



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2023 – Revised Template

Period covered: 01 Jul 2022 to 30 May to 2023

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	4
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	11
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	17
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	20
6. RISKS	22
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	26
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	28
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	29
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	30
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	31
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	33
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	34

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 Environment (MINAMB)
Initial project duration (years):	5 years (plus one year of no-cost extension)
Project coordinates: <i>This section should be completed ONLY by:</i> <i>a) Projects with 1st PIR;</i> <i>b) In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.</i>	Annex 2

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	05/05/2016
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	03/11/2016
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	2/11/2022
Revised project implementation End date (if approved) ²	31/05/2023

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	6,668,182
Total Co-financing amount (USD)³:	23,619,230
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	6,656,372
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)⁴:	6,651,282
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023⁵	23,619,230

¹ As per FPMIS

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

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

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

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

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	9 th Oct 2019; the SC Meeting foreseen in July 2022 was not carried out due to elections.
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	November 2018
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	Oct 2019
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	Feb 2023
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	N/A – Terminal Evaluation is ongoing

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

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

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	Rosalina Carlos	rosalina.carlos@fao.org
Budget Holder (BH)	Gherda Barreto, FAO Angola	gherda.barreto@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)	Julio Ingles João Ferreira	chandalajif@yahoo.com
Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Brathwaite Ronnie	Ronnie.Brathwaite@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	Pierre Jacques Rene Gaston Bégat (OCBDD)	Pierre.Begat@fao.org

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

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

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

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

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.							
Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
Objective(s):	Outcome 1						
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,	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	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	The capacity of governmental institutions of Angola (MINAMB, MINAGRI, MINCO, MINFAMU and the Provincial Governments of Bié, Huambo, Malange and Huíla), Civil Society Organizations and academic	n.a.	15 MINAMB 15 MINAGRIF 15 MINCO (actually named MINDCOM) 10 Civil Society 10 academia and research institutions 40 Provincial Government staff received training Training material on CCA best	At national level, 1 study on the interfaces of the Angola Government's public policies and programs with CCA to disseminate among public officials about SLM practices. At sub-national (field) level, during the project implementation period, 216 technicians belonging to MINAGRIP, MINAMB, MINDCOM (provincial department - <i>Gabinete Desenvolvimento Economico</i>) civil society and provincial governments, were trained through the FFS in CCA and SLM practices. 8 technicians from the Provincial Department of Environment (under MINAMB) were trained to support agrobiodiversity centers in the 4 targeted municipalities. Achieved 180% of trained members belonging to MINAGRIF, MINAMB, MINDCOM, academia and civil society.	MS

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

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

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

¹¹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory** (HS), **Satisfactory** (S), **Moderately Satisfactory** (MS), **Moderately Unsatisfactory** (MU), **Unsatisfactory** (U), and **Highly Unsatisfactory** (HU). Refer to Annex 1.

2023 Project Implementation Report

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

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
programmes And practices; (ii) capacity building and promotion of CC through soil fertility and Sustainable Land Management practices using FFS approach			And research institutions remain weak in adapting to climate change and SLM practices.		practices available and disseminated. 1.2 4 CVA realized Relevant INAMET and GSA staff trained Consolidated Historical climate archive 1971-2000 Consolidated Meteorological database 2005-2015	Four Community Vulnerability Assessment (CVA) realized, achieving 100% of project target. Also, the SAHRP methodology was applied in 2010 and the "Participatory Survey with Agro-ecological Approach" (SPAA) was conducted in 2022 in the municipalities of Caconda, Caluquembe, and Chicomba, to assess the vulnerabilities of farmers against the climate change impacts and identify the most adequate CCA and SLM needs considering the local reality 6 relevant INAMET and GSA officials trained in theoretical and practical aspects of agrometeorology in 2019, using the translated FAO Agrometeorology Guide (AGPM). A data rescue process for historical meteorological data 1971-2000 for the Provinces of Huila, Bié, Huambo and Malange was finalized in October 2021 with the support of two international consultants from International Environmental Data Rescue Organization (IEDRO) 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. Target achieved at 100%. Also, the project contributed to the elaboration of the handbook on agrometeorology published by FAO in 2019 (FAO. 2019. Handbook on climate information for farming communities - What	

2023 Project Implementation Report

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

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
						farmers need and what is available. Rome. 184 pp. Licence CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.)	
	Outcome 2						
	115 000 farmers adopt CCA/SLM practices	Outcome Indicator 2.1 (AMAT indicator 4): Extent of adoption of climate resilient technologies/practices	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	30,000 farmers adopt resilient technologies/practices Master Trainers and Facilitators recruited and having received basic training from MOSAP II in year 2 are re-trained on CCA and SLM	115,000 farmers (75% of the beneficiaries, of which at least 30% are women) adopt resilient technologies/practices MT and SADCP recruited in CCA and SLM practices ; 150 FFS established and part of the agricultural production sold to PAPAGRO supporting economic operations	53 MTs originally trained by the MOSAP II project were retrained on CCA and SLM approaches in Huambo, Bié and Malange between 2019 and 2022. The implementation of these technologies/practices through the MOSAP II project benefited about 138,000 farmers (48% women) in these provinces. 27 MTs were trained through the IRCEA project in Huila province on FFS that include CCA and SLM approaches. In Huila province, 6,074 FFS members (52% women) directly benefited from resilient CCA technologies/practices. The MOSAP project trained about 1.600 facilitators, who were also trained by MTs on SLM and CCA techniques FFS. The IRCEA project directly trained 320 facilitators. The IRCEA created 184 FFS in 4 targeted municipalities of Caconda, Chicomba, Quilenges e Caluquembe (target achieved at 123%), with support of IDA-Huila and Provincial Department for Environment. Of those, a supporting grant of 350 USD (equivalent in AOA) was provided to 90 FFS (35 in Caluquembe, 20 in Caconda, 20 in Chicomba and 15 in Quilengue). Those grants aimed to reinforce financial capacity of those 90 FFS. Following MTR recommendation, one FFS was selected as example for other groups and exchange visits were organized there. It is the FFS Cecilia	S

2023 Project Implementation Report

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

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
			and extreme poverty			<p>Tchamundele located in the Village of Vissongue II, Comuna of Waba, Municipality of Caconda, Province of Huila. The FFS is composed of 40 members, all women, and represent a showcase for the documentation of successful stories due to the number of CCA and SLM techniques applied.</p> <p>Finally, chitakas were installed in 80 FFS in 2022. Chitakas are multi-productive models which foster food security into communities.</p>	
	Outcome 3						
	Environmental and agriculture policies and programmes at national and decentralized level integrate CCA aspects	Outcome indicator 3.1: (AMAT indicator 13): sub-national plans and processes developed and strengthened to identify, prioritize and integrate adaptation strategies and measures	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	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	<p>3.1.1 Intersectoral Working Group established and technical proposal developed;</p> <p>3.1.2 The two interministerial commissions, CNBAC and CMA, meet quarterly; and</p> <p>3.1.3 A 5-year strategy for integrating aspects of CCA and SLM practices are elaborated and used in planning and</p>	<p>The background technical reports on the mainstreaming of CCA in sectorial strategies were prepared to be discussed in the National Commission on Climate Change and Biodiversity (CNACB) with aim of developing the 5 years strategy.</p> <p>The inter-ministerial commission held regular quarterly meeting up to elections in September 2021. After that, the CNACB has been 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 MIMAMB to re-operationalize the commission, establishing technical groups and supporting the quarterly meetings. A National Conference about Farmer Field Schools including Climate Change adaptation issues was held in July 2022.</p> <p>The final 5-year strategy was not finalized due to the internal reorganization of the ministry.</p>	MS

2023 Project Implementation Report

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 TargetMid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
			adaptive aspects in the planning of any investment for economic and social development	budgeting developed	budgeting exercises; 3.2 Land and natural resources management system is developed in 3 municipalities in Huila	<p>Following the recommendations of the MTR, the IRCEA Project has been focusing on implementing partnerships (via LOAs) with local institutions – Academia, Research Centers, NGOS and the Private Sector to disseminate SLM practices and construct an exit strategy for the project, ensuring the continuity of the initiatives to implement agroecological practices as a climate resilience adaptation mechanism. Following this recommendation, a LOA was established with the Herbarium of Lubango (2020) to elaborate an Herbarium manual. Another LOA was established with the Instituto Superior Politécnico Tundavala (ISPT) in 2021 to deliver 4 agrobiodiversity centers in the municipalities targeted by the project and 8 technicians of the provincial department of Environment (part of MINAMB) were involved in the creation and follow up of the agrobiodiversity centers. Also, the ISPT together with the FAO-AO communication unit are finalizing an ATLAS of important botanical species available in target municipalities (and at Country level), which link is available below (see table n° 11).</p> <p>The project has undertaken the community land delimitation in 54 communities in 4 municipalities of Caconda, Caluquembe, Chicomba and Quilengues, benefiting around 29.400 families. The process involved 30 participants (4 women and 26 men) from</p>	

2023 Project Implementation Report

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 TargetMid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
						the Municipalities of Caconda, Quilengues, Caluquembe and Chicomba. The inclusive land and natural resource management systems were established and are being implemented in the target municipalities through the activities developed in the FFS.	
	Outcome 4						
	Project implementation based on result-based management and application of project lessons learned in future operations facilitated	<p>Outcome indicator 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>	N.A	<p>60% progress in achieving project outcomes</p> <p>Monitoring of Results Two six-monthly progress reports prepared. (one PPR and one PIR)</p> <p>Mid-term evaluation/review conducted Project best practices and lessons learned</p>	<p>4.0 Project outcomes fully achieved and showing sustainability</p> <p>4.1.1 Final performance framework developed</p> <p>4.1.2 Six-monthly progress reports prepared and submitted. (one PPR and one PIR)</p> <p>4.1.3 Mid-term evaluation/review and final evaluation conducted.</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>M&E framework developed</p> <p>11 Biannual progress reports prepared 5 Annual progress reports prepared</p> <p>The mid-term evaluation was done between September and November 2019. Final Evaluation held in February 2023.</p> <p>The project activities are regularly posted on social</p>	S

2023 Project Implementation Report

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

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
				collected Newsletter 3	4.2 Project best practices and lessons learned collected, compiled and disseminated through annual newsletters, and reports	networks. Best practices and successful stories were collected in 2022 in MOSAP and IRCEA implementation areas, and a document produced.	

Measures taken to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings on Section 2

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
N/A as the project is being closed			

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
<u>Outcome 1</u> 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.	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	Cumulative: 15 MINAMB, 15 MINAGRI, 15 MINCO, 10 Civil Society Organizations, 40 Provincial Government 10 academia and research institutions staff have increased capacity and knowledge on CCA and SLM practices including on climate vulnerability assessment	8 expert of academia and 8 technicians of provincial department of MINAMB trained on SPAA.	
<u>Output 1.1</u> 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	Cumulative target: 15 MINAMB, 15 MINAGRI, 15 MINCO, 10 Civil Society Organizations,	Training of 8 expert of academia on SPAA and 8 technicians of the provincial Department of Environment (MINAMB). Training handbook on SPPA produced and distributed.	

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.

		40 Provincial Government 10 academia and research institutions	Also, the academy participated in the creation of training material for the Agrobiodiversity Centers.	
Output 1.2 Rapid vulnerability assessment conducted and relevant staff trained to ensure regular updating of vulnerability information	Vulnerability Assessments (4)	Cumulative: 4 CVA realized	SPAA carried out, 8 academia technicians trained.	
Outcome 2 115,000 farmers adopt CCA/SLM practices	Outcome Indicator 2.1 (AMAT indicator 4): Extent of adoption of climate resilient technologies/practice	Cumulative: 115,000 farmers (75% of the beneficiaries, of which at least 30% are women) adopt resilient technologies/practices	About 2,470 farmers have adopted FFS practices and their 175 FFS were upgraded to 2 nd /3 rd learning cycle. About 2,640 farmers benefitted of chitaka tool and agricultural equipment in 80 FFS. About 2,970 farmers received FFS grants in 90 FFS.	
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	Cumulative target: Master trainers and facilitators recruited and having received basic training from MOSAP II in year 4 are re-trained on CCA and SLM.	In October 2022 a total of 81 between MT and facilitators (10 women) participated to a refresher training about CCA and SLM practices in FFS. The 5-days training was carried out in Caluquembe and included practical and theoretical classes enhancing exchanges of experiences among the beneficiaries. Master Trainers and Facilitators were motivated to practice family farming without the use of chemicals, seed multiplication and use of mulch for better water management. They were also trained on management grants and community funds (Caixa comunitaria), food security and gender-sensitive approach.	

<p>Output 2.2 150 new FFS in Huila trained on CCA/SLM</p>	<p>Number of FFS trained</p>	<p>Cumulative target: 150 FFS established</p>	<p>Grants of 350 USD each (equivalent in AOA) were provided to 90 FFS (35 in Caluquembe, 20 in Caconda, 20 in Chicomba and 15 in Quilengue). Those grants aimed to reinforce financial capacity of those 90 FFS.</p> <p>173 FFS were validated to the 2nd and 3rd learning cycle</p> <p>Also, FFS benefitted of the chitaka tool, which is an integrated multi-productive model</p> <p>In October 2022, 6 FFS were involved in the Participatory Agroecological Approach (SPAA) and developed "implementation plans for their commune areas". FFS involved were the following: Capitango (Caluquembe municipality), Chowingue and Tchilinga Tchovaculo (Chicomba), Soy Yepia, Cecilia Tchamundele and Twenda Kovasso (Caconda).</p> <p>Also, during the reporting period, FFS received agricultural materials and small animals to boost their production and economic operations.</p> <p>80 chitakas were installed in the reporting period.</p> <p>A total of 140 FFS members of the 4 municipalities were trained on Community Seed Banks (CSB) and a plan for setting up CSB was presented to the municipal authorities and representatives of</p>	
--	------------------------------	---	--	--

			the IRCEA FFS members, who identified where to place the CSB. CSB Management Group were also created within each municipality. 2 CSB were installed in Caluquembe and Caconda, while 2 CSB are going to be installed by communities themselves. Local varieties were considered as the only ones for the Community Seed Bank due to their drought and climate resilience characteristics.	
Outcome 3 Environmental and agriculture policies and programs at national and decentralized level integrate CCA aspects	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>Cumulative: CCA aspects are being mainstreaming in annual MINAMB, MINDCOM and MINAGRIF sectoral planning and budgeting</p> <p>3 municipalities in Huila Province have an inclusive land and natural resources management system</p>	<p>Agrobiodiversity centers established in 4 municipalities, including communitarian bank seed.</p>	No progress at national level due to the internal reorganization of target ministries after elections.
Output 3.1 Inter-sectoral task forces in place/strengthened, defining integrated CCA agendas and tailoring them into sector-level programming	n/a	<p>Cumulative target:</p> <p>Task force established and meeting quarterly</p> <p>Technical proposal developed</p> <p>The two commission meet quarterly</p> <p>5 year CCA mainstreaming strategy developed and used for planning and budgeting exercises</p>		On 5 th Aug. 2022 a meeting with the Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Environment (MCTA) was carried out. During the meeting the main activities developed, constraints, subsequent actions and monitoring of the decisions agreed during the previous coordination meeting

				held on 5 May were presented. It was also informed that the National Commission on Climate Change and Biodiversity (CNACB) will be the mechanism for technical evaluation and approval of project initiatives and it was emphasized that it was the last meeting for this legislature and that after the elections it will be resumed.
Output 3.2 Climate change adaptation integrated into an effective land and natural resources management system in 3 municipalities	n/a	Cumulative target: 3 municipalities in Huila Province have an inclusive land and natural resources	In September 2022, an LoA was signed with the Instituto Superior Politécnico Tundavala (ISPT) to create 4 Agrobiodiversity Centres within FFS of targeted the municipalities, and to elaborate an Illustrated Catalogue of Plant Species of Agroecological Interest in Huila. Twenty water boreholes were created in the municipality of Quilengues and 3 Dics in the municipality of Caluquembe and repair on a water dam in the municipality of Caconda. This water retention system has contributed to greater water management and mitigating the effects of drought.	
Outcome 4 Project implementation based on result-based management and application of project lessons learned in future operations facilitated.	Fulfilment of planned M&E activities including establishing baseline values for all project indicators, yearly updating of indicators, a mid-term	Project outcomes fully achieved and showing sustainability	The project fully achieved the outcomes 1 and 2. Outcome 3 was not fully achieved due to the political context after elections.	

	evaluation/review and a final project evaluation		IDA, provincial department of environment and Provincial Government of Huila are strongly involved in the project and showing commitment to provide support after project end, following the exit strategy elaborated in early 2022.	
Output 4.1: Project monitoring system providing systematic information on progress in meeting project outcomes and output targets	n/a		A refresher training of M&E data collection on FFS was provided to IRCEA municipal technicians in July 2022. The FFS database was updated through the smartphone/tablets monitoring app, named “platform ECA1.1”, between July and November 2022.	
Output 4.2 Project-related “best-practices” and “lessons learned” disseminated via publications and other means	n/a	Project best practices and lessons learned collected, compiled and disseminated through annual newsletters, and reports	Training of 2 technicians to identify successful stories. Elaborated: Participatory Survey with Agroecological Approach (SPAA) on Climate Resilience of Farmer and Pastoralist households of FFS under IRCEA project IRCEA-SPAA Rapid Soil Assessment document, including report of SPAA carried out and SPAA Questionnaire	

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

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

Major results and challenges during the reporting period are summarized below.

Outcome 1: 8 experts were trained and involved in the SPAA survey.

Outcome 2:

From the 16th to the 30th of January, the project coordination and the operations team carried out the distribution plan for small animals, material for the installation of CSB, micro silos, material for the chicken coop and agricultural equipment in the IRCEA FFS.

Chitakas were installed in FFS.

On March 15, 2023, the installations of the Community Seed Banks of Caluquembe and Caconda were completed and delivered. For the municipalities of Quilengues and Chicomba, the entitled vendor did not proceed with the construction of the remaining 2 CSB due to weather conditions limiting access to selected FFS, and to shortage of construction material in these municipalities. The vendor left all the material to continue the construction of the CSB in the municipality of Quilengues and Chicomba. To complete them it will be necessary to pay the labor.

In March 09 to 11, 2023 a service contract was signed with the Instituto Superior Politécnico Tundavala, to create agrobiodiversity centers in the municipalities targeted by the project, and to train Provincial Directorate for the Environment, municipal administrators, facilitators, master trainers and members of the ECAs those centers and on Herbarium Procedures. The training was provided with support of the Science and Technology Center – Herbarium of Lubango.

Regarding Outcome 3, the project faced constraints in having quarterly meetings and Steering Committee in 2022, mainly due to the election period (Aug.2022), which lead to a reorganization within the Ministry of Environment.

For Outcome 4:

The FAO Angola Monitoring and Evaluation team continued to monitor the FFS created under the project using the ECAS 1.0 digital platform. Field missions were carried out to monitor the materials that were distributed to beneficiaries.

The final evaluation began fieldwork in February, carried out by OED technical team. During the evaluation, field visits were carried out in the provinces of Huila, Huambo and Bié in order to verify the degree of implementation of the FFS and the lessons learned during the implementation of the project.

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

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

	FY2023 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	We had satisfactory results during the execution of the project's activities in this reporting period, and some lessons learned were absorbed in this process that will serve for future projects.
Budget Holder	S	S	The IRCEA Project achieved most of its major global environmental objectives, particularly the outcome 2, with minor shortcomings on outcome 3 ; the project activities are rated as satisfactory. 2- Despite some delays observed during project implementation due, particularly to the covid-19 pandemic and political issues, several progresses were noted in outcomes delivery. The reported results have been rated as satisfactory
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸			
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	S	S	Satisfactory results were achieved during the reporting period, especially for Outcome 1 and 2. The mid-term Review allowed to underline possible shortcuts and criticalities to be solved for Outcome 3 and 4.

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

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

¹⁷ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

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

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

GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	MS	MS	In the reporting period, the project managed to deliver on outstanding activities and launched the terminal evaluation process – despite a challenging electoral context. Terminal evaluation results and lessons learned should be duly shared and be used to inform especially other ongoing FAO-GEF projects in Angola (GEF ID 9798 & 10256).
--	-----------	-----------	--

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

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

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

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

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

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

<i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i>
No grievance received.

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

6. Risks

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder
1	<u>Climate contingency risk:</u> 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 proactive 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 strengthened FFS family members' resilience through the promotion of agroecological approaches, CCA and SLM practices, and establishing community bank seeds at municipality level.</p> <p>To mitigate the Pest and disease outbreaks, the project held trainings of livestock handlers and delivered veterinary kits. Among others, the project supported FFS members with trainings to manage Tuta absoluta on tomato and during locust outbreak (African Migratory Locust - AML) in 2021.</p>	

²¹ Risk ratings means a rating of accesses the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder
2	<p>Institutional risk at the national level: Difficulties in institutional cooperation between MINAMB, MINCO and MINAGRI may constitute a challenge Risk of management change in local institution Decrease in project ownership and support from government.</p>	High	Y	<p>MINAMB and MINAGRI will benefit from several trainings and an inter-sectoral task force including both ministries, MINCO and the civil society will be set up under Component 3 in order to ensure cross-sectoral project coordination.</p> <p>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>At National level, monthly coordination meetings with MCTA 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> <p>However, ministries' set up changed twice during the project life, and the MINAMB became Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Environment (MCTA) in 2019, and back to MINAMB in 2022; the CNBA was restructured and its staff renewed.</p> <p>In this context, the project faced constraints in meeting quarterly with the Commission on Climate Change and Biodiversity (CNACB).</p>	

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder
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, including academia, higher institutes, the Herbarium of Lubango and organization of the civil society. Following the MTR recommendations, LoAs were established with those institutes/organizations.	
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	<p>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.</p> <p>Achievements on the ground that bring benefits to local producers will be demonstrated during the project to overcome scepticism. Regarding local institutions, common objectives will be established by giving emphasis on local ownership of the process as well as capacity</p>	The FFS approach was declared by MINAGRIF as model for the rural extension, in 2015, therefore local institutions are favorable to apply this approach. Also, FFS are widely implemented in Huila, where other FFS project are implemented, namely the ARP (directly by IDA), SAMAP, FRESAN (by FAO), and other FFS projects within the EU FRESAN program are implemented by NGOs (WV, CODESPA, COSPE).	
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	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Also, the project hired technicians at municipal level, to overcome MT constraint in providing regular follow up to FFS. In fact, MT belongs to provincial IDA and local departments of agriculture, and are often busy with governmental agendas.</p> <p>Municipal technicians were hired in 2021 to support MTs and ensure follow up of facilitators, FFS and their monitoring, fulfilling the FFS database and smartphone app "platform FFS 1.1".</p>	

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder
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 were respected. The project contributed in elaborating leaflets on biosafety measures. Those leaflets were translated in each local language and provided to local authorities of target municipalities and to MT to distribute for FFS. Therefore, during the pandemic's restrictions project activities were carried out through local stakeholders.	

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

FY2022 rating	FY2023 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Moderate	Low	During the reporting period, constraints linked with the Covid-19 pandemic decreased.

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	As part of the follow-up of field activities, agricultural materials were delivered to the FFS, as well as FFS grants. Representatives of the IDA/EDA, municipal administration and traditional authorities were present during the delivery.
Recommendation 2: Effectiveness (B) Include teacher's training in capacity building strategy (Component 1)	The project team prepared the exit strategy, which included the definition of a sustainability strategy for the FFS and the definition of plans with the Municipal Administrations for the continuation of support on the ground with the end of the project.
Recommendation 3: Define and implement an "FFS-Model" plan focused on specific themes that act as models/examples in each municipality (Component 2)	A monitoring system was put in place using the digital platform ECAS 1.0. This platform collects geo-referenced data of all FFS.
Recommendation 4: Set up an FFS-based Pilot Internship Program (Component 2)	N/A in the reporting period
Recommendation 5: Hold a National Conference on Climate Change (Component 3)	A National Conference about Farmer Field Schools including Climate Change adaptation issues was 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 survey "Participatory Survey with Agroecological Approaches" was finalized.
Recommendation 7: Strengthen partnerships with national institutions and reduce the weight of international consultants in carrying out activities	Partnership with ISPT, Herbarium and private companies to support agrobiodiversity centers
Recommendation 8: Define an exit strategy for the project, including alignment with "Government's ongoing ECA institutionalization strategy"	N/A in the reporting period .

Recommendation 10: Strengthen internal Monitoring & Evaluation procedures	FFS database/digital platform updated. 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	Backstopping Team created. Regular support provided during the latest phase of the project,
Recommendation 12: Strengthen internal procedures for Communication & Visibility and Knowledge Management	10 Successful stories and 5 lessons learnt collected through the partnership with MOSAP II.
Recommendation 14: Review partner's co-financing strategy and account for other support being provided to the project but not considered as co-financing	N/A in the reporting period
Recommendation 15: Adopt a more inclusive and gender-sensitive strategy	A gender sensitive strategy was adopted within the agro-biodiversity center's coordination unit
Recommendation 16: Prepare and request from GEF an extension of the project execution period	Project extended up to May 2023.
Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize	Not in the reporting period. In the 1 st semester of 2022 the project presented the exit strategy to IDA and the Provincial Government of Huila, who are responsible for monitoring and following up on the FFS implemented by the project.

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			
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management			
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 restrictions related to Covid-19, FAO requested the Government (MCTA) in September 2021 a non-extension of costs November 2022 until to achieve the expected results of the project. And in 2023, a few more agricultural and animal materials were delivered, the final evaluation of the project, the financial closing and the audit.	From November 2021 to May 2023	BH and MINAMB
Executing Entity			
Executing Entity Category			
Minor project objective change			
Safeguards			
Risk analysis			
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%			
Co-financing			
Location of project activity			
Other minor project amendment (define)			

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

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

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

Stakeholder name	Type of partnership	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government institutions			
Government participation in the final project evaluation	Receive the project evaluators and answer all the questions that were asked related to the project	Members of the Ministry, Government, Local Administrations, Provincial Directorate of Agriculture, Provincial Directorate of IDA, Provincial Directorate of Environment had a meeting with the evaluators.	
Private sector entities			
FIRMA DESEDERIO NDALA	Provide services to the project	Installation of two Community Seed Banks and delivery of 2 materials for 2 more CSB	The interested parties participated and were trained on CSB.
Company NDAYULA	Provide services to the project	Delivery of small animals to the FFS and finalization of microsilos.	During the delivery of the animals to the FFS, the IDA representatives in the municipalities were part.
Others²³			
Service contract with the INSTITUTO SUPERIOR POLITÉCNICO TUNDAVALA,	A service contract was signed with the INSTITUTO SUPERIOR POLITÉCNICO TUNDAVALA, and one of the products of this service are the agrobiodiversity centers in the municipalities targeted by the project.	4 Agrobiodiversity Centers were delivered to FAO partners (Representatives of the Provincial Directorate of IDA in the municipality, Representatives of the Provincial Directorate of the Environment in the municipalities and municipal administrators), facilitators, master trainers and FFS members. After delivery, training was carried out on how to use the Agrobiodiversity center and Herbarium Procedures	The interested parties participated

²³ They can include, among others, community-based organizations (CBOs), Indigenous Peoples organizations, women's groups, private sector companies, farmers, universities, research institutions, and all major groups as identified, for example, in Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and many times again since then

10. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) during this reporting period.

Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period.
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	NO	
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	YES	During the implementation of the project, women were integrated into the FFS management committee and, in addition to facilitators, there were also facilitators in each project intervention municipality.
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	YES	Training of women through the FFS activities
b) improving women's participation and decision making	YES	Women in the management of seed banks and in the management of the Agrobiodiversity Centers that were created
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	YES	The agricultural materials and seeds that were distributed in the FFS contributed to increase production and will contribute to access to a financial mechanism that will generate socioeconomic impacts and services with real benefits for women and children.
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	YES	The monitoring system's database has georeferenced information on all the FFS and all the materials that the FFS
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.	<p>The good practices adopted by the project that can be shared are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Living ground cover Composting Biochar Seed cleaning Seed multiplication Crop consortium Cultural rotation Identifying plants and other organic materials that can be used in the production of organic fertilizers (liquid and non-liquid) Use and conservation of existing natural resources in order to increase production, harvests and biomass. Maximizing the use of land spaces, in order to plant vegetable fruits and other plants, conserving water and protecting the soil Adoption and strengthening of sustainable production models Reproduction by grafting
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	<p>For communication, the project's strategy used to share the materials of each training, in the form of brochures with illustrative drawings to help the beneficiaries consult.</p> <p>This year, when delivering the Agrobiodiversity centers, the beneficiaries received an herbarium guide with all the steps on how to maintain the center and with information related to each local species.</p>
Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.	<p>In the municipality of Chicomba, the FFS Tchoiny has 10 members. A success story has been recorded. The members of the community in general had the myth that the soils in the village were not suitable for sowing beans, so in the study plots the FAO technician through the project shared the intercropping technique (beans and maize), the members recorded the results positively. As a result of this technique and they recognized and felt motivated to continue to produce beans not only in consortium with corn, but also on large scales as a cash crop and have already begun to replicate this practice in their farms.</p>
Please provide links to related website, social media account	FAO Official Twitter: https://twitter.com/FAOAngola

a		
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	ATLAS https://unfao.sharepoint.com/:f:/s/faoAO/EnoD61PYXc9Ao5NuOPagmVEBZpPeJ9jOy8mN7jfYpZFW3A?e=luQPUJ	
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details	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 ²⁴	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ²⁵	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
UN	FAO		4,300,000.00	4,300,000	n/a	4,300,000
National Government	MINAGRIF	In-kind	13,500,000.00	13,500,000	n/a	13,500,000
National Government	MINAMB	In-kind	3,325,000.00	3,500,000	n/a	3,500,000
National Government	MINDCOM	In-kind	2,494,230.00	1,629,690	n/a	1,629,690
Government	Provincial Government of Huila	In-kind	0	239,540	n/a	239,540
University	Herbario de Lubango	In-kind	0	450,000	n/a	450,000
		TOTAL	23,619,230	23,619,230		23,619,230

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

Provincial Government and University/High Institute were also considered as cofinancing entities.

²⁴Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

²⁵Grant, Loan, Equity Investment, Guarantee, In-Kind, Public Investment, Other (please refer to the *Guidelines on co-financing* for definitions)

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

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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

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

Annex 2.

GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap](#) or [GeoNames](#) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#)

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location & Activity Description
Caconda Municipality	-13.75376	15.15389	3351379	Province of Huila
Caluquembe Municipality	-13.92093	14.53476	335102	Province of Huila
Chicomba Municipality	-14.30788	14.98672	334994	Province of Huila
Quilengues Municipality	-13.99213	13.76705	3346556	Province of Huila

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