

A. GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION	
Country	Armenia
Region	NEN
Grant Title	Sustainable Land Management For Increased Productivity In Armenia (SLMIP) Infrastructure and Rural Finance Support Programme (IRFSP)
Associated GEF Programme or Framework (FSP/MSP/IP/EA)	FSP
Grant Type (select one from GEF Trust Fund, LDCF, SCCF)	GEF TF
<b>Reference numbers</b>	
PIR Implementation Status (1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 4 <sup>th</sup> , Final)	Final (8 <sup>th</sup> )
GEF ID Number	8005
IFAD Grant Agreement	
<b>GEF Focal Area and Programme</b>	
GEF Focal Area <sup>1</sup>	Land degradation
<b>Critical milestones</b>	
GEF CEO endorsement of FSP and approval of MSP	20/11/2015
IFAD approval date	30/11/2015
Actual implementation start date	29/07/2016
Last supervision mission date	17-28/11/2022
Actual Mid-Term Evaluation date	18/11/2018-04/12/2018
Expected project completion date	28 February 2023
Expected financial closure date (6 months after effective completion)	31/03/2023
<b>Grant Financing (USD)</b>	
GEF Project Preparation Grant (PPG) amount	USD 73,060
GEF grant amount	USD 3,937,500
Total GEF financing (PPG + Grant amount)	USD 4,010,560
First disbursement date	29 November 2016
GEF grant disbursed (as at 30 June of FY)	USD 3,937,500
GEF grant spent (as at 30 June of FY)	USD 3,937,500
Proposed co-financing (as at CEO Endorsement)	USD 29,473,000
Actual co-financing secured (may be different from co-financing proposed at CEO endorsement)	USD 52,910,791
Actual co-financing disbursed (as at 30 June of FY)	USD 47,346,000
Actual co-financing spent (as at 30 June of FY)	USD 47,346,000
GEF Project Preparation Grant (PPG) amount	Mentioned above
<b>Project contact</b>	
Name	Mr. A Vardanyan, Mr. G.Janoyan, Mr. V.Harutyunyan
Email	ashotvardanyan@raed.am, grigorjanoyan@raed.am, vaheharutyunyan@raed.am

<sup>1</sup> Select one among the following: Biodiversity; Climate Change; Land Degradation; International Waters; Chemicals and Waste; Multifocal area; Impact Programs.

<b>B. CONTRIBUTIONS TO INNOVATION and LESSONS LEARNED</b>	
1. Information on progress, challenge and outcomes regarding engagement of stakeholders in the projects/program based on the description included in the Stakeholders Engagement Plan or equivalent documentation submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval	Local stakeholders have been involved in all activities. For 2022-2023, land restoration activities were executed in close coordination with the Ministry of Environment and other relevant stakeholders for selection of the sites and methods.
2. Information on progress on gender-responsive measures and intermediate gender result areas as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval including gender-sensitive indicators contained in the project results framework or gender action plan or equivalent.	<p>The programme as a whole has implemented a gender action plan and a gender and social inclusion specialist was recruited to coordinate the work related to gender equity and women's empowerment. The IRFSP design was also updated at MTR to increase the focus on women's inclusion through 50% outreach quota for women headed households in W1 activities and 30% in W2 activities that are both funded by SLMIP.</p> <p>In line with the graduation program, W1 primarily targeted women, focusing on gender mainstreaming. Under W1, trainings on good agricultural practices were delivered to women and other vulnerable groups, complemented by the provision of start-up packages.</p> <p>In order to increase access to finance for women, financial literacy and business skills trainings were provided through the GEF grant. However, despite project efforts, delays related to the conflict and the inherited effects of COVID19 pandemic resulted in limited female outreach.</p>
3. Progress on the implementation of the project's KM approach approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval	<p>Knowledge transfer activities are primarily related to W1 project outcomes within the same signed contract, including proper trainings for (pre/to be) identified beneficiaries by the W1 subcontractor. After receiving their start-up package, selected beneficiaries were trained and mentored on technical issues, farm management, land conservation technologies, etc. depending on the package they applied for (beekeeping, fruit drying or sustainable vegetable and orchards production).</p> <p>Two main KM products were developed through the GEF grant, including a study on Land Degradation in Armenia and a video on SLMIP's Impact (2021) (<a href="https://youtu.be/t0UYCMu8rko">https://youtu.be/t0UYCMu8rko</a>)</p>

C. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS	
<b>Implementation Progress Rating (IP)</b> Based on progress made for the given reporting period (HS/S/MS/MU/U or HU)	MS
<b>Information on progress, challenges and outcomes on project implementation activities</b>  <i>Achievements and impact to date – if applicable</i>	<p><b><u>Progress:</u></b></p> <p>A total of 220 ha of land were restored during the reporting period (25% of final target). The final target at design of 880 ha was overestimated considering the resources available.</p> <p><b><u>Challenges:</u></b></p> <p>The conflict and COVID19 epidemics severely affected the implementation of activities, causing important delays. Land restoration activities could only be implemented in the last year of the project due to several discussions with the Ministry of Environment and need for redesign.</p> <p><b><u>Outcomes on project implementation activities:</u></b></p> <p>220 ha of land were restored during the last year of implementation. Despite this progress, the financial sustainability of land restoration interventions is hindered by gaps in funding for monitoring and maintenance of the afforested area.</p>
<b>Recommendations to improve progress</b>	N/A

	IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)
<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS):</b>	Implementation of <b>all</b> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
<b>Satisfactory (S):</b>	Implementation of <b>most</b> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that is subject to remedial action.
<b>Marginally Satisfactory (MS):</b>	Implementation of <b>some</b> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with <b>some</b> components requiring remedial action.
<b>Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU):</b>	Implementation of <b>some</b> components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with <b>most</b> components requiring remedial action.

<b>Unsatisfactory (U):</b>	Implementation of <b>most</b> components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):</b>	Implementation of <b>none</b> of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

D. DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE RATING	
<b>Development objective Rating (DO)</b> Based on the likelihood that by the end of the project, implementation will achieve its stated objectives (HS/S/MS/MU/U or HU)	MS
<b>Development Progress (DO)</b>  <i>Achievements and impact to date – if applicable</i>	<p>The restructuring done to SLMIP at MTR was crucial to execute the activities and ensure their relevance to the project objectives. The restructuring also allowed the project to increase its focus on women and youth.</p> <p>The distribution of start-up packages has contributed to increasing the resilience and generating income for women. Due to the economic conditions resulting from the COVID-19 impact, 313 beneficiaries withdrew from window 2 due to the inability of taking loans. However, the provision of grants has helped in reaching more beneficiaries and contributed to the uptake of sustainable farming in the target areas.</p> <p>The delays in the Community-led Land Restoration sub-component have negatively affected the project's ability to timely reach the objective of improving land conditions and land management in the target areas. However, a restoration of 220ha has allowed to partially reaching the objective.</p>
<i>Recommendations to improve DO</i>	N/A

	DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE (DO)
<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS):</b>	Project is expected to achieve or exceed <b>all</b> its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”
<b>Satisfactory (S):</b>	Project is expected to achieve <b>most</b> of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
<b>Marginally Satisfactory (MS):</b>	Project is expected to achieve <b>most</b> of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve <b>some</b> of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.
<b>Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU):</b>	Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only <b>some</b> of its major global environmental objectives.
<b>Unsatisfactory (U):</b>	Project is expected <b>not</b> to achieve <b>most</b> of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):</b>	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, <b>any</b> of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

E. KEY RISKS	
<b>Overall risk level</b>	Based on the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives (H/S/M o L) – See table 3 for rating criteria M (due to land restoration component only) NO risk for the other components.
<i>List key risks and measures implemented to resolve it</i>	
<i>Recommendations to reduce risk level</i>	

<b>High Risk (H)</b>	There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
<b>Substantial Risk (S)</b>	There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.
<b>Modest Risk (M)</b>	There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks.
<b>Lowest Risk (L)</b>	There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks.

<b>F. MEASURING FOR RESULTS</b> <i>As defined to the Annual Work Plan (AWP)</i>		
<b>Main indicators</b>	<b>Target 2022-2023 AWP</b>	<b>Results in 2023</b>
220 ha of land restored	Restore 220 ha of degraded land	220 ha restored.
Add more rows as necessary		

<b>G. For LDCF and SCCF projects only, please complete the following table</b>		
<b>Indicators<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Tick if applicable</b>	<b>Enter number</b>  Please provide cumulative total achieved from the inception
Total number of direct beneficiaries ( <u>enter a number</u> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Ha of land better managed to withstand the effects of climate change ( <u>enter a number</u> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	
No. of risk and vulnerability assessments, and other relevant scientific and technical assessments carried out and updated ( <u>enter a number</u> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	
No. of people trained to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and/or evaluate adaptation strategies and measures ( <u>enter a number</u> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	
No. of regional, national and sub-national institutions with strengthened capacities to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and/or evaluate adaptation strategies and measures ( <u>enter a number</u> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Contribute towards public awareness of climate change impacts, vulnerability and adaption ( <u>Tick if relevant</u> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Expand access to improved climate information services ( <u>Tick if relevant</u> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Expand access to improved climate related early-warning information ( <u>Tick if relevant</u> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	
No. of regional, national and sector-wide policies, plans and processes developed or strengthened to identify, prioritize and integrate adaptation strategies and measures ( <u>enter a number</u> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	
No. of sub-national plans and processes developed or strengthened to identify, prioritize and integrate adaptation strategies and measures ( <u>enter a number</u> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	

<sup>2</sup>Following the GEF guidance on results and indicators, please provide the whole results from the GEF project, which is made up of GEF financing as well as co-financing.

#### **H. DOCUMENTS**

Please refer to the project completion report providing detailed information and account of project results and lessons learned.

### I. GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

The 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](https://openstreetmap.org/) or [GeoNames](https://www.geonames.org/) 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 Description	Activity Description

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



### J. MINOR AMENDMENTS

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope as described in Annex 9 of the Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines.

Each user selects any minor amendment that happened to a project during the latest fiscal year and provides a description of the minor amendment in a narrative format as appropriate in the related textbox. Users may also attach supporting documents as appropriate within the PIR module.

Select the boxes below and give some explanation to why you ticked it.

Minor Amendment	Explanation
• <input type="checkbox"/> Results Framework	
• <input type="checkbox"/> Components And Cost	
• <input type="checkbox"/> Institutional And Implementation Arrangements	
• <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Management	
• <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Schedule	Extension of completion date to 28 February 2023.
• <input type="checkbox"/> Executing Entity	
• <input type="checkbox"/> Executing Entity Category	
• <input type="checkbox"/> Minor Project Objective Change	
• <input type="checkbox"/> Safeguards	
• <input type="checkbox"/> Risk Analysis	
• <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Of GEF Project Financing Up To 5%	
• <input type="checkbox"/> Co Financing	
• <input type="checkbox"/> Location Of Project Activity	
• <input type="checkbox"/> Others	