



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Asia and the Pacific
Country (ies):	Vanuatu
Project Title:	Integrated Sustainable Land and Coastal Management
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/VAN/001/GFF (entity number: 622863)
GEF ID:	5397
GEF Focal Area(s):	<i>Biodiversity (BD-1)</i> – Improve sustainability of protected area systems <i>Land Degradation (LD-3)</i> - Integrated Landscapes: Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape <i>Climate Change Mitigation (CCM-5)</i> – Promote conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks through sustainable management of land use, land use change, and forestry <i>International Waters (IW-3)</i> - <i>Sustainable Forest Management (SFM-1)</i> - Reduce pressures on forest resources and generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services <i>Sustainable Forest Management (SFM-2)</i>
Project Executing Partners:	Ministries of Climate Change; Lands and Natural Resources; Agriculture, Quarantine, Forestry and Fisheries, Trade and Tourism and SHEFA Provincial Government
Project Duration:	5 years

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	20 September 2016
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	13 March 2017
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	15 September 2021
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	N/A
Actual Implementation End Date³:	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	4,605,680
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	15,290,558
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	246,148
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	1,195,000

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	July 2018
Mid-term Review or Evaluation	September 2020

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

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

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

⁵ Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

Date planned (if applicable):	
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	December 2021
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	No

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	MS	
Overall implementation progress rating:	MU	
Overall risk rating:	M	

Status

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

⁶ Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Mr. Hanington Tamla	Hanington.Tamla@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Mr. Aru Mathias	Aru.Mathias@fao.org
Budget Holder	Ms. Eriko Hibi	Eriko.Hibi@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Yurie Naito	Yurie.naito@fao.org

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

Outcomes	Indicators	Start of Project Baseline	Mid-term project Target	End of Project Target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating
Objective: To test and implement sustainable and integrated management of forest, land and marine resources to achieve effective ridge-to-reef (R2R) conservation in selected priority watersheds in Vanuatu						
Component 1: Improving the enabling environment for integrated sustainable land and coastal management.						
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	Discussions and ToR has been developed for visitor carrying capacity in CCAs awaiting finalization of documents and contract – work in progress	MS
	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 without specific definitions or commitments	Proposals under discussion of specific commitments for promoting compatibility between agricultural development and maintenance of ecosystem goods and services	Agriculture, livestock, forestry and planning policy documents include specific commitments for promoting compatibility between agricultural development and maintenance of ecosystem goods and services	A Department of Agriculture LoA on development of Policy Monitoring and Evaluation Framework has been approved. Activities under implementation A Livestock LoA on capacity building on Livestock Act has been approved. LoA under implementation	S
	Indicator 1.1.3: Degree of commitment in policy	Existing Fisheries and Environment policies make generalized references, but lack a vision of inter-	Proposals under discussion of specific commitments for protection of coastal and marine ecosystems through ICZM	Fisheries and planning policy documents include specific commitments for protection of coastal and marine	Discussion and an LoA has been developed by the	MS

	instruments for protection of coastal and marine ecosystems through ICZM approaches	sector integration	approaches	ecosystems through ICZM approaches	Department of Environment – work in progress	
	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					
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	On-going discussion with the Ministry of Environment and other relevant Ministries like the Ministry of Tourism – linked to the carrying capacity study – work in progress	MS
	Indicator 1.2.2: Percentage of planning determinations nationwide that specifically address landscape-wide environmental and social dynamics	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	Activity hasn't been initiated yet	
	Output 1.2.1: Improved procedures for approving lease applications Output 1.2.2: Improved capacities and regulatory instruments for consideration of landscape-wide (ridge to reef) considerations into EIAs and determinations Output 1.2.2: Land use planning guidelines providing for consideration of landscape-wide (ridge to reef) environmental and social processes					

1.3: Increased financial resources channelled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation and PA management	Indicator 1.3.1: Amount of financial resources channelled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation and PA management	No reliable figures available, but assumed to be negligible	\$75,000/year channelled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation and PA management by project end	\$150,000/year channelled from the tourism sector to environmental conservation and PA management by project end ⁷	Meetings have been held with the Ministry of tourism senior management to agree on core tourism activities	MS
Output 1.3.1: Corporate social and environmental responsibility commitments from the cruise industry						
Component 2: Integrated ridge to reef management in priority island localities						
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		100,000ha in target localities covered by integrated landscape/ seascape management plans developed and implemented by local landowners	Activity hasn't been initiated yet.	MS
	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.	Activity hasn't been initiated yet	

⁷ 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.

	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 mid-term 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	Activity hasn't been initiated yet																									
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																														
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	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: <table><tr><th>Locality</th><th>ha</th></tr><tr><td>SW Aneityum</td><td>62</td></tr><tr><td>Middle Bush Tanna</td><td>1,250</td></tr><tr><td>N. Efate</td><td>1,250</td></tr><tr><td>S. Pentecost</td><td>750</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>3,312</td></tr></table>	Locality	ha	SW Aneityum	62	Middle Bush Tanna	1,250	N. Efate	1,250	S. Pentecost	750	Total	3,312	Area with improved farming practices: <table><tr><th>Locality</th><th>ha⁸</th></tr><tr><td>SW Aneityum</td><td>125</td></tr><tr><td>Middle Bush Tanna</td><td>2,500</td></tr><tr><td>N. Efate</td><td>2,500</td></tr><tr><td>S. Pentecost</td><td>1,500</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>6,625</td></tr></table>	Locality	ha ⁸	SW Aneityum	125	Middle Bush Tanna	2,500	N. Efate	2,500	S. Pentecost	1,500	Total	6,625	Activity hasn't been initiated yet	MS
	Locality	ha																												
SW Aneityum	62																													
Middle Bush Tanna	1,250																													
N. Efate	1,250																													
S. Pentecost	750																													
Total	3,312																													
Locality	ha ⁸																													
SW Aneityum	125																													
Middle Bush Tanna	2,500																													
N. Efate	2,500																													
S. Pentecost	1,500																													
Total	6,625																													
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: <table><tr><th>Locality</th><th>ha</th></tr><tr><td>SW Aneityum</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>Middle Bush Tanna</td><td>25</td></tr><tr><td>N. Efate</td><td>250</td></tr><tr><td>S. Pentecost</td><td>10</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>300</td></tr></table>	Locality	ha	SW Aneityum	15	Middle Bush Tanna	25	N. Efate	250	S. Pentecost	10	Total	300	Area with improved ranching practices: <table><tr><th>Locality</th><th>ha</th></tr><tr><td>SW Aneityum</td><td>30</td></tr><tr><td>Middle Bush Tanna</td><td>50</td></tr><tr><td>N. Efate</td><td>500</td></tr><tr><td>S. Pentecost</td><td>20</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>600</td></tr></table>	Locality	ha	SW Aneityum	30	Middle Bush Tanna	50	N. Efate	500	S. Pentecost	20	Total	600	Activity hasn't been initiated yet		
Locality	ha																													
SW Aneityum	15																													
Middle Bush Tanna	25																													
N. Efate	250																													
S. Pentecost	10																													
Total	300																													
Locality	ha																													
SW Aneityum	30																													
Middle Bush Tanna	50																													
N. Efate	500																													
S. Pentecost	20																													
Total	600																													

⁸ Assumes 0.5ha/family with sustainable hillside farming practices

Indicator 2.2.3: Increase in area (ha) in target localities over which community-based fisheries regulations are effectively applied	N/A	<table><tr><th>Locality</th><th>ha</th></tr><tr><td>SW Aneityum</td><td>100</td></tr><tr><td>Middle Bush Tanna</td><td>50</td></tr><tr><td>N. Efate</td><td>300</td></tr><tr><td>S. Pentecost</td><td>50</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>500</td></tr></table>	Locality	ha	SW Aneityum	100	Middle Bush Tanna	50	N. Efate	300	S. Pentecost	50	Total	500	<table><tr><th>Locality</th><th>ha</th></tr><tr><td>SW Aneityum</td><td>100</td></tr><tr><td>Middle Bush Tanna</td><td>50</td></tr><tr><td>N. Efate</td><td>300</td></tr><tr><td>S. Pentecost</td><td>50</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>500</td></tr></table>	Locality	ha	SW Aneityum	100	Middle Bush Tanna	50	N. Efate	300	S. Pentecost	50	Total	500	Activity hasn't been initiated yet												
		Locality	ha																																					
		SW Aneityum	100																																					
		Middle Bush Tanna	50																																					
		N. Efate	300																																					
S. Pentecost	50																																							
Total	500																																							
Locality	ha																																							
SW Aneityum	100																																							
Middle Bush Tanna	50																																							
N. Efate	300																																							
S. Pentecost	50																																							
Total	500																																							
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)	Activity hasn't been initiated yet																																				
Indicator 2.2.5: Fish catch per unit of effort	To be determined at project start	5% increase	10% increase	Activity hasn't been initiated yet																																				
Indicator 2.2.6: Quantities of firewood used for drying of copra and other agricultural products	Annual consumption (t):		Annual consumption (t):		Activity hasn't been initiated yet																																			
	<table><tr><th>Locality⁹</th><th>t</th></tr><tr><td>SW Aneityum</td><td>361</td></tr><tr><td>Middle Bush Tanna</td><td>7,229</td></tr><tr><td>N. Efate</td><td>7,229</td></tr><tr><td>S. Pentecost</td><td>4,337</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>19,156</td></tr></table>	Locality ⁹	t	SW Aneityum		361	Middle Bush Tanna	7,229	N. Efate	7,229	S. Pentecost	4,337		19,156	<table><tr><th>Locality</th><th>t</th></tr><tr><td>SW Aneityum</td><td>343</td></tr><tr><td>Middle Bush Tanna</td><td>6,867</td></tr><tr><td>N. Efate</td><td>6,506</td></tr><tr><td>S. Pentecost</td><td>4,120</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>17,836</td></tr></table>	Locality	t	SW Aneityum	343	Middle Bush Tanna	6,867	N. Efate	6,506	S. Pentecost	4,120		17,836	<table><tr><th>Locality¹⁰</th><th>t</th></tr><tr><td>SW Aneityum</td><td>325</td></tr><tr><td>Middle Bush Tanna</td><td>6,506</td></tr><tr><td>N. Efate</td><td>5,783</td></tr><tr><td>S. Pentecost</td><td>3,904</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>16,518</td></tr></table>	Locality ¹⁰	t	SW Aneityum	325	Middle Bush Tanna	6,506	N. Efate	5,783	S. Pentecost	3,904		16,518
	Locality ⁹	t																																						
	SW Aneityum	361																																						
	Middle Bush Tanna	7,229																																						
	N. Efate	7,229																																						
	S. Pentecost	4,337																																						
	19,156																																							
Locality	t																																							
SW Aneityum	343																																							
Middle Bush Tanna	6,867																																							
N. Efate	6,506																																							
S. Pentecost	4,120																																							
	17,836																																							
Locality ¹⁰	t																																							
SW Aneityum	325																																							
Middle Bush Tanna	6,506																																							
N. Efate	5,783																																							
S. Pentecost	3,904																																							
	16,518																																							
			Overall reduction in year 5 = 2,638t; total reduction over 5 years = 7,914t ¹¹ : total avoided emissions =																																					

⁹ Total fuelwood consumption in Vanuatu in 2007 = 937,203t. Assumed 40% increase to present day gives 1,312,084t, of which 30% (393,625t) is estimated to be for drying of agricultural crops. The target localities contain an estimated 0.09%, 1.84%, 1.84% and 1.10% respectively of the national population; adjusting fuelwood consumption by the same proportions gives an estimated fuelwood consumption of 361, 7,229, 7,229 and 4,337t respectively per locality.

¹⁰ The introduction of solar driers is expected to reduce consumption of fuelwood for drying of agricultural crops by 10, 10, 20 and 10% respectively in the target localities.

¹¹ 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).

					517tCO _{2eq}			
	Output 2.2.1: Extension modules for agriculture, fisheries, livestock and forestry including integrated R2R concepts Output 2.2.2: Field schools and mechanisms for participatory learning and experimentation in target localities Output 2.2.3: Pilot solar driers for copra and other agricultural products							
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		ha				
			SW Aneityum	100		SW Aneityum	200	
			Middle Bush Tanna	100		Middle Bush Tanna	200	
			N. Efate	100		N. Efate	200	
			S. Pentecost	100		S. Pentecost	200	
			Total	400		Total	800	
			With resulting carbon benefit from capture of 153,329tCO _{2eq} .					
Output 2.3.1: Ecosystem restoration programmes implemented in all three target localities								
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		People	Total US\$			
			SW Aneityum	250	45,000	SW Aneityum	500	90,000
			Middle Bush Tanna	50	30,000	Middle Bush Tanna	100	60,000
			N. Efate	300	45,000	N. Efate	600	90,000
			S. Pentecost	50	15,000	S. Pentecost	100	30,000
			Total	650	150,000	Total	1,300	300,000
	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		People	Total US\$			
			SW Aneityum	40	9,750	SW Aneityum	80	19,500
			Middle Bush Tanna	30	6,500	Middle Bush Tanna	60	13,000
			N. Efate	25	45,000	N. Efate	50	90,000
			S. Pentecost	20	15,000	S. Pentecost	40	30,000
			Total	115	32,500	Total	230	65,000
Indicator 2.4.3:	0		People	Total		People	Total	Activity hasn't been done yet

	Numbers of local people receiving economic benefits from sustainable PES schemes				US\$			US\$	been done yet		
			SW Aneityum	15	7,500		SW Aneityum	30			15,000
			Middle Bush Tanna	15	5,000		Middle Bush Tanna	30			10,000
			N. Efate	20	7,500		N. Efate	40			15,000
			S. Pentecost	10	2,500		S. Pentecost	20			5,000
			Total	60	22,500		Total	120			45,000
Output 2.4.1: Ecotourism development plans formulated with local participation in each target locality, including carrying capacity studies											
Output 2.4.2: Ecotourism initiatives managed by local communities or with provision for generating 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.											
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 areas:		Proposed additional areas:		Proposed additional areas:		Activity hasn't been done yet	MS		
		Locality	ha	Locality	ha	Locality	ha				
		SW Aneityum	10	SW Aneityum	600	SW Aneityum	2,600				
		Middle Bush Tanna	10	Middle Bush Tanna	400	Middle Bush Tanna	1,000				
		N. Efate	3,715	N. Efate	600	N. Efate	600				
		S. Pentecost	4,277	S. Pentecost	800	S. Pentecost	800				
		Gaua	5,826								
		Total:	13,838	Total:	2,400	Total:	5,000				
	Indicator 2.5.2: Management effectiveness ratings of existing and new PAs in target localities	Mystery Island	52	Mystery Island	56	Mystery Island	85	Activity hasn't been done yet			
		Central Aneityum (proposed)	1	Central Aneityum (proposed)	56	Central Aneityum (proposed)	85				
		SE Mystery Island MPA (proposed)	1	SE Mystery Island MPA (proposed)	56	SE Mystery Island MPA (proposed)	85				
		Numusetu	37	Numusetu	56	Numusetu	85				
		Proposed Tanna CCA	0	Proposed Tanna CCA	56	Proposed Tanna CCA	85				
		Proposed Tanna MPA	0	Proposed Tanna MPA	56	Proposed Tanna MPA	85				
		ELMA	24	ELMA	56	ELMA	85				
		Tanolu Marine	23	JICA Lelepa	56	Tanolu Marine CCAs	85				
				Lelepa Island Tours	56	JICA Lelepa	85				

		CCAs		New Efate CCA	56	Lelepa Island Tours	85		
		JICA Lelepa	36	Bay Homo CCA	56	New Efate CCA	85		
		Lelepa Island Tours	38	Proposed Pentecost CCA	56	Bay Homo CCA	85		
		Proposed Efate CCA	0	Lake Letas CCA	56	Proposed Pentecost CCA	85		
		Bay Homo CCA	24	Average	56	Lake Letas CCA	85		
		Proposed Pentecost CCA	0			Average	85		
		Lake Letas CCA	21						
		Average	18.4						
	Indicator 2.5.3: Area of buffer zones and corridors around and between PAs in target localities	0ha	15,000ha	30,000ha	Activity hasn't been done yet				
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									
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 per year across the target localities	\$20,000 year across the target localities	Activity hasn't been done yet	MS			
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									
Component 3: Knowledge management									
3.1 Best practices and lessons	Indicator 3.1.1: Numbers of decision-makers	N/A		Directors of all key Government stakeholder institutions (departments)	Activity hasn't been done yet	MS			

learned are systematized and disseminated	in key institutions reporting access to best practices and lessons learned as being useful					
Output 3.1.1: Mechanisms for systematisation, dissemination and awareness raising						
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%	This study has been undertaken by the Government through World Bank funding	HS
	Indicator 3.2.2: Proportions of EIAs in the target localities that take into account monitoring data on ecosystem conditions	0	50%	100%	Activity hasn't been done yet	
	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					
3.3 Project management is subject to effective M&E that feeds back into adaptive management decisions.	Indicator 3.3.1:	N/A	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	Activity hasn't been done yet	MS
	Outputs: 3.3.1 Functioning project M&E system					

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹²

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1: Improving the enabling environment for integrated sustainable land and coastal management	The activities of component 1 that have not been implemented will be included in the next work plan (July 2019 – June 2020)	Project Steering Committee	By June 2020
Outcome 2: Integrated ridge to reef management in priority island localities	Some activities will be of component 2 will be included in the next work plan (July 2019 – June 2020) while others will be included in future work plans	Project Steering Committee	By June 2020, June 2021 Dec 2021
Outcome 3: Knowledge Management	Some activities will be of component 2 will be included in the next work plan (July 2019 – June 2020) while others will be included in future work plans	Project Steering Committee	By June 2020, June 2021 and Dec 2021

¹² To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹³	Expected completion date ¹⁴	Achievements at each PIR ¹⁵					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁶ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1.1: Policy proposals for channeling tourism income to environmental management	Q2 Y5	Terms of reference for the expert to carry out the policy analysis and preparation work drafted	Generation of study/guidance documents analyzing potential for cruise-ship sector & community-based ecotourism to contribute to environmental management and conservation Provision of advisory support for incorporation of cruise sector contribution to eco-tourism				30%	The Government is currently undertaking a cruise ship sector study through MFAT funding, directed at this output.

¹³ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

¹⁴ As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹⁵ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

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

			Support to the Ministry of Tourism in the drafting of policy documents				100%	Tourism Policy has been developed through Vanuatu Government and New Zealand support
Output 1.1.2: Policy proposals for promoting compatibility between agricultural development and maintenance of ecosystem goods and services	Y5	Terms of reference for the expert to carry out the policy analysis and preparation work drafted	Progress halted				0%	

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	Y5	Not started	Not started				0%	
Output 1.2.1. Improved procedures for approving lease applications	Y5	Action plan developed for reviewing the current lease application, including draft of the terms of reference for the expert to be recruited to support the work	Review of current lease approval criteria and their implications				50%	This has been completed through Government and World Bank support
Output 1.2.2. Improved capacities and regulatory instruments for consideration of landscape-wide (ridge to reef) considerations into EIA reports	Y5	Not started	Not started				0%	

and determinations								
Output 1.2.3. Land use planning guidelines providing for consideration of landscape-wide (ridge to reef) biological and social processes	Y5	Not started	Not started				0%	
Output 1.3.1: Corporate social and environmental responsibility commitments from the cruise industry	Y5	Not started	Generation of study/guidance documents				40%	A Cruise Ship Sector study is currently undertaken by the Government through MFAT will also address this output.

Output 2.1.1: Multi-stakeholder mechanisms for landscape planning, decision-making and conflict management covering all three target localities	Y5	Not started	Not started				0%	
Output 2.1.2: Norms for resource management practices developed and agreed among stakeholder groups covering target localities	Y5	Not started	Not started				0%	

Output 2.1.3: Integrated landscape/se ascape management plans developed and implemented by local landowners over 100,000 hectares	Y5	Not started	Not started				0%	
Output 2.2.1. Extension modules for sustainable production models incorporating R2R concepts	Y5	Not started	Not started				0%	
Output 2.2.2. Field schools and mechanisms for participatory	Y5	Not started	Not started				0%	

learning and experimentat ion in target localities								
Output 2.2.3 Pilot solar driers for copra and other agricultural products	Y3	Not started	Not started				0%	
Output 2.3.1: Ecosystem restoration programmes implemented in all three target localities	Y5	Not started	Not started				0%	
Output 2.4.1: Ecotourism development plans formulated with local participation in each target locality, including carrying capacity studies.	Y5	Not started	Not started				0%	A carrying capacity ToR has been developed and submitted for internal approval.

Output 2.4.2: Ecotourism initiatives managed by local communities or with provision for generating significant benefits for local communities, including provisions for environmental sustainability	Y5	Not started	Not started				0%	
Output 2.4.3: Plans and norms agreed by local stakeholders in each target locality for sustainable extraction	Y5	Not started	Not started				0%	

and marketing of NTFPs, incorporating results of ecological studies								
Output 2.5.1: Provincial and local PA prioritization plans	Y3	Not started	Not started				0%	
Output 2.5.2. MPA and CCA agreements negotiated and signed by government and local communities, with corresponding mapping and demarcation	Y4	Not started	Not started				0%	
Output 2.5.3. Buffer zones and corridors established	Y3	Not started	Not started				0%	

between and around CCAs and MPAs								
Output 2.5.4: International designations of PAs	Y3	Not started	Not started				0%	
Output 2.5.5: Management plans for each PA, harmonized with provisions of overall landscape management plans	Y4	Not started	No started				0%	
Output 2.5.6: Local PA management committees, functioning with capacities for adaptive management	Y5	Not started	Not started				0%	
Output 2.6.1: PA-specific financial management and investment plans	Y3	Not started	Not started				0%	Yet to be done

Output 2.6.2: Local-level financial mechanisms in support of PA management and landscape restoration	Y5	Not started	Not started				0%	
Output 3.1.1: Mechanisms for systematization, dissemination and awareness raising	Y5	Not started	Not started				0%	

Output 3.2.1: Systems in provincial government offices for management of information on ecosystem conditions and trends, feeding data to local organizations in target localities	Y3	Not started	Not started				0%	
Output 3.2.2: Functioning Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) unit in the Department of Forestry	Y4	Not started	Not started				0%	

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating¹⁷	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating¹⁸	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	MS	MU	CTA has been on duty from September 1 to familiarize himself with the project team and the FAO Office in Vanuatu. The documents and activities carried out to date by the project team are being reviewed as well as the Minutes meeting from Steering's Committees, (the last one maintained on August 30, 2019). The Annual Work Plan and the budget must be reviewed. The TA will participate in a training, supported by the LTO and AFAOR with the LCOs and government technicians, on the FAO and GEF procedures in the week of September 22-27, 2019.
Budget Holder	MS	MU	The project has faced initial delays including the delay of CTA recruitment. Despite these, the project did make important progress under the outcome relating to policies and enabling environment. Due to the logistical and administrative constraints, the absence of the CTA on the ground was detrimental. Yet now that the CTA will be on board in September 2019, some of the initial constraints should be addressed more effectively and an increased speed of implementation is anticipated in the next quarters.

¹⁷ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet.

Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁸ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	MS	MS	The Project is took some time to start, at present the CTA is still absent but will take-up his post in September 2019. However, with assistance from SAP colleagues and the LTO, several core meetings and consultations have been undertaken with key partner Ministries and a number of LoAs have been approved and now under implementation. A real challenge and issue the training of the project team in Vanuatu to properly understand the Project document especially the outputs and activities and FAO procedures. The LTO spend same quality time in guiding and enhancing understanding, skills and knowledge of the NPC and other project team members. As of now, most of the drafting (of LoAs, ToRs), plans and budget are done by the team and there is marked improvement. With the improved skills and knowledge, it is anticipated that the implementation will speed up and most of the work now reported as work in progress will be advanced and completed. The next PIR reporting will see more activities done, outputs achieved and more improvement.
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MS	MS	Unfortunately, the project has been suffering from a slow start-up. Once the CTA is on board, it is important to plan accordingly how to catch up some of the lags to ensure timely delivery of the project activities/outputs. HQ team including myself will be available to provide necessary support.

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

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation

Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):

Max 200 words:

The progress with implementation of project activities was generally slow. Actually, three Letters of Agreement that went through were only signed last month and first payment for those LoAs were made this month, and no activities were implemented on the ground as yet. A challenge and issue was for the project team and the core partners to clearly understand the project outputs and activities and FAO procedures. As of now, the situation has improved, there is now better coordination between SAP, project team and partners.

Activities of the project began with recruitment of the project personnel. The National Project Coordinator and National Project Officer were the first to be recruited in August and October 2018. The Local Conservation Officers (Field Officers) were in February 2019. The Chief Technical Officer has been recruited but will only join the project in September 2019.

A few Letters of Agreements and Terms of references are on their way to be finalized and approved for implementation. Once these documents are cleared and approved, more activities is expected in the coming months before the end of the year.

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

Max 200 words:

The main challenge is that the executing partners are not familiar with the process and formulation of a Letter of Agreement. At present all TOR and LoAs are drafted by the project team and the LTO after discussion and consultations with the partners. The issue is, submitted proposals often need clarity, further information for justification and alignment with project objectives. However, after some extended discussions, some improvements were made. A training is being planned for the project team and core partner organisations so that they can be more skilled and comfortable with drafting of LoAs, ToRs as required by FAO.

The other main challenge is the absence of the CTA. The post has been advertised but eligible candidates were either unavailable or have secured other jobs during the recruitment process. Absence of the CTA in the first year has affected progress, particularly due to absence of technical guidance in the implementation of the project. This challenge will be eliminated when the CTA joins the project team in September

3. Risks

Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.

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

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²⁰ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
M	The moderate risk rating was provided due to the inclusion of indigenous people in the project. It should be noted that there are no separate indigenous groups in the country whose needs require to be given special consideration. Almost 100 percent of the population are Melanesian ni-Vanuatu, and can be considered indigenous. The project will still adopt Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) approach. The project is designed to accommodate workshops on multi-stakeholder mechanisms for landscape planning, decision-making and conflict management. The local communities will be included in all consultations and decision-making processes regarding the conservation and resource management practices to be implemented under the project.

Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.

Risk ratings

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

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

	Risk	Risk rating ²¹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²²	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Climate change may exceed the coping ranges of the proposed resource management strategies.	Medium	The project will focus especially on developing capacities for the formulation of natural resource management strategies among stakeholders at all levels, through the participatory approaches to technology generation and transfer proposed under Component 2, and the capacities for knowledge management and response to be promoted under Component 3. This will maximize the ability of the stakeholders to adapt to currently unforeseen future climatic extremes, rather than adhering to predetermined and rigid solutions designed for a limited range of conditions.	Project team has had several meetings and consultations with partner Organisations on developing strategies.	A familiarization mission by senior staff of key partner agencies is underway to assess and update status of their activities in the PA sites and in the wider landscape. A prime focus will be on the field activities, practice and existing skills of field officers in managing climate change impacts etc.

²¹ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²² If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

	Risk	Risk rating ²¹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²²	Notes from the Project Task Force
2	Leakage of project threats resulting from site-specific actions (for example unsustainable intensification of agriculture, increased logging in non-project areas) issues	Low	<p>There is a certain degree of unavoidable risk of leakage given that the target localities will not cover the entirety of the islands in question. The net outcomes in terms of environmental impacts will, however be less than in the without-project scenario, given that the project's actions will not be limited to the target localities themselves. They will also include the strengthening of institutional capacities at national and provincial levels for land use planning, environmental assessment and PA prioritisation, which will be applied beyond the project areas themselves; in addition, the policy work foreseen under Outcome 1.1 will have nationwide benefits in terms of the avoidance of the potential impacts of sector development. It is furthermore expected that the innovative models of multi-stakeholder planning and governance promoted in the target localities will be replicated elsewhere on the target islands and beyond, thereby progressively reducing the extent of the areas in which leakage might occur. The involvement in the processes of the councils of chiefs of each of the target islands will have significant implications in terms of island-wide replication of the model.</p>	The project team led by the Local Conservation Officers (LCOs) in the PA sites are carrying out awareness in the Provinces and close consultation with key Government Ministries.	Agreement between project implementing partners in launching joint technical missions to PA sites, ensure coordination and sharing of information on past and current activities.

	Risk	Risk rating ²¹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²²	Notes from the Project Task Force
Social and Institutional Risks					

	Risk	Risk rating ²¹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²²	Notes from the Project Task Force
3	Resistance among key actors to taking or modifying actions in support of environmental sustainability	Medium	<p>Many policy documents already contain strong commitments to environmental sustainability, but there is still a risk of some individual sector policies (e.g. livestock and tourism) being pursued at the expense of environmental considerations. The project's actions in relation to policy influence will recognize the valid motivations of the Government in stimulating the target sectors, as motors of national economic growth: rather than proposing to control their expansion per se, it will therefore focus on promoting the incorporation of considerations of environmental sustainability into sector growth. This will, in the medium and long terms, 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 will help to increase their resilience to climatic shocks; it will also help to ensure that the growth of individual sectors does not occur 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 to optimize the outcomes of these sectors in terms of their impacts on biodiversity and other global environmental values.</p>	<p>Project team attending Government and Ministry Meetings and vice versa.</p> <p>This is to improve communication, understanding of current development activities and resolving any current or upcoming issues and challenges between the project and the Government.</p>	Several Meetings have been conducted to update project team on current on-going activities in the different sectors, including identified gaps, needs and funding requirement needed.

	Risk	Risk rating ²¹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²²	Notes from the Project Task Force
4	Resistance among local communities to collaborating in landscape planning, PA management, sustainable resource management and	Low	The project will adopt a highly participatory and culturally-sensitive approach to raising awareness among community members of the social implications of resource management decisions, in order to maximize their motivation for collaboration in their own interests. Furthermore, the processes of inter-community analysis and negotiated planning will be subject to prior consultation and consent by the national and island-specific councils of chiefs, in order to ensure their credibility among local community members.	On-going awareness meetings in the Provinces and the PA sites	There is strong interest and commitment by communities.
Economic Risks					

	Risk	Risk rating ²¹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²²	Notes from the Project Task Force
5	Variations in availability of funding for PA management and environmental management	Low	<p>The financing strategy is dependent on stability or growth in the levels of tourism activity, which is intended to be one of the main sources of income at local and national levels. Projections for tourism growth are, however, very positive. In order to protect against the risks of short-term downturns in income (for example following hurricanes), it is proposed that the resulting fund will be managed cautiously, building up a sufficient reserve to allow it to weather such periods. Furthermore, the nature of Vanuatu's small community-managed PAs means that such possible funding shortfalls would have limited implications for their management and exposure to threats in the short term, although over a longer term they would limit opportunities to implement proposed investments in infrastructure and management/planning mechanisms.</p>	Not much is done yet as project is starting to roll out activities.	Government is interested in conservation and protected area management especially in safe guarding the resources and livelihood of local communities.

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
---------------	---------------	--

Low	Low	Feedback from meetings and consultations with Government, partners and local communities is encouraging. For example, in Efate Protected Area (ELMA), the Paramount Chiefs and the Efate Council of Chiefs (Vaturisu) are behind the Protected Area and a decree is made to safe guard the biodiversity, forests and overall different ecosystems on Efate (terrestrial and marine).
-----	-----	--

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²³

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

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

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

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

²³ Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

5. Gender Mainstreaming

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

Was a gender analysis undertaken or an equivalent socio-economic assessment? Please briefly indicate the gender differences.

Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data? How is the project tracking gender impacts and results?

Does the project staff have gender expertise?

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

- closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;
- improving women's participation and decision making; and or
- generating socio-economic benefits or services for women.

The field activities have just began; however, one of the proposed activities is to focus on ensuring gender mainstreaming in all of the project activities.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

If applies, 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

As mentioned in the project document, 'There are no separate indigenous groups in the country whose needs require to be given special consideration'. On the other hand, almost 100 percent of the population are Melanesian ni-Vanuatu, and can be considered indigenous. For this reason, the FAO's Environmental and Social Management Guideline classifies the project to be of medium risk, and requires Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) to be incorporated in the project. The main aim of the project is to assist the communities and land indigenous land and resource owners to protect and manage their forest and coastal resources. Since indigenous peoples own land and coastal resources, it is a national requirement that they are consulted on all works relating to management of their resources. The project is designed to accommodate workshops on multi-stakeholder mechanisms for landscape planning, decision-making and conflict management.

7. Stakeholders Engagement

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

If your project had a stakeholder engagement plan, specify whether any new stakeholders have been identified/engaged:

If a stakeholder engagement plan was not requested for your project at CEO endorsement stage, please

- list all stakeholders engaged in the project;
- briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.

The stakeholders of the project can be categorised into three groups. The first group are the executing stakeholders of the project. This group of stakeholders is the one that FAO will be working with to lead delivery of the project outcomes. The stakeholders in this group are made up of the Department of Environment, Department of Agriculture, Department of Livestock, Department of Forestry, Department of Forestry, Department of Tourism, Department of Lands and the SHEFA Provincial Government.

The second group of stakeholders are the institutions that FAO and the executing agencies and FAO will be working with to implement project activities. These are mainly the NGOs such as the Vanuatu Association for Non-Government Organization, Live and Learn Environment, Civil Society Organizations and Provincial Governments.

The third group of stakeholders are the indigenous communities and resource owners.

8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

- Please tell us the story of your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihood and how it is contributing to achieve the expected global environmental benefits
- Please provide the links to publications, video materials, etc.

This activity has not started yet, however, knowledge management activities are aimed at documenting project outcomes and findings and share with communities and relevant institutions to use in their work to improve their knowledge on how to protect and manage their resources.

9. Co-Financing Table

Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
FAO	Grant	1,175,000			1,175,000
FAO	In-kind	600,000			600,000
ACIAR	Grant	571,516	20,000		571,516
VANGO)	Grant	650,000			650,000
VANGO	In-kind	5,000			5,000
Live and Learn Vanuatu	In kind	20,000	5,000		20,000
The Pacific Community (SPC)	Grant	1,354,597	50,000		1,354,597
Vanuatu Government	Grant	10,000,000	1,000,000		10,000,000
Vanuatu Government (in-kind)	In-kind	500,000	100,000		500,000
New York Botanical Garden		414,445	20,000		414,445
	TOTAL	15,290,558	1,195,000		15,290,558

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

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** - Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”); **Satisfactory (S)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** - Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U)** - Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** - The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice”. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

