



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2023 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE).....	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	13
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS.....	19
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS).....	23
6. RISKS	28
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	33
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	34
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT	35
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING.....	38
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	41
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	43
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	44

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
Initial project duration (years):	5 years
Project coordinates: <i>This section should be completed ONLY by:</i> a) Projects with 1st PIR; b) In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.	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	15 Apr 2025

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 4,720,030
Total Co-financing amount (USD)³:	USD 13,340,000
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	1,314,775
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)⁴:	1,314,775
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023⁵	USD 6,540,000

¹ As per FPMIS

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

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

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

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

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	5 th April 2023
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	Q2/Q3 2022
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	Mid-term Review (MTR) was undertaken in October 2022 (Q4 2022) and covered the period from project initiation (in July 2019) to 31 st July 2022. The MTR Report was received by FAO in December 2022, with a response provided in January 2023.
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	January 2025
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	Yes

Overall ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	<i>Moderately Satisfactory</i>
Overall implementation progress rating:	<i>Moderately Satisfactory</i>
Overall risk rating:	<i>Substantial</i>

ESS risk classification

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

Status

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

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.

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	David Piritasi Yeeting National Project Coordinator FAOKI, Kiribati	David.Yeeting@fao.org
Budget Holder (BH)	Xiangjun Yao Sub-Regional Coordinator for the Pacific Islands FAOSAP, Samoa	Xiangjun.Yao@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)	Mrs. Nenenteiti TearikiRuatu Director Environment and Conservation Division Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agricultural Development (MELAD) Kiribati	Ntearik@gmail.com; decd@melad.gov.ki
Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Dr Jeff Kinch Fishery and Aquaculture Officer FAOSAP Samoa	Jeffrey.Kinch@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	Lianchawii Chhakchhuak Technical Advisor- GEF Coordination Unit FAORAP, Thailand	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 Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	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 Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) score moved from 2 to 3.	Cross sectoral mechanisms and community participation as well as stakeholder engagement model formally operationalized and implemented by end of project Y2.	National and island-level cross-sectoral mechanisms effectively engaging men and women and facilitating coordinated R2R decision-making in target areas by project end.	Implementing partners from the Environment and Conservation Division undergoing collaborative planning with FAO for the development of Terms of References (ToRs) and recruitment of local and international consultants to develop a National Environmental Resilience Framework. Implementing partners from the Local Government Division carried out consultations in Butaritari, North Tarawa and Tabiteuea North on their Island Strategic Plans. Education programmes rolled out under the Community-based	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). Refer to Annex 1.

						<p>Fisheries Management (CbFM) activities involving women in the consultations for Island Fisheries Management Plans (IFMPs) and school awareness on the newly legislated Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) Fisheries Regulation and the 2019 Fisheries Conservation and Management of Coastal Resources (FCMCR) Act</p> <p>Cumulative progress: 70 %</p>	
			<p>LD3 (tracking tool): Capacity strengthening to enhance cross-sector enabling environment score moved from 2 to 3..</p>	<p>R2R school, outreach and extension programmes designed by end project Y2.</p>	<p>R2R school, outreach and extension programmes emphasizing gender equity is established in target areas, with regular trainings conducted for communities and Government staff (i.e., cross-sectoral training courses addressing cross-sectoral issues conducted) by project end.</p> <p>INRM framework emphasizing gender equity</p>	<p>During the 4th PSC meeting in April 2023, the Director for the Coastal Fisheries Division emphasized the inclusion of the Trainer-of-Trainers (ToT) program and its linkage to the R2R project in the development and delivery of school curricula. This concept is to be considered for schools to increase awareness and education on marine sustainability and fisheries-related topics. This discussion was recorded in the PSC meeting minutes and endorsed for the project extension.</p> <p>The PSC and PMU have strengthened cross-sectoral consultations linked to the project outcomes ensuring that implementing partners are better able to understand the benefits of</p>	S

					formally proposed by project end.	<p>the project outcomes and associated activities.</p> <p>Extension officers recruited for the project in North Tabiteuea, North Tarawa and Butaritari have commenced their training with the relevant Ministry on South Tarawa to strengthen their capacity whilst working remotely in the outer islands.</p> <p>National Project Personnel (NPP) in the Environment and Conservation Division, Local Government Division and Coastal Fisheries Division have carried out awareness activities in schools and communities on their IFMPs and the newly legislated MCS Fisheries Regulation and the FCMCR Act as part of their official duties while travelling to outer islands.</p> <p>The 4th PSC Meeting in April 2023 recommended consideration for training and exchange opportunities for capacity building of project staff, including those based in outer islands, in the 2-year extension from the respective implementing partners including the PMU.</p> <p>Cumulative progress: 50 %</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	-----------------------------------	--	--

	Outcome 2	National management system for ecosystem-based sustainable use and conservation of island resources established to deliver required benefits.	23,477 ha covered both land and marine using INRM practices in wider landscape.	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.	<p>ToRs for local and international consultants developed to support fisheries in the establishment of a national system of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs).</p> <p>Integrated Community-based Management Plans being developed and established with the local communities in the 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 Protected Areas (PAs) in the project islands.</p> <p>There are several newly established PAs in collaboration with the Community-Based Fisheries Management Division in North Tarawa, Tabiteuea North and Butaritari and managed entirely by local communities with support from the Ministry for Fisheries.</p> <p>Livestock policy consultations have taken place on south Tarawa. The Food and Nutrition Security Policy has been developed through the United Nations International</p>	MS
--	------------------	---	---	--	--	--	-----------

						<p>Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF), but data and findings need to be revalidated before presentation to Cabinet.</p> <p>ECD has developed Integrated Environment Natural Resources Management Plans (IENRMPs) for Butaritari, North Tarawa and North Tabiteuea which cover a much larger area, e.g., Butaritari alone has more than 30,000 ha of lagoon and reef. The project is working with ECD to determine the extent to which these plans and practices have been adopted by local communities has not been properly assessed.</p> <p>Cumulative progress: 50 %</p>	
	Outcome 3	Project implementation based on results-based management and application and sharing of project findings and lessons learned.	Project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system designed, established and applied throughout the project and across all components,		Each annual workplan and progress report reflects lessons learnt and recommendations from M&E exercises until project end.	<p>The Annual Work Plan (AWP) for the project outcomes was revised and endorsed during the 4th PSC meeting in April 2023 with discussions on inclusion of activities-in line with the project objectives-from the relevant ministries. These activities have been included for the project extension period.</p> <p>Cumulative progress: 50 %</p>	S

			provinces and project sites.				
			Successful sharing of lessons learnt across the region.		Annual PSC and R2R meetings are updated on project implementation, achievements and lessons learnt, with relevant communication materials developed until project end.	<p>Visibility materials for FAO and the project were received and distributed to stakeholders during the 3rd PSC meeting held in September 2022.</p> <p>Consultations and awareness raising with implementing partners and local government conducted in Butaritari and North Tarawa and planned for Tabiteuea North in June 2023. PMU is planning, also for the next PSC meeting, to further discuss and plan for future activities.</p> <p>Discussions on the challenges with delayed funding disbursement from FAO were addressed during the 3rd and 4th PSC meetings by endorsing ways forward to change the financial conduit from the Ministry of Finance to Kiribati Fiduciary Services Unit with the project GEF Focal Point liaising with Ministry of Finance for advice on this change.</p> <p>Cumulative progress: 50 %</p>	S

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

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.	<p>Develop new Letter of Agreement (LoA) with ALD to carry out remaining and new activities from the old LoA, including the inclusion of Kiritimati (Christmas) Island.</p> <p>Recruit a NPP to be based at ALD to support implementation of activities in project islands.</p> <p>Recruit administrative and financial component officers in ECD, MIA and CFD as raised during the 4th PSC meeting held in April 2023.</p> <p>Complete the transition of financial arrangement for the project from the Ministry of Finance to the Kiribati Fiduciary Services Unit.</p> <p>Develop new LoAs with ECD-MELAD, ALD-MELAD, CFD-MFMRD and LGD-MIA for 2023 until new project NTE in 2025 and after completion of their old LoAs.</p>	<p>PMU, MIA, and FAOSAP</p> <p>PMU, ALD and FAOSAP</p> <p>PMU, ECD, MIA, CFD and FAOSAP</p> <p>PMU, GEF Focal point</p> <p>PMU, ALD, CFD, ECD, LGD and FAOSAP</p>	October 2023
Outcome 2: National management system for ecosystem-based sustainable use and conservation of island resources established to deliver SFM, LD, and BD benefits.	<p>Finalize recruitment process for the PA National Consultant for Fisheries (CFD).</p> <p>Continue awareness raising and capacity building training of Fisheries Community Wardens (FCWs) in the project islands on the newly legislated MCS Fisheries Regulation and the FCMCR Act.</p> <p>Continue awareness raising and capacity building trainings of environment extension officers in the</p>	<p>PMU, FAOSAP and CFD</p> <p>CFD NPP and Project Island Committees</p> <p>ECD NPP and Project Islands Committees</p> <p>MIA and Project islands Committees</p>	July 2023

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
	<p>project islands on the new IENRMPs on North Tarawa, Tabiteuea North and Butaritari.</p> <p>New and continuous awareness raising on the project islands (North Tarawa, Tabiteuea North and Butaritari) on their individual Island Strategic Plans (ISP)</p>		
Outcome 3: Project implementation based on results-based management and application and sharing of project findings and lessons learned>	<p>Continue knowledge sharing and lessons learnt experiences among stakeholders during 4th PSC meeting in April 2023.</p> <p>Implementing Partners particularly in the ECD and Local Government division have disseminated information about their activities for the project through local newspaper articles, and Ministry-endorsed social media platforms.</p>	PMU, FAOSAP and Implementing partners and relevant stakeholders and PSC.	This is an ongoing activity.

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
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 areas (e.g., policies and legislative frameworks).	<p>Launching and implementing of the IENRMPs for North Tarawa, Tabiteuea North, and Butaritari.</p> <p>Island Strategic Plans (ISPs) consultations in North Tarawa and Butaritari have been completed and the strategic plans have been developed and planned for finalization in 2023. Consultations in Tabiteuea North are currently ongoing prior to the launch of these ISPs.</p> <p>Enforcement of the newly legislated MCS Fisheries Regulation and the FCMCR Act; and awareness raising conducted in North Tarawa, North Tabiteuea and Butaritari.</p>	<p>Implementation of activities continuously delays due to the late disbursement of funds from FAO due to challenges associated with FAO and the Ministry of Finance processes.</p> <p>Staff turnover also contributing to delays in implementation of respective LoAs (e.g., ECD and CFD).</p>

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.

<p><u>Output 1.1.2</u></p> <p>National level coordination mechanism developed for cross-sectoral decision-making (including on PAs).</p>	<p>Cross sectoral coordination and decision-making mechanism present.</p>	<p>Cross sectoral coordination mechanism established and functional.</p>	<p>Endorsement of a special PSC meeting (i.e., and ad-hoc meeting) in between the meetings held every 6 months for urgent updates was included in the PSC ToR as an outcome of the 3rd PSC meeting. Other modes of meeting were included in the PSC ToR from lessons learnt during the COVID-19 pandemic including conducting PSC meetings using ZOOM.</p> <p>Development of IFMPs and ISPs have appropriate participation and input from all community members.</p> <p>Feedback on the ISPs coordination mechanisms are captured from project monitoring activities and reported to the PMU and the PSC.</p> <p>Endorsement in the PSC ToR for the PMU to rotate through respective government ministries and divisions to ensure suitable awareness of the project in the other sectors. The PMU is currently on ongoing rotation with CFD with consideration of rotating to other sectors such as ALD and LGD.</p>	<p>National events in the country including government commitments and parliament meetings limit the participation of PSC members and caused frequent changes on agreed meeting dates.</p>
<p><u>Output 1.1.3</u></p> <p>Resilience and socio-ecological planning for national to island-level coordination mechanism on whole-of-Island</p>	<p>Incorporation of resilience and socio-cultural considerations into the coordination mechanism.</p>	<p>The coordination mechanism incorporates resilience and socio-cultural considerations.</p>	<p>Consultations carried out at the island level to identify landowners of idle land sites on North Tarawa and Butaritari. Tabiteuea North is still progressing with this with an assurance that idle lands will be identified in time for activities associated with the new ALD LoA.</p> <p>Consultations with Island Council members and communities through wards (<i>mwaneabas</i>) in all</p>	<p>Land ownership for idle lands is a sensitive matter therefore, further progress to identify true landowners and consulting them is challenging.</p>

based R2R conservation and sustainable-use strategies streamlined across national and islands levels.			<p>villages carried out successfully for the development of IENRMPs.</p> <p>Consultations with Island Council members, stakeholders and local communities through their respective <i>mwaneaba</i> for the development and validation of ISPs.</p>	Changes to Island Council membership and staff turnover in all level of government is causing delays, especially when there is no proper handover of information and assets.
<p>Output 1.1.4</p> <p>National and island level environmental education, outreach and extension program developed.</p>	<p>Number of individuals in R2R Masters Programs.</p> <p>Number of extension agents trained.</p> <p>Number of schools and communities received outreach activities.</p>	<p>At least two persons enrolled in R2R Masters programs.</p> <p>25 extension agents trained.</p> <p>None schools and 30 communities have received outreach activities.</p>	<p>Complete the recruitment of the Tabiteuea North Environment Extension Officer (EEO).</p> <p>All EEOs have received another refresher training with ECD on South Tarawa and are implementing project activities following their workplan.</p> <p>Three Fisheries Extension Assistants (FEAs) have received training with CFD on South Tarawa once and are implementing project activities following their workplan.</p> <p>Equipment such as laptops, motorbikes and mobile phones were procured from FAO to ensure efficient communication and implementation for the three EEOs and three FEAs while in the outer islands.</p> <p>CFD NPP successfully recruited after the resignation of the previous NPP to carry on LoA activities for the project.</p>	<p>The project has yet to fund formal training of project staff and collaborators and this needs to be done by the end of project including exchange training visits to the two neighbouring R2R project countries of Fiji and Tuvalu.</p> <p>Recruitment of additional project staff to support implementation of LoA activities in the project islands is needed to ensure timely and efficient delivery of expected outputs.</p>
<p>Outcome 2.1 National management system for ecosystem-based sustainable use and conservation of island resources established to deliver SFM, LD, and BD benefits</p>				

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.	Four IENRMPs have been developed by ECD and officially handed over to the respective Island Council and elders in Butaritari.	Problems with the national airline and seat availability has made it very challenging to fly to the outer islands of Kiribati. Fuel outages is another factor delaying timely implementation of LoA activities especially when there is no fuel available for aircraft.
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 livelihood activities developed. Number of households with complementary livelihoods.	At least 350 households adopt complementary livelihoods.	Continuous and ongoing consultation undertaken between PMU, the Office of Agriculture and the project islands to identify idle land sites on the Butaritari, North Tabiteuea and North Tarawa. The Office of Agriculture is proposing to carry out idle land surveys in Kiritimati Island if continuous delays are experienced to progress idle lands activity in Butaritari, North Tarawa and North Tabiteuea.	Continued delays with the development and negotiation with FAO of a new LoA with ALD is still pending approval from FAO.
Output 2.1.3 R2R conservation and use strategies across land and sea implemented at three target islands	Number of hectares of agroforestry sites established. Number of hectares of forests restored. Number of hectares of marine area under	828 ha under agroforestry. 232 hectares under SFM. 22, 417 hectares of marine area under co-	Because of the delays experienced to identify 'true' land owners of idle lands in the project islands and to progress the activity, the Office of Agriculture carried out consultations with respective Island Councils and agreed that it is no longer necessary to develop 24 acres of land for agriculture purposes as long as a small piece of land is available by an interested land owner, then work can progress.	Actual progress of work will begin upon finalization of the LoA with the ALD in later in 2023 once it has been finally approved by FAO.

(through the IENRMPs).	co-management arrangements.	management arrangements.		
Output 2.1.4 At least three PAs established (where identified in Outputs 2.1.1).	Number of new PAs.	Three new PAs established.	The Office of Fisheries is scoping for potential consultants from overseas to carry out the work on establishing a national system in Kiribati for the selection of PAs.	No suitable consultants have been identified.
Outcome 3.1 Project implementation based on results-based management and application and sharing of project findings and lessons learned				
Output 3.1.1	Output 3.1.1 M&E and associated reporting plans and systems for the project established and operational.	Set project targets and milestones achieved according to the work plans.	Set project targets achieved.	Local and international consultant have been recruited and completed consultations with project personnel and beneficiaries for their feedback on the project and recommendations for the 2-year extension of the project. The Mid-term Review (MTR) report has been completed and shared to PSC members and FAO. Successful conclusion of the 4 th PSC meeting in April 2023 whereby the PSC members presented their achievements, challenges and lessons

				learnt and ways forward.
<u>Output 3.1.2</u>	<u>Output 3.1.2</u> 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 has received FAO visibility materials and these have been shared to PSC members during the 4 th PSC meeting in April 2023 including Island Council members.

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

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

Following the 3rd PSC meeting in September, 2022:

ECD-MELAD

- Completed their IENRMPs for North Tarawa, Tabiteuea North and Butaritari.
- Completed recruitment and training for EEOs for North Tarawa, Tabiteuea North and Butaritari.
- Implementing their LoA activities with their 4th tranche of funding.
- Recruitment of additional Administrative and Financial staff planned for the remainder of the project extension period.

CFD-MFMRD

- Recruitment of a CFD NPP to manage LoA activities in the fisheries sector.
- Consultations in project islands for the newly legislated MCS Fisheries Regulations and the FCMCR Act on North Tarawa, Tabiteuea North and Butaritari.
- Completion of socio-economic surveys on North Tarawa with 320 households surveyed,

LGD-MIA

- Completed their consultations for draft ISPs on North Tarawa and Butaritari, while consultations on Tabiteuea North are ongoing.
- Implementing their LoA activities with their 3rd (and final) tranche of funding.

ALD-MELAD

- Consultations on the Livestock Policy on South Tarawa completed by international consultant.
- The Food and Nutrition Security Policy has been completed with support from UNICEF and other stakeholders.
- There were challenges concerning the first, now terminated, LoA with ALD and the negotiation of a new LoA for ALD is still ongoing with FAO.

PMU

- Completion of 4th PSC meeting in April 2023 whereby the PSC ToR was revised with the inclusion of using ZOOM and the ability to hold ad-hoc meetings were included and endorsed by PSC.

- Endorsement of a two-year project no-cost extension and revision of extra activities prepared by implementing partners in the CFD, ECD, LGD and ALD
- MTR consultations was completed and recommendations were presented during the 4th PSC meeting in April 2023. Questions were raised by PSC members regarding the outcome of the MTR report including the proposed exclusion for Kiritimati Island as a project site, especially when strong justifications were made for inclusion of Kiritimati in the NCE phase.
- Processes developed for the presence of the PMU and implementing partners in the outer islands for monitoring activities including office rotations.
- Proposed way forward to mitigate the delays in funding from FAO to the Ministry of Finance have been negotiated with future fund disbursement to be channeled from MoF to Kiribati Fiduciary Services Unit (KFSU) to expedite project activities. The GEF Focal Point is continuing to liaise with Secretary for MoF on this.

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

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

	FY2023 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	MS	MS	Slow disbursement of funding from FAO and internal bureaucratic process within the national government finance system is delaying implementation of activities for the project implementing partners in the project islands, however, it is anticipated that the government is working on improving the issue and is developing a new system to be rolled out soon, otherwise, a change in the financial conduit from the Ministry of Finance to the Kiribati Fiduciary Services Unit (KFSU) is strongly recommended.
Budget Holder	MS	MS	Progress continues and with the two-year no-cost extension, further progress against all activities should be advanced. There has been lessons learned from what has happened to date and these have been taken into consideration in the development of the remaining activities.
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸	MS	MS	<i>Ratings/comments</i>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	MS	MS	Project delivery remains steady despite the problems inherent in the FAO bureaucratic process which are also amplified with the centralisation of finance within the Kiribati Ministry of Finance. Recommendations from the MTR and recent endorsements from the 4 th PSC Meetings will improve the focus on what activities can be delivered realistically during the remainder of the two-year no-

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

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

¹⁷ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

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

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

			cost extensions. Overall, the likelihood of long-term success will be very much dependent on the efficiency of FAO's HR (for recruitment of local and international consultants), Procurement (for obtaining the important things required) and Operations (making sure everything is processed appropriately).
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	MS	MS	Programmatic delivery has been more streamlined during the reporting period and there is more consistent engagement between project staff, FAO and the operational partners, and PSC meetings are being held more regularly. However, the delay in fund disbursement from FAO through the Kiribati Ministry of Finance has a bearing on the scale of implementation and in achieving the expected outcomes of the project. Despite the MTR recommendation of 2 years extension, completion of project activities and associated budget within the extended period remains doubtful. The project also has to fast track the pending recruitment of consultants and officials, as narrated.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

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

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

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
	Community based management plans established and enforced to safeguard management of natural resources.	Handing over of IENRMPs and its implementation and enforcement and as well as awareness raising in the project islands.	Procurement and distribution of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) materials and items and boats to carry out enforcement and monitoring of fisheries and environment acts in the project sites	ECD and CFD.
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
	Enforcement of bylaws and management plans to safeguard natural resource utilization.	Refresher trainings have been carried out in the project islands and as well as in house trainings within the divisions of each ISPs	Development of the ISP for Kiritimati Island. Official handing over of community-based	ECD, CFD and MIA.

		conducted for Fisheries and Environment. Distribution of office materials and items for extension officers have also been done.	management plans and its implementation in targeted communities in North Tarawa and North Tabiteuea, along with development of Island by laws and their implementation.	
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
	Credible forest certification scheme or national forest programmes established.	Selection of idle lands have been completed and proposed to the Office of Agriculture awaiting further consultation with landowners and agreement in a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the Office of Agriculture, respective Island Councils and Landowners. Impact of climate change on health of breadfruit cultivars assessed by CTA.	Complete and finalize the new LoA with ALD and implement idle land activities in the project islands.	ALD and the Lands Management Division.
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				

	Establishment of relevant policies.	Finalization of the Livestock Policy by ALD in consultation with government stakeholders, beneficiaries, and farmers.	Recruitment of a national consultant to review the Biosecurity Act and identify a suitable consultant to revalidate the Food and Nutrition Security Policy Report for Kiribati.	ALD.
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 as per FAO's various and numerous guidelines and standards.	<p>Ongoing capacity building trainings and hands on experience field work for EEOs and FEAs conducted in the project islands and in Tarawa.</p> <p>Rehiring of project personnel also completed and as well as development of ToRs for additional staff.</p>	<p>Recruitment of additional staff to provide support towards implementation of LoA activities for project islands.</p> <p>Regional trainings for project personnel, EEOs and FEAs to be carried out.</p>	ECD, CFD and MIA.
ESS 8: Gender Equality				

	Participation of both men and women in the project activities are recognized.	Women are engaged in capacity building trainings related to fisheries on seaweed farming and agriculture on basic household gardening. The endorsement of IENRMP, ISP and CbFM Plans recognize decisions from women as well.	A Country Gender Assessment report for Kiribati is finalized with FAOSAP for publication later in 2023.	ALD, LGD, CFD, MIA and FAOSAP.
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
	Process of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC).	Both men and women including youth in the communities engaged in awareness raising programs, education and trainings in the project islands.	Consultation to be carried out in Kiritimati Island by the project government implementing partners and PMU.	ALD, ECD, CFD, MIA and PMU.
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				
	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²⁰ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Moderate	There have been no significant changes to environmental and Social Safeguards since project inception.

<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>
N/A.

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

6. Risks

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Logistics stymie project implementation capacity.	Moderate	Y	<p>Implementation of activities in the project sites require mostly travel by the domestic airlines and by boat.</p> <p>FAO's bureaucratic processes, particularly in those governing procurement cannot be applied in the local context and need to have greater flexibility if implementation is to be successful.</p>	<p>The PMU has been working closely with the airline to develop an agreement to ensure that the project is prioritized and is accepted for exceptions whenever the need arises.</p> <p>Unfortunately not much can be done about FAO's bureaucratic processes, except for improved efficiencies with FAO.</p>	

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
2	Sectoral barriers and siloed thinking within government ministries and agencies remain.	Low	Y	The project is conducting regular PSC Meetings twice every year which provided the opportunity for the project stakeholders and government Ministries and respective Island Councils to participate in an exchange of ideas to drive the project forward in a whole of island holistic approach.	The government Ministries are actively engaged in the 4 th PSC Meeting in April 2023 and the PMU is conducting regular meetings with each sector to follow up on activities and often relevant sectors are involved in combined consultations in the project islands.	

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
3	Island Government and community level support is not sustained, including failure of communities to follow the new rules.	Moderate	Y	The MIA through the LGD is providing a link to ensure that active collaboration between the Island Councils and relevant sectors to achieve project outcomes. However, implementation and enforcement of activities in the project islands requires procurement of materials and items for field work and training of local Council Officers, EEOs and FEOs to ensure that there is sense of ownership in the activities and that the benefits are sustained.	<p>The implementation of CbFM Plans in the project islands is very vital in the enforcement and monitoring of activities in line with the project outcomes and objectives.</p> <p>Unfortunately not much can be done about FAO's bureaucratic processes, except for improved efficiencies with FAO.</p>	
4	Communities disengage from implementing management solutions.	Moderate	Y	Awareness raising in the communities and as well procurement and distribution of tools, office items, materials and products complements capacity building training of beneficiaries and will provide incentives for active participation in the project.	The project procured and distributed office items and materials to support EEOs and FEOs in their implementation of LoA activities in the project islands.	

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
5	Over exploited and heavily depleted fishing zones expanded, and new fishing grounds opened without effective conservation and management measures.	Moderate	Y	<p>Some of the mitigation actions to be considered are as follows:</p> <p>Recruitment of additional project staff to support extension officers in the field.</p> <p>Procurement and distribution of office items and materials to support engagement and monitoring of enforcement activities.</p> <p>Capacity building training for the beneficiaries, EEO and FEOs on project activities.</p> <p>Widespread awareness raising campaign in the communities to ensure information is shared and the communities are updated accordingly.</p>	The relevant SPs for the project have included in the recruitment plan additional project staff to be engaged under the project.	
6						

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

FY2022 rating	FY2023 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
---------------	---------------	--

Moderate	Moderate	The project received a two-year no-cost extension which will enable it to substantially achieve its objectives.
----------	----------	---

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: Develop an overall work plan identifying remaining activities, with agreed realistic timeframes for completion, and including an outline of a procurement plan for the remaining project timeframe	The work plan for two-year no-cost extension is under development in collaboration with national project partners and respective Ministries and their Divisions.
Recommendation 2: Project Extension by 24 months.	A strong case has been made for two-year no-cost extension and agreed by all parties.
Recommendation 3: Increase frequency of PSC meetings and set-up Regular Meetings of FAO-Project Task Force (PTF).	Frequency of PSC meetings has been increased to two meetings per year, and PTF is meeting more regularly through ZOOM meetings (with objective to meet monthly).
Recommendation 4: Consider dropping fourth site on Kiritimati Island.	A strong case was made to extend project activities to Kiritimati Island, and this was agreed given its paramount importance for marine biodiversity conservation (especially as a sea-bird rookery) and potential for agricultural utilisation (unencumbered by traditional or private land ownership issues).
Recommendation 5: Establish a monitoring, evaluation and reporting plan and system for the project	An M&E consultant is in the process of being recruited for the extension phase.
Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize	Exit strategy to be developed early in the final year of the two-year no-cost extension.

8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines²². Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories and provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework	Results framework to be reviewed and revised for the two-year no-cost extension phase by the M&E consultant.	3 rd Quarter 2023.	Approval will be sought from the PSC, FAOSAP and GEF for any recommended changes.
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements	Reviewing options to improve delivery of funds from FAO through the Ministry of Finance to the Kiribati Fiduciary Services Unit.	3 rd Quarter 2023.	PSC.
Financial management			
Implementation schedule	Two-year no-cost extension.	Two-year no-cost extension runs from 16/4/2023 to the 15/4/2025.	PSC, FAOSAP and GEF.
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	Kiritimati Island added as fourth project site.	16/4/2023.	PSC, FAOSAP and GEF.
Other minor project amendment (define)			

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

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

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

Stakeholder name	Type of partnership	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
<i>Government institutions</i>			
MFED	Key government partner in financing of LoA with Implementing partners.	MFED is a key partner in the processing of funds through the government account No.: 4.	Delays are frequently encountered in the disbursement of funds from FAO through MFED to the respective government Ministries and their Divisions (and as required to implement the LoAs). Internal reporting and process are rigorous and time consuming especially since several Ministries and their Divisions are involved.
ECD-MELAD	Main implementing partner.	ECD is on top of their implementation of activities and have received their final payment of the LoA. A new LoA is still being negotiated with FAO to cover the two-year no-cost extension period.	Staff turnover the lack of proper handover causes undue and unforeseen delays. New project staff need to be recruited and trained up to carry out project activities in the project islands.
ALD-MELAD	Main implementing partner.	ALD participates actively in regular meetings with PMU and the PSC even though they do not have an active LoA with FAO. A new LoA is still being negotiated with FAO to cover the two-year no-cost extension period.	ALD was not able to participate in some activities due to unavailability of funding as they are still waiting on FAO for a new LoA.

CFD-MFMRD	Main implementing partner.	ALD participates actively in regular meetings with PMU and the PSC. Implementation of their LoA activities is a bit slow and usually takes time to fully maximise their tranches and report.	Staff turnover the lack of proper handover causes undue and unforeseen delays.
LGD-MIA	Main implementing partner.	is on top of their implementation of activities Their reporting is excellent.	MIA are hindered in their implementation by FAO's bureaucratic processes. The FAO payment schedule is not fit-for-purpose as MIA require two tranche payments to be disbursed simultaneously in order to carry out some activities in the field.
NGOs²³			
KIRICAN and Live&Learn	Key partner in outreach of awareness raising activities.	Neither NGO has participated since their involvement in the consultation for the Kiribati Country Gender Assessment Report.	Political issues has unfortunately hindered collaboration.
AMAK	Key partner at national level providing inputs and insights into gender issues relevant to the project.	AMAK has not participated since their involvement in the consultation for the Kiribati Country Gender Assessment Report.	AMAK appear to have ceased operations.
Private sector entities			
Others²⁴			

²³ Non-government organizations

²⁴ 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

Local Communities	Beneficiaries of the project.	Participation is most active when project staff are on the project islands and when the local Council Office interns are active especially with detailing the decisions of the PSC meetings and consultations with relevant Ministries and their Divisions.	Stakeholder engagement can be sensitive depending on the activity involved, for example, the identification of idle land. Subsequently, endorsement from communities takes time and often goes through a very thorough discussion between elders, the Island Council and Chiefs.
<i>New stakeholders identified</i>			

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.	Y	<p>A country Gender Assessment Report for Kiribati has been finalized and is going through FAO's publishing process and should be available later in 2023.</p> <p>Socio-economic surveys conducted by CFD was planned for Tabiteuea North, Butaritari and North Tarawa with partners as part of a Supplementary Livelihoods Options for Pacific Island Communities (SLOPIC) training and socio-economic surveys are ongoing.</p>
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Y	<p>The development of the Country Gender Assessment Report for Kiribati carried out a responsive evaluation assessment aimed at measuring the progress of women's involvement in agriculture and fisheries activities in Kiribati.</p> <p>The Gender Assessment Report for Kiribati has been finalized and is going through FAO's publishing process and should be available later in 2023.</p> <p>Through the CbFM program implemented by CFD, the first ever stakeholder consultation is planned for the 3rd Quarter of 2023 on Butaritari island whereby stakeholders from 11 islands including Tabiteuea North, Butaritari and North Tarawa will be attending, including women groups.</p> <p>This meeting will contribute to addressing gaps for women involvement in fisheries activities and empower women in their involvement and valuable contributions in fisheries management. The program for the</p>

		<p>event includes also lessons sharing and learning presentation from the women groups showcasing their successes and challenges under the CbFM activity where the R2R project can note for relevant project synergies to ensure gender equality throughout the remaining project implementation period. There will also be training carried out to women groups on livelihood using fisheries and marine resources available.</p> <p>One of the activities for MIA is the development of ISP where strengths, weakness, opportunities and threats (SWOT) analysis will be conducted, which again, will include women groups.</p> <p>Training on gardening will also be rolled out under the new LoA between FAO and ALD once negotiations with FAO are finalized, with a focus on women farmers and the Agriculture Assistants.</p> <p>Capacity buildings for EEOs and FEOs have also been completed on South Tarawa, which included six women and two men.</p>	
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		Active participation of women in farming and fisheries activities as well as their involvement in awareness raising and education of relevant fisheries and environment acts in the project islands has shown that women are playing a major responsibility in natural resources management.	
b) improving women's participation and decision making		There is recognition of women being a member of the Island Council in North Tarawa who has contributed to the endorsement of decisions for the people of her community and North Tarawa as a whole.	
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women		Women in Butaritari participated in a fisheries training on how to process seaweed to generate socio-economic benefits through the production of different foods.	
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?		Consultations were carried out to scope for a potential candidate to do M&E for the	

		<p>project. The design of the M&E system should be centred on gender disaggregated data.</p> <p>At least more than 40 % of women have been involved in activities carried out in areas of fisheries, agriculture, environment and local government.</p>
Staff with gender expertise		<p>During the Country Gender Assessment Report of Kiribati, staff from environment, local government and fisheries Divisions provided gender expertise from implementing project activities, for example, mangrove planting, aquaculture trainings, consultations, etc.</p>
Any other good practices on gender		<p>During consultations carried out during project activities, it is evident that men are supportive of women's engagement and involvement in decision-makings and resource management</p> <p>Project staff also have access to FAO's courses on gender.</p>

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval, during this reporting period.

<p>Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.</p>	<p>R2R project pamphlets and banners have been translated into i-Kiribati and used during meetings and workshops.</p> <p>The PMU have received visibility materials from FAO and distributed to during the 3rd and 4th PSC meetings held in September 2022 and April 2023 respectively.</p> <p>There are also FAO vests that the PMU use during their fieldwork in the outer islands.</p> <p>There is a need for refresher training for new project staff especially those working in the field to have access the R2R website.</p> <p>Implementing Partners particularly in the ECD and Local Government division have disseminated information about their activities for the project through local newspaper articles, and Ministry-endorsed social media platforms.</p> <p>The CFD is also planning to have newsletters published highlighting project activities.</p>
<p>Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.</p>	<p>There is a need to finalize the Communication Strategy drafted in 2020 by FAOSAP.</p> <p>So far, only banners for agriculture on African Swine Fever have been received from FAO.</p> <p>R2R project pamphlets and banners have been translated into i-Kiribati and used during meetings and workshops.</p>
<p>Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.</p>	

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.

Throughout project implementation starting from the mini-inception workshops in the project island sites of Tabiteuea North, Butaritari and North Tarawa, indigenous people from the local communities are always involved as Kiribati is populated by i-Kiribati people so it is guaranteed that i-Kiribati (i.e., the indigenous people) have active participation since the beginning of the project.

Through consultations carried out from the individual implementing partners for the project work-plans, i-Kiribati people are key decision makers for project activities. Although there is a local government system where Mayors, Island clerks and Councillors for the islands are usually the main channel of communication for the project, activities and objectives require the engagement of all groups in the community.

Since Kiritimati is now agreed to be the fourth project island for activities during the remaining two-year no-cost extension period, an inception meeting including consultation activities will be carried out.

Overall, the project has acknowledged the importance and value of engaging i-Kiribati people as it assures the sustainability of the project objectives and outcomes for the local community benefits.

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁵	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ²⁶	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Recipient Country Government	MELAD	In-kind	5,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	5,500,000
Recipient Country Government	MELAD	Grant	500,000	300,000	300,000	500,000
Recipient Country Government	MFMRD	In-kind	6,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	6,000,000
Recipient Country Government	University of Wollongong	Grant	378,000	378,000	378,000	378,000
Bilateral	SPC	In-kind	152,000	152,000	152,000	152,000
Bilateral	SPC	Grant	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	250,000	100,000	100,000	250,000
Bilateral	FAO TCPs	Grant	550,000	100,000	100,000	550,000
TOTAL			13,340,000	6,540,000	6,540,000	13,340,000

²⁵Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

²⁶Grant, Loan, Equity Investment, Guarantee, In-Kind, Public Investment, Other (please refer to the *Guidelines on co-financing* for definitions)

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

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 its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits

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

Risk rating will assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:

High Risk (H)	There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks
Moderate Risk (M)	There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk
Low Risk (L)	There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks

Annex 2.

GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

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

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location & Activity Description
North Tarawa	1.4333° N	173.0000° E		All project field activities
Butaritari	3.1167° N	172.8000° E		All project field activities
North Tba	1.1256° S	174.6741° E		All project field activities
Kiritimati Island	1.8721° N	157.4278° W		All project field activities (in extension phase)

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