

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)	5
3.	IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	17
4.	SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	28
5.	ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	32
6.	RISKS	34
7.	FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	43
8.	MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	45
9.	STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	46
10.	GENDER MAINSTREAMING	47
11.	KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	48
12.	INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	49
13.	CO-FINANCING TABLE	50

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	South Pacific Region												
Country (ies):	Vanuatu												
Project Title:	Integrated Sustainable Land and Coastal Management (GEF 5)												
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/VAN/001/GFF												
GEF ID:	5397												
GEF Focal Area(s):	Biodiversity (BD-1) – Improve sustainability of protected area systems Land Degradation (LD-3) - Integrated Landscapes: Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape Climate Change Mitigation (CCM-5) – Promote conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks through sustainable management of land use, land use change, and forestry International Waters (IW-3) - Sustainable Forest Management (SFM-1) - Reduce pressures on forest resources and generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services Sustainable Forest Management (SFM-2) -												
Project Executing Partners:	Ministries of Climate Change; Lands and Natural Resources; Agriculture, Quarantine, Forestry and Fisheries, Trade and Tourism and Shepards, Efate Islands(SHEFA) &Tanna, Erromango, Futuna and Aneityum Islands(TAFEA) Provincial Government												
Project Duration (years):	5 years												
Project coordinates:	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>FATE.PMU</td> <td>- 17.74953883066448, 168.31452879003874</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GAUA ISLAND.LAKE LETAS MP</td> <td>- 14.280421205201556, 167.53896262735796</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SOUTH PENTECOST.BAY HOMO CC</td> <td>- 15.946564721351413, 168.19321365522998</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EFATE.LELEPA-MANGALILIU MPA</td> <td>- 17.63706896066637, 168.2061338491203</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NUSUMETU CC. TANNA ISLAND</td> <td>- 19.397260326392715, 169.30386484735783</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ANEITYUM.MISTERY ISLAND MPA</td> <td>- 20.224489341650067, 169.7691643345507</td> </tr> </table>	FATE.PMU	- 17.74953883066448, 168.31452879003874	GAUA ISLAND.LAKE LETAS MP	- 14.280421205201556, 167.53896262735796	SOUTH PENTECOST.BAY HOMO CC	- 15.946564721351413, 168.19321365522998	EFATE.LELEPA-MANGALILIU MPA	- 17.63706896066637, 168.2061338491203	NUSUMETU CC. TANNA ISLAND	- 19.397260326392715, 169.30386484735783	ANEITYUM.MISTERY ISLAND MPA	- 20.224489341650067, 169.7691643345507
FATE.PMU	- 17.74953883066448, 168.31452879003874												
GAUA ISLAND.LAKE LETAS MP	- 14.280421205201556, 167.53896262735796												
SOUTH PENTECOST.BAY HOMO CC	- 15.946564721351413, 168.19321365522998												
EFATE.LELEPA-MANGALILIU MPA	- 17.63706896066637, 168.2061338491203												
NUSUMETU CC. TANNA ISLAND	- 19.397260326392715, 169.30386484735783												
ANEITYUM.MISTERY ISLAND MPA	- 20.224489341650067, 169.7691643345507												

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	20th September 2016
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	13th March 2017
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	15 th September 2023
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ²	15 th September 2023

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	4,605,680
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc³:	15,290,558

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.

Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)⁴:	2,505,053
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022⁵	9,861,113

M&E Milestones

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	19 th August 2021
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	July 2021
Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):	July 2021
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	June 2023
Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	N/A

Overall ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	Satisfactory
Overall implementation progress rating:	Moderately Satisfactory
Overall risk rating:	Moderate

ESS risk classification

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

Status

Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	5 th PIR
--	---------------------

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.

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.

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	DominguezLlosa Ricardo	ricardo.dominguezllosa@fao.org
Budget Holder	Xiangjun Yao	xiangjun.yao@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Raushan Kumar	raushan.kumar@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Lianchawii Chhakchhuak	lianchawii.chhakchhuak@fao.org

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

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

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
<p>Component 1: Improving the enabling environment for integrated sustainable land and coastal management.</p> <p>Outcome 1.1 Integrated R2R considerations mainstreamed into sector development policies</p>	<p>Indicator 1.1.1: Degree of commitment in policy instruments for channeling tourism income to environmental management</p> <p>Indicator 1.1.2: Degree of commitment in policy instruments for promoting compatibility between agricultural development and the maintenance of</p>	<p>Generalised policy statements exist, but in different sector policy documents and without specific commitments</p> <p>Several sector policies example agriculture, forestry, land and livestock make broad reference to maintenance of ecosystem goods and</p>	<p>Proposals under discussion of specific commitments for promoting the channeling of tourism income to environmental management</p> <p>Proposals under discussion of specific commitments for promoting compatibility between agricultural development and maintenance of</p>	<p>Tourism policy makes specific commitments for promoting the channeling of tourism income to environmental management</p> <p>Agriculture, livestock, forestry and planning policy documents include specific commitments for promoting compatibility between agricultural development and</p>	<p>Openforis+Sentinel Forest Cover and Land Use for Projects sites finalized Maps</p> <p>SW Aneityum: Mapping finalized Openforis+Sentinel Forest Cover and Land Use for Projects sites finalized</p>	MS

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).

<p>Outcome 1.2: Environmental planning and decision-making processes take integrated R2R considerations into account</p>	<p>ecosystem goods and services Indicator 1.1.3: Degree of commitment in policy instruments for protection of coastal and marine ecosystems through ICZM approaches</p>	<p>services but without specific definitions or commitments. Existing Fisheries and Environment policies make generalized references, but lack a vision of inter-sector integration</p>	<p>ecosystem goods and services Proposals under discussion of specific commitments for protection of coastal and marine ecosystems through ICZM approaches</p>	<p>maintenance of ecosystem goods and services Fisheries and planning policy documents include specific commitments for protection of coastal and marine ecosystems through ICZM approaches</p>	<p>Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology, results under study</p>
<p>Outcome 1.3 Increased financial resources channelled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation and PA management</p>	<p>Indicator 1.2.1: Percentage of EIAs that specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics Indicator 1.2.2: Percentage of planning determinations nationwide that specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics</p>	<p>All EIAs are site-specific with little or no consideration of landscape-wide dynamics No planning decisions to date have adequately considered landscape-wide dynamics</p>	<p>EIA procedures specifically require consideration of landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics Planning determinations are required to specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics</p>	<p>50% of EIAs specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics 50% of planning determinations nationwide that specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics</p>	<p>National Invasive Species strategy and Action Plan (NISSAP). Project will support DEPC to organize two consultations workshops one in Santo and a second in Tanna to launch NISSAP. September 2022 TOR for Consultant ready to be launched Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology (ROAM) ongoing in Project Sites Free Prior informed consent & ToR for: (Component 1, 2 and 3) Local Conservation Communities Village Conservation Communities involved</p>
	<p>Indicator 1.3.1: Amount of financial resources channelled from the tourism sector to environmental</p>	<p>No reliable figures available, but assumed to be negligible</p>	<p>\$75,000/year channelled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation and PA</p>	<p>\$150,000/year channelled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation</p>	

<p>Component 2: Integrated ridge to reef management in priority island localities</p> <p>Outcome 2.1 Target landscapes subject to integrated R2R planning and governance.</p>	<p>conservation and PA management</p> <p>Indicator 2.1.1: Area in target localities covered by integrated landscape/ seascape management plans developed and implemented by local landowners</p> <p>Indicator 2.1.2: Levels of satisfaction with multi-stakeholder mechanisms among stakeholders in target localities, by category (chiefs, other village members)</p> <p>Indicator 2.1.3: Proportion of land area in target localities where management decisions (leases, land use changes) coincide with provisions of R2R</p>	<p>0 ha</p> <p>No surveys yet carried out of satisfaction with existing decision-making structures.</p> <p>No relevant provisions have as yet been generated through R2R plans, norms and dialogue mechanisms.</p>	<p>management by project end</p> <p>At least 30% of stakeholders in all categories consider that the mechanisms adequately represent them and address their needs.</p> <p>On at least 40% of the land affected by management decisions (leases, land use changes) between project mid-term and end, the decisions coincide with provisions of R2R plans, norms and</p>	<p>and PA management by project end¹²</p> <p>100,000ha in target localities covered by integrated landscape/ seascape management plans developed and implemented by local landowners.</p> <p>At least 75% of stakeholders in all categories consider that the mechanisms adequately represent them and address their needs.</p> <p>On at least 80% of the land affected by management decisions (leases, land use changes) between project mid-term and end, the decisions coincide with provisions of R2R plans,</p>		
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

¹² Cruise companies, their passengers and crew spent AUS\$34.6 million (US\$25 million) in Vanuatu in 2013. Using a conservative assumption of growth to \$30 million/year, \$150,000/year would be 0.5% of total spending.

<p>Outcome 2.2 Farmers, ranchers and fishers are managing resources sustainably, resulting in improved flows of ecosystem goods and services, as a result of increased capacities and awareness</p>	<p>plans, norms and recommendations of local dialogue mechanisms</p> <p>Indicator 2.2.1: Increase in area (ha) in target localities over which sustainable hillside farming practices are applied</p> <p>Indicator 2.2.2: Increase in area (ha) in target localities over which sustainable hillside ranching practices are applied</p> <p>Indicator 2.2.3: Increase in area (ha) in target localities over which community-based fisheries regulations are effectively applied</p> <p>Indicator 2.2.4: Reef health indices</p> <p>Indicator 2.2.5: Fish catch per unit of effort</p> <p>Indicator 2.2.6: Quantities of</p>	<p>Approximately 13,250ha under cultivation with traditional farming practices @1ha worked/year/family</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>To be determined at project start</p> <p>To be determined at project start</p> <p>Annual consumption (t):</p>	<p>recommendations of local dialogue mechanisms</p> <p>Area with improved farming practices: 3312 ha</p> <p>Area with improved ranching practices: 300 ha</p> <p>Area (ha) in target localities over which community-based fisheries regulations are effectively applied: 500</p> <p>-</p> <p>5% increase</p> <p>Annual consumption (t):</p>	<p>norms and recommendations of local dialogue mechanisms</p> <p>Area with improved farming practices: 6625 ha</p> <p>- 600ha increase in area over which sustainable hillside ranching practices are applied, in target localities apart from Gaua</p> <p>- 500ha increase in area over which community-based fisheries regulations are effectively applied, in target localities apart from Gaua</p> <p>- 10% increase in reef health indices in all target localities apart from Gaua</p> <p>- 10% increase in fish catches per unit of effort in all target localities apart from Gaua</p>	<p>1 LOA with fisheries department for Marine protected Areas</p> <p>1 LOA for Marine protected Areas</p> <p>1 LOA for Marine protected Areas</p>
--	---	---	--	--	---

	firewood used for drying of copra and other agricultural products	19,156	17,836 t	Annual consumption (t): 16,518t Overall reduction in year 5 = 2,638t; total reduction over 5 years = 7,914t ¹³ ; total avoided emissions = 517tCO _{2eq}		
Outcome 2.3 Capacities for generation of ecosystem goods and services are permanently restored in priority areas affected by land degradation	Indicator 2.3.1: Area of degraded lands subject to restoration with direct project support, with resulting carbon benefits	0	- 400ha area of degraded lands subject to restoration, resulting in increase in carbon stocks	- 800ha area of degraded lands subject to restoration, resulting in increase in carbon stocks of 153,329tCO ₂		S
Outcome 2.4: Local people in target localities have opportunities and capacities to	Indicator 2.4.1: Numbers of local people receiving economic benefits from sustainable ecotourism	TBD – a number of ecotourism ventures exist but little specific attention to sustainability	650 local people receiving economic benefits from sustainable ecotourism	1,300 local people receiving economic benefits from sustainable ecotourism	Support to Agrotourism Strategy included	
	Indicator 2.4.2: Numbers of local people receiving economic benefits	TBD – handicrafts are currently produced but little specific	- 115 local people receiving economic benefits from sustainable NTFP extraction	- 260 local people receiving economic benefits from sustainable NTFP extraction	ToR for consultant on timber forestry products. Ready to launch Replication and scaling-up from lesson learnt from Livelihood Recovery	S

¹³ Assumes a linear annual increase in reductions (20, 40, 60, 80 and 100% respectively at the ends of years 1,2,3,4 and 5 = 528, 1,055, 1,583, 2,110 and 2,638t = 7,914t total).

<p>perceive direct benefits from conservation, sustainable land management and sustainable forest management</p> <p>Outcome 2.5: Strengthened protected area network in target localities, filling ecosystem coverage gaps and responding to overall R2R management plans</p>	<p>from sustainable NTFP extraction</p> <p>Indicator 2.4.3: Numbers of local people receiving economic benefits from sustainable PES schemes</p>	<p>attention to sustainability</p> <p>0</p>	<p>- 60 local people receiving economic benefits from sustainable PES schemes</p>	<p>130 local people receiving economic benefits from sustainable PES schemes</p>	<p>Program from TC Harold in Pentecost. Training in Kobo Toolbox in TAFEA//EFATE//DARD//D OFO//DOFISH</p> <p>Management Plan for Community Conservation areas +Action Plan Business Plan developed to be launched Nusumetu Bussines Plan already launched and activities in ECO_Agritourism ongoing, activities included in LCS quarterly Workplans</p>	
	<p>Indicator 2.5.1: Increase in area coverage of PAs in target localities</p> <p>Indicator 2.5.2: Management effectiveness ratings of existing</p>	<p>Current PA area: 13,838ha</p> <p>18.4</p>	<p>- 2400 ha increase in the area declared as CCAs and MPAs, defined together with local communities</p> <p>- Increase in average Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) score to 56</p>	<p>- 2400 ha increase in the area declared as CCAs and MPAs, defined together with local communities</p> <p>- Increase in average Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) score to 85</p>	<p>5,000 ha increase in the area declared as CCAs and MPAs, defined together with local communities</p>	<p>GAUA Island Lake Letas CCA.Management Plan completed with 6,600 HA EFATE.ELMA Task Force ongoing with Free Prior Informed Consent from Vaturisu Council of Chiefs. Mapping to be finalized by September 2022 SOUTH PENTECOST. Free Prior Informed Consent signed by Malbangbang Chiefs. Mapping and consultations for Bay Homo CCA to be finalized by September 2022. TANNA.NUSUMETU CCA.FPIC READY TO BE REGISTERED</p>

<p>Outcome 2.6: Sustainable resource management and PA management supported by sustainable financing</p> <p>Component 3: Knowledge management Outcome 3.1: Best practices and lessons learned are systematized and disseminate</p>	<p>and new PAs in target localities</p> <p>Indicator 2.5.3: Area of buffer zones and corridors around and between PAs in target localities</p> <p>Indicator 2.6.1: Annual income for PAs and ecosystems</p>	<p>0ha</p> <p>0</p>	<p>- 15,000ha of buffer zones and corridors defined around and between the CCAs and MPAs</p>	<p>30,000ha of buffer zones and corridors defined around and between the CCAs and MPAs</p>	<p>ANEITYUM.- MARINE PROTECTED AREA LOA ready to be Launched Aneityum CCA.FPIC signed. Mapping to be completed by August 2022</p> <p>Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool UPDATED (Attached) GEF 5 Vanuatu R2R BD tracking tool 24062016 Integrated Sustainable Land and Coastal Management.xlsx</p> <p>GAUA Island Lake Letas CCA. Management Plan completed with 6,600 HA</p> <p>EFATE.ELMA Task Force ongoing with Free Prior Informed Consent from Vaturisu Council Of Chiefs. Mapping to be finalized by September 2022</p> <p>SOUTH PENTECOST.Free Prior Informed Consent signed by Malbangbang Chiefs. Mapping and consultations for Bay Homo CCA to be finalized by September 2022.</p> <p>TANNA.NUSUMETU CCA.FPIC READY TO BE REGISTERED</p>	<p>5</p>
	<p>and new PAs in target localities</p>	<p>0ha</p>	<p>- 15,000ha of buffer zones and corridors defined around and between the CCAs and MPAs</p>	<p>30,000ha of buffer zones and corridors defined around and between the CCAs and MPAs</p>	<p>ANEITYUM.- MARINE PROTECTED AREA LOA ready to be Launched Aneityum CCA.FPIC signed. Mapping to be completed by August 2022</p> <p>Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool UPDATED (Attached) GEF 5 Vanuatu R2R BD tracking tool 24062016 Integrated Sustainable Land and Coastal Management.xlsx</p> <p>GAUA Island Lake Letas CCA. Management Plan completed with 6,600 HA</p> <p>EFATE.ELMA Task Force ongoing with Free Prior Informed Consent from Vaturisu Council Of Chiefs. Mapping to be finalized by September 2022</p> <p>SOUTH PENTECOST.Free Prior Informed Consent signed by Malbangbang Chiefs. Mapping and consultations for Bay Homo CCA to be finalized by September 2022.</p> <p>TANNA.NUSUMETU CCA.FPIC READY TO BE REGISTERED</p>	<p>5</p>

<p>Outcome 3.2: Decision-making and planning are guided by information on trends in ecosystem conditions</p>	<p>management in target localities</p>				<p>ANNEITYUM.- MARINE PROTECTED AREA LOA ready to be Launched Aneityum CCA.FPIC signed. Mapping to be completed by August 2022</p>	
			<p>\$10,000 per year across the target localities</p>	<p>\$20,000/year between all target localities</p>	<p>Initiated Cost benefit analysis. ROAM give data about new income generation opportunities</p>	S
<p>Outcome 3.3 Project management is subject to effective M&E that feeds back into adaptive management decisions.</p>	<p>Indicator 3.1.1: Decision-makers in key institutions have access to best practices and lessons learned as being useful</p> <p>Indicator 3.2.1: Proportions of lease application determinations in target localities that take into account monitoring data on ecosystem conditions</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>0</p>		<p>Directors of all key Government stakeholder institutions (departments)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replication and scaling-up from lesson learnt from Livelihood Recovery Program from TC Harold in Pentecost. Training in KoboToolbox in TAFEA//EFATE//DARD //DOFO//DOFISH Vanuatu Forest Landscape Restoration Strategy and tools for development Vanuatu Agritourism Strategy prepared 	MS
			<p>50% of lease application determinations in target localities take into</p>	<p>100% of lease application determinations in target localities take into account</p>	<p>LoA with DEPC and de lands to implement EIA in new leases (IN PREPARATION)</p>	S

<p>Indicator 3.2.2: Proportions of EIAs in the target localities that take into account monitoring data on ecosystem conditions</p>	0	account monitoring data on ecosystem conditions	monitoring data on ecosystem conditions		
	The project M&E system will be set up in the first quarter of the project and will be managed by a dedicated M&E specialist on the project team who will ensure that pending baseline values indicated in the project's results framework are measured within the first half of project year 1, and that subsequent measurements of all project indicators are made on time and included into the project's internal decision support system.	- 50% of EIAs in the target localities take into account monitoring data on ecosystem conditions	- 100% of EIAs in the target localities take into account monitoring data on ecosystem conditions		S
		All project indicators are measured in a timely and accurate manner and the results fed into adaptive management of the project	All project indicators are measured in a timely and accurate manner and the results fed into adaptive management of the project	Field works using Datas from KOBO tool box from Community Profile, Adaptation Fund. REPORT IN PREPARATION	S

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1.1. Integrated R2R considerations mainstreamed into sector development policies	Raise the issue of thematic studies to the ISCLM PSC to decide the way forward	PMU DEPC NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF VANUATU	February 2023
Outcome 1.2 Environmental planning and decision-making processes take integrated R2R considerations into account	Finalize the stakeholder’s involvement plan and begin implementation (co-financing)	PMU PSC	February 2023
Outcome 1.3: Increased financial resources channeled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation and PA management	Following MTR recommendations this Outcome is changed, awaiting opening of borders and Cruise ship arrival	PMU	February 2023
Outcome 2.1: Target landscapes subject to integrated R2R planning and governance	To improve communications between the project team and key stakeholders	PMU	February 2023
Outcome 2.2 Farmers, ranchers and fishers are managing resources sustainably, resulting in improved flows of ecosystem goods and services, as a result of increased capacities and awareness	Comprehensive training on the implementation of Farm Field School to be organised in Project Sites Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology conducted Forest Landscape Restorations activities started	PMU	February 2023
Outcome 2.3 Capacities for generation of ecosystem goods and services are permanently restored in priority areas affected by land degradation	Increase public awareness of the ISCLM project through publication of results, public awareness actions in Project sites and Stakeholders	PMU	February 2023
Outcome 2.4 Local people in target localities have opportunities and capacities to perceive direct benefits from conservation and sustainable land management	Increase public awareness of the ISCLM project through publication of results, public awareness actions in Project sites and Stakeholders	PMU PSC	February 2023
Outcome 2.5 Strengthened protected area network in target localities, filling ecosystem coverage gaps and	Finalize and launch of the Management Plans for the proposed Protected areas	PMU PSC	January 2023

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
responding to overall R2R management plans			
Outcome 2.6 Sustainable resource management and PA management supported by sustainable financing	Business plan for the CCA and MPA finalized and launched	PMU PSC	March 2023
Outcome 3.1 Best practices and lessons learned are systematized and disseminated	M&E GEF Tracking Tools completed Kobo Toolbox Community profile completed DaL updated after 2 years TC Harold and covid effects in targeted communities	PMU	March 2023
Outcome 3.2 Decision-making and planning are guided by information on trends in ecosystem conditions	Ensure sure that key inter-sectorial Conservancy-Protected areas issues are identified, captured and integrated into a final Document with Lesson learnt and linked to Disaster Risk Reduction and International Standard Protected areas and Food Security recommendations	PMU	March 2023
Outcome 3.3 Project management is subject to effective M&E that feeds back into adaptive management decisions	Project Communication Plan and Exit Strategy finalized Final evaluation started	PMU PMU//SAP Comm Stakeholder	March 2023 April 2023

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs ¹⁴	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹⁵ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁶ in delivering outputs
Outcome 1.1 Integrated R2R considerations mainstreamed into sector development policies				
Output 1.1.1 Degree of commitment in policy instruments for channeling tourism income to environmental management	Degree of commitment in policy instruments for channeling tourism income to environmental management		Supporting Vanuatu strategy in Agrotourism activities and Policies. Global Importance Heritage Agricultural Systems (GIAHS) ,One International and one national consultant hired. Report and application finalized by 30-August-2021. Final proposal document by January 2023	
Output 1.1.2 Degree of commitment in policy instruments for promoting compatibility between agricultural	Degree of commitment in policy instruments for promoting compatibility between agricultural development and the maintenance of ecosystem goods and services		Agritourism also has the potential to help revitalize rural economies, educate the public about agriculture, and preserve agricultural heritage. In addition, community-focused farms may find agritourism an attractive option	

¹⁴ Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

¹⁵ 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)

¹⁶ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

development and the maintenance of ecosystem goods and services			because it provides more labor opportunities for local residents	
Output 1.1.3 Degree of commitment in policy instruments for protection of coastal and marine ecosystems through ICZM approaches	Degree of commitment in policy instruments for protection of coastal and marine ecosystems through ICZM approaches		<p>ToR to Hire a National Consultant for PSA contract 6 months. Ongoing by 30 August .ICZM</p> <p>The key role of the Integrated Coastal Zone Management Planning Consultant will be to develop a community integrated coastal zone management plan (C-ICZM) at village and area council levels to enhance resilience of coastal ecosystems to climate change in project sites, eventually to be scaled up to national level. The plan will focus on rebuilding resilience to climate change through a number of measures. These would include eco-system-based management of fisheries resources through; enhancement management of scared sites and traditional tabu areas, establishment of additional tabu areas, CCAs and conservation networks, and through additional fisheries management tools including gear restrictions.</p> <p>A comprehensive review the baseline survey conducted by Department of fisheries based on ISLCM project sites will inform the development of the ICZM Plans which will focus on establishing baselines for marine ecosystem health, identifying breeding and recruitment areas and opportunities which will contribute to longer-term zoning for effective management of the sites. The ICZM should be developed using the baseline survey results.</p> <p>The local consultant will work with the government lead responsible for this</p>	

			component (DEPC and Department of Fisheries). The plan should also outline a comprehensive education and outreach program for fishers (men, women and youth) on marine and coastal zone management. This outreach plan will link with and build upon the on-going work of the Marine Protected Areas Network for Vanuatu. Specific to this work, the local consultant will conduct work that will be guided by the following outcome and output of the ISLCM project document (which will be provided upon request)	
Outcome 1.2 Environmental planning and decision-making processes take integrated R2R considerations into account				
Output 1.2.1 Percentage of EIAs that specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics	Percentage of EIAs that specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics		LoA's to develop EIA policy and strategy for Vanuatu Ongoing.July 2022 TOR for Consultant ready to be launched Vanuatu Forest Landscape strategy validated in DEC-2020 (TCP+LoA) Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology (ROAM) ongoing in Project Sites Free Prior informed consent &ToR for:(Component1,2 and 3) Local Conservation Communities Village Conservation Communities involved	
Output 1.2.2 Percentage of planning	Percentage of planning determinations nationwide that specifically address		National Invasive Species strategy and Action Plan (NISSAP).	

determinations nationwide that specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics	landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics		Project will support DEPC to organize two consultations workshops one in Santo and a second in Tanna to launch NISSAP. September 2022 TOR for Consultant ready to be launched Vanuatu Forest Landscape strategy validated in DEC-2020. Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology (ROAM) ongoing in Project Sites Free Prior informed consent &ToR for:(Component1,2 and 3) Local Conservation Communities Village Conservation Communities involved	
Outcome 1.3 Increased financial resources channelled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation and PA management				
Output .1.3.1 Amount of financial resources channelled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation and PA management	Amount of financial resources channelled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation and PA management		Not started due Lockdown from March 2020 till July 2022	

Outcomes and Outputs ¹⁷	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹⁸ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁹ in delivering outputs
Output 2.1 Target landscapes subject to integrated R2R planning and governance				
Output 2.1.1 Area in target localities covered by integrated landscape/ seascape management plans developed and implemented by local landowners	Area in target localities covered by integrated landscape/ seascape management plans developed and implemented by local landowners		LoA with Department of Forestry.Awaiting clearance. Vanuatu Forest landscape Restoration strategy completed and validated in December 2020 6 new LoA's are pending clearance in stand by	
Output 2.1.2 Levels of satisfaction with multi-stakeholder mechanisms among stakeholders in target localities, by category (chiefs, other village members)	Levels of satisfaction with multi-stakeholder mechanisms among stakeholders in target localities, by category (chiefs, other village members)		By 30 May 2022: 4 Local Conservation Committee Constituted: South Pentecost .Bay Homo + Aneityum LCC+ Nusumetu Conservancy (Tanna island).	

¹⁷ Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

¹⁸ 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)

¹⁹ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

<p>Output 2.1.3 Proportion of land area in target localities where management decisions (leases, land use changes) coincide with provisions of R2R plans, norms and recommendations of local dialogue mechanisms</p>	<p>Proportion of land area in target localities where management decisions (leases, land use changes) coincide with provisions of R2R plans, norms and recommendations of local dialogue mechanisms</p>		<p>Lake Letas Conservancy Area Management Plan Finalized and registered.</p> <p>8 Village Conservation Committee ongoing:</p> <p>South Pentecost: Ramputor,Pangi;Wally,Pointcross,Ranwass</p> <p>Aneityum: Anelgouath,Port Patrick</p> <p>Tanna: Nusumetu</p> <p>Efate: Mangaliliu,Tanoliu,Siviri</p>	
<p>Outcome 2.2 Farmers, ranchers and fishers are managing resources sustainably, resulting in improved flows of ecosystem goods and services, as a result of increased capacities and awareness</p>				
<p>Output 2.2.1 Increase in area (ha) in target localities over which sustainable hillside farming practices are applied</p>	<p>Approximately 13,250ha under cultivation with traditional farming practices @1ha worked/year/family</p>		<p>Livelihoods Recovery Program, is being expanded at Project sites in conjunction with the Local Conservation Committee and the Village Conservation Committee</p>	
<p>Increase in area (ha) in target localities over which sustainable hillside ranching practices are applied Increase in area (ha) in target localities over which sustainable hillside ranching practices are applied</p>	<p>N/A</p>		<p>Lake Letas Management Plan finalized and registered</p>	

Output 2.2.2 Increase in area (ha) in target localities over which community-based fisheries regulations are effectively applied	N/A		LoA with Department of Fisheries .Marine Protected Area	
Output 2.2.3 Increase in area (ha) in target localities over which community-based fisheries regulations are effectively applied	N/A		Marine protected Area LoA with Department of Fisheries KoboToolbox Artisanl fisheries assesment	
Output 2.2.4 Reef health indices	To be determined at project start		LoA with Dep of Fisheries	
Output 2.2.5 Fish catch per unit of effort	To be determined at project start		KOBOTOOLBOX	
Output 2.2.6 Quantities of firewood used for drying of copra and other agricultural products	Annual consumption (t):		From data obtained from Adaptation Fund Full project proposal consultations. From 300HH interviewed a 95% 95 percent (285) of these households were gathering fuel wood everyday for domestic use as well selling it in markets. Per Month a total of 789 bundles per month ,each Bundle 25kg=19.725kg=19Tn. Means that in one year 228 Tn.	
Outcome 2.3 Capacities for generation of ecosystem goods and services are permanently restored in priority areas affected by land degradation				
Output 2.3.1 Area of degraded lands subject to restoration with direct	Area of degraded lands subject to restoration with direct project support, with resulting carbon benefits		Working with LCC and VCC and developing Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology. (ROAM). Inlcuded in Department of Forestry LoA. Awaiting for clearance to be	

project support, with resulting carbon benefits			applied in Project sites ad to define Ecosystem Restoration Programme Openforis+Sentinel Forest Cover and Land Use for Projects sites finalized	
Outcome 2.4 Local people in target localities have opportunities and capacities to perceive direct benefits from conservation and sustainable land management				
Output 2.4.1 Numbers of local people receiving economic benefits from sustainable ecotourism	TBD – a number of ecotourism ventures exist but little specific attention to sustainability		Management Plan for Community Conservation areas +Action Plan Business Plan developed to be launched Nusumetu Bussines Plan already launched and activities in ECO_Agritourism ongoing, activities included in LCS quarterly Workplans	
Output 2.4.2 Numbers of local people receiving economic benefits from sustainable NTFP extraction	TBD – handicrafts are currently produced but little specific attention to sustainability		Agrotourism strategy includes specific activities linked with new Incoming generation using appropriate technologies and value chain	
Output 2.4.3: Numbers of local people receiving economic benefits from sustainable PES schemes	0		Business plan in management plans include different ways to receive economic benefits	
Outcome 2.5 Strengthened protected area network in target localities, filling ecosystem coverage gaps and responding to overall R2R management plans				

<p>Output 2.5.1 Increase in area coverage of PAs in target localities</p>	<p>Increase in area coverage of PAs in target localities</p>		<p>GAUA Island Lake Letas CCA.Management Plan completed with 6,600 HA EFATE.ELMA Task Force ongoing with Free Prior Informed Consent from Vaturisu Council Of Chiefs. Mapping to be finalized by September 2022 SOUTH PENTECOST.Free Prior Informed Consent signed by Malbangbang Chiefs.Mapping and consultations for Bay Homo CCA to be finalized by September 2022. TANNA.NUSUMETU CCA.FPIC READY TO BE REGISTERED ANEITYUM.- MARINE PROTECTED AREA LOA ready to be Launched Aneityum CCA.FPIC signed. Mapping to be completed by August 2022</p>	
<p>Output 2.5.2 Management effectiveness ratings of existing and new PAs in target localities</p>	<p>Management effectiveness ratings of existing and new PAs in target localities</p>		<p>METT updated</p>	
<p>Output 2.5.3:Area of buffer zones and corridors around and between PAs in target localities</p>	<p>Area of buffer zones and corridors around and between PAs in target localities</p>		<p>GAUA Island Lake Letas CCA.Management Plan completed with 6,600 HA EFATE.ELMA Task Force ongoing with Free Prior Informed Consent from Vaturisu Council Of Chiefs. Mapping to be finalized by September 2022 SOUTH PENTECOST.Free Prior Informed Consent signed by Malbangbang Chiefs.Mapping and consultations for Bay Homo CCA to be finalized by September 2022. TANNA.NUSUMETU CCA.FPIC READY TO BE REGISTERED ANNEITYUM.- MARINE PROTECTED AREA LOA ready to be Launched</p>	

			Aneityum CCA.FPIC signed.Mapping to be completed by August 2022	
Outcome 2.6 Sustainable resource management and PA management supported by sustainable financing				
Output 2.6.1: Annual income for PAs and ecosystems management in target localities	Annual income for PAs and ecosystems management in target localities		Initiated Cost benefit analysis. ROAM give data's about new incoming generation opportunities KOBOTOOLBOX data's under review	
Outcome 3 Best practices and lessons learned are systematized and disseminated				
Output 3.1.1: Numbers of decision-makers in key institutions reporting access to best practices and lessons learned as being useful	Numbers of decision-makers in key institutions reporting access to best practices and lessons learned as being useful		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replication and scaling-up from lesson learnt from Livelihood Recovery Program from TC Harold in Pentecost. • Training in KoboToolbox in TAFEA//EFATE//DARD//DOFO//DOFISH • Vanuatu Forest Landscape Restoration Strategy and tools for development • Vanuatu Agritourism Strategy 	
Outcome3.2 Decision-making and planning are guided by information on trends in ecosystem conditions				
Output 3.2.1: Proportions of lease application determinations in target localities	Proportions of lease application determinations in target localities that take into account monitoring data on ecosystem conditions		Openforis+Sentinel Forest Cover and Land Use for Projects sites finalized	
Output 3.2.2: Proportions of EIAs in the target localities that take	Proportions of EIAs in the target localities that take		Openforis+Sentinel Forest Cover and Land Use for Projects sites finalized	

into account monitoring data on ecosystem conditions	into account monitoring data on ecosystem conditions			
Outcome 3.3 Project management is subject to effective M&E that feeds back into adaptive management decisions				
Outputs: 3.3.1 Functioning project M&E system			METT UPDATED (Attached) ISLCM METT.Tracking Tools 2022 Datan from KOBO tool box from Community Profile, Adaptation Fund	

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.

The life of the project for this PIR-2022 has several clear phases from July 2021 to February 2022, in this phase, the following activities were carried out:

- Mid-term review
- Project Steering Committee held in August 2021.
- A total of 2115 HH
 - 10,568 persons targeted
 - 5,689 Men
 - 4,879 women
- **Free Prior Informed Consent** signed By Kustomary Jiffs:
 - Vaturisu Council of Chiefs (EFATE)
 - Malbangbang Council of Chiefs (South Efate)
 - Aneityum Council of chiefs
 - Nusumetu Council of Chiefs (Tanna)
- 4 Local Conservation Committee Constituted (LCC): South Pentecost, Bay Homo, Aneityum LCC and Nusumetu Conservancy (Tanna island).
- Nusumetu Conservation Community Business Plan launched together with Department of Tourism and Live & Learn NGO's.
- 6 Village Conservation Committee ongoing (VCC):
 South Pentecost: Ramputor, Pangj, Wally, Pointcross, Ranwass, Aneityum, Anelgouath, Port Patrick **Tanna**: Nusumetu; **Efate**: ELMA Task Force
 Vaturisu Council of Chiefs Constituted
- 15 agroforestry nurseries set up in South Pentecost (Bay Homo Conservancy)
- 6 Root Multiplication Plots in South Pentecost (Kumala, Manioc and Ñam) South Pentecost
- 2 Agroforestry nurseries in Nusumetu (Tanna) *Carposilum Macrosperma* (Bungulu Palm)
- 2 agroforestry nurseries in Aneityum
- Request and endorsement letters from:
 - TAFEFA Area Council :KOBO tool box website established and Community profile started. Training of 25 officers:15 Men//10 women
 - SHEFA Area Council KOBO tool box website established and Community profile started. Training of 25 officers:15 Men//10 women

Other important objectives achieved:

- Vanuatu’s Forest Landscape Restoration Strategy, prepared together with Department of Forest, Forestry Officers from HQ and Project Team. Strategy was approved in December 2020.
 - TCP to develop the FLR strategy action plan
- OPENFORIS//SENTINEL Use land maps created. (2000-2020)
 - Protected areas
 - Drivers for degradation and deforestation.
- Lake Letas (GAUA ISLAND) Management Plan finalized and registered
- Vanuatu’s Agrotourism strategy supported:
 - “Fact finding Mission for Water taro gardens - Global Importance agricultural Heritage sites”
- Active participation in National Disaster Management Office. Post Disaster Need Assessment.
- Centralized Data base using KOBO Tool Box in TAFEA AREA Council established.

Based on learnings from the project, the project has opened opportunities for scaling up through new vertical funds such as GEF, GCF, Adaptation Fund Portfolio and other opportunities that has contributed to building the country capacity, as follows:

- Support to GEF-CBIT PIF: Strengthening capacity in the Energy, Agriculture, Forestry, and other Land-use Sectors for Enhanced Transparency in the Implementation and Monitoring of Vanuatu’s Nationally Determined Contribution
- Support to Inception workshop and launch of GEF-6.: Ecosystem Restoration and Sustainable Land Management in Tonga Island
- Support IW GEF-7 project: Enhancing water-food security and climate resilience in volcanic island countries of the Pacific
- Support to Adaptation Fund Project: ‘Enhancing resilience of the outer islands of Vanuatu to climate change impacts and disaster risk through Landscape Restoration
- Support for SIDS flagship UNJP/GLO/1060/UN. Vanuatu//Comoros and St. Lucie
- Support to KIWA initiative proposal: New Caledonia//Tonga and Vanuatu
- Support to Vanuatu portfolio

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 rating²⁰	FY2022 Implementation Progress rating²¹	Comments/reasons²² justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	MS	Despite the anomalous situation created by the complex situation created by the COVID-19 Outbreak, the project has consolidated the team, defined strategies and adapted its activities to unexpected situations. Respecting at all times the spirit of the project and putting targeted beneficiaries at the centre of action. PMU has faithfully followed established procedures for purchasing and related activities to achieve the objectives
Budget Holder	S	MS	Integrated Sustainable Land and Coastal Management (GEF 5) project has managed to deliver the intended outcomes and is continuing to achieve its national and global goals.
GEF Operational Focal Point²³	S	MS	The project has shown a lot of flexibility and adaptability to changing conditions on the ground and addressing the demands without compromising the integrity of the project. The project has achieved key tangible outputs in this period

²⁰ **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.

²¹ **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.

²² Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

²³ In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

Lead Technical Officer²⁴	S	MS	The project is performing well to meet its target indicators despite COVID 19 challenges on the ground. Project is following innovative methods and practices to engage communities and it is noteworthy to see the improved gender mainstreaming in trainings and capacity building. It is expected that implementation will pick up speed once situation is near normal.
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	MS	The project has progressed well towards meeting its development objective, though implementation suffered some setback due to COVID-19 restrictions. The project has contributed to institutional strengthening – government and local communities and promoted sustainable land management. Through a participatory approach, key implementation decisions are taken in consultation with the councils of chiefs of each of the target islands which has significant implications on the success, sustainability, and replicability of the model throughout the island. Lessons learned from the project has strengthened the country’s capacity to access other vertical funds from GCF and Adaptation Fund. As the project nears its final year, an exit strategy will have to be designed to ensure sustainability of the activities.

²⁴ 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				
	Covid 19 outbreak			

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 ²⁵ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
LOW RISK	COVID 19 OUTBREAK AND TC'S AND LA NINA EFFECTS, NEEDS TO BE REFLETED IN FUTURE PROJECTS

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

²⁵ **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 ²⁶	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Climate change may exceed the coping ranges of the proposed resource management strategies	HIGH	Y	SOP The PMU's monitoring and evaluation of the project's activities on Monitoring and Evaluation under Component 4 have been designed to identify changes in ecosystems due to climate change in order to take appropriate corrective actions. Climate-resilient land and forest management techniques, e.g. soil and water conservation and sustainable management of hydrographic basins. Since October 2021, an M&E specialist has joined the team	Ongoing	This is the real threat affecting all segment of development. PMU is making all efforts to address the resource management requirements under the project scope.

²⁶ 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.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²⁶	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
2	Leakage of project threats resulting from site-specific actions (for example unsustainable intensification of agriculture, increased logging in non-project areas)	LOW	Y	Leakage in the context of this project is unlikely. Forest degradation from logging in Vanuatu is not driven by the demand for industrial wood, but by fuelwood collection and the expansion of the agricultural sector, both in Food-crop and Cash-crop. However, fuelwood collection is highly localized (on the many small islands that have no inter-island trade in fuelwood). Therefore, reduced production in one place is unlikely to lead to increased production elsewhere to replace this. In addition, the project attempts to reduce firewood consumption in some places by promoting solar dryers as an alternative drying technology.	ONGOING	PMU has provided proper justification is given in mitigation actions. But in case, there is need to address such threats, project can create awareness for such issues and suggest options for reducing such threats.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²⁶	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
3	Resistance among key actors to taking or modifying actions in support of environmental sustainability	H	Y	The project focuses especially on capacity building for the formulation of natural resource management strategies among stakeholders at all levels, through participatory approaches (FARM FIELD SCHOOL APPROACH) for technology generation and transfer (Use of data collection tools:KOBO//SEPAL-Openforis) proposed in Component 2, and the capacities for knowledge management and response that will be promoted in Component 3. This is maximizing the capacity of stakeholders to adapt to currently unforeseen future climate extremes, rather than adhering to rigid, predetermined solutions designed for a limited range of conditions.	MS	It is being ensured that all proposed trainings and capacity building measures are implemented so that stakeholders will have flexibility to adapt to situation for better decision making towards environmental sustainability.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²⁶	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
4	Resistance among local communities to collaborating in landscape planning, PA management, sustainable resource management and restoration	MH	Y	The project has adopted a highly participatory and culturally sensitive approach and is raising awareness among Traditional Chiefs and community members about the social implications of resource management decisions, in order to maximize their motivation to collaborate in their own interests, the project has minimized the risks by making the beneficiaries part of the project. In addition, the processes of intercommunity analysis and negotiated planning have been carried out with the utmost respect and subject to the prior consultation and consent of the councils of national and insular chiefs, in order to guarantee their credibility among the members of the local communities.	MS	PMU is ensuring participation of local communities through participatory and culturally aligned approach to involve communities and its chiefs into decision making. This is helping communities to achieve better management of their natural resources.

5	Resistance among key actors to taking or modifying actions in support of environmental sustainability	H		<p>All government policy documents reviewed do contain strong commitments to environmental sustainability, but there is still a risk that some individual sectoral policies (eg livestock and tourism) are followed at the expense of environmental considerations. The project supported the review of agricultural and livestock policies and supported the drafting of new strategies for the Country: FLR and Agritourism, all the actions of the project in terms of political incidence are recognizing the valid motivations of the Government to stimulate the target sectors, as engines of national economic growth and even more so after the incidence of COVID-19: rather than proposing to control its expansion per se, it will therefore focus on promoting the incorporation of environmental sustainability considerations in the growth of the sector and in the decentralization process. This, in the medium and long term, will be positive for the sectors themselves, as it will ensure that they do not undermine the resource base on which they themselves depend and, at the same time, help to increase their resilience to climate shocks; it will also help ensure that growth in individual sectors does not come at</p>	<p>The project is supporting review of those policies which has impacts on environmental sustainability.</p>
---	---	---	--	--	---

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²⁶	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
				the expense of the general good, undermining the sustainability of development as a whole; At the same time, this focus on sustainability will help optimize the results of these sectors in terms of their impacts on biodiversity and other global environmental values.		

6	Leakage of project threats resulting from site-specific actions (for example unsustainable intensification of agriculture, increased logging in non-project areas) issues		<p>Although there is a certain degree of unavoidable risk of flight given that the target localities will not cover all of the islands in question. However, the net results in terms of environmental impacts will be lower than in the scenario without the project, since the project actions are not limited to the target localities themselves, but rather the lessons learned are being applied by the project partners in new localities. The lessons learned are also being used to generate new initiatives and projects with new trust funds. The project is also strengthening institutional capacities at the national and provincial levels for land use planning, environmental assessment, and PA prioritization, which will apply beyond the project areas themselves; In addition, the policy work in Outcome 1.1 is obtaining benefits at the national level in terms of prevention and avoidance of the potential impacts of the development of the sector. In addition, we have confirmed that the bottom-up participatory approach, obtaining the FPICs and working shoulder to shoulder with the traditional Chiefs and the permanent presence of a Local Conservation Specialist in each project site has great visibility for FAO, GEF and the Project, the</p>		<p>Agree with the justification given by PMU on mitigation actions.</p>
---	---	--	--	--	--

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²⁶	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
				<p>innovative participatory multi-stakeholder planning and governance models promoted in the target localities are expected to be replicated in other parts of the target islands and beyond, thereby progressively reducing the extent of areas where leakage could occur.</p> <p>The participation in the processes of the councils of chiefs of each of the target islands is having significant implications in terms of replication of the model throughout the island</p>		

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²⁶	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
7	Variations in availability of funding for PA management and environmental management			One of the risks is the financing strategy that has been depending on the stability or growth in the levels of tourist activity, which aims to be one of the main sources of income at the local and national level, this income has already been greatly affected due to the Lockdown that the country has suffered between March 2020 and June 2022. The projections for the growth of tourism have been totally wrong. At this time, together with the Government, other possibilities are being studied and we have supported the Agritourism Strategy. The creation of a fund for Protected Areas is under study. The project has started working on management plans including business plans for each Protected Area.		The project is supporting various activities which will have sustainability for the management of protected areas.

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
M	M	Lesson learned from multiple catastrophic situations – COVID-19, La Nina, TC, Volcanic eruptions, etc

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

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

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
Recommendation 1: (PMU, PSC, OFP, Provincial Governments): Develop work plan and agree on roles and responsibilities for remaining project timeframe	AWP and Budget approved by 6thPSC for years 2021-2022 and 2022-2023
Recommendation 2: (FAO-SAP, BH, GEF-CU): Project Extension by 6-12 months	NTE of project extended till 15 September 2023
Recommendation 3: FAO-SAP BH, Procurement Unit): FAO-SAP Budget Holder in coordination with procurement unit to develop action plan to address delays associated with payments and disbursements	PMU is in discussion with Apia Office.
Recommendation 4. (PMU/project team): Improve efficient and effective administration in target localities of South Pentecost and Tanna	All Local Conservation specialists have the appropriate means of work: Computers, solar lighting systems with charging capacity for computers, printer and scanner, they also have office furniture and cabinets
Recommendation 5. (PMU/project team). Hire a specialist to improve monitoring and evaluation and knowledge management system	M&E specialist has been hired till NTE of the project to identify gaps and strengthen the M&E process, while also contributing to knowledge exchange and sharing of project's lesson.
Recommendation 6. (PMU and co-finance partners). Track project co-finance	PMU has held a co-financing follow-up meeting, a second meeting, scheduled for the month of March, was cancelled due to the COVID outbreak that has paralysed the country for three months. A meeting is planned for the month of September before the 7th PSC

Recommendation 7. (PMU, DEPC, and other partners): Develop a roadmap to agree on the target terrestrial and marine protected areas:	There is permanent contact with the project partners and with the DEPC. Works closely with each unit
Recommendation 8. (PMU, PSC, and other project partners): Develop exit strategy to ensure sustainability of results	The draft is developed, which will be validated at the 7th PSC to be held in September 2022
Recommendation 9: (PMU/project team, PSC, FAO-SAP, FAO-HQ) Adjusting indicators and targets in the logical framework is recommended.	Adopted by PSC and is reflected in this PIR
Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe	Ongoing. Linked with Recommendation number 8 and 9. To be approved on 7th PSC September 2022

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 Guidelines²⁷. 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	Some minor changes recommended by MTR Team	NA	
Components and cost	NA	NA	
Institutional and implementation arrangements	NA	NA	
Financial management	NA	NA	
Implementation schedule	As per recommendations of the MTR, the project completion date has been revised to 15 September 2023	NA	
Executing Entity	NA	NA	
Executing Entity Category	NA	NA	
Minor project objective change	NA	NA	
Safeguards	NA	NA	
Risk analysis	NA	NA	
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	NA	NA	
Co-financing	NA	NA	
Location of project activity	NA	NA	
Other	NA	NA	

²⁷ Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

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			
DARD	Co-executing	Monthly meetings are held with the government partners listed below	There are no challenges
DOFOR	Co-executing	As above	
DOFISH	Co-executing	As above	
DOLIV	Co-executing	As above	
DOTOU	Co-executing	As above	
DOLAND	Co-executing	As above	
SHEFA PROVINCE	Co-executing	As above	
PENAMA PROVINCE	Co-executing	Regular meetings are held. There are minor politics issues	low capacity
TAFEA PROVINCE	Co-executing	Monthly meetings are held with the Tafea Province	
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
Live & learn	Supporting activities in CCA	Actively supports project implementation	
VANGO	Supporting activities in CCA		Low Capacity
Private sector entities			
Others[1]			
New York Botanical Garden	Supporting activities in CCA	Actively supports project implementation and monthly meetings are held.	
New stakeholders identified/engaged			
National University of Vanuatu	LoA	Monthly meetings are held with the University.	

[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	KOBO TOOL BOX KoBoToolbox is a suite of tools for field data collection for use in challenging environments . Our software is free and open source. Most of our users are people working in humanitarian crises, as well as aid professionals and researchers working in developing countries. AND GESI STARTED
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	The project has differentiated ways of speaking to women and girls, creating inclusive awareness The project supports the Empowerment of Mothers and Young Women
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):	Yes	
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Yes	Project Empowering Women through Farmer Field Schools 40% of women have participated in all the activities
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	Project Empowering Women through Farmer Field Schools
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	Kobo tool analysis to be undertaken by September
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	Yes. BTOR and Monthly Reports
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	Yes CTA, NPC and LCS have a good expertise in Gender mainstreaming and empowerment.
Any other good practices on gender	Yes	Giving access and control over decision making Gender sensitive indicators; OWNERSHIP, HHHEAD,

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.	Yes BTOR TOR
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	Drafted in collaboration with M&E officer and Communication Officer in Apia. Communication strategy to be approved by 7 th PSC
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.	Testimonials and histories reflected in FAO-SAP activities report 2021 https://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cc0061en https://doi.org/10.4060/cc0061en FAO Vanuatu Projects
Please provide links to related website, social media account	https://unfao-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/ricardo_dominguezllosa_fao_org/EmkUarvd2JtKnA96KEUmINMBqpQY5OAcwZxvFLiJL-S8A?e=5%3allfUmE&at=9 FAO Vanuatu Projects
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	https://we.tl/t-yPolqYZibM https://we.tl/t-WO3692AD7y Link 1: https://we.tl/t-CSNLAYQJl Link 2: https://we.tl/t-ntvyra7jXo https://we.tl/t-ijgWvy3Vie https://unfao-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/ricardo_dominguezllosa_fao_org/EmkUarvd2JtKnA96KEUmINMBqpQY5OAcwZxvFLiJL-S8A?e=5%3allfUmE&at=9
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact detail	Ricardo.dominguezllosa@fao.org FAO Vanuatu Projects

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.

- A total of 2115 HH
 - 10,568 persons targeted
 - 5,689 Men
 - 4,879 women
- **Free Prior Informed Consent** signed By Kustomary Jiffs:
 - Vaturisu Council of Chiefs.(EFATE)
 - Malbangbang Council of Chiefs.(South Efate)
 - Aneityum Council of chiefs
 - Nusumetu Council of Chiefs (Tanna)

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁸	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
GEF Agency	FAO	(grant)	1, 175 000	500,000		1,175,000
GEF Agency	FAO	(in-kind)	600, 000	450,000		150,000
Bilateral	ACIAR ²⁹	(grant)	571, 516	571,516		571,516
Civil Society Organization	VANGO ³⁰ ((grant)	650, 000	350,000		300,000
Civil Society Organization	VANGO ((grant)	5, 000	5,000		5000
Civil Society Organization	Live &Learn Vanuatu	(grant)	20, 000	15,000		20,000

²⁸ 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.

²⁹ Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research

³⁰ Vanuatu Association of Non-Governmental Organisations.

Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies)	The Pacific Community (SPC)	(grant)	1 ,354, 597	1,354,597		1,354,597
National Government	Vanuatu Government	(grant)	10, 000 ,000	6,000,000		10,000,000
National Government	Vanuatu Government	(grant)	500 ,000	300,000		500,000
Other	New York Botanical Garden	(grant)	414, 445	315,000		414,445
Total			15,290,558	9,861,113		14,490,558

**Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement
SPC AND ACIAR Cofinancing activities after TC PAM in 2016-2018.**

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.