



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report 2023

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

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	14
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	18
6. RISKS	19
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	22
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	26
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	27
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	29
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	31
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	32
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	33

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Eastern Europe and Central Asia			
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:	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture (MEPA), Regional Environmental Center for the Caucasus (RECC), Caucasus Environmental NGO Network (CENN)			
Initial project duration (years):	3 years			
Project coordinates:	Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID
	<u>Kazbegi, Sno</u>	42.60762	44.63997	611853
	<u>Dmanisi Ganakhleba</u>	41.48737	44.11136	614598
	<u>Gurjaani, Naniani</u>	41.665	45.70444	612764

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	25 February 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	30/11/2024

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	1,776,484
Total Co-financing amount (USD)³:	12,245,000
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	1,049,670
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)⁴:	1,005,257
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023⁵	4,206,095

¹ As per FPMIS

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

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

⁴ The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

⁵ Please refer to the Section 13 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	December 1, 2022
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	N/A - completed
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	October, 2022
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	March 2024
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	Yes, Provided in annex

Overall ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes:	Satisfactory
Overall implementation progress rating:	Moderately Satisfactory
Overall risk rating:	Moderate

ESS risk classification

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

Status

Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	3 rd PIR
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	Dragan Angelovski	dragan.angelovski@fao.org
Budget Holder (BH)	Raimund Jehle	Raimund.Jehle@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)	Nino Tkhilava, Head of Department, Ministry of Environmental Protection	nino.tkhilava@mepa.gov.ge
Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Feras Ziadat	Feras.Ziadat@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex-Technical FLO)	Kaan Basaran, GEF Specialist, REU	kaan.basaran@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)

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start	Progress rating ¹¹
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 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. 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. No monitoring system for the LDN indicators exists at national and/or local levels	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. Proposal for the MEPA Budgetary Programme for implementation of the recommendations from the cost-benefit analyses submitted for inclusion in the state budget for the following years.	92% Legislation drafted; adoption process ongoing but not completed	S
	Enhanced policy and institutional frameworks for LDN with the focus on the implementation of SLM principles on pasturelands						
	Outcome 2					50%	MU

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). Refer to Annex 1.

<p>LDN target # 4 is implemented via SLM practices on degraded pasturelands by local land users with the support of the coordination mechanism</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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.</p>		
<p>Outcome 3 National and local stakeholders are empowered and have capacity to implement SLM practices in pasturelands</p>	<p>Direct and indirect beneficiaries with improved knowledge increased awareness on sustainable management of pasturelands</p>			<p>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, 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</p>	<p>83%</p>	<p>S</p>
<p>Outcome 4 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>No system in place</p>	<p>Implementation of the project based on adaptive results-based management</p>	<p>Project delivers expected results and shared lessons learned</p>	<p>73%</p>	<p>S</p>

Measures taken to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings on Section 2

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	Expedite implementation of field activities	RECC	
	Expedite activities related to business plans and bankable projects	RECC	
	Increase the support with clearances required for field implementation approvals	FAO	

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ 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.</p> <p>LDN principles integrated in the national institutional framework with the focus on pasturelands.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The National Pasturelands Management Policy Document contributes to the implementation of LDN priorities, sets out the vision and principles for pasturelands governance and management, defines issues of ownership and rights, institutional arrangements, economic and fiscal aspects, land use planning and monitoring. The NPMPD is used for drafting the legislation with a focus on the implementation of LDN principles. 	
<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.</p> <p>Costed Action Plan for the Strategy for the Agricultural and Rural Development (2021-2027) reflecting the Pastureland priorities developed and adopted. 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>Pasturelands Management Policy Document developed and is disseminated for wider public review and facilitated for governmental approval at national and local levels</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Pasturelands Management Policy Document (NPMPD) is finalized, validated through validation workshops at national (3 workshops, 67 participants, 55% women) and regional (10 workshops, 207 participants, 14% women) levels. NPMPD is discussed and approved by Intersectoral Coordination Council for Agriculture and Rural Development of Georgia on March 23, 2023; NPMPD is disclosed and accessible for the wider public on the MEPA, NASLM and RECC websites. MEPA web-site: https://mepa.gov.ge/Ge/PublicInformation/34058 The National Agency for Sustainable Land Management and Land Use Monitoring website: https://land.gov.ge/Ge/Public-info/Strategic-documents REC Caucasus web site : https://rec-caucasus.org/publications/ (See Appendix 1. Final version of NPMPD and Appendix 2. Minutes of validation workshops) 	<p><i>No variance regarding updated work plan</i></p>

¹² Outputs as described in the project Log frame or in any approved project revision.

¹³ Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Workplan. Please be concise (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁴ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

<p>Output 1.1.2 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>Development of new legislation based on preliminary agreed national pastureland policy principles</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NPMPD is used to draft the national legislation on Pasturelands Sustainable Management with a focus on the implementation of LDN principles. • The composition and structure of the draft law is developed by the team of national legal experts and validated by Inter-Sectoral Coordination Working Group (ISCWG) (Appendix 3. Minutes of validation workshop on needs structure of the draft law). • The first draft of the Law on Sustainable Pasturelands Management is elaborated and submitted to the MEPA for review. 	<p><i>No variance regarding updated work plan</i></p>
<p>Output 1.1.3 Multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism on pastureland management created at national level.</p>	<p>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 (<i>National Multi-Stakeholder Coordination Platform</i>) on sustainable pastureland management</p>	<p>Continuation of work of the fully functional Pastureland National Multi-Stakeholder Coordination Platform</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has continued the facilitation of the ISCWG, which includes 21 representatives of central governmental institutions, 1 representative of the Parliament of Georgia and 5 representatives of international organizations. • 21 representatives of the central government institutions, 207 representatives of local governmental institutions (State representatives in the regions, municipality mayors, regional and municipal administration representatives), 13 representatives of NGOs and professional associations and 9 representatives of the Parliament of Georgia have been involved in the discussions of the NPMPD by participating in national and regional validation workshops. 	<p><i>No variance regarding updated work plan</i></p>
<p>Output 1.1.4 Multi-stakeholder pasture management groups are established in the three target municipalities</p>	<p>At least one municipal multi-stakeholder group is established in each target municipality;</p> <p>A number of Pasture Users Unions (PUU) for management of s.c. “village pastures” (<i>currently under villagers infromal common use</i>) are facilitated and assisted to be functional, legally organized and registered in all three target municipalities – with at least 30% of women members</p>	<p>Organizing of PUUs with at least 30% of women members</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project has continued the facilitation of the municipal multi-stakeholder working groups on pastures management established in all three target municipalities. - 40 members (12 women) of the municipal multi-stakeholder working groups participated in the meetings to discuss following issues: (i) pasturelands inventory, assessments, and development of mental maps; (ii) pasturelands registration; (iii) transfer of the right-of use of pilot pasture from state to target municipalities; (iv) establishment of Pasturelands Users Unions (PUU)s (Appendix 4. MoMs of municipal working groups). - Statutes for establishment of Pasturelands Users Unions (PUU) that specify PUU objectives, potential organization forms and management, membership eligibility criteria and procedures for PUUs establishment have been elaborated. - Lists of the pastures users in the target villages have been specified to establish PUUs. - PUUs Statutes and establishment were discussed and validated through the working meetings of PUUs potential members in pilot villages attended by 26 local beneficiaries (3 women) (Appendix 5. Minutes of PUUs validation meetings). - The establishment and registration of 3 PUUs in all selected villages in 3 pilot municipalities through consultations, negotiations and in full agreement with the local communities and municipal authorities has been initiated. - Potential members of PUUs in all three target villages are facilitated and assisted through the provision of on job trainings in conducting grazing capacity assessment, 	<p><i>No variance regarding updated work plan</i></p>

			annual planning of village pastures and development of grazing calendars, attended by 45 local beneficiaries (9 women) (Appendix 6. Reports on on-job trainings).	
Output 1.1.5 LDN Decision Support System (LDN-DSS) adapted to Georgian conditions, tested and integrated into existing decision-making system.	LDN-DSS developed incorporating three LDN indicators, piloted/tested for target municipalities	Piloting and mapping of land degradation status and trend in three target municipalities using 3 LDN indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land degradation trends have been assessed using 3 LDN indicators in all three municipalities and are accessible through the interactive mapping and data analyses application (see links in Appendix 7). - Based on the Land Use Land Cover Esri, 2021 data the statistics and maps of rangelands distribution per national, region and municipality has been developed and are accessible (see links in Appendix 7). - Forest and Land Use Information and Decision Support System (https://atlas.mepa.gov.ge/) and existing MEPA GIS portal have been selected in coordination with MEPA as most suitable existing web-portals for hosting LDN-DSS. - The spatial datasets obtained through piloting of LDN indicators in target municipalities are submitted to MEPA for further incorporation into mentioned web-portals. 	<i>No variance regarding updated work plan</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 management for LDN targets scaling up		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 424 people (47% women) living in 116 households in the target villages are direct beneficiaries of the project pilot activities. Additionally, 961 people (46% women) will indirectly benefit from the restoration of the pilot pastures in 3 selected villages of Sno, Ganakhleba and Naniani. • Restoration measures are designed and validated with MEPA and local beneficiaries for 499.5 ha of pre-selected pilot areas of the villages pastures in three municipalities of Georgia and the implementation of measures for the introduction of the controlled grazing system have been initiated. 	
Output 2.1.1 A detailed inventory and multi-factor assessments of pastures are conducted in the three target municipalities	Pastureland inventory data (quantitative, qualitative) set available on the MEPA environmental data web portal.	Application of pasturelands inventory methodology in three target municipalities Testing of grazing capacity methodology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pastureland inventories and multi-factor assessments are finalized for all three target municipalities (Dmanisi, Kazbegi and Gurjaani) based on the methodology for detailed pastureland inventory and assessment developed by the project. - Pasturelands Assessment reports are drafted and discussed at the municipal multi-stakeholder working groups meetings in all three municipalities (Appendix 8. Pasturelands Assessment Reports). - Pasturelands inventory data set (quantitative, qualitative) are submitted to the MEPA for incorporation into Forest and Land and Land Use Information and Decision Support System and existing MEPA GIS portal. (https://atlas.mepa.gov.ge/) - Pasturelands Inventory and assessment methodology developed by the project is being replicated in Akhaltsikhe Municipality of Samtskhe-Javakheti region by the Dairy Modernisation and Market Access Programme, co-funded by the Government of Georgia, the IFAD, and the Adaptation Fund (AF). - It is expected that pasturelands inventory and planning at municipal level will be further replicated in DiMMA other target regions and municipalities, as well as 	<i>No variance regarding updated work plan</i>

			<p>throughout the country. especially in the context of enhanced technical preparedness of central governmental agencies for impending national reform on pastures management.</p> <p>- Grazing Capacity Assessment Methodology developed by the project has been applied through participatory planning of the pre-selected village pastures and development of grazing calendars in all three target municipalities (Appendix 9).</p>	
<p>Output 2.1.2 Pasture management plans (strategic and operational) are developed in participatory manner and implemented in the three target municipalities</p>	<p>Number of strategic and operational land management plans (3 and 3, respectively) (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)</p>	<p>Finalization of the methodology for elaboration of state-owned pastureland management plans Starting of development of strategic municipal pasture management plans</p> <p>Starting of implementation of the restoration measures</p>	<p>- Methodology for Development of Municipal Pastureland Management Plan has been finalized and obtaining information for elaboration of pasturelands strategic management plans for target municipalities has begun (Appendix 10. Methodology for Development of Municipal Pastureland Management Plan).</p> <p>- Pilot Pastures restoration plans have been amended to ensure their effective implementation and sustainability of restoration measures, as well as based on additional field surveys conducted as preparatory activities necessary for the implementation of restoration measures (additional surveys for livestock watering system arrangements and agroforestry application and consultations with stakeholders at national and local level) (Appendix 11).</p> <p>- Based on intensive consultations with local beneficiaries and MEPA, the areas and locations of the pilot pastures where restoration measures are planned to be implemented have been amended and final versions of the restoration plans cover 499.5 ha of village pastures in total (see Appendix 12. location of the pilot pastures), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 269 ha in village Ganakhleba (Dmanisi Municipality); o 52 ha in village Naniani (Gurjaani Municipality); o 208 ha in village Sno (Kazbegi Municipality). <p>The companies for the implementation of different restoration measures have been selected.</p> <p>- The necessary materials for installing electric fences in the selected pilot pastures across all three target villages have been procured. Additionally, a contractor has been hired specifically for the installation of electric fences in Ganakhleba village as part of the controlled grazing system.</p> <p>- Installation of electric fences is ongoing in selected area of pilot pastures of village Ganakhleba (Dmanisi municipality).</p> <p>- Studies for water availability for livestock watering in Naniani have been conducted, with options revealed and ToR for arrangement of livestock watering area developed. A detailed design is being prepared by a consulting company for the arrangement of livestock watering systems in Ganakhleba and Naniani.</p>	<p>Delayed by emerging dynamics in the pilot sites that are discussed in the chapter 4 of this report below.</p>
<p>Output 2.1.3 Business models to encourage investments in pastureland</p>	<p>At least one business model developed for each target municipality</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of the business models for pasturelands in 3 target municipalities has been discussed with FAO, main directions and expectations have been revealed and the ToR for subcontracting the consultant is being developed. • Project Steering Committee meeting held on December 1, 2022 agreed to develop pasture-based business models to encourage investments in pastureland management, including bankable project for private pasturelands or livestock 	<p>Delayed</p>

2023 Project Implementation Report

management to implement SLM and achieve LDN are elaborated in three target municipalities			cooperatives in the target municipalities and to work closely with livestock owners to elaborate bankable projects for commercial banks of Georgia, taking into consideration the latest developments with the GCF (GCF rejected Georgia's project idea for restoration of pastures) and the LDN fund (suspended operation).	
Outcome 3.1 Capacity building of the key stakeholders on sustainable management of pasturelands and achieving land degradation neutrality	Direct and indirect beneficiaries with improved knowledge increased awareness on sustainable management of pasturelands		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 capacity building activities / trainings • 1 knowledge material • Continuous implementation of media outreach activities and development of media products on all project activities under component 3 	
Output 3.1.1 National Capacity Focused on SLM/LDN in 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		Not relevant for reporting period, has been completed in 2020	Delayed
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)	Development of one video knowledge material on "Animal welfare and non-communicable diseases"	Video knowledge material is being developed and uploaded on CENN's YouTube channel and a newsletter is being disseminated through CENN's mailing list. (Appendix: 13)	Delayed
Output 3.1.3 Training provided to national and local decision	Number of farmers national and local decision makers, workers of governmental extension services, women groups with improved	<u>Conduction of 7 capacity building activities / trainings:</u> 1. Farmers training via ICC, 2. Sustainable pasture management,	During the reporting period, 179 farmers and ICC representatives participated in capacity building activities. (Appendices 14, 15 and 16)	Conduction of the training "Food Safety and Hygiene of milk production" was planned in June

makers, workers of governmental extension services, women groups and farmers	knowledge on sustainable management of pasturelands Study tour to Turkey on SLM on pasturelands	3. Animal welfare and non-communicable diseases, 4. Pasture management annual planning and development of grazing calendars, 5. Food safety and hygiene of milk production, 6. International technical study tours in turkey for examining the best SLM applications related to LDN on pasturelands, 7. International technical study tours in turkey for examining the best SLM applications related to LDN on pasturelands		2023. Has been postponed to August 2023. Study tour to Turkey on SLM was replaced with a study tour to North Macedonia and possibilities for study tour in other countries is explored.
Output 3.1.4: Knowledge-sharing with other municipalities, regions and countries and dissemination of verifiable data and tested methodologies	Number of people covered by public awareness and media campaigns. Number of educational and informational events and media outreach activities	Development of 11 public / media outreach products	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five Facebook posts were developed on each activity, and published on social media (FB) (Appendix 17) • Press releases (Newsletters) for each of the 5 activities were developed and published via info CENN mailing list (Appendix 18). • 1 Video course is uploaded and available on CENN's YouTube channel (Appendix 13) • Through social media and national and international knowledge-sharing platforms more than 30.000 people have been covered 	Delayed
Outcome 4.1: Project implementation based on RBM and lessons learned/good practices documented and disseminated	M&E system in place Lessons learned disseminated			
Output 4.1.1: RBM system of the project promoted adaptive management	M&E system ensuring timely delivery of project benefits and adaptive results-based management	Sharing of the project results or lessons at the UNCCD, GASL, LEAP and pastoralist hub and with other municipalities in the country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The case study Pastoral land reform in Georgia developed based on the national pasturelands management policy document was presented at the UNCCD-FAO webinar on Integrating Tenure Security into Land Restoration Initiatives held on May 17, 2023. • The case study to share experience and innovative approaches to improving rangeland management developed and submitted to UNCCD to contribute preparation of UNCCD GLO Report on pastoralism. 	<i>No variance regarding updated work plan</i>

through capturing key results of the project activities and peer-to-peer training			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pasturelands Inventory and assessment methodology developed by the project is being replicated in Akhaltsikhe Municipality of Samtskhe-Javakheti region by the Dairy Modernisation and Market Access Programme, co-funded by the Government of Georgia, the IFAD, and the Adaptation Fund (AF). • It is expected that pasturelands inventory and planning at municipal level will be further replicated in DiMMA other target regions and municipalities, as well as throughout the country. especially in the context of enhanced technical preparedness of central governmental agencies for impending national reform on pastures management. 	
Output 4.1.2: A Gender-Sensitive Project Monitoring & Evaluation Plan and a relevant system are in place	Baseline and targets for GEB indicators and co-benefits refined	Maintenance of an M&E tool preparation of project progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Gender-Sensitive Project & Evaluation Plan is being implemented in a participatory and consultative process. • On Quarterly basis, the project 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 effectiveness. • Project progress reports are produced and submitted in a timely manner. 	<i>No variance regarding updated work plan</i>
Output 4.1.3: Communication Strategy and KM strategy are developed and implemented	Number of appearances in local media, MEPA/municipalities and partner websites		<p>Media outreach activities have been carried out to highlight NPMPD development process and the results of the national validation workshops: 1. Facebook post was developed on each activity, published to social media (FB) and 2 Press releases on each activity were developed and published via RECC website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshops dedicated to the NPMPD validation were highlighted on websites of MEPA and Parliament of Georgia. • 110 articles devoted to the NPMPD were published by popular media. • Two telecasts devoted to the NPMPD were published by popular media. (Links are provided in Appendix 20). 	<i>No variance regarding updated work plan</i>
Output 4.1.4: Project Mid-term review and Final Evaluation are conducted	Mid-term and final evaluation reports		The Midterm review which covers the project implementation period from the approval in 2019 up to July 2022 including project design phase has been finalized in October 2022.	<i>No variance regarding updated work plan</i>

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcomes of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR (max 400 words)

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

The National Pasturelands Management Policy Document (NPMPD) Concept is finalized and validated through stakeholder workshops at a national and regional/municipal levels and is accessible on the MEPA, NALSMLUM and RECC websites for the wider public. The document contributes to the implementation of LDN priorities, sets out the vision and principles for pasturelands governance and management, defines issues of ownership and rights, institutional arrangements, economic and fiscal aspects, land use planning and monitoring. The NPMPD is used to draft the legislation with a focus on the implementation of LDN principles. Composition and structure of the draft law is developed by the team of national legal experts and validated by Inter-Sectoral Coordination Working Group (ISCWG). The first draft of the Law on Sustainable Pasturelands Management is elaborated and submitted to the MEPA for review.

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

Pastureland inventories and multi-factor assessments are finalized for all three target municipalities (Dmanisi, Kazbegi and Gurjaani) based on the methodology for detailed pastureland inventory developed by the project. Pasturelands Assessments reports are drafted for further discussion and validation with local and national beneficiaries. The results and options for the Pasture Inventory can be summarized as spatial set of tools and maps that provide data and information in online, digital format that allows for cross-analysis and planning at a Municipal scale.

Pasturelands Inventory and assessment methodology developed by the project is being replicated in the Akhaltsikhe Municipality of Samtskhe-Javakheti region by the Dairy Modernisation and Market Access Programme, co-funded by the Government of Georgia, the IFAD, and the Adaptation Fund (AF). It is expected that pasturelands inventory and planning at the municipal level will be further replicated through the DiMMA project in other target regions and municipalities, as well as throughout the country, especially in the context of enhanced technical preparedness of central government agencies for impending national reform on pastures management.

The project developed and validated with stakeholders at local and national levels operational-type Pasture Restoration Plans for the 3 Priority Pilot Areas of Village Pastures following LDN hierarchy of responses. Pastures Restoration measures are designed for **499.5 ha** area of the pre-selected village pastures. During the reporting period, pasture restoration plans have been amended based on intensive consultations with local

beneficiaries and MEPA to ensure their effective implementation and sustainability of restoration measures, as well as based on additional field surveys: In Ganakhleba **village** of Dmanisi municipality the pilot site has been expanded by 32 ha to include pastures traditionally used for dairy cattle and fattened calves, where a controlled grazing system will be introduced through installation of electric fences. A contractor has been hired and installation of electric fences has started. Due to the rugged terrain and poor access road, installation of electric fences on the rest of the pilot pasture (199,1 ha) was not considered as feasible and controlled grazing system will be applied through herding by a shepherd. In **Sno village**, application of controlled grazing on the village pasture located in the Kazbegi National Park was successfully negotiated with Protected Areas Agency. Consequently, a controlled grazing system will be applied through installation of electric fences on two pre-selected areas of village pasture with total area of 94.5 ha.

The preparatory activities necessary for the implementation of the Pilot Pastures Restoration Plans have been conducted, including:

1. additional surveys for water supply system arrangements,
2. tenders for procurement of materials and services for restoration measures,
3. intensive consultations with local beneficiaries to specify the technical details of infrastructure to be arranged on the pilot pastures,
4. intensive consultations with MEPA and National Agency of State Property to facilitate pilot pastures registration and categorization for further transferring of the right of use of pasture by the central government to municipalities,
5. intensive consultations with local beneficiaries for establishment and registration of the Pastures Users Unions.

The project also works closely with local farmers and project beneficiaries by providing intensive consultations and explanations on a controlled grazing system and benefits of proposed measures compared to business-as-usual approach, to ensure their active involvement in the implementation of the pilot pastures restoration plans and application of the controlled grazing system.

However, starting of implementation of the majority of pilot activities have been delayed (or cancelled) due to the emerging dynamics in the pilot sites, in particular:

1. Significant challenges have been faced with the implementation of the pilot pasture restoration plan in Melaani as local farmers were no longer interested in the project. The reason for the change in interest was attributed to internal tensions between various interest groups within the community, outside influences and the alternative income opportunities available in the area. Consequently, the cancellation of the planned activities. The project with the government and the local authorities to the extent possible identified and engaged with replacement pastures within the target municipalities.
2. The procurement of items and services for restoration measures has been prolonged due to the cancellation of tenders caused by the limited interest from commercial providers and due to the high price offered, in case of watering system in Naniani. Following a rapid assessment of potential suppliers and labor mobilization the installation of fixed fences was replaced with electric fences which ensure flexibility for application of a controlled grazing (such as herd size, age and sex ratio). Tenders for services have been conducted. Materials have been purchased. The selection of a non-commercial legal person for electric fences installation in Naniani and Sno has been significantly delayed due to the prolonged OPIM procedures of approval non-profit entity to provide commercial services.

3. **Arrangement of the watering system was affected by extremely scarce water resources in pilot villages of Naniani and Ganakhelba.** Boreholes are the most reliable options for sustainable sources of clean safe water, however their installation has been rejected in Naniani and Ganakleba due to the depth of the groundwater (420 m). The subsequent exploitation will be associated with high technological risks and costs. On site B of the Naniani pilot pastureland detailed design of the livestock watering system has been developed including arrangement of pilot solar-powered water well, as inflow of ground water was expected to start in layers of about 150 m. However, the tender for arrangement of livestock watering system was canceled due to the financial offer significantly exceeding the estimated price of the service to be provided that made rationality and sustainability of the investment questionable. The project is considering options for livestock watering systems such as a) water intake from centralized drinking water supply system, b) spring located in the central part of village Naninai, c) restoration of water intake structure near the pilot pasturelands of village Ganakheba d) installation of reservoir, e) arrangement of the small earth banks to capture and store water in wet areas of the pilot sites.
4. Getting consent on starting the rehabilitation activities on the pilot pasturelands from the central authorities has been slow. Without transfer of the pilot pasturelands use-rights to the target municipalities, the project faced difficulties in obtaining approvals for infrastructure installation. If the land plots are not transferred to the municipalities, sustainability problems can be foreseen after the handover. The issue of the right of use of pilot pastures being transferred to the municipalities was discussed at the project SC meeting held in December 2022. The SC (MEPA and the National Agency of State Property) committed to action on the state-owned land plots and on the use-rights transferring to the target municipalities.

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

Generally, female representation on capacity-building activities remains limited, due to the traditional gender division of tasks among the smallholders and hence limited participation of women in field herding of livestock. Due to delays in component 2 (Demonstration of sustainable pastureland management practices and scaling up successful approaches), project component 3 (Capacity building of the key stakeholders on sustainable management of pasturelands and achieving land degradation neutrality) experienced challenges in linking activities and meeting the needs.

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

A Gender-Sensitive Project & Evaluation Plan is being implemented in a participatory and consultative process. The NPMPD development process is highlighted on the websites of MEPA, NALSMLUM, Parliament of Georgia, RECC, as well as through social media, telecast and articles in national media.

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.

	FY2023 Development Objective rating	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating ¹⁶	Comments/reasons ¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	MS	The pandemic has caused delays affecting the field activities. Since 2023 conditions in the field leading to complexities that require dedication of extra efforts have been predominant, inclusive limitations in the number of service providers for procurement actions. The commitment of the project staff is high, however delays on account of administrative procedures for clearances for Due Diligence (reputational risk) have been noted.
Budget Holder	S	MS	A successful relationship between the project, the national counterparts and local institutions has been built in principle, however some challenges have been encountered in transferring this alliance in the field. There is some change in the receipt of the project activities by local stakeholders and changes in the areas covered.
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸			<i>Ratings/comments</i>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	S	MS	<i>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 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 MTR which is expected to provide recommendations for ensuring successful project implementation and sustainability of the outcomes.</i>
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	S	MS	The project has been delivering the targeted support for technical capacity building and strategic approaches. The field work and piloting is expected to be expedited for a greater appreciation of the transformation that can be achieved both by the rural communities as beneficiary groups and policy makers and all the relevant stakeholders.

¹⁵ **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁶ **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁷ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

¹⁸ In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

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

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

This section is under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made to comply 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. Please indicate if new 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:

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

²⁰ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit (Esm-unit@fao.org) should be contacted. The project shall prepare or amend an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) or other ESS instruments and management tools based on the new risk classification (please refer to page 13 <https://www.fao.org/3/cb9870en/cb9870en.pdf>)

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified during the 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 ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	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 communication is regularly maintained, MEPA is being actively involved in all the aspects of the project implementation, including NPMPD validation workshops at national and regional levels, drafting of law on pasturelands management, piloting of NPMPD recommendations on local level.	
2	Prolonged agreement of the policy document and later on the draft legislation document among the line ministries and other institutions	M	N			This has affected the commencement of Outcome 2.
3	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regular meetings and presentations - Ensure appropriate awareness and implementation. - A series of trainings on LDN is planned within the project to be provided to National Agency for Sustainable Land Management and Land Use Monitoring in order to strengthen capacity to support implementation of UNCCD requirements and LDN oriented sustainable land management 	
4	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.	This was not foreseen but has affected implementation of activities in Melaani. There remains a risk that this could be replicated in other areas especially if it is politically motivated.

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
5	Establishment of Pasture User Unions (PUU)	M	N			The level of organisation by farmers is quite low and to implement the controlled grazing, a high level of organisation is required.
6	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effective working contacts are in place with active communication. - At the initiative of the MEPA, the NPMPD was presented and approved by the Inter-Agency Coordination Council for Agriculture and Rural Development. - The project facilitates the process of transferring the right of use of state-owned pilot pastures by the central government to the target municipalities. For this purpose, the project intensively cooperates with the MEPA, NASLM, National Agency of State Property, Mayors of Pilot Municipalities. However, transfer of state-owned pilot pastures to target municipalities is taking too long, which puts at risk the timely start of pilot measures and thus their effectiveness. 	
7	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAO is providing more support (operational and technical) to the OP partner to overcome challenges. • Coordination meeting with OP partner occurs every 2 weeks. 	Locations and scope for study tours adjusted in accordance with absorption capacity
8	Lack of government commitment to ensure agricultural land registration	H	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 was under consideration at the stage of PIF formulation. There are discussions of the potential Phase-2 of the World Bank project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Project of Systematic Land Registration (2022-2024) is being implemented. The project is financed under the loan agreement between Georgia and IBRD. By January 2025, the systematic registration of land titles is to be completed in 59 municipalities of Georgia. However, agricultural land are registered without categorization (without identification of land categories such as pasture, hayfield, arable land, perennial crops). This poses significant challenges to pasturelands management planning and disposal of pasture to users as defined by the NPMPD. - The project has provided support to the municipalities in registration and categorization of pilot pastures. As a result pilot pastures in all target municipalities are registered and categorized as pastures. 	The pastureland plots that were supposed to be transferred to the municipalities have faced significant challenges and the transfer has not been completed. This is a serious risk to the achievement of Component 2.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
9	Climate change	M	Y	The project will closely collaborate with DIMMA project funded by the Adaptation Fund to address climate vulnerability considerations on pasturelands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pasturelands Inventory and assessment methodology developed by the project is being replicated in Akhaltsikhe Municipality of Samtskhe-Javakheti region by the DiMMA, co-funded by the Government of Georgia, the IFAD, and the Adaptation Fund (AF). - It is expected that pasturelands inventory and planning at municipal level will be further replicated through the DiMMA project in other target regions and municipalities, as well as throughout the country. especially in the context of enhanced technical preparedness of central governmental agencies for impending national reform on pastures management. 	
10	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.	Geopolitical location of Georgia makes it predisposed to be affected by high escalations which would also have an impact on government priorities as they would be shifted.

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

FY2022 rating	FY2023 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Moderate	Moderate	Risks have been added to the list in accordance with the MTR, some related to delays and some related to feedback from the implementation of field activities. As some of the project deliverables did not meet the estimated timelines; the project developed an updated Workplan and got approved for non-cost extension. Facing issues on field level in terms of engagement of stakeholders and investment sustainability needs close monitoring and while mitigation measures are in place risks out of control of the project remain.

7. Follow-up on Mid-term review or supervision mission

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>
<p>Recommendation 1: Strengthen coordination among RECC and CENN to seek better integration of the activities of component 2 and 3 e.g. through joint planning and reporting of activities, frequent meetings that also includes MEPA and joint activities in the pilot sites such as trainings</p>	<p>The topics of the provided pieces of training have been jointly defined by RECC and CENN, in coordination with FAO.</p> <p>The local population of the pilot villages was defined as the main target group of the training to ensure better integration of the activities of components 2 and 3.</p> <p>On-job training on grazing capacity assessment and annual planning of pasture use have been conducted in all three pilot villages with the participation of 45 local beneficiaries (9 women).</p> <p>Further training will be dedicated to hygiene and food safety related to milk and milking, as the provision of milking equipment, hygienic storage and transport materials is planned as pasturelands restoration economic support materials.</p>
<p>Recommendation 2: Leverage on CENN's grassroots mobilization comparative advantage</p>	<p>The project partners, RECC and CENN have coordinated their activities under components 2 and 3 through joint planning of pieces of training for direct beneficiaries in target villages.</p>
<p>Recommendation 3: Ensure more intensive engagement of MEPA in Component 3 activities</p>	<p>MEPA's engagement is ensured by regular information sharing on planned activities. Representatives from MEPA have been invited to attend capacity-building activities under component 3.</p>
<p>Recommendation 4: Intensively consult with and seek the support of relevant agencies/entities to ensure achievement of the targeted 747 ha. FAO to keep GEF informed on these discussions.</p>	<p>It is expected that restoration activities will be implemented on 499.5 ha of the pre-selected areas of pilot village pastures, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 269 ha in village Ganakhleba, Dmanisi Municipality (Initially selected 254 ha was reduced to 199.2 ha due to the exclusion of gullies not used for grazing, as well as a potential mining area, however, based on consultations with local beneficiaries, an additional 40 ha of traditionally used village pastures have been identified for restoration); - 52 ha in village Naniani, Gurjaani Municipality (The area of pre-selected pastures (110 ha) in Naniani, has not been correctly indicated in ProDoc, the area of pilot pastures in this village was originally 44,5 ha, which has been further clarified through the cadastral boundaries of the registered land parcels that led to the reduction of the area to 32 hectares. However, implementation of restoration measures was thoroughly supported and endorsed by local pasture users on an additional 20 ha of village pastures as a necessary component of community-scale management plan. - 208 ha in village Sno, Kazbegi municipality (boundaries of the initially selected pilot pastures (207 ha) were adjusted according to the cadastral boundaries of the registered land parcel. Implementation of restoration measures on the part of pre-selected pilot pasture (51,3 ha) located within the Kazbegi National Park was successfully negotiated with Protected Areas Agency). <p>Planned activities of the project were cancelled in the village of Melaani, which led to the reduction of the area of pilot pastures targeted for restoration by 176 ha.</p>
<p>Recommendation 5: FAO to strengthen its monitoring missions (LTO and BH) to the field. FAO PTF to actively offer guidance to the project on thorny issues such as stalemate on pilot sites. PTF can also help the project identify other FAO initiatives in other countries where the project can share and learn some</p>	<p>Regular coordination meetings have been introduced to ensure appropriate support is provided, in addition to already fielded mission of the LTO following the MTR.</p>

2023 Project Implementation Report

<p>best practices from including on organization of farmers, pasture law development, piloting and scaling out SLM.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 6: Include Dmanisi (Ganakhleba) entire village pastures to 440 ha under the pilot activities</p>	<p>Implementation of pilot activities in village Ganakhleba (Dmanisi) is planned on 199 ha area of entire village pasture (436 ha) and is ongoing on an additional 40 ha area traditionally used for grazing by the local community. An extension of application of a controlled grazing system on the entire 499.5 ha area is being negotiated with local beneficiaries and MEPA.</p>
<p>Recommendation 7: Budgetary allocations are yet to be earmarked for implementation of the priorities of NPMPD as this is still a draft policy that is yet to be formally adopted. Follow up discussions with the Minister MEPA to emphasize and follow-up on this.</p>	<p>Development of the action plan for 2024-2027 of the Agriculture and Rural Development Strategy is ongoing. The project provides efforts to ensure a reflection of pasturelands priorities defined by NPMPD in the updated action plan.</p>
<p>Recommendation 8: As the NPMPD is at an advanced stage, the project can gain time by advancing on negotiations for the legislation including by taking advantage of the current active engagement of the policy ISWG.</p>	<p>The NPMPD is used for drafting legislation with a focus on the implementation of LDN principles. National legal experts for the development of the draft law on Pasturelands Sustainable Management have been contracted by the project. The structure of the draft law has been developed and validated by ISWG. First draft of the law has been submitted to the MEPA for review.</p>
<p>Recommendation 9: Incorporate joint planning of activities by MEPA, FAO, RECC and CENN in the current M&E system. Also agree on frequency of joint coordination meetings by all 4 organizations (FAO to coordinate) for planning, reporting and for coherence, production of some joint knowledge products. Potential topics could include joint publications on best practices on pasture restoration in Georgia, Multi-stakeholder policy elaboration processes for sustainable pasture management in Georgia. These publications will enable documentation and sharing of the achievements in Georgia and done jointly, allows sharing of broad framings and ownerships.</p>	<p>Project coordination meetings are held regularly, every two weeks with participation of FAO and RECC. Coordination meetings with participation of FAO, RECC and CENN for jointly planning of training activities and reporting have been held as well.</p> <p>Joint planning for production of knowledge materials is ongoing.</p>
<p>Recommendation 10: Follow up on the recommendations developed in frame of the Study on Possible Legal Solutions for PUU Establishment and advocate for the suggested legal changes.</p>	<p>Charters/Statutes for establishment of Pasturelands Users Unions (PUU) have been elaborated and validated through the working meetings with village representatives in all three target municipalities.</p> <p>Lists of the pilot pastures users in the target villages have been specified in order to establish PUUs.</p> <p>The establishment and legal registration of 3 PUUs in all selected villages in 3 pilot municipalities through consultations, negotiations and in full agreement with the local communities and municipal authorities has been initiated.</p> <p>The draft law on Pasturelands Sustainable Management will provide legal basis for PUUs establishment in Georgia, describe the legal forms under which PUU may be registered, set criteria for membership eligibility and specify the type of title (use right) under which the PUU will access pasture.</p>
<p>Recommendation 11: Hasten start of pilot site activities according to respective needs for first steps.</p>	<p>The preparatory activities necessary for the implementation of the Pilot Pastures Restoration Plans have been conducted, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. additional surveys for water supply system arrangements conducted in Naniani and Ganakhleba, 2. tenders for procurement of materials and services for restoration measures, 3. intensive consultations with local beneficiaries to specify the technical details of infrastructure to be arranged on the pilot pastures, 4. intensive consultations with MEPA and National Agency of State Property to facilitate pilot pastures registration and categorization and transferring of the right of use of pasture by the central government to municipalities. <p>Installation of electric fences is ongoing in selected area of pilot pastures of village Ganakhleba (Dmanisi municipality).</p>

2023 Project Implementation Report

	However, starting of implementation of the other pilot activities for selected pasturelands restoration have been delayed by emerging dynamics in the pilot sites that are discussed in the chapter 4 of this report above.
Recommendation 12: Carry out pending studies on water availability and water quality issues in Gurjaani.	Studies on water availability for livestock watering in Naniani village (Gurjaani municipality) have been conducted, including prognostic hydrogeological survey and revealing of other existing sources for water intake. Although boreholes arrangement was considered as most reliable options for sustainable sources of clean safe water, their installation has been rejected due to the depth of the groundwater and large costs required for borehole arrangement, that make the rationality of the investment questionable. Consequently, the project considers other alternatives of water sources in Naniani, including water intake from centralized drinking water supply system, or from spring located in the central part of village Naniani, restoration of old boreholes or water harvesting.
Recommendation 13: Ensure co-financiers understand obligations and develop a clear co-financing reporting structure.	Additional discussions are ongoing, explaining the necessity for reporting of co-financing, however the counterparts have not developed a structure that enables them to report the expenses.
Recommendation 14: Enable to indicate the information on training participants' location (village) in the training signing sheets so that it is measurable what share of population from the pilot villages are engaged in capacity building activities.	List of participants is modified to enable identification of location of the training participants
Recommendation 15: Integrate future climate projections (e.g IPCC scenarios) into the restoration plans in order to anticipate, identify and mitigate potential site-specific impacts of climate change on the plans. Possible frameworks: Simonson et al, 2021: Enhancing climate change resilience of ecological restoration — A framework for action Transformative adaptation pathway approach for restoration: Pramova et al, 2019: Adapting land restoration to a changing climate: embracing the knowns and unknowns	The results will depend on the capacity of the service providers to develop the appropriate planning.
Recommendation 16: Coordination and concentration of activities by various donors in the pilot sites to improve the entire livestock value chains, from pastures to veterinary services and livestock product development	Cooperation with other FAO initiatives has been established in order to support with additional expertise available in Georgia.
Recommendation 17: 1.5-year non-cost extension will be required (including OPA) to enable achievement of the targeted results in Component 2 (Unless it is decided to be cancelled).	The project has been extended. Budget and work plan have been revised subsequently.
Recommendation 18: Subsequent revision of the budget and work plan.	
Recommendation 19: Advocate prioritization of pilot site farmers among donor-funded and government-funded grant and no-interest credit programmes, facilitate scaling up of this approach for further interventions	Cooperation with other FAO initiatives has been established in order to support with additional expertise available in Georgia. Presentation of results is part of the strategy to improve awareness.
Recommendation 20: Elaborate and communicate holistic vision of the tangible incentives/perspectives with local communities/ farmers	7 meetings have been organized (87 participants, 19 women) in three target villages to provide clear information regarding project outcomes, especially under the components 1 and 2, including expected results of pilot activities, their potential benefits for local farmers, as well as National
Recommendation 21: Structured and "intense" communication of project results especially field/pilot results	

2023 Project Implementation Report

Recommendation 22: Ensure clear communication to cultivate clear expectations among the local communities (e.g. expected taxation, etc.)	Pasturelands Management Policy Document consequences for primary users of village pastures, including land tenure and taxation issues.
Recommendation 23: Schedule the training activities for farmers mostly during the winter season (unless the training does not require practical sessions in the field during a particular season)	Due to intense work plan and agendas, trainings cannot be conducted during the winter. Furthermore, some practical parts of the trainings require field visits and demonstrations, which is impossible during the winter. Despite that, the project will try to schedule capacity-building activities considering farmers' considerations.
Recommendation 24: Gender targets for Output 1.1.4 and 3.1.3 need reconsideration based on consultations with local gender focal points in target municipalities.	To be considered for the next SC meeting in order to seek consensus for amendment of the LFM.

Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize	Exit Strategy is not developed
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------

8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines²². Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories and provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework			
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management			
Implementation schedule	To adjust to the circumstances the project has been extended by 18 months and the workplan has been updated in accordance with the conclusions from the MTR.	Original NTE: 31/05/2023 Revised NTE: 31/05/2024	Project Steering Committee
Executing Entity			
Executing Entity Category			
Minor project objective change			
Safeguards			
Risk analysis	Annual risk analysis has been revised since inception		
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%			
Co-financing			
Location of project activity	Minor changes in size of area covered have been implemented and the project is in the process of adding the revised files in the FAO FERM platform		
Other minor project amendment (define)			

²² Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

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

Stakeholder name	Type of partnership	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government institutions			
Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture (MEPA)	Member of project SC, Member of Inter-Sectoral Coordination Working Group for pasturelands policy development (ISWG), overall project consultations	MEPA is actively involved in all project activities, including NPMPD validation workshop at national and regional levels, drafting of law on pasturelands management, pasturelands assessment and management planning at municipal level, validation of restoration measures and pilot activities. MEPA benefits from project capacity building activities.	
National Agency for Land Sustainable Management and Land Use Monitoring (NASLM)	Member of project SC, Member of ISWG, overall project consultations	NASLM is actively involved in all project activities, including NPMPD validation workshop at national and regional levels, drafting of law on pasturelands management, pasturelands assessment and management planning at municipal level, validation of restoration measures and pilot activities. NASLM benefits from project capacity building activities. A series of trainings on LDN is planned within the project to be provided to NASLM to strengthen capacity to support implementation of UNCCD requirements and LDN oriented sustainable land management	
Scientific-research center of Agriculture	consultations	Provides technical support for planning of restoration activities, in measurement of soil fertility and recommendations for improvement of soil quality through amendments of pilot pastures	
National Food Agency (Veterinary Department)	consultation's	Veterinary Department is involved and benefits from project capacity building activities.	
Agriculture Project's Management Agency	Member of ISWG	Involved in development and validation of NPMPD and pasturelands legislation	
Information-Consultation Centres at municipal and regional levels	consultations, technical support, Participants of capacity building activities	The ICCs are invited to participate in all the workshops, trainings and meetings held within the project. ICCs are involved in identification of demonstration sites, as well as planning of pilot activities, restoration measures, grazing capacity assessment and development of annual grazing objectives for pilot pasturelands, as well as in the capacity building trainings provided by the project	
Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure	Member of project SC, Member of ISWG, overall project consultations	MRDI participated in the NPMPD development and validation workshops, as ISWG member and member of Agriculture and Rural Intersectoral Coordination Council for Agriculture and Rural Development. Draft law on Pasturelands management will be actively consulted with MRDI, mainly regarding pasturelands management related responsibilities to be delegated to local municipalities.	
Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development (MESD)	Member of project SC, member of ISWG, consultations	MESD and NASP participated in the NPMPD development and validation workshops, as ISWG member. Draft law on Pasturelands management will be actively consulted with MESD and NASP, as responsible authorities on state owned pasturelands. The project works closely with	

		NASP on the issue of transferring the right of use of pilot pastures to target municipalities.	
Local government of the selected municipalities	Member of multi-stakeholder pasture management groups established in here target municipalities, consultations	The project reaches all municipalities (59 municipalities) of Georgia and administration of State Representatives in all regions (9 regions), as well as Adjara AR through NPMPD regional validation workshops (in total 10 workshops, 207 participants, 14% women). 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. Local governments of the target municipalities (Dmanisi, Gurjaani and Kazbegi) are regularly consulted on project pilot activities, including assessment and management planning of pastures at municipal level, planning and implementation of restoration measures, issues related to pilot pastures registration, categorisation and transfer of use rights to the municipalities.	
NGOs²³			
Georgian Farmers Association	consultations	Actively involved and consulted during NPMPD development and validation and drafting of legislation of pasturelands	
Association of shepherds	consultations	Actively involved and consulted during NPMPD development and validation and drafting of legislation of pasturelands	
Private sector entities			
Others²⁴			
Farmers, agro cooperatives,	consultations and involvement, Participants of capacity building activities	Farmers in target villages are closely involved in the planning and implementation of pilot pastures restoration activities. They are directly engaged in the introducing of the controlled grazing system as a pilot pasture restoration measure. The project regularly consulted farmers in the target villages, including the establishment of PUUs, grazing capacity assessment, planning of restoration measures, development of grazing calendars. It is expected that as a result at least 600 farmers and other stakeholders will be trained. From the beginning of the project until June 30, 648 people participated in the trainings.	Generally, representation of women on capacity building activities remains limited, due to the traditional gender division of tasks among the smallholders and hence limited participation of women in field herding of livestock. Due to this, share of women participation in the training is 20% instead of planed 30%

²³ Non-government organizations

²⁴ 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.	Y	Based on the work conducted both in municipalities and the overall situation relating to gender sensitivity, the project has analyzed the gaps that currently exist on community level, and this has been reflected throughout the project documents, meetings and workshops across the reporting period.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Y	At the execution stage, the project has made significant strides towards ensuring the creation of equal opportunities for both men and women. This is based on close cooperation with municipal GFPs, as the socioeconomic and gender sensitive approaches were introduced within each project activity.
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Y	<p>Promoting gender equality is a key focus of the project, with an aim to reduce gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources. Given that gender disparities can have significant socioeconomic consequences in this area, the project developed multiple approaches and initiatives to tackle these inequalities. The goal of these actions is to ensure comprehensive and effective measures are taken for promoting gender equality in this domain.</p> <p>Several key areas were targeted by the project to make notable contributions to gender equality. Ensuring that women have equal access to natural resources, in this case pastures/rangelands, was a primary focus. To do so, the project took deliberate measures, including customizing training and capacity building programs specifically for women. The project aims to narrow gender gaps by giving women the capacity to participate in policy development, natural resource management, livestock farming, dairy production, and other activities. This approach allowed women to engage in such activities with greater confidence.</p> <p>The project recognized that economic empowerment is crucial for gender equality in the agriculture field. Women were encouraged to engage in income generating activities relating to sustainable land and pasture management, dairy production practices and other economic activities, seen as the most viable in the pilot regions.</p>
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Y	<p>In close collaboration with the representatives of both local and national governments, during the reporting period the participation and empowerment of women decision makers has been a priority throughout the project implementation, drawing specific focus on empowering local and national stakeholders.</p> <p>The gender dimension was incorporated into all the activities carried out during this reporting period of the project, i.e. during planning, certification seminars, community meetings and on-the-job training. This project team aims to provide women with the necessary skills and information to actively participate in decision-making processes and resource management. By reducing information gaps and increasing awareness, the project is working to address gender disparities in access to and management of natural resources.</p> <p>Throughout the reporting period, the project actively advocated on policy and institutional levels to promote gender equality in pasture management. The project team has actively partnered with government departments, local government, and local communities to develop and implement tangible recommendations and actions on gender-sensitive policies and practices.</p>
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Y	<p>The project activities were carried out with special emphasis on the rights and needs of female pasture users, recognizing the importance of addressing their unique challenges and promoting gender equality in the management of natural resources.</p> <p>To this end, the project provided training opportunities for both men and women in pasture management and animal husbandry. These training programs were designed to provide the local population with the necessary knowledge and skills to participate effectively in pasture management and operations. By enhancing the capacity of women in these areas, the project aims to increase their confidence and decision-making capacity, hoping to enable them to actively participate in pasture-related activities and contribute to sustainable resource management.</p> <p>In total, the project has 424 direct beneficiaries in the villages of Sno, Naniani, Ganakhleba – out of which 47% are women. These women, as previously noted, are actively involved in livestock farming, production of dairy products, etc. Thus, will be greatly affected by the improved conditions and higher productivity of the cattle. Overall, the perception remains the same and woman's work in the households remains unseen.</p> <p>As for the indirect beneficiaries, there are a total of 961 in the villages, out of which 438 are women, totalling 46%. The increase in dairy production, livestock farming, etc. will positively affect the indirect beneficiaries, especially</p>

2023 Project Implementation Report

		<p>women, who are oftentimes in charge of running guesthouses, bakeries and other small-scale establishments. Access to better quality products, sustainably sourced food, is projected to attract socio-economic benefits in these communities.</p> <p>In addition, the project recognized that promoting the rights and needs of female pasture users would lead to social and economic benefits and services, especially for women. Women are being empowered to generate income and improve their economic independence using sustainable agricultural practices and livestock farming. The project aims to improve the social and economic empowerment of women welfare enhanced by supporting women's participation in income generation related to pasture resources.</p>
<p>M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The project has made efforts to meet its gender targets by ensuring the participation and representation of women in various meetings and workshops. The statistics provided indicate the number of participants in each meeting, categorized by gender. By analysing these numbers, we can assess the project's progress in promoting gender equality in its activities.</p> <p>The project demonstrated its commitment to gender equality by actively involving women in key consultations and decision-making processes. For example, during the Consultative Meeting with the Land Melioration and Land Management Department on September 9, 2022, out of the five participants, two were women. This signifies a balanced representation and shows that the project recognized the importance of women's perspectives in discussions related to natural resource management.</p> <p>Furthermore, the NPMPD presentation and discussion with high-level decision makers of the MEPA on October 31, 2022, saw an equal representation of both men and women, with seven participants of each gender. This demonstrates the project's effort to ensure gender parity at influential levels, thereby fostering a more inclusive and equitable decision-making process.</p> <p>In some instances, women's participation outnumbered men's participation, indicating the project's success in engaging women stakeholders. For instance, during the ISCWG seventh meeting / NPMPD national validation workshop on December 9, 2022, 15 out of the 33 participants were women. Similarly, at the NPMPD national validation workshop on December 21, 2022, women constituted 20 out of the 34 participants. These figures reflect a strong presence and active involvement of women, enabling them to contribute effectively to the project's objectives.</p> <p>The project also ensured the inclusion of women at the local community level. For instance, during the Kazbegi municipal multi-stakeholder group meeting on September 13, 2022, seven out of the 17 participants were women. Similarly, at the Gurjaani municipal multi-stakeholder group meeting on September 15, 2022, four out of the 18 participants were women. These numbers indicate the project's efforts to engage women pasture users at the grassroots level, acknowledging their rights and needs in the management of pasturelands.</p> <p>While the project made commendable efforts to promote gender equality, there were instances where women's participation was relatively lower than men.</p> <p>For instance, during the on-job training for local beneficiaries in conducting grazing capacity analyses and planning of village and participatory planning of pasture/grassland restoration measures, held in villages Ganakhleba, Naniani, and Sno, women's participation was encouraged, but the real picture was quite different: out of 45 participants in the four villages, only 9 were women. While the project is committed to raising awareness and ensuring equal participation, the overall picture and the existing pre-conceptions play a large role in the success of the action. Based on the above, the project actively continues to work with local women and municipal GFPs to encourage equal participation.</p> <p>For example, out of 207 participants attending the 10 National Pastureland Sustainable Management Policy Document Validation workshops, only 14% were women. This indicates the low involvement of women in local political activities on a policy level. The project recognizes these discrepancies and continues working towards ensuring a more balanced representation in all activities.</p>
<p>Staff with gender expertise</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>All staff involved in the project are fully familiarized with the project's gender action plan, ensuring that the objectives and strategies for promoting gender equality are fully understood. In addition, staff have valuable experience in implementing gender-sensitive projects, enabling them to effectively integrate gender considerations into all aspects of project operations. This pool of knowledge and expertise empowers the project team to implement a gender-sensitive lens, ensuring that gender equality is prioritized and integrated into all project interventions and outcomes.</p>
<p>Any other good practices on gender</p>		<p>The project has further continued to incorporate gender sensitive actions into daily operations, including but not limited to planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. In addition to developing gender-sensitive approaches to ensure meaningful and representative participation of women in decision-making processes, consultation and capacity building in practice, the collected data was disaggregated by gender and analyses were done to identify potential gender gaps or differences to effectively monitor ongoing progress</p>

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.	At the commencement of the LOA, CENN convened a detailed <i>public awareness raising and outreach plan</i> for project component 3, covering LDN and sustainable pasture management. Plan includes list of activities, target audience, communication channel and tools, indicators, key messages to be communicated to the target audience. (Appendix 19)
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year .	Media outreach activities has been carried out to highlight NPMPD development process and the results of the national validation workshops: 1. Facebook posts were developed on each activity, published to social media (FB) and 2. Press releases on each activity were developed and published via RECC website. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshops dedicated to the NPMPD validation were highlighted on websites of MEPA and Parliament of Georgia; • 110 articles devoted to the NPMPD were published by popular media; • Two telecasts devoted to the NPMPD were published by popular media. (links in appendix 20).
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 available for this PIR.
Please provide links to related website, social media account	https://www.youtube.com/@cenn4023 https://environment.cenn.org/ https://www.facebook.com/ThinkNaturally
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	In total, from the beginning of the project 8 knowledge material (2 guidelines and 6 video materials) are developed and disseminated. During the reporting period 1 video course on <i>Animal welfare and non-communicable diseases</i> is developed and uploaded on CENN’s YouTube channel (Appendix 13)
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point’s name and contact details	RECC Caucasus

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.

No applicable

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁵	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ²⁶	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023	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	3,456,000	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
Beneficiaries	Municipality of Kazbegi	In-kind	300,000	-	-	300,000
CSO	REC Caucasus (RECC)	Grant	700,000	436,000	436,000	700,000
Donor agency	GIZ	Grant	500,000	-	-	500,000
CSO	CENN	Grant	350,000	314,095	20,851	349,095
Other	Government of Turkey	In-kind	50,000	-	-	50,000
TOTAL			12,245,000	4,206,095	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?

Differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement is caused by following reasons:

1. Due to Covid-19 some projects implemented by CENN changed the scope of work and activities
2. During the period 2020-2023 CENN started new projects to build cooperation and attract co-financing
3. In the process of collaborating with some projects, there were identified more cohesions and opportunities for cooperation, which allowed us to increase co-financing from these projects than expected.

²⁵Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

²⁶Grant, Loan, Equity Investment, Guarantee, In-Kind, Public Investment, Other (please refer to the *Guidelines on co-financing* for definitions

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_FI_GN_01_Cofinancing_Guidelines_2018.pdf

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

Annex 2.**GEO LOCATION INFORMATION**

Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap](#) or [GeoNames](#) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#).

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location & Activity Description
Kazbegi, Sno	42.60762	44.63997	611853	
Dmanisi Ganakhleba	41.48737	44.11136	614598	
Gurjaani, Naniani	41.665	45.70444	612764	

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate.