



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2022 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	11
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	16
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	20
6. RISKS	22
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	30
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	32
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	34
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	36
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	38
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	39
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	40

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Africa
Country (ies):	Angola
Project Title:	Integrating climate resilience into agricultural and pastoral production systems through soil fertility management in key productive and vulnerable areas using the Farmer Field School approach (IRCEA)
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/ANG/050/LDF
GEF ID:	5432
GEF Focal Area(s):	Climate Change Adaptation (CCA)
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Environment (MTCA)
Project Duration (years):	5 years (plus one year of no-cost extension)
Project coordinates:	Huíla Province GEO ID: 3348303; Lat -14.69531"; Long 15.00014" Caconda Municipality GEO ID: 3351379; Lat -13.75376; Long 15.15389 Caluquembe Municipality GEO ID: 335102; Lat -13.92093; Long 14.53476 Chicomba Municipality GEO ID: 334994; Lat -14.30788; Long 14.98672 Quilengues Municipality GEO ID: 3346556; Lat -13.99213; Long 13.76705

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	05/05/2016
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	03/11/2016
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	21/11/2022
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ²	Due Covid 19 the project had a no-cost extension NTE of 21/11/2022.

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	6,668,182
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc³:	23,619,230
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)⁴:	4,989,417

¹ As per FPMIS

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

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

⁴ For DEX projects, the GEF Coordination Unit will confirm the final amount with the Finance Division in HQ. For OPIM projects, the disbursement amount should be provided by Execution Partners.

Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022⁵	19,123,511.3
--	--------------

M&E Milestones

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	9 th Oct 2019; the 5 th SC Meeting has been scheduled for July 2022
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	November 2018
Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):	October 2019
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	October 2022
Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	Yes Submitted with the MTR Management Response Report

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

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

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Rosalina Carlos	Rosalina.Carlos@fao.org
Budget Holder	Gherda Barreto, FAO Angola	gherda.barreto@fao.org

⁵ Please refer to the section 12 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

⁶ The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2nd PIR, around half-point between EOD and NTE. The MTR report in English should be submitted to the GEF Secretariat within 4 years of the CEO Endorsement date.

⁷ The Terminal Evaluation date should be discussed with OED 6 months before the project's NTE date.

Lead Technical Officer	Abram Bicksler (NSP)	abram.bicksler@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Pierre Jacques Rene Gaston Bégat (OCBDD)	Pierre.Begat@fao.org

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

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

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating ¹¹
----------------------------------	----------	---------------------------------	----------	------------------------------	-----------------------	---	-------------------------------

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

⁹ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

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

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

<p>Objective(s): Strengthen the climate resilience of the agropastoral production systems in key vulnerable areas through (i) mainstreaming Climate Change Adaptation into agricultural and environmental sector policies, programmes and practices; (ii) capacity building and promotion of CC through soil fertility and Sustainable Land Management practices using FFS approach</p>	<p>Outcome 1: The adaptive capacity of MINAMB, MINAGRI, MINCO, INAMET, GSA, provincial governments, civil society organizations, academia and research organizations, to minimize climate risks in both agropastoral and agricultural production systems, is strengthened.</p>	<p>Outcome Indicator 1.1 (AMAT indicator 10): Capacities of regional, national and sub-national institutions to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and evaluate adaptation strategies and measures</p>	<p><i>At present, the institutions have low capacity and limited knowledge about CCA and SLM practices in the system of agricultural production and livestock. It was carried out in the 4 provinces of intervention</i></p>	<p><i>n.a.</i></p>	<p><i>120 staff from MINAMB, MINAGRIF, MASFAMU and provincial government staff as well as CSOs, academia and research institutions, trained and aware of CCA and SLM practices in crop-livestock production systems</i></p> <p><i>Four Rapid vulnerability assessments conducted in the provinces of Huila, Bié, Huambo and Malange and relevant staff trained to ensure regular updating of vulnerability information</i></p> <p><i>Supported INAMET and GSA in consolidating the 1971-2000 climatic historical archive and the 2005-2015 meteorological data base.</i></p>	<p><i>Coordination with government to organize a training session, using as background the studies produced by the international consultancy commissioned in 2020. On the other hand, at sub-national (field) level, during the project implementation period, 216 technicians belonging to MINAGRIP, civil society and provincial governments, were trained through the FFS in CCA and SLM practices.</i></p> <p><i>In complement to the SHARP survey carried out in February 2020, the methodology "Participatory Survey with Agro-ecological Approach" (SPAA) was applied in 7 FFS in the municipalities of Caconda, Caluquembe, and Chicomba. This tool serves to assess the vulnerabilities of farmers against the climate change impacts and identify the most adequate CCA and SLM needs considering the local reality.</i></p> <p><i>A data rescue process for all historical meteorological data for the Provinces of Huila, Bié, Huambo and Malange was finalized in October 2021 and the final report was submitted to FAO in December 2021. Since then, the two INAMET technicians continue to perform the imaging and digitalization of all records of the other provinces stored at INAMET.</i></p>	<p>MS</p>
--	---	---	--	--------------------	--	---	------------------

<p>Outcome 2:</p> <p>115 000 farmers adopt CCA/SLM practices</p>	<p>Outcome Indicator 2.1 (AMAT indicator 4):</p> <p>Extent of adoption of climate resilient technologies/practices</p>	<p><i>In Huila Province, family farmers are not aware of any mechanism capable of increasing adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change; the levels of agricultural production and productivity have been declining dramatically, consequently reducing their incomes, leaving them in a situation of food shortages and extreme poverty</i></p>	<p><i>30,000 farmers adopt resilient technologies/practices</i></p> <p><i>Master Trainers and Facilitators recruited and having received basic training from MOSAP II in year 2 are re-trained on CCA and SLM</i></p> <p><i>Additional Master Trainers trained and equipped 30 additional Facilitators trained and equipped</i></p> <p><i>50 New FFS established</i></p>	<p><i>115,000 farmers (75% of the beneficiaries, of which at least 30% are women) adopt resilient technologies/practices</i></p> <p><i>MT and SADCP recruited in CCA and SLM practices ;</i></p> <p><i>150 FFS established and part of the agricultural production sold to PAPAGRO supporting economic operations</i></p>	<p>189 MTs originally trained by the MOSAP II project were retrained on CCA and SLM approaches in Huambo, Bié and Malange provinces. The implementation of these technologies/practices through the MOSAP II project benefited 50,000 farmers in these provinces.</p> <p>27 MTs were trained through the IRCEA project in Huila province on FFS that include CCA and SLM approaches. In Huila province, 85.000 farmers benefited from resilient CCA technologies/practices. In total, 216 MTs were trained in CCA and 135.000 farmers were benefited.</p> <p>2 933 facilitators which had originally been trained through the MOSAP II project in Huambo, Bié and Malange provinces were retrained on CCA. 320 facilitators were initially trained through the IRCEA project in Huila province. In total 2 960 facilitators were trained in CCA.</p> <p><i>171 Farmer Field Schools were created and are continuously implementing CCA and SLM practices.</i></p>	<p>S</p>
---	---	--	--	---	---	-----------------

<p>Outcome 3:</p> <p>Environmental and agriculture policies and programmes at national and decentralized level integrate CCA aspects</p>	<p>Outcome indicator 3.1: (AMAT indicator 13): sub-national plans and processes developed and strengthened to identify, prioritize and integrate adaptation strategies and measures</p>	<p><i>The planning and budget sectors in the various state bodies at the national, provincial and municipal level, academic and research institutions have little information and sensitivity on climate change and have not taken into account the adaptive aspects in the planning of any investment for economic and social development</i></p>	<p><i>Bi-annual meeting of the task force, inter-ministerial commission for biodiversity and climate change, and the multi-sectoral commission for the environment 5-year strategy to mainstream CCA in future sectoral planning and budgeting developed</i></p>	<p><i>Intersectoral Working Group established and technical proposal developed;</i></p> <p><i>The two interministerial commissions, CNBAC and CMA, meet quarterly; and</i></p> <p><i>A bi-annual strategy for integrating aspects of CCA and SLM practices are elaborated and used in planning and budgeting exercises;</i></p> <p><i>Natural resource management systems developed in the 4 interventional municipalities of Caconda, Caluquembe, Chicomba and Quilengues in the province of Huíla,</i></p>	<p><i>During project implementation, the National Commission on Climate Change and Biodiversity (CNACB) was under restructuration, and this process was concluded with the publication in January 2022 of the Presidential Decree 21/22 of January 26th. Since then, the project team has been engaging with the MCTA to operationalize the commission, establish the technical groups and support the quarterly meetings.</i></p> <p><i>The 3 technical reports on the mainstreaming of CCA will be used as background document to prepare the 5 years strategy</i></p> <p><i>There is an undertaking to engage with the provincial government of Huila, to finalize the process of issuing 54 community land recognition titles. The inclusive land and natural resource management systems are being implemented in the target municipalities through the activities developed in the FFS</i></p>	<p>MS</p>
---	--	--	--	--	--	------------------

<p>Outcome 4:</p> <p>Project implementation based on result-based management and application of project lessons learned in future operations facilitated</p>	<p>Outcome indicator</p> <p>4.1: Compliance with planned M&E activities, including the establishment of basic values for all project indicators, annual update of indicators, medium-term evaluation/review and final evaluation of the project</p> <p>PIRs Midterm and final evaluations</p> <p>Number of publications and other means of dissemination of the project results</p>	<p><i>n.a.</i></p>	<p><i>60% progress in achieving project outcomes</i></p> <p><i>Monitoring of Results</i></p> <p><i>Two six-monthly progress reports prepared. (one PPR and one PIR)</i></p> <p><i>Mid-term evaluation/review conducted</i></p> <p><i>Project best practices and lessons learned collected</i></p> <p><i>Newsletter 3</i></p>	<p><i>Project outcomes fully achieved and showing sustainability</i></p> <p><i>Final performance framework developed</i></p> <p><i>Six-monthly progress reports prepared and submitted. (one PPR and one PIR)</i></p> <p><i>Mid-term evaluation/review and final evaluation conducted.</i></p> <p><i>Project best practices and lessons learned collected, compiled and disseminated through annual newsletters, and reports.</i></p>	<p>A monitoring system was put in place using the digital platform ECAS 1.0. This platform collects geo-referenced data of all FFS. To implement this system, twenty-eight technicians and MTs (including head of EDAs) were trained on the KoBo collect survey platform.</p> <p><i>10 Biannual progress reports prepared</i></p> <p><i>4 Annual progress reports prepared</i></p> <p><i>The mid-term evaluation was done in October 2019.</i></p> <p><i>A publication with best practices and lessons learned from the project is in preparation.</i></p> <p><i>The project activities are regularly posted on social networks</i></p>	<p>S</p>
---	---	--------------------	--	---	---	-----------------

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1: The adaptive capacity of MINAMB, MINAGRI, MINCO, INAMET, GSA, provincial governments, civil society organizations, academia and research organizations, to minimize climate risks in both agropastoral and agricultural production systems, is strengthened.	Organizing a training session for government about CCA and SLM approaches and as recommended in the mid-term evaluation a national conference of resilient FFS will be conducted.	Project team and FAO's coordinator of resilience and climate change.	The training session will be held in the third quarter of 2022. FFF national conference June-July 2022.
Outcome 3: Environmental and agriculture policies and programmes at national and decentralized level integrate CCA aspects	Support the government in the operationalization of the National Commission on Climate Change and Biodiversity (CNACB) and organize regular meetings to discuss the conception of the strategy for mainstreaming of CCA. Finalize the process of issuing 54 community land recognition titles.	Project team and FAO's coordinator of resilience and climate change.	Second semester of 2022.

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 avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
Outcome 1: The adaptive capacity of MINAMB, MINAGRI, MINCO, INAMET, GSA, provincial governments, civil society organizations, academia and research organizations, to minimize climate risks in both agropastoral and agricultural production systems, is strengthened.				
Output 1.1: 105 staff from MINAMB, MINAGRI, MINCO and provincial government staff as well as civil society organizations, academia and research institutions, trained and aware of CCA and SLM practices in crop-livestock production systems	Number of individuals trained. Training material.	Organizing one training session at national and one at subnational level Training material on CCA best practices available and disseminated.	At sub-national (field) level, training on CCA and SLM practices has been carried out, involving technicians of MINAGRIP, Civil Society, academia and research institutions, and Provincial Government staff. These trainings are detailed in the output 2.2 At National level, coordination with government to organize a training session, using as background the studies produced by the international consultancy commissioned in 2020 has been completed.	In progress

¹² Outputs as described in the project Logframe 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.

			The project supported the elaboration and publication of the FFS manual and disseminated it among the stakeholders	
Output 1.2: Rapid vulnerability assessment conducted and relevant staff trained to ensure regular updating of vulnerability information	Vulnerability Assessments (4)	Finalization of the rescue of historical meteorological data (DARE) to consolidated historical climate archive 1971-2000 and 2005-2015. 4 CVA realized.	In October 2021 was concluded the rescue of historical meteorological data (DARE) for the periods 1971-200 and 2005-2015 from the target Provinces of the project (Huila, Huambo, Malange and Bié). The two employees of INAMET are still working on DARE of the others provinces of the country. In complementation with the SHARP survey held in 2018, the methodology "Participatory Survey with Agroecological Approach" is underway in 3 target municipalities in Huila province (Caconda, Caluquembe and Chicomba) to conduct a vulnerability assessment and identify the most suitable CCA approaches for integration into the project.	Partially completed
Project Outcome 2: 115,000 farmers adopt CCA/SLM practices				
Output 2.1 A core group of master trainers and FFS facilitators involved in MOSAP II trained in CCA and SLM practices	Number of master trainers and facilitators trained	Continue the process of training Master trainers and facilitators on CCA and SLM practices (target 64 master trainers and 5 000 facilitators)	In March 2022, 23 master trainers (15 men and 8 women) of the MOSAP II project were trained on CCA and SLM themes in the municipality of Huambo, Chipipa commune. In August 2021, 31 facilitators (30 men and 1 woman) of the MOSAP II project were trained on CCA and SLM themes in the municipality of Huambo, Chipipa commune.	In progress
Output 2.2 150 new FFS in Huila trained on CCA/SLM	Number of FFS trained	Continue the process of training and implementing CCA and SLM practices in the FFS.	3 new Farmer Field Schools were created in the reporting year, totalizing 171 FFS. The team of the project keeps the implementation of training and practice activities in the FFS related to CCA and SLM. During the reporting period were held a training of livestock handlers and delivered veterinary kits in Quilengues municipality, and a Course of seed and propagules replication in the Waba commune. FAO developed a model of FFS called "Chitaka", which is an integrated system of agro-pastoral production where the farmers develop several agroecological practices in the	Completed. A new process of transforming the current FFS in Chitaka model is in progress

			<p>same space. In this context, 3 FFS were transformed into "Chitaka". The transformation of 20 ECAs into the Chitaka model is in progress. In addition to the above, the project team has been following the 171 FFS in implementing CCA and SLM practices.</p> <p>The project team held several awareness-raising lectures in schools for teachers, students, and also for civil society on various environmental issues such as climate change, afforestation, soil conservation, etc.</p> <p>The project joined the tree planting campaign promoted by the government of Huíla to contribute to the reduction of the effects of drought in southern Angola, and so far more than 10,000 trees have been planted with the project's support. To distribute trees for the campaign, the project created a nursery.</p>	
Outcome 3 Environmental and agriculture policies and programs at national and decentralized level integrate CCA aspects				
Output 3.1 Inter-sectoral task forces in place/strengthened, defining integrated CCA agendas and tailoring them into sector-level programming	n/a	Support the task force of CNACB and quarterly meeting established. 5 year CCA mainstreaming strategy developed and used for planning and budgeting exercises.	The MCTA requested the hiring of a national expert in legal norms to elaborate the regulation of functioning of the CNACB. The ToR of this position was sent to the MCTA, which upon receipt of this document changed its internal strategy to reformulate the CNACB. In January 2022, the presidential decree that updates the CNACB was published. After that, the IRCEA project has been engaging with MCTA to support the CNACB meetings and create the task force. It is important to highlight that the report of the international consultancy commissioned will be used as a base document to elaborate the strategy with integration of climate change adaptation into the public policies.	In progress
Output 3.2 Climate change adaptation integrated into an effective land	n/a	Finalize the process of Land Delimitation process for the target municipalities.	After the conclusion of the Participatory Land Delimitation process for the communities of the municipalities of Caconda, Caluquembe,	In progress

and natural resources management system in 3 municipalities		Continue the implementation of land and natural resources management	Chicomba and Quilenques, the team started a wide engagement with the administration of the 4 municipalities and other stakeholders in order to obtain the titles of community land tenure recognition. Additionally, the implementation of land and natural resources management has been carried out through the activities taught in the FFS, to the public technicians and to the farmers which are implementing it on their farm.	
Outcome 4 Project implementation based on result-based management and application of project lessons learned in future operations facilitated.				
Output 4.1: Project monitoring system providing systematic information on progress in meeting project outcomes and output targets	n/a	Monitoring system fully established using platform ECAS 1.0 with georeferenced and data collection in all FFS	<p>A monitoring system was put in place using the digital platform ECAS 1.0. This platform collects geo-referenced data of all FFS. To implement this system, twenty-eight technicians and MTs (including head of EDAs) were trained on the KoBo collect survey platform. The researchers collected information from 171 FFS, using KoBo collect and were backstopped by field missions of the M&E team in the 4 municipalities. As a result of the survey, the database was updated, where we can highlight that 48% of members are female and 37% of them are young. As part of the monitoring system, monthly coordination meetings with MCTA have been held to align the project activities with the government recommendations.</p> <p>Technical monitoring missions had been regularly carried out by the FAO representative and Luanda office team. In March 2022 the project's Lead Technical Officer (LTO) conducted a monitoring and technical support mission for the implementation of the project strategy. In June 2022, the LTO carried out a technical</p>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>A regular updating of the database is in progress</p>

			mission to provide training in agroecology, CCA, and SLM	
Output 4.2. Project-related “best-practices” and “lessons learned” disseminated via publications and other means	n/a	Systematize and disseminate good practices and lessons learned	The M&E team has been working to systematize and disseminate the cases of success, this regard October 2021 was produced a short video about the implementation of a pilot site on climate resilience adaptation at the FFS Cecilia Tchamundele including the statement of the women that participate in this initiative. On the other hand, the good practices and lessons learned captured by the project team are being systematized and compiled into a publication.	In progress

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcome of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR.

The major key achievements during the reporting period are the following:

Regarding **outcome 1**, the trainings carried out at sub-national (field) level that benefitted public technicians increased the institutional knowledge of on CCA and SLM practices. The base of dissemination of CCA and SLM technologies is the FFS; to this end, an FFS manual was elaborated and disseminated among the stakeholders. To support the elaboration of the agroclimatic vulnerability assessments, the rescue of historical meteorological data (DARE) was concluded for the periods 1971-200 and 2005-2015 from the target Provinces of the project (Huila, Huambo, Malange and Bié). From now on, INAMET already has the necessary capabilities to carry out the DARE, and will continue to do it for the country's other provinces. The vulnerability assessment is being carried out through the methodology "Participatory Survey with Agro-ecological Approach" applied in 7 FFS in the municipalities of Caconda, Caluquembe, and Chicomba.

After reaching 171 Farmer Field Schools (FFS), the FFS are now being transformed into the Chitaka model with an integrated agroecological and CCA approach.

Outcome 2 is focusing on the direct support of family farmers of the Municipalities of Caluquembe, Caconda, Chicomba and Quilenges in the Province of Huila through the FFS approach, and has achieved the mark of 171 FFS units declared as created by the municipal level governmental extension agencies (EDAs). These FFS are now being transformed into the Chitaka's model of integrated agroecology. The project continues the trainings of Master Trainers and facilitators on resilient CCA technologies/practices.

Outcome 3 did not advance as expected because it was very dependent of the restructuration of CNACB. The presidential decree that updates the CNACB was published in January 2022. Since then, the project team has been engaging with MCTA to support the CNACB meetings and create the task force, but due to internal issues, the CNACB has not held any meeting. Regarding the land tenure process, the project team has been engaging with municipal administrations of the 4 municipalities and other stakeholders in order to obtain the titles of community land tenure recognition, which has been ongoing for the life of the project.

For Outcome 4, a monitoring system was put in place using the digital platform ECAS 1.0. This platform collects geo-referenced data of all FFS. A survey using the platform KoBo collect collected information from all 171 FFS and the database was updated. As part of the monitoring system, monthly coordination meetings with MCTA have been held to align the project activities with the government recommendations. Two LTO technical support missions have been held and BH made several monitoring missions in 2022.

Development Objective (DO) Ratings, Implementation Progress (IP) Ratings and Overall Assessment

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence and progress reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR. For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

	FY2022 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2022 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	MS	MS	<p><i>Ratings/Comments</i></p> <p><i>The Covid 19 pandemic in the country still causing difficulty in the implementation of the project during this reporting period. It has impacted the mobility in the field and also at the international level and caused limitations on the operationalization of the project at all levels including in the procurement and recruitment process, for an example the changes of key persons of the project coordination unit, as the CTA that left the project in December 2020. Also, the former National Coordinator only remained 3 months in the project from October 2021 to January 2022, and the current National Coordinator joined the project in March 2022. However, the project has continued the implementation in the field with an adaptive approach. Additionally changes in the direction of the Lead Ministry (Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Environment) slowed down results in components 1 and 3. According to the original implementation schedule, the IRCEA Project was scheduled to end in November 2021. But due to delays in the implementation of some activities caused by Covid-19 related constraints, FAO requested from the Government (MCTA) in September 2021 a no-cost extension until November 2022 in order to achieve the project's expected results.</i></p>
Budget Holder	MS	MS	<p><i>Ratings/comments</i></p> <p>The hire of sufficient personnel to achieve results recommended by the project was key to mitigate the risk</p>

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

<p>GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸</p>		<p>MS</p>	<p><i>Ratings/comments</i></p> <p><i>I came herein as the Angola GEF Political and Operational Focal Point to give my inputs in the IRCEA project report (PIR) as follow:</i></p> <p><i>1- The IRCEA project activities are Satisfactory according to the Development objectives(DO);</i></p> <p><i>2- More engagement from IRCEA, stakeholders, Project management Unit and Field are needed to improve the results.</i></p> <p><i>3- I recommend the IRCEA project management unit to put all its efforts as always in order to speed up the implementation process of project components.</i></p> <p><i>4- I recommend the management unit of IRCEA project continue to regularly implement the Steering Committee meetings.</i></p> <p><i>5- Bring more approach between project activities and community, traditional authorities, woman's NGOs, youth, University students.</i></p> <p><i>6- And strength or reinforce the work with Local administration officers in a way to keep government at local level more involved.</i></p> <p><i>7- Promote more in capacity building and project activities on the media's, TV Interviews, Radios, Instagram, Facebook, also true community meetings etc. to inform the society of project existence and objectives and expected outputs.</i></p> <p><i>8- Continue to involve Civil Society Organization as partners to support the project activities.</i></p> <p><i>9- Congratulate the Brilliant work that FAO under the Guerda Barreto Leadership and her team is been doing helping governments in the preparation and</i></p>
--	--	------------------	--

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

			<p><i>implementation of the project management Physical and financial activities at National level.</i></p> <p><i>And also Congratulate and encourage the Coordination and team of the project management Unit in the field making it happen</i></p>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	MS	MS	<p><i>The IRCEA project was off to a good start, but has been affected by unforeseen difficulties in implementation. Among these include the COVID-19 pandemic which slowed and stopped much of the field work, the departure of 2 CTAs and 1 NC and difficulty on the part of the government to finish the land tenure process. Other factors that have affected the project include the restructuring of CNACB and its slow capacitation into a body that works. On the field, more has been happening and the FFS have been implementing CCA and agroecological approaches despite these difficulties. It will be important to really keep pushing forward during the remaining 5 months of the project to not lose ground.</i></p>
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MS	MS	<p><i>Despite difficulties in implementation that are largely beyond the project control – Covid-19-related constraints, slow operationalization of CNACB - , the project has continued delivering on its intended results. The remaining 5 months will be key to secure some of the project outcomes, take stock of lessons learned from the implementation, work on the sustainability of key outputs by preparing a sound exit strategy and launch the terminal evaluation. Options for GEF8 programming to build on IRCEA's results should also be discussed.</i></p>

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

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made complying with the approved ESM plan. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Add new ESS risks if any risks have emerged during this FY.

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
ESS 7: Decent Work				
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate if the initial Environmental and Social (ESS) Risk classification is still valid; if not, what is the new classification and explain.

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²⁰ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low risk	The Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid

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

No grievance has been received

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

6. Risks

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

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

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.

1	Climate contingency risk: High-probability of increased occurrence of extreme weather events which may affect crop and livestock cycles and increase food/nutritional insecurity.	High.	Y	<p>The project will mitigate those risks by supporting the implementation of CCA practices and measure to strengthen pro-active and coordinated responses as well as setting multi-stakeholder community-based capacity building initiatives and by linking with on-going initiatives. The core of the project is to enhance the resilience of farming systems as a whole in an adaptable manner by e.g. introducing viable agro-ecological approaches such as the diversification of agroecosystems accompanied by organic soil management and water conservation and harvesting (Huila Province).</p> <p>Pest and diseases outbreaks will be taken into consideration by strengthening capacity of rural stakeholders in sustainable crop/pastoral management and rehabilitation strategies. As well, Integrated Production Pest Management is an effective method to reduce the risk of pest and diseases attacks and it will be integrated in FFS curricula. Finally, the project will address this risk by fostering community field observation capacities.</p>	<p>Through FFS activities, the Project is investing in the strengthening of the resilience of family farmers through the promotion of climate smart agriculture, agroecological approaches, and sustainable landscape management practices.</p> <p>To mitigate the Pest and disease outbreaks, the project held trainings of livestock handlers and delivered veterinary kits</p>	
2	Institutional risk at the national level:	High	Y	MINAMB and MINAGRI will benefit from several trainings and an inter-sectoral task force including both	At National level, monthly coordination meetings with MCTA	

	<p>Difficulties in institutional cooperation between MINAMB, MINCO and MINAGRI may constitute a challenge</p> <p>Risk of management change in local institution</p> <p>Decrease in project ownership and support from government.</p>			<p>ministries, MINCO and the civil society will be set up under Component 3 in order to ensure cross-sectoral project coordination. A medium risk of ongoing modification within the framework of the local institutional settings is present. The risk will be addressed by strongly involving local institutions at all level, and building appropriate programmes for the involvement of relevant officers and institutional sectors.</p> <p>The strong interest of the key GoA stakeholders has been verified through a first project identification mission, while the project identification phase was officially requested to FAO through a letter sent by the MINAMB. The GoA has strongly endorsed and has been fully behind the preparation of this concept. Also, all concerned governmental institutions will be fully involved in project preparation and implementation. The project design has taken into consideration the need to achieve results in the short term to show the importance of the objectives and activities of the project. Finally, FAO's long standing relations with both the MINAMB and the MINAGRI will represent a key asset for mitigating this specific risk.</p>	<p>have been held to align the project activities with the government recommendations. At local level the stakeholders are involved in the planning and implementing the activities.</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
3	Risk of cooperation: Partnership-building capacities to ensure mainstreaming into on-going initiatives may constitute a challenge	Moderately	Y	<p>Since the LDCF-funded activities and management will be closely inter-linked to the MOSAP, Terra and PMIDRCP projects, this risk is considered to be low.</p> <p>The project is also expected to specifically strengthen capacities and mechanisms for mainstreaming CCA into programs and planning.</p>	The project has established partnerships with several local institutions to maximize the inclusion of the different stakeholders.	

	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	Social risk: Reluctance to endorse and participate in the project activities by stakeholders and reluctance/ slowness of local institutions to agree on project activities	High	Y	The risk of reluctance of stakeholders is low. Nevertheless, it will be addressed through local participation in project implementation, and in particular through the FFS participatory approach. Achievements on the ground that bring benefits to local producers will be demonstrated during the project to overcome skepticism. Regarding local institutions, common objectives will be established by giving emphasis on local ownership of the process as well as capacity	The FFS approach in Angola was institutionalized by the Angola government through the MINAGRIP as part of a model for the rural extension. In this sense the opening in the local institutions to implement the project approach.	

	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
5	Socio-economic risk: Lack of adequate human and material resources for the implementation of this project could disturb the implementation of the various activities of the project.	High	Y	This risk will be mitigated by mobilizing and articulating the capacity of different actors, projects, programs and bilateral agencies to work intensively with government and gradually transfer skills to government counterparts. In addition, a close collaboration with the baseline projects such as MOSAP, Terra and PAPAGRO will provide strong additional resources as well as opportunities for farmers to sell their products.	FAO has a roster of technical experts, and for the project, a National and international agroecology experts were hired to implement the FFS with CCA practices using local materials.	
6	The COVID 19 pandemic restrictions affected the project operationalization like mobility restrictions, procurement and recruitment process.	Moderate	N	Despite the restrictions, the project will continue to be present in the field with an adaptive approach even supporting awareness campaigns on COVID 19 prevention through the established FFSs.	Related to activities in the field, all biosafety measures are being respected. Regarding procurement and recruitment, the processes are carried out a long time in advance but can still be slow and bureaucratically heavy	

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

FY2021 rating	FY2022 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Moderate	Moderate	COVID 19 situation impacted severely the implementation of the project delaying most of the activities. It is thus more appropriate to maintain the overall risk rating as moderate.

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

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

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
Recommendation 1: Adjust the Project Results Matrix	In line with this recommendation to make the project more efficient and effective, the institutional capacity-building activities were scaled down and the awareness-raising sessions for the general public (including students) were reinforced. The main focus of the project was readjusted to field activities with the 171 FFS outreach and to transformation using the Chitaka model.
Recommendation 2: Effectiveness (B) Include teacher's training in capacity building strategy (Component 1)	In the activities for mainstreaming knowledge on CCA and the use of SLM practices for generating resilience, outreach activities with universities, middle level and technical schools through the establishment of Letters of Agreement have been included.
Recommendation 3: Define and implement a "FFS-Model" plan focused on specific themes that act as models/examples in each municipality (Component 2)	The FFS Cecilia Tchamundele localized in Caconda Municipality is composed of 36 members (100% women) and was selected to be the FFS model. In this FFS several training sessions were conducted which included production and multiplication of seeds of adapted varieties, water management, soil recovery and improvement and livestock handling
Recommendation 4: Set up an FFS-based Pilot Internship Program (Component 2)	As part of the Internship Program, trainings held in FFS Cecilia Tchamundele were attended by members of other FFS, representatives of IDA/EDA and other public technicians.
Recommendation 5: Hold a National Conference on Climate Change (Component 3)	A National Conference about Farmer Field Schools including Climate Change adaptation issues is in preparation to be held in July 2022.
Recommendation 6: Finalize the analysis of the SHARP survey results to inform training themes / actions in Component 1 and 2	In complementation of the SHARP survey, the methodology "Participatory Survey with Agroecological Approaches" is underway in 3 target municipalities in Huila province (Caconda, Caluquembe and Chicomba) to conduct a vulnerability assessment and identify the most suitable CCA approaches.
Recommendation 7: Strengthen partnerships with national institutions and reduce the weight of international consultants in carrying out activities	The activities of projects are carried out by local technicians.
Recommendation 8: Define an exit strategy for the project, including alignment with "Government's ongoing ECA institutionalization strategy"	The project team is preparing the exit strategy, which includes defining a sustainability strategy for the FFS and defining plans with the Municipal Administrations for continued support on the ground.

Recommendation 10: Strengthen internal Monitoring & Evaluation procedures	A monitoring system was put in place using the digital platform ECAS 1.0. This platform collects geo-referenced data of all FFS.
Recommendation 11: LTO, BH and FLO supervision must be reinforced and FAO Office in Angola must establish a "Backstopping Team" linked to the Program Unit for field projects follow-up	Despite Covid 19 mobility restrictions, the BH made several monitoring missions on the field and the LTO carried out two technical backstopping missions.
Recommendation 12: Strengthen internal procedures for Communication & Visibility and Knowledge Management	The project's Communication & Visibility is part of the strategy of communication of the FAO AO Representation. It includes the dissemination of the project's activities in the media and social media, and the production the branding materials.
Recommendation 14: Review partner's co-financing strategy and account for other support being provided to the project but not considered as co-financing	The project is improving the system for collecting and recording information on co-financing.
Recommendation 15: Adopt a more inclusive and gender-sensitive strategy	The project has been successfully involving female farmers in the activities and hired a woman as NPC. Nevertheless, it has been a challenge to hire national female technicians. Investment to change this scenario is done through training opportunities that encourage the participation of female technicians.
Recommendation 16: Prepare and request from GEF an extension of the project execution period	According to the original implementation schedule, the IRCEA Project was scheduled to end in November 2021. But due to delays in the implementation of some activities caused by Covid-19 related constraints, FAO requested the Government (MCTA) in September 2021 for a no-cost extension until November 2022 in order to achieve the project's expected results.
Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe	The project team is preparing the exit strategy, which includes defining a sustainability strategy for the FFS and defining plans with the Municipal Administrations for continued support on the ground.

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	N.A		
Components and cost	N.A		
Institutional and implementation arrangements	N.A		
Financial management	N.A		
Implementation schedule	According to the original implementation schedule, the IRCEA Project was scheduled to end in November 2021. But due to delays in the implementation of some activities caused by Covid-19 related constraints, FAO requested the Government (MCTA) in September 2021 for a no-cost extension until November 2022 in order to achieve the project's expected results.	From November 2021 to November 2022	BH and MCTA
Executing Entity	N.A		
Executing Entity Category	N.A		
Minor project objective change	N.A		
Safeguards	N.A		
Risk analysis	The Covid 19 pandemic forced us to adapt the activities and increased the risk of delays in the implementation.		

²² Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	N.A		
Co-financing	N.A		
Location of project activity	N.A		
Other	N.A		

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

Please report on progress and results and challenges on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan) included at CEO Endorsement/Approval during this reporting period.

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government Institutions			
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Environment (MTCA)	Lead institutions of the Project.	The project team has monthly coordination meetings with MCTA to plan, implement and align the activities with the government recommendations.	The restructuring of the MCTA as the lead institution delayed the implementation of some of the activities directly related to them.
The Ministry of Agriculture (MINAGRI) through the Institute of Agrarian Development (IDA) and Agrarian Development Stations (EDAs)	MINAGRIP, through IDA/EDA, play a key role as an implementation partner on the field supporting the project implementation through their extensionists who have the co-financing commitment of visiting fortnightly all the FFS established.	The IDA/EDA technicians are the MTs and facilitators, they participate in FFS training and follow up the activities of the farmers on the field.	Logistical issues like transport have been a challenge on the field.
INAMET, under the Ministry of Telecommunications, Information Technologies and Social Communication	It has been a very important partner regarding the results related to the exercise of data rescue of historical meteorological data.	The rescue of historical meteorological data (DARE) for the periods 1971-200 and 2005-2015 from the target Provinces of the project (Huila, Huambo, Malange and Bié) has been concluded.	Procurement of the equipment
Provincial Government of Huila	The Provincial Government of Huila play an important role through the institutional support provided to the project at local level.	FAO has provided engagement to the local municipality administrations, local technical directions and communities to participate in project activities.	
Administrations of the municipalities of Caconda, Caluquembe,	Administrations of the municipalities play an important role	The municipalities' administrations are part of the	

Chicomba and Quilengues	providing engagement of local EDAs and communities to participate in project activities.	implementation of the project activities in the FFS	
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
Higher Institute of Education Sciences (ISCED) - Huíla, Herbarium of Lubango.	Universities are part of the project implementation through partnerships for knowledge transfer.	The project is establishing an LoA with the Herbarium to provide training in the FFS on local plants with biocidal, composting, nutritional, and healing properties.	
NGO Caritas Evangelical Congregational Church in Angola		The NGOs participated in the training of livestock handlers held in Quilengues.	
Private sector entities			
The company Quavi from Humpata/Huíla Province	Provide services to the project.	The project explored a possible partnership for a training on an integrated production systems (vegetables, animals, flowers, seedlings, etc).	
Others			
New stakeholders identified/engaged			

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) <u>during this reporting period.</u>		
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	Application of the methodology "Participatory Survey with Agroecological Approaches" in 3 target municipalities in Huila province (Caconda, Caluquembe and Chicomba) to conduct the vulnerability assessment especially considering gender impacts and identify the most suitable CCA approaches. A monitoring survey was held in all FSSs, where we can highlight that 48% of members are female and 37% of them are young.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	YES	The FFS Cecilia Tchamundele selected to be the FFS model is composed of 36 members (100% women). In the project activities women are encouraged to participate. The exit strategy of the project is based on the strengthening of these female-groups' capacity to develop business plans and to aggregate value to their production.
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):	YES	
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	YES	Training of women through the FFA activities
b) improving women's participation and decision making	YES	Women are part of the management commission of the FFS and participate in the decision-making process of the activities
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	YES	The capacity building made in the FFS training and activities also provides access to a financial mechanism that will generate socio-economic impacts and real benefits services for women.
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	The database of the monitoring system has georeferenced information of all FFS disaggregated also by gender.

Staff with gender expertise	YES	The National Coordinator and International consultant are women and have gender knowledge.
Any other good practices on gender		

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.	The main approach on the field of the project is through FFS where knowledge of CCA practices is disseminated to communities. To keep this knowledge available to everyone, an FFS manual was produced. Besides, the M&E team that has been working to systematize and disseminate the cases of success, produced a short video about the implementation of a pilot site on climate resilience adaptation at the FFS Cecilia Tchamundele. The video shows how food security is guaranteed through an agroecological approach without using agrochemicals and a combination of agrobiodiversity.
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.	The FFS model Cecilia Tchamundele composed of 36 members (100% women) is a successful case of how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. An institutional video of that was produced. Link below: https://unfao-my.sharepoint.com/:v/g/person/catia_marinheiro_fao_org/EV626zTreLpFo4bDFI46AAcBNK9d6kaRMT0QWLZ9yVslAw?e=pbEinO
Please provide links to related website, social media account	FAO Official Twitter: https://twitter.com/FAOAngola
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	Catia Marinheiro; FAO Angola Communication Officer - Catia.Marinheiro@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.

There are no indigenous communities in the project's area of intervention. Nevertheless, the mechanism of field implementation of the activities – the FFS approach, is established in the villages with the full consent and participation of the family farmers. Moreover, FAO field workers who are in direct contact with the communities speak the local predominant language (Umbundu), ensuring clear communication and transparency on the project activities.

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²³	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
UN Agency	FAO		4,300,000.00	3,440,000.00	2,580,000.00	4,300,000.00
National Government	MINAGRIF	In-kind	13,500,000.00	10,800,000.00	8,100,000.00	13,500,000.00
National Government	MINAMB	In-kind	3,325,000.00	2,660,000.00	1,995,000.00	3,325,000.00
National Government	MASFAMU	In-kind	2,494,230.00	1,995,384.00	1,496,538.00	2,494,230.00
Government	Provincial Government of Huila	In kind	0	228,127.30	171,095.47	285,159.12
		TOTAL	23,619,230	19,123,511.30	14,342,633.47	23,904,389.12

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

²³ Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives)
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits)
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project’s components and activities is in compliance with the project’s approved implementation plan.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Risk rating. It should assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:	
High Risk (H)	There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks
Moderate Risk (M)	There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.
Low Risk (L)	There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.