

## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

### 2021 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021

### 1. Basic Project Data

#### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	Europe
<b>Country (ies):</b>	The Republic of Serbia
<b>Project Title:</b>	Contribution of sustainable forest management to a low emission and resilient development in Serbia - FSP
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP/SRB/002/GFF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	9089 (FAO Project ID: 635621)
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	CCM, BD, SFM
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management (MAFW) - Directorate of Forests
<b>Project Duration:</b>	19 Feb 2018 - 31 Dec 2021
<b>Project coordinates:</b> ( <a href="#">Ctrl+Click here</a> )	44.817636, 20.420351

#### Milestone Dates:

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	4 December 2017
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	19 Feb 2018
<b>Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	31 Dec 2021
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) <sup>2</sup></b>	1 year no-cost extension is foreseen to be requested
<b>Actual Implementation End Date<sup>3</sup>:</b>	N/A

#### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	USD 3,274,658
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>4</sup>:</b>	USD 26,180,141

<sup>1</sup> As per FPMIS

<sup>2</sup> In case of a project extension.

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

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

<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2020 (USD m):</b>	USD 2,139,199
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2020<sup>5</sup></b>	USD 19,635,106

### Review and Evaluation

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:</b>	23 April 2021
<b>Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):</b>	MTR, September 2020
<b>Mid-term review/evaluation actual:</b>	MTR, October 2020 - May 2021, final MTR report submitted on 25 May 2021, MTR conducted remotely due to COVID-19
<b>Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2020 – June 2021).</b>	<b>Yes</b> or <b><u>No</u></b>
<b>Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2020 – June 2021).</b>	<b>Yes</b> or <b><u>No</u></b>
<b>Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:</b>	Planned date: July 2021 but we foresee to request 1 year no-cost extension
<b>Tracking tools/ Core indicators required<sup>6</sup></b>	<b><u>Yes</u></b>

### Ratings

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

### Status

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

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> 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**

<b>Contact</b>	<b>Name, Title, Division/Affiliation</b>	<b>E-mail</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Mr Predrag Jovic, National Project Coordinator	<a href="mailto:Predrag.Jovic@fao.org">Predrag.Jovic@fao.org</a>
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Mr Norbert Winkler-Rathonyi	<a href="mailto:Norbert.Winkler@fao.org">Norbert.Winkler@fao.org</a>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Mr Goran Stavrik	<a href="mailto:Goran.Stavrik@fao.org">Goran.Stavrik@fao.org</a>
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	Mr Hernan Gonzalez	<a href="mailto:Hernan.Gonzalez@fao.org">Hernan.Gonzalez@fao.org</a>

## 2. Progress Towards Achieving Project Objectives and Outcomes (DO)

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Objective(s):</b>						
<b>Outcome 1.1</b> Improved decision-making in management of productive forest landscapes	<i>Indicator CCM-9: Degree of support for low GHG development in policy, planning and regulations</i> <i>Indicator BD-4: Mainstreaming biodiversity into policy and regulatory frameworks</i>	Rating - 2: Climate change mitigation contribution in the forest sector mentioned in national CCM strategy, but outdated; no sectoral strategy and implementation		Rating - 6: CCM consideration reflected in sectoral documents and action plans, as well as forest development and forest management plans under implementation	Draft Climate Strategy & Action Plan Republic of Serbia (Project Identification No. EuropeAid/1365966/DH/SER/RS) available, reflecting CCM considerations in relation to the forest sector	S
	<i>Indicator CCM-10: Quality of MRV Systems</i>	Rating - 2: Very rudimentary MRV available only taking into account forest area with assigned C-values, but not dynamics		Rating - 8: Strong standardized measurements processes established and implemented through NFI; reporting is widely available in	Proposal for a new MRV system for the forest sector available (deliverable of this GEF project)	S

<sup>7</sup> 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.

<sup>8</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>9</sup> 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).

		included, not covering the whole forest area and not up to international standards		multiple formats through FIS; verification of information through FIS		
	<i>Indicator BD-4: Mainstreaming biodiversity into policy and regulatory frameworks</i>	Forestry: Regulations are in place to implement the legislation: Forest Law and and FDS include biodiversity considerations, FMPs only exist for part of the FMUs		Forestry: The regulations are under implementation in pilot areas because of clear guidelines and improved capacities of forest managers	Twenty draft guidelines for management of specific forest types developed and already in use	S
<b>Outcome 1.2</b> Institutional capacities strengthened for multi-functional forest management	<i>Public, private, academic and civil society institutions with increased capacities in SFM</i>	<i>Public, private, academic and civil society institutions with limited capacities in SFM</i>	10 institutions with a higher ranking than baseline	15 institutions with a higher ranking than baseline	12 recognized institutions are active partners in the project. The multi-functional forest management/planning tools on which the trainings and other capacity development activities will be based, are currently under finalization.	S
<b>Outcome 2.1</b> Increased forest area under sustainable and	<i>Indicator CCM-1: Total Lifetime Direct and Indirect GHG Emissions Avoided (Tons CO2eq)</i>	<i>0 tCO2eq direct emissions avoided</i>		<i>1,784,288 tCO2eq direct emissions avoided</i>	Guidelines for management of specific forest types ready for implementation.	S

multi-functional forest management	<i>Indicator SFM-3: Area of sustainably managed forest (based on new guidelines), stratified by forest management actors (ha)</i>	<i>State Forests (PE Srbjasume/Voivodinasume/National Parks Tara and Fruska Gora): 0 Church Forests: 0 Private Forests: 0 ha Total: 0</i>		<i>State Forests (PE Srbjasume/Voivodinasume, National Parks Tara and Fruska Gora): 18,000 Church Forests and Private Forests: 2,000 Total: 20,000 ha in addition to baseline</i>	Guidelines for management of specific forest types ready for implementation. Areas for the related field work selected in close cooperation with PEs Srbjasume and Vojvodinasume and process of establishment of demonstration plots is ongoing.	S
	<i>Indicator BD-1: Area under which the project will directly and indirectly contribute to biodiversity conservation (Ha.)</i>	Direct coverage: 0 ha Indirect coverage: 0 ha		<i>Direct coverage: 20,000 ha Indirect coverage: 476,010 ha</i>	Guidelines for management of specific forest types ready for implementation. Areas for the related field work selected in close cooperation with PEs Srbjasume and Vojvodinasume and process of establishment of demonstration plots is ongoing.	S
	<b>Outcome 3.1</b> Adaptive management ensured and key lessons shared	<i>M&amp;E system ensuring timely delivery of project benefits and adaptive results-based management</i>	No M&E system in place.	Up-to-date monitoring and reporting on outcomes, outputs and activities	Up-to-date monitoring and reporting on outcomes, outputs and activities	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating <sup>10</sup>**

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

---

<sup>10</sup> To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

### 3. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs <sup>11</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>12</sup>	Achievements at each PIR <sup>13</sup>					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR		
Output 1.1.1: Methodology for forest and biodiversity information collection and management harmonized with global and regional standards and reporting requirements	Q3 Y3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Methodology for collecting and analyzing biodiversity and carbon information for NFI</li> <li>• Methodology for assessing forest biodiversity and nature values as part of SFM for forest development and management planning</li> <li>• Draft technical guidelines for integrating CCM and BD conservation into forest development and management planning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical guidelines for integrating CCM and BD conservation into forest development and management planning</li> <li>• Biodiversity guidelines as part of the FMP for at least 15 forest management types</li> <li>• BD Manual 1 - Nature Value Assessment of forest plots (Biodiversity indicators and field</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integration of BD guidelines in SFM guidelines</li> <li>• Integration of BD guidelines into data collection and analysis software for forestry professionals</li> <li>• 4 trainings of trainers for usage of BD guidelines in forest planning and practice</li> </ul>			95%	

<sup>11</sup> 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.

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

<sup>13</sup> 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)

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



			<p><i>guides for the NFI in Serbia)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>BD Manual 2- Nature Value Assessment of forest stands (Biodiversity indicators and field guides for the FMP in Serbia)</i></li> <li>• <i>Nature Value Assessment Field Form</i></li> <li>• <i>Training Needs Assessment Related to Nature Value Assessment and Mapping of Key Habitats in Serbia</i></li> <li>• <i>BD Report – Obedska bara and NP Tara</i></li> </ul>					
Output 1.1.2: National forest information system, including biodiversity and carbon information, operational functionalities	Q3Y3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Draft technical specification of equipment and software developed</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Technical specification of equipment and software developed (based on FIS functionality list prepared by WG of the DF)</i></li> <li>• <i>Interoperability standards for IT infrastructure</i></li> <li>• <i>Equipment for FIS and NFI procured</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Software for Forest management planning with additional modules procured and in use</i></li> <li>• <i>Trainings for use of software for forestry professionals and other stakeholders implemented</i></li> <li>• <i>Technical specifications for the remaining FIS modules and functionalities under development</i></li> </ul>			70%	Delays due to the complexity and the number of institutions involved, as well as related procurement processes

			<i>(tablets, graphic stations, server)</i>					
Output 1.1.3: National forest inventory conducted (including assessment and collection of information relevant to biodiversity conservation and climate change mitigation)	Q2Y4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Service Contract for the phase I of NFI (Photo Interpretation) under implementation (contracts with Bureau for Forest Management Planning of the Public Enterprises "Srbijasume")</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Photointerpretation on 4x4km grid, 2 regions on the 1x1km grid</i></li> <li>• <i>NFI Methodology (field manual)</i></li> <li>• <i>Field training performed (August 2019)</i></li> <li>• <i>LoA with PE's Srbijasume and Vojvodinasume for the NFI field work (10 teams)</i></li> <li>• <i>NFI data entry software in use</i></li> <li>• <i>Field measurement started (400 clusters measured)</i></li> <li>• <i>Institute of Forestry Control team established and started with control</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>100% of photointerpretation and 20% of related analysis of national territory done,</i></li> <li>• <i>60% of NFI field measurement of the national territory done (Vojvodina and Western Serbia regions 100% finalized)</i></li> <li>• <i>NFI Analyses software developed and analysis started for the 2 finalized pilot regions (Vojvodina and Western Serbia)</i></li> </ul>			60%	NFI field work slightly delayed due to Covid-19 restrictions
Output 1.1.4: Existing carbon monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) systems, reviewed and adapted to Serbian context	Q1Y3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Draft proposal for institutional setup framework including the necessary capacities to be allocated, the choice and description of the protocol and the development of the MRV system</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Proposal for a new MRV system for the forest sector, including institutional setup, choice and description of the protocol</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Proposal for a new MRV system for the forest sector, including institutional setup, choice and description of the protocol</i></li> <li>• <i>NEW: Follow-up plan to ensure the recommendations from the project's MRV review under development</i></li> </ul>			90%	Based on the related MTR recommendation a follow up activity has been introduced (implementation status changed)

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Validation WS (September 26th, 2019)</i></li> </ul>					from 100% back to 90%)
Output 1.1.5: Forest development strategy and legislation revised to incorporate biodiversity and climate change mitigation concerns	Q3Y4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Preliminary consultations with key stakeholders on forest development strategy including legislation issues to incorporate biodiversity and climate change mitigation</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Preliminary consultations with key stakeholders on forest development strategy including legislation issues to incorporate biodiversity and climate change mitigation</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Consultations with key stakeholders on forest development strategy including legislation issues to incorporate biodiversity and climate change mitigation</i></li> </ul>			15%	Consultations are still on informal level; no draft documents yet available
Output 1.1.6: National standards for best management practices in different forest types	Q1Y4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Consultations with researchers and forest managers on best management practices in different forest types</i></li> <li>• <i>Revision of the existing SFM guideline documents</i></li> <li>• <i>Revision and completion of at least 15 guideline documents for sustainable silvicultural practices in different forest types, integrating climate-smart forestry and biodiversity conservation based on the EU habitats directive</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Consultations with researchers and forest managers on best management practices in different forest types</i></li> <li>• <i>Revision of the existing SFM guideline documents</i></li> <li>• <i>8 guideline documents completed; remaining 7 guideline documents for sustainable silvicultural practices in different forest types, integrating climate-smart</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Final 20 SFM guidelines developed</i></li> </ul>			90%	Only related trainings missing (were not possible due to COVID19)

			<i>forestry and biodiversity conservation based on the EU habitats directive in the revision stage</i>					
Output 1.1.7: National level multisectoral coordination platform for multifunctional sustainable forest management established	Q3Y4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regular monthly consultations in multi-actor working groups on Forest information, forest development planning, forest management systems, and private forest owners integration (representatives of PEs Srbjasure/Voivodinasume/Forestry Institute Belgrade and Novi Sad/Directorate of Forests/National Parks/Nature Protection Agency)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regular monthly consultations in multi-actor working groups on Forest information, forest development planning, forest management systems, and private forest owners integration (representatives of PEs Srbjasure/Voivodinasume/Forestry Institute Belgrade and Novi Sad/Directorate of Forests/National Parks/Nature Protection Agency)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regular monthly consultations in multi-actor working groups on Forest information, forest development planning, forest management systems, and private forest owners integration (representatives of PEs Srbjasure/Voivodinasume/Forestry Institute Belgrade and Novi Sad/Directorate of Forests/National Parks/Nature Protection Agency)</li> </ul>			70%	Due to stakeholder decision the coordination remained on a regular but informal level; based on the related MTR recommendation the establishment of a formal platform is currently reconsidered by the DF
Output 1.2.1: Training programme for forest managers, users and administrators in updated SFM techniques and BD management in productive landscapes	Q3Y4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A capacity development strategy and training modules under development: FDP and FMU level Planning, management, monitoring; Forest information system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training needs assessment and trainings design (including training materials) for SFM for forest professionals and forest owners (Part I)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trainings under implementation (4 trainings for trainers implemented)</li> </ul>			50%	Remaining 1-2 days trainings (47) will be implemented in parallel until the end of 2021.

established and implemented, including a training of trainers			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of training courses for the LoA with Chamber of Forestry Engineers of Serbia</li> <li>LoA with Forestry chamber of Serbia on trainings and demonstration plots establishment</li> </ul>					
Output 2.1.1: Biodiversity status and impact of land use on biodiversity assessed in the project areas	Q2Y4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preliminary report on forest biodiversity, threats and impacts in the project areas (Vojvodina and Western Serbia) based on the review of existing knowledge and data and evaluate the current status for forest biodiversity, impacts and threats for Obeska Bara and Tara National Parks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft training materials and training of identified staff of forest management planning units of PE's who are responsible for FMP: 1. Nature Value Assessment (NVA) incorporated by FMP team; and 2. mapping of key biotopes in the 4 selected FMUs within and outside protected areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trainings under implementation (4 trainings for trainers implemented)</li> </ul>			70%	Final BD status report will incorporate NFI data analysis as soon as it becomes available
Output 2.1.2: Integrated and improved forest development plans prepared for 2 forest regions	Q3Y4			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft content of FDPs</li> </ul>			5%	Draft FDPs to incorporate NFI results as soon as it becomes available
Output 2.1.3: Integrated Forest management plans implemented	Q3Y4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Selection of 8 FMUs (4 in Vojvodina and 4 in Western Serbia)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the selected FMUs activities related to forest site mapping, erosion risk</li> </ul>			50%	FMP plans for related FMUs expected to

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>In the 8 selected FMUs preparatory activities related to forest site mapping, erosion risk assessment, landslide cadastre, forest function mapping, assessment of Natura 2000 restrictions and management options</i></li> <li>• <i>16 demonstration plots for typical management measures in common forest types selected</i></li> </ul>		<p><i>assessment, landslide cadastre, forest function mapping, assessment of Natura 2000 restrictions and management options are under implementation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>16 demonstration plots for typical management measures in common forest types established</i></li> </ul>				be finalised by the end of 2021
Output 2.1.4: Strategic and policy options to ensure commitment of private forest owners to sustainable forest management developed and validated	Q1Y4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>A concept for a comprehensive forest extension service for private forest owners under development;</i></li> <li>• <i>Analysis of potential incentives for forest owners to implement SFM (fiscal incentives, ecosystem services, market access, certification schemes) ongoing.</i></li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Selection of the consultant to develop Concept Note for a separate follow-up on funding project for promoting SFM with a component specifically focusing on PFOs/PFOAs</i></li> </ul>			40%	BThe MTR recommends to replace the original activities planned under this output by developing CN in a follow up project
Output 3.1.1: Monitoring system providing systematic information on progress in reaching expected outcomes and targets		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Preparation of Annual Work Plan and Budget</i></li> <li>• <i>Preparation of project progress reports</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Preparation of Annual Work Plan and Budget</i></li> <li>• <i>Preparation of project progress reports</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Preparation of Annual Work Plan and Budget</i></li> <li>• <i>Preparation of project progress reports</i></li> </ul>			75%	M&E system to be fine-tuned

Output 3.1.2: Mid-term and final evaluation conducted				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>MTR of the project finalized in April 2021 and MTR report produced</i></li> </ul>		100%	
Output 3.1.3: Project achievement and results recorded and disseminated		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Preparatory activities of setting up of a project website / social media</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>WEB site under development</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Communication expert of the FAO Project Office in Belgrade hired to professionally communicate and disseminate project results,</i></li> <li>• <i>WEB site under development by DF</i></li> </ul>		10%	FIS, including WEB site delayed

#### 4. Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on Project Implementation

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

Max 200 words:

As in the previous reporting period, the overall implementation of activities under every project outcome is at a satisfactory level, keeping in mind that most of the main results are scheduled for the last year of the project and the delays due to Covid-19 constraints. Under Component 1, the central part of the project, the scheduled activities and preparatory work were finalized on time (methodologies and field manuals for National Forest Inventory detailed specifications for FIS, proposal for MRV system, 20 guidelines for management practices in different forest types) in close cooperation with and the active participation of the project stakeholders. Preparatory activities under Component 2 continued during the reporting period and have been delivered in a timely manner and with high quality, process of establishment of demonstration plots finalized, but slightly delayed due to Covid-19 restrictions affecting field activities. Under Component 3 reporting on activities is detailed and on time, however, the other activities are delayed. The M&E system needs refinement. Concerning co-financing activities, especially in cash, the Forest Fund of the Republic of Serbia continues to provide more funds as originally planned, in-kind contributions of other project partners have been provided. The selected consultants, both national and international, for implementing project activities are meeting the required quality standards.

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

Max 200 words:

Similar challenges as in the previous reporting period were faced in project implementation, namely that this is the first GEF project implemented in the forest sector in Serbia requiring both horizontal (national level) and vertical (capacities, planning, trainings, institutions) integration of activities and extensive coordination. The limited number of experienced international consultants familiar with both, the temperate forests in South East Europe and in a technical subjects of the project (NFI, IS, SFM planning, and others) continue to be a challenge in terms of timely delivery of project implementation. In addition, restrictions in movement due to Covid-19 caused delays in field activities and prevented scheduled missions of international consultants.



## Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2021 Development Objective rating <sup>15</sup>	FY2021 Implementation Progress rating <sup>16</sup>	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2020 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	S	S	The overall implementation of activities has been performed in a timely manner and with satisfactory quality related to the planned outputs for the reporting period. Having in mind that most of the activities are closely interrelated, their coordination has been successfully solved despite the delays experienced due to Covid-19.
<b>Budget Holder</b>	S	S	The budget has been maintained in a solid manner and it has been properly ensured that expenditures are made and resources used in accordance with FAO's rules and regulations.
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>17</sup></b>	S	S	Sound technical overview and support has been provided to the project during the reporting period. Technical clearances have been performed in a timely manner and ensured the satisfactory technical quality of all outputs. The team of technical consultants received adequate guidance related to their activities.
<b>GEF Operational Focal Point</b>	S	S	The overall implementation of activities is satisfactory in spite of some delays experienced due to Covid-19. Project is transparent and in accordance with implementation arrangements. Produced PIR's satisfying.

<sup>15</sup> **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. For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

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

<sup>17</sup> The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

<b>FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<p>The project is advancing in a satisfactory manner and is expected to achieve its objectives. While there have been delays in the development of the National Forest Monitoring System given its inherent complexity, the outputs are expected to be achieved. Similarly, field level activities are expected to advance during the third year of implementation.</p> <p>Constant proper guidance has been provided to the Project Task Force in order to better understand and meet GEF requirements during project implementation and monitoring.</p>
--	----------	----------	---

### 5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

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

This section of the PIR describes the progress made towards complying with the approved ESM plan, when appropriate. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Please add recommendations to improve the implementation of the ESM plan, when needed.

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 Risk classification is still valid; if not, what is the new classification and explain.

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid <sup>18</sup> . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
L	L

<i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i>

---

<sup>18</sup> **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.

## 6. Risks

### Risk ratings

<b>RISK TABLE</b>					
<i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the <b>Project Document</b> and reflects also <b>any new risks</b> 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>					
	<b>Risk</b>	<b>Risk rating<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>Mitigation Action</b>	<b>Progress on mitigation actions<sup>20</sup></b>	<b>Notes from the Project Task Force</b>
1	Lack of close and collaborative cooperation between institutional stakeholders	L	Close and collaborative cooperation between many institutional stakeholders will be essential for the project to achieve its stated goal and objectives. This will be achieved through involvement of all stakeholders from the beginning of the project inception process and through establishment of the national multi-sectoral coordination platform. A communication strategy will also be developed and regular meetings and presentation of project results in different phases of the project implementation will be organized.	Regular daily communication with relevant stakeholders and meetings of the Steering Committee	
2	Low technical capacity of experts and institutions at national and local level halting the project's progress	L	The assessment conducted during the PPG phase shows that this risk is low and suitable national experts can be identified. However, some international experts will be hired with project resources in order to provide guidance on some specific technical issues and further strengthen capacities at	Experienced international and national consultants were hired in the inception project phase	

<sup>19</sup> GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

<sup>20</sup> 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".

			the national level. In terms of institutional capacity, the risk will be mitigated through the project's capacity building activities.		
3	Lack of political support for the project	L	Achievement of the project goals, especially in regard to policy development and enforcement will rely on political willingness. Engagement of high level officials throughout the project implementation and involvement of appropriate officials in the project steering committee will aid in ensuring political support. In the preparation phase, high-level officials were engaged in workshops and discussions.	High – level representatives of main stakeholders are engaged in the Project Steering Committee	
	Natural changes in ecosystems and associated species due to gradual changes in climate and extreme weather events.	L	Outputs and capacity building activities will be designed, taking into account likely changes in ecosystems. The information system developed under the project will identify changes in ecosystems likely to be linked to climate change (e.g. occurrence of forest fires, pests and diseases, spread of invasive species) so that remedial actions can be taken.	Preparatory activities for the implementation of integral forest information system finalised.	
	Lack of willingness and capacities of private forest owners to engage in project activities	M	The communication activities of the project will ensure that private forest owners are aware of the projects and the associated benefits. Alliances will be sought with local forest owners associations and community-based organizations to establish good relationships with local stakeholders. Regular activities and presence of project staff in the intervention areas will also help build trust.	List of active PFOA's was developed and PFOA's contacted to enable their participation in project implementation	
	Difficulties to implement forest management plans at Forest Management Unit level due to a fragmentation of private forests	M	To ensure the generation of the global environmental benefits, the project will intervene both in forest management units of public enterprises with a uniform tenure	Implementation of project outcome 2.1. "Increased forest area under	

			structure, and FMUs at municipal level comprised of holdings of small private forest owners, who for the most part own parcels of 1 ha or less. In the municipal FMUs, the project will work as much as possible with local forest users associations	sustainable and multi-functional forest management” ongoing	
	Lack of willingness of institutions to share information	M	The establishment of the forest information system relies on the willingness of institutions to share data, which is a sensitive issue in Serbia. To mitigate the risk, the project will ensure a regular information flow to partner institutions, ensuring the transparency of the information system including protocols as well as clear regulations on data use and access rights. Furthermore, a by-law on data sharing will be developed which governs the data sharing agreement between the Forest Directorate and other agencies under the Ministry of Agriculture and Environment	Agreement between Directorate of Forests (DF) and National Geodetic Agency on utilisation of geospatial data as a 1st step of cooperation between national institutions.	

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

<b>FY2020 rating</b>	<b>FY2021 rating</b>	<b>Comments/reason for the rating for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period</b>
M	M	Risks remain at the same level for the time being, but may decrease with full impact of mitigation measures taken.

## 7. Adjustments to Project Strategy – Only for projects that had the Mid-term review (or supervision mission)

If the project had a MTR review or a supervision mission, please report on how the MTR recommendations were implemented as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented
<b>Recommendation 1:</b> Increase focus on CCM activities in project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. National consultant with experience of national climate change strategy, plans, actions and MRV will be hired to implement recommendation.</li> <li>2. Project FMP team in cooperation with International CCM specialist will review the Guidelines and decide on possible changes after which the guidelines will be incorporated in the forestry regulatory framework</li> <li>3. The Communication expert of the FAO Project Office in Belgrade is already engaged and will develop with support of the Project team (component 1 &amp; 2) the awareness-raising/outreach programme suggested under 4.</li> <li>4. The Project will discuss with SC members on how to best address the issue of establishment of the project Climate Change Working Group (CCWG) to serve as advisory forum on CC issues to the project</li> </ol>
<b>Recommendation 2:</b> Optimise involvement of PFOs and PFOAs in project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The representatives from selected PFOAs to attend training and awareness-raising events is already incorporated in the existing FMP training plan of the Project.</li> <li>2. The selection of the site of demonstration plots follows the purpose clearly outlined in the project document, namely to demonstrate the new forest management planning approaches responding to CC and BD challenges. PFOAs will be trained on the demonstration plots closest to their operating areas and if there is a chance to address NTFPs management issues the Project will accommodate</li> <li>3. Biomass expert has already been identified and National wood supply and demand study (following WISDOM methodology) under preparation for the two target regions by the Project.</li> <li>4. Concept Note for a separate follow-up on funding project for promoting SFM with a component specifically focusing on PFOs/PFOAs will be developed in 2021.</li> </ol>
<b>Recommendation 3:</b> Improve partner participation in project activities and decision-making	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The SC will re-examine the list of partners, stakeholders and co-financiers and consider expanding the representation as well as seek inputs from stakeholders from the agriculture and rural development sectors, as well as private sector (non-state forestry) actors particularly the involvement of PFOs/PFOAs</li> <li>2. The membership at SC is defined in the project document, however FAO will discuss with SC members the possible involvement of new members in SC and WGs</li> <li>3. FAO PMU in collaboration with MAFW-DF will recalculate co-financing contributions from partners, based on their actual involvement in, and contributions to, the project, and collect updated statements of co-financing contributions</li> </ol>
<b>Recommendation 4:</b> Improve communications and knowledge management on the project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Communication expert of the FAO Project Office in Belgrade is already engaged to ensure effective communication to target audiences.</li> <li>2. Communication expert of the FAO Project Office in Belgrade in cooperation and communication with FAO REU or HQ will develop a project Communications and Knowledge Management Strategy and Plan that sets out key messages to be communicated.</li> <li>3. Web page of the Project will be developed and hosted by DF where all project materials will be available.</li> </ol>



<b>Recommendation 5:</b> Grant project a 1-year No Cost Extension	Extraordinary SC meeting held on 23 April preliminary accepted the idea of 1-year NCE, and regular SC meeting will be organized by the end of July 2021 where revised WP and the Budget will be presented. Formal approval from Project partners will be requested.
--	---

**Adjustments to the project strategy.**

Please note that changes to outputs, baselines, indicators or targets cannot be made without official approval from PSC and PTF members, including the FLO. These changes will follow the recommendations of the MTR or the supervision mission.

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	No	
Project Outputs	No	

**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 is 31 December 2021, no-cost extension until 31 December 2022 is foreseen to be requested.  Justification: COVID19 impact and MTR recommendation

## 8. 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))**

If your project had a stakeholder engagement plan, specify whether any new stakeholders have been identified/engaged:

If a stakeholder engagement plan was not requested for your project at CEO endorsement stage, please

- list all stakeholders engaged in the project;
- Please indicate if the project works with Civil Society Organizations and/or NGOs
- briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.

Please also indicate if the private sector has been involved in your project and provide the nature of the private sector actors, their role in the project and the way they were involved

Stakeholder	Type of engagement in project implementation
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management - Directorate of Forests	The Directorate of Forests (DF) is one of the main beneficiaries of the project. The DF leads the project implementation process along with FAO and provides the bulk of the co-financing through the Forest Fund administered by the DF. The DF is also responsible to transform and adopt recommendations of the project into policies and programmes.
Ministry of Environmental Protection (MEP), notably Department for Nature Protection, and other relevant Ministries	MEP and all other relevant government entities are involved in extensive consultations to understand their current and potential role in promoting and implementing sustainable forest management, and to address conflicts and barriers, for example with regards to data sharing.
PE Voivodinasume and Srbijasume	The PEs are beneficiaries of the project, and key project implementation partners at regional and local level. They have been involved in the implementation of the NFI field surveys, validation of strategies, training activities and implementation of SFM at regional and local level. The PEs are also important contributors of co-financing to the project.
Private forest owners and their associations	PFOs and PFOAs are main beneficiaries of the project, and key project implementation partners at local level. They are involved in the validation of strategies, training activities and implementation of SFM at local level.
Academic and research institutes: Forest Faculty Kraljevo School	Academic institutions are expected to play a key role in capacity building, information management and dissemination activities. They play a central role in providing expertise, for instance in the definition of SFM guidelines. Furthermore, the Kraljevo Forest Technical High School will participate in supporting the SFM training programme.
Civil Society Organizations	CSOs play a vital role in validating recommendations and strategies produced under the project. Furthermore, they are valuable partners for dissemination of information. The project also ensures that those CSOs working with rural women are engaged.
Local communities	Local communities are important partners for project implementation at local level. They are involved in all relevant consultations, to contribute their understanding and perspectives on sustainable forest management, threats and opportunities of forests. The project is ensuring that women and men residing in the pilot areas and depending on forests for their livelihoods, are informed and engaged. Furthermore, they play an important part in disseminating information.
State Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA)	As the main clearing house for environmental information in Serbia, SEPA has a crucial role in ensuring that the information products and services generated under the project are compatible with existing SEPA systems. SEPA has a key role in facilitating data and information exchange with other environmental databases of the government.

Stakeholder	Type of engagement in project implementation
Institutes of Nature Conservation Serbia and Voivodina	As legal entities charged with approving the forest management plans, the Institutes are important partners to advise and approve the Forest Management Plans at local level and Forest Development Plans at regional level. Furthermore, they are engaged in the validation of products such as the SFM guidelines.
PE National Parks	The PEs of the National Parks are beneficiaries of the project, and key project implementation partners at regional and local level. They are involved in the assessment of forest biodiversity in the pilot areas, validation of strategies, training activities and implementation of SFM at local level. NPs Tara, Fruska Gora, and Djerdap are important contributors of co-financing.
Chamber of Forestry	The Chamber of Forestry is an important ally of the project for the dissemination of information through its network of members and partners. It provides co-financing through training and advisory services.
The Coordination Body for Gender Equality of the Prime Minister's Office	The Coordination Body for Gender Equality of the Prime Minister's Office is the main body for gender equality of Serbia. It provides technical advice and coordination support on gender equality issues.
Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia	The Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia is a key partner in enriching the FIS with socio-economic data, which will help to better understand socio-economic aspects that impact on forest management

## 9. 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 the preparation of the project document, a gender assessment in communities in the pilot areas which included field research, was conducted to identify women’s and men’s use of and dependency on forests. According to the assessment’s findings, men are predominantly engaged in firewood collection, whereas women tend to be more engaged in the collection of non-wood forest products (NWFPs). Forest work is socially considered to be more appropriate to men, and private forests are registered in the name of a male family member, who usually tend to take the decisions regarding the family forests. Women also are less likely to attend meetings related to forest management and use. More information and knowledge on economic opportunities in relation for forests was identified as a key need and interest by both, women and men. Even though partly depending on forests for their livelihoods, they do not feel to have sufficient information on how to improve their livelihoods with forests.

A gender mainstreaming strategy has been incorporated throughout the project document, and all relevant outputs include gender and social inclusion considerations, including the following:

- Under Output 1.1.2, the project will support the development and implementation of indicators to monitor the use of forests disaggregated by sex, age, educational level, which will feed the FIS and will allow for improved decision making.
- Under Output 1.1.5, the project will support the inclusion of a gender-responsive budget in the forest development strategy.
- Under Output 1.2.1 the project will develop training modules on socio-economic issues in sustainable forest management, including gender mainstreaming related issues.
- Under output 2.1.4, the project will develop special measures to ensure that the forest extension service reaches those most vulnerable parts of rural population, both women and men.

In addition, the M&E system on the project will include gender sensitive indicators

## 10. Knowledge Management Activities

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

Now, when the first project results and draft of publications become available, the Communication expert of the FAO Project Office in Belgrade has been engaged to ensure effective communication to target audiences.

Communication expert of the FAO Project Office in Belgrade in cooperation and communication with FAO REU or HQ will develop a project Communications and Knowledge Management Strategy and Plan that sets out key messages to be communicated.

Web page of the Project will be developed and hosted by DF where all project materials will be available.

## 11. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

If applies, 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

## 12. Innovative Approaches

**Please provide a brief description of an innovative<sup>21</sup> approach in the project / programme, describe the type (e.g. technological, financial, institutional, policy, business model) and explain why it stands out as an innovation.**

## 13. Possible impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the project

**Please indicate any implication of the Covid-19 pandemic on the activities and progress of the project. Highlight the adaptative measures taken to continue with the project implementation.**

- Are the outcomes/outputs still achievable within the project period.
- Will the timing of the project MTR or TE be affected/delayed?
- What is the impact of COVID-19 on project beneficiaries, personnel, etc.
- Are there good practices and lessons learned to be shared?

The Covid-19 pandemic has added to already occurring delays, mainly by the need to suspend field level operations, the most crucial activities to achieve the results under both main component of the project. This included data collection, within the framework of the NFI (Component 1) as well as trainings (under Component 1 & 2), to name a few.

---

<sup>21</sup> Innovation is defined as *doing something new or different in a specific context that adds value*

## 14. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>22</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2021	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
NG	Ministry for Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management	Cash	15,486,141	11,614,606		15,000,000
NG	Ministry for Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management	In-kind	5,545,000	4,158,750		5,545,000
Benef.	Institute of Forestry	In-kind	445,000	333,750		445,000
Benef.	University Novi Sad (Institute for Lowland Forestry and Environmental Protection)	In-kind	445,000	333,750		445,000
Benef.	NP Fruska gora	In-kind	285,200	213,900		285,200
Benef.	NP Djerdap	In-kind	142,600	106,950		142,600
Benef.	NP Tara	In-kind	855,600	641,700		855,600
Benef.	Public Enterprise Srbijasume	In-kind	980,000	735,000		980,000
Benef.	Public Enterprise Vojvodinasume	In-kind	420,000	315,000		420,000
Benef.	Forest Technical school Kraljevo	In-kind	713,000	534,750		713,000
Benef.	Forest Chamber	In-kind	220,000	165,000		220,000
Benef.	NP Kopaonik	In-kind	142,600	106,950		142,600
BAA	UN FAO	Cash	300,000			300,000
BAA	UN FAO	In-kind	200,000			200,000
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>26,180,141</b>	<b>19,635,106</b>		<b>25,694,000</b>

<sup>22</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.

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

## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

**Development/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.