



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2022– Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	4
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	11
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	17
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	21
6. RISKS	23
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	27
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	28
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	30
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	32
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	33
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	35
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	36

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Near East and North Africa
Country (ies):	Egypt
Project Title:	Sustainable Management of Kharga Oasis Agro-Ecosystems in the New Valley Governorate
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/EGY/030/GFF
GEF ID:	9928
GEF Focal Area(s):	Biodiversity, climate change
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Agriculture and land reclamation (Desert Research Center, agricultural directorate)
Project Duration (years):	3 years
Project coordinates:	El Kharga oasis, New Valley governorate N 25°27'04" E 30°32'48" (GeoNames)

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	1 January 2019
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	1 September 2020
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	31 October 2022
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ²	31 July 2023

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	1,045,890
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc³:	9,000,000
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)⁴:	787,333
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022⁵	5,826,418

¹As per FPMIS

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

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

⁴For DEX projects, the GEF Coordination Unit will confirm the final amount with the Finance Division in HQ. For OPIM projects, the disbursement amount should be provided by Execution Partners.

⁵Please refer to the section 12 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

M&E Milestones

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee(PSC) Meeting:	21 September 2021
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	NA
Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):	NA
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	January 2023
Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	YES

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

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

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Ashraf Elsadek, CTA/ FAOEG	ashraf.elsadek@fao.org
Budget Holder	Nasredin HagElamin, FAO Representative Egypt	nasredin.hagelamin@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	AbdelHamied Hamid, Senior Forestry Officer / FAORNE	abdelhamied.hamid@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Mohamed Bergigui	mohamed.bergigui@fao.org

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

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

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

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

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating ¹¹
Objective: Ensure sustainable food production systems that help maintain and progressively improve soil quality and agro-biodiversity status in oasis agro-ecosystems of the Egyptian Western Desert	Component 1: Building an enabling environment for sustainable land, water and agro-biodiversity management contributing to productive oasis agro-ecosystems						
	Outcome 1. Strengthened institutional, management and technical capacities of key stakeholder groups at the Governorate level in order to support the mainstreaming of	Participants of workshops and other learning activities apply newly acquired technical and functional knowledge systematically	0%		80% of participants – both women and men equally - report systematic application of new knowledge in KAP surveys	Under this component a considerable progress was made (20%) in the achievements of the results of the activities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The capacity development plan for the key governorate institutions based on the results of both the capacity needs assessment and KAP survey was developed. Six functional and technical training topics were selected by the 30 participants of the validation workshop. Five institutions are being benefited from training their staff. A total of 21 participants (14 males and 7 females) attended the first piece of training on GIS application on NR management - After completing the training, the 	S

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

⁹Some 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.

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

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

sustainable management of land, water and agro-biodiversity into development investments					percentage of trainees applying the new acquired knowledge will be assessed through the KAP survey planned by the last year of the project.	
	DRC provides more targeted support to farmer communities in oasis agro-ecosystems on SLWM and agro-biodiversity conservation	Existing DRC objectives, strategies and plans poorly embedded SLWM and agro-biodiversity conservation DRC procedures for planning, management and monitoring of support services is lacking		Reviewed and strengthened DRC objectives, strategies, plans and procedures for planning, management and monitoring of service delivery to farmer communities	Cumulative progress is estimated at 20% based on: A consultancy is underway to review the mandate of DRC and undertake a situation analysis.	MS
Component 2: Demonstrate effective and efficient SLWM and agro-biodiversity conservation practices to improve oasis agro-ecosystems in 3 pilot sites to sustain food production and livelihoods						

<p>Outcome 2: Improved management and sustainable use of oasis agro-ecosystems through the introduction of locally adapted and adopted SLWM practices and agro-biodiversity conservation</p>	<p>Area of landscapes under sustainable land and water management in production systems</p>		<p>1 000 ha</p>	<p>3 520 ha</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cumulative progress is estimated at 40% (1410 ha) based on: - A natural resources management plan was developed for the three intervention sites. Key soil and water indicators and their magnitude in the three villages were identified and/or mapped. - The NRM plan was validated through three workshops that were held at the three villages and were attended by 75 farmers followed by a workshop that was held with local officials and key farmers from the three villages - The monitoring and management arrangements of the NR management plan were identified. This included the establishment of the 3 local development committees. - A total number of 105 farmers and staff members of Ag. Directorate, irrigation directorate and DRC station were trained as facilitators for the farmers field schools - A total of 78 FFSs in the 2021/2022 winter season were implemented in the field of SLWM practices and agrobiodiversity conservation covering the three intervention sites and were attended by 1326 farmers (28 females and 1298 males). - Nine farmer field schools on poultry production were established targeting women and were attended by 137 participants. - Technical training covering different topics in SLWM and agrobiodiversity conservation were provided to the FFS facilitators and were attended by 52 facilitators. - The impact assessment of the FFSs and the adoption rate of participants for the new 	<p>S</p>
---	---	--	-----------------	-----------------	--	----------

				<p>technologies are ongoing and the exact area under SLWM and agrobiodiversity conservation practices will be identified in the next winter season.</p> <p>- In addition to the implementation of FFSs, an area of 60 ha as a first stage is targeted by the project to use the natural enemies in controlling date palm pests. This will be achieved through the project support of the <i>Tricogramma</i> SPPLab established at the DRC station (an extra activity out of the project workplan).</p>	
Improved diversity status of selected target species	0 species	3 species	3 species	<p>Cumulative progress is estimated at 50% based on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A total of 96 wild species were detected through the agrobiodiversity assessment study, from which 22 species were identified as crop wild relatives. ➤ The 3 most important worldwide CWRs to be conserved were selected via a workshop that was conducted in presence of the project stakeholders and it was attended by 60 (40 males and 20 females) participants. ➤ A community seed bank at the newly constructed DRC station in Kharga is under establishment. As part of the field activities, the project started the collection of the seeds of all the 22 crop wild relatives including the three selected by the stakeholders and 28 landraces to be conserved. ➤ The SP for the seed bank establishment was contracted, and the selected species will be propagated at the DRC experimental farm and redistributed among the local farmers 	S

<p>Number of community-based initiatives supporting local development</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Cumulative progress is estimated at 10% based on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A letter of agreement with the Academy of Scientific Research and Technology is ready to be signed ➤ The SP will conduct the following activities: Explore the agro entrepreneurship in Kharga Oasis, Launch the Valley Agro-ecology Entrepreneurs Race, and Support the winners (6 initiatives) to establish their startups (grant and technical support) 	<p>S</p>
<p>Increased awareness of the roles of women and men in the sustainable management and use of natural resources</p>	<p>TBC</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Self-assessed increased awareness</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A raising awareness plan in the context of SLWM practices and agrobiodiversity conservation was prepared and the following activities were conducted; 16 training courses, 13 workshops, 9 field visits, 3 technical and scientific competitions for farmers and university students, communication and visibility materials, social networking and radio programs. ➤ 630 farmers (10-15 % women) have been trained in aspect of SLWM practices and agrobiodiversity conservation. The low participation of women is due to the limited number of women practicing agriculture although they own the land in few cases. ➤ For the above reason, special training sessions were assigned to women e.g., Improving women's diet using moringa which were attended by 150 women in the three villages . ➤ For all the training events, the improvement of participants' knowledge 	<p>S</p>

					<p>in the SLWM and agrobiodiversity topics was assessed and ranged from 20-40% and reached above 60% in some cases</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To raise the awareness of the role of men and women in NR management, 120 participants (40-50% women and almost 20% youth) were engaged in the NR mapping activity in the three villages. Key natural resources indicators were identified in a participatory manner. A final map was developed and analyzed for each village 	
	% of women entrepreneurs that have been granted credit for community-based initiatives	0	N/A	At least 50%	No results achieved so far, as the activity hasn't started yet	MS
Component 3. Knowledge management for project results up-scaling and out-scaling						
Outcome 3: Achievements and lessons of the project are well established and perpetuated	Number and types of documents and tools developed to monitor and evaluate the project and share knowledge	None		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - M&E framework developed - md-term and final evaluation conducted - communication strategy developed - communication materials are produced - reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The M&E plan was refined and completed by the project PMU. The plan included the indicators of the project performance, reporting system, M&E of project impact, baseline data and methods ➤ A project webpage on the DRC website was created in August 2021 with a very long delay resulted from some technical issues with the DRC website ➤ Technical reports and progress reports were submitted in a timely manner 	S

				are regularly submitted	and uploaded on the FPMIS ➤ Production of some communication materials are underway e.g. crop wild relatives of Kharga oasis atlas, New Valley crop calendar	
--	--	--	--	-------------------------	---	--

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1. Strengthened institutional, management and technical capacities of key stakeholder groups at the Governorate level in order to support the mainstreaming of sustainable management of land, water and agro-biodiversity into development investments	1.3.1 Do the benchmarking of existing objectives, strategies, plans and procedures	Consultant in capacity planning development including operational plan (TOR is prepared and cleared)	2 nd semester of 2022
	1.3.2 Develop a proposal for revision of the existing objectives, strategies, plans and procedures	A consultant to Propose a plan to strength the cooperation with other relevant institutions and initiatives and address the capacity needs of DRC	2nd semester of 2022
	1.3.3 Assist the DRC in the understanding, validation and adoption of the proposed revisions	Project PMU	2nd semester of 2022 1 st semester of 2023

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
Component 1: Building an enabling environment for sustainable land, water and agro-biodiversity management contributing to productive oasis agro-ecosystems				
Output 1.1: Capacity needs assessment and KAP conducted of MoALR and Irrigation Directorate agencies at the Governorate level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One KAP study at the beginning of the project -One KAP study at the end of the project - Capacity needs assessment 		Implementation status (80%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A report by a national consultant on capacity needs assessment was submitted. The report addressed the stakeholders' technical and institutional capacities, stakeholders' capacity analysis and recommended modes of capacity development. - A report by a national consultant on KAP analysis was submitted. The report contains the results of the KAP analysis of the stakeholders including the farmers (with a sample of 10%). The SLWM and agrobiodiversity conservation practices were targeted for the analysis. - Another KAP analysis study will be conducted at the last semester of the project. 	
Output 1.2: Based on the capacity needs assessment and KAP, a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A capacity development plan - One workshop to validate the plan - A number of technical and functional training delivered for the stakeholders' 		Implementation status (75%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The capacity development plan based on the results of both the capacity needs assessment and KAP survey was 	

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

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

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

<p>capacity development plan prepared and implemented in order to equip these agencies with the functional and technical capacities needed to fully support farmer communities in their transition towards SLWM and agro-biodiversity conservation adoption</p>	<p>staff</p>		<p>developed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A validation workshop was conducted on 23 June 2021 and was attended by the key officials and key farmers. As a result, 6 training (3 technical and 3 functional) were chosen to be conducted - A service provider through a competition process was selected to conduct the training and is expected to complete by October 2022. - The first training on the application of GIS and remote sensing in NR management was delivered. 	
<p>Output 1.3: Agencies' (DRC in primis) objectives, strategies, plans and procedures for planning, management and monitoring are reviewed in support of SLWM and agro-biodiversity conservation mainstreaming</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 proposal of the revised objectives, strategies, plans and procedures • No of proposed inputs adopted 		<p>Implementation status (20%)</p> <p>The ToR for the national consultant has been prepared and cleared by the LTO. The project in the process of recruiting the consultant to carry out the revision</p>	<p>The execution of this activity was delayed based on DRC president recommendation</p>
<p>Component 2: Demonstrate effective and efficient SLWM and agro-biodiversity conservation practices to improve oasis agro-ecosystems in 3 pilot sites to sustain food production and livelihoods</p>				
<p>Output 2.1: Local smallholder</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An awareness raising plan 		<p>Implementation status (100%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Through a LoA with DRC and with the support of 	

<p>farmer communities in the 3 pilot sites have increased awareness of the need to sustainably manage agro-ecosystems (land, water and agrobiodiversity) in order to support food production and livelihoods</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of workshops, training sessions and thematic days delivered in the pilot sites 		<p>New Valley University, the agricultural directorate and the New Valley governorate, a raising awareness plan in the context of SLWM practices and agrobiodiversity conservation was prepared and the following activities were conducted; 16 training courses, 13 workshops, 9 field visits, 3 technical and scientific competitions for farmers and university students, communication and visibility materials, social networking and raido programs.</p>	
<p>Output 2.2: In a participatory and integrated way, and guided by DRC, a sustainable land management plan for 3 pilot sites in the Kharga oasis agro-ecosystem developed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 workshops on community based mapping A report on the assessment of agrobiodiversity using DATAR 1 atlas for CWR 1 Natural resources management plan 3 workshops for NR management plan validation One study on locally adapted SLWM practices N1 M&E plan for the NR management A report on Water accounting and auditing 		<p>Implementation status (90%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Three workshops on community-based mapping were conducted in the three villages. Key natural resources indicators were identified in a participatory manner. A final map was developed and analyzed for each village. The final report was submitted with all the key findings of the workshops. ➤ The local sustainable soil and water management practices based on traditional knowledge were identified and merged with research and development. Data were collected through conducting a number of key informants' interviews, 15 focus groups discussion attended by 165 participants, 3 workshops and a number of field visits. The key findings of this activity were used to run the farmer field schools in the second year of the project. ➤ The agrobiodiversity status was assessed in the three villages in the context of wild species, crop wild relatives, local crop varieties, pollinators and soil microbes. A total of 96 wild species were detected from which 22 species were identified as crop wild relatives. The diversity of local varieties was very low except for wheat having the highest number of cultivated varieties (14) in the three villages. 	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A natural resources management plan was developed for the three intervention sites. Key soil and water indicators and their magnitude in the three villages were identified and/or mapped. Also, Satellite images for the years 2000, 2013 and 2021 of the three villages were acquired and analyzed for vegetation cover. ➤ 3 workshops in the three villages attended by 75 farmers have been held to raise the awareness about the natural resources issues, followed by a workshop was held with local officials and key farmers from the three villages to validate the NRM plan ➤ The monitoring and management arrangements of the NR management plan were identified. This included the establishment of the 3 local development committees (1 for each village) and a number of training topics were proposed. ➤ The water accounting and auditing activity was conducted for the 2021/2022 growing season this includes the production of crop mapping, calculation of the groundwater discharge and crops water consumption, data collection on groundwater quality, geohydrology characteristics of the area. The report has been prepared by the project team and awaiting for the LTO clearance 	
<p>Output 2.3: Local smallholder farmer communities in the 3 pilot sites of the Kharga oasis agro-ecosystem are trained on a selection of SLWM practices and conservation and monitoring of agro-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A well-designed 100 FFSs plans in place - At least 6 PMGs “ project marketing groups” within the 3 intervention sites are created - A well-designed FFSs curriculums in place - N of facilitators received the training - N of workshops and FGDs organized - Community seed bank established - Regular reports on NR status 		<p>Implementation status (50%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The PMU trained a total number of 105 FFS facilitators in order to run the FFSs ➤ The training of master trainers is planned to be conducted in November 2022 ➤ The FFSs plans and curriculum were developed through the two LoAs with DRC and NVU ➤ A total number of 78 FFSs were established in the three villages during the winter season of 2021/2022 ➤ A LoA with an NGO was signed to establish the community seed bank ➤ A LoA with the Union of Agricultural councils in New Valley to monitor the status of Natural resources in 	

biodiversity through the Farmer Field School approach			the three villages ➤ The project marketing groups are planned to be created by September 2022	
Output 2.4: Business models for 3 community-based initiatives assessed and implemented, creating new revenue streams from the sustainable production, processing and/or marketing of agricultural oasis products	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ One study on SWOT analysis ▪ One study on agro entrepreneurship elements analysis ▪ Four workshops to present and discuss the agro entrepreneurship opportunities ▪ Four entrepreneurship camps are organized ▪ 6 community based initiative are financed and implemented • 1 study on market analysis and feasibility using RuralInvest ▪ Monitoring plan for the progress of the initiatives 		Implementation status (10%) ➤ A letter of Agreement with the academy of scientific research and technology is prepared and awaiting for the signature by the service provider	
Output 2.5: Innovative micro-financing options assessed to support future sustainable livelihood development community-based initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A study on micro-financing options • One workshop to present the results 		No activity implemented so far	Activities under this output are planned for December 2022
Component 3: Knowledge management for project results up-scaling and out-scaling				
Output 3.1: Recommendations are put forth for the further improvement of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N1 communication strategy N1 project webpage N 200 CWR atlas N 100 crop calendar N 1 brochures, roll-ups 		Implementation status (60%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Project webpage was created ➤ CRW atlas and crop calendars are under publication ➤ 2 steering committee meetings were conducted ➤ 1 video on project is planned to be produced by 	

agro-ecosystem services in Kharga and other oases of the Western Desert in order to achieve sustainable food production and livelihoods	N 2 scientific articles N1 video about project activities N2 DRC participated in 2 scientific networks N3 steering committee meetings		November 2022	
Output 3.2: The project's results and lessons are identified, documented, and reported upon in a timely manner	1 inception workshop 1 project M&E plan Reports are prepared and submitted in a timely manner		Implementation status (75%) ➤ Inception workshop was conducted ➤ The project M& E plan was created ➤ Technical reports and the project progress reports are submitted in a timely manner	

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcome of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR.

A considerable progress was achieved in Building an enabling environment for sustainable land, water and agro-biodiversity management.

In terms of planned activities in the first year, the following were accomplished; the capacity needs assessment and the KAP analyses were conducted by the national consultants. A capacity development plan was developed by a national consultant proposing a number of initiatives for capacity development of individuals, organizational, and enabling environment and was validated by the project stakeholders. A letter of agreement was signed with the New Valley University to carry out 6 out of 39 technical and functional training topics included in the plan. The first training on the application of GIS and remote sensing on NR management was delivered.

The project has contributed to raising the awareness of the local community in the field of SLWM and agrobiodiversity conservation practices through creating a raising awareness plan and the execution of 16 training courses, 13 workshops , 9 field visits , 3 technical and scientific competitions for farmers (men and women) , university students and children as well as social networking and radio programs.

A sustainable natural resources management plan for the three intervention sites in addition to a NR monitoring plan were developed by DRC through specific activities and studies. In a participatory manner, 3 community-based maps on natural resources were created. The studies were completed and addressed the local sustainable soil and water management practices based on traditional knowledge, the agrobiodiversity status in the context of wild species, crop wild relatives, local crop varieties, pollinators and soil microbes and the water accounting and auditing activity. An atlas of Kharga CWR was prepared and a national service provider was contracted to establish the community seed bank.

Progress has been made in the implementation of the farmers field school to improve oasis agro-ecosystem through efficient and effective SLWM and agrobiodiversity conservation practices, which were generated by merging local knowledge with research and development. A total number of 78 FFSs were implemented in the winter season of 2021/2022 by DRC and NVU with an active participation of the agricultural directorate and the local communities. The remaining 22 FFSs are planned to be completed by the summer and Nili seasons.

As an extra activity that isn't included in the project planned activities, the project supported the establishment of the *Trichogramma SPP* production lab at the DRC station by providing the technical support and buying some equipment and materials. The Lab will support the biological control of date palm pests in Kharga oasis.

Major challenges experienced by the project

- The outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic has significantly affected the activities which were put on hold in the field affecting the products of the project. Many activities e.g. training sessions and workshops had to be conducted outdoor.
- The current level of interest and participation by the local partners, the Governorate in particular, diminishes because of the nature of project activities by providing technical supports rather than the in kind contribution(procurements). To overcome

this challenge, we got the governor more involved in the activities of the project by submitting regular reports about the progress of the project. As well as involving him in the project different activities e.g., community based initiatives, also supporting the establishment of the *Trichogramma SPP* lab

- The Agrobiodiversity conservation isn't prioritized at the oasis level. To overcome this challenge, the project team was keen to promote and raise awareness among authorities and civil society on the topic of agrobiodiversity conservation and to increase the value placed on agro- biodiversity conservation and the need for sustainable land management. Training has been provided to the local farmers on agrobiodiversity as part of raising the awareness activities. The capacity development plan prepared by the project has a technical training for the stakeholders officials on agrobiodiversity conservation. In collaboration with New Valley University, the project is planning to include the agrobiodiversity assessment and conservation as a graduate level course.

Development Objective (DO) Ratings, Implementation Progress (IP) Ratings and Overall Assessment

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence and progress reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR. For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

	FY2022 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2022 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	The project has made reasonable progress towards the achievement of results despite the considerable delays caused by COVID-19 pandemic, the delays in recruitment and posting of national consultants and other delays related to administrative and coordination aspects at the Governorate level. Number of key activities that have a cross-cutting impact on the entire project and support the achievement of project results were implemented. Namely those aimed at strengthening the capacities of the project stakeholders' staff and the local communities of the three villages as well as developing a natural resources management plan. Mechanisms were promoted to improve the dissemination and disclosure of the project's achievements. The level of resilience to assume project commitments and achieve progress under a pandemic situation caused by COVID-19 is aspects to highlight in this report
Budget Holder	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Despite the delays in final approvals of the project and the subsequent complications related to Covid-19, the project was able to make good progress in achieving its intended results

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

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

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

¹⁷Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Despite all the challenges encountered by the project, as listed in the report, we hope the project achieve its objectives, and yield satisfactory results. There seems to be no issue with the overall relevance of the project objectives and the level of activities implementation so far is encouraging and will lay the ground for achieving most of the project results. We encourage more promotion and awareness raising among authorities and civil society members on the topic of agrobiodiversity conservation and to increase the value placed on agrobiodiversity conservation and the need for sustainable land management.
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Despite all the shortcomings encountered by the project, as listed above, the project is expected to achieve most of its objectives, and yield satisfactory results. To date, the project has made significant progress in terms of development objectives such as the area of landscape under sustainable land and water management practices and the improved diversity status of selected target species. The project showed a satisfactory implementation pattern and reached a delivery of high percentages in most of its activities. All what is needed is to expedite the delivery in the remaining project life time and maintain equal focus on the outcome level as compared with the activities implementation level.
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Despite facing significant delays during its inception, the project team deployed substantial efforts to put the project on track towards achieving its intended results. As we enter the last year of implementation, more efforts are needed to maintain the momentum and ensure all project targets are met, with special attention to gender considerations and stakeholder engagement processes.

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

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

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made complying with the approved ESM plan. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Add new ESS risks if any risks have emerged during this FY.

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
ESS 7: Decent Work				
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate if the initial Environmental and Social (ESS) Riskclassification is still valid; if not, what is the new classification and explain.

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²⁰ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	Yes, it is still valid

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

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

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation (including COVID-19 related risks). The last column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in the project, as relevant.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Public health risk: Nationwide mobilization limitation due to Covid 19 pandemic	Moderate	N	Monitoring of the situation , follow the instructions and messages disseminated by FAO	Prevention measures are being implemented during meetings, workshops and trainings (regular washing of hands, measuring of temperature, wearing of masks and distancing) and, messages are widely disseminated from various media (radio and television), NGO and United Nations Organizations (pamphlets, posters, etc.). following biosafety measures and minimizing risks for personnel performing field activities	

²¹Risk ratings means a rating of accesses the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives.

Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
2	Administrative risk: There is insufficient inter and intra government cooperation.	Moderate	Y	DRC is being equipped through component 1 activities to take a more central role in coordination and intra-governmental consultation and communication. Furthermore, during project implementation, the PMU will liaise with a number of players simultaneously to ensure appropriate coordination of activities of geographically linked investments. The Project Steering Committee (inter-disciplinary, multi-level and multi-stakeholder by design) will review coordination mechanisms and engagement strategies on a regular basis.	The Steering Committee (SC) facilitates the participation of the government, other partners and stakeholders in project implementation. Much of the project activities has been implemented through letters of agreement with partner institutions, which has been effective in accelerating the technical and budgetary execution of the project.	
3	Environmental risk: Climate change leads to increased threats to oasis agro-ecosystems, through increased water stress, soil salinity, pests, diseases and changing climate conditions (temperature, precipitation).	Low	Y	Dry spells can occur during the project implementation phase and have been plaguing the area for a long time already. Though climate change adaptation is not the main objective of this project, it is part and partial of the project's logic and sustainability plan to propose climate resilient solutions. Therefore, it is considered that by greatly improving land and water management, the production land would become more climate resilient in the New Valley oases. As for other risks, the situation will be monitored and the project approach adapted as necessary with support of the appropriate institutes in the country.	The project had a progress in the development of the natural resources management plan. Also, the identification of the SLWM ad agro-biodiversity conservation practices which have been applied in the learning sites of the FFSS	

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
4	<p>Political and institutional risk: The current level of commitment, interest and participation by the local partners, the Governorate in particular, diminishes because other priorities appear.</p>	Low	Y	<p>The likelihood for this risk to occur is considered rather low, as the Governor has been recently reconfirmed in his position, a term that should bridge the full duration of project implementation. Furthermore, the highly participatory and cross-sector approach of the project makes it less dependent of one player, whether this is an individual or institution. Working on the enabling environment and knowledge management, through components 1 and 3, a tendency in favour of the project's narrative is expected.</p>	<p>The governor is continuously updated on the progress of the project implementation. Field visits have been organized and attended by the governor and expressed his usual support of the project</p>	
5	<p>Socio-economic risk: Technical measures are not fully implemented or recognized in the selected areas because of economic pressure for development and insufficient capacity.</p>	Moderate	Y	<p>Media campaigns/sensitization and awareness raising messages about the benefits of sustainable land and water management, agro-biodiversity conservation and oasis agro-ecosystem restoration have been foreseen. This operates at the local/community level, and is complemented by the work at the institutional level in component 1. Capacity on approaches and practices of the local farmer community will be built using the tried and tested Farmer Field School approach, which has a high success rate when it comes to uptake and replication.</p> <p>The economic viability of proposed and demonstrated practices and approaches is a key criteria in the selection process</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Many raising awareness activities have been implemented at the community level in the first fiscal year - The Capacity development plan for the stakeholders staff is being implemented - The FFSs activity is ongoing using the locally adopted SLWM practices and the economic viability of the selected practices will be assessed. 	

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

FY2021rating	FY2022rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Low	Low	No changes have been made to the project risk ratings

7. Follow-up on Mid-term review or supervision mission (only for projects that have conducted an MTR)

If the project had an MTR or a supervision mission, please report on how the recommendations were implemented during this fiscal year as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
Recommendation 1:	
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation 4:	

Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe	
---	--

8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines²². Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories. And, provides supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework			
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management			
Implementation schedule	An extension was introduced to enable the project finalize the remaining interventions.	April 2022	PSC
Executing Entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Implementation of FFSs and its associated activities were assigned to DRC and NVU (2.3.1 and 2.3.4) • The monitoring of the NR status was assigned to the agricultural directorate (2.3.5) • The establishment of the seed bank was assigned to an NGO (2.3.6) 	September 2021 April 2022 February 2022	PSC + Project LTO
Executing Entity Category			
Minor project objective change			
Safeguards			
Risk analysis	Risks related to Covid-19 were added and mitigation actions put in place.		
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%			

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

Co-financing			
Location of project activity	The location of the project activity was modified based on the governorate administrative division as El Sherka, El Moneera and Nasser El Thawra villages rather than El Moneera, Nasr and El Thawre as mentioned in the original document	September 2020	PSC , Project LTO Project BH
Other			

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

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

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government Institutions			
Desert Research Center	Main executing partner, NPC is the president of DRC, co-financer of components 1,2 and 3	Two LoAs with DRC have been signed for the provision of the development of the NR management plan in the project intervention sites and the implementation of 75 FFSs in SLWM and agrobiodiversity conservation practices	
New Valley governorate	Member of the project steering committee, overseeing the implementation of project activities, co financer of components 1,2 and 3	The governor is updated with all the project activities and the implementation progress. Several meetings have been conducted with him and his suggestions and recommendations were considered	The governor always seeks the support of the project in purchasing equipment and facilities and the infrastructure rather than the technical support
The agricultural directorate	Member of the project steering committee manages the project intervention areas, supports the community involvement and it is a direct beneficiary	Through an LoA, the agricultural directorate is conducting the monitoring of the status of the natural resources by training and supporting the local development committees. The directorate was strongly involved in the raising awareness activities and its staff will be directly benefiting from the capacity development initiatives awarded to the NVU	
The irrigation directorate	Member of the project steering committee, a direct beneficiary of the	Some of its staff received the FFS facilitators training, its staff will be directly benefiting from the capacity	

	project	development initiatives awarded to the NVU	
Non-Government Organizations (NGOs)			
The agricultural cooperatives	A direct beneficiary of the project	Selected staff were received the FFS facilitators training, which will be directly benefit from capacity development initiatives	
Private sector entities			
El Tahan company	Beneficiary	Participate in the different training sessions provided by the project	
Others[1]			
New stakeholders identified/engaged			
New Valley University	Member of the Project Steering Committee. Supports in terms of research and academic consultation	Through an LoA , the university is implementing some FFSs in the three sites, and it has been selected to execute the capacity development plan	

[1] They can include, among others, community-based organizations (CBOs), Indigenous Peoples organizations, women's groups, private sector companies, farmers, universities, research institutions, and all major groups as identified, for example, in Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and many times again since then.

10. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) <u>during this reporting period.</u>		
Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	Yes	Even though a gender assessment was conducted during the design stage, a proper gender analysis was not delivered. A socio-economic expert was hired by the project during implementation and he will deliver a gender analysis including recommendations on gender mainstreaming for the project to deliver sound gender results.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Yes	The project has decisively supported the increase in the participation of women in technical training activities aimed at both technical officials of government or academic institutions, as well as members of the communities.
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	The project has some activities which are designed for women e.g., the poultry FFSs which provides equitable participation in technical agricultural training
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	The project target is that 50% of the community based initiatives are awarded to women groups which will improve the socioeconomic conditions of women and also empower women economically
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	M&E keeps gender-disaggregated records of the beneficiaries who participate in the various training and workshops activities. Similarly, it is a requirement for the different consultants who carry out activities in the project to provide information disaggregated by gender on those who participate in the activities they carry out.
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	The project staff has a sociologist that is conducting the gender analysis and is ensuring the disaggregation of gender in all the project activities
Any other good practices on gender		

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.	Internal and external communication of project progress and results has been strengthened. Documents have been entered into FAO's PWS publication system. Which include the systematization of the knowledge gained from the various project consultancies, including the atlas of the crop wild relatives of Kharga oasis and the Kharga crop calendar.
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	The project has a Communication Plan, which contains the communication strategy to be followed, achieving significant and tangible progress. Monthly content has been prepared for social networks that allow real-time monitoring of the actions implemented by the project. Activities of the project are disseminated regularly at FAO page on twitter as well as the page of the agricultural directorate on facebook. Also, many interviews have been conducted with the local radio to spread the information about the project
Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the	<p>Two independent, single women who decided to live together to face the difficulties of farming in the dry lands. The first is Mrs. Amal, who is 50 years old and has a diploma in agriculture, and the second is her older sister, Samia, who is 60 years old.</p> <p>In this difficult environment in the Western Desert of Egypt, 700 km from the capital in the New Valley Governorate, specifically the Kharga Oasis, where the climate is very hot in summer and very cold in winter, the two heroines live in the El Sherka village. To face life challenges and struggle to make a living, The two heroines cultivate a limited area of Poor lands affected by salt, and irrigated with groundwater according to a fixed shift and for a specific time every 11 days.</p> <p>The limited water and the low soil quality, in addition to the climatic changes, prompted the two heroines to exert more effort in confronting these conditions through several practices, the first of which is diversification in the crops, where they cultivate the plot of land with a variety of crops. Amal Said "we grow bean and groundnuts in order to ensure family nutrition and as a source of continuous income throughout the season" She adds, "when cultivating the area with a varied number of crops, it helps to ensure the least losses in the occurrence of any disasters that damage one of those crops." It seems that Amal has reached a high degree of knowledge related to agricultural diversification to diversify agricultural income sources, as agricultural economists say.</p> <p>The Sustainable Management of Agricultural Ecosystems Project in Kharga Oasis, New Valley</p>

2022 Project Implementation Report

<p>project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.</p>	<p>Governorate, provides support to smallholder farmers, including Mrs. Amal and her sister, by supporting them with organic fertilizers (compost) to restore soil fertility and using modern and sustainable agricultural practices to conserve water and soil (raised-bed cultivation system of wheat) The project continues to support these two women by selecting their farm for implementing a peanuts farmer field school for the production of peanuts, as well as installing a modern irrigation system in this farm</p>
<p>Please provide links to related website, social media account</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project page on FAO website https://www.fao.org/egypt/programmes-and-projects/kharga-oasis-agro-ecosystems/ar/ • Project page on DRC website https://drc.gov.eg/en/category/fao/ https://drc.gov.eg/category/%d8%a7%d9%84%d9%81%d8%a7%d9%88/ • NV agricultural directorate facebook page https://www.facebook.com/groups/278821225957351 • FAO page on twitter https://twitter.com/FAOEgypt
<p>Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Press release on project activities https://gate.ahram.org.eg/News/2922749.aspx • Press release on the participation of farmers with disabilities (deaf-mute) https://www.elwatannews.com/news/details/5970316 • Press release on the project FFSs https://www.elbalad.news/5256788 • Press release on the workshop of the validation of the NR plan https://www.almasryalyoum.com/news/details/2374826 • Press release on the implementation of the FFSs https://www.gomhuriaonline.com/Gomhuria/965749.html • Tweet on the introduction of Panicum as a new forage https://twitter.com/FAOEgypt/status/1528646088936374272?t=yHBHF15CBZfss6DnMa6QfA&s=08 • Tweet on FFSs for women to raise poultry https://twitter.com/FAOEgypt/status/1524032224164814849?t=69d_u69wkldIXbb5GmFZlQ&s=08 • Tweet on the support of the project in the establishment of the Trichogramma production Lab https://twitter.com/FAOEgypt/status/1512446536474636288?t=Nxsp9Yoc4rGSP7xwbh0b8Q&s=08 • Tweet on the sustainable practices for wheat production https://twitter.com/FAOEgypt/status/1509436060836810760 • Tweet on the best practices for date palm offshoot propagation https://twitter.com/FAOEgypt/status/1509139280819630091?t=56eWpVmRqFRZVGLAbmVw&s=08 • Yweet on the role of the project in reviving tomato production in Nasser Elthawra village https://twitter.com/FAOEgypt/status/1503994035983339520?t=mxumkdCXxhfujDb51OnlVQ&s=08 •
<p>Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details</p>	<p>RawyaEldabi Communication Expert rawya.eldabi@fao.org Wael Ali UNV Monitoring and Evaluation Associate Wael.Ali@fao.org</p>

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

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

Prior to initiating project implementation, the local communities located in the three intervention sites of the project were consulted about their interest in participating in the project; The participation of the local people in decision-making has been active, with equal participation of men and women.

Among the activities that have been consulted and are in execution we have: Selection of participants in the different farmer field schools implemented in the communities, selection of the learning locations for the implementation of the farmers field school, development of the NR management plan, the selection of the CWR to be conserved selection of areas for date palm nursery establishment, as well as the crop species to be cultivated in the selected sites,

Actions have been implemented for the active participation of the local communities, reflected in the following results:

- The local community has representation with voice and vote in the Project Steering Committee.
- They participate in the working groups formed for the design of methodologies to be applied in the management of the farmers field school
- Actively participate in the training courses/workshops.

13.Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²³	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
TCPs	FAO	Grant	1,200,000	847,225	NA	1,200,000
National government	DRC	In-kind	5,000,000	2,625,272	NA	5,000,000
National government	Local Government of Kharga Oasis	Grant	2,500,000	2,080,610	NA	2,500,000
National government	Local Government of Kharga Oasis	In-kind	300,000	223,311	NA	300,000
National government	New Valley university	In-kind	New co-financer engaged (providing a furnished office to the PMU)	50,000	NA	50,000
		TOTAL	9,000,000	5,826,418	NA	9,050,000

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

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives)
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits)
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project’s components and activities is in compliance with the project’s approved implementation plan.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Risk rating. It should assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:	
High Risk (H)	There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks
Moderate Risk (M)	There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.
Low Risk (L)	There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.

Core Indicators

Core Indicator 1	Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use				<i>(Hectares)</i>						
	<i>Hectares (1.1+1.2)</i>										
	<i>Expected</i>				<i>Achieved</i>						
	PIF stage		Endorsement		MTR		TE				
Indicator 1.1	Terrestrial protected areas newly created										
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares								
			Expected			Achieved					
			PIF stage		Endorsement		MTR		TE		
			(select)								
(select)											
Sum											
Indicator 1.2	Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness										
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares	METT Score							
				Baseline		Achieved					
				PIF stage		Endorsement		MTR		TE	
				(select)							
(select)											
Sum											
Core Indicator 2	Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use				<i>(Hectares)</i>						
	<i>Hectares (2.1+2.2)</i>										
	<i>Expected</i>				<i>Achieved</i>						
	PIF stage		Endorsement		MTR		<i>TE</i>				
Indicator 2.1	Marine protected areas newly created										
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares								
			Expected			Achieved					
			PIF stage		Endorsement		MTR		TE		
			(select)								
(select)											
Sum											
Indicator 2.2	Marine protected areas under improved management effectiveness										
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares	METT Score							
				Baseline		Achieved					
				PIF stage		Endorsement		MTR		TE	
				(select)							
(select)											
Sum											
Core Indicator 3	Area of land restored				<i>(Hectares)</i>						
	<i>Hectares (3.1+3.2+3.3+3.4)</i>										
	<i>Expected</i>				<i>Achieved</i>						
	PIF stage		Endorsement		MTR		TE				
Indicator 3.1	Area of degraded agricultural land restored										
			Hectares								
			Expected			Achieved					
			PIF stage		Endorsement		MTR		TE		
			(select)								
(select)											
Sum											
Indicator 3.2	Area of forest and forest land restored										
			Hectares								
			Expected			Achieved					
			PIF stage		Endorsement		MTR		TE		
			(select)								
(select)											
Sum											

	Area of forest land restored					
Indicator 3.3	Area of natural grass and shrublands restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 3.4	Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 4	Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)					(Hectares)
			Hectares (4.1+4.2+4.3+4.4)			
			Expected		Expected	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 4.1	Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		Globally significant landraces/CWR maintained on 700ha		700	NA	200
Indicator 4.2	Area of landscapes that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations					
Third party certification(s):			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 4.3	Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
				3,520	NA	1,410
Indicator 4.4	Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided					
Include documentation that justifies HCVF			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 5	Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity					(Hectares)
Indicator 5.1	Number of fisheries that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations					
Third party certification(s):			Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 5.2	Number of large marine ecosystems (LMEs) with reduced pollution and hypoxial					
			Number			

			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 5.3	Amount of Marine Litter Avoided					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 6	Greenhouse gas emission mitigated					<i>(Metric tons of CO_{2e})</i>
			Expected metric tons of CO _{2e} (6.1+6.2)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		Expected CO _{2e} (direct)				
		Expected CO _{2e} (indirect)				
Indicator 6.1	Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector					
			Expected metric tons of CO _{2e}			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		Expected CO _{2e} (direct)				
		Expected CO _{2e} (indirect)				
		Anticipated start year of accounting				
		Duration of accounting				
Indicator 6.2	Emissions avoided Outside AFOLU					
			Expected metric tons of CO _{2e}			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		Expected CO _{2e} (direct)				
		Expected CO _{2e} (indirect)				
		Anticipated start year of accounting				
		Duration of accounting				
Indicator 6.3	Energy saved					
			MJ			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 6.4	Increase in installed renewable energy capacity per technology					
		Technology	Capacity (MW)			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		(select)				
		(select)				
Core Indicator 7	Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management					<i>(Number)</i>
Indicator 7.1	Level of Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Program (TDA/SAP) formulation and implementation					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 7.2	Level of Regional Legal Agreements and Regional Management Institutions to support its implementation					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE

Indicator 7.3	Level of National/Local reforms and active participation of Inter-Ministerial Committees					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 7.4	Level of engagement in IWLEARN through participation and delivery of key products					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating		Rating	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 8	Globally over-exploited fisheries Moved to more sustainable levels					<i>(Metric Tons)</i>
Fishery Details			Metric Tons			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 9	Reduction, disposal/destruction, phase out, elimination and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste in the environment and in processes, materials and products					<i>(Metric Tons)</i>
			Metric Tons (9.1+9.2+9.3)			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	PIF stage	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.1	Solid and liquid Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) removed or disposed (POPs type)					
	POPs type		Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
	(select)	(select)	(select)			
	(select)	(select)	(select)			
	(select)	(select)	(select)			
Indicator 9.2	Quantity of mercury reduced					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.3	Hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFC) Reduced/Phased out					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.4	Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste					
			Number of Countries			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.5	Number of low-chemical/non-chemical systems implemented particularly in food production, manufacturing and cities					
		Technology	Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.6	Quantity of POPs/Mercury containing materials and products directly avoided					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	PIF stage	Endorsement

Core Indicator 10	Reduction, avoidance of emissions of POPs to air from point and non-point sources					<i>(grams of toxic equivalent gTEQ)</i>
Indicator 10.1	Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control emissions of POPs to air					
			Number of Countries			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 10.2	Number of emission control technologies/practices implemented					
			Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 11	Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment					<i>(Number)</i>
			Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		Female		900	NA	300
		Male		1350	NA	1320
		Total		2,250	NA	1670