted in local languages to ensure engagement from all.

9. Stakeholders Engagement

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

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

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

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

Steering committee, Project Advisory Committee, PPAs, Multistakeholder fora, project partners, research partners. Same stakeholders engaged throughout the process. Key stakeholders engaged include the following:

Research Partners		
1. Agrarian University La Molina, Peru	Academic & Research	Letter of Agreement, implementing field working activities, dissemination
2. University of Makerere, Uganda	Academic & Research	Letter of Agreement, implementing field working activities, dissemination
3. Association of Uganda Professional Women in Agriculture and Environment AUPWAE, Uganda	NGO	implementing field working activities, dissemination
4. University of Pattimura, Indonesia	Academic & Research	Letter of Agreement, implementing field working activities, dissemination
5. University of Lampung, Indonesia	Academic & Research	Letter of Agreement, implementing field working activities, dissemination
Steering Committee Members		
6. Bob Kazungu, Forestry Sector Support Department, Ministry of Environment, Uganda	Participation in decision making	Consultation, participation in decision making, implementation action plan
7. Hadi Wiratno, Ministry of Forestry/MoF, Indonesia	Participation in decision making	Consultation, participation in decision making, implementation action plan
8. Ronald Salazar, Ministry of National Land Cadastre and Registration Office, Peru	Participation in decision making	Consultation, participation in decision making, implementation action plan
Key Project Advisory Committee Members		
9. Rights and Resources Initiative, all countries	CSOs - Global coalition; Participation in decision making as PSC member	Information and consultation - knowledge sharing and dissemination
10. ONAMIAP - National Indigenous Women Organization, Peru	Indigenous Organization	Information and consultation - knowledge sharing and dissemination

8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

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

The project objective was to improve the way knowledge about forest and land tenure reforms is understood, communicated and used so that decision makers, practitioners and forest-dependent people in developing countries are well-equipped to develop and implement policies and projects that support tenure security, livelihoods and sustainable forest management. The project employed well targeted and effective outreach and knowledge sharing deployed through a mix of multiple for a, media and materials as listed below. This has contributed to tenure reform processes that are in alignment with people's livelihoods and improvement in forest governance.

Materials produced:

- Global review of impacts of tenure (security) on forest sustainability and livelihoods
- Synthesis of findings and lessons of global comparative research
- Policy briefs, info-briefs, pamphlets/newsletters in local, national and international languages
- Best practice manuals and handbooks for policy makers, officials etc.
- E-learning tool on tenure and conflict resolution
- E-network linking implementers
- Radio programs in local languages
- Website and project videos

Mechanism for knowledge sharing:

- Policy roundtables, stakeholder dialogues
- National, regional and global forums/roundtables on tenure security
- Trainings for policy makers, NGOs, CSOs, communities, Universities etc in project countries

Websites, etc

See separate Annex 2 for complete information

9. Co-Financing Table

Materialized Co-financing – Mandatory for projects that are completing the Mid-term review or ending operations within this reporting period (July 2018 – April 2019). Recommended for all projects.

Name of Co-financer	Co-financer source	Type of Co-financing	Co financing at project start			Actual co-financing at project end		
			In Kind	Cash	Total	In Kind	Cash	Total
International Fund for Agricultural Development	Other	Grant		3,430,000	3,430,000		3,150,927	3,150,927
CIFOR	Other	Other		815,852	815,852		25,000	25,000
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	GEF Agency	Grant		300,000	300,000	603,728		603,728
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH	Donor Agency	Grant					88,720	88,720
International Food Policy Research Institute	Other	Other					42,525	42,525
World Resources Institute	Civil Society Organization	Grant					17,000	17,000
International Union for Conservation of Nature - Switzerland	Civil Society Organization	Grant					8,000	8,000
Austrian Development Agency	Donor Agency	Grant					603,921	603,921
Tetra Tech International Development	Private Sector	Grant					144,084	144,084
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH	Donor Agency	Grant					906,078	906,078
NORAD	Donor Agency	Grant					800,000	800,000
GRAND TOTAL			-	4,545,852	4,545,852	603,728	5,786,255	6,389,983

Explain “Other Sources of Co-financing”: _____

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

1. IFAD Grant -- for project titled "Global Collaborative Study on Tenure". This represent expenditures from period of January 2014 to June 2018.
2. These include various projects:
 - Grant by IFPRI as part of the CGIAR collaborative Research Program on "Policies, Institution and Markets (PIM)" , specifically under its Flagship Program 5 on the Governance of Natural Resources to support activities contributing to Cluster of Activities 5.1 Enhancing Tenure Security.
 - Small grant from IUCN used to draft a discussion paper titled Recognition and Respect for Tenure Rights. The purpose of this paper is to inform debates around governance of natural resources as part of a series of IUCN publications on this topic.
 - "Addressing the gender gap in participation and representation in community forestry: Consolidation of research and action on gender, tenure and community forestry in Uganda and Nicaragua" with support from Austrian Development Agency (ADA);
 - "Assessment of Natural Resource Governance Including Land and Forest Tenure in Coastal Mangrove Forests of Southeast Asia and Africa" focusing on Indonesia and Tanzania, with support from TetraTech;
 - Paper on "Administrative Barriers to the Formalization of Indigenous and Community Land" with support from WRI;
 - Research on tenure and Gender as part of larger funding titled "Impact of Trade and Investment on Forests and People" with support from the German Government;
 - One work package under a grant from NORAD on "Global Comparative Study for achieving effective, efficient and equitable REDD+ results". The specific work package focuses on multi-level governance and aims to improve inclusiveness in decision-making about forests.
3. The FAO grant co-contribution includes work on: Uganda forest tenure project (2014-2016), Uganda customary rights registration study, forest tenure assessment framework development/consultations/revision, testing of framework in four countries, COFO 23 session on forest tenure, forest tenure papers (UNECE/FLARE), forest tenure assessments (in Honduras, Portugal, Tanzania, Senegal, Zambia), Sierra Leone community based forestry Technical Cooperation Project, and staff time. With the exception of Uganda forest tenure project which was supported by DFID, all the remaining were FAO regular program funds.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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

Annex. 2

Specific materials produced:

Papers/reports

- Global: The Scramble for Land Rights: Inequity in community and company procedures to acquire formal land rights, in collaboration with WRI. Report launched in July 2018: <https://www.cifor.org/library/7021/>
- Indonesia: Herawati, T., E. Mwangi, N. Liswanti. 2019. Implementing forest tenure reforms: Perspectives from Indonesia's forestry agencies. CIFOR InfoBrief No. XX (pending publication)
- Indonesia: Firdaus, A.Y. 2018. Panduan Praktis Penerapan Kebijakan Perhutanan Sosial : Kerangka PENCEPATAN Reformasi Tenurial Hutan. Bogor, Indonesia: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17528/cifor/006856>
- Indonesia: Durán R, Monterroso I y Larson AM. *Género e interculturalidad en la formalización de las comunidades nativas en Perú: Desafíos y recomendaciones*. Folleto. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR
- Peru: Book chapter. Monterroso, I., P. Cronkleton and A.M. Larson. Commons, indigenous rights and governance. In Blake Hudson, Jonathan Rosenbloom and Dan Cole (eds) 2019. *Routledge Handbook of the Study of the Commons*. Routledge. Published.
- Peru: Policy paper on outcomes of reform (awaiting publication)
- Peru: Report completed on titling and deforestation trends in indigenous communities in Madre de Dios. Results presented at final national workshop.
- Peru: Monterroso I y Larson AM. 2018. *Desafíos del proceso de formalización de derechos de CCNN en Perú*. InfoBrief. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR.
- Peru: Monterroso I y Larson AM. 2018. *Avances del proceso de formalización de derechos de comunidades nativas en la Amazonía peruana (2014-2018)*. InfoBrief. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR.

Handbooks

- Peru: Illustrated guide on steps for titling native communities. <https://www.cifor.org/library/7162/>
- Indonesia: Illustrated handbook on laws, policies and institutions in Bahasa Indonesia <https://www.cifor.org/library/6856/panduan-praktis-penerapan-kebijakan-perhutanan-sosial-kerangka-pencepatan-reformasi-tenurial-hutan/>

- Uganda: Amooti Nsita, S., C Mukasa, A. Tibazalika. 2019. Understanding and protecting our forest tenure rights and privileges; A Guide to Training of Local Community Leaders in Uganda. CIFOR InfoBrief No. XX (pending publication)

Briefs

- Global: Models for formalizing customary and community forest lands: The need to integrate livelihoods into rights and forest conservation goals: http://www.cifor.org/publications/pdf_files/infobrief/7273-infobrief.pdf
- Indonesia: PPA National brief: What future direction for forest tenure reform implementation in Indonesia?: Perspectives of national-level stakeholders <https://www.cifor.org/library/7283/>
- Perú: Larson A.M., I. Monterroso, N.H. Vigil. 2019. Los conflictos en la tenencia forestal colectiva: Lecciones para Perú de un estudio comparativo. CIFOR Infobrief No. 252. Center for international Forestry Research <https://www.cifor.org/library/7267/>
- Perú: Brief in Spanish El impacto de la formalizacion de los derechos sobre la tierra y el bosque: perspectivas de comunidades en Madre de Dios : <https://www.cifor.org/library/6952/>
- Perú: National Brief Formalizacion del derecho colectivo de las comunidades nativas: Las perspectivas de funcionarios: <https://www.cifor.org/library/7122/>
- Perú: Briefs on Progress in reforms: <https://www.cifor.org/library/7080/>
- Peru: Briefs on Challenges in formalizing rights of native communities: http://www.cifor.org/publications/pdf_files/infobrief/6294-infobrief.pdf
- Peru: Gender and formalization of native communities in Peruvian Amazon brief: <https://www.cifor.org/library/7108>
- Peru: Popular flyer on history of reforms in Peru previously published in Spanish, available in English: http://www.cifor.org/publications/pdf_files/flyer/7014-flyer.pdf
- Peru: Infographics on procedures for titling of indigenous communities (In Spanish)
 - o Posted on line:
 - o <https://www.cifor.org/library/6845/reconocimiento-de-la-personeria-juridica-de-la-comunidad-campesina/>;
 - o <https://www.cifor.org/library/6846/reconocimiento-de-la-personeria-juridica-de-la-comunidad-nativa/>;

- <https://www.cifor.org/library/6847/titulacion-de-la-comunidad-campesina/>
- Uganda: Forest tenure reform implementation in Uganda: Current challenges and future opportunities

Videos

- Uganda: Women's rights and forest tenure reform in Uganda. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q-KvemlhHdo>
- Uganda: Achieving tenure security in Uganda. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LC5vxjUBGwE>
- Uganda: Customary rights and forest tenure reforms in Uganda
- Uganda: Advances in forest tenure reform in Uganda (Part 1/2):
- Uganda: Forest tenure reform in Uganda: Building capacity (Part 2/1):
- Uganda: Video on Forest tenure reform in Uganda: An interview with Rachel Musoke.
- Uganda: Forest tenure reform in Uganda: An interview with Levi Etwodu:
- Uganda: Video on Forest tenure reform in Uganda: An interview with Justine Namaalwa.
- Uganda: Forest tenure reform in Uganda: An interview with Hillary Agaba.
- Peru: Two videos published: <https://www.cifor.org/gcs-tenure/resources/videos/>
- Peru: Video Maluku: Sequence Maluku Story: <https://youtu.be/zQHofc5tAT0>
- Indonesia: Video Lampung: Why social forestry: Securing the sap: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jf82Jea2xO8>
- Indonesia: Why social forestry: Keeping the coffee: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jsP_IJB6bU

Radio spots

- Peru: Two radio spots and one radio program: <https://www.cifor.org/gcs-tenure/resources/features/peru/>
- Nepal: Expert panel was broadcasted on 10 June 2018. The video recording of the expert panel discussion can be accessed at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=share&v=L8rjfKgNJMI&app=desktop>

Blogs

- Global: Blog launched on International Day of World Indigenous People (August 2018) <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/57404/por-que-los-asuntos-de-los-pueblos-indigenas-deben-ser-asuntos-nacionales?fnl=es>
- Global: GLF also produced a blog on the report: <https://news.globallandscapesforum.org/28307/reduce-bureaucracy-for-community-indigenous-groups-embroiled-in-land-rights-challenges-report-urges/>
- Peru: Técnicos de gobierno también enfrentan desafíos para titular las tierras indígenas <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/60483/peru-tecnicos-de-gobierno-tambien-enfrentan-desafios-para-titular-las-tierras-indigenas?fnl=es> (April, 2019)
- Indonesia: Blog (April 2018): <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/55795/perhutanan-sosial-merawat-getah?fnl=id>
- Indonesia: Blog (April 2018): <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/55775/perhutanan-sosial-merawat-kopi?fnl=id>
- Indonesia: Blog (May 2018): In Indonesia, social forestry gets socialized. <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/55625/in-indonesia-social-forestry-gets-socialized?fnl=en>.
- Indonesia: Blog (January 2018): 'The forest belongs to the community': <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/53571/forest-belongs-community?fnl=en>.
- Indonesia: Blog (January 2018): Croft-Cusworth, C. 2018-01-24. The forest farmers: <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/53573/the-forest-farmers?fnl=en>.
- Indonesia: Blog (January 2018): Croft-Cusworth, C. 2018-01-25. Postcards from the field: The view from Honitetu: <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/53577/postcards-field-view-honitetu?fnl=en>.
- Indonesia: Blog (January 2018): The power of 'sasi': A sustainable taboo. <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/53575/power-sasi-sustainable-taboo?fnl=en>.
- Indonesia: Blog in Forest News (29 October 2018): Taking stock of Indonesia's social forestry program <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/58344/taking-stock-of-indonesias-social-forestry-program?fnl=en>

Websites

- Project website: <http://www.cifor.org/gcs-tenure/>

- Peru GCS Tenure Features Website including all project publications, videos, blogs, radio spots and photographs available here <https://www.cifor.org/gcs-tenure/resources/features/peru/>

Trainings

- Indonesia: Training Justice Gender and Forest Tenure (12-14 March 2018, Indonesia): 40 participants (**30 women, 10 men**)
- Indonesia: Training for implementing agency, on 5 – 6 July 2018 at the 101 Hotel Suryakencana, Bogor. The training was organized by GCS-Tenure in collaboration with WG-Tenure. Attended by 27 stakeholders (10 Women and 17 Men), consisting 11 policy makers; 12 practitioners; 4 NGO. The objective of this training is to facilitate the implementing agency of forest tenure reforms of front-line by improving their knowledge and capacity on legal literacy including government policies and regulations related to post-permit tenure reform and improving their skills to facilitate the reform implementation at the community level.
- Peru: Training on below topics (15 June 2018, Peru): 34 participants (**19 women and 15 men**)
 - o Key factors affecting security and insecurity in the context of collective tenure, Anne M Larson, CIFOR
 - o VGGTs, Hector CisnerosVelarde/Safia Aggarwal, FAO Peru/FAO Rome
 - o Strategies for addressing conflict in collective formalization processes, Silvana Baldovino, SPDA-Tenure Facility
- Uganda: Trainings on legal provisions on community tenure, requirements for implementation and how best to support local communities to demand/negotiate for their tenure rights in three districts:
 - o Kakumiro District (26th June 2018): 23 participants (**10 women, 13 men**)
 - o Kibale District (27th June 2018): 27 participants (**11 women, 16 men**)
 - o Lamwo District (29th June 2018): 25 participants (**6 women, 19 men**)
- Nepal: PPA training organized titled “What rights for forest communities under the newly adopted federal structure of Nepal? Using Participatory Prospective Analysis (PPA) as foresight method for co-elaborating future scenarios and developing strategies”. Held in Chautara SangaChok Gadhi Municipality, Sindupalchowk district on 14-15 May 2018, and continued 1-3 June 2018. (Participants: 40; 25 men, 15 women)