



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2021 – Revised Template



Period covered: 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Eastern Europe		
Country (ies):	Georgia		
Project Title:	Achieving Land Degradation Neutrality Targets of Georgia through Restoration and Sustainable Management of Degraded Pasturelands		
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/GEO/006/GFF		
GEF ID:	10151		
GEF Focal Area(s):	Land Degradation		
Project Executing Partners:	MEPA, RECC, CENN		
Project Duration:	2020-2023		
Project coordinates: (Ctrl+Click here)	Kazbegi	N 42° 39' 27"	E 44° 38' 43"
	Gurjaani	N 41° 45' 0"	E 45° 48' 0"
	Dmanisi	N 41° 19' 12"	E 44° 12' 0"

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	December 17, 2019
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01/06/2020
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	31/05/2023
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	N/A
Actual Implementation End Date³:	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	1,776,484
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	12,245,000

¹ As per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

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

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

Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2021 (USD m):	443.004
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2021⁵	1,490,851 USD

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee Meeting:	September 29, 2020
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	Midpoint of year 2 of project
Actual Mid-term review date:	N/A
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022)⁷:	No
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date:	N/A
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022):	No
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁸	No

Ratings

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

Status

Implementation Status:	1 st 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 The MTR should take place about halfpoint between EOD and NTE – this is the expected date

⁷ Please note that the FAO GEF Coordination Unit should be contacted six months prior to the expected MTR date

⁸ 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/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Dragan Angelovski	dragan.angelovski@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Feras Ziadat	Feras.Ziadat@fao.org
Budget Holder	Raimund Jehle	Raimund.Jehle@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Margarita Diubanova	Margarita.Diubanova@fao.org

2. Progress Towards Achieving Project Objectives and Outcome (DO)

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ¹¹
Objective(s): Support the national efforts to implement LDN targets of Georgia through restoration and sustainable management of the degraded pasturelands (National Targets 1 and 4)						
Outcome 1: Enhanced policy and institutional frameworks for LDN with the focus on the implementation of SLM principles on pasturelands	<p>LDN principles integrated in the national legal and policy frameworks with the focus on pasturelands.</p> <p>LDN principles integrated in the national institutional framework with the focus on pasturelands</p>	<p>LDN principles are not yet integrated in the existing national legal and policy frameworks related to agricultural lands. There is no framework in place to mainstream LDN into sectoral planning and decision-making processes. LDN principles are not yet integrated in the existing national legal and policy frameworks related to agricultural lands.</p>	<p>LDN principles are formulated in response of national priorities and context and agreed with stakeholders for further integration into national legal, policy, and institutional frameworks</p>	<p>National legal and policy frameworks for LDN with the focus on the implementation of SLM on pasturelands are developed and presented to the Government. Strengthened national institutional framework with the functional coordination mechanism and LDN DSS. A monitoring system for the LDN indicators in place at national and local levels.</p> <p>Proposal for the MEPA Budgetary Programme for implementation of the recommendations from the</p>	15 %	(S)

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ 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.

¹¹ 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)**.

		No monitoring system for the LDN indicators exists at national and/or local levels		cost-benefit analyses submitted for inclusion in the state budget for the following years		
Outcome 2: LDN target # 4 is implemented via SLM practices on degraded pasturelands by local land users with the support of the coordination mechanism	Number of local communities as the main project beneficiaries (number of communities: their population, total ha of land, % share of pastures, and technical features of the pastures). Number of hectares under SLM that meet LDN criteria (20,000 ha). Number of hectares of land restored (747 ha) Increased investments in pastureland management for LDN targets scaling up	SLM and restoration on pasturelands is not practiced in three target municipalities. Status of pasturelands degradation is assessed using rapid LADA during PPG and results available in three target municipalities	Methodology for detailed pastureland inventory and multi-factor assessment, methodology and uniform outline for strategic and operational municipal pastureland management plans and draft business models for at least 747 ha of pasturelands developed following LDN hierarchy of responses	At least 20,000 ha under SLM that follow LDN hierarchy of responses. At least 747 ha of pastureland restored following LDN hierarchy of responses	5 %	(S)
Outcome 3: National and local stakeholders are empowered and have capacity to implement SLM	Direct and indirect beneficiaries with improved knowledge increased awareness on sustainable management of pasturelands			600 people from the relevant State agencies and farmers with improved knowledge on sustainable management of pasturelands (30% women). At least 5 knowledge products (handouts, guidelines, tutorials,	40 %	(S)

practices in pasturelands				publications, brochures) developed on sustainable management of pasturelands. Public awareness raising/educational campaign reaches people 30,000. At least 10 educational and informational events and media outreach activities		
Outcome 4: Project implementation based on RBM and lessons learned/good practices documented and disseminated	M&E system in place Lessons learned disseminated	No system in place	Implementation of the project based on adaptive results-based management	Project delivers expected results and shared lessons learned	30 %	(S)

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-

3. Progress in Generating Project Outputs (Implementation Progress, IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as planned in the Annual Work Plan)

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		
Output 1.1.1 A national pastureland management policy contributing to implementation of LDN principles, designed and agreed with key stakeholders	Q3 Y2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scope, outline and methodology for Feasibility study for Integrated Pastureland and Livestock Development in Georgia, including Cost-benefit Analysis for current and alternative future scenarios (FSIPLD) have been developed and validated with MEPA and stakeholders from national multi-stakeholder platform and development of the FSIPLD is in the process. Outline of the Pastureland Management Policy Document has been elaborated and agreed with the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture. International and national experts are in the process of elaboration of the document. 					30 %	According to updated Project Work Plan agreed by the PSC, development of the National pastureland management Policy Document should be preceded by the FSIPLD. The feasibility study is essential for making informed and economically justified decision-making for the National Pastureland Management Policy for upcoming decades. MEPA provided additional co-financing by allocating government/IFAD funds. The OP supported the above-mentioned process through development of ToRs for the FSIPLD development.
Output 1.1.2 Pastureland management law and supplementary sub-laws drafted	Q3 Y3	Legislative expertise has been recruited and the revision of the available legislation has been initiated.					15%	<i>no variance regarding three-year work plan</i>
Output 1.1.3 Multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism on pastureland management created at national level	Q4 Y1	Multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism a form of Pastureland Management Policy Interagency Group was established by the Statutory Order of the Minister of					100 %	<i>no variance regarding three-year work plan</i>

		Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia #2-828 dated June 7, 2021						
Output 1.1.4 Multi-stakeholder pasture management groups are established in the three target municipalities	Q4 Y1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipal LDN Working Groups to lead the land degradation target setting process have been established in target municipalities and respective orders of Mayors of the target municipalities are adopted and available for stakeholders. • Memorandums of Understanding for cooperation on pasture management issues were signed with the target municipalities as legally binding commitment of local stakeholders to collaborate in the project implementation. 					100 %	<i>no variance regarding three-year work plan</i>
Output 1.1.5 Decision Support System (DSS) for LDN integrated and tested	Q3 Y3	ToRs for International Expert for Development of LDN-DSS design based on the LDN indicators is drafted and the selection process is ongoing. There are discussions ongoing on the potential additional co-financing from FAO to undertake this work.					15 %	

¹² Outputs as described in the project log frame 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). please see latest three-year work plan in Annex 2

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.

Output 2.1.1 A detailed inventory and multi-factor assessments of pastures are conducted in the three target municipalities (in total 20 000 ha)	Q2 Y3	Development of Nationally appropriate pasturelands inventory and Pasture grazing capacity methodologies is ongoing. Outline of the both methodologies has been elaborated and has been agreed with the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture. Elaboration of the document is ongoing.					15%	<i>no variance regarding three-year work plan</i>
2.1.2 Pasture management plans (strategic and operational) are developed in participatory manner and implemented in the three target municipalities (in total 20 000 ha)	Q4 Y3	N/A in this reporting period.					-	
2.1.3 Business models to encourage investments in pastureland management to implement SLM and achieve LDN are elaborated in 3 target municipalities	Q3 Y3	N/A in this reporting period.					-	
3.1.1 National Capacity building program focused on the application of the SLM/LDN in pastureland management with gender mainstreaming consideration elaborated	Q3 Y3	Capacity Needs Assessment at the national, regional, and local levels is conducted and the Capacity needs assessment report, including capacity building program, has been developed. Capacity development activities are ongoing.					100 %	
3.1.2 Knowledge materials on SLM and LDN are developed and disseminated to a wide range of relevant stakeholders	Q3 Y3	Guidelines on Sustainable Land Management (Kazbegi, Dmanisi and Gurjaani Municipalities) developed and distributed					20 %	
3.1.3 Training provided to national and local decision	Q1 Y3	3 thematic trainings conducted in each target municipality (9 in total)					40 %	

makers, workers of governmental extension services, women groups and farmers		with participation of 214 trainees (28% women), farmers, cooperatives and ICCs: 1. <i>Investment access for farmers</i> –enhancing the knowledge on farm management and economics; 2. <i>Choosing the right AnGR for the local environment and the importance of the right breeds</i> - to raise awareness and enhance the knowledge on choosing the right animal genetic resources and animal breeds for the local environment; 3. <i>Climate change and land/pasture degradation</i> - to raise awareness and enhance the knowledge about impact of climate change on land/pasture degradation and sustainable pasture management;						
3.1.4 Knowledge-sharing with other municipalities, regions and countries and dissemination of verifiable data and tested methodologies	Q4 Y3	The guideline on SLM in Kazbegi, Dmanisi and Gurjaani Municipalities was published on the educational portal ¹⁶ and shared via info CENN mailing list and through national and international knowledge sharing platforms, reaching more than 30.000 persons.					10 %	
4.1.1 RBM system of the project promoted adaptive management through capturing key results of the project activities and peer-to-peer training	Q3 Y3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An M&E system has been developed. The monitoring tool informs on project progress. The system incorporates information from the field, monitors the gender mainstreaming and is 					30%	<i>no variance regarding three-year work plan</i>

¹⁶ www.environment.cenn.org

		<p>aligned with the MRV gender indicators of the LDN report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grievance mechanism established 						
4.1.2 A Gender-Sensitive Project Monitoring & Evaluation Plan and a relevant system are in place	Q4 Y3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Gender-Sensitive Project Monitoring & Evaluation Plan has been elaborated. Focal point for communication with stakeholders designated Annual work plan and National Inception workshop organized via Zoom with participation of 42 attendees - 19 women and 23 men. Municipal inception in-person workshops were organized and attended in Dmanisi meeting by 13 participants (7 women and 6 men), 11 in Kazbegi (9 women and 2 men), and 10 in Gurjaani (6 women and 4 men); 					70%	<i>no variance regarding three-year work plan</i>
4.1.3 Communication Strategy and KM strategy are developed and implemented	Q2 Y1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communication and Knowledge Management Strategy been elaborated, including Project Brand Guideline¹⁷ and is currently being implemented. 					30%	<i>no variance regarding three-year work plan</i>
4.1.4 Project Mid-term review and Final Evaluation are conducted	Q4 Y3	N/A in this reporting period.					-	<i>no variance regarding three-year work plan</i>

¹⁷ https://drive.google.com/file/d/1uJi4r8Yqe5mKuMpSidTR-VIMn1_0HqmF/view

4. Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on Project Implementation

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

The inception phase of the project has been successfully completed with the project team assembled, project operational documents have been developed and the relevant national and local stakeholders mobilized.

The Project Steering Committee (PSC) consisting of 16 members (11 men and 5 women) has been created and is chaired by the Deputy Minister of MEPA and including the Ministries of Regional Development and Infrastructure, Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development, National Agency of Public Registry, National Agency of State Property and the newly established National Agency for Sustainable Land Management and Land Use Monitoring.

The Project Management Unit (PMU) has been established within RECC with a Policy and Institutional Advisor; Administrative Support Staff (including Finance Assistant and Administrative Assistant for Policy and Institutional Advisor and Administrative Support Staff); Gender Expert and a Communication Specialist. The technical team recruited includes International Expert for Development of National Pastureland Management Policy Document; Legal Expert; Technical Advisor in Agricultural Development; Expert on Development of Pastureland related Methodologies, International Expert for Development of Pasture Restoration Plans for Priority Pilot Areas of Village Pastures, International Expert for Development of LDN-DSS design based on the LDN indicators.

Capacity development needs have been assessed and approximately 40% of the capacity development target has been reached.

Strategic documents and policies are being prepared following to the establishment and adoption of the methodologies for their respective development by the national counterparts.

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?

The emergency that was announced in March of 2020 in Georgia due to the COVID-19 pandemic continued through the whole period of 1st year of project implementation. This was the major challenge for the implementation of the project activities in accordance to the initially planned schedule. After the project start a variety of rules, strict restrictions and recommendations were considered by the project team when planning project events and activities. To adjust to the circumstances the project workplan has been updated with revision of the timeframe for 2021.

The continuation may impact pasture inventory field works planned for the 2nd year of implementation, as the restrictions of are expected to last until December 31, 2021 in Georgia. Eventual increase in restrictions might challenge all field activities envisaged under the project and especially the involvement of international consultants. This, in turn, could lead to delayed elaboration of state-owned pastureland strategic management plans and delayed start in the implementation of sustainable participatory pasture management measures.

In case of materialization of the risk the project will request special government permit to carry out inventory and field activities.

While the project adapted to the pandemic with alternatives for indoor gatherings (*roundtables, workshops, and meetings*), through online meetings via ZOOM platform, their effectiveness is limited and not applicable for rural residents /stakeholders from local communities.

	FY2021 Development Objective rating ¹⁸	FY2021 Implementation Progress rating ¹⁹	Comments/reasons ²⁰ justifying the ratings for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	MS	The main impact on the project implementation has been the pandemic which has limited the effectiveness of the implementation. It is expected that the delays in the project implementation will affect the field activities given their seasonality, leading to a non-cost extension for some of the project activities. The commitment of the project staff is high. While the implementation has been slowed there is no impact expected on the Development Objective, hence its rating is evaluated as satisfactory.
Budget Holder	S	MS	During the first year of implementation, a successful relationship between the project, the national counterparts and local institutions has been built. The cooperation with the government is appropriate and the major inception targets has been met. There is a good receipt of the project activities by all stakeholders and the active cooperation has yielded in some activities more than what was expected. The joint institutional actions have allowed positive results to be obtained during the inception phase, facilitating the preparatory activities at two levels: central and local institutions.
GEF Operational Focal Point			<i>Optional Ratings/comments</i>
Lead Technical Officer²¹	S	MS	The project activities are impacted by the Pandemic. However, the project team is striving to find alternatives and avoid delay. Output2 is an important output and requires a lot of preparation and field work. It is advisable that the project team rearrange the priorities of activities implementation to ensure that all preparations for output2 are advanced so that implementation start as soon as mobility restrictions allow for field activities.

¹⁸ **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.

For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁹ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

²⁰ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

²¹ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	S	<p>Despite the challenges posed by the pandemic, the project team was able to initiate project implementation and start the delivery on nearly all outputs, some even completed. Additional co-financing opportunities have been identified that we not envisaged before the project approval, which is positive. However, it is recommended that further efforts are made for the mobilization of co-financing. It is recommended that preliminary preparatory activities for GEBs delivery in the field are undertaken as soon as feasible to ensure timely delivery. Given the vulnerabilities and potential changes posed by the pandemic, these could include confirmation of the project landscapes, SLM/restoration option, etc.</p>
--	----------	----------	---

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid²². If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low risk	Environmental and social risk classification still valid

Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.
No grievance has been received by FAO or its partners.

6. Risks

²² **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.

	Risk	Risk rating ²³	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁴	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	COVID-19 Pandemic	M	Complying with safety rules and standards / vaccination, adapting to the situation development of alternatives for communication with stakeholders and transfer of knowledge.	All mitigation actions are in effect and have been implemented, with progress achieved for most project activities.	Direct impact: limitations in communication and stakeholder engagement and mobilization. Indirect impact: Affected availability and input of expertise, due to limited ability to work and travel
2	Lack of commitment from MEPA to develop and approve some of the policy recommendations within the scope of the Project	L	Establish close and strong cooperation with the MEPA, communicating the project information to relevant decision-makers on regular basis, maintaining a continuous constructive dialogue and to ensure MEPA ownership of the Project's results	The cooperation with MEPA is satisfactory and communication is regularly maintained, with MEPA being actively involved in all aspects of the project implementation	

²³ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High

²⁴ 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 ²³	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁴	Notes from the Project Task Force
3	Insufficient absorption capacity of the MEPA staff to use fully and benefit from the policy development support provided by the project	M	Elaboration of a detailed work plan of the project coupled with the agendas of the MEPA activities and consideration of an adequate timing to ensure MEPA participation	The needs assessment defined the MEPA capacities and the needed level of capacity development. Activities are implemented / planned in accordance with the SARD	Absorption capacity at MEPA is adequate for the current situation, but limited to few key persons, establishing cap on the ability to implement some of the project results on national level
4	Lack of coordination or integration of the actions of the ministries	M	Develop effective working contacts and method for active communication and networking with the ministries; Engaging in the activities of the Inter-Agency Coordination Council for Rural Development chaired by the MEPA	Effective working contracts are in place with active communication, presence in project bodies is satisfactory	
5	Limited capacities of the implementing partner/s to manage the investment	M	The Project will revise the selection of implementing partners prior to distribution of activities among them; identifying other potential implementing partners from the pool of potential candidates in the country	FAO is providing more support (operational and technical) to the OP partner to overcome challenges	The delivery is limited compared to the WP, resulting from limited working opportunities due to the pandemic. It is expected that the limitations will subside with vaccinations

	Risk	Risk rating ²³	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁴	Notes from the Project Task Force
6	Lack of government commitment to ensure agricultural land registration	M	The World Bank piloted a land registration program to redefine and test the policies and procedures for registration of agricultural land to allow most existing land ownership rights to be registered. The Government is committed to include agricultural land registration among the top priorities in the upcoming revision of the Agricultural Policy (starting 2020) which is under consideration at the stage of PIF formulation. There are discussions of the potential Phase-2 of the World Bank project.	Limited progress in establishing the registration programme	The activity has not been initiated by the World bank and discussions are ongoing, due to the pandemic and the resulting changing priorities of the government
7	Climate change	M	The project will closely collaborate with DIMMA project funded by the Adaptation Fund to address climate vulnerability considerations on pasturelands	Exchanges between the project teams are ongoing	

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

FY2020 rating	FY2021 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Low	Moderate	Risk 1 has been added to the list. The lockdown of the pandemic and the prolongation of limits on meetings and events have limited the effectiveness of the project activities, causing some delays in the overall delivery. Some of the project deliverables did not meet the estimated timelines and the project developed an updated Workplan which accounts for the materialization of the risk up to now. Further consideration for a non-cost extension will be considered in 2021 and is expected to account for the delays. Worsening of the situation (considering that Georgia has still moderate levels of vaccination and relatively high rates of infection) could cause further prolongation of activities on account of extended government lockdown measures that affect communication and cooperation with the project stakeholders.

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))			
Stakeholder Name	Stakeholder Type	Stakeholder profile	Commitment mechanism
Government representatives	Direct beneficiary	<i>Government institution</i>	The following government institutions have been identified and have joined the project PSC: Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure, Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development, National Agency of Public Registry, National Agency of State Property and National Agency for Sustainable Land Management and Land Use Monitoring. Additionally, other representatives (agencies, non-governmental organizations and development partners/projects) have also joined the working groups of the project and are actively participating, which is a major achievement, considering the goal of the project for development of a national policy
Local Government representatives	Direct beneficiary	<i>Local Government Institution/body</i>	Links with local governments is a sustainability strategy for the project and overall effort, considering that they are managing the State-owned pastures. Participation from the local government representatives has been high both in terms of commitments (signed MOUs as binding documents) and in terms of support and attendance provided to the project.
MEPA Information-Consultation Centers in Municipalities	Direct beneficiary	<i>Local Government Institution/body</i>	Involvement in capacity development activities, both as beneficiary of advanced training (Train the trainer) and as training providers for the farming population, as a way or ensuring sustainability.
Farmers/land users including private sector	Direct beneficiary	<i>Local community</i>	Capacity building and direct engagement through participation in the design of pasture management plans according to their needs. Co-financing by producers for the implementation of good livestock practices (AnGR, pasture management). Engagement with private sector owners of pastures on all levels as a way of mobilizing resources for implementation of bankable interventions in pasture management.
Other projects and donors (FAO, IFAD, GIZ)	In direct beneficiary	<i>Development Projects</i>	Articulation of joint actions with initiatives in areas of shared intervention. Exchange of experiences (working meetings). Dissemination of knowledge and information.

8. Gender Mainstreaming

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

To carry out the gender analysis and mainstream the gender approach, a gender specialist was hired by the project in the inception.

The gender specialist provided support on mainstreaming gender in the training curricula and knowledge materials. However, the implementation of the capacity building activities achieved limited representation of women (18%, instead of 30% as planned). Initial findings indicate small share of women in the work force directly related to pastures and grazing, within the traditional settings such as rural Georgia, as they tend to be more oriented towards production of animal products.

A set of recommendations to incorporate gender in the workplan of the project is being developed to provide support to engaging women.

The project team will continue close cooperation with women in the target municipalities to encourage them to further participate in project in accordance with the GEF Gender policy.

9. Knowledge Management Activities

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

The Project knowledge management strategy has been developed incorporating different levels and including an array of tools. The strategy was implemented with the support of a dedicated communication expert in charge of analyzing, systematizing, and publishing the main findings and lessons learned. The strategy addresses producers, central and local authorities and technical stakeholders; which constitute an opportunity to improve the setup for pasture management in the country.

Changing the perception of livestock and livestock grazing activities one of the biggest challenges to be faced by the project. However, setup allowing a well-suited training process, through Farmer Field Schools, technical assistance, monitoring and evaluation, co-financing and, inter-institutional linkage and management has been established, achieving favorable results.

A knowledge product/guideline on Sustainable Land Management in Kazbegi, Dmanisi and Gurjaani Municipalities is developed and printed. This guideline is uploaded on the educational portal www.environment.cenn.org and shared/disseminated via the CENN mailing list. The guideline is available [here](#).

A Project brochure in Georgian and in English printed and disseminated in the target municipalities covering the project partners, objectives, and outcomes.

News on project activities are disseminated on national and local levels. Target municipalities have published related news (8 in total) on their official social media pages. News on project activities published on the FAO-Georgia and REC official webpages and social media sites.

10. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

n/a in Georgia

11. Innovative Approaches

Please provide a brief description of an innovative²⁵ approach in the project / programme, describe the type (e.g. technological, financial, institutional, policy, business model) and explain why it stands out as an innovation.

The project aims to capitalize on its focus as the main innovation, by tackling LDN in pasturelands for the first time in Georgia, while linking it to a global pilot project on LDN coordinated by the UNCCD. New and innovative approaches to pastureland planning based on testing and implementation in the three target municipalities are expected, followed by scaling-up, through design of a National Policy for Sustainable Management of Pasturelands, including establishment of multi-stakeholder pasture management groups.

12. Possible impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the project

Please indicate any implication of the Covid-19 pandemic on the activities and progress of the project. Highlight the adaptative measures taken to continue with the project implementation.

- **Are the outcomes/outputs still achievable within the project period?**
With the pandemic ongoing in Georgia and the limitations on gatherings and physical presence, it is becoming increasingly evident that some results are delayed and at least 1 year of non-cost extension may be required for completion of outcomes/outputs.
- **Will the timing of the project MTR or TE be affected/delayed?**
Timing of the project MTR and TE will be affected in line with the anticipated extension of the project.
- **What is the impact of COVID-19 on project beneficiaries, personnel, etc.?**
Cases of infection; Restrictions on movement, transportation, indoor and outdoor gatherings etc.
- **Are there good practices and lessons learned to be shared?**
While the project coped with the pandemic using online communication tools and training alternatives, they are not a replacement for the actual physical interactions.

²⁵ Innovation is defined as *doing something new or different in a specific context that adds value*

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁶	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2021	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	5,100,000	1,260,000	N/A	5,100,000
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia	In-kind	200,000	0	N/A	200,000
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia	Public Investment	3,600,000	0	N/A	3,600,000
Beneficiaries	Municipality of Dmanisi	In-kind	300,000	0	N/A	300,000
Beneficiaries	Municipality of Dmanisi	Public Investment	845,000	0	N/A	845,000
Beneficiaries	Municipality of Gurjaani	In-kind	300,000	0	N/A	300,000
Beneficiaries	Municipality of Kazbegi	In-kind	300,000	0	N/A	300,000
CSO	Rec Caucasus	Grant	700,000	210,000	N/A	490,000
Donor agency	GIZ	Grant	500,000	0	N/A	0
CSO	CENN	Grant	350,000	20,851	N/A	150,000
Other	Government of Turkey	In-kind	50,000	0	N/A	50,000
TOTAL			12,245,000	1,490,851	N/A	12,035,000

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

²⁶ 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.

Annex 2. RECC Updated 3-Year Workplan

Output	Activities	Project Year 1				Project Year 2				Project Year 3				Comments
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
		Calendar Year 2020		Calendar Year 2021				Calendar Year 2022				Calendar Year 2023		
		Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	
Component 1: Strengthening the regulatory and institutional framework for sustainable management of pasturelands in Georgia														
Outcome 1.1: Enhanced policy and institutional frameworks for LDN with the focus on the implementation of SLM principles on pasturelands														
Output 1.1.1: A national pastureland management policy contributing to implementation of LDN principles, designed and agreed with key stakeholders	Activity 1: A national pastureland policy integrating LDN principles drafted in participatory manner through series of roundtables, workshops, discussions under the national multi-stakeholder platform based on Feasibility study of integrated pastureland and livestock development in Georgia (incl. cost-benefit analyses for current and alternative future scenarios)													
	<i>Preparation and validation of scope, outline and methodology for feasibility study of integrated pastureland and livestock development in Georgia (incl. cost-benefit analyses for current and alternative future scenarios) with MEPA and stakeholders from national multi-stakeholder platform</i>				X									completed
	<i>Development of feasibility study of integrated pastureland and livestock development in Georgia (incl. cost-benefit analyses for current and alternative future scenarios)</i>					X	X							ongoing
	<i>Elaboration of main principles, scope and outline for national pastureland policy document with integration of LDN principles</i>					X	X							ongoing
	<i>Discussion and validation of main principles, scope and outline for national pastureland policy document with integration of LDN principles at Multi-stakeholder national workshop</i>					X	X							
	<i>Development of national pastureland policy document with integration of LDN</i>						X	X	X	X	X			
	Activity 2: National Pastureland/LDN stakeholder consultation to discuss and agree on the national pastureland management policy													
	<i>Multi-stakeholder national workshop to discuss and agree on the first findings and outcomes under the draft national pastureland management policy document (if applicable)</i>							X	X					
	Activity 3: Dissemination of national pastureland policy document for wider public review and facilitation of at national and local levels for governmental approval													
	<i>Dissemination of national pastureland policy on local level</i>								X	X				
<i>Facilitation of public review of national pastureland policy on local level</i>								X	X					
Output 1.1.2: Pastureland management law	Activity 1: Identification of needs for new legislation and/or revisions of existing legislation based on agreed national pastureland policy and pastureland management law (legal package) drafted													

Output	Activities	Project Year 1				Project Year 2				Project Year 3				Comments
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
		Calendar Year 2020		Calendar Year 2021				Calendar Year 2022				Calendar Year 2023		
		Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	
and supplementary sub-laws drafted	<i>Review and analyses of existing national legislation on pastureland and livestock management with view of LDN principles (including Georgia's international treaties and agreements)</i>				X	X	X							ongoing
	<i>Identification of needs for new legislation and/or revisions of existing legislation based on preliminary agreed national pastureland policy principles</i>								X					
	<i>Development of new legislation and/or revisions of existing legislation based on preliminary agreed national pastureland policy principles</i>								X	X	X			
	Activity 2: Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA) of the draft law (legal package) on pasturelands										X	X		
	Activity 3: Pastureland management law (legal package) on pasturelands presented to the national stakeholder platform										X	X		
	Activity 4: Stakeholder consultations on draft pastureland law /legal package/ (along with RIA) for wider review and arrangement of regional public hearing meetings and submission of final draft law to the Government for further formal governmental review procedure											X		
Output 1.1.3: Multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism on pastureland management created at national level	Activity 1. Development of terms of references and identification of communication channels for establishment of coordination mechanism in a form of Pastureland National Multi-Stakeholder Coordination Platform													
	<i>Identification and mapping of stakeholders</i>			X	X									completed
	<i>Drafting and validation of terms of references and identification of communication channels for Pastureland National Multi-Stakeholder Coordination Platform – through consultations with stakeholders (roundtables and discussions)</i>			X	X									completed
	Activity 2. Creation of Pastureland National Multi-Stakeholder Coordination Platform													
	<i>Establishment of the Pastureland National Multi-Stakeholder Coordination Platform at its 1st workshop session</i>				X									completed
	<i>Start of a work of the fully functional Pastureland National Multi-Stakeholder Coordination Platform</i>				X									
Output 1.1.4: Multi-stakeholder pasture management groups are established in	Activity 1. Establishment of pasture management groups at municipal level in communities integrating LDN principles in at least three target municipalities													
	<i>Preparation and signing of Memorandums of Understandings with 3 target municipalities on cooperation in the field of pasture management and LDN</i>				X									completed
	<i>Preparation of final lists and Terms of References for municipal level pasture management groups</i>				X									completed

Output	Activities	Project Year 1				Project Year 2				Project Year 3				Comments	
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		
		Calendar Year 2020		Calendar Year 2021				Calendar Year 2022				Calendar Year 2023			
		Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2		
three target municipalities	<i>Formal creation of pasture management groups at municipal level with view of integrating LDN principles in at least three target municipalities</i>					X	X								completed
	Activity 2. Development of a coordination mechanism between the croppers, food processors and livestock keepers to ensure wise use of resources (e.g. use of post-harvest residues for feeding) and prevent damage of crops by the animals														
	<i>Identification of coordination mechanism between the croppers, food processors and livestock keepers to ensure wise use of resources (e.g. use of post-harvest residues for feeding)</i>						X	X							
	<i>Develop prevention measure to ensure wise use of resources (e.g. use of post-harvest residues for feeding)</i>								X	X					
	<i>Development of a coordination mechanism</i>								X	X					
	Output 1.1.5. LDN Decision Support System (LDN-DSS) adapted to Georgian conditions, tested and integrated into existing decision-making system	Activity 1: Identification/validation metrics for Land Cover (based on Collect Earth-PPG work)													
	<i>Identification/validation metrics for Land Cover (based on Collect Earth-PPG work)</i>							X	X	X					
	Activity 3: Identification/calibration metrics for Land Productivity (based on Collect Earth +PRAGA -PPG work)														
	<i>Identification/calibration metrics for Land Productivity (based on Collect Earth +PRAGA -PPG work)</i>							X	X	X					
	Activity 4: Piloting of DSS for 3 LDN indicators and integration into existing processes (based on LADA-PPG work)									X	X				
	Activity 5: Integration and mapping land cover, land productivity, and Soil Organic Carbon for SOC monitoring												X		
	Activity 6: Facilitate access of stakeholders to the labs for checking quality of the soils														
	<i>Identification of labs for checking quality of the soils accessible for local population of three target municipalities</i>									X	X				
	<i>Elaboration of mechanisms to facilitate access of stakeholders to the labs for checking quality of the soils in three target municipalities</i>									X	X	X			
Component 2: Demonstration of sustainable pastureland management practices and scaling up successful approaches															
Outcome 2.1: LDN target # 4 is implemented via SLM practices on degraded pasturelands by local land users with the support of the coordination mechanism															
Output 2.1.1: A detailed inventory and multi-factor assessments of	Activity 1. Inventory system/methodology with parameters (quantitative, qualitative) is agreed through the coordination mechanism and developed in at least one municipality based on Collect Earth														
	<i>Elaboration of inventory system/methodology with parameters (quantitative, qualitative)</i>			X	X	X	X								ongoing

Output	Activities	Project Year 1				Project Year 2				Project Year 3				Comments	
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		
		Calendar Year 2020		Calendar Year 2021				Calendar Year 2022				Calendar Year 2023			
		Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2		
pastures are conducted in the three target municipalities	<i>Discussion and agreement on Inventory system/methodology with parameters (quantitative, qualitative) through the coordination mechanism</i>					X	X								
	<i>Application of inventory system/methodology with parameters (quantitative, qualitative) in at least one municipality based on Collect Earth</i>								X	X	X				
	Activity 2. Nationally appropriate pasture grazing capacity methodology developed, tested and promoted, with transparent, well documented analysis of operational costs of proposed livestock production system														
	<i>Development of Nationally appropriate pasture grazing capacity methodology with transparent, well documented analysis of operational costs of proposed livestock production system</i>			X	X	X	X							ongoing	
	<i>Testing of Nationally appropriate pasture grazing capacity methodology</i>								X	X	X				
Output 2.1.2: Pasture management plans (strategic and operational) are developed in participatory manner and implemented in three target municipalities	Activity 1: Elaboration of State-owned pastureland management plans (strategic and operational) in participatory manner for three target municipalities (in total 20,000 ha)														
	<i>Development of scope, outline and methodology for elaboration of state-owned pastureland management plans (strategic and operational) in participatory manner for three target municipalities (in total 20,000 ha)</i>					X	X							ongoing	
	<i>Discussion and validation of scope, outline and methodology for elaboration of state-owned pastureland management plans (strategic and operational) in participatory manner for three target municipalities (in total 20,000 ha) through the coordination mechanism</i>						X								
	<i>Development of the Management Plans</i>								X	X	X				
	Activity 2. Implementation of sustainable participatory pasture management practices (grazing management, weed control, breeding program with local stock, fertilization, terracing, gully prevention, mobile livestock water points, water harvesting, mobile fencing, mobile shade structures, etc.) (in total 747 ha)														
	<i>Elaboration of pilot projects on sustainable participatory pasture management practices</i>						X	X	X						
	<i>Implementation of the pilot project on sustainable participatory pasture management practices</i>								X	X	X	X	X		
	Activity 3: Pastureland management municipal group discussions and community consultations														
	<i>Organization of municipal group discussions on pastureland management</i>						X	X	X						
<i>Organization of community consultation on pastureland management</i>					X	X	X	X							
Output 2.1.3: Business models to encourage	Activity 1: Development of 5 differing business models for pasturelands under different land tenure systems in 3 target municipalities mainstreaming LDN principles based on the cost-benefit analysis							X	X	X					

Output	Activities	Project Year 1				Project Year 2				Project Year 3				Comments
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
		Calendar Year 2020		Calendar Year 2021				Calendar Year 2022				Calendar Year 2023		
		Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	
investments in pastureland management to implement SLM and achieve LDN are elaborated in 3 target municipalities	Activity 2: Livestock value chain strengthening in three target regions										X	X		
	Activity 3: Development of at least one bankable project for the LDN fund										X	X		
	Activity 4: A pilot solar-powered water well on a remote pasture to demonstrate potential RoI from the pastures <i>Note: Implementation of the activity 4 will be depended on outcomes of the pilot sites' pasture management plans and consultation with local population</i>										X	X		
Component 4: Effective Knowledge Management through RBM, monitoring and evaluation														
Outcome 4.1: Project implementation based on RBM and lessons learned/good practices documented and disseminated														
Output 4.1.1: RBM system of the project promoted adaptive management through capturing key results of the project activities and peer-to-peer training	Activity 1: Sharing of the project results or lessons at the UNCCD										X	X		
	Activity 2: Sharing of the project results or lessons at the FAO Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock (GASL), the Livestock Environmental Assessment and Performance (LEAP) Partnership, and Pastoralist Hub											X	X	
	Activity 3: Sharing of the project results or lessons with other municipalities in the country											X	X	X
Output 4.1.2: A Gender-Sensitive Project Monitoring & Evaluation Plan and a relevant system are in place	Activity 1: Design of grievance mechanism, designation of focal point and communication to stakeholders													
	<i>Design of grievance mechanism</i>			X	X									completed
	<i>Designation of focal point and communication to stakeholders</i>			X	X									completed
	Activity 2: Development and maintenance of an M&E tool													
	<i>Development of M&E tool</i>			X										completed
	<i>Maintenance of an M&E tool</i>			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
	Activity 4: Preparation of annual workplan													
	<i>Preparation of annual work plan</i>			X				X					X	
	Activity 5: Preparation of six-monthly progress reports													
	<i>Preparation of first six-monthly progress report</i>			X										completed
	<i>Preparation of second six-monthly progress report</i>					X								
	<i>Preparation of third six-monthly progress report</i>							X						
<i>Preparation of fourth six-monthly progress report</i>									X					
<i>Preparation of fifth six-monthly progress report</i>												X		
Activity 6: Inception workshop														

2021 Project Implementation Report

Output	Activities	Project Year 1				Project Year 2				Project Year 3				Comments
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
		Calendar Year 2020		Calendar Year 2021				Calendar Year 2022				Calendar Year 2023		
		Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	
	<i>Organizing of National Inception Workshop</i>	X												completed
	<i>Organizing of 3 Local Inception Workshops in 3 Project Municipalities</i>	X												
	Activity 7: Final workshop													
	<i>Organizing of Final National Workshop</i>												X	
	Activity 8: Preparation of inception and final reports													
	<i>Preparation of inception report</i>	X												completed
	<i>Preparation of final report</i>												X	
Output 4.1.3: Communication Strategy and KM strategy are developed and implemented	Activity 1: Development of a communication strategy for the institutional communication													
	Development of a communication strategy for the institutional communication		X											completed
	Implementation of communication strategy for the institutional communication			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
	Activity 2: Development of a communication strategy for the communication with farmers													
	<i>Development of a communication strategy for the communication with farmers</i>		X											completed
	Implementation of communication strategy for the communication with farmers			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	