



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2022 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	4
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	7
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	17
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	22
6. RISKS	24
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	29
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	30
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	31
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	33
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	36
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	37
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	38

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 (years):	2020-2023		
Project coordinates:	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"

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	25/02/2020
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01/06/2020
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	31/05/2023
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ²	31/05/2024 (MTR with review of Non cost extension request is ongoing)

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	1,776,484
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc³:	12,245,000
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)⁴:	1,033,416
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022⁵	1,716,851

¹ As per FPMIS

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

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

⁴ For DEX projects, the GEF Coordination Unit will confirm the final amount with the Finance Division in HQ. For OPIM projects, the disbursement amount should be provided by Execution Partners.

⁵ Please refer to the section 12 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

M&E Milestones

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	December, 2021
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	Midpoint of year 2 of project
Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):	August, 2022
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	N/A
Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	Yes

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

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

Status

Implementation Status	2 nd PIR
------------------------------	---------------------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Dragan Angelovski	dragan.angelovski@fao.org
Budget Holder	Raimund Jehle	Raimund.Jehle@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Feras Ziadat	Feras.Ziadat@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Hernan Gonzalez	Hernan.Gonzalez@fao.org

⁶ The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2nd PIR, around half-point between EOD and NTE. The MTR report in English should be submitted to the GEF Secretariat within 4 years of the CEO Endorsement date.

⁷ The Terminal Evaluation date should be discussed with OED 6 months before the project's NTE date.

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

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

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ Level at 30 June 2022	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	LDN principles integrated in the national legal and policy frameworks with the focus on pasturelands.	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 formulated in response of national priorities and context and agreed with stakeholders for further integration into national legal, policy, and institutional frameworks	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.	50%	S
	Enhanced policy and institutional frameworks for LDN with the focus on the implementation of SLM principles on pasturelands	LDN principles integrated in the national institutional framework with the focus on pasturelands	LDN principles are not yet integrated in the existing national legal and policy frameworks related to agricultural lands.		Proposal for the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture (MEPA) Budgetary Programme for implementation of the recommendations from the cost-benefit analyses		

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

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

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

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

			No monitoring system for the LDN indicators exists at national and/or local levels		submitted for inclusion in the state budget for the following years		
	Outcome 2					35%	MS
	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).	SLM and restoration on pasturelands is not practiced 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		
Number of hectares under SLM that meet LDN criteria (20,000 ha).		Status of pasturelands degradation is assessed using rapid LADA during PPG and results available in three target municipalities					
Number of hectares of land restored (747 ha) Increased investments in pastureland management for LDN targets scaling up							
	Outcome 3					80%	S
	National and local stakeholders are empowered and have capacity to	Direct and indirect beneficiaries with improved knowledge increased awareness on sustainable			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,		

	implement SLM practices in pasturelands	management of 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	M&E system in place	No system in place	Implementation of the project based on adaptive results-based management	Project delivers expected results and shared lessons learned	32%	S
	Project implementation based on RBM and lessons learned/good practices documented and disseminated	Lessons learned disseminated					

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 2: LDN target # 4 is implemented via SLM practices on degraded pasturelands by local land users with the support of the coordination mechanism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalize preparations for field activities Finalize introduction of arrangements for implementation of field activities Finalize procurement activities	RECC	End of 2022

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs	Indicators LF	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance in delivering outputs
<p>Outcome 1.1 Enhanced policy and institutional frameworks for LDN with the focus on the implementation of SLM principles on pasturelands</p>	<p>LDN principles integrated in the national legal and policy frameworks with the focus on pasturelands LDN principles integrated in the national institutional framework with the focus on pasturelands</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>Output 1.1.1 A national pastureland management policy contributing to implementation of LDN principles, designed and agreed with key stakeholders</p>	<p>National pastureland management policy document contributing to implementation of LDN priorities Costed Action Plan for the Strategy for the Agricultural and Rural Development (2021-2027) reflecting the Pastureland priorities developed and adopted</p>	<p>The pastureland policy is agreed by key stakeholders 10% of allocated budget for pastureland management related activities of Actional Plan</p>	<p>Feasibility Study for Integrated Pastureland and Livestock Development (FSIPLD) in Georgia, has been elaborated (see appendix 1) and validated by MEPA and key stakeholders at the validation workshop with participation of 46 stakeholders (46% women) and the results and provisions of the study are reflected in the National Pasture Management Policy Document. The MoM are provided in appendix 2. The official data and statistics on agriculture land and pastureland registry, pasture distribution according to municipalities, regions and ownership types have been obtained from relevant institutions aggregated and structured (see appendix 3). Pasture Management Institutional Analysis has been completed. The report reflects policy factors and institutional mechanisms for their implementation, administrative frameworks, rules and regulations in</p>	<p><i>No variance regarding updated workplan</i></p>

	<p>Percentage of budget of Action Plan (AP) for the Strategy for the Agricultural and Rural Development (2021-2027) for implementation of the priorities of national policy for Sustainable Management of Pasturelands (USD) allocated by various sources</p>	<p>mobilized by various sources</p>	<p>place and processes for establishment and enforcement by institutions. The Institutional Analyses includes recommendations for further institutional changes (see appendix 4). Pasture Management in Protected Areas has been analyzed (see appendix 5). The study provides the lessons learned related to the pasturelands management within the protected areas. Draft National Pasturelands Management Policy Document (NPMPD) (appendix 6) has been developed. The Policy Document sets out the vision and principles, defines issues of ownership and rights, institutional arrangements, economic and fiscal aspects, land use planning and monitoring to achieve LDN targets. National Validation Conference with discussion on the Policy Document, resulting in consensus on the principal issues of the pasturelands management, (see appendix 7). The NPMPD has been updated according to the agreed positions and based on the comments received. Further funding has been secured from the US Forest Service International Programs through bilateral contacts with locally available initiatives in Georgia for: (i) Structuring rangeland management related best practices and existing legal and institutional frameworks in a form of policy briefs (ii) development of rangeland vegetation standard cover type descriptions (iii) pastureland policy development through independent peer review. The funding obtained has been included in the Co-Financing table under the RECC section.</p>	
<p><u>Output 1.1.2</u> Pastureland management law and supplementary sub-laws drafted</p>	<p>Drafts of the pastureland management legislation (<i>law/s and supplementary sub-laws</i>)</p>	<p>Justification for new pastureland management legislation and/or revisions of existing legislation (<i>based on agreed national pastureland policy</i>)</p>	<p>Review and analyses of existing national legislation on pastureland and livestock management with view of LDN principles (including signed international treaties and agreements) has been completed (see appendix 8) as basis for identification of needs and further steps for development of the legislation. The reviews reveal key shortcomings and makes recommendations for the NPMPD development. The analysis also examines the national legislation, strategies and policies and state of reflection of requirements of MIAs, including EU-Georgia association Agreement regarding food safety and LDN. Legal implications of the draft NPMPD have been analyzed and discussed at the National Validation Conference and a recommendation to draft a law on pasture management has been agreed. The National Pasture Management Policy Document forms the basis for the preparation of a</p>	<p><i>Achievement in line with the workplan is challenging and the activity has been considered for the non-cost extension period</i></p>

		<i>outcomes</i>) validated by key stakeholders	full legal package, including Regulatory impact assessment, which will be also supported by the project.	
Output 1.1.3 Multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism on pastureland management created at national level	Number of central and local governmental institutions, professional associations/representatives of local pilot communities ,civil society and non-governmental organizations, academia, businesses, youth and gender groups and experts, involved in the multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism (National Multi-Stakeholder Coordination Platform) on sustainable pastureland management	Multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism (National Multi-Stakeholder Coordination Platform) structure is agreed with key stakeholders and mechanism established working on regular basis (based on TOR)	<p>The project facilitates Inter-Sectoral Coordination Working Group (ISCWG)'s regular meetings and consultations with a wide range of stakeholders to ensure drafting of NPMPD in participatory manner.</p> <p>Capacity building of the ISCWG has been provided as part of the co-financing mobilized from the US Forest Service International Programs. 6 seminars, each with participation of 35 stakeholders (43% women) (MoM in appendix 9).</p> <p>3 experience sharing workshops with participation of 33 key stakeholders each (51% women) were organized under the ISCWG (MoMs are provided in the appendices 3,4 and 5).</p> <p>3 meetings of the ISCWG with participation of 36 key stakeholders each (51% women) organized to discuss the main directions of the National Pasturelands Management Policy Document (NPMPD) Concept. (MoMs are provided in the Appendix 10).</p>	
Output 1.1.4 Multi-stakeholder pasture management groups are established in the three target municipalities	<p>At least one municipal multi-stakeholder group is established in each target municipality</p> <p>A number of Pasture Users Unions for management of s.c. "village pastures" are facilitated and assisted to be functional, legally organized and registered in all three target municipalities – with at</p>	Memorandums of Understandings (MoUs) are signed with all three target municipalities for cooperation on pasture management issues	<p>The project team supported the pasture municipal multi-stakeholder as following the local elections in October 2021, the composition of the working groups has been adjusted considering the changes in the municipal administration. Gender focal points from the municipalities have also been included.</p> <p>5 meetings of the municipal multi-stakeholder groups were organized in all target municipalities with participation of 15 stakeholders (43% women) each on the pilot pastures restoration plans and Pasture Users Unions (PUUs). The outputs of the pasturelands inventory exercise have been presented to the Dmanisi municipal working group (MoMs in appendix 11).</p> <p>Preliminary survey on opportunities for establishment of Pasture Users Union (PUU) for 4 priority pilot areas in all 3 municipalities is ongoing. Legal experts provided in-depth analyses of the possible legal solutions</p>	

	least 30% of women members	Survey for organizing PUU to be in charge for s.c. “village pastures” in all three target municipalities	for PUUs and the concept has been validated by the pasture municipal multi-stakeholder groups.	
Output 1.1.5 Decision Support System (DSS) for LDN integrated and tested	LDN-DSS developed incorporating three LDN indicators, piloted/tested for target municipalities	LDN-DSS based on three LDN indicators is developed and piloted/tested for each target municipality	Considering the FAO’s experiences in DSS ‘s system created within the similar GEF-funded LDN projects, the project developed an interactive mapping and data analyses application. Digitalized data from various sources on pasturelands and land degradation has been incorporated in the system and is accessible through the following links: https://www.arcgis.com/apps/View/index.html?appid=fb4e460b7ae74f3cb9a366284a86ac1f https://www.arcgis.com/apps/View/index.html?appid=5484bfe9907745d6882e5046d1086811 This App allows users to perform a multi-criteria analysis to select land degraded hotspots and areas of interest as basis for a digital database that captures the information on pasture areas.	<i>Achievement in line with the WP is challenging the activity is considered for the non-cost extension period</i>
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	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	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		

	management for LDN targets scaling up	least 747 ha pasturelands developed following LDN hierarchy of responses		
<p>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)</p>	Pastureland inventory data (quantitative, qualitative) set available on the MEPA environmental data web portal	Methodology for detailed pastureland inventory and multi-factor assessment of pastures (quantitative, qualitative) developed and validated with key stakeholders	<p>The final draft of Pasture Inventory and Grazing Capacity Methodology has been elaborated (see appendix 12) as stepwise instruction manual for users, considering the LDN conceptual framework. The methodology was approved by MEPA and the Sustainable Land Management and Land Use Monitoring Agency. The process relies on i) remote sensing, ii) participatory stakeholder inputs and analysis, and iii) field surveys to verify on-ground realities and trends, contributing data to the LDN conceptual framework. The methodology is a necessary step for development of the Municipal Pasture Management Strategic Plans</p> <p>Pasture Inventory based on the methodology has been initiated in all 3 target municipalities. The spatial information on the pastureland location has been collected by digitizing soviet land use maps from the National Agency of Public Register (NAPR). The data gathered by using Collect Earth ¹² was used to explore the pastureland locations. Additionally, Esri 10-meter resolution Land use/land cover map for 2020 was used for spatial analysis of the pasturelands. The Trends-Earth platform of Conservation International was used for the assessment.</p> <p>To ensure stakeholder engagement in line with the requirement of the PRAGA, a stakeholder WS was organized in Dmanisi municipality with participation of 15 stakeholders (53% women) (appendix 13). Initial maps were presented and validated.</p> <p>Following the PRAGA methodology the field survey sites have been identified and surveys initiated for collection of the ground truthing data for quality control of the mapping exercise.</p> <p>Grazing Capacity Assessment Methodology has been developed and applied in development of the grazing calendars for 4 pilot village pastures that are included into the Pastures Restoration Plans.</p>	<p><i>Achievement in line with the current workplan is challenging and the activity has been considered for the non-cost extension period</i></p>

¹² Collect Earth is free and open-source software developed by FAO with a partnership with Google to support the national efforts to conduct quality land monitoring and management. Collect Earth relies on visual interpretation of the satellite imagery but does not require users to be remote sensing experts.

¹⁷ www.environment.cenn.org

<p>Output 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)</p>	<p>Number of strategic and operational land management plans (3 and 3, respectively) <i>(Population, land area, land under various land cover types according to IPCC, grassland health indicator according to PRAGA methodology, status of degradation according to LADA methodology)</i></p>	<p>Methodology and uniform outline for strategic and operational municipal pastureland management plans developed and validated with key stakeholders</p>	<p>The draft outline for the Municipal Pastureland Management Plan Development Methodology has been developed considering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LDH framework principals for Monitoring and Evaluation • information gathered within the Pasture Inventory • available spatial data and stakeholders’ recommendations for Municipal investments and planning. <p>Validation of the draft outline is ongoing.</p> <p>Innovative approaches for the village pastures management are embedded in the restoration plans with four principal objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate that pasture and ecosystems can be restored within relatively short time periods. Restoration includes recovery of functional ecosystem processes (water cycle, nutrient cycle, community dynamics, flow of energy) and approximation to what would be considered as optimal Land Potential within 3 years (2022-2024). Measurement of restoration is expected in line with UNCCD recommendations on use of the 3 SDG 15.3 indicators (Sims et al 2017) and the local Land Degradation indicators (Orr & Crowe 2017). • Demonstrate that ecosystem and pastureland restoration is possible within community contexts and stocking rates through management and planning. In other words, it does not require extreme changes to the socio-economic patterns and local livelihoods to function but will require motivation on part of the producers to take basic data records and plan together. • Demonstrate that the restoration techniques and investments can provide positive return on investment, be affordable for and lead to increased product quality and producer income. <p>Provide economic opportunities and tested tools and approaches to the authorities, technicians and producers within the wider Dmanisi Municipality, in order to support the Municipal plans envisioned under the project Output 2.12 using the LDN conceptual framework.</p> <p>The final drafts of Pasture Restoration Plans for 4 priority pilot areas of village pastures have been developed in close cooperation with local stakeholders and beneficiaries. The discussions were carried out with local stakeholders via municipal working group meetings (MoM municipal level in appendix 11, MoM at village level in Appendix 16). Based on the comments and recommendations from stakeholders at national, municipal and village levels the Pasture Restoration Plans cover 199,2 ha in Ganakhleba village (Dmanisi municipality), 52,2 ha in Naniani</p>	<p><i>Achievement in line with the current workplan is challenging and the activity has been considered for the non-cost extension period</i></p> <p><i>A total of 577,6 ha or approximately 77 % of the 747-ha targeted restored area is being restored under the project.</i></p> <p><i>The reduction of the target area to be covered is not expected to have any</i></p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

			<p>village and 176 ha in Melaani village (Gurjaani municipality), 150,3 ha in Sno village (Kazbegi municipality) (see appendix 17), or a total of 577,6 ha, or approximately 77 % of the 747-ha targeted for restoration under the project.</p> <p>The following reduction of the area of the pilot pastures are noted: 1) in Kazbegi municipality due to overlap of territories of the pilot pastures and Kazbegi National Park and the limitations for pasture management in Protected areas and restrictions in terms of grazing and infrastructure. 2) part of initially planned pilot pastures in Dmanisi Municipality includes gullies that practically are not used as pasture due to the steep slopes 3) boundaries of the selected pilot pastures were adjusted according to the cadastral boundaries of the registered land parcels that led to some reduction in pre-selected pilot pastures.</p> <p>Pasture Restorations Plans for 4 Priority Pilot Areas of Village Pastures were validated at national validation workshop with participation of 30 stakeholders (appendix 18).</p> <p>Additional filed national expert has been hired to ensure involvement of the local farmers in implementation of the pilot pastures restoration plans, through consultations and explanations on controlled grazing compared to business-as usual approach, as well as for filed monitoring of the restoration measures implementation.</p>	<p><i>impact on the project implementation in terms of outputs, however it will be an under delivery compared to the target in the pro doc.</i></p>
<p>Output 2.1.3 Business models to encourage investments in pastureland management to implement SLM and achieve LDN are elaborated in 3 target municipalities</p>	<p>At least one business model developed for each target municipality</p>	<p>Draft business models to attract additional investments are developed with local stakeholders</p>	<p>No progress to be reported</p>	
<p>Outcome 3.1 Capacity building of the key stakeholders on sustainable management of pasturelands and</p>	<p>Direct and indirect beneficiaries with improved knowledge increased awareness on sustainable management of pasturelands</p>			

achieving land degradation neutrality				
Output 3.1.1 National Capacity building program focused on the application of the SLM/LDN in pastureland management with gender mainstreaming consideration elaborated	Number of people from the relevant State agencies and extension with improved knowledge on sustainable management of pasturelands involved in the elaboration process of the national capacity building program	10 people involved in elaboration of the National Capacity Building Program on Application of the SLM/LDN (30% women)	Completed - 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.	
Output 3.1.2 Knowledge materials on SLM and LDN are developed and disseminated to a wide range of relevant stakeholders	Knowledge products developed on sustainable management of pasturelands in line with LDN principles (number, type)	1 knowledge product – to be determined at Project Inception meeting	Six knowledge materials developed, distributed, and published. 1 guideline, 1 brochure and 5 video courses created. Video courses although not foreseen were added as adjustment to the Covid pandemic. Publications on SLM and pasture management based on the activities of pilots still have to be developed.	<i>Achievement in line with the WP is challenging the activity is considered for the non-cost extension period</i>
Output 3.1.3 Training provided to national and local decision makers, workers of governmental extension services, women groups and farmers	Number of farmers national and local decision makers, workers of governmental extension services, women groups with improved knowledge on sustainable management of pasturelands Study tour to Turkey on SLM on pasturelands	300 people trained (30% women) - - to be determined at project inception 1 study tour	6 thematic trainings with participation of 258 trainees conducted during the reporting period (16% women) (See appendices 20 and 21) Study visit implemented by FAO in Macedonia (visit to the Agency for Pasture management, the Food Safety and Veterinary Agency and the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water management – Farm registry) implemented for one representatives of MEPA and the Agency for land management agency Study tour to Turkey pending	Since the inception of the project 472 people have been trained, which is 78.6 % of target (600 people).

<p>Output - 3.1.4 Knowledge-sharing with other municipalities, regions and countries and dissemination of verifiable data and tested methodologies</p>	<p>Number of people covered by public awareness and media campaigns Number of educational and informational events and media outreach activities</p>	<p>Public awareness raising/educational campaign reaches 10,000 people</p>	<p>30 media outreach activities 1. posts on project activities on social media (FB) 2 https://www.facebook.com/page/101823779896820/search/?q=GEF . press releases on project activities 3. uploading knowledge material on the educational portal and CENN's YouTube channel (See appendix 22)</p>	
<p>Outcome 4.1 Project implementation based on RBM, and lessons learned/good practices documented and disseminated</p>	<p>M&E system in place Lessons learned disseminated</p>	<p>Implementation of the project based on adaptive results-based management</p>	<p>No progress to be reported</p>	
<p>Outcome 4.1.1 RBM system of the project promoted adaptive management through capturing key results of the project activities and peer-to-peer training</p>	<p>M&E system ensuring timely delivery of project benefits and adaptive results-based management</p>	<p>Timely monitoring of project outcomes, outputs, and activities</p>	<p>No progress to be reported</p>	
<p>Outcome 4.1.2 A Gender-Sensitive Project Monitoring & Evaluation Plan and a relevant system are in place</p>	<p>Baseline and targets for GEB indicators and co-benefits refined</p>	<p>Project M&E system delivers expected reports and informs project management</p>	<p>Completed - No grievance has been received by FAO or its partners during the reporting period Detailed information on GAP implementation is provided in section 8 – Gender Mainstreaming A National Monitoring and Evaluation Expert has been hired. M&E Expert through participatory and consultative process reviewed the Result Based Monitoring Action Plan designed at inception phase, identified M&E priorities and structured M&E plan with the supporting documents and instruments. More specifically the following documents designed: - M&E framework that guides the routine monitoring and evaluation as the data received through the M&E tools feeding data directly into the outcome indicators. - Indicator Matrix- with indicator tracking system that calculates the achievement against the indicators at output level. - IPTT (indicator performance tracking table), which provides a standardized presenting per reporting period.</p>	<p><i>Achievement in line with the current workplan is challenging the activity is considered for the extension</i></p>

			<p>On Quarterly basis the team reviewed the project implementation plan, the input and output indicators, the budget, as well as the additional contextual information. Based on the discussions the team determines adaptations to maximize the effectiveness.</p> <p>Project annual workplan for calendar year 2022 was developed and approved by the Steering Committee meeting, held in December 22, 2021 (Annex 2), including a proposal workplan for a 4-Year project implementation Period on basis of the SC approved non-cost extension of 12 months (Annex 3).</p>	
<p>Outcome 4.1.3 Communication Strategy and KM strategy are developed and implemented</p>	<p>Number of appearances in local media, MEPA/municipalities and partner websites</p>	<p>To be determined at project inception</p>	<p>USFS and RECC cooperation to support NPMPD development process in Georgia has been highlighted by the article published on the USDA website (https://www.fs.usda.gov/features/rockies-caucasus-supporting-sustainable-management-grasslands) and shared through the social media (Twitter: https://twitter.com/forests-service/status/1479183998744240141?s=20; Facebook:https://www.facebook.com/100067149121218/posts/247141537534149/?d=n Instagram:https://www.instagram.com/p/CYaAHgNfJy/?utm_medium=copy_link)</p> <p>NPMPD development process and the results of the national validation workshop has been highlighted by the article published on RECC website: https://rec-caucasus.org/new/sustainable-pastureland-management-policy-document-validation-workshop/</p>	<p><i>No variance regarding updated work plan</i></p>
<p>Outcome 4.1.4 Project Mid-term review and Final Evaluation are conducted</p>	<p>Mid-term and final evaluation reports</p>	<p>Mid-project review recommendations implemented</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p><i>No variance regarding updated work plan</i></p>

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcome of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR.

Outcome 1: Enhanced policy and institutional frameworks for LDN with the focus on the implementation of SLM principles on pasturelands

The draft of the National Pasturelands Management Policy Document (NPMPD) Concept developed and validated through 12 stakeholder workshops at national level. The NPMPD is designed to support implementation of LDN principles through sustainable management of pasturelands. The document includes requirements of LDN national targets supporting restoration of degraded land through sustainable pasture management systems. The Policy Document is developed as unified, coherent approach to pasture management contributing to achievement of the Country's LDN targets. Pasture management is considered as integral part to the livestock sector, considering that different socio-economic categories of farmers have different objectives. The Document formed the basis for the preparation of a legislative package.

The Project obtained additional funding from the US Forest Service International Programs, supporting the Governmental Working Group on pasture policies via capacity development and exchange of the best international practices and through independent review of the draft policy document and producing policy briefs on selected topics.

Review and analyses of the existing national legislation on pastureland and livestock management with view of LDN principles is completed, legal implications of the draft NPMPD have been analyzed and discussed at the National Validation Workshop. As per agreement of key stakeholders it is recommended to draft a law on pasture management.

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

The draft of the Pasture Inventory and Grazing Capacity Methodologies have been produced and the implementation of the pasture inventory started in two pilot municipalities (Dmanisi and Kaznegi). The results and options for the Pasture Inventory can be summarized as a spatial set of tools and maps that provide data and information in an online, digital format that allows for cross-analysis and planning at a Municipal scale. Through application of the conceptual framework Georgia seeks to fulfil its national voluntary targets, in particular targets #1 Integrate LDN principles into national policies, strategies and planning documents and #4 Degraded land will be rehabilitated. The field survey sites have been identified and the field survey is being implemented in the Dmanisi Municipality under the PRAGA methodology.

The drafts of Pasture Restoration Plans for 4 priority pilot areas of village pastures in Georgia have been produced and validated for 577,6 ha of pastures, or approximately 77% of the 747 ha targeted for restoration under the project. They are a result of project activities under Output

2.1.2 and supply data and provide a framework for activities under Output 2.1.3. One of the objectives of the pasture restoration plans is to provide economic opportunities and tested tools and approaches to authorities, technicians, and producers within the pilot Municipalities and wider at the national scale, in support to the development of Pasturelands Management Municipal Plans using the LDN conceptual framework. The project works closely with local farmers and project beneficiaries by providing intensive consultations and explanations on controlled grazing system and benefits of proposed measures compared to business-as usual approach, to ensure their active involvement in implementation of the pilot pastures restoration plans and application of the controlled grazing system.

Outcome 3.1: Capacity building of key stakeholders on sustainable management of pasturelands and achieving land degradation neutrality.

Despite the challenges/restrictions related to Covid-19, the project was able to conduct most of the trainings face-to-face in target municipalities, in compliance with the governmental rules and preconditions.

Outcome 4.1: Project implementation based on RBM and lessons learned/good practices documented and disseminated

A Gender-Sensitive Project & Evaluation Plan has been elaborated and implemented in a participatory and consultative process.

Major Challenges:

The emergency that was announced in March of 2020 in Georgia due to the COVID-19 pandemic that continued through the whole period of 1st year of project implementation, also affected significant actions during the sections of the 2nd year of the project implementation, affecting the initial schedule for implementation.

Participation of women to trainings targeting farmers remains limited (15-20%), due to the poor representation of women in the field of agriculture, particularly, livestock. Output 3.1.3.

The need to build awareness and capacities of stakeholders in pasturelands management, especially at the local level, prior to discussions on policies, in combination with the Covid limitations, led to protracted consultations and require additional efforts. In particular in regard to Common Property Resource Management (CPRM) practices as well-proven pasture management system in Europe, and successfully tested in some post-soviet countries. Formalization of the CPRM arrangements for ``village pastures`` and establishment of Pasture Users Unions is necessary but challenging part of the National Pasturelands Management Policy.

Significant challenges have been faced with the implementation of the pilot pasture restoration plan in Melaani village as local representatives remain skeptics about the proposed controlled grazing system, restoration measures and their potential benefits. The farmers question their ability to manage a controlled grazing system given the large number of households and livestock in the village and worry that the investments made by the project will eventually lead to introduction of pasture fees. The success of the pilot activities will largely depend on how the farmers will accept the controlled grazing approach and grazing calendar. Intensive work with the local population is being provided by the project to raise awareness on the need for sustainable management to gain their support and trust. With this regard the project together with the representatives of Gurjaani municipality continues intensive consultations at local level. A national expert has also been hired in order to support the farmers in the implementation of the pilot pastures restoration plans, through consultations and explanations on the benefits of proposed measures.

During the field works related to the pasture restoration plans a number of challenges were identified, in particular two issues are evident:

a) the need for registering and/or transfer in use of pilot pasturelands to the balance of the municipalities as most of the pilot pastures are state property by default managed by the National Agency of State Property, or not registered at all. Lack of government commitment to ensure agricultural land registration of the pilot pasturelands had been assessed as moderate risk at the project development stage. The project assumptions included expectations that the local governments would solve the ownership issues cases and that the project would facilitate a smooth registration (in case of unregistered pilot sites in Sno village of Kazbegi municipality) or transfer to the municipal ownership (in the case of pasturelands in Ganakhleba village in Dmanisi Municipality and Naniani village in Gurjaani municipality). However, after local elections in October 2021 and consequent changes in the local governments, it became clear that more input is required to assist the municipalities in the registration and transfer processes. With support from the project official correspondence between the local governments and state agencies, is ongoing and Kazbegi municipality has submitted documentation to the National Public Registry Agency for the registration of the pilot pastures, while the Dmanisi and Gurjaani municipalities have submitted documentation to the National Property Management Agency for the transfer of the pilot pastures to the municipalities for use.

b) The pilot pasturelands boundaries have some overlapping with the area protected under the Kazbegi National Park and privately owned pastures. As there are certain restrictions regarding the regulation of grazing and the arrangement of the infrastructure within the National parks, the part of the pilot pastureland located within the park has been excluded from the restoration plan.

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

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

	FY2022 Development Objective rating¹³	FY2022 Implementation Progress rating¹⁴	Comments/reasons¹⁵ justifying the ratings for FY2022 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 and caused delays affecting the field activities. Additionally, the delay has also resulted in change in the conditions in the field leading to minor complexities that require dedication of extra efforts. The commitment of the project staff is high and while the implementation has been slowed there is no impact 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 project despite the delay is on track. There is some change in the receipt of the project activities by local stakeholders, although the significant cooperation achieved is expected to allow positive resolution of all identified challenges.
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁶			GEF OFP has opted out from adding a rating for the PIR
Lead Technical Officer¹⁷	S	S	While the project is in principle on track in terms of development of the envisaged outputs, despite the impact of the pandemic, some concerns exist in

¹³ **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.

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

¹⁴ **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁵ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

¹⁶ In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

¹⁷ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

			relation to technical elements envisaged, such as the links between all components and the link between the policies on pasture management and land degradation neutralities, stemming largely from the capacity limitations of the rural population and institutions. These elements as well as the impact of the pandemic are being addressed by the ongoing MTR which is expected to provide recommendations for ensuring successful project implementation and sustainability of the outcomes.
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	MS	Despite challenges related to the COVID pandemic, that affected the first and part of the second year of project implementation with delays in the overall delivery, the project is likely to achieve most of the expected outcomes and is on track. In addition, (i) awareness and capacities building of stakeholders in pasturelands management, especially at the local level and (ii) the implementation of the pilot pasture restoration plans have proven to be challenging. Nevertheless, mitigation actions are being implemented and with additional resources and efforts activities are expected to be fulfilled in a satisfactory manner.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

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

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

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

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ¹⁸ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low risk	Environmental and social risk classification still valid

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

¹⁸ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

6. Risks

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Identified in the Pro Doc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the BH in consultation with PMU
1	COVID-19 Pandemic	M	N	Complying with safety rules and standards / vaccination, adapting to the situation and development of alternatives for communication with stakeholders and transfer of knowledge.	Every mitigation action is in force and has been implemented, with progress in most project activities. The restrictions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic for most of 2022 were lifted.	New Risk The pandemic limitations on gatherings and physical presence delayed some results are and at least 1 year of non-cost extension is required for completion of outcomes/outputs.

¹⁹ Risk ratings means a rating of accesses the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Identified in the Pro Doc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the BH in consultation with PMU
2	Lack of commitment from MEPA to develop and approve some of the policy recommendations within the scope of the Project	L	Y	Establish close and strong cooperation with the MEPA, communicating 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 the mentioned communication is regularly maintained, MEPA is being actively involved in all the aspects of the project implementation	
3	Lack of trust among local level stakeholders towards the state institutions and the project activities	M	N	Work closely with the local authorities for building confidence and trust and provision of assurances as needed, to facilitate the implementation of the filed activities envisaged by the project.	A lack of experience and limited knowledge at the local level led to protracted discussions and additional efforts from the project to strengthen stakeholder capacity. The above mainly applies to the introduction of CPRM practices. The project through the ISCWG supported workshops, learning seminars and in-depth discussions. A common understanding and an agreed position have been reached on the basic principles defined by the NPMPD.	

	Type of risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Identified in the Pro Doc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the BH in consultation with PMU
4	Insufficient absorption capacity of the MEPA staff to use fully and benefit from the policy development support provided by the project	M	Y	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	A template for a detailed work plan has been established and is currently in use by the project. Regular meetings and capacity development further ensure appropriate awareness and implementation.	
5	Lack of coordination or integration of the actions of the ministries	M	Y	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 contacts are in place with active communication, presence in project bodies is satisfactory	
6	Limited capacities of the implementing partner/s to manage the investment	M	Y	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 Country Office in particular the Project Supervisor and the Programme Officer is providing more support (operational and technical) to the OP partner to overcome challenges	

	Type of risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Identified in the Pro Doc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the BH in consultation with PMU
7	Lack of government commitment to ensure agricultural land registration	M	Y	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 which is under consideration at the stage of PIF formulation. There are discussions of the potential Phase-2 of the World Bank.	Limited progress in establishing Georgia's land registration programme. As most of the selected pilot pasturelands are state property managed by the NASP or not registered at all. Ongoing consultations with the local governments and the NASP and support for official correspondence between local governments and state agencies. Kazbegi municipality has submitted documentation to the NPRA regarding the registration of the pilot pastures in the municipality's ownership, while Dmanisi and Gurjaani municipalities have submitted documentation to the NASP for the transfer of the pastures to the municipalities.	The activity has not been initiated by the World bank as assumed and discussions are ongoing, due to the pandemic and the resulting changing priorities of the government
8	Climate change	M	Y	The project will closely collaborate with DIMMA project funded by the Adaptation Fund to address climate vulnerability considerations on pasturelands	The project team in-between exchanges are ongoing	

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

FY2021 rating	FY2022 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Moderate	Moderate	Risk 1 and 3 have been added to the list. The pandemic had limited but sustained effect on the effectiveness of the project, causing 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. Non-cost extension has been proposed and approved by the SC to account for the delays. The ongoing MTR will review the implementation and provide recommendations on the planning for field activities and the non-cost extension.

		Facing of issues on field level in terms of participatory engagement of stakeholders is in principle expected and while mitigation measures are in place, it overall indicates allocation of additional staff resources and possibly delays in some activities.
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

7. Follow-up on Mid-term review or supervision mission (only for projects that have conducted an MTR)

If the project had an MTR or a supervision mission, please report on how the recommendations were implemented during this fiscal year as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
Recommendation 1:	N/A MTR Ongoing
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation 4:	

Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe	NO
---------------------------------------------------------------------	----

8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines²⁰. Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories. And, provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Implementation schedule	<p>To adjust to the circumstances the project workplan has been updated with revision of the timeframe for 2021 (Annex 2). However, as the adjustments are not sufficient to make up time for the season sensitive activities, such as field pilots, in December 2021 the project SC approved a 12 month non cost extension and budget revision also entailing extension of the OPA with RECC (workplan, BR and procurement plan) and LOA with CENN (Annex 3).</p> <p>From May 2021 the project-initiated a Mid Term Review considering the possibility for the non-cost extension and budget revision on basis of the achieved results and possible improvements in the project implementation, including the review of proposal for extended 4-year Work Plan and Budget</p> <p>On Basis of the MTR findings the LTO and the Budget Holder will decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations.</p>	<p>Original NTE: 31/05/2023</p> <p>Revised NTE: 31/05/2024</p>	
Risk analysis	Annual risk analysis, two risks have been added since inception		
Location of project activity	Minor reduction in size of area covered on account of a number of contributors		

²⁰ Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

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

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government Institutions			
Government representatives Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture (MEPA)	Direct beneficiary	Pasture Management National Policy Development Inter-Sectoral Coordination Working Group has been established based on the Order of the Minister of Environment Protection and Agriculture #2-828, dated 07/06/2021 and is being actively participated by MEPA, line ministries and state agencies, parliament committees and donor organizations, which is a major achievement, considering the goal of development of a national policy. MEPA, 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 and Land Use Monitoring National Agency and development partners are members of the project SC .	
MEPA Information-Consultation Centers in Municipalities	Direct beneficiary	Involvement in the capacity development activities, both as beneficiary of advanced training (Train the trainer) and as training providers for the farming population, MEPA ICCs are a way or ensuring sustainability. The ICCs are invited to participate in all the workshops, trainings and meetings held within the project.	
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
Farmers/land users including private sector	Direct beneficiary	Capacity building of beneficiaries and direct engagement through participation in the design of pasture management plans according to their needs. Co-financing for the implementation of good livestock practices (AnGR, pasture management).	

		Engagement as a way of mobilizing resources for implementation of bankable interventions in pasture management. The project together with the local government continues intensive and regular consultations at local level, especially in the pilot villages, on measures for restoration of the village pasture and active involvement.	
Other projects and donors (FAO, IFAD, GIZ)	Indirect beneficiary	Cooperation initiatives in areas of shared interests. Exchange of experiences (working meetings), dissemination of knowledge and information and participation in the ISCWG, the project SC, and project events.	
Private sector entities			
Others[1]			
Local Government representatives Municipal councils of the 3 pilot municipalities	Direct beneficiary	Links with the local government is a sustainability strategy for the project and overall effort, considering that they are managing the state-owned pastures. Participation from the local government has been high both in terms of commitments (signed MOUs as binding documents) and support and attendance provided to the project. The project team continues to support the pasture municipal multi-stakeholder groups in the target municipalities. The local governments are invited to all workshops and meetings held within the project.	
New stakeholders identified/engaged			

[1] They can include, among others, community-based organizations (CBOs), Indigenous Peoples organizations, women's groups, private sector companies, farmers, universities, research institutions, and all major groups as identified, for example, in Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and many times again since then.

10. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) during this reporting period.		
Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	Yes	<p>The project identified Gender Focal Points in all relevant institutions, who have actively participated in all meetings of the Inter-Sectoral Working Group, which consists of 28 members, of which 43% (12). The project team identified and familiarized the GFPs with the project Gender Action Plan and with their active involvement planned the relevant activities in Gurjaani, Dmanisi and Kazbegi Municipalities.</p> <p>The municipal Pasture Management Working Groups have been renewed in all three target municipalities, with the addition of at least one person responsible for gender issues.</p> <p>The MEPA GFP has been familiarized with the project goals in line with the Gender Action Plan and was invited to attend all project workshops and meetings; relevant recommendations are being elaborated with the involvement of the MEPA GFP for further integration into the National Pastureland Management Policy.</p> <p>The project Gender Impact Assessment is in progress, consultations are currently underway with all relevant stakeholders in both MEPA and the target municipalities.</p>
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	<p>In all three target municipalities meetings were held (Gurjaani – 7th of April attended by 11 participants) including 5 women; Dmanisi – 14th of April, by 12 participants including 6 women, Kazbegi – 18th of April, attended by 12 participants including 6 women (MoM in Appendix 12), in order to present the proposed restoration measures and to familiarize the stakeholders with the project Gender Action Plan. The meetings invited the stakeholder's opinions on the proposed pasture restoration measures and the current pasture management legislation, its limitations and strengths, and to discuss the situation regarding gender (including issues of land ownership and leadership</p>

		opportunities within livestock farming). During the meeting, both genders were encouraged to contribute to the discussion, with substantial results reflected in the summary of each meeting.
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):	No	
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Yes	Gender sensitive pasture inventory methodology has been developed by the project international expert, provided in Appendix 13, which pays special attention to including gender not only in creating equal opportunities for men and women, but including the groups that could provide quality data or first-hand information on Gender issues and their links to LD and how governance of natural resources management and LD affected women and men in the pasture inventory process. This also includes highlighting gender in agriculture issues during the workshops and other planned activities during the inventory process.
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	Gender balance has been ensured to a great extent throughout the project workshops and conferences. The average participation of women in the events held on national level is 53%. In the events held on a municipal level, the average participation of women was 48%. The pasturelands inventory process being undertaken, including the creation of mental maps with the project team closely following the UNCCD "Scientific Conceptual Framework for Land Degradation Neutrality" (2017) as specified in the GAP, the presentation and discussion took place on May 11 th in Dmanisi Municipality and was attended by 15 participants, including 7 men and 8 women. The local workshops have been held with an active participation of (i) the GFP in each municipality, (ii) a diverse body of local representatives (summary of the meeting provided in Appendix 22).
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	No	
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	The project is also closely cooperating with the identified GFPs to highlight involvement opportunities for both women and men during the project implementation process. On April 29 th , 2022 the project GFP presented and discussed the Gender Action Plan to the GFPs from MEPA and each municipality (MoM in Appendix 22), inviting a discussion on the activities and

		<p>milestones laid out in the action plan. Recommendations were received regarding the reporting period, with the GFPs from Gurjaani and Dmanisi municipalities recommended a bi-yearly reporting on gender issues, as the reporting period will coincide with that of the municipalities', creating a stronger collaboration and the reflection of more accurate information. During this meeting, the need for labor alleviating equipment was discussed, the need for such measures being highlighted.</p> <p>Dmanisi, Kazbegi and Gurjaani municipalities have provided an approximate census data to the project, specifically regarding vulnerable individuals and gender separated ownership information. To this date, there is no official data available regarding the households led by women, which creates a challenge for reaching the 30% milestone specified in the Gender Action Plan ("Women-headed households will comprise at least 30% of beneficiaries of operational pasture management plans"). Additional consultations are being planned regarding this matter with the local GFPs.</p>
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	<p>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 (16%, instead of 30% as planned) due to the poor representation of women in the field of agriculture, particularly, livestock.</p>
Any other good practices on gender	No	

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval during this reporting period.	
Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.	Yes, included in the reporting on Component 3 of the project Six knowledge materials have been developed, distributed and/or published on CENN's YouTube channel Information about every conducted training, as well as elaborated and uploaded knowledge materials are disseminated via 1) social media (FB) 2. Info CENN mailing list and 3. educational portal and CENN's YouTube channel.
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	Communication strategy has been elaborated and the communication activities are planned and implemented in accordance with the strategy.
Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.	Not applicable
Please provide links to related website, social media account	https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC2oq0PI40XDDmdZWRGe651A http://environment.cenn.org/
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. knowledge product/brochure on Intensification of livestock production 2. Video Course on Climate Change and Land / Pasture Degradation 3. 1 Video Course on Intensification of Livestock Production 4. 1 Video Course on Animal health and veterinary - Animals Infectious/Invasive Diseases and Prevention Methods 5. 1 video course on LDN oriented sustainable Pasture Management 6. 1 video course on Effective Communication, Training and Facilitation
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details	REC Caucasus – Ana Rukhadze ana.rukhadze@rec-caucasus.org

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples and local communities involved in the project (as per the approved Project Document)? If yes, please briefly explain.

n/a in Georgia

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²¹	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	5,100,000	1,260,000		5,100,000
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia	In-kind	200,000	-		200,000
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia	Public Investment	3,600,000	-		3,600,000
Beneficiaries	Municipality of Dmanisi	In-kind	300,000	-		300,000
Beneficiaries	Municipality of Dmanisi	Public Investment	845,000	-		845,000
Beneficiaries	Municipality of Gurjaani	In-kind	300,000	-		300,000

²¹ 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.

Beneficiaries	Municipality of Kazbegi	In-kind	300,000	-		300,000
CSO	REC Caucasus (RECC)	Grant	700,000	436,000		700,000
Donor agency	GIZ	Grant	500,000	-		500,000
CSO	CENN	Grant	350,000	20,851		350,000
Other	Government of Turkey	In-kind	50,000	-		50,000
		TOTAL	12,245,000	1,716,851		12,245,000

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

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives)
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits)
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

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

Risk rating. It should assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:	
High Risk (H)	There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks
Moderate Risk (M)	There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.
Low Risk (L)	There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.

GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet

Annex B

Core Indicator 1	Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use				<i>(Hectares)</i>	
	<i>Hectares (1.1+1.2)</i>					
	<i>Expected</i>			<i>Achieved</i>		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 1.1	Terrestrial protected areas newly created					
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
		(select)	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		(select)				
		Sum				
Indicator 1.2	Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness					
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares	METT Score		
				Baseline		Achieved
		(select)		Endorsement	MTR	TE
		(select)				
		Sum				
Core Indicator 2	Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use				<i>(Hectares)</i>	
	<i>Hectares (2.1+2.2)</i>					
	<i>Expected</i>			<i>Achieved</i>		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 2.1	Marine protected areas newly created					
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
		(select)	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		(select)				
		Sum				
Indicator 2.2	Marine protected areas under improved management effectiveness					
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares	METT Score (Scale 1-3)		
				Baseline		Achieved
		(select)		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR
						TE

		(select)				
		Sum				
Core Indicator 3	Area of land restored					(Hectares)
	Hectares (3.1+3.2+3.3+3.4)					
	Expected			Achieved		
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE		
	700	747				
Indicator 3.1	Area of degraded agricultural land restored					
	Hectares					
	Expected			Achieved		
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE		
Indicator 3.2	Area of forest and forest land restored					
	Hectares					
	Expected			Achieved		
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE		
Indicator 3.3	Area of natural grass and shrublands restored					
	Hectares					
	Expected			Achieved		
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE		
	700	747				
Indicator 3.4	Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) restored					
	Hectares					
	Expected			Achieved		
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE		
Core Indicator 4	Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)					(Hectares)
	Hectares (4.1+4.2+4.3+4.4)					
	Expected			Expected		
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE		
	20,000	20,000	20,000			
Indicator 4.1	Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity					
	Hectares					
	Expected			Achieved		
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE		

Indicator 4.2	Area of landscapes that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations				
Third party certification(s):	Hectares				
	Expected		Achieved		
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 4.3	Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems				
	Hectares				
	Expected		Achieved		
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
	20,000	20,000			
Indicator 4.4	Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided				
	Hectares				
	Expected		Achieved		
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Core Indicator 5	Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity				<i>(Hectares)</i>
Indicator 5.1	Number of fisheries that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations				
Third party certification(s):	Number				
	Expected		Achieved		
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 5.2	Number of large marine ecosystems (LMEs) with reduced pollution and hypoxial				
	Number				
	Expected		Achieved		
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Core Indicator 6	Greenhouse gas emission mitigated				<i>(Tons)</i>
	Tons (6.1+6.2)				
	Entered		Entered		
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
	Expected CO2e (direct)	116,527	770,710	770,710	
	Expected CO2e (indirect)	660,319			

Indicator 6.1	Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector					
			Tons			
			Entered		Entered	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		Expected CO2e (direct)	116,527	770,710	770,710	
		Expected CO2e (indirect)	660,319			
		Anticipated Year	2020	2020	2022	
Indicator 6.2	Emissions avoided					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		Expected CO2e (direct)				
		Expected CO2e (indirect)				
		Anticipated Year				
Indicator 6.3	Energy saved					
			MJ			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 6.4	Increase in installed renewable energy capacity per technology					
			Capacity (MW)			
		Technology	Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		(select)				
		(select)				
Core Indicator 7	Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management					(Number)
Indicator 7.1	Level of Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Program (TDA/SAP) formulation and implementation					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 7.2	Level of Regional Legal Agreements and Regional Management Institutions to support its implementation					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 7.3	Level of National/Local reforms and active participation of Inter-Ministerial Committees					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE

Indicator 7.4	Level of engagement in IWLEARN through participation and delivery of key products					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			Rating		Rating	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 8	Globally over-exploited fisheries Moved to more sustainable levels					(Tons)
			Metric Tons			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 9	Reduction, disposal/destruction, phase out, elimination and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste in the environment and in processes, materials and products					(Tons)
			Metric Tons (9.1+9.2+9.3)			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	PIF stage	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.1	Solid and liquid Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and POPs containing materials and products removed or disposed					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
	(select)	(select)	(select)			
	(select)	(select)	(select)			
	(select)	(select)	(select)			
Indicator 9.2	Quantity of mercury reduced					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.3	Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste					
			Number of Countries			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.4	Number of low-chemical/non-chemical systems implemented particularly in food production, manufacturing and cities					
		Technology	Number			
			Expected		Achieved	

			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 10	Reduction, avoidance of emissions of POPs to air from point and non-point sources					<i>(Grams)</i>
Indicator 10.1	Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control emissions of POPs to air					
			Number of Countries			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 10.2	Number of emission control technologies/practices implemented					
			Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 10.3	Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste					
			Number of Countries			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 11	Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment					<i>(Number)</i>
						Number Achieved
					MTR	TE
				Female		
				Male		
				Total		