



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report 2022 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	9
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	13
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	16
6. RISKS	20
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	28
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	29
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	30
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	33
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	36
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	38
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	39

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Pacific/Oceania
Country (ies):	Kiribati
Project Title:	Resilient Islands, Resilient Communities
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/KIR/009/GFF
GEF ID:	5551
GEF Focal Area(s):	BD-1, LD-3, IW-3, SFM-1
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development, Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources Development, Island Councils through Ministry of Internal affairs.
Project Duration (years):	5 years
Project coordinates:	3.1167° N, 172.8000° E (Butaritari), 1.4333° N, 173.0000° E (North Tarawa), 1.1256° S, 174.6741° E (North Tabiteuea) and 1.8721° N, 157.4278° W (Kiritimati)

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	08 Jan 2018
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	16 Apr 2018
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	15 Apr 2023
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ²	NA

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 4,720,030
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc³:	USD 13,340,000
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)⁴:	USD 994,000
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022⁵	USD 6,540,000

¹ As per FPMIS

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

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

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

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

M&E Milestones

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	9 th March 2021
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	Q2/Q3 2022
Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):	
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	Jan 2023
Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	Yes

Overall ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/outcomes (cumulative):	Moderately satisfactory
Overall implementation progress rating:	Moderately satisfactory
Overall risk rating:	Substantial

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	Moderate
---	----------

Status

Implementation Status <i>(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):</i>	4 th PIR
--	---------------------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	David Piritasi Yeeting, National Project Coordinator, FAOKI, Kiribati	David.Yeeting@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.

Budget Holder	Xiangjun Yao, Sub-Regional Coordinator for the Pacific Islands, FAOSAP, Samoa	Xiangjun.Yao@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Florence Poulain, Fishery and Aquaculture Officer, FAO HQ	Florence.Poulain@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Lianchawii Chhakchhuak, Technical Advisor- GEF Coordination Unit	Lianchawii.chhakchhuak@fao.org

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

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

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

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating ¹¹
Improve biodiversity conservation and landscape level management to enhance socio-environmental resilience to climate variability and change	Outcome 1						
	Enabling environment improved for ecosystem-based sustainable use and conservation of island resources	- LD3 (tracking tool) Framework strengthening INRM score moved from 2 to 3	- Inadequate capacities for ecosystem-based sustainable use and conservation of island resources	- Cross sectoral mechanisms and community participation/stakeholder engagement model formally operationalized/implemented by end of project Y2.	- National and island level cross-sectoral mechanisms effectively engaging men and women stakeholders and facilitating coordinated R2R decision making in target areas by project end.	- Implementing partners have developed workplans with inclusive cross-sectorial approach, including effective mechanisms for whole island approach through extensive consultative process with island councils, elders and villages, and executed missions to the project islands to engage local level participation in decision making using a bottom up approach for	HS

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

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

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

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

						the management of land resources and sustainable production of agriculture.	
		- LD3 (tracking tool) Capacity strengthening to enhance cross-sector enabling environment score moved from 2 to 3	- Weak cross-sectoral framework for ecosystem-based sustainable use and conservation	- R2R school, outreach and extension programmes designed by end project Y2.	- R2R school, outreach and extension programmes emphasizing gender equity established in target areas, with regular trainings conducted for communities and Government staff (cross-sectoral training courses addressing cross-sectoral issues conducted) by project end. - INRM framework emphasizing gender equity formally proposed by project end.	- Development of school curricula in R2R approach is considered by certain implementing partners and to be developed through their AWP for outcome 1. The decision was endorsed by the PSC members in March 2021 consultations with relevant Ministry of Education and the curriculum unit have been conducted. - PSC and PMU have strengthened the cross-sectoral consultation linked to the project outcomes and implementing partners understand better the benefits of common outcomes and missions for the activities	S
	Outcome 2						
	National management system for ecosystem-based sustainable use and conservation of island resources established to deliver SFM, LD, and BD benefits	- 23477 hectares covered by integrated natural resource management (land and marine) practices in wider landscape	- Very limited integrated land and marine management practices implemented across wider landscapes	- Sense of ownership in resources and project activities is maintained and practiced sustainably at all levels in the local communities.	- 23,477 ha with integrated natural resource management (land and marine) practices adopted by local communities by project end.	- ToRs for international consultants developed to support fisheries in the establishment of a national system in place for MPAs. - Integrated community based management plans being developed and established with the local communities in the	MS

2022 Project Implementation Report

						project islands and enforced by the local council office. Consultation by the Ministry of Fisheries has been carried out with relevant partners and local government and communities on the establishment of a system for the selection of PAs in the project islands.	
	Outcome 3						
	Project implementation based on results based management and application and sharing of project findings and lessons learned	- Project M&E system designed, established and applied throughout the project and across all components, provinces and project sites	N/A	N/A	- Each annual workplan and progress report reflects lessons learnt and recommendations from M&E exercises until project end.	- AWP for the project outcomes was revised and endorsed during the PSC meeting in March 2021. Activities implemented are aligned to the project outcomes and based on results based management.	S
		- Successful sharing of lessons learnt across the region			- Annual Project Steering Committee and R2R meetings updated on project implementation, achievements and lessons learnt, with relevant communication materials developed throughout project life.	- Continuous consultation and awareness raising with implementing partners and local government conducted in the project islands. Preparations are currently in progress for the 3 rd PSC meeting and procurement of project materials was completed to be shipped from Rome to PMU for distribution during the PSC meeting.	S

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1: Enabling environment improved for ecosystem-based sustainable use and conservation of island resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop new LoA with ALD to carry out remaining activities from old LoA. - Recruit an NPP to be based at ALD to support implementation of activities in project islands. - Finalize recruitment of an NPP to be based at ECD to support implementation of LoA activities in the project islands. - Finalize LOA for MIA (implementing partner); Implementing partners with disbursements of LoA to execute as per their workplans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PMU and FAOSAP - PMU, ALD and FAOSAP - PMU, ECD and FAOSAP - PMU, MIA and FAOSAP 	July 2022
Outcome 2: National management system for ecosystem-based sustainable use and conservation of island resources established to deliver SFM, LD, and BD benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Finalize recruitment process for the PA National Consultant for Fisheries (CFD) - Continuous awareness raising and capacity building trainings of fisheries community wardens in the project islands on the newly endorsed fisheries regulation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PMU, FAOSAP and CFD - CFD NPP and Project Islands 	July 2022
Outcome 3: Project implementation based on results based management and application and sharing of project findings and lessons learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Knowledge sharing and lessons learnt experiences shared among stakeholders. - Improved information sharing through dissemination of project awareness materials and FAO visibility materials among stakeholders and the wider community (workshop report, newsletters, publication, PacIW:LEARN website and Pacific R2R website) - Development of communication strategy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PMU, FAOSAP and Implementing partners and relevant stakeholders and PSC. 	- To be finalized at the end of the project cycle but implemented through the entire project. The project's communication strategy was developed in May 2020.

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
Outcome 1.1				
Enabling environment improved for ecosystem-based sustainable use and conservation of island resources				
Output 1.1.1 R2R concept mainstreamed into sectoral development priorities, legal framework and policies with an emphasis on protecting and developing livelihoods	Integration of cross sectoral and ecosystem considerations in sectoral priorities	R2R concept integrated or mainstreamed into at least three sectoral priorities/policies / legal framework	- Development of Integrated community based mangrove managed plans in Butaritari, North Tarawa and North Tabiteuea. - Establishment of newly endorsed fisheries regulation enforced in North Tarawa, North Tabiteuea and Butaritari	- Delivery of project activities has not followed the timeline as per annual work plans of implementing partners due to the Covid19 pandemic which caused considerable delays and frequent pauses in progress.
Output 1.1.2 National level coordination mechanism developed for cross-sectoral decision-making (including on PAs)	Cross sectoral coordination and decision making mechanism present	Cross sectoral coordination mechanism established and functional	- Second PSC meeting in March 2021 recognized local level decision making in project activities and workplans for the project islands. - Development of Agricultural production on idle lands in the project islands incorporated participation and decision	- The PSC meeting as agreed by the committee members during the first PSC meeting in 2019 is to be convened twice every year. The Second PSC was convened in March 2021 and a third one was supposed to be October but because of the Covid19 community

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.

			making of local elders, chiefs and women.	transmission in Kiribati, it has to be postponed to July 2022. - For some islands, the project encountered delay with the selection of idle lands sites as landownership is a sensitive issue.
Output 1.1.3 Resilience and socio-ecological planning for national to island-level coordination mechanism on whole-of-island based R2R conservation and sustainable-use strategies streamlined across national and islands levels	Incorporation of resilience and socio-cultural considerations into the coordination mechanism	Coordination mechanism incorporates resilience and socio-cultural considerations	- Island level consultation with land owners on the selection of idle land sites for agricultural productivity recognizes an assessment that incorporated sensitive social-cultural considerations in the project islands.	- As explained above, the selection of idle land sites in North Tabiteuea was delayed and followed several consultations with the local communities as landownership matters are sensitive.
Output 1.1.4 National and island level environmental education, outreach and extension program developed	Number of individuals in R2R Masters Programme. Number of extension agents/staff trained. Number of schools/communities under the outreach programme.	At least two persons enrolled in R2R Master's program. 25 extension agents/staff trained and nine schools and 30 communities under the outreach programme	- At least 6 extension officers were recruited and undertook training to support implementation of LoA activities in the field for the offices of Environment and Fisheries. - No individuals identified as yet for the R2R master's program.	- The budget allocation for the Master's programs has not been used and PMU is not sure if the Master's program is still an activity to be included as a commitment of the project. Given lack of suitable candidates a budget revision is required.
Outcome 2.1 National management system for ecosystem-based sustainable use and conservation of island resources established to deliver SFM, LD, and BD benefits				
Output 2.1.1 R2R conservation and sustainable use strategies initiated in three islands in aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems	Number of integrated land and marine management plans	Three completed island level R2R management plans	- Integrated community based mangrove management plans were developed in Butaritari, North Tarawa and North Tabiteuea and enforced by the island council office together with community elders and chiefs.	- The Covid19 community transmission in Kiribati including the project islands is causing delays in the timely development of the integrated mangrove management plans.

Output 2.1.2 Expanded and complementary livelihoods developed as a part of the plans developed under Output 2.1.1	Number of new or complementary subsistence or livelihood activities developed. Number of households with expanded livelihood opportunities.	At least 350 households adopt engage in expanded/ complementary livelihoods	- Several idle lands have been identified in Butaritari, North Tarawa and North Tabiteuea and consultations were undertaken towards its development for agricultural productivity and sustainability. - Distribution of seedlings and agricultural trainings were conducted in the communities.	- Same as above, the pandemic caused a major setback for the implementation of the LoA activities for ALD and not able to be completed by the expiry date such that the entire LoA had to be closed.
Output 2.1.3 R2R conservation and use strategies across land and sea implemented at three target islands (through the integrated plans)	Number of hectares of agroforestry sites established. Number of hectares of forests restored. Number of hectares of marine area under co-management.	- 828 ha under agroforestry - 232 hectares under SFM - 22, 417 hectares of marine area under co-management	- 24 acres of idle lands sites was agreed by the project islands to be selected for agriculture production.	- This activity is part of the LoA with ALD that had already expired and so had to be closed. However, it is anticipated that these remaining activities are to be carried forward into a new LoA currently being developed and to be finalized and submitted for review in July 2022.
Output 2.1.4 At least three PAs established (where identified in Outputs 2.1.1)	Number of new PAs	3 new PAs established	- Discussions were undertaken between Fisheries FAOSAP technical officer, and potential consultants were identified to be engaged to establish a national system for the selection of PA in Kiribati. - ToRs were being discussed and developed.	- There was considerable delays with the identification of a potential national consultant to carry out this work as most of the candidates did not meet the experience requirements for this consultancy.
Outcome 3.1 Project implementation based on results based management and application and sharing of project findings and lessons learned				
Output 3.1.1 Monitoring, evaluation and reporting plan and system for the project established and operational	Set project targets and milestones achieved according to the work plans	Set project targets achieved	- A mid-term review national and international consultant was recruited in June 2022 to carry out the MTR work for the R2R project. - Preparations were underway for the conduction of the third PSC meeting with the main objective to discuss NTE of project and budget revision.	The MTR recruitment process encountered delays because of Covid19 pandemic.

Output 3.1.2 Project related 'knowledge' captured and shared	Knowledge and communication products. Number of regional R2R events participated in and contributed to	A project publication (in a format relevant to local stakeholders) with the results and lessons documented	- The project was procuring FAO visibility materials from Rome and to be shipped to Kiribati for distribution during the third PSC to the committee members and to be used as awareness raising materials in the project islands.	The shipment of these FAO visibility materials had been considerably delayed due to the restriction of borders for shipment of cargoes and passengers because of Covid19.
--	---	---	--	---

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

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

After the second Project Steering Committee (PSC) meeting conducted in March 2021, a LoA with the Ministry of Internal Affairs was developed in response to the request of the three project island councils for the development of their Strategic Plans (ISP). The Island Strategic plans are a fundamental mechanism that will ensure the project concept is mainstreamed into the sector development priorities of the project islands. The LoA has been submitted to the Local Procurement Committee (LPC) and was approved in June 2022, and currently finalizing vendor registration processes before facilitation of counter signatures. Furthermore, the office of the Environment and Conservation Division (ECD) as an implementing partner of the project managed to develop three integrated community based mangrove management plans in Butaritari island and three drafted in North Tarawa, and also completed engagement and capacity building development trainings for three extension officers in Butaritari, North Tarawa and North Tabiteuea. The coastal fisheries Division also successfully established a newly endorsed fisheries regulation and carried out and completed recruitment processes for three extension officers to be based in the project islands and conducted trainings for them to support implementation of LoA activities in the field.

Although, the progress of activities highlighted above proved success for some of the project outputs, yet it was challenged with delays and activities being executed in the midst of the Covid19 pandemic. The implementing partners found it challenging to cope with the timeframe of their annual work plans when the Covid19 pandemic struck Kiribati and was later found to be widespread in the communities in May 2021. As most of the activities are 100% island based, meaning that implementation require full time travels to the project islands, when Covid19 went community widespread, the government had to declare national emergency in the country on alert level 3 and borders had to be closed restricting interisland travel. This caused a major delay in the execution of the project activities in the field and eventually the period of the LoA with Agriculture and Livestock Division (ALD) expired. ALD only managed to receive the first funding disbursement of the LoA and carried out activities on the selection of idle lands in the project islands and a review of the Kiribati Biosecurity Act 2011. All these activities however, came to a halt when the Covid19 pandemic hit Kiribati and the long delay from then got caught up with the expiry date of the LoA such that it needed to be closed. Most of the progress of activities were carried out through virtual mode for consultation meetings to endorse decisions and also to monitor implementing partners' progress but in overall challenging and the Covid19 pandemic was a major factor causing delay in the overall execution of the R2R 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.

	FY2022 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2022 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	MS	MS	Covid19 restrictions and uncertainties with especially travel to the project islands to implement activities is slowing down progress. However, it is anticipated that the project will utilize the available options on the ground to continue delivery of the outputs from FY2019, FY2020, FY2021 and FY2022 onwards until project ends.
Budget Holder	MS	MS	Implementation of project activities has been delayed by COVID19 which has prevented the CTA and international consultant travel to Kiribati and travel of local staff (PMU) and Government project partners to outer island project sites to plan and implement field work, and led to initial LoA with MELAD expiring. With the forthcoming MTR and recommendations, appointment of new CTA, development of new LoA with MELAD and new sites on Kiritimati Island (flight schedules permitting) it is expected that these activities can be completed within budget (but will almost certainly require a no-cost extension)

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

Lead Technical Officer¹⁸	MS	MS	A number of project activities have been delayed due to COVID19, the difficulty/impossibility of travel from Tarawa to project outer islands and international travel to Kiribati by FAO staff and consultants. Progress has also been thwarted due to delays in recruitment of a project CTA
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MS	MS	The project has followed a participatory process in selection of idle land for agricultural production through consultations with community elders, village leaders and women. Trainings were conducted with officials on R2R approaches. Community based plans for mangrove management and fisheries regulations are in place to support the integrated natural resource management by local communities in over 20,000ha, during the course of the project. The project managed to conduct these activities under the challenging conditions posed by COVID 19, which also caused some setback in activities, including timelines agreed in the letters of agreements (LoAs) with different partners, recruitment of key personnel, movement to project sites in the outer islands, mid-term review, etc. The severe drought situation in Kiribati, including the project sites, and challenges in transport logistics further affected the project implementation. This is also reflected in the overall low delivery rate. In view of the above challenges, the project may require an extension to fully achieve its objectives.

¹⁸ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

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

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
	Community based management plans established and enforced to safeguard management of natural resources.	Development of integrated community based management plans in the project islands and enforcement of legal instruments to safeguard the marine resources in the project islands.	Capacity building trainings of community wardens and extension officers in the project islands to enforce legal instruments.	Environment and Conservation Division of the Ministry of Environment Lands and Agricultural Development (ECD MELAD) and Coastal Fisheries Division of the Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources Development (CFD MFMRD)
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
	Enforcement of bylaws and management plans to safeguard natural resource utilization.	Recruitment and training of extension officers in the project islands conducted to enforce conservation and management	Development of Island strategic plans in the 4 project islands and development of community based management plans	ECD MELAD, CFD MFMRD and Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA)

		measures on the natural resource access	some communities in North Tarawa and North Tabiteuea.	
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
	Credible forest certification scheme or national forest programmes established.	Development of idle land selection criteria for agricultural productivity being consulted with the local communities, local council members and landowners in Butaritari, North Tarawa and North Tabiteuea.	Consultation workshop with landowners to discuss further final selection of idle land sites in Kiritimati island and North Tabiteuea and North Tarawa.	Agriculture Livestock Division (ALD), MELAD
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
	Establishment of policies aligned with FAO strategic policies.	Development of the livestock policy and the Biosecurity regulation by ALD MELAD in consultation with government stakeholders and beneficiaries and farmers.	Review of the Biosecurity Act to be done and finalization of the livestock policy completed.	ALD MELAD (Livestock Policy Consultant)
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
	NA	NA	NA	NA
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
	NA	NA	NA	NA
ESS 7: Decent Work				
	Promoting more and better decent employment opportunities adhering to FAO's guidelines and standards.	Complete recruitment of 3 project personnel and 6 extension staff to support implementation of project activities in the project islands.	Capacity building training of extension staffs in the project islands to be completed.	ECD MELAD and CFD MFMRD

ESS 8: Gender Equality				
	Participation of both men and women in the project activities are recognized.	Community consultation on selection of idle land sites and community based management plans in Butaritari, North Tarawa and North Tabiteuea are conducted with the full council members where participation of both men and women in the endorsement of decision is recognized.	Further consultation with landowners and stakeholders on the production of the idle lands are to be completed and as well as distribution of agricultural seedlings, materials and tools to the beneficiaries.	ALD MELAD
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
	Process of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC)	Indigenous local communities in the project islands participate actively in the endorsement of decisions during consultation.	Consultation with local landowners in some of the project islands are yet to be undertaken to decide on the development of idle lands for agricultural development	ALD MELAD
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				

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

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ¹⁹ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Moderate	Current classification remains valid; this may change when project moves into Outcome 2. For the time being Outcome 1 will not have much impact on the risk classification.

<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>
NA

¹⁹ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

6. Risks

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Logistics stymie project implementation capacity	Moderate	Y	Distances are great and logistics challenging in Kiribati. The project is designed specifically to be sure adequate resources are available and focused. Pilot sites were chosen based upon the ability to generate strong models for replication.	PMU is continuously working with implementing partners to register local companies in the UNGM platform.	Transport logistics remain a challenge for the project, both international and domestic flight schedules, especially for travel by PMU and CTA to new project site Kiritimati which is 3,300 km from Tarawa (and with access via Fiji)

²⁰ 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 ²⁰	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
2	Sectoral barriers and siloed thinking within government ministries and agencies remain.	Substantial	Y	The project approach is to create space for government ministries, local councils and community leaders to share information and experiences. A special “listening” session has been arranged for communities to participate in the PSC. Project staff will emphasize the merits of creating a common and unified vision and assist in taking steps towards achieving a common goal. Links between the R2R and other relevant projects (including the GEF LDCF project) will be strengthened. M&E will track and provide specific feedback on progress towards cross-sector cooperation and non-silo thinking.	PSC as mechanism of discussion has been established with great success. As requested from the PSC stakeholders, the establishment of technical working groups among the implementing partners to meet and discuss issues between PSCs kept the momentum of project progress. Also ongoing regular meetings and follow ups with implementing partners progress helped PMU to evaluate progress of activities as per AWP and budget of Implementing partners.	Project is helping to facilitate communications and better coordinated approaches among different Ministries in relation to improved management of natural resources, including fisheries and agriculture.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
3	Island Government and community level support is not sustained, including failure of communities to follow the new rules.	Moderate	Y	<p>Collaboration of local communities will be critical to achieving the objectives of the project, but the communities will need incentives to take ownership and participate in the resource management and biodiversity conservation activities. It may be difficult to reach agreement with all members of communities on management and enforcement measures.</p> <p>Extensive community consultations are built into every aspect of the project. Project sites will be selected, in large part, in places where communities demonstrate an interest and willingness to engage in project activities. Project ownership will be generated very early and economic incentives through livelihood diversification and improvement activities will be provided. The project is also working very closely with the MIA. The Ministry is responsible for supporting the activities of Island Councils.</p>	<p>All implementing partners are continuously working with the project islands councils where feedback and endorsement of decisions undertaken were reported to the PMU to provide backstopping technical support and advice where required.</p> <p>The Finalizing of the LoA with MIA to develop Island Strategic Plans will act as a fundamental mechanism to ensure the project concept is streamlined into the sector development priorities.</p>	Good support from island government and communities, especially considering challenges for PMU and national government staff to visit them frequently

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
4	Communities disengage from implementing management solutions.	Substantial	Y	Community engagement in substantive project activities coupled with in-field vocational training coupled with providing a community voice in the project steering committee will provide both the means for (i) real community engagement in the project, and (ii) monitoring perceptions and benefits being derived by the project at the community level.	The project adopted a bottom up approach whereby endorsement of certain decisions and arrangements are endorsed at the grass root level. For example, communities in the three project islands actively participated in the development of their integrated community based mangrove management plans and take ownership of its implementation and enforcement in the villages.	Communities remain engaged.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
5	Over exploited and heavily depleted zones expand and new fishing grounds are opened up without effective conservation and management measures.	Medium	Y	<p>This risk stems through unsustainable activities creeping into the project sites through external actors. The approach to address this risk would be triple pronged. One, local ownership and engagement for local level monitoring and reporting. Two, through engagement of Island Councils for immediate action on transgressions and three, through providing livelihood diversification pilots.</p> <p>As mentioned above, ownership and engagement of local communities is an integral part of the project. Similarly, Island Councils are key partners in the project planning and implementation processes.</p>	Establishment of the newly endorsed fisheries regulation and integrated community based mangrove management plans in the 3 project islands ensured that management of resources are strictly monitored and enforced at the communities by the local government or island councils.	Risk has been reduced for inshore fisheries due to new regulations and community mangrove plans but challenges remain, including for connected pelagic fisheries.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
6	Government support, including sustainable financing, becomes inconsistent with long term project objectives.	Medium	Y	While MELAD and MFMRD have experience implementing GEF-financed and other projects, overall human resource capacity is generally low, particularly in the outer islands where government presence to look after environment management and protection, is nearly non-existent. Government budgets are fairly low, which could present problems if already low budgets are reduced due to changes in national budget allocations. Significant capacity-building activities, for government and stakeholders alike, are included in the project to address capacity gaps. Project management will closely monitor government budget allocations in order to flag and potential shortfalls as soon as possible, so that corrective measures can be taken as needed to ensure continued implementation of project activities.	Six extension officers recruited by the government and supported by the project have undergone relevant trainings on areas or topics related to the priorities of both MELAD and MFMRD and procurement of work materials to help them support LoA activities in the project island is in progress. One national expert recruited by FAO has been assigned to support coordination of LoA activities with MFMRD while a recruitment is in progress for an expert to support MELAD and another expert to support implementation of the new LoA with the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA).	Government support has been overall highly satisfactory

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
7	Climate change negatively impacts project outcomes.	Medium	Y	Sea level rise, storm surge, and variable rainfall patterns may cause communities to migrate to other areas, potentially disrupting community-led activities. The project is designed specifically to improve resilience to climate change. The likelihood of short-term impacts is low.	The establishment of local bylaws and community based management plans in the project islands help to safeguard actions that will pose threat to climate change in the communities.	On 11 June 2022, the Kiribati Government declared a State of Disaster due to drought. The entire country has been drought affected - with the most critical situation to be for Tarawa. The drought continues to worsen, with increasing challenges and threats from water contamination, brackish water, water accessibility and availability. The ongoing drought is a risk to project land

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
8	Covid19.	Medium	N	<p>Impossibility of international travel for staff or Technical Advisors and Consultants. Disruption on domestic air travel.</p> <p>Materials purchased overseas not possible to reach Kiribati in a timely manner.</p>	Engagement of international consultants are supporting the project on homebased mode. Uncertainty of flight availability and cancellation of flights due to covid19 restrictions is delayed implementation of project activities in the field. Implementing have to improvise at times according to the situation.	COVID19 remains an ongoing challenge for the project with emergence of new more contagious variants that impact travel to and within Kiribati

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

FY2021 rating	FY2022 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Moderate	Substantial	

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:	
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation 4:	
Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe	

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 Guidelines²¹. 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			
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			

²¹ 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	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government Institutions			
MFED	Key government partner in financing of LoA with Implementing partners	Engagement of partner is only at times when implementing partners are requesting for countersignature on their LoA and also when requesting for the release of warrant for their funds disbursements from the government account number 4. The finance process at MFED is at least 2 weeks but at times delayed due to the Covid19 restrictions and SOPs in place by the government.	MFED plays a major role in especially providing counter signatures to support implementing partners with their LoAs. For the reporting period apart from Covid19 restrictions, a lot of reshuffling within the Ministry requires new information from the project and raise a lot of questions, thus often delaying endorsement of decisions or approvals on the disbursement of funds.
ECD-MELAD	Main implementing partner	Stakeholder engagement and participation is average due to Covid19 and adapting to the new norm is often challenging.	Stakeholder engagement is often disrupted during the reporting period because of the covid19 restrictions and SOPs set in place by the government of Kiribati. Although virtual meetings

			ensured regular follow ups and monitoring of progress, the virtual mode is not effective and has many downfalls with the consideration of poor internet connection in Kiribati in general as well. Delivery of project activities in the field has to be delayed and often falls outside of the timeframe of government partners AWP because of cancellation of flights and closure of borders due to Covid19.
ALD-MELAD	Main implementing partner	As above	As above
CFD-MFMRD	Main implementing partner	As above	As above
LGD-MIA	Main implementing partner	As above	As above
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
KIRICAN and Live&Learn	Key partner in outreach of awareness raising activities	As above	As above
AMAK	Key partner at national level providing inputs and insights into gender issues relevant to the project	Actively participated and provided inputs in the Country Gender Assessment (CGA) which is currently finalized for publication soon.	Although actively participated but delivery of responses and inputs on the CGA document is often delayed because of the virtual mode that AMAK is not used to and the poor internet

			connection in Kiribati in general.
<i>Private sector entities</i>			
<i>Others[1]</i>			
Local Communities	Beneficiaries of the project	Participation is very active when project is on the mission to the project islands.	Endorsement and approvals of decisions at the community level is sometimes delayed in response to the project proposals and discussions, but this is especially where topics discussed are sensitive and considers social-cultural aspects. For example, selection of idle land sites in the project islands and identification of land owners of the idle land sites.
<i>New stakeholders identified/engaged</i>			

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

10. Gender Mainstreaming

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

Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	Yes	Comprehensive Country Gender Assessment of Agriculture and the Rural Sector for Kiribati completed and 73 pg report finalised. The assessment detailed the state of gender (in)equality and rural women's empowerment in agriculture and rural development and will inform the country and regional level work of the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) to more precisely target technical support for agriculture and rural development, through a gender lens, to the Government of Kiribati.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?		There is a deeply rooted patriarchal heritage that still prevails in the i-Kiribati society. Particularly in rural areas, gender-biased norms, practices and customs against women are sustained, and gender-response measures need to take account of and address these societal-cultural impediments to advancement of women in agriculture and more generally. Gender equality is anchored in the two major governmental developmental frameworks: the <i>Kiribati 20-year Vision 2016-2036</i> and the <i>tenth Kiribati Development Plan</i> , however gender equality and rural women's empowerment are not fully elaborated. Policy level recommendations from the Gender Assessment were for the Government include the promotion of an integrated, comprehensive and multi-stakeholder approach for efficient integration of rural women's and girls'

		needs and priorities in policies, strategies, plans and budgets; and the development of sectorial evidence-based gender policies across ARD ministries. Policy level recommendations for FAO include the provision of technical support in the formulation and revision of ARD policies, strategies and plans and institutional capacity development of sex-disaggregated data in ARD for evidence-based policy preparation and implementation. At the institutional level one of the key recommendations for the Government is to establish an intra-governmental (central and local) coordination mechanism on gender equality and rural women's empowerment.
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		It is proposed to close gender gaps by promoting training of rural women with at least 30% of trainees being women
b) improving women's participation and decision making		In the project sites participation of women is being promoted in the community groups supported and established by the project, through ensuring that women make up at least 30% of the members.
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women		Women in the project sites received capacity buildings trainings in Fisheries and Agriculture, and at the local council level, there is recognition in their participation and decision making towards socio-economic generations and related benefits.
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?		At least more than 30% of women involved in the project activities in the outerislands received similar trainings in agriculture and fisheries that men received. Even at the household and community level, both men and women share equal roles and responsibilities and decision making on the direction of the project for the benefit of all.
Staff with gender expertise		The international consultant who was engaged to do the Country Gender Assessment of Kiribati is a gender specialist who has been completing gender assessment reports for other countries in the

		<p>acific region and has vast experience in gender issues. Stakeholders who were consulted during the assessment includes gender experienced staff working for the government, NGOs and church groups as well.</p>
Any other good practices on gender		<p>Project staff receive training (on-line UN training modules) in gender, including gender-based violence (which is prevalent in Kiribati as described in the country gender assessment). Also during consultation with local councils and communities, both women and men equally shared decisions that are recognized and endorsed at the higher local government level.</p>

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.	The project initially produced awareness materials which were translated into the country language (I-Kiribati) in consultation with the relevant project implementing partners to achieve the right vocabulary. Then, these were widely disseminated during national events in Kiribati by the implementing partners and as well as in the project sites at the inception phase of the project. The project has also contributed to the Pacific R2R website and has been involved in a virtual training conducted by SPC on how to use the website and finally a production of video clips was done in a collaborative effort between the project and its partners and this provides the opportunity to still share the awareness and information about the project activities and synergies on the web despite the complications with Covid19.
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	The project has a communication strategy that was drafted at the end of May 2020 by the FAO-SAP communications specialist and requires feedback from the PMU. The challenge with this is on the engagement of a local communication specialist requested by the implementing partners as there are different understandings from GoK and FAO in what it has to cover as per ToR for such post, which still needs to be discussed and look at the next steps forward.
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.	
Please provide links to related website, social media account	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fish Size Limit Final Version • https://www.pacific-r2r.org/index.php/partners/member-countries/kiribati?pid=125

Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details	Lex.thomson@fao.org David.yeeting@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.

As noted during project development, the i-Kiribati are the majority in Kiribati. The entire project is designed to support indigenous communities. The mini induction workshops in the project islands worked very closely with individual outer island councils and communities to prepare appropriate and inclusive workplans. Project activities cannot be carried out without FPIC of local communities and is initiated through the Local Government Division of the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA), an implementing partner of the project dealing with indigenous communities and island councils. As such, MIA is an important implementing partner for the project, linking the Island councils and the project to coordinate and facilitate the Island councils' project development activities, while at the same time support the recognition and acknowledgement of village elders (Unimwane) to make decisions that will reflect good governance for the local councils and ensure preservation, protection and promotion of tangible and intangible cultural heritage in order to enhance the public interaction with collections, histories and legacies. Therefore, integrating science and tradition but most of all ensure effective collaboration between the project and the indigenous communities throughout the project duration successfully as well.

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²²	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Recipient Country Government	MELAD	In-kind	5,500,000.00	2,500,000		
Recipient Country Government	MELAD	Grant	500,000.00	300,000		
Recipient Country Government	MFMRD	In-kind	6,000,000.00	3,000,000		
Recipient Country Government	University of Wollongong	Grant	378,000.00	378,000		
Bilateral	SPC	In-kind	152,000.00	152,000		

²² 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.

Bilateral	SPC	Grant	10,000.00	10,000		
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	250,000.00	100,000		
Bilateral	FAO TCPs	Grant	550,000.00	100,000		
		TOTAL	13,340,000.00	6,540,000		

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

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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

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