



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)	6
3.	IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	16
4.	SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	18
5.	ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	23
6.	RISKS	25
7.	FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	31
8.	MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	32
9.	STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	33
10.	GENDER MAINSTREAMING	39
11.	KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	40
12.	INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	41
13.	CO-FINANCING TABLE	42

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	RNE																																						
Country (ies):	Iraq																																						
Project Title:	Sustainable Land Management for Improved Livelihoods in Degraded Areas of Iraq (FSP)																																						
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/IRQ/003/GFF																																						
GEF ID:	9745																																						
GEF Focal Area(s):	Land Degradation (LD)																																						
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Environment																																						
Project Duration (years):	48 months																																						
Project coordinates:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">No</th> <th rowspan="2">Name</th> <th colspan="2">Coordinates</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Latitude</th> <th>Longitude</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="4">1</td> <td rowspan="4">Um-Al-akaf\ Muthana Governorate</td> <td>31.415676°</td> <td>45.146545°</td> </tr> <tr> <td>31.398920°</td> <td>45.147234°</td> </tr> <tr> <td>31.364962°</td> <td>45.203711°</td> </tr> <tr> <td>31.369486°</td> <td>45.213090°</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="4">2</td> <td rowspan="4">Al-Tar sub-district\ Thi Qar Governorate</td> <td>30.883603°</td> <td>46.590027°</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30.865321°</td> <td>46.602056°</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30.902305°</td> <td>46.741358°</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30.936467°</td> <td>46.748853°</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="4">3</td> <td rowspan="4">Shawya area\ Muthana Governorate</td> <td>30.534736°</td> <td>44.890009°</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30.441958°</td> <td>44.968110°</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30.462659°</td> <td>45.031907°</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30.571370°</td> <td>44.941183°</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			No	Name	Coordinates		Latitude	Longitude	1	Um-Al-akaf\ Muthana Governorate	31.415676°	45.146545°	31.398920°	45.147234°	31.364962°	45.203711°	31.369486°	45.213090°	2	Al-Tar sub-district\ Thi Qar Governorate	30.883603°	46.590027°	30.865321°	46.602056°	30.902305°	46.741358°	30.936467°	46.748853°	3	Shawya area\ Muthana Governorate	30.534736°	44.890009°	30.441958°	44.968110°	30.462659°	45.031907°	30.571370°	44.941183°
No	Name	Coordinates																																					
		Latitude	Longitude																																				
1	Um-Al-akaf\ Muthana Governorate	31.415676°	45.146545°																																				
		31.398920°	45.147234°																																				
		31.364962°	45.203711°																																				
		31.369486°	45.213090°																																				
2	Al-Tar sub-district\ Thi Qar Governorate	30.883603°	46.590027°																																				
		30.865321°	46.602056°																																				
		30.902305°	46.741358°																																				
		30.936467°	46.748853°																																				
3	Shawya area\ Muthana Governorate	30.534736°	44.890009°																																				
		30.441958°	44.968110°																																				
		30.462659°	45.031907°																																				
		30.571370°	44.941183°																																				

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	02 April 2019
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01 January 2020
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	01 January 2024
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ²	NA

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	3,549,321
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc³:	21,200,000

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.

Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)⁴:	420,144
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022⁵	1,075,000

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:	24 August 2021
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	June – August 2022 - ongoing
Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):	
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	September-October 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):	MS
Overall implementation progress rating:	MS
Overall risk rating:	Moderate

ESS risk classification

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

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Ali AlHasani , National Project Coordinator, FAO Iraq	Ali.Alhasani@fao.org
Budget Holder	Hajj Hassan, Salah FAO Representative in Iraq	Salah.ElHajjHassan@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.

<p>Lead Technical Officer</p>	<p>AbdelHamied Hamid Senior Forestry Officer, FAO Regional Office for Near East and North Africa</p>	<p>AbdelHamied.Hamid@fao.org</p>
<p>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</p>	<p>Bergigui, Mohamed Fouad, GEF Portfolio Support and Project Development Specialist, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit</p> <p>Chris Dirkmaat, Executive Officer, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit</p>	<p>Mohamed.Bergigui@fao.org</p> <p>Chris.dirkmaat@fao.org</p>

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

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

<i>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.</i>							
Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress¹⁰ since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating¹¹
Reverse land degradation processes, conserve and sustainably manage land and water resources in degraded marshland ecosystems in Southern Iraq for greater access to services from resilient ecosystems and improved livelihoods	Outcome 1						
	Enhanced policy, legal, and institutional frameworks support SLM	Number of national and governate staff reporting higher SLM management capacity.	0: MOA 0: MoH&E 0: MoW 0: Muthanna Gov. 0: Thi-Qar Gov.	3: MOA 5: MoH&E 2: MOW 2: Muthanna Gov. 2: Thi-Qar Gov.	10: MOA 12: MoH&E 5: MOW 5: Muthanna Gov. 5: Thi-Qar Gov.	0/37 trained. Nomination ongoing; the training is expected to be rolled out in August/September 2022 with 37 government officials from the different Ministries MoA, MoE, MoW, Muthana and Thi-Qar governorates. The trainings are divided in four different modules that will provide information to	MS

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

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

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

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

				decision makers on SLM and its adaptation to policies and local frameworks. Each module will be completed in one week for a total of three weeks training.		
	Number of Government staff exclusively mandated to support implementation of SLM programming, including agriculture and wetlands	0 CAD Staff 0 MoH&E Staff	20 CAD (Conservation Agriculture Directorate) Staff 20 MoH&E Staff	40 CAD Staff 40 MoH&E Staff	0/80. A specific curriculum for Decision Policy Makers has been finalized and approved to train government personnel on SLM; challenges have been encountered with regard to the participants' nomination. At least 20 participants are required to be currently working in conservation agriculture, and 20 from the Ministry of Environment with knowledge in CA and wetlands.	MS
	A national SLM strategy action plan developed with implementation financed by government	0 SLM action plans developed and financed	1 SLM action plans developed and financed	1 SLM action plans developed and financed	0 SLM action plans developed and financed. A specific curriculum for Decision Policy Makers has been finalized and approved to train government personnel on SLM,	MU

				however despite FAO several attempts to coordinate such trainings, government nominations are still pending. As part of the training activities a strategy will be developed and integrated in the national plans.		
	A national strategic action plan for agriculture and marshlands developed with implementation financed by government.	0 agriculture and marshlands action plans developed and financed	0 agriculture and marshlands action plans developed and financed	1 agriculture and marshlands action plans developed and financed	0 agriculture and marshlands action plans developed and financed. The training on agriculture and marshlands action will be implemented in 2023 after the roll out of the SLM FFS to shape the programme based on the observed impacts of agriculture activities to wetlands conservation.	MS
	Number of annual users reported for project emplaced capacity and knowledge tools.	0 users of project social media (e.g. Facebook) 0 users of project emplaced knowledge management website	150 users of project social media (e.g. Facebook) 500 monthly visitors of project emplaced knowledge management website	300 users of project social media (e.g. Facebook) 1,000 monthly visitors of project emplaced knowledge management website	0 users of project social media (e.g. Facebook) and 0 users of project emplaced knowledge management website. Once the different trainings are implemented the beneficiaries	MU

					will start using the knowledge management tools	
	Number of annual national SLM progress reports delivered based upon information generated by GIS-based monitoring and knowledge platform	0 national SLM progress reports	2 national SLM progress reports	4 national SLM progress reports.	0 national SLM progress reports. The platform of M&E base on GIS is one of the main trainings for the government. FAO is planning to establish a national information and knowledge management platform supported by a digital land use mapping system to serve as a tool to assist farmers, extension officers, and government agencies to make informed decisions regarding the application of best Sustainable Land Management (SLM) practices. The data collected from the monitoring before and after the establishment of the FFS, will feed the platform regarding the condition of natural resources, agriculture and socioeconomic	MU

					conditions of the area.	
Outcome 2						
Number of Government staff exclusively mandated to support implementation of SLM programming, including agriculture and wetlands	Number of extension officers with proven capacity to implement FFS SLM training programs.	0 extension officers	50 extension officers	50 extension officers	0 extension officers trained through FFS. FAO has created FFS curricula, facilitate the FFS pilot plots with local farmers and coordinate the trainings. Nominations is ongoing and FFS expected to be rolled out in August/September 2022, before planting season. The plan is the following: ToT of 50 extensionists during four weeks on the delivery of FFS to beneficiaries, covering topics of CA such as: soil facts, soil cover, tillage, mix and crop rotation, salinity and water management. FAO will follow up and monitor the extensionists on the training to 2,500 beneficiaries during October - November 2022.	MS

					0 ha under improved SLM. FAO has created FFS curricula, facilitate the FFS pilot plots with local farmers and coordinate the trainings, however the government hasn't be able to nominate extensionist. Therefore, no beneficiaries have reported improvement. It is expected that by the end of the year 2,500 beneficiaries have been trained in different topics of CA and adapted the techniques, after the planting season FAO will monitor the integration of the techniques of the farmer's participants in the FFS.	MU
	Number of hectares of degraded agriculture and grazing lands under improved SLM management as a result of FFS implementation .	0 ha	2,000 ha	6,000 ha		
	Number of agricultural producers reporting higher economic returns based upon participation in FFS SLM	0: men 0: women	N/A	150: men 150: women	0 agricultural producers reporting higher economic returns. FAO has created FFS curricula, facilitate the FFS pilot plots with local farmers and coordinate the trainings, however the government	MU

					hasn't be able to nominate extensionist. Therefore, no beneficiaries have reported improvement. However, it is expected that by the end of the year 2,500 beneficiaries have been trained in different topics of CA and adapted the techniques, after the planting season FAO will monitor the integration of the techniques of the farmer's participants in the FFS. After the harvest season at the beginning of 2023 FAO will report the economic returns of those who participated in the FFS.	
	training programs.					
	Number of agriculture hectares (degraded and under SLM) monitored annually as a result of FFS programming with linkages to	0 ha monitored and reporting to national KM	15,000 ha monitored and reporting to national KM	30,000 ha monitored and reporting to national KM	0 ha monitored and reporting to national KM. FAO has created FFS curricula, facilitate the FFS pilot plots with local farmers and coordinate the trainings, however the government hasn't be able to	MU

	the national KM system.				nominee extensionist therefore, no reports have been generated yet.	
Outcome 3						
Measures to restore and sustainably manage marshland ecosystems adopted	Number of extension officers with proven capacity to implement FFS agroecological training programs that support marshland conservation.	0 extension officers	20 extension officers	20 extension officers	0 extension officers. The agroecological training program will be implemented after the farms schools have been established. Also, no extensionist have been nominees by the government yet.	MS
	Number of marshland dependent agricultural producers reporting higher economic returns based upon participation in FFS agroecological training programs.	0: men 0: women	N/A	100: men 100: women	0: men 0: women The agroecological training program will be implemented after the farms schools have been established. Also, no extensionist have been nominated by the government yet therefore, no beneficiaries list has been distributed.	MS
	Number of hectares of wetlands restored and sustainably managed as a	0 ha restored	1,500 ha restored	4,000 ha restored	0 ha restored. The agroecological training program will be implemented after the farms schools	MU

	result of FFS agroecological implementation				have been established.	
	Number of wetland agriculture hectares monitored annually to promote SLM practices and reporting to national KM system.	0 ha monitored and reporting to national KM system	10,000 ha monitored and reporting to national KM system	20,000 ha monitored and reporting to national KM system	0 ha monitored and reporting to national KM system. The agroecological training program will be implemented after the farms schools have been established.	MU
Outcome 4						
Monitoring and evaluation informs knowledge management with best practices upscaled	Percentage of intended outputs and indicators reported by the project's mid-term and final report as delivered and/or on-track for delivery.	0% delivered 100% on-track for delivery	50% delivered 50% on-track for delivery	100% delivered 0% remaining for delivery	No progress achieved	MU
	Number of annual KM tool reports uploaded into regional and international KM tools.	0: reports submitted to WOCAT 0: reports submitted to Regional SLM FAO Unit	2: reports submitted to WOCAT 2: reports submitted to Regional SLM FAO Unit	4: reports submitted to WOCAT 4: reports submitted to Regional SLM FAO Unit	No progress achieved	MU

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Enhanced policy, legal, and institutional frameworks support SLM	<p>Train national and government staff on SLM management including wetlands and agriculture capacity through implementation of farm schools using ToT method.</p> <p>The curricula has been approved, there are four modules explaining and addressing SLM, the last module is dedicated to the integration of SLM practices into the government national strategies and plans.</p> <p>37 government staff will take the training and by the end of the year a framework should be completed by the government.</p>	FAO, MoE, MoA, MoW	If the political/security situation allows, by September 2022 it is expected to have national and government staff trained and already practicing with local beneficiaries in both governorates, academia, research facilities.
SLM best practices promoted and delivering global environmental benefits	<p>Locally adapt SLM practices for target areas by building capacity to extension agents in the areas, deliver training programs.</p> <p>50 extensionists are being selected by the government to take training with the curricula developed by FAO. The methodology use will be ToT, after the training FAO will monitor and follow up the delivery of the training to 2,500 beneficiaries. Some of the main topics covered in the training will be soil facts, soil cover, tillage, mix and crop rotation, salinity and water management</p>	FAO, (Research facility of Morocco)	If the political/security situation allows, between August - September 2022
Measures to restore and sustainably manage marshland ecosystems adopted	<p>At least 20 extension agents with capacity to implement FFS agro ecology programs will be trained by FAO starting the end of 2022, after the implementation of the SLM and collecting information from the adaptation of the techniques from the farmers, all the information collected will be take into consideration for the develop of the training on marshlands.</p>	FAO, (Research facility of Morocco)	If the political/security situation allows, between December 2022 and March 2023 it is expected to have the same number of local extension agents for SLM as well as for agro ecology practices.
Monitoring and evaluation inform knowledge management with best practices up-scaled	<p>FAO is planning on the establishing of a national information and knowledge management platform supported by a digital land use mapping system to serve as a tool to assist farmers, extension officers, and government agencies to make informed decisions regarding the application of best Sustainable Land Management (SLM) practices. A consultant will be joining the team in August/September for the platform develop and the coordination of the data collection to be uploaded into the platform.</p>	FAO, MoE, MoA	If the political/security situation allows, by September 2022.

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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	Enhanced policy, legal, and institutional frameworks support SLM	Q3	A curricula for Policy Maker has been developed to train 37 government staff	FAO team has developed curricula of CA practices. If the political/security situation allows, it is expected to start August/September 2022. Initially to government staff and by the end of the year to academia, research facilities and representatives of private sector.
Output 1.1	National SLM training program established	Q3	A curricula on SLM practices has been developed	
Output 1.2	National SLM strategy and action plan developed and implemented	Q3	No progress to be reported during the last reporting period	
Output 1.3	National strategic action plan for agriculture and marshlands developed and implemented	Q4	No progress to be reported during the last reporting period	
Output 1.4	National monitoring and knowledge management platform to inform SLM decision-making established	Q4	Six monitors have been hired to assist on data collection, conduct beneficiary verification, progress monitoring, and daily field monitoring visits to ascertain the progress of activities on the FFS for 2,500 beneficiaries. The international consultant will join the project in the next few months to develop the platform.	
Outcome 2	SLM best practices promoted and delivering global environmental benefits	Q2	The curricula have been cleared and finalized. The training is expected to start in August/September 2022, 2,500 benefices will receive the training thru	Project team has developed curricula of CA practices.

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.

			ToT methodology with 50 local government extensionists.	If the political/security situation allows, it is expected to start the ToT on the main activities pre cultivation and preparation of land once the government nominee's extensionist. 50 extensionist will learn how to train using FFS tools and methodology on topics such as soil facts, soil cover, tillage, mix and crop rotation, salinity and water management
Output 2.1	Locally Adapted SLM best practices describe and prioritized for target areas	Q2	2,500 beneficiaries will be selected from three different areas, one in Al-Tar in ThiQar governorate and from Al-Muthana governorate in Al-Salaman and Al-Majid. FAO will revise the lists of beneficiaries to ensure the criteria of the project, 50% of the farmers should be women.	
Output 2.2	SLM extension training program established	Q2	50 extensionists have been identified, however, FAO is waiting for final approval from the government MoE. FAO is expected to start training in August/Septemebr 2022.	
Output 2.3	SLM production systems established with FFS program	Q2	No progress to be reported during the last reporting period	
Outcome 3	Measures to restore and sustainably manage marshland ecosystems adopted	Q4	No progress to be reported during the last reporting period	
Output 3.1	Agroecology best practices described and prioritized for marshlands	Q4	No progress to be reported during the last reporting period	
Output 3.2	Agroecology and marshlands extension training program established	Q4	No progress to be reported during the last reporting period	
Output3.3	Marshland agroecology production systems established with FFS program	Q4	No progress to be reported during the last reporting period	
Outcome 4	Monitoring and evaluation inform knowledge management with best practices upscaled	Q3	No progress to be reported during the last reporting period	
Output 4.1	Project M&E system operationalized	Q3	An M&E system is in place, 6 monitors were hired from the target communities, plans are in place to collect and process data in line with the M&E plan.	
Output 4.1	Project lessons and practices captured and disseminated	Q4	No progress to be reported during the last reporting period	

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.

Despite all the efforts and managerial responses put in place by the project team to unlock the current situation (pre and post-election in October 2021) and accelerate delivery, the political and security situation remains very challenging. The new government formation deadlock, and the lack of social, economic and political prospects have impacted and will continue to affect our operations, including the movement and security of staff. Decision makers at central and governorates level are not fully empowered to take action to mobilize resources already committed, take steps to support the project implementation and agree on a clear structure due to the political impasse.

The ToRs for the Local Project Implementation Unit (LPIU) were endorsed during the SC, to provide technical guidance and expertise, to facilitate the timely implementation of the project and to serve as a link between the Project Steering Committee (PSC), PMU, project implementing teams and partners at local and central level. However, to ensure timely and effectively planning and implementation of the project, although LPIU not officially in place, relevant focal points within the governorates of Thi-Qar and Muthana have been nominated to support the implementation of the agreed tasks.

During the SC, it was also agreed to share the timeline of activities by FAO to the MoE; the revised plan was sent to the MoE two weeks after the meeting. Additionally, one of the main agreements during the SC was the promotion and commitment of co-finance obligations from the MoE.

Several meetings have been conducted with the main stakeholders at governorates and central level to discuss the project implementation plan and review the progress against the agreed outputs, more specifically the main bottlenecks and delays for the implementation, also to discussed implementation on FFS, topics on the curricula's, soil sampling and its implication on exploring solutions on soil salinity, different approaches to the communities, facilitation on government storage for FFS and beneficiaries inputs. The analysis of the natural resources were discussed, specifically regarding the soil sampling, the agriculture research facility is analyzing the samples, it is expected to finalize the analysis at the end of June 2022, a future discussion will take place regarding the level of degradation and the possible solutions to address during the FFS.

Date	Venue	Participants
28/12/2021	MoE	Head of International Environmental relationships, FAO project coordinator, SLM officer
07/06/2022	MoE	Minister of Environment, FOAIQ Rep., SLM officer
31/01/2022	Online	Focal point of GEF of the MoE and FAO SLM team
23/02/2022	Online	Focal point of GEF of the MoE and FAO SLM team
16/03/2022	Online	Focal point of GEF of the MoE and FAO SLM team
2/05/2022	Online	Focal point of GEF of the MoE and FAO SLM team
8/05/2022	Online	Focal point of GEF of the MoE and FAO SLM team
10/05/2022	Online	Focal point of GEF of the MoE and FAO SLM team
16/05/2022	Online	Focal point of GEF of the MoE and FAO SLM team
22/05/2022	Online	Focal point of GEF of the MoE and FAO SLM team
25/05/2022	Online	Focal point of GEF of the MoE and FAO SLM team
31/05/2022	Online	Focal point of GEF of the MoE and FAO SLM team
2/05/2022	Online	Focal point of GEF of the MoE and FAO SLM team
12/06/2022	Online	Focal point of GEF of the MoE and FAO SLM team
15/06/2022	Online	Focal point of GEF of the MoE and FAO SLM team
20/06/2022	Online	Focal point of GEF of the MoE and FAO SLM team
22/06/2022	Online	Focal point of GEF of the MoE and FAO SLM team

In January 2022, the MoE changed the GEF focal point; during the interim period, very little progress was achieved.

Additionally, several meetings were held with Local directorates of GoI partners, farmers associations from Thi-Qar and A-Muthana, community leaders. Facts and more specific details were gathered about surface water availability, groundwater specs, water logging in some areas, extension services capacities, agricultural directorates capacities, and irrigation directorates capacities. The objective was to collect information of the project anticipated impact on land productivity and livelihood from reliable sources; including the level of degradation of the soil and water. Farmers associations were also an important source of information and contributed to re-shape the curricula.

FAO Iraq focused on advancing administrative processes for the recruitment of the essential staff within the GEF project team, specifically for a Knowledge Management consultant. FAO is currently in discussions with the *Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique (INRA)* to start

cooperation for the project by providing their extensively expertise in Conservation Agriculture and implementation of FFS, this will improve the implementation of the project by bringing on board several experts on FFs, policy decision making training and delivery of know-how in SLM and CA country plan development. They will support on the implementation through ToT to 70 government extensionists on best practices on livestock management, intensification, conservation tillage, nutrient management, integrated farm management, perennial forages, grassed waterways, forage buffer strips, and set back distances for crop inputs, annual crop boundaries, filter strips, crop selection and rotation, strip cropping and cover crops.

Farmers associations with the local governorate in Thi-Qar and Al-Muthana have identified three different FFs; FAO committed with the owners to use the land for FFs purposes for the next year, each plot has 4 hectares and were selected using the minimum standards for crop production in the area. FAO has employed six monitors in the three different areas, three men and three women, to conduct data collection of natural resources, social and economic situation of the community and farmers. The data will be used for the Knowledge platform of the project, the monitors will also do verification of farmer's criteria and will follow up during and after the FFs.

FAO has finalized two curricula's; one for FFS implementation, the methodology use will be ToR, 50 extensionists are being selected by the government to take training. After the training of the extensionists, FAO will monitor and follow up the delivery of the training to 2,500 beneficiaries in two governorates, Thi-Qar and Al-Muthana. The main topics covered in the training will be soil facts, soil cover, tillage, mix and crop rotation, salinity and water management.

The other curricula is for Decision Policy Makers targeting 37 government representatives. The ToT will then provide cascaded trainings to the LPIUs members. The training has four modules explaining and addressing SLM, the last module is dedicated to the integration of SLM practices into the government strategies and framework.

In order to continue moving forward while waiting for the MoE to provide the LPIU final nominees, list of extensionists and beneficiaries, FAO is finalizing clearance to procure inputs for the future beneficiaries for FFs purposes. FAO is also compiling list of beneficiaries from farmers associations as a mitigation measure in case MoE has more delays on the delivery of the lists.

If the political/security situation allows, the FFs are expected to be implemented no later than August. During the planting season Sept –Nov, FAO will follow up, monitor and collect data on the techniques adapted.

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	FAO planned and organized several activities of the project, two different curricula have been developed, and both have been translated to Arabic to ensure better delivery of outputs. FAO has maintained continuous communication with MoE in-person and/or via virtual platforms. FAO is working for the full engagement of the stakeholders to the project.
Budget Holder	MS	MS	Several meetings have been held with the Minister of Environment and efforts made to advance the programme. The Coordination structure has been established. FFS Curricula developed. Inputs for the implementation of FFS under procurement process. Commitments of decision makers improved despite the current government formation deadlock and uncertainties However, more support from the main stakeholders is required to overcome differences and communication barriers between central and governorates level to accelerate project implementation.
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸			Iraq sought from the first moments, in cooperation with the FAO, to promote sustainable land management, reduce its degradation and improve the livelihoods of people in degraded areas through the implementation of this project. For which the basic steps have been completed and the final structure of the working teams has been prepared down to the local level. We hope the officials in the organization will work to hold a joint meeting between the Ministry of

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.

			Environment and the organization to reach a satisfactory solution to continue the work and initiate implementation and achieve the goals set by the project.
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	MS	MS	Number of executed activities and those under implementation could be translated into tangible results in the next reporting period thus lay the ground for achieving planned outcomes.
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MS	MS	The project continues to operate under a very challenging environment characterized by the ongoing political/security situation. Despite the significant efforts made by the project team and partners to put the project on track, the ability to deliver field interventions such as FFS and monitor SLM systems depends very much on how the political/security situation will evolve. The current situation in Iraq, which may or may not evolve positively, is a force majeure that is outside of the direct sphere of influence of the project team and partners. Efforts need to be made to set in place adaptive joint responses to enable the project meet its targets through adaptive/innovative and alternative ways given the current deadlock.

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

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. Risks

	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	The current level of commitment and interest to work on multi-sectoral approach on sustainable agriculture diminishes.	L	N	This project is designed with the full support of Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Agriculture. Extensive meetings were held at central and governorates levels with responsible representatives. This will be ensured through an approach that continues to be highly inclusive and facilitates full engagement by multi-sectoral stakeholders.	MoE, as the executive partner of Gol is coordinating with the stakeholders from other ministries and local governments.	High level meetings have been held with the different ministries to ensure commitment and accountability.

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
2.	Political instability and civil unrest in addition to internal conflict	L	Y	The political instability contributes to delay the project activities and decision from the government officials; it can also limit the access to some areas and/or access to data as well as limit the potential for some income generating activities. It is vital to undertake mitigation measures. This includes continuous consultation with the Governments to identify possible interventions to solve any new risk faces the project and working closely with local community to provide them with the needed skills and tools to be used once the political situation enhanced.	FAO team with support from UNDSS and UNAMI is always keen to follow up the security status in the targeted areas, not only political side and protesting, but even the conflict between tribes in the rural areas. Feedback from Gol is always on the track, which assists in the evaluations.	The current government formation deadlock, lack of social, economic and political prospects have impacted and will continue to affect the project operations, including the movement and security of the staff. Decision makers at central and governorates level are not fully empowered to take action to mobilize resources already committed, take steps to support the project implementation and agree on a clear structure due to the political impasse. High level meeting with the MoE were conducted regularly to overcome the challenges and ensure proper engagement in line with the high level government plans and strategy.

	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	Challenged project coordination	M	N	The project will ensure that there is close coordination between the relevant agencies within Iraq. Close and collaborative cooperation between many institutional stakeholders will be essential for the project to achieve its stated goal and objectives.	Face-to-face and online meetings were held during the last year in the venues of MoE, MoA, MoWR and the different governorates to push the delayed tasks, and to elaborate some key issues. FAO maintains constant communication with the different stakeholders, farmers associations among them, to ensure everyone understand their roles and responsibilities.	Lack of regular coordination/communication between central level authorities and between central and local authorities have been identified as the main challenges. To overcome the challenges, FAO efforts to bring together different stakeholders have been notable.
4	Low capacity of local and national institutions	M	N	National institutions capacity and technical expertise at various levels are sometimes low. To mitigate this risk, the project will support the institutional framework and technical capacity development at national and local levels, a capacity building program and training.	The capacity building has been slow, the government is working on the final list of nominees for local capacity of the different areas and administration. FAO is expected to have list by the end of June. The delay mainly was due to the country elections. Face to face meetings are mandatory at the beginning of the working relationship with the institutions.	A solid training plan to address the main gaps has been developed. There are four modules explaining and addressing SLM in the country, the last module is dedicated entirely to the integration of SLM practices to the national and local strategies/frameworks. Additionally, the project will develop a national sustainable land management and conservation agriculture strategy and action plan to drive forward the SLM

	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	Incentives for local stakeholders are not adequate to generate engagement	L	Y	The project is designed to engage fully with local stakeholders. This will make certain that stakeholder desires, including local resource users, have the opportunity to help define how best to conserve steppe resources. A major part of this effort will involve working directly with pastoralists to assist them to measure how various steppe conservation activities result in economic benefits.	The project will provide stakeholders with the technical support required to measure how improved management delivers both enhanced ecosystem services as well as production improvements. FAO is currently working on the development of an informative platform. This will serve as a major incentive for local project support. In addition, project funding will provide a bridge to reduce risks to producers who may be hesitant to adopt “new” technologies	Advocate for financial support and project co-financing as committed

	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
6	Climate Change	M	Y	The project's approach will enable stakeholders better understand vulnerabilities and strategically adapt. Strengthening resilience will be key to the project's long-term success. SLM and CA practices will be selected based on their potential contribution to more resilient production systems and marshland ecosystems. Steps will be taken to build resilience measures into project design to minimize the risk and/or adapt to new conditions when possible.	SLM and CA practices have been identified based on their contribution to more resilient production according to the possible adaptation of farmers. Some of the next steps to improve agriculture conditions in both governorates should be the promotion of alternative crops and more diversified cropping patterns, addressed in the FFS curricula.	The implementation of FFS and introduction of new climate smart agriculture practices will strengthen the resilience of the population in the targeted areas.
7	Low ownership and lack of sustainability of new technologies and techniques	L	Y	Lack of ownership and subsequent lack of sustainability of new technologies promoted under the project could cause difficulties in achieving desired adoption levels. This will be mitigated through capacity building and awareness targeted at project beneficiaries. This will involve tools, such as economic models and plans, economic analysis that clearly show that there is an economic and social benefit to the adoption of these technologies (win-win).	A plan on capacity building is in place thru FFS and M&E plan that will show while data collection the changes on the current agriculture situation vs the integration of sustainable techniques. A platform will be develop by FAO with information on the natural resources of the area of intervention	Public awareness to build trust and confidence between the farming communities and the local authorities. Continuous engagement with field staff and farmers.

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

FY2021 rating	FY2022 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Moderate	Moderate	<p>The overall risk is moderate.</p> <p>The project was able to deliver relatively solid results. FFS curricula's have been developed, approved and translated into Arabic. The FFS pilot plots have been identified according to the requirements of the project, in the different areas the farmers associations and communities have been supporting the intervention and willing to contribute for the success implementation of the project.</p> <p>However, the current political/security situation in Iraq resulted in an institutional deadlock that is negatively impacting the project's progress and delivery. Government nomination of extensionists and beneficiaries has been delayed; expected to be finalized during the next reporting period. FAO is has been regularly following up and working closely with farmers association as an alternative solution to the government nomination. The high turnover in Gov. vis-à-vis is also causing significant delays.</p>

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 Guidelines²². Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories. And, provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework			
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management			
Implementation schedule	Given the recorded delays and slow pace of implementation in light of the current political/security situation in Iraq, an extension could be envisaged during the next reporting period.		
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			

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	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
<i>Government Institutions</i>			
MoE	Responsible for the overall implementation of the project's activities, Coordinate with other national stakeholders. Provision of digital mapping services. Executive Partner from Gol	Several official meeting with FAO management and technical staff has been held besides informal meetings to familiarize with the project. FAO will continue communicating with the MoE to remind them of their and all stakeholder's their responsibilities.	Several official meetings with FAO management and technical staff have been held besides several informal meetings and phone calls to address delays, plan and reviews of the progress against the agreed outputs, more specifically the main bottlenecks and delays for the implementation, also to discussed FFS, curricula's, soil sampling and its implication on exploring solutions on soil salinity, different approaches to address the communities main necessities.
MoA	In partnership with other national partners provide implementation resources and	The Ministry of Agriculture in Thi-Qar and Al-Mutha have been involved in the project, the FFS pilot and facilitating the meeting with the farmers associations.	Efforts should be made to further engage the MoA. The LPIUs is not yet officially established.

	technical SLM/CA support. Provision of digital mapping services.		
MoWR	Implementation of the project's water management plan in SLM/CA in partnership with MoHE and MoA.	MoWR representatives had attended the meetings, and shared information for the project. As part of the project MoWR needs to improve and/or rehabilitate the water infrastructure in the targeted areas. They haven't confirmed when these actions will take place.	The Ministry of MoWR in Thi-Qar and Al-Mutha have been involved in the project, the FFS pilot and facilitating the meeting with the farmers associations. MoWR in Bagdad hasn't been engaged yet as planned.
National Centre for Water Resource Management	Implementation of the project's water management plan in SLM/CA in partnership with MoHE and MoA	One official meeting with FAO management and technical staff has been held besides informal meetings to organize the project.	The LPIU has not been officially established, however, several focal points at governorates level are acting as focal points and delivering against the agreed tasks
The State Commission Authority for Ground Water	Implementation of the project's water management plan in SLM/CA in partnership with MoHE and MoA	During the field visits to Al-Salman a representative provided support to the team and collaborated with information about the situation of water and the communities. The discussions held were to discuss the current situation of water and water management in the area. FAO collected information that was integrated into the curricula to provide solutions to local farmers.	The LPIU has not been establish, there isn't a focal point yet to engaged as propose in the project. FAO is working with the MoE to complete the list
Department for Underground Water in Muthanna and Thi-Qar governorates	Implementation of the project's water management plan in SLM/CA in partnership with MoHE and MoA	During the field visits to both governorates, their representatives have supported the team by providing valuable information on the water situation and data to take into account for the project. The information discussed	The LPIU has not been stablish, there isn't a focal point yet to engaged as propose in the project.

		was related to quantity of ground water, salinity and the major management challenges. All the data was discussed with FAO team to incorporate solutions for the farmers in the FFS curricula.	
Muthanna Governate	Instrumental for project site level implementation Al Salman district (Al-Shawea) and Al-Rumaitha district (Al-Majid)	The Agricultural consultant of the governorate had participated in several meetings and phone call conversations, he made recommendations about the project implementation. The heads of districts in Al-Majed and Al-Salam cooperated with the team and provided support during the field visits. The information discussed was related to the condition of the farmers, the major challenges, the projects put into the government plan, the integration of activities and actions regarding land degradation and water management.	The centralized structure contributes to delay project operations.
Thi-Qar Governate	Instrumental for project site level implementation Al-Chibayish district (Al-Tar)	The Agricultural consultant of the governorate had participated in several meetings and phone call conversations, he made recommendations about the project implementation. The heads of districts in Al-Majed and Al-Salam cooperated with the team and provided support during the field visits. The information discussed was related to the condition of the farmers, the major challenges, the projects put into the government plan, the integration of activities and actions regarding land	The centralized structure contributes to delay project operations.

		degradation and water management. The wetlands and their major challenges were also discussed.	
Office of Forests and Combating Desertification	Consultations for the implementation of SLM/CA.	Exchange of information on desertification up to request of the different sites. The office provide the latest information regarding the statistics on degradation on the sites of intervention.	The LPIU has not been established, there isn't a focal point yet to engaged as propose in the project.
Office of Agriculture Research	Support universities in delivering published research into the socio-economic and environmental benefits of SLM/CA.	Informal meeting has been held with their staff to compare data and discuss actions and activities. The research facility is in charge of the analysis of the soil samples of the project.	The LPIU has not been established, there isn't a focal point yet to engaged as propose in the project.
Office of Agriculture Extension Services and Training	Support MoA extension services in project implementation in partnership MoWR, ICARDA, FAO and private sector SPs.	The office has shared information regarding extension services in the area, FAO has included some of the information in reports and documents of the project	The LPIU has not been established, there isn't a focal point yet to engaged as propose in the project.
Centre for Restoration of Iraqi Marshlands	The Centre will be consulted in the process of carrying research on the marshes.	The center has shared information and reports regarding the Marshlands, FAO is revising the information.	The LPIU has not been established, there isn't a focal point yet to engaged as propose in the project.
National Council for Seeds	Will partner with the project in supporting the development of private sector seed nurseries and seedbanks.	The office has shared information regarding seeds rules and regulations in the area, FAO has included some of the information in reports and documents of the project	The LPIU has not been established, there isn't a focal point yet to engaged as propose in the project.
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
Private sector entities			
Private Sector Service Providers	Providing local employment and function as facilitators and providers of technical support to the smallholder farmers as well as	Informal meetings have been held to keep up to date with the latest activities on the project.	The LPIU has not been established, there isn't a focal point yet to engaged as propose in the project.

	guaranteed buyers and the link to market.		
Others[1]			
Stallholder farmers	The main focus of project activities is improving livelihoods, food security and environmental rehabilitation.	The FFS have been located, the different farmers associations are supporting the project.	Access to farmers due to the absence of a LPIU
Farmers Association South	Provide support in the development of Farmer Associations and cooperatives at the smallholder level.	The representatives of the associations had joined all the field visit in the targeted areas, they presented they perspectives and recommendations, also they had highlighted the main challenges existing in the areas.	Lack of inclusion in the decision making process
University of Thi-Qar	Be a source of technical knowledge on agricultural research in the region. Produce peer-reviewed research into capacity of the identified soil rehabilitation techniques to reverse salinisation and soil degradation and improve yields.	Informal meetings have been held to keep up to date with the latest activities on the project.	The LPIU has not been established, there isn't a focal point yet to engaged as propose in the project.
University of Muthanna	Be a source of technical knowledge on agricultural research in the region. Produce peer-reviewed research into capacity of the	Informal meetings have been held to keep up to date with the latest activities on the project.	The LPIU has not been established, there isn't a focal point yet to engaged as propose in the project.

[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.

	applied soil rehabilitation techniques to reverse salinisation and soil degradation and improve yields.		
--	---	--	--

10. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) during this reporting period.		
Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	No	
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	Six monitors were hired on daily basis; three of them are women, this measure was taken in order to ensure female farmers are fully involve with the project. The data collection of such farmers also will be ensured by guarantee female monitors.
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	No	
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	By including 50% of participation of women farmers the project will ensure woman are part of the decision making.
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	The trainings as well as any inputs provided by the project aims its distribution equality to women and man farmers. (HH)
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	The formulation of questionnaires and any data collection tool has been designed to segregate the information by gender.
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	
Any other good practices on gender		

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.	Yes, the project has a knowledge management strategy, a specialist is being hired to support the project in the relevant activities, the project is expected to report actions taken by August 2022.
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	The project will generate a specific marketing strategy to make certain lessons are captured and disseminated effectively. The project will use knowledge management tools to facilitate the development of networks of women contributing to project objectives. This will include generating management templates, training materials, and other educational resources. The project will initiate at the end of 2022 an annual lessons-learned workshop to share advances with associated stakeholders, projects, and government agencies.
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.	Farmers are expecting to learn techniques that help them to improve land degradation and water management. Both problems are the main concerns for farmers in the south. They believe that the inclusion of new technology and the access to fertilizers will highly improve their land. They are willing to start with the principles of Conservation of Agriculture and explore the alternatives that will present to them.
Please provide links to related website, social media account	NA
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	NA
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details	Marzouk, Zeineb, Communication Specialist Nazirov, Alisher, M&E Officer

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.

The indigenous groups in the marshlands are the so called “Me’dan” who are buffalo breeders. One of the targets of the project is to upscale the biodiversity integration in the marshlands, where the increasing of cultivation intensity will secure more fodders to livestock breeders, keeping in mind that buffalos are the main source of income for Me’dan communities.

The project aims to include the different local communities as much as possible throughout its interventions in 2022. The farmers associations were consulted and involved in the discussion around the project activities, including implementation of FFS and selection of beneficiaries/plots where FFS demonstrations will be undertaken.

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²³	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Government of Iraq	Ministry of Environment	In-Kind	5,000,000	500,000		5,000,000
Government of Iraq	Ministry of Agriculture	In-Kind	5,000,000	25,000		5,000,000
Government of Iraq	Ministry of Water Resources	In-Kind	5,000,000			5,000,000
Recipient Governorates	ThiQar, Muthanna	In-Kind	2,500,000			2,500,000
Private Sector	USAID/WADA	In-Kind	1,200,000			0,00
GEF Agency	FAO	In-Kind	2,500,000	550,000		2,500,000
		TOTAL	21,200,000	1,075,000		20,000,000

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

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.

Annex C1

GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet

Core Indicator 1	Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use				<i>(Hectares)</i>				
					<i>Hectares (1.1+1.2)</i>				
					<i>Expected</i>		<i>Achieved</i>		
					PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 1.1	Terrestrial protected areas newly created								
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares						
			Expected			Achieved			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE			
			(select)						
			(select)						
		Sum							
Indicator 1.2	Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness								
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares	METT Score					
				Baseline		Achieved			
					Endorsement	MTR	TE		
				(select)					
				(select)					
		Sum							
Core Indicator 2	Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use				<i>(Hectares)</i>				
					<i>Hectares (2.1+2.2)</i>				
					<i>Expected</i>		<i>Achieved</i>		
					PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 2.1	Marine protected areas newly created								
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares						
			Expected			Achieved			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE			
			(select)						
			(select)						
		Sum							
Indicator 2.2	Marine protected areas under improved management effectiveness								
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares	METT Score					
				Baseline		Achieved			

			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		(select)				
		(select)				
		Sum				
Core Indicator 3	Area of land restored					(Hectares)
	Hectares (3.1+3.2+3.3+3.4)					
	Expected			Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 3.1	Area of degraded agricultural land restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 3.2	Area of forest and forest land restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 3.3	Area of natural grass and shrublands restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 3.4	Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 4	Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)					(Hectares)
	Hectares (4.1+4.2+4.3+4.4)					
	Expected			Expected		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			10,000	10,000	0	NA
Indicator 4.1	Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity					
		Conservation Agriculture and	Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	

		agrobiodiversity practices	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 4.2	Area of landscapes that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations					
Third party certification(s):		Hectares				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 4.3	Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems					
		Hectares				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
		10,000	10,000	0	NA	
Indicator 4.4	Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided					
Include documentation that justifies HCVF		Hectares				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Core Indicator 5	Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity					<i>(Hectares)</i>
Indicator 5.1	Number of fisheries that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations					
Third party certification(s):		Number				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 5.2	Number of large marine ecosystems (LMEs) with reduced pollution and hypoxial					
		Number				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 5.3	Amount of Marine Litter Avoided					
		Metric Tons				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	

Core Indicator 6	Greenhouse gas emission mitigated					<i>(Metric tons of CO₂e)</i>
	Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (6.1+6.2)					
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
	Expected CO ₂ e (direct)					
	Expected CO ₂ e (indirect)					
Indicator 6.1	Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector					
	Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e					
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
	Expected CO ₂ e (direct)					
	Expected CO ₂ e (indirect)					
	Anticipated start year of accounting					
	Duration of accounting					
Indicator 6.2	Emissions avoided Outside AFOLU					
	Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e					
		Expected			Achieved	
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
	Expected CO ₂ e (direct)					
	Expected CO ₂ e (indirect)					
	Anticipated start year of accounting					
	Duration of accounting					
Indicator 6.3	Energy saved					
	MJ					
		Expected			Achieved	
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 6.4	Increase in installed renewable energy capacity per technology					
		Technology	Capacity (MW)			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		(select)				
		(select)				
Core Indicator 7	Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management					<i>(Number)</i>
Indicator 7.1	Level of Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Program (TDA/SAP) formulation and implementation					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE

Indicator 7.2	Level of Regional Legal Agreements and Regional Management Institutions to support its implementation					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 7.3	Level of National/Local reforms and active participation of Inter-Ministerial Committees					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 7.4	Level of engagement in IWLEARN through participation and delivery of key products					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			Rating		Rating	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 8	Globally over-exploited fisheries Moved to more sustainable levels					<i>(Metric Tons)</i>
Fishery Details			Metric Tons			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 9	Reduction, disposal/destruction, phase out, elimination and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste in the environment and in processes, materials and products					<i>(Metric Tons)</i>
			Metric Tons (9.1+9.2+9.3)			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	PIF stage	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.1	Solid and liquid Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) removed or disposed (POPs type)					
POPs type			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
(select)	(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)	(select)				
Indicator 9.2	Quantity of mercury reduced					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE

Indicator 9.3	Hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFC) Reduced/Phased out					
	Metric Tons					
	Expected			Achieved		
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE		
Indicator 9.4	Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste					
	Number of Countries					
	Expected			Achieved		
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE		
Indicator 9.5	Number of low-chemical/non-chemical systems implemented particularly in food production, manufacturing and cities					
	Technology	Number				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 9.6	Quantity of POPs/Mercury containing materials and products directly avoided					
	Metric Tons					
	Expected			Achieved		
	PIF stage	Endorsement	PIF stage	Endorsement		
Core Indicator 10	Reduction, avoidance of emissions of POPs to air from point and non-point sources					<i>(grams of toxic equivalent gTEQ)</i>
Indicator 10.1	Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control emissions of POPs to air					
	Number of Countries					
	Expected			Achieved		
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE		
Indicator 10.2	Number of emission control technologies/practices implemented					
	Number					
	Expected			Achieved		
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE		
Core Indicator 11	Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment					<i>(Number)</i>
	Number					

			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		Female	250	1,250	0	NA
		Male	250	1,250	0	NA
		<i>Total</i>	500	2,500	0	NA