

## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

### 2022 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

## Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA .....	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE) .....	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	10
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS .....	19
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS) .....	23
6. RISKS .....	25
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION (ONLY FOR PROJECTS THAT HAVE CONDUCTED AN MTR) .....	28
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS .....	29
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	30
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING.....	32
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES .....	34
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT .....	38
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE.....	39

## 1. Basic Project Data

### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	RAP
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Afghanistan
<b>Project Title:</b>	Community-based sustainable land and forest management in Afghanistan
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP/AFG/084/GFF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	9285
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Land degradation (LD1, Programme 2)</i></li> <li>• <i>Biodiversity (BD 4, Programme 9)</i></li> <li>• <i>Climate change mitigation (CCM 2, Programme 4)</i></li> <li>• <i>Sustainable forest management (SFM 3, Programme 7)</i></li> </ul>
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock (MAIL) / General Directorate of Natural Resources Management-(DDNRM); Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development (MRRD); National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA); Independent General Directorate of Kuchis (IGDK) <sup>1</sup>
<b>Project Duration (years):</b>	6 years
<b>Project coordinates:</b>	34°33'21.46"N 69°12'50.36"E

### Project Dates

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	25 April 2018
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD:</b>	26 August 2018
<b>Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>2</sup>:</b>	25 August 2024
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if approved) <sup>3</sup></b>	N/A
	N/A

### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	USD 10 495 873
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>4</sup>:</b>	USD 54 257 233
<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)<sup>5</sup>:</b>	4 271 385

<sup>1</sup> Please note for the purpose of this report, any mention of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and/or line entities are in reference to the government in office before August 2021.

<sup>2</sup> As per FPMIS

<sup>3</sup> If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF CU.

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

<sup>5</sup> For DEX projects, the GEF Coordination Unit will confirm the final amount with the Finance Division in HQ. For OPIM projects, the disbursement amount should be provided by Execution Partners.

<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>11,679,568</b>
--	-------------------

---

<sup>6</sup> Please refer to the section 12 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

**M&E Milestones**

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:</b>	N/A
<b>Expected Mid-term Review date<sup>7</sup>:</b>	November, 2022
<b>Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):</b>	June-November 2022
<b>Expected Terminal Evaluation Date<sup>8</sup>:</b>	May/June 2024
<b>Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)</b>	No

**Overall ratings**

<b>Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):</b>	<i>Satisfactory</i>
<b>Overall implementation progress rating:</b>	<i>Satisfactory</i>
<b>Overall risk rating:</b>	<i>Low</i>

**ESS risk classification**

<b>Current ESS Risk classification:</b>	<i>Low risk</i>
---	-----------------

**Status**

<b>Implementation Status (1<sup>st</sup> PIR, 2<sup>nd</sup> PIR, etc. Final PIR):</b>	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR
--	---------------------

**Project Contacts**

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Mohammad Ajmal Rahimy	<a href="mailto:mohammad.rahimy@fao.org">mohammad.rahimy@fao.org</a>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Richard Trenchard, FAOR Afghanistan	<a href="mailto:richard.trenchard@fao.org">richard.trenchard@fao.org</a>
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Illias Animon, Forestry Officer Shono, Kenichi, HQ Forestry Officer	<a href="mailto:Illias.Animon@fao.org">Illias.Animon@fao.org</a> <a href="mailto:kenichi.shono@fao.org">kenichi.shono@fao.org</a>
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	Yurie Naito, Technical Officer	<a href="mailto:Yurie.Naito@fao.org">Yurie.Naito@fao.org</a>

<sup>7</sup> The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> The Terminal Evaluation date should be discussed with OED 6 months before the project's NTE date.

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

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

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 <sup>9</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term Target <sup>10</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>11</sup> since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating <sup>12</sup>
	<b>Outcome 1.1</b> Enhanced capacity of national and sub-national government institutions across all sectors for SLM/SFM	Increased capacities of MAIL/DAIL NRM and other relevant government institutions and staff to plan for and implement SLM/SFM	Baseline scores for capacity on: • Institutional, policy and legal framework for SLM/SFM: 2.7 • Planning, implementation, and M&E of SLM/SFM measures: 2.8 Community engagement on SLM/SFM: 2.5	Mid-term milestone scores for capacity on: • Institutional, policy and legal framework for SLM/SFM: 3.0 • Planning, implementation, and M&E of	Target scores for capacity on: • Institutional, policy and legal framework for SLM/SFM: 3.2 • Planning, implementation, and M&E of SLM/SFM measures: 3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has enhanced capacities of 54 government staff from MAIL, MRRD, NEPA and IGDK on institutional policy and legal framework for SLM/SFM, 158 staff on planning implementation and M&amp;E of SLM/SFM measures, as well as 101 staff on community involvement on SLM/SFM</li> <li>Three government officials were trained on forest policy in Malaysia</li> <li>Ten staff members from Rangeland Directorate, Forest Directorate, and other executive partners were trained on REDD+ readiness roadmap</li> </ul>	S

<sup>9</sup> This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

<sup>10</sup> 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.

<sup>11</sup> Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic Co-benefits as well.

<sup>12</sup> 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)**.

				SLM/SFM measures: 3.0 Community engagement on SLM/SFM: 2.8	Community engagement on SLM/SFM: 3.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>National Consultation workshops on Forest Inventory, Rangeland Inventory in Afghanistan conducted.</li><li>Animal Husbandry, and Improved Livestock Management Practices training were conducted and enhance the capacities of 105 individuals including 57 government staff and 48 members from other counterparts</li><li>Enhance the capacities of 101 government staff mainly from National Environment Protection Agency (NEPA), Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development (MRRD), Independent General Directorate of Kochi's (IGDK), Directorate of Women Affairs (DoWA) and Provincial Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock (PAIL) on preparation and implementation of Community-based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) Plans</li><li>Established and well equipped 46 Forest Management Association (FMA) in Kunar, Paktya and Badghis and 15 Rangeland Management Associations (RMA) in Ghazni, Badghis and Bamyan provinces</li></ul>	
<b>Outcome 1.2.</b> Enhanced capacity of local communities in Badghis, Bamyan, Ghazni, Kunar and Paktya provinces for developing and implementing	Number of Community Development Committees, Forest Management Committees and Rangeland Social	Zero	At least 10 Community Development Committees, Forest Management Committees and/or Rangeland Social	At least 10 Community Development Committees, Forest Management Committees and/or Rangeland Social	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The project has established 61 FMAs/RMAs in existing CDCs and DDAs and consequently enhanced capacities of 304 executive members of FMAs/RMAs and 2609 regular member and local community members.</li><li>Enhanced the capacity of 46 FMAs and 15 RMAs members in the preparation, implementation, and monitoring of CBNRM plans and interventions</li></ul>	S	

	community based SLM/SFM plans	Associations trained		Associations trained	Associations trained	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similarly, enhance the capacity of 328 FMA members including 24 government staff on the establishment, operation, and maintenance of home-based nursery for the production of HCVFs species saplings in the provinces of Paktya and Kunar.</li> <li>Enhanced capacity of 2,811 community members including 659 women and 202 local government staff on CBNRM plan preparation &amp; implementation, backyard poultry farm management, poultry coops construction, feeding, medication &amp; vaccination and egg production, seed cultivation and land preparation practices, small scale woodlots establishment and management, pistachio &amp; Ferula (agriculture best practice) plantation and cultivation, agroforestry practices and its contribution to rural livelihoods, sustainable rangeland management, FMA/RMA formation, and introduction to the concept of Pastoralist field school in the targeted provinces</li> </ul>	
	<b>Outcome 2.1</b> Improved management of 10,000 ha of HCVFs and 20,000 ha of other forest types to increase biodiversity conservation and	Area of forest resources restored in the landscape, supported by forest management actors, training and materials	Zero ha	2,000 ha of HCVFs and 4,000 ha of other forest types restored	10,000 ha of HCVFs and 20,000 ha of other forest types restored	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>13,250 ha of HCVF has been restored through 5,122 ha of afforestation/reforestation and 8,128 ha of HCVFs improved management practices Paktya, Kunar and Badghis provinces to increase biodiversity conservation and carbon sequestration.</li> <li>Furthermore, 409 ha of other forest types has been restored though</li> </ul>	HS

	sequester 1,530,069 tCO <sub>2</sub> e in Badghis, Kunar and Paktya provinces	[from GEF Indicator 5 – SFM3 Pr7]				<p>establishment of woodlots/shelterbelts and plantation of fruit and non-fruit tree saplings as agroforestry with mixed crops.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As per the project log-frame, HC VF is overachieved. Though opportunities for restoration of other forest types are limited in Kunar and Paktya provinces therefore, the progress so far on this is around 10%. The project has a good potential in Badghis province to restore other forest types. Since the field work is accessible in Badghis province, the project will consider this activity in future.</li> </ul>	
	<b>Outcome 3.1</b> Climate-resilient SLM practices implemented across 200,000 ha of degraded rangelands in Badghis, Bamyan and Ghazni provinces	Land area under effective agricultural, rangeland and pastoral management practices and/or supporting climate-smart agriculture [GEF Indicator 1.1 – LD1 Pr2]	Zero ha	At least 50,000 ha of rangelands under rangeland and pastoral management practices.	At least 200,000 ha of rangelands under rangeland and pastoral management practices.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A total of 116,799 ha of degraded rangeland has been restored through improved management practices mainly rotational grazing and quarantine as well as through reseeding of rainfed Alfa-alfa and other local grasses in the targeted provinces.</li> <li>To ensure sustainability of rangeland restoration and have sufficient time after completion of the set target this outcome is overachieved.</li> </ul>	HS
	<b>Outcome 4.1.</b> Improved knowledge to inform planning and implementation of SLM/SFM practices	Improved capacity for knowledge management on SLM/SFM	Baseline score for capacity for knowledge management on SLM/SFM: 2.6	Mid-term milestone score for capacity for knowledge management on SLM/SFM: 2.8	Target score for capacity for knowledge management on SLM/SFM: 3.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>514 awareness raising sessions were conducted, in which 12,732 individuals including 3,889 women actively participated. These awareness raising campaigns were carried out under the titles of forests and its importance, direct plantation of pistachio seeds and land preparations, importance of NRM and avoid deforestation,</li> </ul>	S

						<p>advantages of FEC, poultry management, natural resources management, pasture management and soil erosion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project conducted same campaigns as in 2021 in newly selected sites as well as some new features such as biodiversity conservation in Pistachio forests, importance and values of forests in human life, carbon emission, climate change under different FMAs/RMAs.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

### 3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs <sup>13</sup>	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (As per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements <sup>14</sup> (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>15</sup> in delivering outputs
<b>Output 1.1.1.</b> National 'Centre of Excellence for Natural Resource Management' established for coordinating the capacity development and knowledge management on SLM/SFM at all levels	Existence of MoU, organogram, methodology and sustainability strategy for 'Centre of Excellence for NRM'	Set up a MoU between FAO, MAIL/NRM and other relevant institutions for establishing a 'Centre of Excellence for NRM' within host institution such as MAIL/NRM according to the provisions of the methodology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed discussions on the establishment of CoE, particularly on developing financial and operational strategies for the approved concept of CoE were conducted with GD-NRM. DG-NRM has recommended to start procurement of tools and equipment for establishment of CoE and withhold developing the financial and operational strategies for now.</li> <li>The project team together with GD-NRM finalized the list of tools and equipment's and the procurement is under progress. Discussed and suggested to establish and operationalize CoE at project base and will be transitioned to MAIL/NRM when the political situation is stabilized.</li> </ul>	Not planned in this reporting period
<b>Output 1.1.2.</b> Training programme developed and delivered to national and sub-national government officials on land degradation assessment	Existence of a long-term capacity building programme and a training package outlining modules	Develop a long-term capacity building programme in local languages that details materials required for training government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participatory rural appraisal (PRA) training manual, natural resource management manual, rangeland management training manual, threats causing forest degradation and benefits of sustainable forest management</li> </ul>	One national event and 27 provincial events were conducted during this reporting period. One national and three provincial events will be conducted by end of this year.

<sup>13</sup> Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

<sup>14</sup> 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)

<sup>15</sup> Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

and planning for integrated SLM/SFM, including mainstreaming of SLM/SFM into sectoral planning and budgeting processes	and course material  Number of people trained (% women)	officials at the national, provincial and district levels on mainstreaming SLM/SFM principles into planning and budgeting processes - 30 events at provincial level and 2 events at national level	manual and threats causing rangeland degradation and benefits of sustainable rangeland management manual, Agroforestry manual are prepared, finalized, and translated into local languages are being utilized.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>750 individuals including 156 women were trained through conducting 27 different training sessions at provincial, district FMA/RMA and community levels.</li> </ul>	
<b>Output 1.1.3.</b> Fine-scale inventory of forest and rangeland resources – including ecosystem goods/services, rangeland/forest condition and socio-ecological resilience – undertaken for Badghis, Bamyān, Ghazni, Kunar and Paktya provinces	Existence of a forest/ rangeland inventory for each target province	Develop a nationwide methodology for conducting fine scale - inventory for forest, rangeland, and carbon measurement (Draft for field piloting), Develop a training programme on the methodology for conducting fine-scale inventories at both the national and provincial level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The international consultants are recruited to conduct forest and rangeland inventory and biodiversity assessment in targeted areas. First draft of methodology for rangeland inventory is prepared and circulated for review and methodology for forest inventory and biodiversity assessment is in progress. Similarly, biodiversity assessment guideline is prepared. Field data collection consultants are hired for conducting field surveys and field data collection. A work plan for conducting fine-scale inventory of forest and rangeland is developed and implementation is under progress. Training program is developed for the project staff to be delivered by the international consultant for conducting fine-scale inventory.</li> <li>Furthermore, all the required equipment/tools are procured for forest and rangeland inventory data collection.</li> </ul>	Draft methodology is prepared, and the training will be delivered in once the methodology is finalized.
<b>Output 1.1.4.</b> National REDD+ Readiness Roadmap – including provisions for a national MRV system – formulated	Existence of REDD+ Readiness Roadmap document with provisions for	Technical working group formation for REDD+;  Resource materials on local-level planning, implementation, and	Not planned for this reporting period	Most of the technical working group members are no more available in country. Operation and maintenance of this activity may not be possible with de-facto authorities.

	national MRV system	M&E for SLM/SFM developed, based on the LADA-WOCAT and other relevant tools.  Workshop on social and environmental safeguard (6 workshop)		Materials are prepared and workshops will take place in third /fourth quarter
<b>Output 1.2.1</b> Resource materials on local-level planning, implementation, and M&E for SLM/SFM developed, based on the LADA-WOCAT and other relevant tools	Number of resource materials on SLM/SFM tailored to local socio-economic and environmental conditions	Deliver training to local communities on participatory community-based approaches to planning and implementation of SFM/SLM and distribute toolkits (30 events)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CBNRM Planning and implementation manuals for sustainable land and forest management were distributed to FMA/RMA and local community for their further reference and operations.</li> <li>• Associated trainings were delivered at district and community levels. Participatory M&amp;E approaches jointly with provincial, district and community level were conducted.</li> </ul> <p>Agroforestry manual, participatory rural appraisal (PRA) training manual, natural resource management manual, rangeland management training manual, threats causing forest degradation and benefits of sustainable forest management manual and threats causing rangeland degradation and benefits of sustainable rangeland management manual are prepared, finalized and are being utilized.</p>	The training are delivered at FMA/RMA and district level in all 5 provinces.
<b>Output 1.2.2</b> Training provided to local-level technical government staff on facilitation of community-based planning and M&E for SLM/SFM as well as best practices for inter alia animal husbandry, rangeland management, forest conservation and sustainable resource use	Number of local-level technical government staff members trained (% women)	Conduct training for NRM technical officers to enable them to use toolkits and other tools on SLM LADA, WOCAT (6 events, one in National and 5 in Province) -The consultant will prepare the module and deliver a ToT training to the government staff,	<p>As per capacity need assessment conducted during project formulation phase and updated by the project team, a total of 669 individuals including 156 women and government staff were trained in 21 different training sessions at provincial, district FMA/RMA and community levels during this reporting period. Following are the main trainings delivered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CBNRM plan preparation and development.</li> <li>• Community based forest and rangeland management laws and regulations.</li> </ul>	Basic M&E training were delivered, however, detailed technical trainings and toolkits will be developed and conducted by M&E specialist

		different executive partner in Kabul and cascade the training to provincial level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participatory rural appraisal.</li> <li>• Forest inventory and its instruments.</li> <li>• Non-timber forest product assessment.</li> <li>• Forest carbon emission and measurement.</li> <li>• Participatory forest and rangeland monitoring.</li> <li>• Sustainable land and forest management.</li> <li>• FMA/RMA establishment.</li> <li>• Animal husbandry and rotational grazing.</li> </ul> <p>Furthermore, a technical TOT training on “Conservation and sustainable use of natural resources” was delivered to 19 project staff and the same training was conducted in each targeted province.</p>	
<b>Output 1.2.3.</b> Awareness-raising campaign conducted on community-based and gender-sensitive SLM/SFM planning, implementation, and M&E	Number of awareness-raising activities undertaken, disaggregated by type and theme	<p>Update and develop awareness-raising campaign materials (e.g., posters, brochures, booklets, video, and radio broadcast messages) in local languages to raise awareness on importance and benefits of SFM practices.</p> <p>Conduct awareness-raising campaign at provincial and district level to raise awareness on the benefits and importance of SFM/SLM practices (30 events- at least 6 events/ province)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 348 awareness raising sessions had been conducted, and 8,161 individuals including 2,508 women actively participated. These awareness raising campaigns were carried out with the topics of; forests and its importance, direct plantation of pistachio seeds and land preparations, importance of NRM and avoid deforestation, advantages of FEC, poultry management, natural resources management, pasture management and soil erosion.</li> <li>• The project has also produced 25 different audio messages about the conservation of natural resource specifically (forest and rangeland) and based on broadcasting schedule all the messages were disseminated through local radio channels in all five targeted provinces for the duration of 6 month.</li> <li>• Furthermore, for best project visibility project brochures, flyer, booklets, pen, notebook, USB pen drives, wall and stand banners and tea mugs as well as 63 sign boards containing project name, FAO and GEF logo and project interventions for all</li> </ul>	<p>Materials developed</p> <p>Planned awareness raising campaign conducted in all five provinces.</p>

			63 FMAs/RMAs have been printed and installed in each FMA/RMA relevant area. Moreover, 80 sign boards for 80 reservoirs have been printed and installed in each reservoir. The project interventions were also disseminated from FAO and other project stockholder's social media links such as Facebook and tweeter, there have been 21 posts in this regard (All the links are available in section 11).	
<b>Output 1.2.4.</b> Community Development Committees (CDCs), Forest Management Associations (FMAs) and Rangeland Management Associations (RMAs) supported to develop participatory, community-based and gender-responsive SLM/SFM plans	Number of community-based and gender-responsive SLM/SFM plans developed	Develop and update training material and packages for CDCs, FMAs on developing community-based plans for SFM/ /SLM 14characterization of rangeland, forest and other natural resources relevant to communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All the established FMAs/RMAs are regularly receiving technical assistance and support on preparation and implementation of CBNRM plans and interventions. Currently all FMAs and RMAs have been engaged in implementation of CBNRM interventions in their respective targeted areas.</li> </ul>	All province CBNRM plans are updated
<b>Output 1.2.5.</b> Pastoralist field schools conducted on livestock husbandry and community-based rangeland management/SLM practices	Number of pastoralists trained (% women)	<p>Pastoralist field school's methodological framework and manual and translate to local language.</p> <p>ToT for Community mobilizer and Government staff in the province on Pastoralist field school.</p> <p>Pastoralist field schools (28 sessions) to male and female members of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eight pastoralist field school (PFS) were established in the province of Ghazni, these PFS are established for the purpose of livestock husbandry and sustainable land management practices. The PFS methodical framework is finalized and translated into local language and distributed to the provincial staff for implementation.</li> </ul>	<p>PFS methodological framework prepared, presented, and translated into local languages.</p> <p>ToT at RMAs and district al level conducted.</p> <p>15 sessions conducted and the remaining 13 will be conducted until end of the year.</p> <p>15 PFSs awareness and training program conducted.</p>

		<p>RMA (Including, books, toolkits etc.)</p> <p>Undertake pastoralist field schools making use of the newly-developed awareness and training programme</p>		
<b>Output 2.1.1.</b> Biodiversity assessments undertaken in HCVFs in Kunar and Paktya provinces	Number of biodiversity assessments conducted in Kunar and Paktya provinces	<p>Finalize methodology for bio- diversity assessment</p> <p>Bio- diversity assessment in Kunar and Paktya province.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The international consultant was hired, and biodiversity assessment manual prepared. Field data collection consultants were hired for performing the actual field data collection. A work plan for conducting biodiversity assessment was developed and implementation has been under progress. Training program was developed for the project staff to be delivered by the international consultant for conducting biodiversity assessment.</li> <li>Furthermore, all the required equipment/tools were procured for biodiversity assessment.</li> </ul>	<p>Draft methodology is prepared</p> <p>The assessment is not yet done</p>
<b>Output 2.1.2.</b> Community nurseries and woodlots established to support assisted natural regeneration and provide sustainable timber and non-timber forest products to reduce pressure on forest resources in Badghis, Kunar and Paktya provinces	Number of nurseries and woodlots established	Transplant saplings from nurseries to the field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In this reporting period, 313623 saplings (8000 Almond, 35377 <i>Pinus gerardiana</i>, 167551 <i>Juglans Regia</i> and 102695 <i>Pinus Eldarica</i>) were produced and transplanted to forest area for the purpose of afforestation/reforestation, and the remaining number of saplings due to small size were left in the nurseries that will be transplanting next year.</li> <li>190 ha of woodlots has been established with the plantation of 1,762,731 (Nigra and local) cuttings.</li> </ul>	313,623 saplings transplanted to the field
<b>Output 2.1.3.</b> Assisted natural regeneration, rehabilitation/ restoration	[same as Project Objective Indicator]	Improve management of high conservation value forest and economically	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During this reporting period, total 3,372 ha HCVFs were restored through plantation of HCVFs species in Kunar, Paktya and Badghis.</li> </ul>	3,372 ha restored through afforestation/reforestation.

and SFM implemented over 10,000 ha of HCVFs (Kunar and Paktya) and 20,000 ha of other forest types (Badghis) leading to an overall increase in vegetative cover over the landscape and improved connectivity between forest patches		valuable degraded forest in Kunar, Paktya and Badghis (6000 ha) in Kunar, 2500 ha in Paktya 2500 ha and 1000 ha in Badghis i) assisted natural regeneration; ii) sustainable harvesting of forest resources; and iii) the provision of alternative sources for fuelwood and NTFPs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similarly, 2,350 ha of degraded HCVFs were restored through improved management practices, such as supporting natural regeneration, stop cutting, control grazing and quarantine, fire control in exiting forests.</li> </ul>	2,350 restored through improved management.
<b>Output 2.1.4.</b> Diversified livelihood options promoted to reduce pressure on forest resources, including agroforestry, alternative energy sources and value addition for timber and non-timber forest products in Badghis, Kunar and Paktya provinces	Number of households benefiting from agroforestry, alternative energy sources and value addition for timber and non-timber forest products	Alternative livelihood activity (Agroforestry, Medicinal plant cultivation and alternative energy promotion, backyard poultry activity) Agroforestry: Bamyan (Red Apple 4000 saplings), Ghazni (Gala 10000 saplings and Golden 10000 saplings), Kunar (sweet orange 15000 saplings and Persimmon 10000 saplings) Paktya (Almond 80000 saplings) Paktya (Red Apple 50000) Ferula: Bamyan (350kg), Ghazni (330kg), Badghis (300kg), Kunar (10kg) and Paktya (10kg) Poultry: 500 packages	In this reporting, agroforestry practices were implemented in 165 ha of land: 63,800 number of saplings including Apple, persimmon, and sweet orange as well as 500 kg of Ferula seed along with 6300 kg of kidney bean were given to cultivate as associated crop with agroforestry.	Established agroforestry in 165 ha
<b>Output 3.1.1.</b> Climate-resilient SLM interventions	[same as Outcome 3.1]	Improve Rangeland Management Practices in	Climate resilient sustainable land management interventions implemented in	In total on 99,134 hectares of land climate resilient & land

– including soil and water conservation, rotational grazing, and restoration/ rehabilitation with palatable species – implemented over 200,000 ha of degraded rangelands		Bamyan (70000 ha), Ghazni (70000 ha) and Badghis (70000 ha) Practice rotational grazing in rangeland (Block division by planting on the stone and pole) Bamyan (750 ha), Ghazni (750 ha) and Badghis (500 ha)	99,134 hectares of rangeland in Badghis (??ha, Bamyan ( ???ha and Ghazni (??ha) provinces. These interventions included, direct reseeding with rain-feed alfalfa seed in (785 ha), quarantine areas (26,718 ha), rotational grazing in (71,468 ha), cutting plantation of poplar and willow in (163 ha)  Furthermore, 80 small size water reservoirs with the total amount of water capacity 2880 m <sup>3</sup> have been constructed in Kunar Province. Similarly, survey and design of another 70 small size reservoirs with the capacity of 2520 m <sup>3</sup> water were completed in Paktya, Badghis and Ghazni provinces and procurement process for reservoirs in Paktya , and Badghis is in progress.	management interventions implemented.
<b>Output 3.1.2.</b> Enhanced livelihoods through strengthened value chains for products from livestock husbandry	Number of households benefiting from strengthened value chains for livestock husbandry	Implementation of livestock products value chain support activities;	The assessment of value chain of livestock husbandry conducted, and key intervention were identified for the enhancement of livelihoods that includes: a. Stable improvement b. Dairy processing and hygiene toolkits c. Artificial insemination Procurement of mentioned interventions are in progress.	Implementation of stable renovation, homebased dairy processing and hygiene toolkits, artificial insemination is in progress
<b>Output 4.1.1.</b> National information and resource center with associated M&E system and database for SLM/SFM established	Existence of 'knowledge hub'/ national information and resource center with M&E system and database	Project base database updated	The database for SLM/SFM has established with segregated data for male & female beneficiaries. The database has been regularly updating with national and subnational data/information in terms of project interventions, beneficiary list, GPS points, capacity building activities, awareness raising, knowledge management and publications.	Regularly updated
<b>Output 4.1.2.</b> Local-level, participatory M&E system for SLM/SFM established for monitoring of rangeland and forest condition, including biodiversity	Number of participatory M&E assessments of rangeland and forest condition	Joint monitoring by Executive partners in 5 provinces	On quarterly basis participatory M&E assessment was conducted together with project key counterparts. Relevant reports are available.	In each province one participatory M&E together with key counterpart conducted

conservation and carbon sequestration	undertaken in project sites			
<b>Output 4.1.3.</b> Best-practice guidelines on rangeland and forest restoration and management developed and disseminated	Number of synthesized best-practice guidelines developed and disseminated	Collect success stories	Best practices associated with rangeland and forest restoration such as intercropping of some crops with fruit and non-fruits sapling, as agroforestry were identified and replicated in other project sites.	Three success stories were prepared and published in the FAO websites; two other success stories have been in progress.
<b>Output 4.1.4.</b> Lessons learned on SLM/SFM practices in Badghis, Bamyan, Ghazni, Kunar and Paktya provinces collated and disseminated nationwide as well as regionally	Number of lessons learned on SLM and SFM practices documented, disaggregated by theme	Not planned for this reporting period	Not planned for this reporting period	Not planned in this reporting period
<b>Output 4.1.5.</b> Mid-term review (MTR) and Terminal Evaluation (TE) conducted	Existence of MTR and TE reports	Mid-term review of the project	The national and international consultants are on-board, the required for MTR have been shared with the review team and initial meetings have been conducted. The MTR team has been working on inception report.	Mid-term review of the project is in progress

## 4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

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

**Project is on track in achieving its targets, outputs and outcomes as set out in the Pro-Doc. Summary of progress, challenges, and outcome despite some challenges as shown below.**

### **Progress:**

Enhanced the capacities of 750 community members including 156 women on backyard poultry farm management, poultry coops construction, land preparation practices for plantation and cultivation of agroforestry practices and pistachio plantation, small scale woodlots establishment and introduction to the concept of Pastoralist Field School in the targeted provinces. Enhanced the capacities of 65 individuals including through conducting 2 trainings in Animal Husbandry and Improved Livestock Management Practices. Capacitated members of 46 FMAs and 15 RMAs on the preparation, updating, validation, implementation, and monitoring of CBNRM plans and interventions.

In addition, prepared, finalized, translated, and disseminated training manuals such as participatory rural appraisal (PRA) training manual, natural resource management training manual, rangeland management training manual, threats causing forest degradation and benefits of sustainable forest management manual and threats causing rangeland degradation and benefits of sustainable rangeland management manual, Agroforestry training manual to district level project staff, counterparts and stakeholders as well as FMAs/RMAs and local communities.

The international consultants were recruited to conduct forest and rangeland inventory and biodiversity assessment in targeted areas. The 1<sup>st</sup> draft of methodology for rangeland inventory was prepared and circulated for review and methodology for forest inventory and biodiversity assessment is in progress. Similarly, biodiversity assessment guideline was prepared. Field data collection consultants were hired for conducting field surveys and data collection. A work plan for conducting fine-scale inventory of forest and rangeland was developed and implementation is under progress. Training program was developed for the project staff to be delivered by the international consultant for conducting fine-scale inventory. Moreover, all the required equipment/tools for conducting forest and rangeland inventory were procured.

The project has also produced 25 different audio messages on natural resources (Forests and Rangelands) protection and conservation, these messages were broadcasted and disseminated through local radio channels in all five targeted provinces for the duration of 6 months. Feedback from local people have been received on after this KM activity, though no comprehensive impact assessment has conducted yet. The project also produced and disseminated visibility materials such as brochures, flyers, booklets, pen, notebook, USB pen drives, wall and stand banners and tea mugs. Additionally, the project has designed, printed, and installed 63 sign boards with project name, FAO and GEF logo including brief introduction of project interventions for all 63 FMAs/RMAs. Besides, sign boards with project details have been designed, printed, and installed in all 80 reservoirs constructed in Kunar province. The success of project activities was also tweeted and posted from FAO and other project stockholder's social media links such as Facebook and Twitter.

Several discussions have been conducted within project team and with MAIL/GD-NRM on establishment and operationalizing centre of excellence (CoE), however, the current leadership in MAIL/GD-NRM was found not to be able to host CoE. Therefore, it has been concluded and suggested to establish and operationalize CoE at project base and will be transitioned to MAIL/NRM, when the political situation is stabilized.

The project successfully established 8 pastoralist field school (PFS) for managing and coordinating livestock related activities and sustainable land management practices in Ghazni province.

The project has restored 5,722 ha of HCVFs through 3,372 ha of afforestation/reforestation and 2,350 ha of HCVFs improved management practices to increase biodiversity conservation and carbon sequestration in Paktya, Kunar and Badghis provinces.

Climate resilient sustainable land management interventions implemented in 99,134 ha of rangeland in Badghis, Bamyan and Ghazni provinces. These interventions included, direct reseeding with rain-feed alfalfa seed in (785 ha), quarantine areas (26,718 ha), rotational grazing in (71,468 ha), cutting plantation of poplar and willow in (163 ha)

Furthermore, 80 small size water reservoirs with the total amount of water capacity 2,880 m<sup>3</sup> have been constructed in Kunar Province. Similarly, survey and design of another 70 small size reservoirs with the capacity of 2,520 m<sup>3</sup> water were completed in Paktya, Badghis and Ghazni provinces and procurement process for reservoirs in Paktya, and Badghis is in progress.

A livestock value chain assessment has been conducted, and key interventions such as stable/barn improvement, home-based dairy processing, and hygiene toolkits as well as artificial insemination for cattle's breed improvement were identified to be implemented for strengthening of livestock value chain in the targeted provinces.

Awareness of 8,161 individuals including 2,508 women were raised on sustainable forests and land management, biodiversity conservation, climate change and other NRM related issues through conducting 348 awareness raising campaigns in targeted provinces, districts, and communities.

The project based internal database for recording project related data segregated by gender, type of beneficiary and intervention is updated. Furthermore, GPS points collected from FMAs/RMAs and location maps were produced based on the GPS points.

Best practices associated with rangeland and forest restoration such as intercropping of some crops with fruit and non-fruits sapling, as agroforestry were identified and replicated in other project sites.

The MTR team is on-board, the required data and information was already shared with the review team and initial meetings have been conducted. The MTR team has been working on inception report.

### **Challenges**

- Recent political changes in the country have restricted some project interventions such capacity building, awareness raising, and field missions to project targeted provinces
- To some extent COVID-19 restriction affected moments, gathering in campaigns and training at province and district level.
- Due to change in the leadership of project principal government counterparts including project implementation government partner MAIL and GEF operational focal point NEPA, the project steering committee was dissolved, and steering committee meetings have been pending.
- Restriction in movement and difficulties in travel to some project sites due to current security measures and political uncertainty.
- Unexpected snowfall caused by rapid change in weather and drought due to climate change damaged some newly planted fruit-tree saplings and intercrop (agroforestry) as well as woodlots/cuttings in some targeted districts. The level of damage is being investigated and will be reported in the next PIR.
- Conflict between nomads/kuchies and local communities on the ownership of rangelands have restricted in the implementation of interventions such as reseeding, quarantine and rotational grazing in some RMS sites in Ghazni and Bamyan.
- Staff turnover at the provincial level, especially the field staff in Badghis, Ghazni and Bamyan provinces, created challenges to the smooth implementation of project activities.
- Lack of reliable data for designing forests and rangeland inventory methodology. The international consultant will rely on existing data or may purchase updated data from reliable international sources during the inventory.
- Delays to some extent in payments to suppliers and service providers due to the restriction and limitation in banking sector in Afghanistan.
- Cultural sensitivity, especially regarding women's mobility, has also made it difficult to include women in NRM institutions in targeted provinces. De-facto authority does not allow female staff to attend their office at Kabul and provincial level.

### ***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.

	<b>FY2022 Development Objective rating<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>FY2022 Implementation Progress rating<sup>17</sup></b>	<b>Comments/reasons<sup>18</sup> justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	S	S	<i>Development objective is rated Satisfactory (S), as project is delivering results on the ground and progressing well on achieving the set targets to contribute toward accomplishing project objectives. Despite some challenges caused due to third wave of COVID-19, climate changes, economic crisis, and political unrest in the country, the project</i>

<sup>16</sup> **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.

<sup>17</sup> **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.

<sup>18</sup> Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

			<i>has successfully delivered and even exceeded all planned activities within the agreed timeline. Hence the implantation progress is rated satisfactory (S) during this reporting period.</i>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	S	S	<i>Ratings/comments The project delivery is now in full momentum and return back to track despite facing passing through multi crises period in the country.</i>
<b>GEF Operational Focal Point<sup>19</sup></b>			<i>In line with the UN Transitional Engagement Framework for Afghanistan, the de facto authorities are not officially engaged since August 2021 due to uncertain political situation</i>
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>20</sup></b>	S	S	<i>The project has progressed well with certain outputs on the ground despite confronting challenges including COVID-19 and political unrest in the country. Some outputs (e.g., 1.1.1) need further discussions for ensuring effective delivery, which is underway.</i>
<b>FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	S	S	<i>The project is steadily making progress with activities despite ongoing political and pandemic challenges. Ongoing MTR will help identify good practices to scale up and lessons learned to be addressed in the remaining project duration.</i>

<sup>19</sup> In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

<sup>20</sup> The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

## 5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

*Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)*

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

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

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

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid <sup>21</sup> . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low-Risk	The initial ESS risk classification is still valid. Since the project is directly involved in sustainable land and forest management for promoting biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation and rangeland productivity to promote sustainable management of natural resources natural resources. Furthermore, the project also involves stakeholders at national and sub-national level in sustainable land and forests of project implementation therefore, the Environmental and Social Risk tends to be decreased gradually.

***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.***

<sup>21</sup> **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

## 6. Risks

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>22</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Climate risks – especially drought, flooding, extreme weather events	Low-Medium	Yes	Mitigation measures are considered in site selection to avoid flood prone areas for project interventions, drought resistance species, support on supplementary irrigation.	Drought-resistance varieties have been selected for reseeded as well as saplings for agroforestry from the same locality that are adapted with local climatic condition. Also supported FMAs in provision of supplementary irrigation to the newly planted saplings.	The actions taken are confirmed

---

<sup>22</sup> Risk ratings means a rating of accesses the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>22</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
2	Covid-19 pandemic	Low- Medium	Yes	Avoid large gatherings and crowds, implement COVID-19 safety measures, adapt alternative working modalities such as virtual meeting and trainings	COVID-19 measures are strictly followed during conducting training and awareness campaigns, internal meetings including project progress meetings with provincial team are conducted virtually	
3	Limited capacity of relevant national- and local-level institutions	Low-Medium	Yes	Project is utilizing FAO in-house capacity for specific technical tasks	FAO and project team is fully providing technical support towards implementation of project interventions	
4	Fragile security situation prevents project staff visits and implementation of plan	Medium	Yes	Appoint local community facilitation volunteers and directly involve FMAs/RMAs and local communities in project implementation.	Local community facilitation volunteers are deployed, FMAs/RMAs and local communities are involved in project implementation.	
5	Disease outbreaks affect livestock of participating communities	Medium	Yes	ToT Training for technical government staff and project staff on control of potential livestock diseases and animal healthcare to pastoral network	ToT training on livestock management was delivered to Provincial staff and provincial staff regularly cascading at district level before the political upheaval.	

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

<b>FY2021 rating</b>	<b>FY2022 rating</b>	<b>Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period</b>
Low- Medium	Low	In this reporting period, the spread of Covid-19 pandemic is very low and security situation at provincial and district level is stabilized to some extent.

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

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

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
Recommendation 1:	MTR is ongoing.
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation 4:	
Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe	

## 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 Guidelines<sup>23</sup>. 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	NA		
Components and cost	NA		
Institutional and implementation arrangements	NA		
Financial management	NA		
Implementation schedule	NA		
Executing Entity	NA		
Executing Entity Category	NA		
Minor project objective change	NA		
Safeguards	NA		
Risk analysis	NA		
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	NA		
Co-financing	NA		
Location of project activity	NA		
Other	NA		

<sup>23</sup> Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

## 9. Stakeholders' Engagement

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

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
<b>Government Institutions</b>			
Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock (MAIL)	The lead government partner of the project, engaged in project oversight and implementation of project activities with the technical support of FAO	Provincial directorate Agricultural, Irrigation and Livestock (PAIL) departments are regularly updated on project progress at provincial level	Level of engagement with MAIL is limited as per United Nations Transitional Engagement Framework (TEF)
Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development (MRRD)	MRRD is integral member of the Project steering Committee (PSC), and TWG providing support for capacity building, M&E and other local level activities.	Provincial Rural Rehabilitation and Development directorates are regularly updated on progress at provincial level	Level of engagement with MAIL is limited as per United Nations Transitional Engagement Framework (TEF)
National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA)	Is the GEF operational focal point for Afghanistan, NEPA oversee implementation of the proposed project in the country. NEPA is identified as an implementation partner for this project.	Provincial directorates of NEPA are regularly updated on progress at provincial level	Level of engagement with MAIL is limited as per United Nations Transitional Engagement Framework (TEF)
Independent General Directorate of Kochies (IGDK)	This is another implementing partner in this proposed project, mainly engaged in rangeland activities.	Provincial IGDK directorates are regularly updated on progress at provincial level	Level of engagement with MAIL is limited as per United Nations Transitional Engagement Framework (TEF)
<b>Non-Government organizations (NGOs)</b>			
<b>Private sector entities</b>			
Forests and Rangeland Associations/ Local communities	Involved in consultations at the local level to participate in identification community's needs,	Regularly involved in project implementation	During the initial months of the year payment of inputs suppliers were challenging however, the

	initiate dialogue and promote community buy-in relating to project activities. Local communities participate actively in the implementation, prioritizing and planning of project activities.		payment issues are fixed now
Input supplier & construction companies	Provide input supplies based on project need, construction companies are involved in providing direct implementation support to project interventions	Supplies/inputs have been delivered based on project need, construction contracts are in place and implementation of local infrastructure work is in progress	Increased workload and contract management due to award to contract to more than one supplier/company due to financial problems with the companies
<b>Others[1]</b>			
<b>New stakeholders identified/engaged</b>			

---

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

## 10. Gender Mainstreaming

**Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) during this reporting period.**

Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	Yes	In most of the project interventions, deliverables, and results around 30% beneficiaries were women. This is higher than the originally envisioned 20% at the CEO endorsement stage.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	In the RMAs, female members were included in executive body of the association. The capacities of female RMA members enhanced in CBNRM plan preparation, development, and implementation. Also provide technical NRM trainings to the female members of RMAs.
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):	Yes	The project as expected to contribute to gender equality in capacity building at provincial and district level, raised awareness of around 30% female beneficiary, livelihood interventions, livestock improvement etc.,
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Yes	Women are representing RMAs and some cases women are leading the associations has helped in closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	In community association i.e., RMA/FMA, operating for conservation of natural resources in project target areas, most of the women holds decision making power in executing bodies of the association.
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women		The project intervention has paid special attention in uplifting the livelihood of rural women through implementation of 1,300 backyard poultry packages, fuel efficient cooking stoves, livestock hygiene toolkits, have generated multiple socio-economic benefits
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	Gender disaggregated data are collected on progress bases in an excel database, will be integrated in an M&E system
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	This activity is disseminated among the other national expert of the project in their specific area for conducting gender assessment and analysis

Any other good practices on gender	Yes	In one of FMA in Sayed Karam district of Paktya province, a family headed by widow has increased backyard poultry package from 30 hens to 70 hens, this has motivated other female beneficiaries of the project to participate actively in gender-based activities of the project
------------------------------------	-----	---

## 11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.	Yes, the project has knowledge management strategy and based communication plan, all good practices and other knowledge management and communication activities are being implementing.
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	<p>Yes, as aforementioned, the project has communication strategy and based on the mentioned strategy all activities are carrying forward.</p> <p>348 awareness raising sessions had been conducted, where 8,161 individuals including 2,508 women actively participated. These awareness raising campaigns were carried out with the topics of; forests and its importance, direct plantation of pistachio seeds and land preparations, importance of NRM and avoid deforestation, advantages of FEC, poultry management, natural resources management, pasture management and soil erosion.</p> <p>The project has also produced 25 different audio messages about the conservation of natural resource specifically (forest and rangeland) and based on broadcasting schedule all the messages were disseminated through local radio channels in all five targeted provinces for the duration of 6 months.</p> <p>Furthermore, for best project visibility some materials were printed such as, project brochures, flyer, booklets, pen, notebook, USB pen drives, wall and stand banners and tea mugs, as well as 63 sign boards containing project name, FAO and GEF logo and project interventions for all 63 FMAs/RMAs have been printed and install in each FMA/RMA relevant area. Moreover, 80 sign boards for 80 reservoirs have been printed and installed in each reservoir.</p> <p>The project interventions were also disseminated from FAO and other project stockholder's social media links such as Facebook and tweeter, there have been 99 posts in this regard</p>
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.	<p><b><i>The establishment of woodlots and tree plantations improve sustainable land management in central Afghanistan</i></b></p> <p>Rangeland degradation is an issue of growing global concern, including for Afghanistan. Bamyar province, in central Afghanistan, has become one of the country's epicenters for rangeland degradation due to high levels of grazing and the increasing encroachment of invasive shrubs and woody species. A multi-year FAO project funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) has shown that degradation can be reversed.</p>

	<p>Bamyan has been historically known for its rangelands and highlands. However, large-scale rangeland degradation has become an increasing problem for both herders and other community members. The province's mountainous topography makes the rangelands a valuable resource, particularly for people grazing livestock but also for crop production and agroforestry. The rangelands are, therefore, vital for livelihoods and food security, which is why FAO has worked with local communities and other stakeholders to identify ways of protecting rangelands and reversing degradation where possible.</p> <p><b>Rehabilitating degraded rangeland</b></p> <p>To address the growing problem of rangeland degradation in Bamyan province, FAO began working with a range of stakeholders to rehabilitate 6,710.5 ha of degraded rangeland (more than 67 square kilometers) in July 2019 thanks to funding provided by the GEF. By July 2021, the project had achieved significant milestones.</p> <p>The project focusses on two main sets of activities: restoring rangeland health, through increased fodder production and the introduction of locally adapted tree varieties to reduce erosion and increase household incomes. Over half a million plant cuttings (willow, poplar, and bamboo species) have been cultivated on 140.5 ha of land across Yakawlang and Punjab districts of Bamyan, 1,600 kg of <i>alfalfa</i> seeds ideally suited to rainfed areas have been cultivated on 190 ha of degraded rangeland and 5,000 red chief apple saplings were planted on 20 ha of land to improve agroforestry.</p> <p>"Rangeland is the best source of fodder for livestock and needs to be managed sustainably. Sustainable fodder production in rangeland areas helps fix soil, reducing potential flood damage and erosion, thereby, ensuring that communities and their animals can benefit for years to come. Similarly, conserving locally adapted plants and shrubs in the rangeland helps absorb water for groundwater reserves," said Richard Trenchard, FAO Representative in Afghanistan. "Women play a vital role in the livestock sector in Afghanistan, often unremunerated" Trenchard added. "We are pleased that this work will provide direct benefits to women, as well as communities in general."</p> <p>Afghanistan is one of the world's lowest carbon emitters but is also one of the country's most at risk of climate change. Sustainable land management and tree plantation help mitigate climate change impacts (and provides a pathway for long-term adaptation). Sustainable land management, tree plantation and awareness raising are key mitigation measures for countries such as Afghanistan, which is why the technical support of FAO, funded through the GEF is so important, as it seeks to protect vital natural resources and contribute to global efforts to combat climate change.</p> <p>The benefits of sustainable tree production are clear to communities. "Cuttings and tree plantation are good alternative options for fuelwood for our houses and cooking food. Rangeland degradation can be reduced while natural bushes and plants are not excessively used. If alternative options</p>
--	---

	<p>are available, people will stop over-using rangeland plants and bushes,” says Khalil, a community member in Yakawlang district.</p> <p><b>Community-based natural resources management</b></p> <p>The project also supported the establishment of seven Rangeland Management Associations (RMAs) in two districts of Bamyan in collaboration with a range of key stakeholders. The project invested heavily in capacity development training for members of these RMAs and community members in general to help them develop community-based natural resources management (CBNRM) plans. The plans will enable communities to manage their natural resources sustainably.</p> <p>The people in Baghalak village, north of Yakawlang district, initially thought that community rangelands were not suitable for tree plantation and woodlot establishment, but the project helped them appreciate the range of benefits associated with sustainable rangeland management. “We did not know the value of trees and woodlots until we received the training from FAO. We now understand how to sustainably manage the natural resources and how to develop feasible plans” explained Joma Khan, a CBNRM training participant.</p> <p>In addition, the project has also led to 1,800 ha of rangeland being kept free from grazing to accelerate restoration whilst another 4,560 ha of land has been prepared for rotational grazing.</p>
Please provide links to related website, social media account	<p><b>FAO Twitter account and website:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="https://twitter.com/FAOAfghanistan/status/1412744586628378626">https://twitter.com/FAOAfghanistan/status/1412744586628378626</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://twitter.com/FAOAfghanistan/status/1495344401060618241/photo/1">https://twitter.com/FAOAfghanistan/status/1495344401060618241/photo/1</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://twitter.com/FAOAfghanistan/status/1494258364192333830">https://twitter.com/FAOAfghanistan/status/1494258364192333830</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://twitter.com/FAOAfghanistan/status/1497879699703283719">https://twitter.com/FAOAfghanistan/status/1497879699703283719</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://twitter.com/FAOAfghanistan/status/1510943134691336194">https://twitter.com/FAOAfghanistan/status/1510943134691336194</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://twitter.com/FAOAfghanistan/status/1513385035449176066?s=20&amp;t=LypKLeOMxsWS8FB36LnwsA">https://twitter.com/FAOAfghanistan/status/1513385035449176066?s=20&amp;t=LypKLeOMxsWS8FB36LnwsA</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://www.facebook.com/FAOAfghanistan/posts/122292067059690">https://www.facebook.com/FAOAfghanistan/posts/122292067059690</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://www.facebook.com/FAOAfghanistan/videos/2158389304308526/">https://www.facebook.com/FAOAfghanistan/videos/2158389304308526/</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://twitter.com/FAOAfghanistan/status/1516287853776588800?s=20&amp;t=S4wX_ApNWKXR1EJF6hGHQ">https://twitter.com/FAOAfghanistan/status/1516287853776588800?s=20&amp;t=S4wX_ApNWKXR1EJF6hGHQ</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://twitter.com/FAOAfghanistan/status/1518164588797304834?s=20&amp;t=olgvYJbGUB37zCFTJ_9oeg">https://twitter.com/FAOAfghanistan/status/1518164588797304834?s=20&amp;t=olgvYJbGUB37zCFTJ_9oeg</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://twitter.com/FAOAfghanistan/status/1524617156851384322">https://twitter.com/FAOAfghanistan/status/1524617156851384322</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://www.fao.org/afghanistan/news/detail-events/en/c/1505486/">https://www.fao.org/afghanistan/news/detail-events/en/c/1505486/</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://www.fao.org/fao-stories/article/en/c/1472607/">https://www.fao.org/fao-stories/article/en/c/1472607/</a></li> </ul> <p><b>MAIL and PAIL Facebook Page:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="https://www.facebook.com/DAILpaktia/posts/5021621451205941https://m.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=854449338805319&amp;id=100027207810099">https://www.facebook.com/DAILpaktia/posts/5021621451205941https://m.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=854449338805319&amp;id=100027207810099</a></li> <li>• <a href="http://www.fao.org/3/cb5651en/cb5651en.pdf">http://www.fao.org/3/cb5651en/cb5651en.pdf</a></li> </ul>

## 2022 Project Implementation Report

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="https://www.facebook.com/permalink.php?story_fbid=2850286388602806&amp;id=100008644179427">https://www.facebook.com/permalink.php?story_fbid=2850286388602806&amp;id=100008644179427</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://www.facebook.com/100008644179427/posts/2902458253385619/">https://www.facebook.com/100008644179427/posts/2902458253385619/</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://m.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=995024024747849&amp;id=100027207810099&amp;post_id=100027207810099_995024024747849&amp;notif_id=1644930605971414&amp;notif_t=close_friend_activity&amp;ref=notif">https://m.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=995024024747849&amp;id=100027207810099&amp;post_id=100027207810099_995024024747849&amp;notif_id=1644930605971414&amp;notif_t=close_friend_activity&amp;ref=notif</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://m.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=994511254799126&amp;id=100027207810099&amp;post_id=100027207810099_994511254799126&amp;notif_id=1644855437727039&amp;notif_t=close_friend_activity&amp;ref=notif">https://m.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=994511254799126&amp;id=100027207810099&amp;post_id=100027207810099_994511254799126&amp;notif_id=1644855437727039&amp;notif_t=close_friend_activity&amp;ref=notif</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://www.facebook.com/100008644179427/posts/2901832616781516/">https://www.facebook.com/100008644179427/posts/2901832616781516/</a></li> </ul>
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="https://www.fao.org/afghanistan/news/detail-events/en/c/1505486/">https://www.fao.org/afghanistan/news/detail-events/en/c/1505486/</a></li> </ul>
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details	<p>Azatullah Sahil  <a href="mailto:Azatullah.sahil@fao.org">Azatullah.sahil@fao.org</a></p>

## 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.**

If applicable, please describe the process and current status of on-going/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities.

The project team worked closely with group of indigenous peoples such as Kuchis from the beginning of the project. Some of the targeted communities are indigenous people who have land in the project selected areas. Indigenous people were consulted during project site selection, and, only after getting their agreement the project team selected FMAs/RMAs members and forests and rangeland areas for project intervention.

Do indigenous peoples and or local communities have an active participation in the project activities? If yes, briefly describe how.

Indigenous people in all targeted provinces, have taken active part in developing CBNRM plans, and making decisions regarding the classification of forest, pasture, and rangeland rehabilitation. Furthermore, indigenous people with local communities have developed understanding on rangeland management issues particularly on quarantine, control, and reseedling of rangelands, however, small conflicts have been reported from few RMAs in some projects in Ghazni province.

### 13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>24</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized on 30 June 2022	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (Confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Implementing agency	FAO	In-Kind Co-Financing	USD 7,860,000	USD 4 716 000		USD 7,860,000
Local government	MAIL	In-Kind Co-Financing	USD 38,656,984	USD 2 319 419		USD 38,656,984
Local government	MRRD	In-Kind Co-Financing	USD 3,630,249	USD 2 178 149		USD 3,630,249
Local government	NEPA	In-Kind Co-Financing	USD 710,000	USD 426 000		USD 710,000
Local government	IGDK	In-Kind Co-Financing	USD 3,400,000	USD 2 040 000		USD 3,400,000
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>USD 54,257,233</b>	<b>USD 11,679,568</b>		<b>USD 64,753,106</b>

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

<sup>24</sup> Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

<b>Development Objectives Rating.</b> A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
<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>Moderately 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>Moderately 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.)

<b>Implementation Progress Rating.</b> 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.	
<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 resented 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 are subject to remedial action
<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>	Implementation of <b>some</b> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action
<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</b>	Implementation of <b>some</b> components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most 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 none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

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