



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

### 2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



## 1. Basic Project Data

### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	Asia Pacific
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Sri Lanka
<b>Project Title:</b>	Rehabilitation of degraded agricultural lands in Kandy, Badulla and Nuwara Eliya Districts in the Central Highlands
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP/SRL/063/GEF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	5677
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Land Degradation
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment Natural Resource Management Centre
<b>Project Duration:</b>	Four years

### Milestone Dates:

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	30 January 2015
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	1 July 2016
<b>Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	30 June 2020
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) <sup>2</sup></b>	
<b>Actual Implementation End Date<sup>3</sup>:</b>	

### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	1,344, 657
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>4</sup>:</b>	9,860,000
<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):</b>	689,978
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019<sup>5</sup></b>	2,269,184

<sup>1</sup> as per FPMIS

<sup>2</sup> In case of a project extension.

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

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

<sup>5</sup> 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.

## Review and Evaluation

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:</b>	27 <sup>th</sup> February 2018
<b>Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):</b>	15-31 July 2019
<b>Mid-term review/evaluation actual:</b>	n/a
<b>Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:</b>	n/a
<b>Tracking tools/ Core indicators required<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>No</b>

## Ratings

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

## Status

<b>Implementation Statuts</b> <i>(1<sup>st</sup> PIR, 2<sup>nd</sup> PIR, etc. Final PIR):</i>	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR
---	---------------------

## Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Nimal Gunasena, National Project Manager	Nimal.Gunasena@fao.org
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Niino Yuji	Yuji.Niino@fao.org
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Xuebing Sun (FAOR, FASRL)	Xuebing.Sun@fao.org
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division</b>	Sameer Karki,	Sameer.Karki@fao.org

<sup>6</sup> 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

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Objective(s):</b>						
<b>Outcome 1: Outcome 1: Enabling institutional policy and regulatory frameworks for SLM established and operational in accordance with participatory land use development (PLUD) principles</b>	<p><b>Indicator:</b> 50,000 ha of agricultural land of the Central Highlands managed under SLM methods</p> <p><b>Indicator:</b> Mainstreaming of SLM in planning and budgetary processes</p>	The enabling environment for SLM in Sri Lanka is weak and fragmented, and does not properly integrate PLUD principles, which impede the scaling up of SLM.	25,000 ha of agricultural land of the central highlands managed under SLM methods	<p>50,000 ha of agricultural land of the central highlands managed under SLM methods</p> <p>SLM mainstreamed into 3-4 sector plans and budgets (Agriculture and Fisheries, Water Supply and Sanitation, and Forestry)</p>	<p>3rd draft on Participatory Land Use Plan (PLUP) completed and being reviewed by Land Use Policy Planning Department (LUPPD). 2784 number of farmers directly trained by the project while stake holder agencies trained 6050 farmers covering 2650 ha.</p> <p>Consultation meeting on SLM Policy studies with stakeholders conducted and review Report on SLM related policy study 70% completed and is being reviewed IC.</p> <p>Stake holders' Consultation Workshop to develop Land Resources Information System (LRIS) was held.</p>	MS

<sup>7</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>9</sup> 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)**.

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating 9

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					LUS maps are being prepared. LADA training is scheduled.	
<b>Outcome 2: Appropriate technologies for rehabilitation of degraded lands demonstrated and scaled up by strengthened networks of training and extension institutions</b>	<p><b>Indicator:</b> 20,000 of farmers benefitting (disaggregated by gender) from enhanced capacity of the three district training units providing consistent training and transfer of technologies to farmers</p> <p><b>Indicator:</b> 6,000 ha of agricultural land restored and under SLM</p>	Farmers in Kandy, Nuwara Elyia and Badulla have scarce knowledge of the adverse impacts of land degradation and climate change on agricultural productivity and sustainability, and minimal experiences in SLM technologies and approaches. They therefore continue old land management practices that exacerbate soil erosion and cause other LD problems.	<p>10,000 farmers benefitting from SLM training and technology transfer</p> <p>3,000 ha agricultural lands restored and under SLM</p>	<p>10,000 farmers benefitting from SLM training and technology transfer</p> <p>6,000 ha of agricultural land restored and under SLM</p>	<p>Four government training sites on SLM improvements are in progress. 6050 persons have been trained in these sites. Direct training by the project 2784. (Total 8834)</p> <p>08 contiguous blocks (mini watersheds) implementation is in progress. Total extent of the direct implementation areas is 717 ha.</p> <p>80 individual farm lands selected and 40 farmers (11 ha extent) have started development as demo sites</p> <p>46 number of PLUP completed and selected eight PLUP implementation is in progress. Technology packages on five farming systems developed</p> <p>Training manual on SLM to be validated</p> <p>75 training events completed - male 1560 and female 1224 farmers were trained on SLM</p>	MS

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Outcome 3: Capacity of developing innovative funding mechanisms established in both public and private sector</b>	<b>Indicator:</b> Increased resources flowing to SLM from diverse sources such as social responsibility funds and other innovative funding systems (e.g. CSR, PES, PPPs developed through GEF SGP, other PPPs, etc.)	At present, there are number of on-going funding mechanisms for SLM with different organizations such as, GEF SGPs, state companies, Dept. Export Agriculture – soil conservation measures in Tea lands, Hadabima. Further, with regard to the Soil Conservation Act, budgetary allocations are directed to identified soil erosion areas in the Project Provinces.	US\$ 3 million in increased resource flow to SLM from innovative funding mechanisms	A total of US\$ 6 million mobilized by end of Project.	<p>Stake holder's Consultation meeting on innovative funding system conducted in March 2019</p> <p>Ecosystem services identified and mapping in progress.</p> <p>Inventory on on-going and past projects completed.</p> <p>A proposal on innovative financing for SLM for Good agricultural practices (GAP) programme with private sector (Cargill's supermarket) has been developed and TC cleared. Private and farmer contribution is LKR 31 million.</p>	MS

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Outcome 4:</b> Enhanced national knowledge base for sustainable land management and project implementation based on adaptive results-based management	<b>Indicator:</b> National knowledge base on SLM to support adaptive results-based management and monitoring of SLM upscaling resulting from the project.	No SLM knowledge base or M&A system in place	M&A system in place  Adaptive results-based M&A	Strengthened national SLM knowledge base  Adaptive results-based M&A	<p>Web site development is in progress.</p> <p>Six public awareness programs were completed. (468 males and 516 females attended)</p> <p>Seven videos on SLM for farmers produced and one newsletter issued.</p> <p>Seven paper articles were published.</p> <p>2784 farmers were trained on SLM</p> <p>M&amp;E system in progress PIR 2018 June - July 2019 submitted</p> <p>Jan – June 2019 six month report submitted</p> <p>MTR is rescheduled to 15 -30 July 2019</p>	S

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating <sup>10</sup>

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1: Enabling institutional policy and regulatory frameworks for SLM established and operational in accordance with participatory land use development (PLUD) principles	<b>The component indicators</b> : 50,000 ha of agricultural land of the Central Highlands managed under SLM methods. This should be assessed and should be revised	PMU, MTR, CO	At the MTR
Outcome 2: Appropriate technologies for rehabilitation of degraded lands demonstrated and scaled up by strengthened networks of training and extension institutions	The indicators 20,000 of farmers benefitting (disaggregated by gender) from enhanced capacity of the three district training units providing consistent training and transfer of technologies to farmers and 6,000 ha of agricultural land restored and under SLM should be assessed and revised.	PMU, MTR, CO	At the MTR
Outcome 3: Capacity of developing innovative funding mechanisms established in both public and private sector	Ecosystem services identified and mapping report Inventory of SLM in the project area Economic value of ecosystem services report Validated guidelines on innovative financing mechanisms National level awareness workshop report  Training of trainers' workshops conducted District level awareness workshops conducted Five Innovative financing mechanisms and project proposals Fund mobilization	IUCN  FAO	August – September 2019      October 2019 to June 2020
Outcome 4 Enhanced national knowledge base for sustainable land management and project implementation based on adaptive results-based management			

## 2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs <sup>11</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>12</sup>	Achievements at each PIR <sup>13</sup>					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> or any challenge in delivering outputs	
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR			
Outcome 1: Enabling institutional policy and regulatory frameworks for SLM established and operational in accordance with participatory land use development (PLUD) principles									
<b>Output 1.1:</b> Guidelines for Participatory Land Use Planning (PLUP) established and agreed among the involved agencies for coordinated action  <b>Indicator:</b> PLUP guidelines developed <b>Indicator:</b> PLUP guidelines agreed among stakeholder agencies <b>Indicator:</b> Existing guidelines from LUPPD revised	Q4 Y3	LOA with LUPPD Draft guideline prepared	3rd draft completed and is being reviewed by LUPPD				60%		
<b>Output 1.2:</b> A package of modifications in policies and standards for SLM and good agricultural practices  <b>Indicator:</b> Reviewed report on SLM related policies	Q2 Y4	Preliminary draft report on SLM policy study completed. Gaps of SLM policies identified. IC on SLM Policies recruited.	Consultation meeting on SLM Policy studies with stakeholders was conducted.  Review Report on SLM related policy study completed and is being reviewed IC.				70%		

<sup>10</sup> To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

<sup>11</sup> Outputs as described in the project log frame 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.

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

<sup>13</sup> Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

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



<b>Output 1.3:</b> Strategy to align related policies with SLM endorsed by concerned sectors.  <b>Indicator:</b> Strategy endorsed document	Q2 Y4	Activity will begin after completion of Output 1.2	Activity will begin after completion of Output 1.2				0%	
<b>Output 1.4:</b> Establishment of a new coordination and information sharing platform among the stakeholders  <b>Indicator:</b> Coordination and information sharing platform <b>Indicator:</b> 15 number of agencies join the platform <b>Indicator:</b> Technical Coordination Committee (TCC) established for agriculture-related activities	Q3 Y4	Draft project proposal developed.	IC on LRIS was recruited.  Stake holders' Consultation Workshop to develop LRIS was held on 5th April 2019. Assessment of data and capacity needs of stakeholders are being assessed. Based on this LOA with NRMCC is ready to sign.  TCC was established				25%	
<b>Output 1.5:</b> Degraded agricultural lands in the project areas in the central highlands classified and mapped  <b>Indicator:</b> 536,770,000 ha of land classified and mapped according to level of land degradation	Q1 Y4	Initial stake holder meeting was held. Basic information was collected by LUPPD.	LUS maps are being prepared				20%	
<b>Outcome 2: Appropriate technologies for rehabilitation of degraded lands demonstrated and scaled up by strengthened networks of training and extension institutions</b>								
<b>Output 2.1:</b> Demonstration sites established in the three districts in the CH  <b>Indicator:</b> 120 demonstration sites (08 contiguous block/ 04 government sites/ 108 individual sites)	Q2 Y4	Demonstration site establishment modality was agreed in PSC and PCC and District Agriculture Committee (DAC). Development of three government sites were started as demonstrated models.	Development of four government training sites on SLM is in progress  08 contiguous blocks implementation is in progress  80 individual sites were selected, and 40 sites are under implementation.				40%	

<b>Output 2.2:</b> Participatory land use plans (PLUP) using SLM technologies formulated and implemented  <b>Indicator:</b> 32 plans formulated, and 50,000 ha covered <b>Indicator:</b> 48 plans implemented, and 50,000 ha covered	Q2 Y4	LOA with LUPPD to prepare 32 PLUP.  Nine PLUP completed.  Eight PLUP implementation in progress.	46 number of PLUP were completed.  Eight PLUP implementation is in progress.				50%	
<b>Output 2.3:</b> SLM training programme developed and implemented  <b>Indicator:</b> 80 training events <b>Indicator:</b> 2,000 of farmers trained, disaggregated by gender	Q1 Y4	Consultant on SLM recruited.  Trainer's training manual on farming system developed.	Five technology packages were developed  Training manual to be validated.  75 training events completed by the project - male 1560 and female 1224 farmers were trained on SLM (Total 2784)				55%	
<b>Outcome 3: Capacity of developing innovative funding mechanisms established in both public and private sector</b>								
<b>Output 3.1:</b> Tailored guidelines on innovative project financing prepared and disseminated to the stakeholders under the Soil Conservation Act  <b>Indicator:</b> Guidelines on innovative project financing available to key stakeholder groups (public officers and private sector stakeholders)	Q2 Y4	n/a	Consultation meeting conducted in March 2019  Ecosystem services identified and mapping and questionnaire survey are in progress				30%	
<b>Output 3.2:</b> Training on innovative project financing guidelines organized and implemented in the project area, involving public officers and private sector stakeholders  <b>Indicator:</b> 10 (2 ToTs + 8 trainings) training events on innovative project financing organized <b>Indicator:</b> 50 ToT trained	Q2 Y4	n/a	Activity yet to start				0%	

<b>Indicator:</b> 250 public and private sector participants								
<b>Output 3.3:</b> One workshop per DS division organized for innovative funding systems, involving both private and public sectors stakeholders  <b>Indicator:</b> 8 workshops on innovative funding systems <b>Indicator:</b> 250 participants from private and public sectors, respectively	Q2 Y4	n/a	Activity yet to start				0%	
<b>Output 3.4:</b> Main environmental services provided by the agricultural sector valuated as a basis for establishing innovative project financing  <b>Indicator:</b> Identification of 5 number of innovative project funding mechanisms	Q2 Y4	n/a	Activity yet to start				0%	
<b>Outcome 4: Enhanced national knowledge base for sustainable land management and project implementation based on adaptive results-based management</b>								
<b>Output 4.1:</b> Public awareness increased on the issues of land degradation and the benefits of SLM  <b>Indicator:</b> Project website <b>Indicator:</b> 9 number of project newsletters <b>Indicator:</b> 7 number of awareness/outreach events organized <b>Indicator:</b> 5 paper articles published per year	Q2 Y4	Project website development in progress  03 public awareness programs conducted parallel to Soil Day (2017 & 2018) and Water Day (2018)  Four newspaper articles published	Final stage of project web site development  Five public awareness programs completed  Four videos on SLM produced  One newsletter issued Seven paper articles published				60%	
<b>Output 4.2:</b> Targeted education, awareness and outreach campaigns for SLM implemented  <b>Indicator:</b>	Q1 Y4	201 field level officers and 243 farmers trained on SLM	2784 farmers trained				60%	

## 2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Increased awareness among land users and policy makers of SLM		Two radio programs conducted						
<b>Output 4.3:</b> SLM good practice guidelines developed and disseminated <b>Indicator:</b> Guidelines available <b>Indicator:</b> Guidelines disseminated to 20 stakeholder groups	Q1 Y4	n/a	The activity is in progress				30%	
<b>Output 4.4:</b> M&E system established to measure project progress and impact <b>Indicator:</b> Baseline and targets for project indicators refined <b>Indicator:</b> Annual project implementation review (PIR) reports submitted to GEF Secretariat <b>Indicator:</b> Six monthly project progress reports	Q2 Y4	M&E plan technically cleared.  No PIR reports submitted.	M&E system in progress PIR 2018 June - July 2019 submitted  Jan – June six month report submitted				80%	
<b>Output 4.5:</b> Midterm and terminal evaluations carried out <b>Indicator:</b> Mid-term and final evaluation reports	Q4 Y3	MTR evaluation is scheduled to end of 2018 – early 2019	MTR is rescheduled to 15 -30 July 2019				50%	

## 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:**

- SLM technical packages for five farming systems, i.e. marginal tea, low input and high input vegetable cultivation, paddy farming and home gardening, were prepared and validated with experts in relevant technical agencies. Based on this development of the training manual was started based on the technical packages;
- PLUPs in eight mini watersheds are being developed with SLM practices;
- 46 Participatory Land Use Plans ;
- Third draft of participatory land use plan (PLUP) is being reviewed. The consultation workshop is scheduled in July 2019 for validation of PLUP guideline;
- Preliminary draft report on SLM policy study completed. Gaps of SLM policies identified. Consultation meeting on SLM Policy studies with stakeholders conducted. The third draft is being reviewed by IC on SLM.
- IC on LRIS was recruited. Stake holder's meeting was conducted in April 2019. LADA training has been scheduled to August 2019. Land Use System maps are being prepared;
- Preliminary study on innovative finance for SLM was conducted. Consultation meeting conducted in March 2019. Ecosystem services identified, and mapping is in progress;
- The World Water Day and the Soil Day was conducted with the participation of famers and other stake holders;
- Four government training centres are being developed as farmer training and demonstration sites on SLM. 45 Individual farmer demonstrations are being developed;
- Totally, 2784 number of farmers were trained by the project while 6050 farmers were trained at the project supported government training centres on SLM practices

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

Max 200 words:

- The farmers are well attended for the SLM training programs. But the implementation of SLM practices are restricted depend on financial ability of the farmer.
- As per the new government rule, the allocated funds to government institutions should come through the government treasury and this process takes extra time and paperwork. Initiation of activities with the government institutions through letter of Agreements (LOAs) were delayed due to this reason.
- Developing coordinated action in implementing SLM at ground level is a major challenge, since different agencies have mandates and responsibilities on different components (e.g. tea, minor export crop, coconut, vegetable etc.)

## Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating <sup>15</sup>	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating <sup>16</sup>	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<i>Activities were delayed in initial phase but with after the restructuring of the PMU and with good stakeholder engagement, project activities are catching up the time line.</i>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	<i>Delay of the project activities slowed down the overall progress of results delivery. However, the project has managed to complete majority of the o the ground activities coupled with start-up of replications and scaling up. The project should allocate more financial and Human resources on policy influencing and scaling up in the final year of the project cycle.</i>
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>17</sup></b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	<i>Various factors, both in external and internal, caused delaying the implementation. Hope stronger leadership and overall support from external expertise will facilitate in implementing and completing the remaining works which are the core of the project, particularly strengthening capacity of assessing land degradation and decision support.</i>

<sup>15</sup> **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.

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

<sup>17</sup> The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>S</b>	<i>The project has made good progress in the reporting progress in the reporting year. However, there is still room for improvement in overall achievement of outcomes. The project needs to make sure that its implementation strategy focuses on accelerating wider scale impacts and not just on small-scale demonstration. The fact that its activities are going to be scaled up through a World Bank loaned government project is a very positive sign that its activities are relevant. The mid term review that took place after this PIR was done should point out ways to improve project performance.</i>
------------------------------------	-----------	----------	--

### 3. Risks

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

<b>Overall Project Risk classification</b> (at project submission)	<b>Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid<sup>18</sup>.</b> 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

<b>RISK TABLE</b>
-------------------

<sup>18</sup> **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.



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

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
<b>1</b>	Institutional framework and project coordination	L	Project encourage stake holders to participate in project activities	With PSC, PCC and participatory land use plan institutional coordination has been improved.	Functioning institutional framework for project coordination is in place.
<b>2</b>	Insufficient funding to sustain SLM activities	M	Promotion of PLUP among the stake holders	Co - financing from stake holders are progressive. Promote private sector involvement in SLM	Financing to sustain SLM will be an important issue to address as the project moves forward.
<b>3</b>	Slow uptake of Policy Recommendations	L	Increase awareness among the decision makers	Consultation meeting for the top-level officers to address the importance of policy recommendation.	Promote Implementation of policy recommendation

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Medium	Low	Project has taken actions to mitigate risk factors

<sup>19</sup> GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

<sup>20</sup> 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".

## 4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months<sup>21</sup>

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

### Adjustments to Project Time Frame

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

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	<div>Original NTE:                      Revised NTE:</div> <div>Justification:</div>

## 5. Gender Mainstreaming

---

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

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

M&E system has gender disaggregated data farmer training and SLM technology introduction

Total 2784 were trained on SLM and 1544 are male and 1240 are female farmers. The women participation in SLM training has increased the women's participation in SLM related decision making.

The project has introduced crop - dairy integration model, home gardening model with vanilla cultivation and intercropping with tea for the women farmers. These models have gain popularity among the women farmers and the additional income generated is generate extra income and uplift the socio – economic benefits of the family.

Activity	Male count	Female count
Crop – livestock integration model	05	05
Orange plants	115	71
Grevilia plants	49	31
Durian grafted plants	03	12
Vanilla plants	09	32
Ginger seeds	03	20
Pepper plants	44	59
Organic fertilizer	30	06
Tea plants	66	41
Curry leaves plants	66	42
Pomegranate grafted plants	59	39

## 6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

No involvement of indigenous peoples.

## 7. Stakeholders Engagement

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

Stakeholder	Engagement events	Time/date	Purpose	Outcome
Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment (MoMDE)	Inception workshop	27-28 October 2016	Project focal point and UNCCD national focal point	Government stakeholder's cooperation is very satisfactory.
	2 PSC meetings	28 Nov 2017 and 27 Feb 2018		<i>project focal point and coordinate all stake holders</i>
	Appointed Project Director	From 2016		

Stakeholder	Engagement events	Time/date	Purpose	Outcome
Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture (DOA)	Organized World Soil Day  Organized World Water day  Support to develop technical packages for SLM  Technical inputs for field implementation	05 Dec 2017  27 Mar 2018  2018 – 2019  2017 onwards	Mandatory government technical agency for crop production	SLM training programs and SLM campaigns were implemented  <i>Lead technical agency of the project and support to develop technical packages on SLM, Development of Project proposal etc.</i>
Natural Resources Management Centre (NRMCC)	PMU office  Support for LRIS	From 2016  2018 onwards	Mandatory government technical agency for formulating and implementing soil conservation act	Supported with technical support for implementation  <i>Lead technical agency of the project.</i> Provide technical expertise for the field implementation of SLM
Department of Land Use Policy Planning Department	Preparation of PLUP  Field workshop on PLUP guideline preparation	2018 onwards  2018	Mandatory government technical agency for LU planning and policy	46 PLUP were prepared. PLUP preparation guidelines document.  <i>Lead agency of the project</i>
Department of Export Agriculture	Involvements for PRA in the field level  Farmer training and planting materials	2018  2018 - 2019	Mandatory government technical agency for export agricultural crops	Tea farmers have been trained on tea and pepper intercropping  <i>Lead agency of the Preparation of PLUPs and PLUP guidelines.</i>
Hadabima Authority	Technical and field coordination for implementing soil conservation	2019	Mandatory government technical agency for implementation of soil conservation	Soil conservation have been successfully implemented in Doluwa and Deltota divisions.
The Department of Animal Production and Health	Technical assistance to implement crop – livestock integration	2018 -2019	Mandatory government technical agency for	Six dairy farmers have completed crop – dairy integrated models as demonstrations

Stakeholder	Engagement events	Time/date	Purpose	Outcome
			livestock development	
Tea Research Institute (TRI)	SLM demonstration model in TRI Passara Regional Training Centre	2018 - 2019	Mandatory government technical agency for tea research and development	A SLM demonstration site have been completed  <i>Support to develop technical package for SLM in tea</i>
Provincial Department of Agriculture (PDOA)	Inputs for technical packages  Field training activity implementation support  3 Provincial coordinating meetings in each province have been conducted.	2018 - 2019	Mandatory government technical agency for agriculture extension at provincial level	Five technical packages have been developed  <i>Lead agency for the implementation of SLM in Nuwaraelya and Badulla District.</i>
Tea Small Holdings Development Authority (TSHDA)	Validation of technical package for tea  SLM demonstration model in Kandy district	June 2017	Mandatory government technical agency for tea small holders	Technical package for tea was developed  SLM demonstration model on Tea is being implemented  <i>Lead agency for implementation of SLM in tea lands in project districts.</i>
District Secretariats	District Agriculture Committee (DAC) meeting	2018 -2019	District level coordinator	Conducted DAC in 2018 (field coordination and supervision)
Divisional Secretariat	Divisional Agriculture Committee (DAC) meeting	2018 -2019	Divisional level coordinator	Conducted DAC in 2018
PLUP Groups at each mini watershed	PLUP preparation, implementation and participatory monitoring	From 2018	CBO at the mini watershed level supporting the implementation	08 PLUP are being implemented.  Participatory monitoring

Stakeholder	Engagement events	Time/date	Purpose	Outcome
University of Rajarata	Water quality testing in Kandy district	2019	Academic collaboration	Water quality report of 3 mini watersheds in Kandy district  Graduate student completed the final thesis

## 8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

### Press Coverage

- Sunday Observer: Soil Pollution. A danger lurking beneath our feet.  
<http://sundayobserver.lk/2018/12/09/business/soil-pollution-danger-lurking-beneath-our-feet>  
<http://epaper.sundayobserver.lk/?id=35&tday=2018/12/09>
- DailyFT: Soil Pollution. A danger lurking beneath our feet. (Page 11)  
<http://www.ft.lk/environment/Soil-pollution--A-danger-lurking-beneath-our-feet/10519-668652>  
[http://epaper.ft.lk/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=2071:20181212&catid=35:epaper](http://epaper.ft.lk/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=2071:20181212&catid=35:epaper)
- Daily News: World Soil Day 2018. Call for solution to soil pollution  
<http://www.dailynews.lk/2018/12/11/features/170894/call-solution-soil-pollution>
- Dinamina (Sinhala Newspaper): Soil is part of life  
<https://bit.ly/2RNT74C>
- Dinamina  
<http://www.dinamina.lk/2019/03/25>
- Sunday Observer  
<http://www.sundayobserver.lk/2019/03/03/business/fao-confident-new-measures-will-increase-productivity>
- Dailynews  
<http://www.dailynews.lk/2019/03/22/features/180935/water-fast-running-out>

### Radio Programme

FAO Sri Lanka also participated in radio interviews with “KANDURATA FM” and “UVA Radio”, state-owned regional radio stations broadcasting to the main agricultural districts in the country including the districts in which both FAO Projects are implemented.

KANDURATA FM programme: <https://drive.google.com/open?id=11Y3y4-ccmD1lN2SmAjSXMovWewfB-0Fd>

### **Social Media Posts**

Posts about soil pollution were posted on December 5th on the United Nations Sri Lanka Facebook and Twitter account. The social media posts were about the collective efforts taken by the Government, farmers and youth with the support of FAO to reduce soil pollution, and the posts were linked to an article that is on the FAO Sri Lanka webpage.

Facebook Post: [https://www.facebook.com/pg/UNSriLanka/posts/?ref=page\\_internal](https://www.facebook.com/pg/UNSriLanka/posts/?ref=page_internal)

Twitter Post: <https://twitter.com/UNSriLanka/status/1070240722073346048>



## 9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>22</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National Government	Department of Agriculture (DoA)	In Kind	5,720,000	286,128		5,720,000
National Government	Provincial Department of Agriculture - (Uva)	In Kind	187,700	174,374		187,700
National Government	Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment	In Kind	168,500			168,500
National Government	Land Use Policy Planning Department - LUPPD	In Kind	154,100	836,759		100,000
National Government	Tea Research Institute - Passara TRI	In Kind		58,314		75,000
National Government	Tea Small Holdings Development Authority (Badulla)	In Kind		364,170		450,000
National Government	Tea Small Holdings Development Authority (Kandy)	In Kind		549,439		750,000
<b>TOTAL</b>			6,230,300	2,269,184		7,451,200

<sup>22</sup> Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

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

## 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.