



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2023 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	16
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	21
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	25
6. RISKS	28
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	37
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	38
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	39
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	40
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	42
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	43
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	44

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 Shepherds, Efate Islands (SHEFA) &Tanna, Erromango, Futuna and Aneityum Islands (TAFEA) Provincial Government
Initial project duration (years):	5 years
Project coordinates: <i>This section should be completed ONLY by:</i> <i>a) Projects with 1st PIR;</i> <i>b) In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.</i>	<i>[Projects in a) and b) categories should indicate YES here and provide the geocoded data in Annex 2]</i>

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 2024

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	4,650,680
Total Co-financing amount (USD)³:	15,290,558
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	3,235,212
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)⁴:	3,235,213
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023⁵	11,501,113

¹ As per FPMIS

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

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

⁴ The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

⁵ Please refer to the Section 13 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	7 March 2023
Expected Mid-term Review date ⁶ :	
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	July 2021
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date ⁷ :	May 2024
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	<i>[It is mandatory for projects to update the TT or CI before Mid-Term or Terminal Evaluation stage. For projects that have a planned MTR or TE in the next fiscal year, please indicate YES here and provide the updated TT or CI as Annex.]</i>

Overall ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	<i>Satisfactory</i>
Overall implementation progress rating:	<i>Satisfactory</i>
Overall risk rating:	<i>Substantial</i>

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	<i>Moderate</i>
----------------------------------	-----------------

Status

Implementation Status (1 st PIR, 2 nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	6 th PIR
--	---------------------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	DominguezLlosa Ricardo	ricardo.dominguezllosa@fao.org
Budget Holder (BH)	Xiangjun Yao	xiangjun.yao@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)	Esline Garabeity	gesline@vanuatu.gov.vu
Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Raushan Kumar	raushan.kumar@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	Lianchawii Chhakchhuak	lianchawii.chhakchhuak@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 Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
Component 1: Improving the enabling environment for integrated sustainable land and coastal management.	Outcome 1.1 Integrated R2R considerations mainstreamed into sector development policies	Indicator 1.1.1: Degree of commitment in policy instruments for channeling tourism income to environmental management	Generalized Policy statements exist, but in different sector policy documents and without specific commitments	Proposals under discussion of specific commitments for promoting the channeling of tourism income to environmental management	Tourism policy makes specific commitments for promoting the channeling of tourism income to environmental management	100% Provide support to Agritourism strategy	HS
		Indicator 1.1.2: Degree of commitment in policy instruments for promoting compatibility between agricultural development and the maintenance of ecosystem goods and services	Several sector policies example agriculture, forestry, land and livestock make broad reference to maintenance of ecosystem goods and services but	Proposals under discussion of specific commitments for promoting compatibility between agricultural development and	Agriculture, livestock, forestry and planning policy documents include specific commitments for promoting compatibility between	100% Provide support to forestry policy review, land scape restoration	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). Refer to Annex 1.

			without specific definitions or commitments	maintenance of ecosystem goods and services	agricultural development and maintenance of ecosystem goods and services		
		Indicator 1.1.3: Degree of commitment in policy instruments for protection of coastal and marine ecosystems through ICZM approaches	Existing Fisheries and Environment policies make generalized references, but lack a vision of inter-sector integration	Proposals under discussion of specific commitments for protection of coastal and marine ecosystems through ICZM approaches	Fisheries and planning policy documents include specific commitments for protection of coastal and marine ecosystems through ICZM approaches	100% Support to fisheries department on policy and training (Emergency SOP) and fish FAD procured	HS
	Outcome 1.2: Environmental planning and decision-making processes take integrated R2R considerations into account	Indicator 1.2.1: Percentage of EIAs that specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics	All EIAs are site-specific with little or no consideration of landscape-wide dynamics	EIA procedures specifically require consideration of landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics	50% of EIAs specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics	50% Provide it equipment's, GPS and recruitment of specialist within the department and carry out awareness	HS
		Indicator 1.2.2: Percentage of planning determinations nationwide that specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamic	No planning decisions to date have adequately considered landscape wide dynamics	Planning determinations are required to specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics	50% of planning determinations nationwide that specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics	75% Support to the new EIA policy review	HS
	Outcome 1.3 Increased financial resources channeled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation and PA management	Indicator 1.3.1: Amount of financial resources channeled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation and PA management	No Reliable figures available, but assumed to be negligible	\$75,000/year channeled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation and PA management by project end	\$150,000/year channeled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation and PA management by project end66	5% Project support new Vanuatu sustainable cruise development strategy 2023 – 2030 First meeting was on August 16 th 2023	U

	Outcome: 2.1 Target landscapes subject to integrated R2R planning and governance	Indicator 2.1.1: Area in target localities covered by integrated landscape/ seascape management plans developed and implemented by local landowners	0 ha		10,000ha in target localities covered by integrated landscape/ seascape management plans developed and implemented by local landowners	65% After ROAM in project sites, we identify almost 9000 ha. After TC Judy and Kevin, cause destruction to most of the selected sites. Focus on forest restoration	S
		Indicator 2.1.2: Levels of satisfaction with multi-stakeholder mechanisms among stakeholders in target localities, by category (chiefs, other village members)	No surveys yet carried out of satisfaction with existing decision-making structures	At least 30% of stakeholders in all categories consider that the mechanisms adequately represent them and address their needs	At least 75% of stakeholders in all categories consider that the mechanisms adequately represent them and address their needs	60% Project address activities through use of Free Prior Inform Consent approach, consultation with community chiefs, provincial government (Shefa, Penama and Tafea)	S
		Indicator 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	No relevant provisions have as yet been generated through R2R plans, norms and dialogue mechanisms	On at least 40% of the land affected by management decisions (leases, land use changes) between project midterm and end, the decisions coincide with provisions of R2R plans, norms and recommendations of local dialogue mechanisms	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, norms and recommendations of local dialogue mechanisms	70% Project address activities through use of Free Prior Inform Consent approach, consultation with community chiefs, provincial government (Shefa, Penama and Tafea)	S
	Outcome 2.2 Farmers, ranchers and fishers are managing resources sustainably, resulting in	Indicator 2.2.1: Increase in area (ha) in target localities over which sustainable hillside farming practices are applied	Approximately 13,250ha under cultivation with traditional farming practices @1ha worked/year/family	Area with improved farming practices: 3,312 ha	Area with improved farming practices: 6625 ha	100% (50%) Project has supported the use of Farm to school approach . After the effect of TC Judy and Kevin, most of the nurseries and farms were destroyed.	MS

		Indicator 2.2.2: Increase in area (ha) in target localities over which sustainable hillside ranching practices are applied	N/A	Area with improved ranching practices: 300 ha	Area with improved ranching practices 600 ha	75% (50%) Project has supported in improving ranching practices .After the effect of TC Judy and Kevin, most of the activities established and farms were destroyed.	S
		Indicator 2.2.3: Increase in area (ha) in target localities over which community-based fisheries regulations are effectively applied	N/A	500 ha	500 ha	100% Project targets ridge to reef and support establishment of MPA. Most than 500ha of MPA in mystery island and Efate island was documented.	HS
		Indicator 2.2.4: Reef health indices	To be determined at Project start		10% improvement in index ratings in all sites (to be confirmed once baseline values are determined)	8% The project has supported fisheries with site inspection and after cyclone the loss and damage in fisheries sector .Reports on the damage to marine resources within the MPA	S
		Indicator 2.2.5: Fish catch per unit of effort	To be determined at Project start	5% increase	10% increase	8% Provide support through LoAs but until now, LoA Is yet to approve	S
		Indicator 2.2.6: Quantities of firewood used for drying of copra and other agricultural products	Annual consumption 19,156 tonne	Annual consumption 17,836 tonne	Annual consumption is 16,518 tonne (Overall reduction in year 5 = 2638 tonne, total reduction over 5 years = 7,914t70: total avoided emissions = 517tCO ₂ eq	75% Hiring an expert to conduct research to quantify the annual consumption of firewood in project site and how it affects the natural resources.	S

	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	400 ha	800 ha, With resulting carbon benefit from capture of 153,329tCO ₂ eq.	100% Project has support training of the EX-ACT tool to provide update on the METT	
	Outcome 2.4 Local people in target localities have opportunities and capacities to perceive direct benefits from conservation and sustainable land management	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	150,000 USD	300,000 USD	100% Project support the ecotourism strategy including GIS map and GIAHS.	S
		Indicator 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	32,500 USD	65,000 USD	85% Project is supporting the project sites to use of local materials use as plastics for sowing seeds instead of plastic poly bags	S
		Indicator 2.4.3: Numbers of local people receiving economic benefits from sustainable PES schemes	0	22,500 USD	45,000 USD	85% Project is supporting the project sites to use of local materials use as plastics for sowing seeds instead of plastic poly bags	HS
	Outcome 2.5 Strengthened protected area network in target localities, filling ecosystem coverage gaps and responding to overall R2R management plans	Indicator 2.5.1: Increase in area coverage of PAs in target localities	Current PA 13,838 ha	2,400 ha	5,000 ha	100% Project has supported the activity through establishment of PA and overachieved the target of 5000 ha as recorded from the GIS mapping	HS
		Indicator 2.5.2: Management effectiveness ratings of existing and new PAs in target localities	Average 18..4 PA effective management	Average 56 PA effective management	Average of 85 PA effective Management	75% Project support the CCA management plans and most CCA management plan are in the process of registration and launching.	S
		Indicator 2.5.3: Area of buffer zones and corridors	0 ha	15,000 ha	30,000 ha	75%	S

		around and between PAs in target localities				Project supports through management plan and rules of each CCA. Currently, buffers zones has been established. The project also targets setting up ecological corridors to accommodate for specific endemic species.	
	Outcome 2.6 Sustainable resource management and PA management supported by sustainable financing	Indicator 2.6..1:Annual income for PAs and ecosystems management in target localities	0	10,000 USD per year across the target localities	20,000 USD year across the target localities	86% Project supports activities through management plans and that includes specific business plans and actions for community to undertake in a more sustainable and control approach	S
Component 3: Knowledge management	Outcome 3.1 Best practices and lessons learned are systematized and disseminated	Indicator 3..1.1: Numbers of decision-makers in key institutions reporting access to best practices and lessons learned as being useful	N/A		Directors of all key government stakeholder institutions (Departments)	100% The project always involve stakeholders in terms of project activities and funding approval, project update and also briefing sector directors on the progress. In terms of CCA, chiefs and provincial government are always involved and consulted when developing the management plans and business plan actions	HS
	Outcome 3.2 Decision making and planning are guided by information on trends in ecosystem conditions	Indicator 3..2.1:Proportions of lease application determinations in target localities that take into account monitoring data on ecosystem conditions	0	50%	100%	100% Project has work very closely with the department of land to identify leases and cancel leases that are within the approved CCA land size area.	HS
		Indicator 3.2.2: Proportions of EIAs in the target localities that take into account monitoring data on ecosystem conditions	0	50%	100%	100% Project contributes to incorporate the activity in the CCA management plan, and support department of environment with hiring of a specialist and GPS tools also review of the EIA policy.	HS

	Outcome 3.3 Project management is subject to effective M&E that feeds back into adaptive management decisions.	Indicator 3.3.1:	N/A	All projects indicators are measured in a timely and accurate manner and the results fed into adaptive management of the project	All projects indicators are measured in a timely and accurate manner and the results fed into adaptive management of the project	60% Currently, GEF projects has well define M&E system in place that reports on activity progress and capture output indicators .Currently, an Indicator Performance tracking table is developed to capture activities and progress over time for proper recording and reporting.	s
--	---	------------------	-----	--	--	--	---

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1.1 Integrated R2R considerations mainstreamed into sector development policies	This outcome is achieved in most of the project target stakeholders especially government departments through revise policies over the past year such as Forestry policies outcome indicator reflects on the Ministerial Corporate plan 2022 – 2025.	Chief Technical Assistant National Project Coordinator Local Conservation Specialist National Operations Finance Assistant Government Partners	January 2023
Outcome 1.2: Environmental planning and decision-making processes take integrated R2R considerations into account	This outcome is focus on Environment sector and other government departments such as Forestry and Department of Agriculture .The implementation of EIA s including other program activities within the department of Environment has taken into consideration the R2R, and fully involve in decision making approach to facilitate and provide effective data to support most environmental planning and development. The department of Agriculture strategy on reintegration framework has capture an effective environmental planning to sustain agricultural development. National Invasive Species strategy and Action Plan (NISSAP)	Chief Technical Assistant National Project Coordinator Local Conservation Specialist National Operations Finance Assistant Government Partners	January 2024
Outcome 1.3 Increased financial resources channeled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation and PA management	To effectively increase financial resources directed towards environmental conservation and protected area (PA) management, certain actions need to be taken in the tourism sector. One of the first steps is to establish partnerships between tourism stakeholders and conservation organizations to leverage resources and knowledge. Additionally, there is a need to develop and implement sustainable tourism practices that align with environmental conservation goals. This can be achieved by promoting eco-friendly tourism activities, encouraging responsible behavior among tourists, and supporting local communities that depend on natural resources. Another crucial action is to create incentives for businesses and individuals who	Chief Technical Assistant National Project Coordinator Local Conservation Specialist National Operations Finance Assistant Government Partners	January 2024

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
	invest in environmental conservation and sustainable tourism practices. This can include tax breaks, grants, and recognition programs. Finally, there is a need for increased collaboration and communication among all stakeholders to ensure that financial resources are effectively allocated towards environmental conservation and PA management initiatives		
Outcome: 2.1 Target landscapes subject to integrated R2R planning and governance	This outcome is achieved through the community chiefly land governance system and project tend to address through Free prior inform consent approach to achieved an effective activity integration alignment to existing governance. All project target communities are consulted and feedbacks are documented.	Chief Technical Assistant National Project Coordinator Local Conservation Specialist National Operations Finance Assistant Government Partners	January 2024
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	This outcome is achieved through engagement of government sectorial activities as described in the LoA. Project activities address sustainable use of resources such as Smart agriculture, Integrated farming system and back yard gardening.	Chief Technical Assistant National Project Coordinator Local Conservation Specialist National Operations Finance Assistant Government Partners	January 2024
Outcome 2.3 Capacities for generation of ecosystem goods and services are permanently restored in priority areas affected by land degradation	The project has provided community trainings as part of capacity building in terms of ecosystem resource management, also awareness to community members on CCA management plan that incorporates all management rules decide by community members on how resources has to be managed.	Chief Technical Assistant National Project Coordinator Local Conservation Specialist National Operations Finance Assistant Government Partners	July 2023
Outcome 2.4 Local people in target localities have opportunities and capacities to perceive direct benefits from conservation and sustainable land management	This outcome is achieved also in this project through the CCA management plan developed and launched. The information on how communities will utilise the resources and how they will benefit from the resources is very well outline and described in the Management Plan.	Chief Technical Assistant National Project Coordinator Local Conservation Specialist National Operations Finance Assistant Government Partners	January 2024

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
	The LCS in each project site carry out awareness on management to communities.		
Outcome 2.5 Strengthened protected area network in target localities, filling ecosystem coverage gaps and responding to overall R2R management plans	Community networks and existing chiefly land governance is highly respected and prioritised when implementing this project. Most CCA are registered according to what the community needs or requirement. The existing governance within community networks strengthen the CCA and also allow for effective implementation of management plan	Chief Technical Assistant National Project Coordinator Local Conservation Specialist National Operations Finance Assistant Government Partners	January 2024
Outcome 2.6 Sustainable resource management and PA management supported by sustainable financing	This outcome is 100% achieved through engagement of government sectors especially registration of the CCA management plan. The government has its priorities and each year, it allocates certain percentage of funds to support the implementation. So the CCA launched or established by the GEF 5 project are all capture and align to existing government yearly funding support program (Seen in department of environment business plan). Also within the CCA management plan, sustainable financing opportunities are also described/capture. This guides the CCA committee and existing community governance to plan and create financing opportunities that will generate funds to sustain the management of the CCA	Chief Technical Assistant National Project Coordinator Local Conservation Specialist National Operations Finance Assistant Government Partners	January 2024
Outcome 3.1 Best practices and lessons learned are systematized and disseminated	The project priorities the Free Prior Inform consent approach allows for both parties (Project and community) to share ideas and contribute to support existing development and how it link to support the CCA .The project has recruited Local Conservation specialist in each project site as they provide project information and other relevant data for community people. This project achieved this outcome through Loss and damage assessment	Chief Technical Assistant National Project Coordinator Local Conservation Specialist National Operations Finance Assistant Government Partners	January 2024

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
	conducted and results are analysed and reported on each project site. LCS also support disseminate information on management plan to communities as part of consultation .The activities in terms of lessons and practices and other information dissemination is ongoing		
Outcome 3.2 Decision making and planning are guided by information on trends in ecosystem conditions	The project priorities the Free Prior Inform consent approach allows for both parties (Project and community) to share ideas and contribute to support existing development and how it link to support the CCA .The project has recruited Local Conservation specialist in each project site as they provide project information and other relevant data for community people to improve knowledge. The project has also achieved activity and baseline data integration into existing government programs to support development of policies and strategies	Chief Technical Assistant National Project Coordinator Local Conservation Specialist National Operations Finance Assistant Government Partners	January 2024
Outcome 3.3 Project management is subject to effective M&E that feeds back into adaptive management decisions.	This outcome is achieved through existing M&E plans and evaluation plan developed to guide the monitoring of project activities through reporting and evaluation of outcomes. The project is planning another mid-term review this year and prepared for the final terminal evaluation. The most important contribution of the project is that it provides tools and information to support government reporting and monitoring of all its programs and activities. The project also prepared planning templates that align existing government policies objectives to project outcomes and activities help during development of LoA and also a guide to project exit strategy approach.	Chief Technical Assistant National Project Coordinator Local Conservation Specialist National Operations Finance Assistant Government Partners	December 2023

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
Outcome 1.1 Integrated R2R considerations mainstreamed into sector development policies Output 1.1.1: Policy proposals for channeling tourism income to environmental management Output 1.1.2: Policy proposals for promoting compatibility between agricultural development and maintenance of ecosystem goods and services Output 1.1.3: Policy proposals in support of ICZM including protection of coastal and marine ecosystems on which fisheries sustainability and marine biodiversity depend	Indicator 1.1.1: Degree of commitment in policy instruments for channeling tourism income to environmental management	100%	100%	
	Indicator 1.1.2: Degree of commitment in policy instruments for promoting compatibility between agricultural development and the maintenance of ecosystem goods and services	100%	All government department that engage in this project has input priorities into existing policies to guide and promote compatibility between agriculture development and maintenance of ecosystem goods and services. For instance, Ministry of Agriculture 5 year corporate plan. Another good example is with existing Agritourism action plan. National Invasive Species strategy and Action Plan (NISSAP)	
Outcome 1.2: Environmental planning and decision-making processes take integrated R2R considerations into account Output 1.2.1: Improved procedures for approving lease applications Output 1.2.2: Improved capacities and regulatory instruments for	Indicator 1.2.1: Percentage of EIAs that specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics	50%	35%	
	Indicator 1.2.2: Percentage of planning determinations nationwide that specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamic	50%	The government departments that engaged directly in this project have insert activities and budget into existing business plans that address	

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

¹³ 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)

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

consideration of landscape-wide (ridge to reef) considerations into EIAs and determinations Output 1.2.3: Land use planning guidelines providing for consideration of landscape-wide (ridge to reef) environmental and social processes			importance of planning of landscape wide environmental National Invasive Species strategy and Action Plan (NISSAP)	
Outcome 1.3 Increased financial resources channeled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation and PA management Output 1.3.1: Corporate social and environmental responsibility commitments from the cruise industry	Indicator 1.3.1: Amount of financial resources channeled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation and PA management	150,000 USD	Cruise ship has been down significantly, due COVID-19. Start in 30 January 2023 and interrupted after TC Judy and Kevin. However, we are working on this activity always. But this will be 100% after all PA Management Plans are approved. It is happening slowly but progressively.	??
Outcome: 2.1 Target landscapes subject to integrated R2R planning and governance Output 2.1.1: Multi-stakeholder mechanisms for landscape planning, decision-making and conflict management covering all three target localities Output 2.1.2: Norms for resource management practices developed and agreed among stakeholder groups covering target localities Output 2.1.3: Integrated landscape/seascape management plans developed and implemented by local landowners	Indicator 2.1.1: Area in target localities covered by integrated landscape/ seascape management plans developed and implemented by local landowners	10,000 ha	The current CCA to be launched are Gaua, Nusumetu, Aneityum, ELMA are registered in different approach, Aneityum alone is registered within custom governance for management of the CCA whereas the other are registered within the government established system. Even though the registration system differs, but land owners and community people are the main driver for the CCA management and implementation of the Management Plan	
	Indicator 2.1.2: Levels of satisfaction with multi-stakeholder mechanisms among stakeholders in target localities, by category (chiefs, other village members)	75%	This indicator is a major achievement this year for this project as project engaged most of the community leaders including other stakeholders such as the department of land and provincial government is establishing the CCA in target local communities.	
	Indicator 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	<u>80%</u>	Project work in collaboration with department of land to address the land leases through area council dialogues and land owners including chiefs and community people. Most important approach that was take is the Nagoya Protocol	
Outcome 2.2 Farmers, ranchers and fishers are managing resources sustainably, resulting in	Indicator 2.2.1: Increase in area (ha) in target localities over which sustainable hillside farming practices are applied	6625	The department of Agriculture and Forestry department including livestock continued to be sustained with government funding support the	

<p>Output 2.2.1: Extension modules for agriculture, fisheries, livestock and forestry including integrated R2R concepts</p> <p>Output 2.2.2: Field schools and mechanisms for participatory learning and experimentation in target localities</p> <p>Output 2.2.3: Pilot solar driers for copra and other agricultural products</p>			integrated farming system which is more reliable and suit the hillside farming practices through the Project LoA	
	Indicator 2.2.2: Increase in area (ha) in target localities over which sustainable hillside ranching practices are applied	600ha	The department of Agriculture and Forestry department including livestock continued to be sustained with government funding support the integrated farming system which is more reliable and suit the hillside farming practices through the Project LoA	
	Indicator 2.2.3: Increase in area (ha) in target localities over which community-based fisheries regulations are effectively applied	500ha	This year, Mystery Island Protected area of about 8577 ha is a based target localities for fisheries and project team discussed also the management plan for the PA with the community people including chiefs and other tourism executive members on the island	
	Indicator 2.2.4: Reef health indices	10% Improvement	We arrange meeting with fisheries department to obtain reports on this indicator	
	Indicator 2.2.5: Fish catch per unit of effort	10% Increase	Fisheries apps tails design to collect data from fishermen and , project still need to consult with fisheries to provide the data	
	Indicator 2.2.6: Quantities of firewood used for drying of copra and other agricultural products	16,518 tonne	This indicator, project needs to consult with Vanuatu Primary Producers Authority and conduct a Focus Group discussion with community people.	
<p>Outcome 2.3 Capacities for generation of ecosystem goods and services are permanently restored in priority areas affected by land degradation</p> <p>Output 2.3.1: Ecosystem restoration programmes implemented in all three target localities</p>	Indicator 2.3.1: Area of degraded lands subject to restoration with direct project support, with resulting carbon benefits	800ha		
<p>Outcome 2.4 Local people in target localities have opportunities and capacities to perceive direct benefits from conservation and sustainable land management.</p> <p>Output 2.4.1: Ecotourism development plans formulated with local participation in each target locality, including carrying capacity studies</p> <p>Output 2.4.2: Ecotourism initiatives managed by local communities or with provision for generating</p>	Indicator 2.4.1: Numbers of local people receiving economic benefits from sustainable ecotourism	286 (175M//111W)	Nusumetu CCA	
	Indicator 2.4.2: Numbers of local people receiving economic benefits from sustainable NTFP extraction	286 (175M//111W)	We still need to consult with rest of Conservancies, due TC community people on the economic benefits.	
	Indicator 2.4.3: Numbers of local people receiving economic benefits from sustainable PES schemes	286 (175M//111W)	We only know datas from Nusumetu CCA.	

significant benefits for local communities, including provisions for environmental sustainability Output 2.4.3: Plans and norms agreed by local stakeholders in each target locality for sustainable extraction and marketing of NTFPs, incorporating results of ecological studies.				
Outcome 2.5 Strengthened protected area network in target localities, filling ecosystem coverage gaps and responding to overall R2R management plans Output 2.5.1: MPA and CCA agreements negotiated and signed by government and local communities, with corresponding mapping and demarcation Output 2.5.2. MPA and CCA agreements negotiated and signed by government and local communities, with corresponding mapping and demarcation Output 2.5.3. Buffer zones and corridors established between and around CCAs and MPAs Output 2.5.4. International designations of PAs Output 2.5.5. Management plans for each PA, harmonized with provisions of overall landscape management plans Output 2.5.6: Local PA management committees, functioning with capacities for adaptive management	Indicator 2.5.1: Increase in area coverage of PAs in target localities	5,000 ha	A project team visit to Aneityum on February 2023 to further detail the importance of Mystery Island PA and how it will link to the CCA management plan especially in terms of financial economic benefits. The project team also managed to map out whole area which is 8577ha Protect Area (PA)	
	Indicator 2.5.2: Management effectiveness ratings of existing and new PAs in target localities	Average of 85 PA effective Management	Currently, this year project has achieved four major CCA completed for registration and planning for official launching. It's possible to have a follow up later to see how effective the CCA committees are implementing the Management Plan	
	Indicator 2.5.3: Area of buffer zones and corridors around and between PAs in target localities	30,000 ha	The CCA area ready for launching this year, the CCA management plan detail very clearly buffer zone areas even clearly spotted on the zoning activity carry out with community members. Total buffer zone area is about 20,000 ha	
Outcome 2.6 Sustainable resource management and PA management supported by sustainable financing Output 2.6.1: PA-specific financial management and investment plans Output 2.6.2: Local-level financial mechanisms in support of PA management and landscape restoration	Indicator 2.6..1: Annual income for PAs and ecosystems management in target localities	20,000 USD year across the target localities	SO far, project needs to collect this information from PA committees responsible, once Management launched	
Outcome 3.1 Best practices and lessons learned are systematized and disseminated Output 3.1.1: Mechanisms for systematization, dissemination and awareness raising	Indicator 3..1.1: Numbers of decision-makers in key institutions reporting access to best practices and lessons learned as being useful	Directors of all key government stakeholder institutions (Departments)	Project support through the area Local conservation specialist has promoted the dissemination of information especially conducting awareness on CCA Management Plan. All four CCA area ready for launching, awareness has been conducted and preparation is underway ready for launching.	

Outcome 3.2 Decision making and planning are guided by information on trends in ecosystem conditions Output 3.2.1: Systems in provincial government offices for management of information on ecosystem conditions and trends, feeding data to local Organisations in target localities Output 3.2.2: Functioning Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) unit in the Department of Forestry	Indicator 3.2.1: Proportions of lease application determinations in target localities that take into account monitoring data on ecosystem conditions	100%	Currently, ELMA CCA lease has been sorted out with assistance from the government department of land and natural resources. As a result, 100% has been achieved.	
	Indicator 3.2.2: Proportions of EIAs in the target localities that take into account monitoring data on ecosystem conditions	100%	Project CCA registered by department of Environment all targeted for data collection and ecosystem monitoring and also according to the management, if a development is to take place, EIAs has to be conducted with approval from the CCA committee.	
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	Indicator 3.3.1: Effective M&E plan and report on project outcomes is published	100%	Currently, Monitoring tools and reporting have been developed, including an evaluation plan for the project and we looking forward to a mid-term review and terminal evaluation of the project	

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcomes of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR (max 400 words)

The GEF 5 project has supported and contributed to achieving government priorities in terms of sustainable resource management, community capacity building, and Food security and improve livelihood, support to Market and Commodity priority 1 of the Ministry of Agriculture corporate plan. The draft exit strategy of this project outlines the process on how respective government agencies operate and sustain the results component achieved under the project.

Project activities have been delayed for implementation due to major disasters such as two category 4 cyclones, TC JUDY & TC Kevin including other damages to infrastructure caused by flooding.

Currently, the project has contributed to support the early recovery phase in priority 1 areas that highly impacted from the twin cyclones by providing seeds to farmers and other farming tools.

Summary of the accomplishments and activities carried out during the life of the PIR-2023 project from July 2022 to February 2023.

- The project has targeted 2950 households, comprising 16,225 individuals, and has obtained Free Prior Informed Consent from various councils of chiefs.
- The project's human rights approach ensures that the indigenous people who make up 100% of the population in targeted areas are fully involved in decision-making processes.
- Several local conservation committees and village conservation committees have been constituted, and agroforestry nurseries have been set up to restore around 2500 hectares under agroforestry restoration with endemic trees and food crops.
- Project support and Launch National Invasive Species strategy and Action Plan (NISSAP), linked to have a IKI Invasive species.(Preliminary approved)
- In March 2023, Vanuatu was hit by two category 4 tropical cyclones, TC Judy & TC Harold. Three project sites (Efate, Tanna, Aneityum) were severely affected, and most of the agroforestry nurseries were destroyed. The project had to reassess its activities to aid in the emergency and recovery phases. The project supported the Food Security and Agriculture cluster in satellite assessments and the distribution of seeds, tools, and rotovators that are helping to restore the livelihoods of the project's beneficiary communities, and FISHFADS
- The project's GIS unit has carried out maps of vegetation cover and land use for all provinces of Vanuatu and the project sites. The project provided support to the SHEFA provincial government with rugged tablets and computers and training seminars in Kobo-toolbox for 78 officials (52 men and 26 women).
- The project is working on the proposal for the declaration of "Water taro gardens" as GIAHS, which will be sent to Rome in July. The management plans for three Community Conservation Areas (ELMA, Aneityum, and Tanna) have been completed, and on June 17, 2023, the management plan for Lake Letas was launched in the presence of the Minister of Climate Change and Environmental Protection.

- Overall, the project has been actively supporting the recovery efforts in Vanuatu after the devastating cyclones. The project's assistance in satellite assessments, distribution of resources, and training has been crucial in restoring the livelihoods of the affected communities. The project's efforts in promoting sustainable land use practices and conservation areas are also commendable.
- On 10 August, we received notification that the case study, "Innovative climate resilient indigenous food system combining Water Taro, shrimp, eel and water cress in Vanuatu – scaling up", submitted to SIF 2023, was selected among the top 10 and the project team will travel to Rome in October to present the case study. This two year study has been carried out under project financing in our GIAHS proposal.

The project has opened opportunities for scaling up through new vertical funds such GEF7-CBIT, GEF8, IKI Invasive Species, SIDS FLAGSHIP Initiative, Adaptation Fund Portfolio and other opportunities that have contributed to building the country's capacity.

Project team is giving full support to “Hand in hand Initiative” and GAFSP Initiative in Value chain.

[GCPVAN001GFF-PIR2023](#)

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.

	FY2023 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	<i>My rating is linked to the challenges facing the project on 5 islands due to natural disasters such as "La Niña", submarine eruptions and tropical cyclones. Despite these difficulties, the project has been able to move forward with the help of a good team spirit with 4 local conservation specialists on each island. However, unsafe air and sea transportation remains a major challenge. I would like to emphasize that natural disasters present a significant challenge to the success of the project, but progress can still be made with the right resources and staff.</i>
Budget Holder	S	S	<i>In spite of several challenges, project has managed to achieve its maximum goals and we expect that Integrated Sustainable Land and Coastal Management (GEF 5) project will deliver the intended outcomes and global goals in the remaining period.</i>
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸	S	S	<i>The project team has shown great flexibility and adaptability to changing conditions on the ground and has addressed demands without compromising the integrity of the project. Likewise, the project team has given support to this OFP in the generation of new projects that serve for Vanuatu, based on the lessons learned, to continue "scaling up" in other islands and provinces, as is the case of the proposal for the GEF8. The project has achieved key tangible results in this period.</i>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	S	S	<i>The project shows good institutional arrangements and strong technical leadership established in place for the fast tracking the implementation due to the time lost during</i>

¹⁵ **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

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

¹⁷ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

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

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

			<i>COVID 19 outbreak and other impediments. It is expected that project will achieve the desired milestones in the remaining life span.</i>
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	S	S	<i>This being the last year of project implementation, most of the project activities have been achieved. However, some of the progress made suffered a serious setback due to the natural disasters that struck the country. New activities, including the partnership with the tourism sector, have to be followed through and incorporated into the exit strategy to ensure its sustainability beyond the project period, potentially linking it with the GEF8 Project that focuses on the tourism sector. Quantifying/measuring the results achieved/progress made will assist in evaluation of the project's impacts, including incomes from livelihood interventions across sectors – tourism, NTFP, etc as well as areas of PA and/or buffer zones strengthened.</i>

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

This section is under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made to comply 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. Please indicate if new 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				

Moderate risk	The effects of climate change in Vanuatu are increasing and must be taken into consideration. The project activities have been greatly impacted by El Nino, underwater eruptions, and tropical cyclones. It is important to carefully assess and address these challenges to ensure the success of the project and the well-being of the local communities. It is important to work together to find sustainable solutions and adapt to the changing environment.			
---------------	---	--	--	--

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate:

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²⁰ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low Risk	As this project was drafted almost 10 years ago, the ESM plan was not drafted during the CEO Endorsement stage.

²⁰ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit (Esm-unit@fao.org) should be contacted. The project shall prepare or amend an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) or other ESS instruments and management tools based on the new risk classification (please refer to page 13 <https://www.fao.org/3/cb9870en/cb9870en.pdf>)

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.

N/A

6. Risks

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	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.

²¹ 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 ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
2	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 ²¹	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 ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
4	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</p>		<p>The project is supporting review of those policies which has impacts on environmental sustainability.</p>
---	---	---	--	--	--	---

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
				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 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</p>		<p>Agree with the justification given by PMU on mitigation actions.</p>
---	---	--	--	---	--	--

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
				<p>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 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. 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 ²¹	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):

FY2022 rating	FY2023 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Moderate	Substantial	Overall, it is clear that natural disasters pose a significant challenge to the project's success, but with the right resources and personnel, progress can still be made.

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>

Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize	<p>Yes, Drafted.</p> <p>The current project objectives are aligned to existing government department priorities within policies and annual business plan and budgeting. However, this current draft explain the sustainable mechanism approach and also recommendation for further development of the CCA through other support funds in the future.</p>
--	--

8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines²². Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories and 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	NA	NA	NA
Components and cost	NA	NA	NA
Institutional and implementation arrangements	NA	NA	NA
Financial management	NA	NA	NA
Implementation schedule	NA	NA	NA
Executing Entity	NA	NA	NA
Executing Entity Category	NA	NA	NA
Minor project objective change	NA	NA	NA
Safeguards	NA	NA	NA
Risk analysis	NA	NA	NA
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	NA	NA	NA
Co-financing	NA	NA	NA
Location of project activity	NA	NA	NA
Other minor project amendment (define)	NA	NA	NA

²² 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	Type of partnership	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
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 Questionnaire: KoBoToolbox is a suite of tools for field data collection for use in challenging environments . This software is free and open source. Most of its users are people working in humanitarian crises, as well as aid professionals and researchers working in developing countries.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	The project has differentiated, speaking of women and girls creating inclusive awareness The project has worked hard on 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):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Yes	The project is making significant contributions to achieving gender equality and closing gender gaps in access to and control of natural resources. Specific areas where the project is anticipated to have an impact include outcomes related to gender equality. The project is promoting gender equality and reducing gender gaps, the project aims to create a more equitable and sustainable society.
b) improving women's participation and decision making		The project is making significant contributions to achieving gender equality and closing gender gaps in access to and control of decision making. Specific areas where the project is anticipated to have an impact include outcomes related to gender equality. The project is promoting gender equality and reducing gender gaps, the project aims to create a more equitable and sustainable society.
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women		Employment and entrepreneurship opportunities: Projects that focus on creating job opportunities or supporting women-owned businesses can help to promote economic empowerment and reduce gender-based inequalities in the workforce. Education and training: Projects that provide education and training opportunities for women can help to improve their skills, knowledge, and

2023 Project Implementation Report

		<p>capacity to participate in various sectors of the economy.</p> <p>Health and well-being: Projects that focus on improving access to healthcare, nutrition, and other basic needs can help to improve the overall health and well-being of women, which can in turn contribute to their economic</p> <p>Project supplies seeds to mama's market</p>
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	yes	1650 people, 990 men, and 660 women
Staff with gender expertise	yes	CTA and recruiting a Gender specialist
Any other good practices on gender	Yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Encourage women's participation in decision-making processes, both at the community and household levels. 2. Provide equal access to education and training opportunities for both men and women. 3. Promote women's economic empowerment through entrepreneurship programs and access to credit. 4. Raise awareness about gender-based violence and provide support services for survivors. 5. Encourage men to become allies in promoting gender equality and challenging harmful gender norms. 6. Ensure that public spaces are safe and accessible for women and girls.

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.	One of the knowledge management approach is the Integrated farming system
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year .	Draft
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.	GCPVAN001GFF-PIR2023
Please provide links to related website, social media account	NA
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	NA
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details	Ricardo.dominguezllosa@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.

Yes, this project 100% involve community beneficiaries as the target audience. When setting up the CCA management plan,

- Project team must provide room for community engagement and knowledge sharing (Free Prior informed consent) from the initial stages of development to the final stages and launching of management plan.
- The project allows 100% community ownership on the activities implemented
- It's the community people that will benefit directly or indirectly from the CCA management plan through Economic financial return also the management and administration of the management plan
- It's still the indigenous people to decide members within the CCA committee to take up the roles

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²³	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ²⁴	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023	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	700,000		1,175,000
GEF Agency	FAO	(in-kind)	600, 000	600,000		150,000
Bilateral	ACIAR ²⁵	(grant)	571, 516	571,516		571,516
Civil Society Organization	VANGO ²⁶ ((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	20,000		20,000
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	7,000,000		10,000,000

²³Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

²⁴Grant, Loan, Equity Investment, Guarantee, In-Kind, Public Investment, Other (please refer to the *Guidelines on co-financing* for definitions)

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_FI_GN_01_Cofinancing_Guidelines_2018.pdf

²⁵ Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research

²⁶ Vanuatu Association of Non-Governmental Organisations.

National Government	Vanuatu Government	(grant)	500 ,000	500,000		500,000
Other	New York Botanical Garden	(grant)	414, 445	400,000		414,445
Total			15,290,558	11,501,113		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?

NA

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 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 will 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

Annex 2.

GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at

least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap](#) or [GeoNames](#) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#)

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location & Activity Description

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate.