

2018

Project Implementation Review (PIR)

**IAP Reducing Deforestation from Commodity Production - child**

[Basic Data](#_Toc1)

[Overall Ratings](#_Toc2)

[Development Progress](#_Toc3)

[Implementation Progress](#_Toc4)

[Critical Risk Management](#_Toc5)

[Adjustments](#_Toc6)

[Ratings and Overall Assessments](#_Toc7)

[Gender](#_Toc8)

[Social and Environmental Standards](#_Toc9)

[Communicating Impact](#_Toc10)

[Partnerships](#_Toc11)

[Annex - Ratings Definitions](#_Toc12)

# Basic Data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Information** | |
| UNDP PIMS ID | 5664 |
| GEF ID | 9180 |
| Title | Reducing Deforestation from Commodity Production |
| Country(ies) | Regional Centre - Panama, Liberia, Indonesia, Paraguay, New York - GEF, Regional Centre - Panama |
| UNDP-GEF Technical Team | Ecosystems and Biodiversity |
| Project Implementing Partner | UNDP1 (Regional Centre - Panama) |
| Joint Agencies | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| Project Type | Full Size |

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Description** |
| As a key part of the Commodities Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP), the "Reducing Deforestation from Commodity Production Project" seeks to turn the sustainable production of key commodities from niche and specialized operations to the norm in each commodity sector. The Program's overall objective is to reduce the global impacts of agriculture commodities on GHG emissions and biodiversity by meeting the growing demand of palm oil, soy and beef through supply that does not lead to deforestation and related GHG emissions. Specifically, the production project will encourage sustainable practices for oil palm and beef production while conserving forests and safeguarding the rights of smallholder farmers and forest-dependent communities. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Contacts** | |
| UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser | Mr. Andrew Bovarnick (andrew.bovarnick@undp.org) |
| Programme Associate | Ms. Katarina Hadad (katarina.hadad@undp.org) |
| Project Manager | Ms. Pascale Bonzom (pascale.bonzom@undp.org) |
| CO Focal Point | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| GEF Operational Focal Point | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| Project Implementing Partner | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| Other Partners | *(not set or not applicable)* |


# Overall Ratings

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall DO Rating | Satisfactory |
| Overall IP Rating | Moderately Satisfactory |
| Overall Risk Rating | Moderate |

# Development Progress

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | | | | | | |
| **Objective**  **Encourage sustainable practices for oil palm and beef production while conserving forests and safeguarding the rights of smallholder farmers and forest-dependent communities** | | | | | | |
| **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Midterm target level** | **End of project target level** | **Level at 30 June 2017** | **Cumulative progress since project start** |
| Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or subnational level. | Two national green commodity platforms (in Indonesia and Paraguay) | At least 40 private sector, civil society, and donor organizations newly connected and engaged in broad-based dialogue under national and sub-national platforms | At least 60 private sector, civil society, and donor organizations newly connected and engaged in broad-based dialogue under national and sub-national platforms | *(not set or not applicable)* | In Indonesia, 76 organizations were newly connected and engaged in broad-based dialogue under the platforms. 19 new partners were connected through the national Indonesia Palm Oil Platform (FOXSBI) including 3 private sector, 11 NGOs, 1 association, 3 development organizations, and 1 certification body. At the provincial level, 38 partners were newly connected including private sector, NGOs, universities, and associations. 19 new organizations, farmers groups, academic institutions, donor organizations, financial institutions, etc. were connected through district fora.    In Liberia, although the existing Oil Palm Technical Working Group has not yet been strengthened (through creation of stronger governance structure and increasing outreach to new stakeholders), 40 partners are connected through the newly established landscape forum, with dialogue beginning.    Similarly, in Paraguay, although the regional commodity platform has not yet been formed, discussions with up to 10 partners have already been engaged about the regional commodity platform, including local government, national Ministries, NGOs, cooperatives, and farmer associations. |
| Number of direct project beneficiaries among groups including smallholder farmers and forest-dependent communities | NA | At least 2,500 households benefitting | At least 6,000 households benefitting | *(not set or not applicable)* | 0 households.  Direct support to beneficiaries has not yet started in the countries; it is planned to begin in the second half of 2018. |
| Area of high conservation value forest (HCVF), or equivalent, identified and set aside within commodity production landscapes for conservation of globally significant biodiversity and associated ecosystem goods and services |  | At least 25% of total HCVF is set aside | At least 50% of HCVF is set aside | *(not set or not applicable)* | In Liberia, an HCS study was conducted by Sime Darby, the private sector partner that owns the largest concessions in the target landscape; this study is under review by Conservation International, and once approved will inform the set-asides in the target landscape.    In Indonesia, a landscape-level assessment of HCS/HCV areas in Pelalawan was conducted. The preliminary results show a total of 1,348,649 hectares of HCVF/A . These results will be peer reviewed and publicly consulted with stakeholders at the end of July 2018. Once the final map of the high conservation forests and areas has been finalized, the project will propose several protection scenarios of set aside areas in the landscape, to be approved by the Head of the District and/or the Minister of Environment and Forestry as “Essential Ecosystems” for protection.    In Paraguay, meetings were organized with local governments and Chaco cooperatives, as they are in the process to improve legal environmental adequacy allowing for an integrated approach to land use planning. The project will work with them to map areas of HVCF. |
| **The progress of the objective can be described as:** | | **On track** | | | | |
| **Objective**  **Component 1 Dialogue and public private partnerships; production policies and enforcement** | | | | | | |
| **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Midterm target level** | **End of project target level** | **Level at 30 June 2017** | **Cumulative progress since project start** |
| Outcome 1.1 Responsible Governmental authorities, along with private sector & civil society organizations, build consensus and reduce conflict related to target commodity production and growth at national and sub-national levels    Outcome Indicator 1.1.1  Number of national and sub-national commodity platforms, and number of district district/target landscape forums established and fully operational | Baseline 1.1.1  1 national commodity platform (Indonesia = INPOP), 1 sub-national commodity platform (Indonesia = JSSPO) | Mid-term Target 1.1.1  3 national commodity platforms; 4 sub-national platforms; and up to 4 district/target landscape forums | End of Project Target 1.1.1  3 national commodity platforms; 4 sub-national platforms; and up to 4 district/target landscape forums | *(not set or not applicable)* | 2 national commodity platforms in Indonesia and Liberia; 1 sub-national platform (North Sumatra in Indonesia); 4 landscape-level fora (Pelalawan, South Tapanuli and Sintang in Indonesia, and in the Sime Darby landscape in Liberia).    In Indonesia, the project began with 1 national platform, the nascent Joint Secretariat for Sustainable Palm Oil (JSSPO) in North Sumatra, and 1 district forum (Pelalawan). 2 landscape-level fora were launched in early 2018 (South Tapanuli and Sintang districts) and the North Sumatra provincial platform was formalized through a governor decree.    In Liberia the project also started with 1 national commodity platform, based on work done by CI between project design and the start of the Good Growth Partnership (GGP) implementation. Since the project implementation began, some meetings were held with the OPTWG to present the support to be offered by GGP and the North Western Oil Palm Landscape Forum was launched with co-financing in early 2018.    In Paraguay, two national commodity platforms on soy and beef are under development through the GEF-funded Green Landscapes Project. The regional beef platform in the Chaco will be informing the national beef platform, and is currently under development. |
| Outcome 1.2 Practical alignment and implementation of public and private investments and other actions related to target commodities    Outcome Indicator 1.2.1  Number of national and sub-national Commodity Action Plans finalized and adopted by national and sub-national governments | Baseline 1.2.1  0 national and sub-national Commodity Action Plans finalized and adopted | Mid-term Target 1.2.1  1 national level action plan finalized, adopted and under implementation | End of Project Target 1.2.1  2 national-level and 4 sub-national level action plans finalized, adopted and under implementation | *(not set or not applicable)* | 0 national or sub-national action plans.    In Indonesia, the national action plan has been finalized and approved by the FoKSBI (National Commodity Platform) Steering Committee, and strategies for legal adoption of the NAP are under discussion. Options include Presidential Instruction or Presidential Decree combined with Indonesia Sustainable Palm Oil (ISPO) strengthening. The Riau provincial action plan is nearly finalized. |
| Outcome 1.3 Improved national and sub-national policies, regulations and programmes related to commodity production practices in three target countries    Outcome Indicator 1.3.1  Number of priority policies and regulations drafted and proposed that address systemic barriers to government oversight of and support for sustainable, reduced-deforestation commodity production practices, with priorities identified in Table 7 of the CEO Endorsement request as well as through national and sub-national commodity platforms and project global support services. | Baseline 1.3.1  0 policy and regulatory priorities realized | Mid-term Target 1.3.1  3 policy and regulatory priorities drafted and proposed | End of Project Target 1.3.1  5 policy and regulatory priorities drafted and proposed | *(not set or not applicable)* | In Indonesia, facilitation to strengthen 2 national policies (“Min. of Agr. Director General Regulation on Community Plantation Development” and “Government Regulation on Life Support System – a higher regulatory umbrella for KEE regulation facilitated under Outcome 1.4”) have begun; academic papers for the development of draft regulations are being developed. At sub-national level, revisions to the “Pelalawan Regional Regulation (PERDA) on corporate social responsibility,” with added clauses on private sector obligation to assist smallholder have been approved by the Pelalawan House of Representatives for legalization. Meanwhile, facilitation to develop a “Head of District Regulation (PERBUP) on Private Sector Partnership to Enhance Farmers Capacity,” as a regulatory derivation of the newly approved “Regional Regulation (PERDA) on corporate social responsibility” in the Palm Oil Sector has been approved by the head of district (Bupati); the first internal working group meeting will be convened in the beginning of the third quarter. |
| Outcome 1.4 Improved national and sub-national policies, regulations and programmes related to land use allocations for commodity production and set asides in three target countries    Outcome Indicator 1.4.1  Number of new or revised national and sub-national policies, regulations and programmes drafted, proposed, and adopted that are related to land use allocation for commodity production | Baseline 1.4.1  0 policies, regulations and programmes | Mid-term Target 1.4.1  3 national or sub-national policies, regulations or programmes drafted, proposed, and adopted | End of Project Target 1.4.1  4 national or sub-national policies, regulations or programmes drafted, proposed, and adopted | *(not set or not applicable)* | In Indonesia, the Minister of Env. & Forestry Regulation on Essential Ecosystems (Kawasan Ekosistem Essensial/KEE) has been finalized and cleared by the Legal Bureau of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. It is awaiting approval of the Minister. District regulations are being strengthened in Tapsel to protect the HCV/HCS area set-aside with production areas, including an instruction to review company environmental impact assessments (EIA), develop district zoning regulations, and review the spatial plan. |
| Outcome Indicator 1.4.2  Number of national and sub-national policies, regulations and programmes established or endorsed that increase protection for and conservation of HCV and HCS areas. | Baseline 1.4.2  0 national and sub-national policies, regulations and programmes | Mid-term Target 1.4.2  3 national and sub-national policies, regulations and programmes drafted, proposed, and adopted. | End of Project Target 1.4.2  5 national and sub-national policies, regulations and programmes drafted, proposed, and adopted. | *(not set or not applicable)* | In Indonesia, 1.4.1, 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 need to first be achieved, in order to progress on this.    In Liberia, meetings have been held with various stakeholders to gain a better understanding of the policy environment. |
| Outcome 1.5 Improved monitoring of land use change in three target countries and particularly within target landscapes      Outcome Indicator 1.5.1  Improved land-use change monitoring systems in target landscapes, as measured by the number of land-use change reports on target landscapes published and disseminated in the countries. | Baseline 1.5.1  0 reports (No monitoring system is in place) | Mid-term Target 1.5.1  0 reports (Improved land-use change monitoring system is in place) | End of Project Target 1.5.1  10 reports (6 in Indonesia, 2 in Liberia, 2 in Paraguay) | *(not set or not applicable)* | In Indonesia, the signing of a letter of agreement between UNDP and the Bogor Agricultural University is at its final stage (awaiting the submission of technical and financial proposals from the university) to develop a Land Use Change Monitoring (LUCM) system. ICRAF (World Agroforestry Center) has also been identified as an NGO to support the development of the LUCM, however work on Component 3, Outcome 3.1 needs to be finalized before the ToRs for ICRAF can be finalized.    In Liberia, identification of monitoring and reporting needs and evaluation of the monitoring tools is ongoing. |
| **The progress of the objective can be described as:** | | **On track** | | | | |
| **Outcome 1**  **Component 2: Farmer support systems and agri-inputs** | | | | | | |
| **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Midterm target level** | **End of project target level** | **Level at 30 June 2017** | **Cumulative progress since project start** |
| Outcome 2.1 Improved national and sub-national systems for supporting sustainable, reduced deforestation commodity production and intensification    Outcome Indicator 2.1.1  Existence of national and sub-national farmer support strategies emphasizing: (i) reduced deforestation, (ii) sustainable intensification, (iii) biodiversity conservation and (iv) elimination of gender gap in agricultural productivity | Baseline 2.1.1  No farmer support strategies exist | Mid-term Target 2.1.1  2 national and 1sub-national strategies under preparation | End of Project Target 2.1.1  2 national and 1 sub-national strategies adopted | *(not set or not applicable)* | No strategies have been prepared or adopted. This work stream is planned for year 2, following completion of Outcome 2.2. |
| Outcome 2.2: Effective approaches to smallholder support (via public private partnerships) have been demonstrated    Outcome Indicator 2.2.1  Number of smallholder farmers trained in, and employing sustainable agricultural practices | Baseline 2.2.1  0 farmers trained | Mid-term Target 2.2.1  2,500 farmers trained, with at least 25% employing sustainable agricultural practices | End of Project Target 2.2.1  6,000 farmers trained, with at least 25% employing sustainable agricultural practices | *(not set or not applicable)* | Training has not yet started in the countries, and is planned to begin in the second half of 2018 for Indonesia and Paraguay.  Training assessments have been completed in the 3 landscapes in Indonesia, and potential target locations for the training have also been identified. The project teams are still working on identifying appropriate target farmers and establishing demo-plots. In addition, for Pelalawan, UNDP is in discussion with IFC to use their farmers training package developed under another project (IPODS). The project teams have also begun engagement with private sector companies as off-takers for the target smallholders (UNDP with Musim Mas Group, CI with ANJ, and WWF with SAM).    Liberia has developed ToRs for a needs assessment, but no farmer trainings are planned there as part of the workplan. |
| **The progress of the objective can be described as:** | | **On track** | | | | |
| **Outcome 2**  **Component 3: Land use plans and maps in targeted landscapes** | | | | | | |
| **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Midterm target level** | **End of project target level** | **Level at 30 June 2017** | **Cumulative progress since project start** |
| Outcome 3.1: Improved land use planning / zoning helps to shift targeting and conversion to commodity production from high biodiversity value, high carbon stock, ecosystem service-rich forested areas to degraded or otherwise appropriate lands    Outcome Indicator 3.1.1  Number of hectares of HCV and HCS forest areas in commodity-producing landscapes protected through zoning, or similar legal protections | Baseline 3.1.1  0 ha of HCVF and HCS covered | Mid-term Target 3.1.1  230,000 ha of HCVF and HCS covered | End of Project Target 3.1.1  925,000 ha of HCVF and HCS covered | *(not set or not applicable)* | In Indonesia a preliminary report has been developed on the methodology and potential location of critical land areas (HCV, HCS, other essential ecosystems) in Pelalawan, and is now being used as the basis for on-the-ground verification of critical land areas.    In Liberia an HCS study conducted by private sector partner Sime Darby is under review by the project team. |
| Outcome 3.2: Enhanced land use set aside and protection strategies, including gazettement, of HCV and HCS forest areas within commodity-producing landscapes, reduces deforestation, avoids 59.3 million tons of CO2e emissions    Outcome Indicator 3.2.1  Tons CO2e emissions avoided due to gazettement and other related land use and protection strategies | Baseline 3.2.1  0 additional tons Co2e emissions avoided | Mid-term Target 3.2.1  6 million tons Co2e emissions projected to be avoided based on actions to date | End of Project Target 3.2.1  59.3 million tons CO2e emissions avoided (lifetime direct and indirect) | *(not set or not applicable)* | No activities planned for 2018. Work on Outcome 3.1.1 needs to be completed first. |
| **The progress of the objective can be described as:** | | **On track** | | | | |
| **Outcome 3**  **Component 4: Knowledge management.** | | | | | | |
| **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Midterm target level** | **End of project target level** | **Level at 30 June 2017** | **Cumulative progress since project start** |
| Outcome 4.1: Increased knowledge of effective strategies and tools for improving production of commodities in ways that do not involve conversion of forested land      Outcome Indicator 4.1.1  Level of technical understanding of landscape-level dynamics of change towards reduced-deforestation commodity production in each target landscape, as measured by the number of reports generated from the application of a landscape assessment tool that:  i. Assesses the political, economic, social, and environmental drivers of deforestation related to commodity production and expansion;  ii. Scores and compares the enabling environment readiness towards deforestation-free commodity production of multiple landscapes within the Production child project; and  iii. Evaluates the effectiveness of interventions targeting the drivers of deforestation with a landscape. | Baseline 4.1.1  0 (No tool exists) | Mid-term Target 4.1.1  5 (Tool has been developed, and baseline assessments completed in each target landscape) | End of Project Target 4.1.1  10 (End-of-project assessment for each target landscape completed, in addition to the baseline assessments) | *(not set or not applicable)* | Terms of Reference for consultant(s) to create a landscape assessment tool has been developed and posted, following research and consultation with partners and organizations working on landscape issues. The planned start date for the contract is September 2018, to be completed and tool presented February 2019. |
| Outcome 4.2: Uptake, adaptation and replication of demonstrated lessons and knowledge    Outcome Indicator 4.2.1  Documented examples of specific lessons shared via Community of Practice being applied in other sub-national and national situations | Baseline 4.2.1  0 examples | Mid-term Target 4.2.1  3 examples applied | End of Project Target 4.2.1  7 examples applied | *(not set or not applicable)* | Lessons learned have begun to be extracted from each country, but have not yet been disseminated through the Community of Practice. |
| **The progress of the objective can be described as:** | | **On track** | | | | |

# Implementation Progress



|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Cumulative GL delivery against total approved amount (in prodoc): | 12.31% |
| Cumulative GL delivery against expected delivery as of this year: | 18.86% |
| Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June (note: amount to be updated in late August): | 1,795,137.47 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key Financing Amounts** | |
| PPG Amount | 300,000 |
| GEF Grant Amount | 14584403 |
| Co-financing | *(not set or not applicable)* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key Project Dates** | |
| PIF Approval Date | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| CEO Endorsement Date | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| Project Document Signature Date (project start date): | Jun 15, 2017 |
| Date of Inception Workshop | Nov 17, 2017 |
| Expected Date of Mid-term Review | Mar 15, 2020 |
| Actual Date of Mid-term Review | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| Expected Date of Terminal Evaluation | Mar 15, 2021 |
| Original Planned Closing Date | Jun 15, 2021 |
| Revised Planned Closing Date | *(not set or not applicable)* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Dates of Project Steering Committee/Board Meetings during reporting period (30 June 2017 to 1 July 2018)** |
| 2017-12-11 |
| 2018-06-20 |

# Critical Risk Management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Current Types of Critical Risks | Critical risk management measures undertaken this reporting period |
| N/A | Not applicable – no critical risks during the reporting period. |

# Adjustments

**Comments on delays in key project milestones**

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Manager: please provide comments on delays this reporting period in achieving any of the following key project milestones: inception workshop, mid-term review, terminal evaluation and/or project closure.** |
| Although the 2 UNDP ProDocs covering the CEO endorsed Production project were signed in June 2017, the official launch of the project was not until September 2017, the same time that the Project Manager took her position. The project therefore has been operating with a functional start date of September 6, 2017. The inception workshop was intended to take place within 3 months of the signing of the ProDoc, but instead took place in November 2017 for the UNDP project managed by the Regional Hub LAC (covering Global, Indonesia and Liberia), within three months of the functional project start, and in March 2018 for the UNDP project managed by UNDP Paraguay (covering Paraguay). The Project Coordinator in Paraguay only started in December 2017. |
| **Country Office: please provide comments on delays this reporting period in achieving any of the following key project milestones: inception workshop, mid-term review, terminal evaluation and/or project closure.** |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |
| **UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser: please provide comments on delays this reporting period in achieving any of the following key project milestones: inception workshop, mid-term review, terminal evaluation and/or project closure.** |
| The official launch of the Good Growth Partnership, including the Production project, took place in September 2017. The launch was a major event attended by all Production project and GGP programme partners as well as high-level representatives from key private sector partners, the GEF, and UNDP as well as a range of stakeholders from each of the target countries; this event significantly increased buy-in to the project on the part of all partners. The GGP launch took place 3 months after the 2 ProDocs covering the Production project were signed, and has been considered the functional start of the project. The Global Project Manager came on board the project at the same time, in September 2017, and in November 2017 held the inception workshop for the LAC Regional Hub-managed UNDP project covering Global, Indonesia, and Liberia. The Paraguay Project Coordinator began in December 2017, and in March 2018 held the inception workshop for the UNDP-Paraguay managed project covering Paraguay. |

# Ratings and Overall Assessments

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Role** | **2018 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2018 Implementation Progress Rating** |
| **Project Manager/Coordinator** | Satisfactory | *- IP Rating provided by UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser and UNDP Country Office only -* |
| Overall Assessment | The project is progressing satisfactorily towards meeting its mid-term and end-of-project targets, despite delays in its inception phase (related to recruitment of full project teams taking several months for Global and Indonesia, and more in the case of Liberia and Paraguay), and rather low financial delivery.    However progress is uneven across countries:  1. Indonesia is progressing very well with activities initiated and contributing towards achieving all of the outcomes, despite a difficult enabling environment with a highly politicized commodity and very work intensive processes to ensure high level government buy-in. Notably, Indonesia has finalized its National Action Plan (NAP) on Sustainable Palm Oil, approved by the FoKSBI (the multistakeholder Sustainable Palm Oil Platform) Steering Committee, and agreed on legalization through presidential regulation. It has engaged all 3 target Provinces (Riau, North Sumatra, West Kalimantan) for platform and sustainable palm oil action plan creation. South Tapanuli Forum in North Sumatra and Sintang Forum in West Kalimantan have been created and are working on sustainable palm oil strategies. Kawasan Ekosistem Esensial (KEE) – Essential Ecosystem regulation legislation is almost finalized. Farmers Training Needs Assessment have been produced for all 3 target landscape. Finally, a report on HCS/HCV assessment in Pelalawan was drafted.  2. Liberia is progressing more slowly due to a difficult start with a political transition and the first platform manager resigning after 3 months. As a result, progress has mostly been made at landscape level where the Northwest Landscape Forum has been established and work is well underway to sign a conservation agreement with local communities by the end of the year. At the national level, work to strengthen the existing sustainable palm oil platform has been initiated including preparing a stakeholder engagement strategy and convening the platform to present plans for the year.  3. Paraguay is also progressing slowly, due to delays in recruitment and a team which will be completed in the next few months. Progress has mostly been made in launching the project and outreaching to project stakeholders and beneficiaries in the Chaco and in building trust and getting their buy-in.    At the Global level, the team of advisors has provided much technical support to all 3 countries in relation to platforms, policy work, communication and private sector engagement. A Landscape Analysis Tool has been conceptualized and procurement is under way for a firm to create and test it. | |
| **Role** | **2018 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2018 Implementation Progress Rating** |
| **UNDP Country Office Programme Officer** | *(not set or not applicable)* | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| Overall Assessment | *(not set or not applicable)* | |
| **Role** | **2018 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2018 Implementation Progress Rating** |
| **GEF Operational Focal point** | *(not set or not applicable)* | *- IP Rating provided by UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser and UNDP Country Office only -* |
| Overall Assessment | *(not set or not applicable)* | |
| **Role** | **2018 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2018 Implementation Progress Rating** |
| **Project Implementing Partner** | *(not set or not applicable)* | *- IP Rating provided by UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser and UNDP Country Office only -* |
| Overall Assessment | *(not set or not applicable)* | |
| **Role** | **2018 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2018 Implementation Progress Rating** |
| **Other Partners** | *(not set or not applicable)* | *- IP Rating provided by UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser and UNDP Country Office only -* |
| Overall Assessment | WWF Indonesia assessment:  Overall the project is on track although some of activities were delayed (adjustment time with government and farmers). Next we will doing intensive communication and coordination with key stakeholders to accelerate project delivery and results based on workplan.    The project implementation progress includes:  • WWF launched the GGP program in Sintang on 19 December 2017 with attendees from government, private sector, financial institutions, and local CSO/CBOs.  • Training Needs Assessment (TNA) for independent smallholders in GGP landscape was established for 63 farmers from a 300 farmers target (20%).  • Launch of the sustainable palm oil forum for Sintang District on 23 May 2018, attended by multi stakeholders in Sintang District.  • The first process to develop District Action Plan for sustainable palm oil in Sintang District was initiated on 24 May 2018, to get support input from multiple stakeholders for draft 0.    Conservation International Indonesia Assessment:  The project is progressing although there were delays due to project mobilization. The longstanding CI relationships with both North Sumatera provincial government and South Tapanuli district government have been advantageous for acceleration of the project implementation, particularly in relation to developing FOKSBI and promoting the District regulation to protect HCV/HCS areas.    The project implementation progress includes:  • Launch and first meeting of South Tapanuli FOKSBI in May 2018. The FOKSBI format at South Tapanuli was being used as reference for FOKSBI at Provincial level. The first meeting discussed a new regulation, PP 88/2018 on agrarian reform acceleration, and formulated recommendations for the Head of District to send inputs for revisions to PP 88/2018, especially regarding the clause on land use decisions.  • The data information for 350 of 700 farmers has been collected to support the training needs assessment and development of a demonstration plot.  • Preliminary HCV/HCS area and production set-asides have been identified.    Conservation International Liberia assessment:  Despite the delay in signing the Responsible Party Agreement (RPA), the implementation of project activities is going well and is on track to achieve the mid-term and end of project targets. The factors contributing to the good progress include: (a) the use of CI’s Rights-Based Approach (RBA), and gender mainstreaming strategy in the implementation of activities; (b) CI Liberia working with the local leadership structures and embracing local communities’ cultural and traditional norms in implementing its activities; and (c) the good community mobilization and facilitation skills of the Landscape Manager were very crucial in establishing and engaging with local communities, landscape forum members, and other stakeholders.    Key achievements so far include:  • Stakeholder mapping was conducted where local, national and international partners were identified, and their capacities were evaluated.  • A resolution for sustainable management of Zodua community forest was signed after CI convened and facilitated a two-day multi-stakeholder dialogue conference in Senje, Garwula District.  • The North Western Oil Palm Landscape Forum (NWOPLF) has been established for structured dialogue, planning, consensus building and knowledge sharing at the landscape level, comprising 50 members including an eight-person Secretariat. The terms of reference including roles/functions, principles and code of conduct for the NWOPLF were developed and ratified by all the members.  • Preliminary assessment of policy and governance issues at the landscape level has been conducted using Sustainable Landscape Rating Tool (SLRT). A preliminary dashboard has been produced to that effect.  • High Carbon Stock (HCS) study conducted by Sime Darby Plantations is being reviewed by CI Experts.  • Three target communities of Gohn, Kangar and Falie were identified after CI conducted pre-feasibility visits in Zodua Clan; subsequent feasibility assessments for conservation agreements with the three target communities have been conducted. | |
| **Role** | **2018 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2018 Implementation Progress Rating** |
| **UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser** | Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory |
| Overall Assessment | The global production project includes a global KM component as well as support to sustainable commodity production in three countries – Indonesia, Liberia and Paraguay. The project initiated country level activity in all three countries, with hiring of teams, development of workplans and engagement with government counterparts.    In Indonesia the work builds on years of UNDP efforts in the Sustainable Palm Oil Initiative, part of UNDP Green Commodities Programme. So work in Indonesia is quite advanced and GGP furthered and expanded the work with the injection of more resources and partners (WWF and CI). The team was strengthened and the national palm platform’s National Action Plan was finalized. The NAP is key for transforming the sector and the team has worked for it to be legalized. This is still under consideration. Efforts in general with government have been positive although the team needs to finalize approvals and make the NAP official. Work has effectively started in all three target landscapes working directly with District governments and farmers. These efforts are important complements to the national work.    In Liberia the work builds on the activities of CI, which formed the Palm Oil Task Force. GGP has been working to evolve the Task Force into a national palm platform within the Ministry of Agriculture. In Paraguay GGP has built on the work of GCP in the east of the country where it was working with GEF resources on soy and beef. Building on this work GGP developed a team for the Chaco and has started to form a national beef platform and a Chaco vision. However, start up has been delayed and more is expected from this intervention.    At a global level the project has strengthened partnerships with the consumer goods forum and key commodity brands and traders to bring the buyers into the national platforms and support smallholder farmers in their efforts to produce the commodities more sustainably. This is not about increasing sustainable demand but bringing more resources to production from the markets that want the products. The project has also developed a TOR for the development of a landscape assessment tool. This tool will provide practitioners the ability to analyse what is happening in a given landscape and assess the effectiveness of the interventions by the project and other commodity related efforts to result in reduced deforestation in any given landscape. The tool is to be piloted in the GGP landscapes but then will be for global application.    Overall the global production project has started well. A bit slow in Paraguay and Liberia but they are challenging environments. The foundations are set for accelerated action and results in year 2. | |

# Gender

**Progress in Advancing Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

This information is used in the UNDP-GEF Annual Performance Report, UNDP-GEF Annual Gender Report, reporting to the UNDP Gender Steering and Implementation Committee and for other internal and external communications and learning.

|  |
| --- |
| **Gender Analysis and Action Plan:** *not available* |
| **Please review the project's Gender Analysis and provide an update on progress to advance gender equality and women's empowerment. If the Gender Analysis is not attached upload the document below or send to the Regional Programme Associate to upload in PIMS+. Please note that all projects approved since 1 July 2014 are required to carry out a gender analysis.** |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |
| **Please specify results achieved this reporting period that focus on increasing gender equality and the empowerment of women.**    **Please explain how the results reported addressed the different needs of men or women, changed norms, values, and power structures, and/or contributed to transforming or challenging gender inequalities and discrimination.** |
| Each of the three target countries is in the process of conducting a gender analysis focused on the target commodities, which will include recommendations on entry points for working with women involved in production.    Efforts have been made to include and address women’s issues, such as through the training needs assessment conducted in Indonesia that included questions on the division of labor between men and women in the plantation and their roles in decision making.    In Liberia, meetings are planned with consideration of women and ways to increase participation. This includes instruction to the Town Chiefs to mobilize both men and women, holding meetings at locations accessible to both women and men, sending invitation letters to both men and women, timing the meetings so that women are able to complete their household work before or afterwards and still attend, and providing transportations refunds and sitting allowances to all participants. Furthermore, during the meetings and workshops, specific sessions are held for both men and women in order to generate gender-specific information. As a result of these efforts, 22% of the representatives elected to the Zodua oil palm forum were women (11 out of 50 total). Women make up 38% of the forum’s executive team (3 out of 8 total). During the town hall meetings in the Kanga, Falie and Gohn communities women were identified as key stakeholders based on their engagement in forest activities, and the need for women’s representation in the forum is recognized.    50% of the people attending the platform training in Liberia were women (4 out of 8 participants), and women were invited to and participated in the platform meetings. 21% of the Oil Palm Technical Working Group meeting participants were women, providing voice to women in a technical discussion on the oil palm sector.    Although Indonesia, Liberia, and Paraguay are three very different countries with different cultural contexts, in each scenario women producers are often marginalized or excluded from decision making. The gender studies being produced will help to evaluate the role of women in the production supply chain of commodities and also identify additional ways to address some of the traditional gender norms and increase gender equality. |
| **Does this project specifically target woman or girls as direct beneficiaries?** |
| No |
| **Please describe how work to advance gender equality and women's empowerment enhanced the project's environmental and/or resilience outcomes.** |
| Women work in various aspects of commodity production in the three target countries, and are needed in order to effectively improve supply chain sustainability. In Indonesia, although women and men engage in different production activities, men are primarily considered to be “farmers” because they traditionally hold the land titles. One of the activities performed by women in the palm oil supply chain is pesticide spraying, which has significant environmental and health risks. By targeting these women for training in Indonesia (although the training has not yet started) instead of only focusing on the legally considered farmers, the project is protecting women’s health while enhancing the environmental outcomes. |

# Social and Environmental Standards

**Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)**

The Project Manager and/or the project’s Safeguards Officer should complete this section of the PIR with support from the UNDP Country Office. The UNDP-GEF RTA should review to ensure it is complete and accurate. For reference, the project's Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP), which was prepared during project design, is available below. If the project began before the SESP was required, then the space below will be empty.

|  |
| --- |
| **SESP:** [5664\_Indonesia,Liberia,Paraguay\_ProDoc Annex H\_SESP.docx](https://undpgefpims.org/attachments/5664/214391/1717325/1723677/5664_Indonesia%2CLiberia%2CParaguay_ProDoc%20Annex%20H_SESP.docx) |
| **1) Please provide a brief update on the project’s social and environmental risks listed in the SESP. If the project has not prepared an SESP (i.e. if the project began before the SESP was required), then please indicate when that screening will be done (recommended before the Midterm Review and/or Terminal Evaluation, or after a significant change to the project context). If the project has updated its SESP during implementation, then please upload that file to this PIR. If any relevant grievances have arisen during the reporting period please describe them in detail including the status, significance, who was involved and what action was taken.** |
| Each of the risks listed in the SESP for each country is included below, followed by an update of that risk.    Indonesia Risks:  1. Human rights concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process.  Update: Concerns about potential human rights issues were taken into account in project design, and are reflected in project implementation. Affected communities and the appropriate government agencies have been involved in the inception and start-up phase, consistent with the project design.    2. Violence to project-affected communities and individuals.  Update: Concerns about potential human rights issues have been taken into account in project design, and are reflected in project implementation. The project is working directly with affected communities as well as with the appropriate government agencies at national and sub-national levels to ensure dialogue and reduce potential conflict.    3. Involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation.  Management Measures: The project is following the Indonesia environmental standards.  Update: The project is working with palm producers to reduce deforestation.    4. Extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water.  Management Measures: The project is following the Indonesia environmental standards.  Update: The project working with producers to ensure sustainable agricultural practices.    5. Generate potential adverse transboundary or global environmental concern.  Management Measures: The project is following the Indonesia environmental standards.  Update: The project is contributing to global environmental benefits of carbon emission reduction, biodiversity conservation, and sustainable land management.    6. Secondary or consequential development activities which could lead to adverse social and environmental effects.  Update: Concerns about potential adverse social and environmental effects have been taken into account in project design, and are reflected in project implementation.    7. Possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources.  Management Measures: The project follows the land classification by National Land Agency (BPN).    8. Potentially result in the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous).  Management Measures: The project does not work at the level of processing palm fruits into oil and as such is not involved in the creation of any waste.    9. Potentially involve the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous chemicals and/or materials.  Management Measures: The project does not work at the level of processing palm fruits into oil and as such is not involved in the manufacture, trade, release, and/or of hazardous chemicals and/or materials.    10. Project involves the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health.  Management Measures: The project follows best practices and standards released by the Ministry of Agriculture for the use of pesticides.  Update: The project will also be providing training for producers and farm workers on the proper use of pesticides, including appropriate safety measures.    Liberia:  11. There may not be interest from local communities to engage in community Conservation Agreements.  Management Measures: The project will demonstrate through strong community engagement that the environmental, social and economic benefits of Conservation Agreements have the potential for sustained impact over time. The project will demonstrate that the livelihood benefits associated with Conservation Agreements are determined together with communities and respond to local needs and priorities. The project will achieve this through numerous community meetings and workshops. CI has implemented Conservation Agreements in many countries including Liberia and the lessons learned from this experience will be utilized in this project.    12. A resurgence of the Ebola virus in Liberia.  Management Measures: Whilst the Ebola epidemic has subsided and all but disappeared in the West African region, there remains a risk that Ebola could reappear in Liberia. CI will work with all stakeholders to ensure the safety of those affected by this project. The Project Management team will ensure that strict hygiene procedures are maintained in the field and that there is continued awareness on Ebola and its impact among stakeholders.    13. Restriction of access to natural resources.  Management Measures: For the potential restriction of access to and use of natural resources as a result of land-use planning or Conservation Agreements, the Project team has prepared a &quot;Process Framework&quot; that describes the nature of the restrictions, the participatory process by which project components will be prepared, criteria by which displaced persons are eligible, measures to restore livelihoods and the means by which any conflicts would be resolved. A plan may also be developed during implementation providing more detail on the arrangements to assist affected persons to improve or restore their livelihoods.    14. Conflict in Liberia.  Management Measures: It has been over 14 years since civil conflict ended in Liberia. Whilst the risk of conflict remains low, upcoming national elections in 2017 may result in some unrest in local communities. CI will ensure that actions taken in the project do not exacerbate potentially volatile situations in local communities. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Process Framework for Restriction of Access to Natural Resources in this document are important tools that will help mitigate against the risk of conflict in this project.  Update: National elections took place in October 2017, were contested and taken to the Supreme Court, and settled in a run-off election at the end of December. The situation has now calmed and a peaceful transition of power took place in early 2018.    15. Lack of capacity within government agencies to take on conservation work.  Management Measures: While a recognized risk, the project will focus heavily on building the capacities within key government agencies to support monitoring and law enforcement.  Update: With the new government that came to power on January 22, 2018, the capacity building activities will continue to be a heavy focus within key government agencies.    16. Lack of sufficient political will in the Ministry of Agriculture to support conservation of primary forest in major palm oil concessions.  Management Measures: There is already political will from various government agencies, the challenge however will be to ensure full commitment from the Ministry of Agriculture who want to ensure that Sime Darby maximize production in their allotted concession area. This project will work directly with the Ministry of Agriculture to build up their knowledge and ensure that there is a clear understanding of the international commitment that companies such as Sime Darby have made in order to meet &quot;No deforestation&quot; pledges.  Update: The project has continued to work directly with the Ministry of Agriculture during and after the political transition to the new President George Weah. The Liberia high-level launch was postponed to June 2018 to ensure appropriate support and buy-in from newly on-boarded government counterparts.    Paraguay:  17. Potential outcomes of the Project are sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change.  Management Measures: The Chaco region is affected by periods of prolonged drought and flooding, which is exacerbated by climate change. This can negatively impact the productivity and profitability of beef raising. However, the production project is specifically promoting sustainable production practices that take into consideration climate change projections. The demand work to be carried out in this project will support increased demand for this sustainable production. Furthermore, the national interpretation of international standards will take into account climate change risks and considerations.    18. Indigenous peoples are present in the Project area (including Project area of influence).  Management Measures: A total of nine different indigenous groups inhabit the Chaco area. The project will ensure that any workshops to support the interpretation of international standards include full representation of indigenous groups and ensure that their voices are taken into consideration. Furthermore, the UNDP has in place a formalized process in the event that there are any concerns and grievances with regard to project activities to enable these to be discussed and solutions sought.    19. Culturally appropriate consultations are necessary on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned.  Management Measures: The project has been presented to INDO (National Indigenous Institute) which is the governing body of the rights of indigenous peoples and responsible driving processes of consultation with indigenous peoples. It has been agreed with the INDI to conduct consultation and validation with communities that participate in pilot activities in Boqueron Center for the implementation of Good Practices Sustainable Production, as well as to present the project to the indigenous associations to engage them in the evaluation process of the regional action Plan for sustainable beef and the definition and validation of go and no go areas. |
| **2) Have any new social and/or environmental risks been identified during project implementation?** |
| No |
| **If any new social and/or environmental risks have been identified during project implementation please describe the new risk(s) and the response to it.** |
| Not applicable - no new social and/or environmental risks identified during the reporting period. |
| **3) Have any existing social and/or environmental risks been escalated during implementation? For example, when a low risk increased to moderate, or a moderate risk increased to high.** |
| No |
| **If any existing social and/or environmental risks have been escalated during implementation please describe the change(s) and the response to it.** |
| Not applicable - no existing social and/or environmental risks escalated during the reporting period. |

# Communicating Impact

|  |
| --- |
| **Tell us the story of the project focusing on how the project has helped to improve people’s lives.**  **(This text will be used for UNDP corporate communications, the UNDP-GEF website, and/or other internal and external knowledge and learning efforts.)** |
| The Production project is part of the Good Growth Partnership (GGP), which uses a supply chain approach to increase the sustainability of agricultural commodities. This project works to improve the livelihoods of smallholder farmers producing palm oil in Indonesia and Liberia, and beef in Paraguay while conserving forests and safeguarding the rights of farmers, smallholder farmers and forest-dependent communities. The farmers receive training in sustainable production practices through farmer support services provided in the target landscapes, which will be scaled up to national and provincial extension services based on lessons learned and best practices in the pilot landscapes.    The direct farmer support is complemented by national and regional policy and regulatory interventions, and the proposal of new or revised regulations, policies, and programmes related to commodity production practices, land use allocations, and set-asides.    The project is establishing national and sub-national (provincial, regional, and district-level) commodity platforms and landscape-level fora where all relevant stakeholders can engage in dialogue to develop commodity action plans.    Dialogue is an essential part of the project approach, as demonstrated by the recent multi-stakeholder conference held in Liberia for the Zodua Community Forest (ZCF). The ZCF has suffered deforestation and degradation due to illegal activities such as pit-sawing and charcoal burning, conducted at a commercial scale by both community members and migrant workers from outside the community. These activities have been a source of conflict between the people carrying them out and the community members who want to conserve the ZCF. In response, the project convened and facilitated a two-day conference in Garwula District to establish mechanisms for sustainable management of the ZCF, in partnership with Sime Darby Plantations Liberia, civil society organization Community Action Against Hunger, and multiple government agencies (Ministry of Agriculture (MOA), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and Forestry Development Authority (FDA)). At the end of the conference, a 10-point resolution was signed by 56 participants including the illegal charcoal burners and pit-sawyers. The resolution establishes a definite timeline for abolishing all illegal activities in the forest, and focuses on sustainable forest management including demarcation, engagement and awareness of key stakeholders and governance. This was enabled by the common vision and priorities for the sustainable management of the ZCF developed during the conference, and is a major step taken towards safeguarding the rights of forest dependent communities.    The value of effective dialogue and collaboration in the platform process can also be seen in the finalization of the National Action Plan for sustainable palm oil in Indonesia, which was recently finalized and approved by the National Commodity Platform (FoKSBI) Steering Committee, and is now initiating the legalization process. This National Action Plan is a direct result of the work done to engage with each FoKSBI partner and to build buy-in through the process.    Through these platforms, policy and regulatory reform, and direct support to farmers, the project uses a multi-pronged approach to make production more sustainable in the target countries. |
| **What is the most significant change that has resulted from the project this reporting period?**  **(This text will be used for internal knowledge management in the respective technical team and region.)** |
| In Indonesia, the National Commodity Platform for palm oil (named FoKSBI) has finalized and approved the National Action Plan (NAP). This builds on work done through previous and concurrent projects through the UNDP country office and Green Commodities Programme to establish the platform and move towards creation of the NAP.    As the project team for GGP Production worked to achieve NAP finalization, they had to deal with a number of misunderstandings and work hard to ensure buy-in from the various platform participants. Some of the stakeholders thought the NAP was UNDP’s document or a tool for UNDP to get donor funding, and there was confusion about the NAP replacing the Indonesia Sustainable Palm Oil draft regulation. These misunderstandings and misapprehensions have been cleared through individual stakeholder meetings and audiences with the government agencies, NGOs, and private sector companies involved.    The project team worked with the FoKSBI drafting team on the finalization of the NAP for legalization, which involved facilitating drafting team meetings, and regular consultation with the platform Steering Committee Chairwoman to ensure the accommodation of stakeholder comments and inputs. A consultant was also hired to work on the process of NAP legalization, the most effective strategy for which has yet to be determined. Options include a Presidential Instruction or Presidential Regulation/Decree combined with strengthening the Indonesia Sustainable Palm Oil (ISPO) regulation.    Endorsement for the NAP at the ministerial and district government level is also very challenging, despite continuous engagement between the project team and government entities. This is also true for NGOs and private sector companies, for whom more effort is needed to ensure support on the NAP. The private sector is especially leery given the trauma they experienced from the dissolution of the IPOP (Indonesia Palm Oil Pledge) in the recent past; their involvement and support for the FoKSBI and NAP remain passive. The project team will continue to engage with all key stakeholders individually to build trust and buy-in for the NAP. |
| **Describe how the project supported South-South Cooperation and Triangular Cooperation efforts in the reporting year.**  **(This text will be used for internal knowledge management within the respective technical team and region.)** |
| This project is centered around South-South cooperation, with the three target countries (Liberia, Indonesia, and Paraguay) working together. The monthly GGP Secretariat calls provide an opportunity to share experiences and challenges, and they have been useful to see the similarities as well as the differences between the country contexts. The gender consultants hired in Liberia and Indonesia have been in communication to discuss the gender studies being conducted in the two places, and strategies that would work in both contexts.    In May 2018, the Liberia project team went to Indonesia for a training led by a UNDP Senior Commodities Advisor on national commodity platforms, where they were able to learn from a team with a lot of experience in the process of establishing and implementing a platform. This training will help the Liberia team as they work towards establishing a national commodity platform in Liberia, and also enabled the Indonesia team to learn from the perspective of the Liberia team. |

**Project Links and Social Media**

|  |
| --- |
| **Please include: project's website, project page on the UNDP website, Adaptation Learning Mechanism (UNDP-ALM) platform, Facebook, Twitter, Flickr, YouTube, as well as hyperlinks to any media coverage of the project, for example, stories written by an outside source. Please upload any supporting files, including photos, videos, stories, and other documents using the 'file upload' button in the top right of the PIR.** |
| During the reporting period, the GGP website was developed: http://goodgrowthpartnership.com/  A presentation of GGP, of the context and the integrated approach and a description of all the Child Projects and GGP initiatives are available on the website. Blog articles and resources are also posted, and contacts of team members available.    GGP YouTube channel: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCrYsnX7ZGJIPJ30wCsAl1lw  Green Commodities Community facebook group: https://www.facebook.com/groups/886853894801170/  Social media guidance shared with partners: https://trello.com/b/6MeZTebD/ggp-at-the-tfa    Media articles:  - http://news.trust.org/item/20170929093743-f1ig8/  - http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2017/09/08/undp-calls-stronger-action-plan-palm-oil-sustainability.html  - https://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/2017/sep/29/companies-zero-deforestation-pledges-agriculture-palm-oil-environment  - http://frontpageafricaonline.com/news/liberia-agriculture-ministry-ci-launch-new-program-to-tackle-deforestation/ |

# Partnerships

Give the name of the partner(s), and describe the partnership, recent notable activities and any innovative aspects of the work. Please do not use any acronyms. (limit = 2000 characters).This information is used to get a better understanding of the work GEF-funded projects are doing with key partners, including the GEF Small Grants Programme, indigenous peoples, the private sector, and other partners. Please list the full names of the partners (no acronyms please) and summarize what they are doing to help the project achieve its objectives. The data may be used for reporting to GEF Secretariat, the UNDP-GEF Annual Performance Report, UNDP Corporate Communications, posted on the UNDP-GEF website, and for other internal and external knowledge and learning efforts. The RTA should view and edit/elaborate on the information entered here. All projects must complete this section. Please enter "N/A" in cells that are not applicable to your project.

|  |
| --- |
| **Civil Society Organisations/NGOs** |
| In Indonesia, the project is partnering with Bogor Agricultural University for the production of a land-use change monitoring tool, and is in discussion with ICRAF for the same and other activities related to land use planning.    In Indonesia, Responsible Party Agreements were signed with WWF to execute the landscape work in West Kalimantan, and with Conservation International in North Sumatra.    In Liberia, Conservation International functions as the Responsible Party implementing landscape-level work (through formalized agreement). |
| **Indigenous Peoples** |
| In Paraguay, the indigenous peoples live widely dispersed in the Chaco area, and we are identifying which communities could be within the pilot areas of the project, although many of them have the pilot areas as ancestral territory, and that is why they were invited to the inception workshop in March 2018. They will also be invited to join the Chaco regional commodity platform, and other activities related to their livelihood. |
| **Private Sector** |
| In Liberia, the project is working with Sime Darby, a large-scale concession owner and the dominant concession in the target landscape. Conservation International is providing technical review support for the HCS and HCV studies conducted for its plantations. Sime Darby recently hosted a high-level team with representatives from the Global Environment Facility (including the GEF CEO), Conservation International and UNDP.    In Indonesia, the project is engaging with the members of the largest Palm Oil private sector organization (GAPKI) in dialogues at the national level (through FOKSBI) and the jurisdictional level (through Provincial and District platforms and Forae). The project is also engaging with Musim Mas, ANJ and SAM on farmer support systems, and plans to sign an agreement with each of them in the second half of 2018.    GGP supports Value Beyond Value Chains (VBVC), a UNDP initiative aimed at increasing the effectiveness of private sector collaboration with governments to protect and strengthen agricultural commodity production and supply chains. The initiative focuses on how to address systemic issues in the global food system more effectively, specifically on how to increase the effectiveness of private sector collaboration with governments in developing countries to help build the enabling conditions for the sustainable production of major agricultural commodity crops driving deforestation. GGP intends to use the initiative as an opportunity to create better private sector engagement at country level through the medium of our national commodity platforms and landscape related work. The kick-off workshop for the VBVC initiative took place in April 2018, and discussions are underway with potential implementation and funding partners. |
| **GEF Small Grants Programme** |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |
| **Other Partners** |
| While not formalized, there is ongoing discussion with Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) to work together on the National Interpretation of the standard for Liberia to move towards a jurisdictional approach.    There is also ongoing discussion with Tropical Forest Alliance 2020/ Africa Palm Oil Initiative/ Proforest to support actions on the sustainable production of oil palm and supporting the civil society participation in oil palm sector, although this is not a formal agreement.    Discussion has been initiated with the World Bank on an agricultural stakeholder platform project and potential synergies; this is still under development. |

# Annex - Ratings Definitions

**Development Objective Progress Ratings Definitions**

(HS) Highly Satisfactory: Project is on track to exceed its end-of-project targets, and is likely to achieve transformational change by project closure. The project can be presented as 'outstanding practice'.

(S) Satisfactory: Project is on track to fully achieve its end-of-project targets by project closure. The project can be presented as 'good practice'.

(MS) Moderately Satisfactory: Project is on track to achieve its end-of-project targets by project closure with minor shortcomings only.

(MU) Moderately Unsatisfactory: Project is off track and is expected to partially achieve its end-of-project targets by project closure with significant shortcomings. Project results might be fully achieved by project closure if adaptive management is undertaken immediately.

(U) Unsatisfactory: Project is off track and is not expected to achieve its end-of-project targets by project closure. Project results might be partially achieved by project closure if major adaptive management is undertaken immediately.

(HU) Highly Unsatisfactory: Project is off track and is not expected to achieve its end-of-project targets without major restructuring.

**Implementation Progress Ratings Definitions**

(HS) Highly Satisfactory: Implementation is exceeding expectations. Cumulative financial delivery, timing of key implementation milestones, and risk management are fully on track. The project is managed extremely efficiently and effectively. The implementation of the project can be presented as 'outstanding practice'.

(S) Satisfactory: Implementation is proceeding as planned. Cumulative financial delivery, timing of key implementation milestones, and risk management are on track. The project is managed efficiently and effectively. The implementation of the project can be presented as 'good practice'.

(MS) Moderately Satisfactory: Implementation is proceeding as planned with minor deviations. Cumulative financial delivery and management of risks are mostly on track, with minor delays. The project is managed well.

(MU) Moderately Unsatisfactory: Implementation is not proceeding as planned and faces significant implementation issues. Implementation progress could be improved if adaptive management is undertaken immediately. Cumulative financial delivery, timing of key implementation milestones, and/or management of critical risks are significantly off track. The project is not fully or well supported.

(U) Unsatisfactory: Implementation is not proceeding as planned and faces major implementation issues and restructuring may be necessary. Cumulative financial delivery, timing of key implementation milestones, and/or management of critical risks are off track with major issues and/or concerns. The project is not fully or well supported.

(HU) Highly Unsatisfactory: Implementation is seriously under performing and major restructuring is required. Cumulative financial delivery, timing of key implementation milestones (e.g. start of activities), and management of critical risks are severely off track with severe issues and/or concerns. The project is not effectively or efficiently supported.