



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).....	16
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	27
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	33
6. RISKS	35
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	46
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	50
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	52
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	54
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	57
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	61
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	62

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Asia and Pacific
Country (ies):	Lao PDR
Project Title:	Climate Change Adaptation in Wetlands Areas (CAWA) in Lao PDR
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/LAO/022/LDF
GEF ID:	5489
GEF Focal Area(s):	Climate Change Adaptation
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) International Union for Nature Conservation (IUCN)
Project Duration (years):	6.5 years
Project coordinates:	16° 20' N 105° 15' E (centroid Xe Champhone wetland complex) 14° 44' N 106° 05' E (centroid Bueng Kiat Ngong wetland)

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	23 October 2015
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	30 May 2016
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	30 May 2021
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ²	31 December 2022 (two budget neutral extensions due to Covid-19 pandemic lock-down implementation delays)

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 4,717,579
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc³:	USD 15,367,380
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)⁴:	USD 4,389,295
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022⁵	USD 8,770,000

¹ As per FPMIS

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

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

⁴ For 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.

⁵ Please 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:	26 November 2020 (national steering committee) 18 & 19 April 2022 (provincial steering committee – Champasak) 25 & 26 April 2022 (provincial steering committee – Savannakhet)
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	August 2020
Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):	10 August 2020 – 16 March 2021
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	7 May – 15 August 2022
Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	YES – TE stage

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Kevin Jeanes, Chief Technical Advisor, FAOLA	Kevin.Jeanes@fao.org
Budget Holder	Nasar Hayat, FAO Representative to Lao PDR, FAOLA	Nasar.Hayat@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Louise Whiting, FAO Lead Technical Officer, FAO RAP	Louise.Whiting@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Sameer Karki, GEF Funding Liaison Officer, CBC	Sameer.Karki@fao.org

⁶ The 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.

⁷ The 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
Reduce climate change vulnerability of the local communities and threats to the wetland landscapes upon which they depend	Outcome 1 - Improved understanding of CC impacts & risks in XC & BKN wetlands, & with district & provincial agency stakeholders, & enhanced capacities to design & implement CCA & DRM measasures	Outcome Indicator 1.1 - - Perceptions & understandings of CC impacts & risks resulting from training, vulnerability assessments, management & participatory planning & livelihood activities with PONRE, DONRE, PAFO, DAFO, LWU and communities	Some limited awareness of CC vulnerability due to: a) the CC & wetlands study in XC by the MRC, & in BKN due to Mekong Water Dialogues work; b) MRC CCAI work in Savannakhet,		70% of members of PONRE, DONRE, PAFO & DAFO staff covering the target wetlands (28 out of 40) & 70% of members of community organizations (both men & women) in the target villages are aware of CC impacts & risks	Estimated >90% of PONRE, DONRE, PAFO, DAFO & LWU agency staff involved in CAWA, and > 75% of community members involved in CAWA at both sites, are now expected to be aware of CC impacts & risks, & how to implement CCA – DRM - NRM response measures. Endline KAP/qualitative survey scheduled to be conducted within the last 6 months of project over July-October 2022.	HS

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

⁹ 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.

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

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

		within and around the target wetlands	; & c) PPG discussions				
	Outcome 2: Efficient & cost-effective adaptation measures in place to reduce the impact of CC & natural disasters on wetlands eco-systems & local livelihoods	Outcome Indicator 2.1: Numbers of families within & surrounding the wetlands involved in and benefitting from adaptive on-farm or within-wetland livelihood practices, systems and infrastructure (e.g. climate smart agriculture, vegetable & mushroom production, small & large livestock & NTFP production, animal disease control, native fisheries & aquaculture)	160 families apply two or more of these practices		1,280 families (total 8,400 family members) apply two or more of these practices	At least 2,096 families within or surrounding the wetlands involved in and benefiting from one or more adaptive on-farm or within wetlands livelihood practices, systems and infrastructure, which include activities related to: horticulture, fisheries, NTFPs, aquaculture, livestock, irrigation.	HS
		Outcome indicator 2.2: Number of families within or surrounding the wetlands involved in or benefitting from at least one non-agricultural off-farm an out of	50% of vulnerable people surveyed have no reliable fall-back livelihood support option if their main option		800 families (5,250 family members) have received with equal benefits for men & women	1,651 families within or surrounding the wetlands are involved in and benefiting from at least one non-agricultural off-farm livelihood support options which include activities related to ecotourism, handicraft, NTFPs, fish processing and wetland product value adding (IUCN 96 families – NTFP planning; Tetraktys 559 families - ecotourism site; LWU Pathoumphone 70 families – handicrafts; LWU Savannakhet 741	HS

	wetland livelihood & NRM support option as a CC fall-back option (e.g. eco- & cultural tourism, handicrafts, NTFP & fish processing)	fails due to climate change.			families – handicrafts & women’s livelihoods; DONRE Champhone 44 families – NTFPs; PAFO LFS Savannakhet – 141 families – fish processing).	
	Outcome indicator 2.3: Numbers of families within & surrounding the wetlands with improved and more sustainable access to & benefit from wetland products & services (e.g. from management of wetland reserves & sites, FCZ & fisheries, dry season water use & wetland clearance & restoration; plus improved water supply / access from restored semi-natural storages, irrigation oftakes & wells)	Baseline to be established in year 1		6400 families with total of 42,000 family members, with equal benefits for men & women	At least 13,829 families alone benefit from improved fish consumption & sales from wetlands around the 48 project established & managed FCZ in BKN & XC (XC 12,117 families & BKN 1,712 families as accounted in 2021). No plans were presented over 2016 – 2018 project period to expand project activities away from the 24 previous XC & BKN Ramsar target villages. Yet, ProDoc suggested the expansion was needed. Only since late 2019 were project activities expanded to cover adjusted target of total wetland landscape, with expanded focus in XC to the greater wetland (72 villages in 3 districts) & in BKN to the total wetland & near catchment area (14 villages). The activities expansion was implemented through LoAs with provincial/district counterparts. The project now accounts for a total 86 villages in XC and BKN.	HS
	Outcome indicator 2.4: Area of target wetlands under	Baseline to be established in year 1			2129.3 ha (direct) 48 FCZ – 591.20 ha set-up new & existing supported (XC Champhone – 22 FCZ, 17 villages & 411.9 ha; XC	HS

	<p>effective management & protection to promote resilience & the flow of ecosystem services</p>	<p>None</p>			<p>Songkhone – 7 FCZ, 7 villages & 109.2 ha; XC Xonnabuly – 6 FCZ, 6 villages & 37.7 ha; BKN 13 FCZ, 10 villages & 32.4 ha); and four XC wetland reserves – 51538.1 ha (Nongkan -Nongmaehang – Nongdern 50.2 ha; Taloung 890.04 ha; Koudkhean Tai 473.32 ha; & Koudkhean Nue 124.34 ha). All established 2018-2020 as core wetland conservation areas: district government recognized boundaries, management committees & management rules; sign-boarded; renovated dykes & new established semi-natural ponds; dry season water use plans; wetland clearing & reforestation programs.</p> <p>73,800 ha (managed zone)</p> <p>Revised 2019 CAWA wetland landscape management planning & implementation approach, has shifted wetland habitat protection focus (hydrology, native habitat & fish migration) to: BKN ~2500 ha total wetland falling within ~ 7,000 ha north catchment & total wetland CAWA operations area; & XC 66,800 ha total wetland (3 Districts).</p>	
	<p>Outcome indicator 2.5: Area of wetland habitats in XC & BKN under improved forms of direct management to</p>	<p>Practices (ha)</p> <p>Improved management of forests to increase resilience to effects of CC (floods,</p>		<p>ha</p> <p>200</p>	<p>ha</p> <p>219 ha</p> <p>Identified priority 240.5 reforestation areas in 16 villages in XC (IUCN 2019 – 20) – with noted over-emphasis on agro-forestry on private lands, & under-emphasis on riparian and flooded forests on public land.</p>	<p>HS</p>

		address CC-induced risks	erosion etc.) (0)		Implementation plan revised (under DAFO / DONRE 2020 – 22 workplans) with shifted focus to flooded and riparian forests. Resulting in 218.93 ha implemented reforestation. Inclusive of 20 ha wetland & riparian reforestation / restoration in 6 villages (DONRE reforestation); 121.25 ha reforestation in 3 villages (DONRE World Wetland Day); & 77.63 ha river bank & wetland reforestation in 17 villages (DAFO reforestation)	
			Invasive species management (0)	200	45.06 ha Figure includes both Mimosa (invasive shrub) & water hyacinth (invasive water weed) control. Approximate 7.1 ha mimosa (4 villages) cleared under experimental treatments in XC (2017-18) & BKN 2019-21). Effort needed to apply best-practice controls to eliminate mimosa in BKN. XC mimosa too extensive & requires revised approach & further investment. 37.96 Ha of water hyacinth & other floating weeds were cleared (2017 – 22) in BKN (6.96 ha, 4 villages) & XCP wetlands (31.0 ha, 13 villages, 3 districts), 2017 - 2022.	MS
			Water flow, dry season water storage, water quality & wetland habitat	20	37.96 ha 37.96 Ha of water hyacinth & other floating weeds were cleared (2017 – 22) in BKN (6.96 ha villages) & XCP wetlands (31.0 ha, 13 villages, 3 districts).	HS

			improved due to wetland re-opening (0)		<p>Program is under 2021-22 expansion in 5 villages in BKN, & across Greater XC wetland in 13 villages (3 Districts), with focus upon floating water weed removal in demarcated wetland reserves and FCZ.</p> <p>Indicator is reworded to emphasis that water flow is not the target but improved aquatic habitat & dry season water storage.</p>	
			Protection of wetland habitats & nesting sites (e.g. lakes & reserves for natural wetland habitat, fisheries, crocodiles, forest patches for bird & fish nesting) (0)	600	<p>2129.3 (direct)</p> <p>48 FCZ – 591.20 ha set-up new & existing supported (XC Champhone – 22 FCZ, 17 villages & 411.9 ha; XC Songkhone – 7 FCZ, 7 villages & 109.2 ha; XC Xonnabuly – 6 FCZ, 6 villages & 37.7 ha; BKN 13 FCZ, 10 villages & 32.4 ha); and four XC wetland reserves – 51538.1 ha (Nongkan -Nongmaehang – Nongdern 50.2 ha; Taloung 890.04 ha; Koudkhean Tai 473.32 ha; & Koudkhean Nue 124.34 ha). All established 2018-2022 as core wetland conservation areas: district government recognized boundaries, management committees & management rules; sign-boarded; renovated dykes & new established semi-natural ponds; dry season water use plans; wetland clearing & reforestation programs.</p> <p>76,300 (managed zone)</p> <p>Revised 2019 CAWA wetland landscape management planning & implementation approach has shifted wetland habitat protection focus (hydrology, native habitat & fish</p>	HS

					migration) to: BKN ~2500 ha total wetland & ~ 7,000 ha catchment; XC 66,800 ha total wetland – 50-year return flood zone (3 Districts).	
		Controlled burning (0)		200	N/A (removed with 2019 project re-design due to likely negative social & environmental impacts)	
Outcome 3: Efficient and cost-effective CC adaptation & disaster management measures in wetlands integrated & budgeted in District & Provincial planning & implementation processes & inform national planning processes	Outcome Indicator 3.1: Number of local & national level plans that incorporate CC vulnerability assessments, CCA, NRM & DRM mitigation measures & analyses of impacts on wetlands	No local plans provide for application of CC/DRM assessment approaches At least 1 national plan provides for application of CC/DRM assessment approaches		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All projects & plans developed by PONRE/DONRE & PAFO/DAFO that directly affect the target wetlands - At least 50% of all other provincial & district plans & projects in the target provinces & districts - BKN Ramsar site management plan - Water allocation & abstraction management plans/rules at district level in the target 	<p>Following listed plans as of 2022 include application of CC/DRM assessment & adaptation implementation approaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partly progressed (early 2020) on Draft Strategy (5-year Roadmap) for National Ramsar Wetlands Program of Lao PDR. - XC Management Plan (draft final); - BKN Management plan; - Integrated Spatial Plan of Champhone District (draft – MONRE); - 12 government partner agencies' activity plans (funded through LoAs with FAO-CAWA over 2016-2022) have adaptation, DRM & NRM measures incorporated. - Small-scale village-level site management plans developed in XC & BKN sites for FCZ, wetland reserves & associated dry season water use, veterinary centres & vaccine fund, handicraft revolving fund & handicraft / fish processing groups and LWU focal point & women's group plans (DAFO, DONRE, PAFO & LWU LoAs 2019-2022) & for 5 eco-tourism development sites & district tourism loop plans in XC (Tetraktys LoAs 2017-2022). 	S

				<p>districts</p> <p>At least 5 national plans related to natural resources management & agriculture¹² provide application of CC/DRM assessment approaches.</p>	<p>- Project 'Theory of change' approach & lessons learned on CCA-DRM-NRM were integrated into livelihood & wetland sites protection plans in the district & provincial planning process, & have informed the national planning process.</p> <p>- Implication of learning from CCA, DRM, NRM & wetland – fisheries management with 10 government agencies/partners suggests understanding of CCA-DRM-NRM planning & implementation tools.</p>	
	<p>Outcome Indicator 3.2: Number of institutions adopting tools for participatory CCA, NRM & DRM planning & implementation & M&E in wetlands</p>	None		<p>- Participatory CCA and DRM planning and M&E is used in 2 other districts within the province, & for 2 other wetlands nationally</p> <p>- DONRE & DAFOs in four districts</p> <p>CCA & DRM planning & implementation lessons shared nationally with MONRE (DoE,</p>	<p>Project 'theory of change' approach & lessons learned on CCA-DRM integration into livelihoods & wetland site protection into district, provincial & national planning processes</p> <p>presented in CAWA activities, meetings and workshops at national, provincial and district levels.</p> <p>-12 government agencies (national, provincial & district) have adopted CCA, DRM & wetland tools, plan methods & field activity plans supported by FAO-CAWA LoAs over 2016 – 2022.</p> <p>- 3 years of CCA, DRM, NRM & wetland management 'learning by doing' training & hands-on implementation activities with 10 government agency partners (LoAs 2019 – 2022), suggest >90% agency staff now understand CCA-DRM</p>	S

¹² Including the 15-year MONRE Action Plan, the NAPA, the CC Sub-sector working group strategy and the National Strategy on Environment and Climate Change Education and Awareness

				DWR & DCC), MAF & wetland management stakeholders.	– NRM planning & implementation tools.	
	Outcome Indicator 3.3: Perceptions of effectiveness of institutional coordination at district, provincial & national level in support of wetland CCA, NRM & DRM	TBD through baseline evaluation of perceptions		70% of members of the institutions targeted for improved institutional coordination have favorable perceptions of the effectiveness of this coordination	Efforts continued through 2017-2022 for a national linkage on wetland CCA – DRM – NRM through CAWA support to MONRE & National Ramsar Secretariat, & initiation of development of draft national road map plan & management guidelines for wetlands in Lao PDR. Project Provincial-District PPC meetings (Dec 2019; Sept-Oct 2020; April 2022), MTR review (Aug 2020), & Terminal Evaluation review (May 2022) confirm provincial – district agency & governor’s perceptions of increased effectiveness of project coordination & delivery, after CAWA 2019 work plan, budget & LoA re- design to improve integration of district & provincial planning & implementation activity into project. Under national- level coordinating & district-provincial governor’s offices in parallel. CAWA XC management plan meetings (Jun - Aug 2020; Sept 2021; Mar - Apr 2022) further progressed the set-up of district – province institutional planning & implementation coordination mechanisms; National-level institutional coordination & integration made with CAWA support for: - MONRE-DoE top-supervision & guidance of provincial & district field- activities (DoE LoAs 2019-2021)	S

					<p>-MONRE Ramsar National Secretariat (National Ramsar Steering Committee meetings; Survey new Ramsar sites; & draft national Ramsar program strategy / road map (DoE LoAs 2019-21);</p> <p>-2020 planning of MONRE DCC planning & institutional review for flood risk DRM early-warning data collection & analysis multi- departmental capability assessment workshop;</p> <p>-National Consultation Workshop on Eco-Friendly Water Management for Sustainable Wetland Agriculture (Dec 2019);</p> <p>-Project National Steering Committee (PSC) meeting & multi-ministerial review of CAWA workplan, budget & proposal for time extension (Nov 2020)</p>	
<p>Outcome 4: Effective M&E & sharing of lessons learnt, knowledge, data, & activity visibility, to verify project impact & results</p>	<p>Outcome 4.1 - Project Reporting & Evaluations Implemented effectively and as per requirements</p>	<p>No system for evaluations prior to project commencement</p>		<p>System developed is effective for monitoring, evaluation & knowledge sharing</p>	<p>System developed, maintained & continuously updated. MTR evaluation completed (Aug 2020 – Jul 2021). Terminal Evaluation conducted in-country (May 2022), with final reporting on-going (Jun – Aug 2022 onwards)</p> <p>90% complete</p> <p>Ongoing data harvest & documentation of lessons learned & results over the last 6 months (Jul – Dec 2022)</p>	<p>S</p>
	<p>Outcome Indicator 4.2 - Project M&E system established & implemented to monitor activities, outputs &</p>	<p>No baseline - no communications or data output prior to project</p>			<p>- Significant progress was made on internal (Jul 2020), MTR (Aug – Sept 2020) & post-MTR (Apr – Sept 2021) review of project log frame (outcome & output) wording & indicators.</p>	

	outcomes effectively - No indicator developed	commencement			Inclusive of Tracking-Tool (MTR) output (Sept 2021) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updating review & validation of 2016 – 2022 activity / village / participants matrix for CAWA, partners & consultants at BKN & XC sites (May 2021 – May 2022) 	
	Outcome Indicator 4.3 - Knowledge management, data sharing & communication output are delivered effectively - No indicator developed	No baseline - no communications or data output prior to project commencement			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significant progress on distribution of technical reports & development of 2016 – 2021 report meta-data archive (Sept – Nov 2021) & web-based report catalogue (May – Aug 2021) linked to CAWA web-site, MONRE Minister & partner agencies; - Significant progress on output of communication products (news updates, events & field activity videos) on FAO GEF, CAWA & UN-Laos web sites, face book pages, radio interview & press releases - Initial development of CAWA mobile phone app. public distribution of CAWA information products 	

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<p>Outcome 3: Efficient and cost-effective CC adaptation & disaster management measures in wetlands integrated & budgeted in District & Provincial planning & implementation processes & inform national planning processes</p>	<p>Ensure CAWA final delivery of field-level lessons on CCA, DRM & NRM for wetlands & community livelihoods, & the understanding of CAWA CCA, DRM & NRM “theory of change” approach, to: a) inform National stakeholders, & wetland, CCA, DRM planning & policy forums (project PSC, Ramsar committee, MONRE-CC & DRM & NDC forums); & b) progress in integration into District & Provincial development & site management planning processes & guideline documents.</p>	<p>LTO, CTA, Terminal Evaluation & CAWA – DoE - PoNRE Provincial and National Ramsar Secretariat support teams</p>	<p>December 2022</p>
<p>Outcome 4: System developed & implemented for monitoring, systematization & dissemination of results & lessons learned</p>	<p>Recognise Component 4 is missing from past PIR, PPR & Project Results Matrix, & ensure Project M&E & Knowledge Management systems are updated with final project results & provide improved visibility of project effectiveness & activities to project partners, national stakeholders, public & regional / global technical focums.</p>	<p>LTO, CTA, Terminal Evaluation & Task Force</p>	<p>December 2022</p>

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs ¹³	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹⁴ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁵ in delivering outputs
Outcome 1.1				
Output 1.1. Pilot methodological tool developed for participatory CC VDRA in wetlands	Output Indicator 1.1.1 State of development and use of pilot methodological tool for participatory CC VDRA in wetlands	Participatory CC VDRA tool available in Lao language for national replication, based on test and refinement at two wetland sites	Completed	
Output 1.2. Effective training programme on CC/CCA3 and VDRA in wetlands	Output Indicator 1.2.1 Numbers of stakeholders trained in participatory CC vulnerability and DRM management (<i>CCA Outcome 2.1 Indicator 5</i>)	Totals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 PONRE and 15 PAFO staff in each target province (= 60) • 15 DONRE and 15 DAFO staff in each of 3 districts surrounding the wetlands (=60) • 400 villagers, of which 200 were female (20 villagers in each of 20 villages) 	Completed	

¹³ Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

¹⁴ Please 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)

¹⁵ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

<p>Output 1.3. Participatory VDRAAs carried out in BKN and XC wetlands</p>	<p>Output Indicator 1.3.1 Numbers of participatory VDRAAs carried out in wetland communities, addressing aspects of wetlands, wetland-based livelihoods and gender</p>	<p>By year 2, one in each of 20 key villages, including focus on gender differences in vulnerability</p>	<p>Completed</p>	
<p>Output 1.4. recommendations for appropriate adaptation measures based on analyses of CC-related issues affecting the target wetlands (including traditional knowledge)</p>	<p>Output Indicator 1.4.1 Number of studies generated on CC-related issues affecting the target wetlands, including analysis of gender dimensions</p>	<p>Reports available on the following key topics available in English and Lao languages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allowable rates and locations of water extraction for irrigation - Spatial priorities for wetland re-opening - Acceptable fish off-take levels, timing of closed seasons, locations of no-take areas - Spatial priorities and technical recommendations for improved watershed management - Sustainable limits and locations for grazing - Integrated Pest Management options - Measures for management of invasive alien species - Appropriateness for controlled burning to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Survey report on Greater Xe Champhone flood patterns (2019 extreme flood & flood surface versus early warning water gauge levels) by PONRE Savannakhet - Now Completed 	

		<p>protect valuable wetland habitats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Protection measures for key wetland species (e.g. fish crocodile, turtles) 		
Outcome 2.1				
<p>Output 2.1 Planning and inter-sectoral coordination frameworks for the two sites promoting CCA measures</p>	<p>Output Indicator 2.1.1 Numbers of plans that incorporate CCA considerations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 CCA-friendly territorial LUP per wetland - 1 CCA-friendly financial investment plan per wetland - 1 specific CCA plan per wetland - All infrastructure, agriculture and rural development plans in target districts incorporate wetland-focused CC vulnerability assessment with corresponding CCA measures 	<p>159</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - XC Management Plan (draft final); - BKN Management plan; - Integrated Spatial Plan of Champhone District (draft – MONRE); - 13 government partner agencies’ activity plans (funded through 24 LoAs with FAO-CAWA over 2016-2022) have adaptation, DRM & NRM measures incorporated. <p>Plus approximately 132 small-scale village-level management plans developed in XC & BKN sites for: wetland reserves (4); FCZ and fisheries (48); associated dry season water use (13); veterinary centres & vaccine fund (11); handicraft revolving fund & handicraft / fish processing groups (10); LWU focal point & women’s group plans (40); and 5 eco-tourism development sites & district tourism loop plans in XC (6).</p>	

	Output Indicator 2.1.2 Frequency of meeting of coordination mechanisms that embrace CCA in target wetlands and buffer zones	1 Ramsar National Committee meets annually; 2 provincial Ramsar committees meet at least 2 times annually Site specific wetland stakeholder committees meet at least 2 times annually	30 meetings organized till end of reporting period which include meetings of the Project Steering Committee (PSC), Provincial Project Committee (PPC), Provincial Ramsar Committee (PRC), Ramsar National Secretariat, and Wetland management planning meetings at national and local levels.	
Output 2.2 Capacities of water/natural resources/wetlands user groups strengthened to apply effective governance of NRM use and management	Output indicator 2.2.1 Capacities of user and governance groups	User and governance groups covering all key areas of target wetlands have capacities ¹³ to apply effective governance, with a specific focus on adaptation and resilience issues and a gender focus	Capacity building and on-the-job trainings through LoA activities for local user and governance groups: - Wetland demarcation committee - Wetland clearing groups - Water use and management committees - Weir management committee - Fisheries conservation zone committees - Fishermen catch monitoring groups - Tourism loop committee and 5 local site ambassadors	Endline KAP/qualitative survey to be conducted within the last 6 months of the project July-December 2022
	Output Indicator 2.2.2 Number of villages in wetland and buffer areas covered by effective governance groups and water user groups	All target villages have governance groups and wetland user group with rules, providing for adaptation considerations, applied and adhered to.	Across both sites XC and BKN: - Wetland Demarcation Committee covering 13 villages in XC; - Water Use and Management Committees in 13 villages in XC and BKN; - Fisheries Committees for 48 FCZs in 40 villages in XC and BKN;	

			<p>Fish breeding groups covering 5 established breeding center and 5 villages in XC and BKN;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Veterinary committees covering established network of 11 centers covering 40 villages in XC, and 4 centers covering 12 villages in BKN; - Handicraft and food processing revolving fund Committees for 3 clusters covering 12 villages in BKN, and 7 clusters covering 28 villages in XC; - Women's development committees facilitated / supported in 28 villages in XC and 12 villages in BKN; - Tourism Site Committees in 5 villages and Xe Champhone District Tourism Loop Committee comprising 8 villages, involved with the 5 CAWA eco-tourism target sites. 	
<p>Output 2.3 Direct investment in CCA strategies</p>	<p>Output Indicator 2.3.1 numbers of families (male and female led) benefiting from one or more forms of direct investment in CCA</p>	1600 families	<p>At least 6,363 families* in XC and BKN are benefiting from one or more forms of direct investment in CCA till now.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demarcation of wetlands (Nongkan- Nongmaehang- Nongdern, Ta Loung, Kout Khaen Neua & Kout Khaen wetlands as 4 separate unified wetland reserves in 13 villages in XC; - Establishment of dry season water storages & weir (Heuy Mah) repair in 2 villages in BKN; 	<p>Endline KAP/qualitative survey to be conducted within the last 6 months of the project July-December 2022</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Weir (Nongdern) spillway and dyke repairing for 3 villages in XC; - Support to improve 18 dug wells for drinking water supply in 2 villages in BKN; - Physical re-opening of wetlands and management of invasive species in 18 villages in XC and BKN; - Establishment of nurseries for reforestation in 2 village (at DONRE and DAFO offices) in XC, and 1 village in BKN; - Fish conservation zones established or supported in 40 villages in XC and BKN; - Establishment of a hatchery in 3 villages in XC and 2 villages in BKN; - Veterinary networks covering 40 villages in XC and BKN; - Construction and investment in ecotourism sites involving 8 villages in XC. 	
	<p>Output Indicator 2.3.2 number of villages with value-adding facilities for NTFPs established, benefiting men and women</p>	10 Villages	<p>53 villages</p> <p>12 villages in BKN and 41 villages in XC where NTFPs and wetland resources value adding activities (handicraft, fish processing and household products) are benefiting men and women, implemented under LoAs of: DONRE Champhone, PAFO-LFS Savannakhet, Tétraktys, LWU Savannakhet and LWU Pathoumphone.</p>	

	Output Indicator 2.3.3 number of villages with visitor facilities for ecotourism established benefiting men and women	10 Villages	8 villages Villages covered by the five ecotourism sites supported by the project and implemented through LoAs with Tetraktys, in collaboration with district authorities. Cf. Tetraktys LoA Final Report.	
	Output Indicator 2.3.4 number of semi-natural reservoirs established benefiting men and women	4 small/medium reservoirs	11 small/medium lakes / ponds In XC: 1. Nongdern lake 2. Nongkan wetland 3. Nongmaehang wetland 4. Koutkhaen Tai wetland 5. Koutkhaen Neua wetland 6. Taloung wetland 7. Laonard community fish pond 8. Phaleng community fish pond In BKN: 9. Phapho water storage 10. Phakkha water storage 11. Phakkha Heuy Mah storage	
	Output Indicator 2.3.5 Area of riparian forest replanted (ha)	200ha	218.88 ha	
Output 2.4 Strengthened individual capacities through effective programmes and innovation systems to support CC resilience strategies	Output Indicator 2.4.1 Number of men and women with increased knowledge and awareness to apply CC-resilient wetlands management, CC-resilient agricultural practices and/or non-agricultural livelihood support options	50% of men and women's population in project target area	At least 3,309 men and women trained by the project to apply CC-resilient wetlands management, agricultural practices and non-agricultural livelihood support options. (NB: Output indicator 2.4.1 has been proposed to be adjusted to	In the absence of a baseline (no KAP surveys done at the beginning of the project), the indicator will be informed quantitatively (# of men/women trained) and qualitatively (the

			'Number of men and women trained to apply [...]')	application of knowledge) and results will be reported in the terminal report.
Output 2.5 Early warning, disaster risk reduction and early recovery measures and systems in place	Output Indicator 2.5.1 Effectiveness of early warning systems in 20 target villages, as measured by promptness of receipt of, and effectiveness of response to, early warning messages	Early warning messages delivered on time to 100% of all events in target villages in year 5, and effective action taken in response by 50% of all affected villagers	Early warning systems for water resources, flood and fish populations functional and effective during flooding period, thanks to project establishment and operation of water level, water quality and fish species / population monitoring systems in XC and BKN.	The project endline survey will be conducted within the last 6 months July-December 2022, and results will be reported in the terminal report.
Outcome 3.1				
Output 3.1 Methodological guidelines for integration of CC adaptation and DRM into local and national plans	Output Indicator 3.1.1 Numbers of methodological guidelines used in planning instruments at different levels	Guidelines used in: - Provincial and district plans and new proposals. - BKN Ramsar site management plan - Water allocation and abstraction management plans/rules at district level	157 CC adaptation and DRM guidelines have steered the development of the following Provincial and District plans, with CCA, DRM & NRM measures incorporated: - XC Management Plan (draft final); - BKN Management plan; - Integrated Spatial Plan of Champhone District (draft – MONRE); - 13 government partner agencies' activity plans (funded through 24 LoAs with FAO-CAWA over 2016-2022) have adaptation, DRM & NRM measures incorporated.	

			Plus approximately 132 small-scale village-level management plans developed in XC & BKN sites for: wetland reserves (4); FCZ and fisheries (48); associated dry season water use (13); veterinary centres & vaccine fund (11); handicraft revolving fund & handicraft / fish processing groups (10); LWU focal point & women's group plans (40); and 5 eco-tourism development sites & district tourism loop plans in XC (6).	
Output 3.2 Effective learning programme for community, district and provincial stakeholders in planning and M&E for participatory CC adaptation and disaster management.	Output Indicator 3.2.1 Numbers of stakeholders effectively trained in participatory adaptation and DRM planning and M & E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 10 PONRE and 10 PAFO staff in Savannakhet and in Champassack - 10 DONRE and 10 DAFO staff in each of 3 districts surrounding the wetlands - 50 community members from surrounding wetlands 	Completed	
Output 3.3 Institutional mechanisms for intersectoral coordinating CC resilience in wetlands strengthened at national level	Output Indicator 3.3.1 Existence and frequency of meeting of coordination mechanisms for CC resilience in wetlands	Revise members of committees to integrate new sectors into wetlands management.	Revision of members of the following Ramsar wetlands management committees: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Ramsar Committee - National Ramsar Secretariat - National Ramsar Focal Points National Consultation Workshop on Eco-Friendly Water Management for Sustainable Wetland Agriculture led by FAO,	Additional meetings within the last 6 months July-December 2022 will be updated and reported in the terminal report.

			<p>on the 6th of December 2019. CAWA contribution with a presentation on 'Lessons learned on integrated wetland livelihood and wetland conservation practice in the field'.</p> <p>Progress on DRM early warning coordination with MONRE CCC workshop concept (pending implementation).</p>	
Output 4.1 Reporting and evaluations implemented effectively	Output Indicator 4.1.1 Number of progress reports (PPR and PIR) submitted	12	11.5	Completed with the submission of the current PIR
	Output indicator 4.1.2 Midterm and final evaluations implemented	2	1.5	
			Midterm review completed. Final evaluation field mission and preliminary results presented.	
Output 4.2 M&E system established and implemented to monitor activities, outputs and outcomes effectively	Output indicator 4.2.1 Number of M&E workshops organized	3	2	
			Final M&E workshop to be organized within the last 6 months for the endline survey.	
	Output indicator 4.2.2 Number of supervision and backstopping missions organized	10	7	
			FAO-R 4 LTO 2 FAORAP 1	
Output 4.3 Knowledge management, sharing and communication outputs are delivered effectively	Output Indicator 4.3.1 Number of awareness/knowledge-sharing events and activities organized and involved	18	14	
			WWD 6 WED 5 WFD 2	

			Eco-water wetlands by FAORAP 1 AIS 1	
	Output indicator 4.3.2 Number of people following project online content on websites, portals and social media platforms	2,000	1,576	
	Output indicator 4.3.3 Number of knowledge-sharing products (publications, news, stories, videos, IEC materials)	75	104 Technical reports 80 News/stories 4 Radio Interview 1 Videos 7 complete & 3 in process IEC materials 4	Technical reports are available in the CAWA online catalogue. Key reports will be published through FAO PWS within the last 6 months

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.

Project implementation progress and challenges over July 2021 – June 2022 may be reported by two distinct periods:

- July-November 2021 period – with significant challenge to project implementation progress due to the almost continuous Covid-19 nationwide, provincial and district lock-downs, with travel, meeting and public safety restrictions, most seriously from April 2021 through to November 2021. Field supervision missions from CAWA PMU and national partners, field work at district and provincial level from government agency and NGO partners, and on over-arching gender mainstreaming from Lao Women’s Union (LWU), all virtually halted over this period at both BKN and XC sites. Project field delivery effectively halted (with exception of community-based tasks), with progress largely restricted to PMU procurement, contractual (LoA) and M&E review and operations (Vientiane desk-based work);
- December 2021 – June 2022 – with project district and provincial partners (minus national partners) resuming field work under relaxed Covid-19 conditions, and resuming their previously good implementation progress, with activity, outcome (cumulative) and output delivery consolidated, expanded and accelerated, and on track to achieve the extended LoA workplans completion by April 2022.

July 2020 – June 2021 reporting period saw the project sustain:

- A decentralized CAWA project delivery which, despite Covid-19 epidemic and lock-down challenges, was able to maintain coordination and communication efficiency, and partner buy-in at the expanded Xe Champhone (XC) and Beung Kiat Ngong (BKN) wetland sites over the reporting period, and were able to well recover implementation effectiveness and catch-up on lost project delivery in the late reporting period after relaxation of Covid-19 restrictions. District and Provincial government partners remained well-engaged and cooperate well under the multi-sectoral district – provincial implementation framework (PONRE, DONRE, PAFO, DAFO, LWU and Tétraktys inputs), integrated site management, data collection, livelihood raising, NRM, DRM, wetland protection, gender mainstreaming and eco-tourism topics under national (CAWA PMU, DoE and IUCN) supervision.
- A project Terminal Evaluation (TE) was planned (Dec 2021 – Apr 2022), and conducted (May 2022) over the reporting period. Evaluation focused on project relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, factors affecting progress, Cross-cutting issues, adaptive management and progress towards impact. International team leader and national expert, conducted 13 days field tour to review project activities and evidence of progress both wetland sites, combined with interview of 13 government partner agencies. 1 INGO (IUCN) and 83 community members from 16 villages. Final reporting and detailed findings to be delivered over June – August 2022, with 27 May de-briefing at FAO Laos presenting satisfactory project progress findings on all stated evaluation parameters above;

- Component 1 – completed, initial foundation studies and training outputs were achieved against end-targets over 2017-2018, further VDRA updates were conducted under XC management planning process (2020), and the one remaining study (i.e flood patterns in XC) was completed in reporting period (Mar 2022) by PONRE Savannakhet with GPS and interview collection of data on mapping of extreme Oct 2019 flood patterns across 83 villages and 3 Districts of the Greater Xe Champhone wetland;
- Component 2 – progress to completion and maximum expansion during reporting period despite the serious Covid-19 challenges to field-level implementation and delivery progress over Apr – Nov 2021. Covid-19 lock-downs and travel restrictions (national, provincial & district) over this period resulted in an almost complete halt of on-ground activities of the 10 active sub-national partners (government & NGO) in the two target sites, with no supporting CAWA senior supervision or coordinating missions from Vientiane, and CAWA field staff similarly confined to work-from-home for most of the period (Output 2.1). Limited progress was made on Outputs 2.2, 2.3 & 2.4 over the difficult period by some partners (XC site: Tetraktys eco-tourism - waste management, IT & signboard design; LWU - handicraft training; & PONRE - land use planning. BKN site: PAFO LFS - FCZ, fish hatchery, veterinary network & duck & chicken extension. Yet the work of DONRE, DAFO, PAFO LFS at XC, and PONRE, DONRE & LWU at BKN was stalled Early warning data collection (fish stocks & water resources) implemented by community data-collectors fortunately continued uninterrupted over the whole period (Output 2.5). Only over Dec 2021 – April 2022, with lift of Covid-19 restrictions, did work by all partners at both resume under accelerated implementation (under amended extended LoAs) for Component 2 outputs CAWA field staff support resumed as well with rapid progress on 6-month delayed delivery of procured materials to field partners, and supervision support for the completion of remaining NRM and sustainable use, infrastructure investment, and livelihood-raising options activities (Outputs 2.2, 2.3 & 2.4), and support for continued water resource and fishery early-warning data collection into the Jul – Sept 2022 CAWA project extension period;
- Component 3 – work completely stalled on this Component over the April – November 2021 Covid-19 national capital lock-down period, due to the very restricted access to national DoE and DCC partners at MONRE. Under relaxed Covid-19 restrictions from Dec 2021 onwards some progress was made on Component 3 delivery of CAWA CCA-DRM-NRM implementation lessons to inform district and provincial planning and implementation processes, through presentations at the Provincial and District PPC / Ramsar committee meetings in April 2022 at both sites (Outputs 3.2 & 3.3); and at village-level with specific lessons learnt review of livestock, fishery and FCZ livelihood & NRM interventions in BKN (PAFO LFS Apr 2022) (Output 3.2). Due to the serious Covid-19 related delay on Component 2 activities (from which lessons were to be learnt) and Component 3 delivery over 2021, the bulk of remaining work on Outputs 3.2 and 3.3 was re-scheduled for delivery in the Jul – Oct 2021 project extension period;
- Component 4 (evaluations, M&E data-sharing and communications) - significantly progressed over reporting period as desk-work under Covid-19 lock-downs, with focus on: an improved M&E data archive and collection process (villages, participants and women) for all project activities since 2016; review and final adjustment of project log-frame under the GEF MTR period tracking tool output; update and revision of project's technical report meta-data list and web-based catalogue; editing and production of project videos and development of CAWA mobile phone-based app for project information dissemination; and on design and delivery of the project Terminal Evaluation.

To sum up:

- Component 1 – previously was mostly achieved, now completed with key study on XCP flood patterns by PONRE.
- Component 2 – CCA-DRM-NRM planning/coordination, community-NRM, direct investment, livelihood innovation initially made little progress over period to Nov 2021 due to Covid-19 restrictions, with only early warning data collection progressing under community data collection. Dec 2021 onwards to end of partner LoA contracts (Apr 2022), saw a catch-up on implementation time with accelerated implementation and > 95% of Component 2 activity delivery achieved.
- Component 3 – no progress was made on delivery of lesson learned outputs over period due to national partner and CAWA team continuous Covid-19 lock-down and work-from-home status over early reporting period, and urgent priority focus of implementation effort on Component 2 outputs (from which lessons were to be learnt) over the late reporting period.
- Component 4 – significant progress was made on updating and improvement of M&E data and technical reporting archives, log-frame & GEF tracking tool review and adjustment, on output of information dissemination products (videos and mobile phone app development), and on planning and delivery of the project Terminal Evaluation (TE).

Summary of challenges:

- Prior to April 2021, project had reached maximum delivery rate under the mid-2019 project redesign of expanded geographical area and community beneficiary number, with 10 district and provincial LoA partners working at full speed. Progress was underway to follow-up to MTR comment to consolidate community level results, institutional approach and gender outcomes. Project and partners were well supported by the CTA and 9 well-experienced team members (2 operations and administrative, 3 senior technical staff, 3 field officers and 1 driver), and ample remaining budget (i.e no financial issues). There were no serious staffing, partner, management or budget issues hampering delivery, except the continuous challenge of timely procurement, contract management and technical support for the project's large network of LoA partners under FAO's regulations and procedures with tendency towards inflexible approaches not well-suited to small-scale community and local delivery. Partner LoA workplan delivery remained very good, yet progress reporting remains often much delayed (local partner challenge of English language reporting). Post April 2021, up to December 2021, a marked national rise in Covid-19 infections led to enforcement of national capital, provincial and district lock-downs, meeting and travel restrictions, brought project delivery almost to a halt with team and all partners confined to 'work from home' and only local community-implemented activities remaining on-going. CAWA technical and support assistance to field partners stalled with whole team and field officers confined to home. Project budget expenditure dropped close to zero. All previous project management problems of timeliness of project procurement and contract management under FAO procedures became more intense with CAWA and FAO staff tele-working status and reliance on electronic communications only greatly extending time input on each management task with no Covid-19 time saving innovations or flexibility introduced by FAO to accelerate working procedures. In result CAWA materials procurement efforts spanned from June – November 2021 with no delivery, and Covid-19 impact on partner field delivery necessitated implementation of 10 LoA extensions (amendments) which dominated staff focus and time over last 3 months of 2021. In short, management and administrative work load increased sharply under Covid-19 pandemic impact, yet project delivery was significantly reduced.
- A sole benefit of the Covid-19 lock-down conditions to CAWA project management issues over the reporting period was the increased time for desk-top focus upon the persistent project M&E and log frame deficiencies. In regard to M&E and the project logical framework,

a lack of systematic baseline information for many indicators was noted by the MTR. Many indicators and targets as originally defined in the Prodoc were unclear, with tendency to overlap or lack relevance to the current Project context and approach. A completion of revision of the project log frame and indicator was implemented in the project period to enable output of the MTR period GEF Tracking Tool (Sept 2021). This resulted in an updated wording of log frame indicators and outputs. Supported by an updated mapping of project activities and results to these new indicators / outputs; and development of a revised project activities / sub-activities details, villages and participant / women numbers matrix, to provide updated baseline for the > 350 CAWA and partner-led activities implemented over 2016 – 2022.

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 rating¹⁶	FY2022 Implementation Progress rating¹⁷	Comments/reasons¹⁸ justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	HS	HS	Ratings/Comments - Development objective progress has upgraded to Highly Satisfactory compared to Satisfactory recorded for previous 2021 rating. This was based on: consolidation and expansion of delivery, budget expenditure, lessons learnt and results generated from field-progress to achieve all major global environmental objectives and environmental benefits (in cases exceeding original project target) without major shortcomings. This was supported by the effective management of project risk, coordination, communications and delivery derived from 2019 project re-design and adoption of decentralized and bottom-up delivery approach. Implementation progress rating has also been upgraded to Highly Satisfactory as compared to Satisfactory recorded from previous 2021 rating. This based on the continued consolidation and expansion of decentralized and bottom-up project delivery approach and achievement of field implementation results on the foundation of previous successful delivery, despite 9 months of serious Covid-19 pandemic impact on project implementation. All components are now either complete (Components 1 and 2), or in excess of plan (Component 4), as compared to original project plan. Only exception is Component 3 which was justifiably delayed due to 2021 Covid-19 impacts and delay in Component 2 results. This has been accommodated by final project budget neutral time extension () needed to deliver the delayed Component 3 results, and further improve on project delivery from Terminal

¹⁶ **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.

¹⁷ **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.

¹⁸ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

			Evaluation recommendations, during the project Jul – Dec 2022 extension period.
Budget Holder	S	S	The CAWA design is ambitious, with progress on objectives resting largely on strong support and delivery at the field level. This support and progress was unfortunately severely hampered due to the COVID pandemic through most of 2021. Relaxed COVID travel and safety restrictions from end 2021 into 2022, combined with excellent work of the project team, has allowed very effective delivery from an innovative partnership of District and Provincial agencies under Ministries of Agriculture & Forestry and Environment & Natural Resources, supported by the Lao Women’s Union. In result, by end of reporting period, the project had caught-up and overcame the serious COVID delays with highly Satisfactory Implementation achieving a Satisfactory delivery of project objectives, cost-effectively and under budget.
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁹			Comments and ratings from OFP were not received within the set deadline for PIR final submission.
Lead Technical Officer²⁰	S	S	After a slow start in the initial phases, the CAWA project has made significant progress during this reporting period, this is despite severe delays due to the COVID 19 pandemic. In particular, the new partnerships that have been nurtured by the project have helped to ensure CAWA is back on track, and that the achievements and progress are better understood by key stakeholders, especially central and provincial government agencies.
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	S	CAWA project has mostly completed its execution in the field and has recently undergone its final evaluation. The key tasks ahead for the project is to prepare and agree on an exit strategy with its key stakeholders, and ensure that lessons learnt are adequately documented and disseminated nationally and internationally.

¹⁹ In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

²⁰ The 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) Risk classification 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 ²¹ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low at project submission, yet classified Category B – where all project activities need analysis to assess potential positive and negative impacts prior to implementation	The rating of low risk remains, with no justification of basis for the Category B project social and environmental impact assessment. The project’s “theory of change” approach requires a project in which livelihood, management and site protection activities by design deliver improved CCA, reduced DRM risk, reduced wetland impact and improved NRM outcome compared to the community “business as usual” setting. Project field activities consequently may be classed as ‘mitigating’ efforts, which either produce direct positive social and environmental outcomes, or reduce the negative social and environmental outcomes of existing community practices, land use, site management, or government or private sector development. Further environmental and social assessment and management interventions related to project field activities are not expected to be needed.

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.

No grievance has been submitted related to FAO or GEF ESS policies during the reporting period.

²¹ **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 ²²	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
--	--------------	---------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	---

²² Risk 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.

1	Continued low staffing and technical capacities in MONRE, the national executing partner, which is a newly established ministry, with on-going and disruptive periodic restructuring, fortunately offset by well-established, more stable and technically capable provincial and district level structures	Low	Y	<p>Strengthening of community-based governance structures, backed by project facilitated multi-sector local government and local technical agency integrated support, has offset the limited central government supporting resources.</p> <p>Strengthening of community, civil society and local government agencies capacities under the project capacity development program based on the ‘learning-by-doing approach’, and sharing of field-level lessons of implementation success, has closed any local capacity gaps and provided good foundation for post project progress.</p> <p>The resulting capable community – local agency partnership requires only light future top-supervision, regional coordination and policy guidance input from central government. Which should be possible despite central government’s resources, funds and time input limitations.</p>	<p>Project implementation modality, budget and capacity building focus shifted with the 2019 project re-design, from previous focus on over-burdened national partners, to focus on provincial and district agency partners. New active partners who had stronger mandates and were better located to support project implementation. The shift facilitated access to capable local agency staffing and skilled technical support over the final 2019 – 2022 period, which was previously under-utilised over the earlier 2016 – 2018 period.</p> <p>Project 2019 spatial expansion (to total wetland landscape), and continued consolidation / expansion of project activities within these added areas over 2019 – 2022, has increased the number and network of</p>	
---	--	-----	---	--	--	--

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²²	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
					<p>community-based governance structures with the 2019 - 2022 expansion of number of participating communities. Project 2020 engagement of Lao Women’s Union (LWU) in both sites added further civil society support, and facilitated a network of supportive and energised district and village-level women’s groups. This was needed to multiply delivery of project lessons and local implementation capability with the expanded participation of local women.</p> <p>Project capacity development of local partners (community & local agencies) over 5 years has consolidated and improved possibility of future locally sustained efforts, minus central government input.</p>	

2	Continued focus by national actors on sector-specific rather than integrated and collaborative approaches to sustainable natural resources management, climate change adaptation and rural development in general.	Low	Y	<p>Project has facilitated throughout 2019 – 2022 period Provincial and District partner efforts to strengthen and establish multi-sector coordination and management mechanisms. Inclusive of: District and Provincial vice governor’s overall coordination efforts; integration of efforts into District and Provincial government planning processes; over-sight by Provincial and District Ramsar Committees; project’s facilitation of multi-stakeholder (multi-sector) local agency planning and Implementation teams; supported by development of over-arching multi-sector wetland management plans, institutional coordination and communication mechanisms and shared data-hubs.</p> <p>Project national focus over 2019 – 2023 had alternatively been restricted to development of linkages to, and sharing of lessons learnt with, climate change, rural development, wetland and disaster management agencies / committees, with aim to deliver concrete experiences and evidence of the practicalities and benefits of integrated and collaborative multi-sector field-level NRM and development approaches with village, district and province level partners.</p>	<p>Successful conclusion of 3 year action program of capacity building with, budget and task allocation to, sub-national community, agency and civil society (LWU) partners. With focus and implementation approach which has: a) markedly improved the inter-sectoral coordination, communication and results delivery of integrated multi-sector CCA – DRM – NRM effort within the wetland sites; b) Increased support of District and Provincial Ramsar steering committees, and District and Provincial Planning processes, to facilitate improved inter-sectoral interaction; and c) improved district – province – national planning, coordination & communication linkages.</p>	
---	--	-----	---	---	--	--

<p>3</p>	<p>Continued growth in pressures on wetlands landscapes (eco-systems, natural habitat, hydrology and fish migration) (including implications of climate change) beyond the coping limits of the currently proposed adaptation strategies.</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Development of capacities and mechanisms at local agency and community levels to: a) recognize and monitor CC-driven climate, flood and drought changes on-site; b) recognize and mitigate community and development driven pressures on wetland landscape, natural habitats, flood hydrology and fish migration (ie. ecosystem status); and c) recognize local wetland landscape value (products, functions and services) in support of CCA, DRM, food security and local livelihoods. Supported by broader understanding points of a), b) and c), community and local agencies will be assisted to innovate, adapt and implement combined NRM, wetland site management and CCA – DRM livelihood strategies to address CC changes, combat development and use pressures, and preserve wetland and landscape values.</p> <p>Development of capacities and mechanisms at district, provincial and national government levels to integrate the preservation of natural wetland habitats (and supporting flood patterns and fish migration), and recognize wetland landscape CCA and DRM values and services, and rising</p>	<p>Progress has continued through 3 years implementation (2019 – 2022) of on-ground investments and raising of community, civil society (LWU), district and provincial government capacity, to facilitate improved assessment, planning, mitigation and monitoring actions across the wetland landscape and catchments. This was needed to address the growing pressures on water, wetland, fishery and land resources and associated wetland landscape / ecosystem function.</p> <p>Progress also continued over 2019 – 2022 on efforts to strengthen community utilization, food security and profit from wetland landscape and resource utilization.</p> <p>This has translated into a raised community awareness of the greater food security and livelihood value of</p>	
----------	---	----------------------	----------	--	---	--

				<p>flood risks, as important considerations for the district and provincial integrated land use, development, natural resource, environmental planning processes.</p> <p>Facilitated dialogue with national and provincial partners to convey ESS impact assessment messages and mitigating advice (via DoE ESS processes) in regard to provincial, national or international development proposals likely to encroach into wetland areas or have serious negative social and environmental impacts (inclusive of impacts on wetland habitat, wetland function, hydrology and water resources and fish migration).</p>	<p>intact wetland and functioning catchments, versus increased crop encroachment, increased flood damage and reduced dry season water supply. This community awareness and district government support, provides a strong basis the mobilisation of site and local resources protection in the face of 'outside' and 'local' development pressures.</p> <p>The above has been associated with the development of raised awareness of local government planners on need and advantage of integrating the preservation of natural wetland habitats and improved NRM (supported by functioning flood hydrology and fish migration), and consideration of rising flood risk, into the district and provincial</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²²	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
					integrated land use, natural resource and environmental planning processes. This raised agency awareness and improved planning processes, facilitated by the project, has in turn provided another layer of protection to guard against incidence of unduly negative and locally unwanted developments.	

4	Continued Covid-19 pandemic national infection and staff / partners safety risk and risks to project implementation and staff due to extended / intensified national or provincial lock-downs	Low	N	<p>Risk continued over 2020 – 2021 of an extension of the then UN staff Covid-19 pandemic national lock-down (on-going over Apr - Nov 2021), and the intermittent Lao government national and provincial lock-downs. The national & provincial partners only becoming free of lock-downs from June 2021, operating under safety guidelines. National management of Covid-19 pandemic over 2020 – 2021 remained very effective, yet situation in neighboring Thailand and Vietnam presented medium to high risk that more strict intermittent lock-downs would need to be imposed on UN staff, national and provincial-district partners over coming 2021 - 2022 reporting period. This risk could have led to further delays in project field and local-level implementation progress, and the risk to complete satisfactory delivery of field and GEF progress (indicator) results over the remaining project period. A further CAWA budget-neutral extension of project time line by 3 – 4 months (budget allowing) was projected to be needed and was in process of planning from mid-2021 as a mitigating action (i.e. proposed NTE shift to around 30 June 2022).</p>	<p>Mitigation steps to address risk of Covid-19 pandemic impacts (lock-downs, border closures & travel restrictions) on project implementation & delivery included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 2019 project re-design removal of international consultant inputs (except CTA, MTR & TE), reducing Covid risk on implementation schedules due to inability of international consultant to travel to & enter Lao PDR; b) 2019 project re-design of field-level task allocation to provincial, district or community partners, reducing Covid risk on implementation schedules with local partners less affected by Covid lock-downs than national-level partners; c) Jun '20 recruitment of resident international as MTR team leader solving delay to MTR caused 	
---	---	------------	---	--	---	--

					<p>by Covid related national border closure & FAO Jan '20 selection of Rome-based expert (unable to enter Laos);</p> <p>b) 1st project extension (Aug – Dec '20 processed) of 9-month no-cost extension to NTE 28 Feb 2021. MTR recommended added project time to achieve delivery result in view of early project delays & 2020 Covid-19 related delays (including MTR);</p> <p>c) 2nd. project extension (Mar – Aug '21 processed) 4 month no-cost extension to NTE 30 June, 2022;</p> <p>d) project amendment, renewal & time extension (to Apr 2022) of 9 partner LoAs (Aug – Dec 2021 processed), to adjust for previous Covid-19 progress / time loss & project extension;</p> <p>e) 3rd. project extension (processed Apr – Jun '22) 6-month</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²²	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
					no-cost extension to NTE 31 Dec, 2022; f) one partner LoA renewal (May 2022 processed) to adjust for previous Covid-19 progress / time loss & project extension.	

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

FY2021 rating	FY2022 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Medium	Low	<p>Project has maintained a low risk of limited national government staffing input and technical capacity; progressed to lower (low) risk of national-level of inter-sectoral planning, collaboration, coordination and implementation challenges; continued at medium risk of resumed growth in pressures on wetlands landscapes / fisheries / water resources over-whelming or overriding existing established coping strategies; and markedly progressed to low risk of Covid-19 pandemic disruption of project implementation and results delivery.</p> <p>The progression to three risk categories at low and one at medium level, would suggest the overall project has progressed to a predominantly 'low' risk, an advancement on medium risk previously in 2021.</p>

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>
<p>Recommendation 1: Review ToC with stakeholders to create consensus through a series of target network actions and events</p>	<p>Agreed by Project Management. Project TOC was presented and discussed post-MTR with: a) district, provincial and national stakeholders (PPC meetings Savannakhet & Champasak, April 2022 with district & provincial stakeholders; b) scheduled with national stakeholders in the re-scheduled final PSC meeting Sept 2022; and c) aim to gain shared understanding on how the observed and monitored 3 years of project field activities were designed to contribute to higher-level TOC to address the multiple objectives of the GEF CAWA project</p>
<p>Recommendation 2: Hire an International Short-Term Institution Building Specialist to prepare a strategy and roadmap towards an institutional framework for wetlands management in Lao PDR</p>	<p>Not agreed by Project Management. International consultant (institutional specialist) already employed by CAWA in 2017 to output institutional review and roadmap for wetlands management (MTR team missed this point). Further refinement of multi-sectoral institutional structures and approaches for wetland site management were advanced over 2019 – 2022 CAWA PONRE under the Savannakhet Greater Xe Champhone Management Plan program. Project team and PONRE Savannakhet further developed the provincial-district focused institutional approach for wetland CCA-DRM-NRM management in reporting period under the Greater XC management provincial – district planning processes (Output 2.1) – with Feb-Mar 2022 District, April 2022 Provincial and May – June 2022 National draft management plan reviews. This Greater XC Management final draft plan presents CAWA’s output on required community - district - provincial institutional framework for wetland management, and roadmap for approach at other sites. This CAWA-facilitated output from combined district-province-national planning process, supported by extensive wetland institutional experience of CAWA and local / national government teams, replaces the need for late input from a new international consultant to repeat study on institutional conclusions which was already conducted by CAWA in 2017 by another international consultant</p>
<p>Recommendation 3: Revise the capacity building strategy in the light of the new institutional strategy and roadmap</p>	<p>Not agreed by Project Management. Project wetland management institutional strategy and roadmap was already in place pre-MTR over 2019-2020, and was further advanced post-MTR over 2021-2022, as noted above. Similarly, CAWA local government capacity building approach and strategy was also well established and well advance pre-MTR over 2019-2020 with a ‘learning by doing’ focus on capacity development for wetland integrated approach and project</p>

	<p>management. This approach and strategy further expanded and consolidated over post-MTR 2021-2022 period in XC and BKN. Community, village authorities and local agencies were observed to be happy and appreciative of the approach over 3 years of field implementation (2019 – 2022) of jointly implementing activities to increase knowledge and skills in livelihood options and wetland–fishery–water–NRM management, assisted by district–provincial–CAWA project facilitators / trainers.</p>
<p>Recommendation 4: Project partners should agree on a budget-neutral extension of at least one year</p>	<p>Agreed by Project Management. Additional to post-MTR budget-neutral project extension to NTE 28 February 2022 (Sept – Dec 2020 processed), further successive budget neutral extensions have been submitted to NTE 30 June 2022 (Mar – Aug 2021 processed) and to NTE 31 December 2022 (Apr - Jun 2022 processed; May 2022 TE recommended), and agreed with by FAO GEF unit, Rome.</p>
<p>Recommendation 5: Project should focus on establishing good models in inner core villages first, before scaling up to outer core villages and district.</p>	<p>Agreed by Project Management. Project management agreed in principle with suggested approach post-MTR. Yet, took issue with MTR missing recognition that Project had already conducted the ‘good model / core village’ steps over 2017 – 2019 early implementation. Project 2019 – 2022 implementation continued over reporting period with the scale-up approach adopted in the 2019 project redesign. Original ProDoc proposed limited 22 core villages (close to Ramsar site) was adopted over Project Years 1 – 3 to develop a ‘good model’ approach, Project Year 4 (2019) project re-design revised and up-scaled this approach: a) following community and district-provincial agency opinion that previous limited focus was too small and in-effective to be maintained (in view of large available project budget); and b) to allow CAWA’s application of global best-practice wetland management by scaling-up implementation (and stakeholder capacity development) to cover the total wetland landscape and a more effective spatial spread of focus villages through this area. Project has continued over 2021-2022 with late-2019 scaled-up focus, which now translated into 74 contact villages over 3 districts in Greater XC wetland, 14 contact villages in BKN wetland, and a project implementation approach which facilitates site protection, NRM efforts and livelihood lessons learnt to assist natural wetland landscape function across the total landscape (i.e. inclusive floods, water, fish and wildlife movement through landscape supported by a network of natural wetland habitats).</p>
<p>Recommendation 6: Project should do a participatory evaluation of CCA measures to improve quality and chances of replication before end 2020</p>	<p>Agreed by Project Management. Project management agreed in principle with added participatory planning and evaluation. Yet, took issue that MTR missed recognition that much of the work was already done pre-MTR over 2019 – 2020 period. This included 5 rounds of participatory evaluations of CCA approach conducted by CAWA in XC and BKN (IUCN VDRA 2018; KAP survey 2019; IUCN R-Mett 2019; IUCN management planning 2020; MTR 2020). Evaluations again repeated with district and provincial partners (PONRE, DONRE, PAFO, DAFO, LWU and Tetraktys) in redesign of the 2nd. round of partner LoAs (Sept 2020 – Jan 2021) and amendment / time extension of same LoAs (Sept – Dec 2021). These evaluations expanded and improved delivery of tested and community preferred CCA – NRM - livelihood options over project’s final 2021-22 field workplan at XC and BKN based on community-level meetings, participatory planning and consent.</p>

<p>Recommendation 7: Project should have good models on the ground for conservation of flooded forests by reforestation with native species established before June 2021</p>	<p>Agreed by Project Management. Project management agreed on need for wetland habitat restoration including flooded forests, weed removal, herbaceous habitat, hydrology and fish migration restoration. Yet, took issue on MTR stress on flooded forests alone, rather than the CAWA adopted multi-habitat and site function approach. Project also noted the MTR had missed review of 2018 – 2019 work done already on topic of restoration and reforestation (i.e IUCN reforestation planning with local communities 2018-2019; DAFO & DONRE 2019-2020 tree nursery establishment and operation to support flooded and riparian forest restoration with native species; and 2018 – 2021 wetland clearing / invasive weed control programs of PONRE, DONRE and CAWA. CAWA further expanded on the previous approaches with extended 2021 – 2022 wetland clearing in BKN (DONRE) and continued tree nursery operation and completed riparian and flooded forest reforestation programs in XC (DONRE & DAFO).</p>
<p>Recommendation 8: Project could support NTFP management in forests adjacent to wetlands to create synergy in community management of natural resources (e.g. malva nuts in XBN) by end of 2021</p>	<p>Not agreed by Project Management. Project management disagreed post-MTR on any moves to shift livelihoods focus away from options focused on wetlands which were designed to support project TOC and GEF project objectives. Numerous wetland livelihood and NRM issues required focus over the 2019 – 2022 3 year field work program to improve wetland site / fisheries management and supporting NRM, CCA and DRM (e.g. wetland habitat conservation & establishment of micro-reserves; native fisheries management & FCZ establishment; dry season water management to support both; riparian / flood forest restoration & weed clearance). Shift of focus away from wetlands and closely adjacent areas, to more distant adjacent uplands, only for added forestry livelihood option reasons, was rejected and concluded to only disturb project focus, budget allocation and time needed to improve CCA-DRM-NRM in wetland landscapes.</p>

<p>Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project exit strategy for field / community level for CCA, DRM, NRM, food security and livelihood activities rests upon hand-over of project responsibilities to CAWA established networks of functioning, district government and technical agency supported, village-level committees, with responsibility for: a) wetland site and fishery management (wetland reserve & FCZ committees); and b) NRM / livelihood / food security committees (dry season water use; veterinary centers & vaccine revolving funds; handicraft revolving funds & supported fish processing & handicraft production groups; gender mainstreaming & women’s livelihoods & LWU supported gender focal point; eco-tourism investment sites & village ambassadors – village tourism facilitators; and Champhone tourist loop multi-village district committee). - Project exit strategy for continued district and provincial agency CCA, DRM, NRM, food security, livelihood and natural resource data collection / early warning planning and implementation support rests upon: a) acceptance of
---	--

agencies that the CAWA integrated multi-sectoral TOC approach has shown promise and is worthy of continuing; b) provision of government's own or other donor funds to implement the CAWA developed over-arching multi-district Greater XC Wetland Management Plan (inclusive coordination, communication, integrated planning, land use & development controls, flood water flows & dry season shallow water storage, fish migration, fish / water resource data collection & data sharing); c) provision of government's own or other donor funds to adjust IUCN-developed BKN Management Plan to support bottom-up village managed site, fishery, NRM, water use & livelihood development established by CAWA under village-level committees; and d) allocation of funds under an upscaled GEF8 LDCF proposal (covering 8 extra lowland Lao province) to use XC and BKN wetland sites, district and provincial partners and CAWA lessons learnt / output examples, as a learning / training resource using sites for study tour focus and local government / community partners as trainer-of-trainers for information hand-over to other provincial government and agency teams.

- Project exit strategy for continued national agency involvement in integrated multi-sectoral CCA, DRM, NRM, food security, livelihood and natural resource data collection / early warning planning and implementation support rests upon hand-over of CAWA lessons learnt (implementation modalities, multi-sectoral agency partnerships, over-arching wetland landscape plans, innovative / successful site management and livelihood development approaches) to inform MONRE and MAF ministerial policies, planning processes and implementation support. The above lessons-learnt handover, followed-up and supported by an upscaled GEF8 LDCF proposal (for 8 added lowland Lao provinces), using XC and BKN pilot sites and GEF CAWA lessons as training resource for national lowland floodplain management under climate change and flood threat

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 Guidelines²³. Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories. And, provide 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	Adjusted wording & refined focus of Outcomes 1, 2 and Outcome 3 and associated indicators (new wording shown in red in Section 2)	June 2020 – Sept 2021 processed (including MTR review); 5 th PIR June 2021 submitted	CTA, FAO Laos MTR team
Components and cost	Component 4 - System developed & implemented for monitoring, systematization & dissemination of results & lessons learned – proposed & added to results framework	- June 2019 proposed addition in 3 rd . PIR Section 1 Action Plan - June 2021 added in 5 th . PIR Section 2	CTA, FAO Laos
Institutional and implementation arrangements	- Reduction of INGO partners (3 to 2) & international consultants (10 to 3); - Expansion from 4 provincial agency partners (including crop agencies) to 7 provincial / district agencies (minus crop agencies) - Addition of provincial / district civil society & gender agencies (LWU)	- May – Sept 2019 processed - May – Sept 2019 processed; Oct 2019 – Jan 2020 agreed - Feb – Jun 2020 processed; Jun – Aug 2020 agreed	BH / FAO-R FAO Laos
Financial management	None		

²³ Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

Implementation schedule	--1 st . budget-neutral project extension to NTE 28 February 2022 - 2 nd . budget-neutral project extension to NTE 30 June 2022 - 3 rd . budget-neutral project extension to NTE 31 December 2022	- Sept – Dec 2020 processed; Dec 2020 agreed - Mar – Aug 2021 processed; Dec 2021 agreed - Apr - Jun 2022 processed; May 2022 agreed	GEF Unit, FAO Rome
Executing Entity	None		
Executing Entity Category	None		
Minor project objective change	Refined wording of overall development objective, & Outcome 1 and Outcome 3 objectives (see adjusted wording in red in Section 2)	June 2020 – Sept 2021 processed (including MTR review); 5 th PIR June 2021 submitted	CTA, FAO Laos MTR team
Safeguards	None		
Risk analysis	None		
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	None		
Co-financing	None		
Location of project activity			
Other	None		

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			
LWU Pathoumphone*	LOA/LAO/2020-013	cf. LoA Final Report	English language progress reporting
LWU Savannakhet*	LOA/LAO/2020-015	cf. LoA Final Report	
DONRE_Pathoumphone	LOA/LAO/2021-004	cf. LoA Final Report	
DAFO_Champhone	LOA/LAO/2021-005	cf. LoA Final Report	
DONRE_Champhone	LOA/LAO/2021-006	cf. LoA Final Report	
PONRE Champasak	LOA/LAO/2021-010	cf. LoA Final Report	
PONRE-SVK	LOA/LAO/2021-011	cf. LoA Final Report	
Livestock and Fisheries Section _ Pakse	LOA/LAO/2021-012	cf. LoA Final Report	
Livestock and Fisheries Section _ Savannakhet	LOA/LAO/2021-051	cf. LoA Final Report	
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
Tetraktys	LOA/LAO/2021-015	cf. LoA Final Report	None
Tetraktys	LOA/LAO/2022-009	cf. LoA Final Report	None
Private sector entities			

<i>Others[1]</i>			
<i>New stakeholders identified/engaged</i>			

[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) during this reporting period.

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	Project formulation included 'Gender Analysis and Strategy' (Annex 8, ProDoc) with 2015 assessment of project gender considerations, implications and strategies per activities and output. Project execution followed with SP IUCN January 2017 output of the Gender Report, based on village gender assessment conducted in Xe Champhone (XC) (but not BKN) wetland. Report outputs validated earlier ProDoc Annex 8 results, highlighting gender differences at XC site of: i) poverty in small population proportion, with poor women particularly lacking social capital/livelihood assets, and access to knowledge/skills; ii) unequal power relations present in wider community and local government structures; iii) lack of access to information that could strengthen the capacity of women, and iv) prevailing perception that 'technical matters' such as wetland/resource management is a male domain, and not women's concern. These results, plus separate IUCN Vulnerability Assessment (VA) findings (XC and BKN), fed into December 2017 IUCN Gender Mainstreaming Framework and Strategy (GMS) report for both sites. This contained a theory of change as framework to design gender mainstreaming actions, and strategic considerations for mainstreaming gender in the outputs of the project.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	The most effective measure contributing to promote gender equality and women's empowerment for the project was the LWU facilitated setting-up of gender committees at provincial, district, cluster and community levels. All villages supported these initiatives with the clear role of the committees understood by all levels of the CAWA project partners - to support

2022 Project Implementation Report

		gender mainstreaming effectiveness and gender outcomes.
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	In villages where the project has implemented NRM activities such as fish conservation zones, wetlands demarcation and water use management, women have actively participated in the whole process from the initial consultations to drafting regulations and finally using the resources in a way that enhance wetland protection and livelihood development.
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	Implemented in the LoAs of the Lao Women's Union (LWU) of Savannakhet province Pathoumphone district, the project has significantly contributed to improve women's participation and decision making through multiple angles: i) gender mainstreaming training for the LWU and implementing partners at provincial and district levels and for the project communities on key topics related to women's rights and protection and the structure of the women's advancement committees; ii) participatory consultation meetings to scope community desires, needs and ability in relation to gender mainstreaming interventions at village level, i.e. the potential production activities of each village, problems encountered by villages and the way forward for project implementation; iii) Support the identification and strengthening of local gender focal points or 'gender champions' (within LWU, partner agencies, village cluster and community) with a clear mandate, responsibility and focus on raising awareness and communicating on gender issues especially gender norms and uneven power relations, advocating the role of gender mainstreaming in planning and decision making in all the project and government activities. The emphasis is on developing full ownership and participation of these local focal points to continue this work sustainably.
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	The project generated socio-economic benefits for women through various activities involved: i) establishment of gender revolving funds and committees for handicraft and value-added processing activities in several villages with

2022 Project Implementation Report

		<p>trainings on gender revolving fund management, handicraft, household use products, fish processing, vegetable processing and weaving; ii) adaptation livelihood activities such as dry season vegetable production, chicken raising and fish processing.</p>
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	<p>Project 2019 internal review of log frame and M&E framework further proposed integration of gender-specific indicators and the FAO gender marker system to highlight project achievement related to gender objectives. M&E gender data was further augmented mid-2019 by project redesign of LoA monitoring and quarterly progress reporting procedures to provide gender disaggregated data on all project activities and sub-activities of a new network of 10 sub-national and national partners. This assisted M&E framework greatly to improve tracking of performance on women's inclusion in policy, planning and implementation processes.</p>
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	<p>Gender expertise is included as sub-task of the Knowledge Management and Participation Expert. National-based project team top-supervision ensured gender-sensitive planning, implementation, capacity development and monitoring were included in design of project activities. However, project 2019 re-design recognized this approach would not assure effective gender mainstreaming implementation in the field. Project responded with new plan and budget to engage national and local level Lao Women's Union (LWU) to assist project in gender strategy review and supervise partner gender mainstreaming activities under project in the field. Revised 2020 strategy opted for decentralized local-level LoAs with LWU of Pathoumphone district and LWU of Savannakhet province with officers to provide gender strategy evaluation, gender mainstreaming training women's livelihood raising (handicrafts), gender focal points identification and supervision of partner gender mainstreaming implementation in field.</p>
Any other good practices on gender	Yes	<p>The project integrates gender-specific indicators and the FAO gender marker system to highlight project achievement related to gender objectives.</p>

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval during this reporting period.

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.

The project has a knowledge management strategy and has added Component 4 to the results matrix which contains Output 4.3 “Knowledge management, sharing and communication outputs are delivered effectively”. The project collects and documents lessons learned through workshops with beneficiaries, and through LoA reports on activities submitted by our district, provincial, and international implementing partners. The project is focused on a bottom-up implementation-based approach, with aim to deliver field-evidence of CCA-DRM-NRM results and “learning-by-doing” capacity development output for communities and local agencies. It is intended that these results and outputs will be passed-up as evidence to inform national and provincial level policy, planning and implementation processes on topic of integrated site and landscape-level wetland – CCA – DRM management.

Good project practices and innovations include:

- **Natural wetland protection and site management** (wetland demarcation, wetland reserves, fish conservation zones, community-led wetland clearing of invasive species, wetland and river bank reforestation and tree nurseries, wetland water use management and land use planning to accommodate wetlands);
- **Wetland management for livelihood improvement** (native fisheries management, native fish breeding centres, development of fish, NTFP and wetland products and development of semi-natural dry season water storages)
- **CCA and DRM adaptation of local livelihoods** – livelihood options development to jointly provide: a) reduced CC and DRM (flood and drought) risk; b) reduced resource and land use impact on natural wetlands; and c) improved profitability (low inputs, organic and improve marketing). Encouragement of local livelihood to shift from high impact / high risk livelihoods within wetlands (e.g. flood impacted wet season rice and aquaculture with foreign fish); to low impact / low risk /

	<p>higher profit livelihoods (e.g. organic vegetables; poultry and larger livestock production supported by veterinary centres and fodder production; community-based eco – and cultural tourism development; handicraft production and NTFP / fish processing; dry season rice with improved water use and wetland water storage)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data collection to support wetland management (rainfall, river discharge, water level, ground-water level, water quality, fish catch (species, size, weight, migratory or not, with egg or not, and equipment) and fish marketing data). • Overall multi-sector wetland landscape management plans to integrate, coordinate and communicate on all above CCA-DRM-NRM implementation steps <p>In addition, the project has piloted the following processes in Lao wetlands:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participatory and gender-sensitive vulnerability and disaster risk assessment (VDRA) - Participatory adaptation planning based on local strengths and potentials - Wetland management training for community and government site managers.
<p>Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.</p>	<p>The project has a communications plan and strategy established at the arrival of the Knowledge Sharing Specialist in 2019. Referring to the project updated results matrix, the Communications Plan will help achieve Component 4.</p> <p>One of our challenges during the Covid pandemic (2021 particularly), was the inability to conduct field visits and limited communication with the field and partner teams. Bad road conditions in many areas, and periods of serious flooding in XC, during the rainy seasons, posed another challenge. However, despite all these challenges, field visits after the lift of Covid restrictions have been successful due to the active coordination and cooperation of the project field team, implementing partners and our community-level project beneficiaries. This allowing film interviews (testimonials), and collection of photos and video footage which are all valuable communication materials. The assets collected from our field visits include photos, interviews, and footage of the project activities and community context, which we will further develop into articles, social media posts, and videos to be disseminated to the public.</p>

<p>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 project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.</p>	<p>Grandma Pien, 54, is one of the local diligent farmers who participated in our CAWA project. She has actively engaged with the activities, gaining more insight and tips on organic vegetable gardening and managing organic / natural pesticides and compost, while also bringing home new crop seeds, disseminated by the project. Previously, grandma Pien and her husband does paddy field farming as their dominant form of living but would face challenges, especially during the rainy season. They weren't unable to cultivate any crops and had a shortage of plant produce leading to less income. Currently, that had changed, grandma Pien has now been able to financially support her family by selling organic vegetables she grows on her land.</p> <p>"The project had given me some plant seeds that can be grown easily with all the plants that I am already growing, also I learned how to effectively get rid of chemical pesticides and manage by crops so I have crops to sell every day. I am making up to 5 hundred thousand kips a day selling vegetables."</p>  <p>Photo credits: ©FAO/K. Sengsavang</p>
<p>Please provide links to related website, social media account</p>	<p>https://www.fao.org/in-action/climate-adaptation-in-wetland-areas-in-lao-pdr-cawa/en/</p> <p>https://cawa-hqfao.opendata.arcgis.com/</p> <p>Ecotourism program in XC: https://www.facebook.com/XeChamphoneLoop</p>
<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"> - 80 technical reports - 7 videos completed & 3 in process - 4 articles - 1 radio interview (Lao Youth Radio) - Communications assets include project leaflet, theory of change poster, eco-tourism IECs, Uncle CAWA mascot, CAWA mobile phone app (under development)

2022 Project Implementation Report

Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Sitthideth Abhay, Knowledge Management and M&E Expert, sitthideth.abhay@fao.org• Mr. Kingsada Sengsavang, Knowledge Sharing Specialist, kingsada.sengsavang@fao.org
--	---

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.

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

Do indigenous peoples and or local communities have an active participation in the project activities? If yes, briefly describe how.

The findings on village demographics from the VA indicate that in both sites where the project is active, the population is predominantly Lao Loum (the main ethnicity in Lao PDR). In Beung Kiat Ngong Lao Loum predominate among the villages surrounding the wetland core and the catchment villages in the project's extension area. No additional vulnerability due to ethnicity was considered to be an issue at the site. In Xe Champhone, three ethnic groups are present within the communities surrounding the Greater Xe Champhone wetland (Champhone, Songkhone and Xonnabouly districts). The most common group and dominant within the lowland Lao PDR is Lao Loum making up twelve of the initial villages surveyed in Champhone district. In two villages, Nakhathang (Champhne) and Tamli (Xonnabury), however, there are Makong, and in three villages, Dondaeng, Taleo and Phomkhor, there are Phouthai. The minority ethnic groups were not identified as especially more vulnerable compared with the dominant Lao Loum ethnic group.

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁴	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
National Government	MONRE	In kind	500,000	150,000		
National Government	MAF	In kind	500,000	150,000		
Bilateral Aid Agency	KfW	Cash	2,187,380	200,000		
Other Multilateral Agency	World Bank	Grant	8,430,000	7,000,000		
Other Multilateral Agency	IWMI	Grant	600,000	75,000 USD (CCAFS in 2016) + 50,000 USD (CCAFS in 2017) + 20,000 USD in 2018		

²⁴ 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.

Other Multilateral Agency	IUCN	Grant	2,400,000	615,000 (BMUB) 280,000 (KfW) 30,000		
Other Multilateral Agency	FAO	Grant	750,000	200,000		
		TOTAL	15,367,380	8,770,000		

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 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.