



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Central Asia
Country (ies):	the Kyrgyz Republic
Project Title:	Sustainable Management of Mountainous Forest and Land Resources under Climate Change Conditions
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/KYR/010/GFF
GEF ID:	4761
GEF Focal Area(s):	CCM-5; LD-1; LD-2; SFM/REDD-1
Project Executing Partners:	State Agency for Environment and Forest Protection (SAEPF), Ministry of Agriculture, Food Industry and Melioration (MoA)
Project Duration:	Proposed EOD – NTE 01 Aug 2014 - 31 Jul 2018 Actual EOD – NTE 01 Aug 2014 - 31 Dec 2019 (48 months)

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	May 2012
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	12 August 2014
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	31 Dec 2019
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	30 November 2020
Actual Implementation End Date³:	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	5,454,545
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	19,000,150
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	4,348,335

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

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

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

Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	13,412,601
--	------------

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	March 6, 2019 (VI PSC Meeting)
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	June 2016
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes or <u>No</u>
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes or <u>No</u>
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	December 31, 2019
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	<u>Yes</u> or <u>No</u> 20 November 2017

Ratings

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

Status

Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	4 th PIR
--	---------------------

⁵ Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

⁶ Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Cholpon Alibakieva, NPM	Cholpon.Alibakieva@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Yazici Ekrem, Forestry Officer Hafiz Muminjanov, Plant Production and Protection Officer	Yazici.Ekrem@fao.org Hafiz.Muminjanov@fao.org
Budget Holder	Viorel Guttu, a.i. FAOR in the Kyrgyz Republic	Guttu.Viorel@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Hernan M. Gonzalez, Technical Officer	Hernan.Gonzalez@fao.org

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Objective(s): Contribute to the sustainable management and enhanced productivity of mountainous silvo-agro-pastoral ecosystems and improved mountain livelihoods in the Kyrgyz Republic						
Outcome 1.1: Enhanced policy, legal and institutional framework in forestry and land management for integrating SFM/SLM principles and practices into national and local level land-use plans	Principles of sustainable forest and land management included into national and local land use plans	Principles of sustainable forest and land management so far not included into land use plans, no cross-sectoral cooperation mechanisms are weak.	Assessment on sustainable forest and land management provided	By the end of the project, the principles included into national and local land use plans	new concept for forest development sector until 2040, NAP for the next 5 years, amendments to the forest legislation has been prepared and approved (TCP)	S
Outcome 1.2 Increased understanding and awareness on roles of SFM/SLM and LULUCF in carbon	Principles of SFM/SLM included into national legal framework.	Principles of SFM/SLM are not fully included into the national programs.	Assessment provided	Farmers and breeders received economic incentives for application of SFM and SLM practices due to the increase in income	National carbon absorption coefficients for 9 main tree-shrub species have been developed, payment	S

⁷ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

⁸ 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.

⁹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)**, **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
sequestration and GHG balance				due to increased productivity and PES.	mechanisms for ecosystem services have been introduced at the level of one pilot forestry enterprise with users of natural resources in the Tup rayon of Issyk-Kul oblast. Trainings on LULUCF and Collect Earth for 50 participants (data under verification stage).	
Outcome 2.1 Management of existing forests and trees improved	On 20,000 ha of forest land the improved management lead to the increase of Carbon by 15%	Forests are severely degraded because of the excessive use of forests for wood and overgrazing.	Management plans (afforestation/reforestation plans) for all 8 pilot Leskhozoes and 5 ayil aimaks are elaborated.	Improving management of 20,000 ha of forest land (integrated management plans)	Management plans (afforestation/reforestation plans) for all 8 pilot Leskhozoes and 5 ayil aimaks are elaborated.	S
Outcome 2.2 Dryland forest areas rehabilitated/afforested through introduction and demonstration of innovative technologies/practices and pressures on forests reduced	Afforested/reforested areas	Local population does not use innovative technologies.	4,000 ha of forest lands afforested/reforested	8,000 ha of forest lands afforested/reforested	7,150 ha of forest lands afforested/reforested	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
<p>Outcome 3.1 Improved agricultural management and rehabilitation practices and techniques in drylands by demonstrating and adopting agricultural and agro-forestry best practices that increase vegetative cover and soil fertility, reduce soil degradation, and avoid greenhouse gas emissions</p>	New practices to increase vegetation cover and soil fertility are used by farmers due to project introduction.	New practices so far not used	Soil and agrochemical studies of degraded lands and agroforestry of pilot plots on the area of 10,000 ha. Geobotanical survey of pastures lands on the area of 20,000 ha. Good innovative practices of SLM based on WOCAT methodology. The use of organic fertilizers. Creation of a nursery for the production of varietal seeds of grassland grasses. Sowing seeds of natural grassland to improve degraded pastures.	176 FFS are established 200 demonstration plots 11 plots on agroforestry are created. Development of pasture management plan with GIS cartographic materials	176 FFS are established Nursery for the production of pasture seeds on 4 ha. The seeds of natural pasture grasses were sown to improve degraded pastures on the 120 hectares.	S
<p>Outcome 4.1 Monitoring and evaluation of project progress for adaptive results-based</p>	The project steering committee meets at least once a year and approves management		Three Project Steering Committee meetings conducted.	Regular Steering Committee meetings are conducted	Realized according to plan. 1st PSC meeting – January 30, 2015; 2nd PSC meeting -	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
management to mitigate risks and changing conditions	planning and changing.				January 21, 2016; 3rd PSC meeting – February 10, 2017; 4th PSC meeting – February 2, 2018; 5 th PSC Meeting – September 11, 2018; 6 th PSC Meeting – March 6, 2019	
Outcome 4.2 Knowledge Dissemination of information and best practices through knowledge management platforms, national and international cooperation and awareness raising.	The project is monthly present in Kyrgyz mass media.	The official signature of the project by Kyrgyz Government in October 2014 has been published in mass media.	Kyrgyz mass-media (newspaper, TV etc.) report at least once every month about the project activities.	Kyrgyz mass-media (newspaper, TV etc.) report at least ones every month about the project.	Newspaper + internet articles: 38 (2014) 18 (2015) 16(2016) 18 (2017) TV + radio broadcasting: 3 (2014) 3 (2015) 4 (2016) 8(2017) 4(2018) but not monthly presence. The book for 70 anniversary and the video- film of the Kyrgyz Forest Service has been prepared. The book for 30 anniversary of the Kyrgyz Ecological Service has been prepared.	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					Web-site of the project has been created on the SAEPF domain. http://ecology.gov.kg/page/view/id/199	

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹⁰

¹⁰ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1.1 Proposals for forestry and land policy and legislation for sustainable forest and land management developed.	Done	100 %	TCP project on forest policy and legislation is implementing	An assessment of forest and agrarian policy on sustainable management of forest and land resources was carried out and submitted to SAEPF and MAFIM in 2015. A draft Concept for the development of the forestry sector up to 2040 and a NAP within the framework of			100 % LoA with the Association of forest users and land users of Kyrgyzstan on the assessment of the results of agricultural and forest policy completed. Recommendations submitted to the government of the Kyrgyz Republic. FAO has found the possibility of implementing the TCP project	

¹¹ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

¹² As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹³ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

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

				<p>the TCP project have been developed.</p> <p>With the participation of the project team, a draft legislative act on low-productive lands was developed.</p>				
<p>Output 1.1.2 Cross-sectoral strategies and agreements between sectoral authorities on integrated land-use management developed to foster cross-sectoral cooperation.</p>	Q3 Y5	40%	<p>Local population is involved into reforestation. The memorandum is signed between the SAEPF and the MoA on the use of pastures on the lands of State Forest Fund (SFF)</p>	<p>The order of the local state administration to establish a commission for intersectoral cooperation. Minutes of the issues discussed at the commission.</p>			<p>80 % The contract has been concluded with a national expert to develop a strategy for a cross-sectoral cooperation mechanism. Strategy will be developed before September 2019</p>	
<p>Output 1.1.3 Operational mechanism for ensuring better collaboration at national level and between national and local levels developed and implemented</p>		0%	<p>Actions taken to improve cooperation with the Forest Institute of the National Academy of Sciences, Kyrgyz National Agrarian University and the Science Research Institute of Livestock and Pastures.</p>	<p>Forest inventory data will be included in the electronic information system.</p>			80 %	

<p>Output 1.2.1 SFM/SLM based on resource user associations is effectively promoted in the project area/s and respective local resource management institutions are fully functional</p>	50%	SFM/SLM principles are implemented in pilot areas of the project	SLM and SFM principles are implemented by FFS on project pilot sites			80 % In 6 pilot ayil aymaks, one-year and five-year pasture management plans developed, with GIS cartographic materials	
<p>Output 1.2.2 Training and awareness creation tool kit on roles of SFM/SLM and LULUCF in carbon sequestration and GHG balance prepared and disseminated</p>	50%	Training modules are developed	Plans for land management and forest management			90 % Trainings for partners on SLM and SFM in the LULUCF and REDD + sector	
<p>Output 2.1.1 National LULUCF and REDD+ Strategy and sector assessment, national climate change mitigation standards and National Action Plan together with national partners developed.</p>	20%	In cooperation with the Climate Change Centre national coefficients of carbon sequestration are developed	The draft new forest policy (Concept) covers the issues of adaptation and mitigation to climate change and LULUCF issues			80%	

<p>Output 2.1.2 Sustainable forest management planning covers at least 20,000 ha of forest.</p>		50%	Forest management plans have been developed for 8 pilot leshozes with an area of more than 20 thousand hectares	Forest management plans for 8 pilot leshozes have been developed			60% Developed forest management plans for 8 pilot leshozes (forest enterprises) and nearby ayyl aimaks (village administrations)	
<p>Output 2.1.3 Carbon monitoring system established based on field sampling of forests and various dryland land use systems.</p>		40%	In cooperation with the Climate Change Centre national coefficients of carbon sequestration are developed	National coefficients for the main 9 tree species have been developed.			70% A contract with international and national experts to develop the LULUCF strategy and carbon monitoring system	
<p>Output 2.2.1 8,000 ha of degraded forest land rehabilitated/afforested through successfully demonstrated innovative technologies and practices including agroforestry trials and controlled grazing</p>		17%	2500 ha of degraded forest land rehabilitated/afforested	Forests were planted on an area of 2,200 hectares and the promotion of natural regeneration - on an area of more than 2500 hectares			90% 7 150 ha afforested/reforested	
<p>Output 2.2.2 2,650 ha of tree plantations established by local people with indigenous fast-growing forest trees in order to reduce the</p>							90% About 500 hectares of fast-growing forest species plantations, in accordance with the recommendations of the mid-term project evaluation	

wood demand from natural forests (forest degradation prevented in at least 10,000 ha forest areas)								
Output 2.2.3 Efficiency of fuel wood use improved by introduction of innovative technologies and improved house insulation.	Done	30%	Local residents of 8 pilot leskhozoes were trained in the practical insulation technologies and construction of energy-efficient stoves	Energy-efficient stoves have been installed in 8 cordons of leshozoes and forestry houses have been insulated, more than 250 builders and stove-makers have been trained in energy-efficient methods.			100% Insulation of 8 houses in forest areas, installation of energy-efficient furnaces, as well as solar kits. Trained over 230 local people.	
Output 3.1.1 200 demonstrations of innovative agricultural practices covering a total of 10,907 ha of arable land		30%	76 field farmer schools and 200 demonstration plots are established, including WOCAT methodology	176 FFS and 200 demonstration plots were organized in 19 ayilak aimaks on advanced agricultural practices and innovative technologies. Fruit trees were provided for agroforestry practices.			90% 200 demonstration plots, 176 farmer field schools were created (2200 farmers were trained, of which 641 are women) 4 seeders for direct sowing of the brand "Vence Tudo SA 14600" were acquired and transferred Contract concluded with RPAS. A soil-agrochemical study of the soils of the pilot plots is carried out on an area of 35,000 hectares of	

							irrigated arable land.	
Output 3.1.2 20,000 ha of non-forest land of State Forest Fund or degraded agricultural land using innovative technologies successfully rehabilitated.		50%	A nursery for the grass seeds production has been organized, work has been carried out to sow the seeds of natural pasture grasses on an area of 60 hectares of degraded pastures, management plan for grazing on 35,000 hectares has been developed.	A nursery on the area of 4 hectares for the production of high-quality grass seeds has been established on the basis of the Kyrgyz Scientific Research Institute on Livestock and Pastures. Pasture grass seeding on area of more than 120 hectares Pasture management plans for pilot pasture committees have been developed			80% A nursery for the production of pasture grasses (4 hectares) was organized. Sowing of natural pasture grasses, on an area of 120 hectares. In 6 pilot ayil aymaks, one-year and five-year pasture management plans were developed, with GIS cartographic materials	
Output 4.1.1 M&E system operating and providing systematic information about meeting project outcome and output targets		50%	There is a system for annual monitoring and SFM and SLM indicators assessment	Four meetings of PSC were held. Monitoring and evaluation of reports, minutes of PSC meetings			90%	
Output 4.1.2 Midterm and final evaluations		50%	Mid-term assessment has been completed in June 2016	A mid-term evaluation was conducted in 2016, according to			50%	

				which the project was extended for 1 year.				
Output 4.2.1 Synthesis of lessons learnt and generation of best practices		50%	The website of the project is working. The results of best practices are used to expand SFM and SLM practices	The website of the project is working. The results of best practices are used to expand SFM and SLM practices			Publications and guidelines on SFM and SLM, green fertilizers, crop rotation WOCAT cases	
Output 4.2.2 Application of research results and best practices of previous projects		50%	cooperation contract with the Climate Change Centre and Forest Research Institute	There are 4 posters, 3 recommendations, 14 brochures on the results of the project. The project activity is constantly presented in the media.			90%	
Output 4.2.3 Integration of the project into knowledge exchange platforms		20%	The best project practices are disseminated through the media, the web site and the FFS	The results obtained with the project activities are reflected in the international knowledge platforms			90% Web-site of the project has been created on the SAEPF domain. http://ecology.gov.kg/page/view/id/199	
Output 4.2.4 Environmental education and awareness raising strategy		60%	In cooperation with SAEPF and KNAU, the ecological education concept is being discussed	In pilot areas of Osh and Jalal-Abad oblasts, educational trainings are conducted for different levels (regional, rayon and local).			80%	

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

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

Max 200 words:

The planting of trees on about 1,500 has primarily enhanced the livelihoods of the beneficiaries and by the introduction of innovative agricultural technologies. These are sustainable environmental and financial/economical improvements. Draft LULUCF/REDD+ strategy and action plan and criteria and indicators for National Carbon Monitoring System for 2019-2030 were shared and presented to the stakeholders. Stakeholders welcomed the draft documents and provided their feedback for each document. Kyrgyzstan National LULUCF/REDD+ Strategy (2019-2030) provides guidance for the implementation of National LULUCF/REDD+ Action Plan through (i) supporting and increasing the capacity of institutions at all levels, (ii) analyzing and harmonizing the legal and regulatory frameworks, (iii) promoting stakeholder participation in decision making and implementation, (iv) implementing SFM/SLM practices to enhance environmental and socioeconomic benefits and livelihoods, and (v) increase GHGs removals and enhance carbon stocks.

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

Max 200 words:

Projects should have either a focused geographic scope, or a focused thematic scope.

- Budget planning should envision lower levels of expenditure in the first year or two of a project, with expenditure rising in the 2nd half of the project.
- Project work planning in the design phase need to consider normal start-up time requirements.
- Project financial planning should take into consideration the budget situation of various partners and stakeholders, and if incremental cash contributions are requested from partners, then opportunities for offsetting revenue-generating opportunities should be considered.
- All planned results should be clearly discussed with all project stakeholders during the design phase, and all stakeholder expectations about planned results should be validated or denied during the project design stage.
- Communications tools are critical, and putting them in place should be an early priority of all projects.
- Local resource users are willing to contribute a lot of in-kind support to invest in their own future benefit, but projects must take care to maintain their confidence and buy-in.
- International technical expertise is resource-intensive, and full-time use of such expertise should only be planned for under highly necessary circumstances.

	FY2019 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	Project activities are implemented in accordance with WP. Some outputs are remaining. In order to cover two additional planting seasons (March and October) and to monitor the forest and fruit trees planting of 2014-2019 years, it is proposed to have possible no-cost extension of the project till November 2020
Budget Holder	S	S	Implementation of the project is assessed as satisfactory and meets the project objectives. However to fulfill some outputs of the project, the no-cost extension is proposed.
Lead Technical Officer¹⁷	S	S	Project implementation is on right track, some remaining outputs will be achieved during the rest of the project life time together with possible extension.
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	S	The project is on its way to achieve its objectives, and has contributed significantly to the development of the forestry sector in Kyrgyz Republic. As recommended by the Mid Term Review, a no-cost extension for one year is proposed in order to complete pending activities and to consolidate the project results.

¹⁵ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁶ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

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

3. Risks

Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid¹⁸. If not, what is the new classification and explain.

Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
<i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant.</i>

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
--	------	---------------------------	-------------------	--	-----------------------------------

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

¹⁹ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²⁰ If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period”.

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Slow Uptake of Policy Recommendations	S			The project mitigates risks by: - demonstration of new approaches, technologies and practices in pilot sites; - Training relevant staff and stakeholders on sustainability issues; - awareness raising activities in support of relevant reforms.
2	Climate change	S			The project supports the ongoing work of SAEPF and other government agencies in mitigation and adaptation to climate change.

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
S	S	

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²¹

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	No	
Project Outputs	Yes	In Output 1.1.1 the project team reduced the result of the project to the development of proposals for forestry and land management and deleted the improvement. The reason is that the project can only develop proposals on adapting policy and legislation. Approval, implementation and improvement is not in the hand of the project. In Output 2.1.2 the focus was set on sustainable management, because the term “multifunctional forest management” is discussed by institutions and users controversial.

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	Original NTE: 31 December 2019 Revised NTE: November 2020 Justification: Due to cover two additional planting seasons (March and October) and to monitor the forest and fruit trees planting of 2014-2019 years, it is

²¹ Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

proposed to have a no-cost extension of the project, as the budget is available. The no-cost extension discussed and preliminary approved by GEF FP. The detailed work plan is prepared and pre-approved by PSC.

5. Gender Mainstreaming

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

The project is in line with the FAO's new cross cutting Strategic Objective of Gender which is aiming to ensure that gender equality becomes a regular feature of work on standard setting and of regional, sub-regional and country-level programme and projects. Although women have equal legal rights with men in terms of land ownership, acquisitions, access to credits and markers, rural women living in poverty often can't use these rights due to lack knowledge, education and other social and economic reasons. The project pays special attention to the role of rural women in natural resources management and support this role through capacity building. 1096 families (more than 5500 local people) benefit by new lease contracts for tree plantations on pilot areas from the project. In farmer field schools on 200 demonstrations plots about 3000 families will participate (about 15000 local people). Especially women will benefit from workshops for 250 households on energy efficiency, planned for 2016 and 2017, which include house insulation, improved stoves and solar kitchen.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

Social Sustainability: Local socioeconomic benefits link to GEB including food security, gender equality and mainstreaming, and indigenous people
The project has immediate socio-economic benefits to and impact on the well-being of vulnerable local people, particularly women and indigenous people, in project areas.

7. Stakeholders Engagement

Please report on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable))

Implementing Agencies: State Agency for Environment Protection and Forestry (SAEPF), Ministry of Agriculture and Melioration (MoA), and FAO.

Donors: GEF, SAEPF, MoA (including IFAD funding), FAO, GIZ, Mountain Partnership, farmers and herders associations, and WFP.

Other stakeholders: Oblast (sub-national political entity in Kyrgyzstan) Executive Authorities, Rayons (second degree of administrative division below the oblast level), NGOs, and Scientific/Academic institutions

8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

- Please tell us the story of your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihood and how it is contributing to achieve the expected global environmental benefits
- Please provide the links to publications, video materials, etc.

Information campaign for the youth of the Kyrgyz Republic on sustainable nature management, climate change and integrate youth groups of the Kyrgyz Republic into the UN Global Youth Alliance (YUNGA).

In the framework of these activities - the series of practical training aids, as well as YUNGA Challenging Badges on Biodiversity and Forests, Climate Change are being adopted. They are also translated into Russian and Kyrgyz language.

Installing solar panels on foresters' houses and educating children and youth on sustainability and environmental protection – these are two recent ways in which Kyrgyzstan, together with FAO, has set about upscaling its sustainable forest management.

Solar panels are gaining popularity as an affordable and clean source of energy, and now, they are bringing electricity to Kyrgyz foresters. FAO supported the installation of solar panels on houses in eight pilot forestry enterprises (leskhozes) throughout the country. The project was implemented in cooperation with the State Agency for Environmental Protection and Forestry.

<http://www.fao.org/yunga/home/ru/>

<https://www.facebook.com/YungaKG/>

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yjO6_cYMNg

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mNCqWGbGB80>

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²²	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National contribution	MoA (incl. IFAD) SAEPF	in kind	11.500.000	6.141.000 2.650.000		
UN	FAO	in kind	2.400.000	900.000		
BMZ	GIZ	in kind	1.700.000	1.965.900		
UN	WFP	in kind	500.000	845.602		
	Local Land Users	in kind	1.716.850	910.099		
		TOTAL	17 816 850	13 412 601		

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

²² Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** - Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”); **Satisfactory (S)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** - Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U)** - Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** - The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice”. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.