



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Africa
Country (ies):	Angola
Project Title:	Integrating climate resilience into agricultural and agropastoral 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), Ministry of Agriculture and Forest (MINAGRIF)
Project Duration:	

Milestone Dates:

Datas

GEF CEO Endorsement Date	05/05/2016
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD:	03/11/2016
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	30/09/2021
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	N/A
Actual Implementation End Date³:	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD)	6,668,182
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴	23,619,230

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

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

Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	2,683,757
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	11,900,000

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	Dez 2018
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	01/10/2019
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	01/10/2019
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	YES
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	N/A
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	YES (to be submitted after the mid term review)

Ratings

Classificações

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

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

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

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

Status

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

Project Contact

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Joao da Costa Vintem, FAO Angola	Joao.vintem@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Abram Bicksler (AGPM)	abram.bicksler@fao.org
Budget Holder	Gherda Barreto	gherda.barreto@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Fritjof Boerstler, CBC Technical Officer	fritjof.boerstler@fao.org

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ¹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹
Objective(s): strengthen the climate resilience of the agropastoral production systems in key vulnerable areas in the provinces of Bbié, Huambo, Huila and Malange 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						
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.	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	Institutions currently have a low capacity and limited knowledge on CCA and SLM practices in crop-livestock production systems No climate vulnerability assessments have been conducted in any of the 4 provinces of intervention	MINAMB, MINAGRI, MINCO, Provincial Government, Academia and research institution, and Civil Society staff trained, aware of CCA and SLM practices, and aware of the results of the CVA	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	Technical Agro meteorology guide produced and being translated to Portuguese. 6 relevant INAMET and GSA officials trained in theoretical and practical aspects of agrometeorology	MS
Outcome 2: 115 000 farmers adopt CCA/SLM practices	Outcome Indicator 2.1 (AMAT indicator 4): Extent of adoption of climate resilient technologies/practices	Farmers already involved in FFS but not specifically adopting CCA and SLM practices to increase their resilience. 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	3,000 farmers adopt resilient technologies/practices	115,000 farmers (75% of the beneficiaries, of which at least 30% are women) adopt resilient technologies/practices	54 (41 men, 13 women) Master Trainers and 978 (893 men and 85 women) facilitators of MOSAP II trained in CCA; Aprox 50.000 families benefit from this approach in MOSAPII FFS 27 Master Trainers and 320 FFS Facilitators trained in Huila Province 160 FFS Established in the 4 Municipalities of Huila. This means 5600 families benefitted by participating in FFS in Huila	MS

<p>Outcome 3: 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>At national level: no strategy to integrate CCA into sectoral annual budgeting and planning is in place</p> <p>Municipalities in Huila do not have a land and natural resources management system including CCA considerations in place</p> <p>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</p>	<p><i>No defined in the Prodoc</i></p>	<p>CCA aspects are being mainstreamed in annual MINAMB, MINCO and MINAGRI sectoral planning and budgeting</p> <p>3 municipalities in Huila Province have an inclusive land and natural resources management system</p>	<p>4 municipal teams composed of 6 technicians each were trained in the Participatory Community Land-DPTC methodology;</p> <p>54 Participatory Land Delimited Communities are in official process of land delimitation, benefiting around 29.400 families</p> <p>Natural resource management systems have been initiated in the 4 interventional municipalities in the province of Huila, Caconda, Caluquembe, Chicomba and Quilengues</p>	<p>MS</p>
--	---	--	--	--	--	------------------

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

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.	Hire CTA immediately to support national coordinator in the re-activation of this outcome. Reproduce training at national and provincial level. Continued dialogue with line ministries to define action plan for capacity building of national officials Implement the training program on Agro-meteorology and climatology and provide extended trainings to a larger group to ensure the critical mass needed to handle the challenges of data processing.	UCP FRANG LTO	Oct 2019
Outcome 2: 115 000 farmers adopt CCA/SLM practices	Continue with the implementation of this outcome, as it is currently in progress Strengthen coordination between the project and IDA and also MOSAPII and IRCEA Set periodic coordination meetings	UCP FRANG LTO	Dec 2019
Outcome 3: Environmental and agriculture policies and programmes at national and decentralized level integrate CCA aspects	Reinforce pressure at national level to get the land titles approved by local governors. Engage local and traditional authorities in the process of participatory community land delimitation Promote high-level policy dialogue to help streamline the administrative and legal process of delimitation of community land.	UCP FRANG LTO	Dec 2019

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ⁷	Expected completion date ⁸	Achievements at each PIR ⁹ Conquistas em cada PIR					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁰ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1: 120 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	Q1 Y3	Following dialogues with the MINAMB, the recruitment of the Capacity Building consultants (IC and NC) was postponed to 2nd semester in order to link the work of two IC. The ToRs were formulated and the selection process started since last April, 2018	An Agrometeorology introductory training was conducted in Luanda for 21 Government officials during 3 weeks in February 2019. The 6 most promising students went for a 12-week higher training to Italy in the Italian institute of agrometeorology (IVIMET). A practical guide on Agrometeorology is completed in English and is being translated into Portuguese. This output is being developed in partnership with the Mozambique GEF project on climate resilience.				35%	The outputs for the results of components 1 and 3 pose a challenge for the coordination of the Project. The recruitment process for the CTA has not yet been completed, as there are very few specialists with the required experience and necessary language skills for the project work. It is expected that during the third quarter suitable consultants will be identified. In order to accelerate the recruitment process, FRANG requested support from several Representations in order to share consultant lists on different FAO ROSTER.

⁷ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

⁸ As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q

⁹ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁰ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

Output 1.2: Rapid vulnerability assessment conducted and relevant staff trained to ensure regular updating of vulnerability information	Q4Y4	Preliminary institutional capacity assessment concluded; Consolidation of the historical data initiated; The two trainings (1 internal, 1 abroad) sessions of national staff is planned for Q3 Y2	First exploratory mission of the agronomist consultant to INAMET, GSA and the 4 intervention municipalities of Caconda, Caluquembe, Chicomba and Quilengues set the bases for the rapid vulnerability assessment. This output is being done in parallel with output 1.1				30%	
Output 2.1: A core group of master trainers and FFS facilitators involved in MOSAP II trained in CCA and SLM practices	Q2Y5	The progress of this expected output was pending on the implementation of MOSAP-II/SADCP. The training manuals for FFS as well as the guideline notes for facilitators to be used by MOSAP-II/SADCP was concluded and ready to be deployed	54 (41 men, 13 women) Master Trainers and 978 (893 men and 85 women) facilitators of MOSAP II trained in CCA. This training has have impact in 1428 FFS in the MOSAP II, contributing to around 50.000 Families				40%	The re-training/refreshment of Master Trainers from MOSAP is dependent on the speed of the implementation of the second phase of the project (MOSAP-II). Delays in launching MOSAP-II/SADCP have seriously affected the progress of this output in the beginning but now is starting to happen. The hiring of the CTA is also needed to consolidate the partnership with MOSAP II. For now the impact of IRCEA in these trainings has been soft, only introducing basic concepts on CCA, however it is expected that more solid CCA curricula will be introduced in the following months
Output 2.2: 150 new FFS in Huila trained on CCA/SLM	Q2Y5	27 master trainers (EDA extension workers) were trained in FFS methodology. 80 FFS in 14 municipalities created;; 160 FFS facilitators trained 240 FFS representatives trained	160 FFS in the province of Huila established and in implementation.				106%	More involvement of local extension services is needed to monitor FFSs. Drawing from the lessons learned from past projects, the selection of communities and the implementation of FFS was based on (i) the definition of a set of criteria (ii) the participation of local and traditional authorities in the selection process and (iii) the elaboration of study of the social, economic and environmental dimensions of the municipalities (the latter to be conducted under LoA signed between FAO and a local academic institution
Output 3.1: Inter-sectoral task	Q2Y5	Preparation of the comparative study of the operation of	The expert has been selected and is in hiring process				20%	Important delays in this output due to internal administrative delays in hiring, the absence of the CTA to facilitate the

<i>forces in place/strengthened, defining integrated CCA agendas and tailoring them into sector-level programming</i>		environmental commissions						dialogue with the commissions and the low activity of the commissions in the Ministry of Environment. (Change of president of Angola let the commissions in stand by)
Output 3.2: Climate change adaptation integrated into an effective land and natural resources management system in 3 municipalities	Q2Y5	Legal land rights expert supported the delimitation of community land at municipal level in 6 (six) communities (Calepi, Luvale II, Cambundi, Mbundji, Giraul, and Chindovi). The Municipality of Caluquembe has concluded the process of the limitation of their community land. 30 participants (4 women and 26 men) from the Municipalities of Caconda, Quilengues, Caluquembe and Chicomba, in the province of Huila, received a Hands-on training in "Participatory land delimitation and application of legal land rights" based on the "Manual for Participatory Land Delimitation".	Delimitation of the lands of 54 Communities (12 Caconda, 12 Chicomba and 12 Quilengues and 18 in Caluquembe. This sums a total of 29.400 beneficiary families. Titles are waiting for institutional endorsement (signature).				45%	It is necessary to reinforce the policy dialogue with the government to get the titles signed and then proceed with natural resources management plans.
Output 4.1: Project monitoring system providing systematic information on progress in	Q4Y5	The PCU continues to monitor key indicators. SHARP survey which was initially planned for October was further delayed to 2018 due to fact that the	The monitoring system is being managed by the Project coordinator with support of the FAO AO Office. The project received visits from LTO and FAOREP in different periods.				40%	The absence of the CTA makes it difficult to maintain the activity of the project. The selection process is getting to the end and it is planned that by October the new CTA will be on board.

meeting project outcomes and output targets		<p>upgrade of new version latest until November.</p> <p>PCU received the visit of FAOR, Mr. Diallo. During his mission the FAO Rep was able to discuss with trainees and trainers and visit the experimental plots.</p> <p>iii) PCU meet with the newly appointed new official of the ministry of environment to discuss relevant aspect of the project implementation.</p> <p>Discussion with DG IDA, to prepare a field mission.</p>						
Output 4.2: Project-related “best-practices” and “lessons learned” disseminated via publications and other means	Q3Y5	<p>Visibility materials:</p> <p>1 flyer on FFS printed; basic concept of farmer field school, soon to be printed.</p> <p>1 flyer on CCA printed; introduction to CCA, soon to be printed</p> <p>1 booklet presenting the project and its expected results elaborated. ~10 A5 pages, including pictures, maps and graphs (still waiting final graphical).</p> <p>1 Roll – UP printed presenting the project key components and the intervention sites.</p> <p>2 large format maps of the project sites of intervention printed on canvas</p> <p>300 T-shirts of IRCEA</p>	Existing visibility materials for trainings and field activities are being used and new ones are being produced when necessary				30%	The absence of the CTA makes it difficult to maintain the visibility as the national coordinator is busy with many tasks. The selection process is getting to the end and it is planned that by October the new CTA will be on board.

		<p>were confectioned and distributed</p> <p>300 Caps of IRCEA</p> <p>30 collets for Masters</p> <p>30 Caps for Master Trainers</p> <p>Project on the media:</p> <p>The national project coordinator was interviewed on several occasions by the local radios and TV stations</p> <p>The FFS – Field day was an important event that gathered over 450 local participants. The message of the event was well disseminated through a wide media coverage(TV, Radio and Newspapers)</p> <p>The Webpage design is still an ongoing objective. After reviewing the technical and the financial proposal from an external company, the PCU is considering the engagement of national company. The proposal also included several products (short video, infographics, posters, flyers etc...) in at least Portuguese and Unbundo</p>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

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

Max 200 words:

Component 1: Strengthening knowledge and understanding of climate change vulnerability and adaptation

The dialogue with national officials helped identify the main sectors to be targeted. More than 100 officials from the planning and budget sectors of the Central and Provincial Government will receive training in CCA. The training materials and leaflets related to the training cycles are prepared but its finalization remains dependent on the hiring of the International Consultant (CTA).

Regarding the institutional capacity of INAMET and GSA, an international consultant was hired, who carried out an initial mission of study and evaluation of the institutional capacity of both institutions, besides having meetings with some academic institutions. Taking advantage of his experience and knowledge, the consultant made an identification of suitable training institutions, including with the selection of the IBIMET-CNR from Italy. This training was preceded by an introductory training with a duration of 6 weeks in a collaboration between GCP/ANG/050 LDF of Angola and GCP /MOZ/112 LDF of Mozambique.

Component 2: Scaling up of improved CCA/SLM practices through Farmers Field Schools (FFS)

The Coordination Units of the IRCEA and MOSAP Projects is doing the joint training program of Master trainers and facilitators of field schools.

Master trainers and facilitators of 4 municipalities of Huíla (Caconda, Caluquembe, Chicomba and Quilengues) and 160 FFS were created and a training plan was established. The respective Starting Funds in local currency equivalent to USD 700 were transferred to each FFS. The Technical Unit of Support and Facilitation-UTF carried out a systematic follow-up of the FFS.

The detailed implementation plan of 160 FFS in the 14 communes of the 4 municipalities was designed by the IRCEA project and discussed with IDA and municipal authorities responsible for agriculture and rural development. At the foundation of the plan, schools were created in all communes of the four intervention municipalities as indicated in the tables below:

Table 1: Current FFS and their respective cycle and members desegregated by gender in the municipality in the province of Huíla.

Municipality	# of FFS	Cycle			Members		
		I	II	III	Men	Women	Total
Caconda	47	X			832	644	1476
Caluquembe	38	X			696	489	1185
Chicomba	52	X			717	537	1254

Quilengues	23	X			416	261	677
TOTAL	160				2661	1931	4592

Table 2: The Management team of the FFS by municipality of the Huila province.

Municipality	# of FFS	Cycle			Management team		
		I	II	III	Men	Women	Total
Caconda	47	X			119	67	186
Caluquembe	38	X			87	65	152
Chicomba	52	X			170	38	208
Quilengues	23	X			75	17	92
TOTAL	160				451	187	638

Component 3: Integration of the CEC into agricultural and environmental policies and programs

FAO Angola hired a national expert for 100 days to support the 4 municipal teams trained in community land delimitation processes. 48 Communities were delimited, also benefiting from a training and awareness session as part of the delimitation process in each of the three municipalities of Caconda, Chicomba and Quilengues and 18 in Caluquembe. Due to logistical challenges, there were delays in the allocation of funds for field subsidies, service payments and fuel.

The community land delimitation methodology developed by FAO was used as a preliminary step to guarantee land tenure and its use as a mortgage asset to obtain financing from banking institutions, and as an ultimate goal for the development of community resource management action plans to be carried out by an international expert to be hired for this purpose. The development of this product is still very dependent on the hiring of an international consultant and the CTA to facilitate the political dialogue with the government.

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

Max 200 words:

The challenges can be summarized as follows:

The main challenge has been the difficulty in hiring specific consultants with the additional challenge of the language (Portuguese speaking is very much important to work in Angola). Additionally, it has been a challenge for the office to adapt to the new FAO hiring procedures in a period that the office was without a FAOREP and there has also been a change of LTO. Both the prior FAOREP and LTO have retired and a new FAOREP and LTO have been appointed.

Another challenge is the large amount of activities that the project plans to implement at the same time, which along with the absence of the CTA, makes the delivery of the project very challenging.

Gender: it is very challenging to work with a balanced gender approach due to cultural and social reasons in the area. However, with the support of the FAO Angola office the project is maintaining a gender approach.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating ¹¹	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating ¹²	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	MU	MS	The UCP understands that the current levels of project implementation do not correspond to the commitment of the project staff. The arrival of the new Representative and the structuring of services under way at FRANG was key in helping FAO to eliminate delays in the administrative treatment of processes in terms of ensuring logistics and services for the realization of the products defined for each project.
Budget Holder	MU	MS	Although important delays have been accumulated due to the absence of CTA and changes of FAOREP and LTO, the project team has maintained activities in the ground. The office and the team have worked strongly in hiring the required consultants and will be soon incorporated in the team.

¹¹ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet.

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

¹² **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex.

Lead Technical Officer¹³	MU	MU	Project implementation has been beset by challenges, especially related to staff turnover of key positions (CTA, FAOREP, and LTO) and finding suitable replacements for key consultants and project CTA in addition to challenges inherent in the country. However, the FAOAO office and project teams have shown incredible resolve to carry on with the work and move forward to ensure the successful and relevant implementation of the project through FFS. The community land delimitation shows much promise, but needs the signing off of the government to be fully implemented. The PTF encourages the quick hiring of a CTA ASAP to lead the project in the remainder of its time and welcomes the Mid-Term Review which will happen soon.
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MU	MU	<i>The project implementation has slowed down drastically this year mainly due to the absence and re-hiring process of the project's CTA (the former left Angola for another position), slow procurement and difficulties in the identification of suitable consultants with the required expertise (including language skills). However, the new FAO Representation is well aware of the situation, mitigating and solving the bottlenecks. The successful implementation of Outcome 2 highly depends on a close collaboration with the baseline project. A close follow up (even without the CTA) is required to ensure the project's impact on the ground (farm level).</i>

¹³ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Unit

3. Risks

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

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ¹⁴ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Category C (LOW risk)	Category C is still valid

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

Risk ratings

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

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁵	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ¹⁶	Notes from the Project Task Force
--	------	---------------------------	-------------------	--	-----------------------------------

¹⁴ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

¹⁵ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

¹⁶ If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁵	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ¹⁶	Notes from the Project Task Force
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	Moderately High	<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 disease 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>	The project is mitigating 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	The project has made strong investments in FFS MTs and trainers, which will be critical in supporting the adoption of CCA practices

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁵	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ¹⁶	Notes from the Project Task Force
	<p>Institutional risk at the national level</p> <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>	High	<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 of 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>	The PCU and FAOREP has an intense strategy of involvement with national and local institution	<p>No major concerns regarding this institutional risk.</p> <p>Between MINAMB, MINAGRI has been fully engaged and intersectoral coordination to help foster the project activities is being implemented.</p> <p>Full engagement and intersectoral coordination between the two key ministries is very positive. The project has established engagement with government counterparts. Maintaining and enhancing these relationships will be key for many project outcomes.</p>

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁵	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ¹⁶	Notes from the Project Task Force
3	Risk of cooperation: Partnership-building capacities to ensure mainstreaming into on-going initiatives may constitute a challenge	Moderately High	Since the LDCF-funded activities and management will be closely inter-linked to the MOSAP, Terra and PMIDRCP projects,. The project is also expected to specifically strengthen capacities and mechanisms for mainstreaming CCA into programs and planning.	Some difficulties have been observed due to delays in hiring processes in IRCEA and starting in MOSAP II, but now this issue seems to be addressed. Now the risk is considered as low.	Strengthening coordination and collaboration with SADCP is a key priority.
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	Nevertheless, this risk 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 PCU has an intense awareness campaign in the field through the net of facilitators, master trainers, etc. Now the risk of reluctance of stakeholders is low.	Not only achieving targets to scale up FFS, but also focusing on high-quality FFS will be key to ensure community engagement.
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.	Moderately High	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.	The project is also strengthening the institutional capacity of key actors with the necessary technical equipment and materials to boost their analytic capacity and decision making process	No comments
6	Delays in selection process of International consultants, could affect the planning of project activities.	Moderately high	Training of staff in the new procedures	Recent changes in the platform and streamlining the process will mitigate delays. we expect that selection process could improve, hence the risk could become manageable.	This is a priority to address to prevent delays/risks in project delivery. Trainings have been done with support of regional offices and now contracts are being issued.

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁵	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ¹⁶	Notes from the Project Task Force
7	Lack of fluency in Portuguese language of most hired experts hinders the interaction with national institutions	medium	Improve criteria of selection process	Portuguese language proficiency is being considered as an important asset in the hiring processes.	Since Portuguese is not a UN official language it cannot be used as selection criteria of ICs.

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Medium	Medium	Currently all project risks are deemed manageable and no risk is adversely threatening the normal implementation of this project; however, mitigation measures have to be considered and more fully implemented

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months¹⁷

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

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

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

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	N/A

¹⁷ Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

5. Gender Mainstreaming

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

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

Yes, the socio-economic study of the 4 municipalities highlighted the social differences between men and women, showing how cultural issues, habits and customs conditioned the equal development among family members in rural societies. Although women play a major role in food production and income generation, they benefit little from this condition. The basis of this study has allowed the implementation of a strategy to raise competition among village social groups.

In the intervention zones, habit and custom relegate women to inferior positions. The FFS national consultant has been able to maintain a dialogue to raise awareness among the traditional authorities and the members of the schools on the issue of gender and the relationship between men and women in society. In this sense, there is already some progress in the communities with women occupying relevant posts in the field schools (including in roles of President, Treasurer and Facilitator). After 2.5 years of implementation, the percentage of women's involvement is 42% for FFS members and 29% of members in the Management Committees. The challenge of the Coordination Unit until the end of the year is to reach also about 30% of women as titular Facilitators.

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

Yes. The prodoc defines that at least 30% of the beneficiaries of the project are women. The experience of the staff of the Project has contributed greatly to emphasizing the issue of gender and the concerns about the various problems of women, maternal and reproductive health, HIV / AIDS, nutrition and breastfeeding, literacy, etc.

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

- Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources; YES
- Improving women's participation and decision making; YES
- Generating socio-economic benefits or services for women. YES

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

If applies, please describe the process and current status of on-going/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities

No indigenous people in all intervention areas

7. Stakeholders Engagement

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

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

- list all stakeholders engaged in the project;
MINAMB, MINAGRIF, MASFAMU, MTTI, PG Bié, Huambo, Huíla, Malange, ADRA, CODESPA, ACADIL, IIA, ISPT and UNICEF.
- briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.

MINAMB, MINAGRIF, MASFAMU and MTTI - engaged throughout the implementation period of the project contributing to specific products referred to in the prodoc, National Cross-National Commissions-CMA and CNBAC, FFS, CVA;
- GP Bié, Huambo, Huíla and Malange training and qualification of technicians and staff on CCA integration in the planning and budgeting sectors; and
- ADRA, CODESPA, ACADIL Recognition certificates for community lands;

8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

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

The project is being innovative in terms of bringing CCA approaches to the communities, in a context with high levels of poverty and food insecurity. Communities are concerned about climate change, not only due to the awareness made by the project but also because they are suffering the effects of climate change in their fields, reducing their yields due to droughts, irregular rains, etc. In this sense, the new techniques proposed in the FFS, including diversification of livelihoods, planting of more draught tolerant plants, and using specific SLM techniques are being very well accepted not only by farmers but also by technicians and local authorities that see in these approaches a response to the problem of Climate Change.

The first reconnaissance visit and presentation to the municipal authorities were carried out in some villages for contacts with the beneficiaries of the project. The main questions raised by communities in terms of problems in their production related to the shortening of the rainy season and its irregularity, (not knowing the start and the end). In the last years, rain levels increased and became irregular, resulting in an extension of the short dry season and increasing losses, including seeds, weak harvests, impassable routes, non-existence of markets, low cost of their production and consequently high levels of poverty and food insecurity.

The intervention of the project has also introduced new market-oriented production concepts, focusing on products that have greater commercial value and great demand in the market. The project also promotes the transition to organic farming, increasing farmers' incomes and improved agricultural cycles.

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ¹⁸	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval Montante	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
	FAO	In-kind	4,300,000	1,400,000		
National Government	Ministry of Environment	In-kind	3,325,000	3,000,000		
National Government	Ministry of Agriculture	In-kind	13,500,000	6,000,000		
National Government	Ministry of Commerce	In-kind	2,494,230	1,500,000		
TOTAL			23,619,230	11,900,000		

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

In the two years of implementation, the partners made new co-financing contributions, some IRCEA implementing municipalities have experienced major new activities either through direct government investments that are involved in the relaunch of agricultural production to reduce food imports or through projects funded by other bilateral or multilateral agencies and banking institutions. Most of the financial resources allocated are to support the reconstruction or construction of rural infrastructures, roads, dams and irrigation schemes.

¹⁸ 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/Global Environment Objectives Rating – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** - Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”); **Satisfactory (S)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** - Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U)** - Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** - The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

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