



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Pacific Islands
Country (ies):	Tonga
Project Title:	Integrated Land and Agro-ecosystem Management Systems (ILAMS) in Tonga
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/TON/001/GFF
GEF ID:	5578
GEF Focal Area(s):	Biodiversity, Land Degradation
Project Executing Partners:	MAFF, MEIDECC, MLSNR, MIA, MORDI, Tonga Trust
Project Duration:	4 years

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	09/20/2016
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	15 February 2017
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	31 August 2020
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	n/a
Actual Implementation End Date³:	n/a

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	\$2,344,954
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	\$7,170,000
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	\$1,104,767
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

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

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

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	21 February 2019
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	October 2019
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	n/a
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	July 2020
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	Yes

Ratings

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

Status

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

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

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Mr Taniela Hoponoa	Taniela.Hoponoa@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Mr Madankumar Jainakiraman	Madankumar.Jainakiraman@fao.org
Budget Holder	Ms Eriko Hibi	Eriko.Hibi@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Ms Yurie Naito	Yurie.Naito@fao.org

2. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative – since project start)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Objective(s): To strengthen the resilience of communities by enhancing land tenure systems, improving forest management, and piloting an integrated agro-ecosystem approach to rehabilitate degraded landscapes.						
Component 1: Improving the enabling environment for integrated land and agro-ecosystem management.						
Outcome 1.1: Increased acknowledgement and incorporation of integrated land and agro-ecosystem management in national policies, laws, and regulations through effective community management	1. Integrated land and agro-ecosystem management principles and approaches mainstreamed in national policies, laws, and regulations	No Policies specifically indicate intention to promote ILAMS.	3 ILAMS Policy Intention Papers developed	At least 3 ILAMS Policy Intention Papers developed and published to inform national policies, strategies and plans. National Land Use Policy Document adopted by Government.	Four (4) draft ILAMS Policy Intention Papers in draft for the four key Ministries (MAFF, MEIDECC, MLSNR, MIA) ready for their review and consultations for finalisation	MS
Outcome 1.2: Reliable information on land tenure is	2. Number of 'complete watershed' areas with up to date cadastral maps used	None of the 'complete watershed' areas i.e., project locations have up-to-date allotment	Up-to-date allotment cadastre layer of map data available for	4 'complete watershed' areas, with completed up to date cadastral maps used for GIS-based	The term 'watershed area' corresponds to the broader target localities where the	S

⁷ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

⁸ 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.

⁹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory** (HS), **Satisfactory** (S), **Marginally Satisfactory** (MS), **Marginally Unsatisfactory** (MU), **Unsatisfactory** (U), and **Highly Unsatisfactory** (HU).

2. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative – since project start)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
available to guide land use planning and facilitate the application of sustainable land management nationwide	for GIS-based applications for land use planning and for monitoring land use changes over time.	cadastre layer of map data available for developing mapping products.	developing mapping products.	applications for land use planning and for monitoring land use changes over time.	pilot villages are located within. Survey Plans and Survey Files	
	3. Degree of completion of allotment map data capture and quality improvement work	Less than 10% of both the tax and town allotments in the right allotment map data quality for digital capture	Allotment map data capture and quality improvement work at least 70% completed	Allotment map data capture and quality improvement work 100% completed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Tongatapu, 98% of villages have their town allotment registration records and 100% tax allotment registration records digitized. • For 'Eua, 100% of villages have their town and tax allotments registration records digitized. • For Ha'apai, 100% of villages have their town allotment registration records and 86% tax allotment registration records digitized. • For Vava'u, only 3% of villages have their town allotment registration records 	S

2. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative – since project start)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					and 6% of villages have their tax allotment registration records digitized.	
	4. Level of in house capacity in MLSNR for data capture and input	Tonga SOLA system not able to utilize spatial functionality of SOLA to deal with the cadastral mapping due to significant gaps in capacity for data capture and data quality.	Tools required for data improvement work in place and local staff received training on these tools.	By project end MLSNR staff have assumed all responsibility for data capture and input	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eleven Standard Operating Procedures have been developed and training delivered to MLSNR staff. 	S
	5. Capacity of MLSNR to streamline business processes and accept applications and new survey plan data digitally through the internet.	Land administrative processes and services predominantly paper-based		MLSNR is actively accepting applications and new survey plan data digitally through the internet.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The data capture is close completion. 	MS
Outcome 1.3: Improved strategic planning of forest resources	6. Extent of application of National Strategic Forest Development Plan by Central and local government bodies and civil society organizations	No National Strategic Forest Development Plan exists to implement the 2009 Tonga Forest Policy.	Management Plan for Forestry and Trees Resources in Tonga, 2017 published	The Management Plan for Forestry and Trees Resources in Tonga, 2017 published and key priorities implemented by Central and Local Government bodies and Civil Society Organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The published Management Plan for Forestry and Trees Resources in Tonga, 2017, is yet to be implemented in terms of key priorities. 	MS

2. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative – since project start)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	7. Degree to which National Forest Monitoring System (FMS) is utilised in planning	No Forest Monitoring System in place	Conceptual design and workplan for establishing the FMS developed; implementation at least 15% completed.	A fully functional FMS is in place and its data outputs are being used in planning by key entities of central and local Government and civil society organisations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A needs assessment has been carried out with a conceptual design completed. 	S
Component 2: Site-based capacities for evidence-based negotiation of land use planning, management and tenure rights						
Outcome 2.1: Capacities for evidence-based, and negotiated formulation of, resource management plans at landscape and village levels, clarification of farmers' tenure rights and obligations	8. Frequency of meeting of multi-stakeholder mechanisms in target locations <i>[Note: Project team propose to revise this indicator to "Multi-stakeholder mechanisms established within target localities."]</i>	N/A	Multi-stakeholder mechanisms are active at least twice per year in target locations	Multi-stakeholder mechanisms are active at least twice per year in target locations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The various Village Committees participated in ILAMS Plans consultations and are involved in coordinating project activities within their communities. The communities in the target localities include villages surrounding the pilot villages. A mechanism to include surrounding villages have not yet been established and will require incentives for those communities to do so. 	MU

2. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative – since project start)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	9. Representativeness of participation in multi-stakeholder mechanisms in target locations	N/A	All key stakeholder groups (commoners and nobles, men and women) participate actively in the mechanisms	All key stakeholder groups (commoners and nobles, men and women) participate actively in the mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No formal mechanisms have been established yet. 	U
	10. Percentage of participants in multi-stakeholder mechanisms consider that the mechanism contributes significantly to resolving issues that impede equitable and sustainable approaches to land management <i>[Note: Project team propose to revise this indicator to refocus on "Measure of the effectiveness of the ILAMS Plans in supporting the adoption of ILAMS practices."]</i>	N.A	50%	80%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ILAMS Plans have been drafted for the pilot villages and agro-ecosystems data collection commenced on all sites. Some key activities are already being implemented but the Plans themselves are not finalized. The tools based on Open Tenure for spatial mapping and tracking of land use are currently being planned to be developed. 	MU

2. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative – since project start)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	11. Degree of initial implementation of 'Eua Watershed Management Plan (WMP)	Inter-sectoral Committee established with GIZ support, to coordinate work on a Catchment Area Management Plan.	Draft Plan developed, including identification of alternatives for farmers to reduce encroachment, and rehabilitation plans for degraded forest areas.	Operational plan developed for the implementation of the 'Eua WMP over at least the project period, and corresponding activities implemented in accordance with the plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rehabilitation work has begun in areas where the farmers have been relocated. 	MU
	12. Effectiveness of the Plan in reducing encroachment on forests in the watershed.	75 ha of farmed land within the catchment areas (45 registered tax allotments) relocated and rehabilitated with forest as a conservation area	90 ha of farmed land rehabilitated with forest as part of the expanded 'Eua Watershed Catchment area under the WMP	No new instances of clearance of forests in the watershed for agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The watershed area where encroachment occur is in 'Eua where Ta'anga Village has a draft ILAMS Plan that addresses the need to reduce encroachment. However, Encroachment to watershed areas is not limited to the ILAMS Pilot Village of Ta'anga. The indicator therefore, should to be revised to capture all farmers who potentially encroach the watershed areas. 	U
Component 3: Strengthening of capacities for the formulation and implementation of sustainable land management practices with an integrated R2R approach						

2. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative – since project start)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Outcome 3.1: Increased capacities in Government institutions and NGOs for identifying and supporting SLM practices	<p>13. Numbers of staff members in Government institutions and NGOs who have received effective training through the modules</p> <p><i>[Note: Project team propose to revise this indicator to combine with one below on making regular use of the modules. The indicators to read, "Numbers of staff members in Government institutions and NGOs who received effective training through the modules and making regular use of the modules."]</i></p>	zero		20 members of Government institutions and 28 members of NGOs have received training through the modules and 'how to' manuals, and show improved knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) as a result	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed field training modules are yet to be produced. A Letter of Agreement (LOA) has been drafted and in the process of finalizing, to support MAFF in coordinating the development of manuals for extension services. 	MU
	Number of members in Government institutions and NGOs making regular use of the training manuals					n/a

2. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative – since project start)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	<i>[Note: Project team propose to delete and combine with above indicator on training on the manuals.]</i>					
Outcome 3.2: Increased capacities in local communities to develop, apply and adapt SLM practices.	14. Number of tax allotments ('api tukuha) in target localities on which integrated agroecosystem management practices are applied, including more than one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of piggery digestate as fertiliser - Use of cover crops - Enrichment of fallows - Integrated pest management - Increased use of agroforestry trees for animal feed, household or commercial tree products and/or nutrient cycling 		75 'api tukuha (tax allotments) covering 250ha, with at least 12 'api tukuha covering 40ha in each of the target localities	225 'api tukuha covering 750ha, with at least 30 'api tukuha covering 100ha in each of the target localities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Around 35 tax allotments have protection of crops from roaming pigs as a result of pig fencing along villages boundaries. • The supply of seedlings and planting materials to be planted at tax allotments have been supported by upgrading the nurseries, through supplies of nursery shade cloth and structures at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MAFF-Forestry Division nurseries in; Tokomololo (Tongatapu), Pangai (Ha'apai) and Fatai (Vava'u) and 'Eua. - Hango College nursery and Seed Centre in 'Eua 	MS

2. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative – since project start)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seedlings and planting materials also strengthened through partnership with MORDI. Crops at tax allotments in Haveluliku have been protected from roaming pigs by installing boundary pig fencing. 	
	15. Reduction in the amounts of firewood collected from vulnerable forest areas (in the target localities where such forest areas exist).	Baseline to be established at project start	25% reduction over baseline levels (baseline to be established at project start)	75% reduction over baseline levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline data collected by the team but no data on change in firewood use has been collected as no biogas yet generated. 	MU
	Percentage increase in water harvesting and storage capacity in target communities (m ³ /month). <i>[Note: Project team propose to delete this indicator as the validation of baseline data through household surveys by the project team]</i>	Baseline to be established at project start	At least 20% increase in water storage capacity in whole area where piggeries and intercropping systems will be covered under each ILAMP.	At least 50% increase in water storage capacity in whole area where piggeries and intercropping systems will be covered under each ILAMP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validation of baseline data through household surveys by the project team indicates water supplies for all pilot villages are considered adequate and no longer a priority issue. 	n/a

2. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative – since project start)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	<i>indicates water supplies for all pilot villages are considered adequate and no longer a priority issue.]</i>					
	<p>16. Availability of water to local communities in target localities.</p> <p><i>[Note: Project team propose to revise this indicator to “No change in availability of water to local communities in target localities as a result of adopting new piggery management practices.]</i></p>	Baseline to be established at project start	No net reduction in water availability for domestic uses in pilot communities, despite the establishment of piggeries.	No net reduction in water availability for domestic uses in pilot communities, despite the establishment of piggeries.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RFP for livestock water and wastewater management is included in the RFP for the biodigester installation and maintenance. 	MU
	17. Percentage reduction in crop damage and loss from roaming pigs in pilot communities and demonstration sites.	Baseline to be established at project start	On average farmers in the pilot communities report a 25% reduction in the areas of crops damaged by roaming pigs.	On average farmers in the pilot communities report a 75% reduction in the areas of crops damaged by roaming pigs. The total area benefitting from reduced degradation over the life of the project will be 245ha.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roaming pigs have been reduced significantly in Haveluliku from boundary fencing and installation of ‘a puaka Tonga in partnership with MORDI. No data on crop yields yet. 	MU

2. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative – since project start)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	18. Numbers of farmers in target localities with increased crop yields	Baseline to be established at project start	12 farmers in each target locality with 15% increases in crop yields over 40ha.	30 farmers in each target locality with 15% increases in crop yields over 100ha.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not enough data yet. A toutu'u growing yams covering 8 acres protected from roaming pigs was established in Haveluliku. 	U
	19. Numbers of farmers in target localities who report an increase of at least 20% in the numbers of established (live after 1 year) trees on their farms	Baseline to be established at project start	75 farmers report an increase of at least 20% in the numbers of established (live after 1 year) trees on their farms	225 farmers report an increase of at least 20% in the numbers of established (live after 1 year) trees on their farms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moringa trees were distributed and planted in Haveluliku. 	MU
	20. Avoidance of CH ₄ emissions as a result of the use of piggery waste as biogas fuel	N/A	247tCO ₂ eq/year	247tCO ₂ eq/year (988t total by project end)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No progress 	U
	21. Numbers of households benefiting from biogas produced from piggery biodigesters	No households use biogas and 70% use bottled gas	70, with a corresponding 7% reduction in the amounts of bottled gas used	130, with a corresponding 14% reduction in the amounts of bottled gas used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Materials have been distributed to build 15 pig pens ('a puaka palangi) with cement floor and drainage in pilot villages where the biodigesters will be installed. RFP has been issued for the installation of 	MU

2. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative – since project start)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					biodigesters.	
	22. Number of people in target villages where pig management practices have been modified who report no reduction in their abilities to meet social and cultural obligations	Baseline to be established at project start	100% of interviewees in villages where pig management practices have been modified report that there has been no reduction in their abilities to meet social and cultural obligations	100% of interviewees in villages where pig management practices have been modified report that there has been no reduction in their abilities to meet social and cultural obligations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No data yet on meeting social and cultural obligations. Training have been delivered to pilot villages on pig management. 	U
Outcome 3.3: Increased capacities for the formulation and implementation of forest restoration plans, and for supporting improved management of forests,	23. Area in target localities covered by operational plans and Sustainable Forest Management Agreements (SFMA) that are under effective implementation	No areas under SFMA		Forestry Division and communities concerned agree that the provisions of operational plans and SFMA covering 150ha ¹⁰ are being met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No progress yet 	U

¹⁰ Assuming 20% of each tax allotment = 225 total covering 750ha to be trees/forest

2. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative – since project start)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
mangroves, and trees outside forests						
	24. Numbers of tree nurseries nationwide able to meet their seed supply requirements	No nurseries currently meet seed supply requirement	30% of tree nurseries nationwide are able to meet at least 90% of their seed supply requirements	80% of tree nurseries nationwide are able to meet at least 90% of their seed supply requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nurseries upgraded at MAFF-Forestry Division nurseries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tokomololo (Tongatapu); - Pangai (Ha'apai); - Fatai (Vava'u); and - Mata'aho ('Eua). Hango College nursery and Seed Centre in 'Eua The project Field Officers have been collecting data on seed supply requirements. The results are yet to be analysed. 	MS
	25. Number of tree nurseries nationwide with long term funding needs ensured	No nursery has secure long term funding	30% of tree nurseries nationwide with long term funding needs ensured (from sources other than short term project-	80% of tree nurseries nationwide with long term funding needs ensured (from sources other than short term project-based support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None of the nurseries have a financial resource strategy in place. 	U

2. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative – since project start)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
			based support)			
	26. Area of agricultural land returned to forest use in the target localities (where land managers express intention to maintain the area under forest and there are at least XX trees/ha already present alive after 1 year)	Baseline to be established at project start	30ha	100ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree replanting have been carried out in the 'Eua watershed area where farmers have been relocated but area have not been estimated. 	MU
Component 4: Knowledge Generation and Dissemination and Monitoring and Evaluation.						
Outcome 4.1: Project implementation based on results-based management and application of lessons learned and good practices in current and	27. Number of ILAMS reports presented at R2R regional meetings or shared with R2R regional networks.	zero	n/a	At least 2 technical reports presented at R2R regional meetings or disseminated through R2R regional networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentations on ILAMS presented in two regional R2R meetings and at a side event for a Pacific Regional R2R programme at the 9th IWC in Morocco. Submitted a GEF Implementing Agency Results reporting. 	MS

2. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative – since project start)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
future interventions, facilitated.	<p>28. Number of Technical or Policy reports published online, including on MAFF website and ECC Portal.</p> <p><i>[Note: The Project Team proposes this indicator should be revised to extend the project content made available online, beyond Technical and Policy Reports. To better align with sharing of knowledge, the indicator should include all online presence, such as media coverage and presence on social media.]</i></p>	zero	n/a	At least 10 Technical or Policy reports published on MAFF website and ECC Portal	<p>The MAFF website has very low traffic or users and is poorly managed and maintained.</p> <p>The ECC portal is project-based and relies on project funding to be maintained.</p> <p>The project has featured on the FAO news in Dec 2017 (http://www.fao.org/asiapacific/news/detail-events/en/c/1073952/)</p> <p>The project has an active presence in social media through its Facebook Group page (https://www.facebook.com/groups/763339937157345/), with 676 pre-screened members in the Group. The Moderators for the Group include all</p>	MU

2. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative – since project start)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					members of the Project Team, including Project Field Officers in the outer island.	

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹¹			
Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1.1: Increased acknowledgement and incorporation of integrated land and agro-ecosystem management in national policies, laws, and regulations through effective community management	The 4 Ministry specific Policy Intention Papers requires Senior Officials in those Ministries (MEIDECC, MAFF, MLSNR, MIA) to read, understand and own the policy intentions articulated in those PIPs. The STA need to simplify the drafts prepared by an international consultant, then organize and facilitate ½-day workshops for each Ministry and one national workshop to finalise these PIPs.	Senior Technical Adviser (STA), Project Manager	mid-December 2019
Outcome 1.3: Improved strategic planning of forest resources	The local Forestry Specialist position has been vacant for a while and need to be filled as soon as possible.	STA, PMU	September, 2019.
Outcome 2.1: Capacities for evidence-based, and negotiated formulation of, resource management plans at landscape and village levels, clarification of farmers' tenure rights and obligations	The quality of the draft ILAMS Plans developed by a consultant was below par and was not well targeted for village communities. The Plans need to be redesigned to be made simple and easier for the village to have ownership of them.	STA	October 2019
Outcome 2.1: Capacities for evidence-based, and negotiated formulation of,	Identify incentives (project activities) to bring in the village communities surrounding the pilot villages in order to establish multi-stakeholder mechanisms for	STA, PM	December 2019

¹¹ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

resource management plans at landscape and village levels, clarification of farmers' tenure rights and obligations	supporting ILAMS practices. The application of Open Tenure for field data collection might provide this incentive.		
Outcome 3.1: Increased capacities in Government institutions and NGOs for identifying and supporting SLM practices	Finalise Letter of Agreement with MAFF to lead the development of Manuals for extension services.	PMU, FAO-SAP	August 2019.
Outcome 3.3: Increased capacities for the formulation and implementation of forest restoration plans, and for supporting improved management of forests, mangroves, and trees outside forests	Procure the services of a Forestry Specialist international consultant to lead the forest management activities.	STA, PMU, FAO-SAP	September 2019
Outcome 4.1: Project implementation based on results-based management and application of lessons learned and good practices in current and future interventions, facilitated.	Secure the services of a Communications and Knowledge Management Specialist to drive knowledge sharing and preparation of communications and knowledge products, including online presence and social media.	PMU	October 2019

3. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹²	Expected completion date ¹³	Achievements at each PIR ¹⁴					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁵ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
<u>Output 1.1.1:</u> Policy intention papers to inform sectoral policy and planning processes	Q4 2019	4 Policy Intention Papers drafted for key Ministries (MAFF, MEIDECC, MLSNR, MIA)	The 4 draft PIRs reviewed by the STA with only preliminary review by two of the Ministries.				85%	The 4 Government Ministries need technical support to facilitate internal consultations for reviewing their respective draft Policy Intention Papers. Review by the Ministries require hands-on facilitation by the STA.
<u>Output 1.1.2:</u> National Land Use Policy (NLUP) document	Q2 2020	The draft NLUP is under review and tied to public sector reform to identify the	No change. The NLUP is tied up with the public reform in transformin g the Planning				50%	The Government has not decided which agency should be responsible for the NLUP.

¹² Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

¹³ As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹⁴ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁵ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

		Government Agency to be responsible.	and Urban Management Authority into a Spatial Planning Authority.					
<u>Output 1.2.1:</u> Enhanced National System of Land Administration, and operational with spatial functionality of SOLA utilized to recommend allowable land uses, monitor land use changes over time and clarify tenure.	Q4 2019	Procedures and Protocols in place to compile and digitize cadastral data in the quality required for SOLA. About 40% of town allotment cadastral data to be digitized.	The digitization of land registration records (tax and town allotments) are progressing well. Town allotment records for all islands are near complete, except for Vava'u. The records of tax allotments completed for Tongatapu and 'Eua with Ha'apai 86%. The tax allotments records for				70%	There have been several changes in Data Entry Operators personnel. The procurement of a A3 scanner also took a very long time and is still to be installed. The digitization of land registration records are nevertheless progressing, albeit at a slower rate.

			Vava'u and the Niuas are only 3% completed. Updating the cadaster data for informal tenure is yet to commence.					
<u>Output 1.3.1:</u> National Strategic Forestry Development Plan developed	Q4 2017	Completed.	n/a				100%	The Management Plan for Forestry and Trees Resources in Tonga, 2017 has been published but limited public consultations.
<u>Output 1.3.2:</u> National Forest Monitoring System	Q2 2020	ToR developed for an international consultant to lead.	A needs assessment has been completed with options for the System identified.				25%	The needs assessment identified equipment required for the setting up of a lab. The funding for the equipment was to be covered under a Technical Cooperation Project as co-financing. The TCP has yet to materialise.
<u>Output 2.1.1:</u> Multi-stakeholder mechanisms for the negotiation of resource management and tenure	Q3 2020	The key stakeholders were involved in the consultations for ILAMS Plans.	No change				25%	There's a need to identify incentives (project activities) to bring in the village communities surrounding the pilot villages in order to establish multi-stakeholder mechanisms for supporting ILAMS practices. The application of Open Tenure for field data collection and establishment of a few small scale biodigesters in those

								communities might provide the required incentives.
<u>Output 2.1.2:</u> Negotiated and evidence-based plans for land use and integrated agroecosystem management at landscape and village levels	Q3 2020	Draft ILAMS Plans drafted for Ta'anga and Haveluliku. Consultations have been completed for all 4 pilot villages as well as baseline surveys. Template for collecting and compiling agro-ecosystem data completed.	The ILAMS Plans are yet to be finalised when the spatial layout and cadastral maps of the villages have been updated to include the 'informal' customary tenure arrangements.				30%	The project team is exploring the customization of the open source software, Open Tenure, to confirm tenure and map the spatial layout of villages (town and tax allotments) as basis for the Plans. To date, finalising the spatial layout has been difficult to finalise as the household data used for the baseline surveys are not fully aligned with the land registration and cadastral map data in the land administration system because tenure is both based on land lease under the Lands Act and 'informal' customary arrangements and agreements amongst family members.
<u>Output 2.1.3:</u> 'Eua Watershed Area Management Plan developed, and implemented	Q2 2019	Stocktake of the Management Plan document carried out. Farmers have been relocated	No change towards the 'Management Plan for the watershed area. Work is				15%	Coordinating the process for developing the Watershed Area Management Plan has been difficult as the Forestry Specialist position has been vacant for a while and recruitment process did not attract qualified people. Since the completion of the

		from the expanded watershed area and MAFF has commenced replanting of forest trees in those areas.	continuing on further rehabilitation of degraded land where farmers used to farm.					SPC/GIZ project, the cross-sector Committee that was established to drive the development of the EWMP has not been active and those involved have moved to other positions.
<u>Output 3.1.1:</u> Training modules for extension agents	Q4 2019	Yet to commence.	A Letter of Agreement (LOA) has been developed for MAFF to drive the development of training modules for the extension agents.				5%	
<u>Output 3.1.2:</u> Manuals for use by extension agents	Q2 2019	Yet to commence.	Cover under same LOA for Output 3.1.1 as well as output/deliverable under 3.2.1.				5%	
<u>Output 3.2.1:</u> Demonstration modules for integrated	Q2 2019	Demonstration sites	A RFP was issued and proposal received for				10%	Procurement of Biodigester Expert took significantly longer than anticipated.

agroecosystem management systems			a company to design and install piggery biodigesters in both the demonstration sites and in the pilot villages. The ToR also include livestock wastewater management and water quality.					The RFP was revised to include both the demonstration sites and the pilot villages. As well as installation, operation and management of biodigesters, the TOR for the RFP include livestock wastewater management and water quality with a view towards the biodigester effluent as liquid fertiliser.
<u>Output 3.2.2:</u> Farmer field schools for participatory problem analysis and development of SLM practices	Q4 2019	Yet to commence.	Partially included under the LOA with MAFF in Output 3.1.1.				5%	
<u>Output 3.2.3:</u> Extension modules applied in target communities	Q2 2019	Yet to commence.	Included under the LOA with MAFF in Output 3.1.1.				5%	Extension modules have also been developed by MORDI and by Nishi Ltd for growers supplying the company. The challenge is the coordination and establishing partnerships.
<u>Output 3.3.1:</u> Operational plans for forest restoration, including mangroves,	Q1 2020	Priority areas for forest rehabilitation identified.	No change				5%	The vacant position of the Forestry Specialist has been difficult to fill. An international Forestry consultant will be recruited to

formulated and implemented		Some restoration work already commenced within the 'Eua Watershed Area,						led the development of the Operational Plans. Nurseries upgrades take time to produce seedlings for rehabilitation work.
<u>Output 3.3.2:</u> Systematisation of traditional tree management systems	Q4 2019	Nurseries upgrades started.	A draft LOA has been developed with the NGO Tonga Community Development Trust (TCDT) to support the conservation and sustainable use of trees with high cultural and medicinal values.				25%	Challenge still with the procurement of equipment and materials for upgrade of nurseries taking longer than anticipated.
<u>Output 3.3.3:</u> Sustainable Forestry Management Agreements	Q2 2020	Yet to commence	No change				0%	An international consultant will be recruited to lead the development of SFMAs.
<u>Output 3.3.4:</u> Improved mechanisms for supply of tree seed and planting materials	Q2 2019	Nurseries upgrades started.	Continued to upgrade nurseries. Activities under the LOA with				25%	Procurement of equipment and materials for upgrade of nurseries took longer than anticipated.

			TCDT under 3.3.2 will also contribute.					
<u>Output 3.3.5:</u> Training modules on forest restoration and management, for Forestry Division staff and community members	Q3 2019	Yet to commence	Some training was provided by the previous Forestry Specialist.				5%	Forestry Specialist position difficult to fill.
<u>Output 4.1.1:</u> Monitoring and evaluation system established, supporting adaptive project management	Q4 2018	Draft M&E developed	M&E Plan in place but limited capacity to implement.				25%	Provisions for technical support for the M&E system underestimated.
<u>Output 4.1.2:</u> Mechanisms for effective management and dissemination of knowledge within Tonga and the region	Q2 2019	A Communications Strategy has been drafted but not finalised and not implemented.	The project contributed to the regional R2R knowledge sharing.				10%	Limited capacity within PMU to finalise and implement the Communications Strategy. Provisions need to be reallocated to a Communications and Knowledge Management Specialist.

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year) (Max 200 words)

There has been some progress in implementation of the work plan, supported by improvements in the clarity of FAO procurement processes during the reporting period. As the project approaches its half way mark however, the rate in implementation of the multi-year work plan is relatively slower than that which is expected to deliver on all of the outputs by the NTE of August 2020.

Under component 1 for improving the enabling environment, progress was made towards the outputs for the 3 outcomes, which are on track to be achieved. Eleven (11) Standard Operating Procedures were developed and trainings provided for local staff to implement various components of the computerized land administration system.

Under Component 2, some progress was made towards the outputs for the 1 outcome, which remain on track to be achieved. Piggery fencing at village boundaries were installed to reduce damage of roaming pigs in tax allotments.

Under component 3 , there was only limited progress made towards the outputs for the 3 outcomes which are slightly off track to be achieved. Trainings were delivered in all pilot villages on livestock management, focusing on piggery management, livestock health and husbandry.

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period? (Max 200 words):

One of the key factors that have contributed to the slower than expected rate of implementation is the disruptions in continuity and sustainability of the capacity of the Project Management Unit. During 2018 for example, the National Project Manager was replaced and as the new National Project Manager came on board, the Senior Technical Adviser's contract took 4.5 months to be renewed. A lot of the momentum was lost during this period. The Forest & Agroforestry Specialist position and the Communications Specialist positions have also been vacant for most of 2018 and first half of 2019 and has resulted in delays in implementation of key sustainable forest management activities.

While improvements have been made on the clarity of FAO procurement processes, there remain significant delays in obtaining technical clearances of RFPs, TORs and LOAs and the modality of cash advances to local project personnel and consultants continue to pose risks.

Some major changes are also required in terms of stakeholder ownership of the project in order for the outcomes to be achieved.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating¹⁶	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating¹⁷	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	MS	MU	There have been continuous delays in procurements of goods and services, especially when it involves technical clearances of ToRs, RFPs or LOAs from the relevant divisions of FAO.
Budget Holder	MS	MS	Taking into account both the Project Team's and LTO's comments, it is understandable the frustrations experienced by the team on the ground with delays in procurement. On the other hand, overall, the project implementation progress is Moderately Satisfactory.
Lead Technical Officer¹⁸	MS	MS	The delays in procurements was mainly due to the efforts to meet all the operational and technical requirements of FAO, this was to ensure the technical quality of the outputs to be generated. In spite of the delays in delivering certain outputs, overall the project is moving ahead reasonably in an effective manner.
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MS	MS	Some of the implementation challenges, such as delayed procurement, may be one of the important areas to be addressed during the upcoming MTR.

¹⁶ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet.

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

¹⁷ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

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

3. Risks

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

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ¹⁹ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	The risk classification is still valid. One of the key risks and impact identified was support from all community members. While this could still be considered a low risk, it is starting to lean towards a moderate classification with delays in implementation on the ground.

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

Risk ratings

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

	Risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
--	------	---------------------------	-------------------	--	-----------------------------------

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

²⁰ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²¹ If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

	Risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Limited collaboration by local communities: Collaboration of local communities will be critical to achieving the objectives of the project, but these communities will need to meet their own needs before agreeing to devote time and resources to resource management and biodiversity conservation. It may be difficult to reach agreement with all members of communities on management and enforcement measures.	M	Extensive community consultations are built into every aspect of the project. Project sites have been selected, in large part, on the basis of communities' expressions of interest and willingness to engage in project activities and the existence of relations of trust that have been built up through previous agency initiatives. Participation will further be ensured through the tangible socioeconomic benefits that will result from the project's actions in the short term, in the form of reductions in the damage to crops and lands caused by roaming pigs, and the provision of clean and accessible renewable energy in the form of biogas.	There have been some socioeconomic benefits realized in terms of reduction in the impacts of roaming pigs on crops. These benefits however are not at the scale and rate of delivery required to secure buy-in and collaboration of local communities. The significant delays in implementation of key activities like the establishment of piggeries and biodigesters, due to delays in procurement of services, have delayed the realization of the expected socioeconomic benefits and risks reduce the buy-in of local communities.	

	Risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
2	Limited human and financial capacities in national Government: while the Government of Tonga (GoT) has experience implementing GEF-financed and other projects, overall human resource capacity is generally low, particularly in the outer islands where government presence is nearly non-existent. Government budgets are fairly low, which could present problems if already low budgets are reduced due to changes in national budget allocations.	M	Significant capacity-building activities, for government and stakeholders alike, are included in the project to address capacity gaps. Project management will closely monitor government budget allocations in order to flag and potential shortfalls as soon as possible, so that corrective measures can be taken as needed to ensure continued implementation of project activities. In addition, the project will seek to minimize communities' dependence on Government support by promoting their capacities for the participatory generation, adaptation and dissemination of SLM technologies, based wherever possible on traditional knowledge; and "low-tech" approaches to the production and supply of planting materials.	Some trainings have been delivered to government and stakeholders on Standard Operating Procedures for the customization of SOLA to modernize the land administration system. Training in pig husbandry and management have also been delivered to communities. A Letter of Agreement between FAO and MAFF has been developed to facilitate MAFF coordination of and development of training modules for extension services.	

	Risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
3	Unsuitability of technologies to local conditions: While the biogas/piggery system is already being piloted in Tongatapu, the integration of the system with whole farming system at the community-level to be piloted under this project has not been tested as yet in Tongatapu or the outer islands.	M	The project will build on previous experiences with piggery systems in Tonga and community-based biogas systems in other countries, which have shown a high level of uptake and sustainability. On-going training in operating and maintenance of the entire system would be provided during project implementation. In addition, this training will focus on developing capacities among community members to troubleshoot technical, social or other problems that may arise in the future; while the community-based governance mechanisms to be supported by the project will facilitate the resolution of any stakeholder conflicts that may arise regarding, for example, roles and responsibilities for the maintenance of the systems, or the equity of the distribution of their benefits.	To date, only traditional pig fencing ('a puaka Tonga) have been installed. No pig pens ('a puaka palangi) have been installed. The RFP for installation and training on operation and maintenance of biodigesters was delayed and eventually had to be reissued. The project need to place more emphasis and focus on the technology being livestock-crop farming systems to support the health of agro-ecosystems, and shift focus away from piggery biodigesters.	

	Risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
4	Climate change: climate change will pose a risk to the achievement of the project's objective as it may result in the climatic coping limits of the proposed production systems being exceeded (due to increases in temperature, rainfall variability and storm damage); land loss and degradation due to sea level rise, saltwater intrusion and salt spray impacts may also exacerbate productive pressures, and associated degradation, on the remaining land.	L	The project's approach will mitigate these risks by promoting capacities among extension agents and among community members to innovate and adapt the resource management systems they promote or apply, through the use of participatory, adaptive approaches to analysis, learning and technology generation such as farmer field schools. The project's support to negotiated approaches to addressing land use planning and land tenure issues will further enable communities to adapt to CC-related changes in biophysical and demographic conditions.	The modules for extension services and farmer field schools are yet to be delivered.	

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
	M	The procurement of materials and provision for technical expertise in installation and training on piggery biodigesters need to be delivered during second half of 2019 or risk losing the buy-in of local communities and for project to demonstrate livestock-crop integrated farming systems by end date.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²²

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	Yes	<p>No changes in terms of the Outcomes themselves but several indicators need to be revised (see Section 2 above) to better reflect realities on the ground and based on the results of household surveys carried out by the project team.</p> <p>During consultations on ILAMS Plans and project team meetings, the policies and legislations are often already in place and it is the enforcement of the policies and legislations where the challenges are. For example, there are land regulations already in place requiring permits for any new construction on your piece of land, or to plough or even do significant burning on your land.</p>
Project Outputs	Yes	For Outcome 3.1, some changes will need to be made after the mid-term review to combine training manuals with training modules based on a needs assessment to be carried out under the LOA currently being finalised with MAFF on strengthening the coordination of extension services.

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

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

²² Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	<div>Original NTE:</div> <div>Revised NTE:</div> <div>Justification:</div>

5. Gender Mainstreaming

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

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

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

Does the project staff have gender expertise?

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

- closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;
- improving women's participation and decision making; and or
- generating socio-economic benefits or services for women.

As proposed in the project document, the project has the potential to generate significant gendered benefits for women, including the following:

- Increase access to clean biogas for cooking and lighting, thereby reducing their workload in gathering firewood, and improving the home environment.
- Increased opportunities for the generation food and income through small-scale vegetable and fruit production, and improvement of sanitary conditions, due to the elimination of roaming pigs from the village environment.
- Increased opportunities for handicraft production and other economic activities based on agroforestry products such as pandanus, paper mulberry and vanilla.

The project document proposed an international community development specialist will be contracted to provide methodological support to the project for the formulation and implementation of the project's gender strategy, "in order to identify means of promoting women's effective participation in these meetings and in such complementary spaces as may be necessary". There were gender aspects covered in the ILAMS Plans development process but not yet at a level where quality analysis can be carried out.

A draft LOA has been developed with Tonga Community Development Trust to tap into their network of Women Groups to support their efforts in the conservation and sustainable use of trees with high cultural and medicinal values.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.

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

Not applicable.

7. Stakeholders Engagement

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

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

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

- list all stakeholders engaged in the project;
- briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.

- A multi-stakeholder meeting/workshop was carried on 15th February 2019 to provide inputs into the development of the 2019 Annual Work Plan. It was attended by Town Officers from the 4 pilot villages, MAFF Outer island Officers in Charge (OICs), MAFF Extension Officers, MLSNR GIS staff, Tupou College staff, Ministry of Internal Affairs, and Project Field Officers.
- Training was provided between 30th October - 1st November 2018 to MLSNR staff from Survey, Land Information Systems/GIS divisions on different aspects of the customization of SOLA based on the procedures outlined in the Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) developed.
- There have been ongoing consultation with NGOs such as MORDI and TCDT during implementation of the Plan.

8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

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

- Some project stories can be found on the Project Facebook page:

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/763339937157345/>

9. 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 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
		TOTAL				

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

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.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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