

1- Identification

1.1 Project details

GEF ID	10204	SMA IPMR ID	95093
Project Short Title	SABAL	Grant ID	S1-32GFL-000712
		Umoja WBS	SB-018526
Project Title	Transforming agricultural systems and strengthening local economies in high biodiversity areas of India through sustainable landscape management and public-private finance		
Project Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full Sized Project (FSP)	Duration months	<i>Planned</i> 60
Parent Programme if child project			<i>Age</i> 13.8
GEF Focal Area(s)	Biodiversity; Land Degradation	Completion Date	<i>Planned -original PCA</i> 31-Mar-28
Project Scope	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National		<i>Revised - Current PCA</i>
Region	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Asia Pacific	Date of CEO Endorsement/ <i>Approval</i>	28-May-21
Countries	India	<i>UNEP Project Approval Date (on Decision Sheet)</i>	28-May-21
GEF financing amount	USD 6,266,883	Start of Implementation (PCA entering into force)	10-May-22
Co-financing amount	USD 68,590,000	Date of First Disbursement	1-Aug-22
		<i>Date of Inception Workshop, if available</i>	6-Jul-22
Total disbursement as of 30 June	USD 300,000	<i>Midterm undertaken?</i>	No
Total expenditure as of 30 June	USD 494,039	<i>Actual Mid-term Date, if taken</i>	
		Expected Mid-Term Date, if not taken	30-Jun-25
		Expected Terminal Evaluation Date	30-Sep-27
		Expected Financial Closure Date	30-Sep-28

1.2 EA: Project description

The objective of the project is to reduce land degradation and conserve biodiversity in agricultural landscapes in the states of Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka, by promoting sustainable agricultural production, supply chains, and public-private finance.

Project executing organization: Rainforest Alliance (lead EA); Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers' Welfare (MoAFW – national nodal agency); Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC); State government of Andhra Pradesh; State government of Karnataka; Rythu Sadhikara Samstha (RySS); Foundation for Ecological Security (FES).

Component 1: Enabling LDN and biodiversity conservation in priority landscapes through national fiscal and agriculture policies and multi-stakeholder landscape management.

The first component addresses barriers related to the effective implementation of policies to promote the government's commitment to LDN and biodiversity conservation through integrated land and water management. Additionally, it strengthens structures to enable local participation in landscape-based natural resource planning and management, in line with government policy.

Component 2: Scaling up of sustainable agriculture and SLM to restore degraded land, conserve biodiversity and improve human wellbeing in priority landscapes.

The project's second component focuses on land use techniques and the people who live on and from the land at farm and landscape scales. It focuses to mobilize technical expertise in sustainable agriculture, biodiversity conservation and integrated land use and water management to promote and facilitate the uptake and progressively the upscaling of sustainable agricultural production, restoration of degraded land and biodiversity conservation in the project landscapes.

Component 3: Market mechanisms and public-private finance for scaling up sustainable agriculture and landscape-scale SLM.

Component 3 addresses the commodity and financial markets for agricultural products, which are two critical enablers of SLM at farm and landscape scales. The project's theory of change is that transformation of agriculture will require a combination of supportive and enabling policies for SLM (Component 1), access of farmers to knowledge, technology and services that enable them to grow their businesses and engage with markets (Component 2), and the commitment of commodity and financial markets to SLM, because it can deliver positive business and financial results (Component 3).

Component 4: Knowledge management and outreach to scale-up sustainable value chains and landscape-scale SLM.

Component 4 of the project serves three purposes. First, provide the knowledge base for the project to review and adjust its strategy and measure its impact performance and progress as part of project M&E Plan. Second, generate data on the economic returns to farmers from adopting sustainable agricultural practices. Third, communicate externally to key stakeholders verified information that supports scale-up of sustainable production, supply chains and SLM through government policies, company commitments, farmer adoption and private investment

1.3 Project Contact

Division(s) Implementing the project	Ecosystems Division	Executing Agency(ies)	Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers' Welfare (MoAFW); Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC); State government of Andhra Pradesh; State government of Karnataka; Rainforest Alliance; Rythu Sadhikara Samstha (RySS); Foundation for Ecological Security
Name of co-implementing Agency	International Union for Conservation of Nature	Names of Other Project Partners	Watershed Support Services and Activities Network (WASSAN)
TM: UNEP Portfolio Manager(s)	Sitki Ersin Esen	EA: Manager/Representative	Madhuri Nanda
TM: UNEP Task Manager(s)	Kavita Sharma	EA: Project Manager	Aniruddha Brahmachari
TM: UNEP Budget/Finance Officer	Paul Vrontamitis	EA: Finance Manager	Stefanus Bramandhie Laksayuda
TM: UNEP Support/Assistant	Serah Shaiya	EA: Communications lead, if relevant	Hannah Ward

2- OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

TM: UNEP Current Subprogramme(s)	Nature Action	TM: UNEP previous Subprogramme(s)	
TM: PoW Indicator(s)	(iii) and (iv)		
EA: UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages	2-. Environment, climate resilience and disaster risk management		

2.1 UNEP PoW & UN

EA: Link to relevant SDG Goals

13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts
 15: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss

EA: Link to relevant SDG Targets

13.3: Improve education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning
 15.2: By 2020, promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally
 15.3: By 2030, combat desertification, restore degraded land and soil, including land affected by desertification, drought and floods, and strive to achieve a land degradation-neutral world
 15.9: By 2020, integrate ecosystem and biodiversity values into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts

2.2. GEF Core or Sub Indicators

TM: GEF core or sub indicators targeted by the project as defined at CEO Endorsement/Approval, as well as results

Indicators	Targets - Expected value			Materialised to date
	Mid-term	End-of-project	Total Target	
Area of degraded agricultural lands under restoration	35000	75000	75000	0
landscapes under improved management to benefit	40000	135000	135000	0
under third-party certification that incorporates bio	55000	75000	75000	0
landscapes under sustainable land management in pro	440000	940000	940000	138896
Area of High Conservation Value or other forest loss a	5000	25000	25000	0
Greenhouse gas emission mitigated in the AFOLU se	2000000	5601545	5601545	0
1: People benefitting from GEF-financed investment	375000	770000	770000	338201
11.1: Male	223000	466000	466000	11571
11.2: Female	152000	304000	304000	326630

Implementation Status

2023

1st PIR

2.3 Implementation status & Risk

EA: Summary of status
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

The project is based in India in the Eastern Ghats landscape of Andhra Pradesh (AP) and the Western Ghats landscape of Karnataka. Post the completion of the preparatory phase the project formally started with an inception workshop in July 2022. All the required staff were onboarded, project partners were aligned and apprised, the constitution of the Project Steering Committee (PSC), and Project Management Unit (PMU) were completed and subgrantees were engaged for the successful execution of the project.

All planned activities for all four project components were initiated and executed according to the workplans, and the outcomes progress are elaborated below.

Policy dialogues with the government were initiated under component 1 to promote their interest and consideration of proposed policy adjustments and to complement the policy dialogues; two studies were initiated on sustainable agricultural practices, sustainable land management and biodiversity conservation, of which a draft report on "Natural Farming: A Pathway towards Land degradation Neutrality" circulated among partners for feedback. To ground and augment the landscape scale activities, nine micro landscapes were identified: eight in the Eastern Ghats and one in the Western Ghats landscape and detailed participatory profiles were prepared in detail for each. Dialogue with five districts' administrations was initiated to help ensure the formation of eight Multi-Stakeholder Landscape Management Bodies (MSLMBs) in the Eastern Ghats landscape of Andhra Pradesh (AP).

Under component 2, sustainable agricultural practices, Andhra Pradesh Community Managed Natural Farming (APCNF) and Rainforest Alliance Sustainable Agricultural Standard (RA-SAS) were initiated. Progress was made for APCNF in the Eastern Ghats landscape, resulting in additional involvement of more than 0.3 million farmers and a land extent of more than 0.1 million hectares. Selected farmers were assisted in adopting agriculture technologies for the first time to reduce dependence on labour, water, and agrochemicals. Five Farmer Producer Organisations (FPOs) strengthened in the Eastern Ghats Landscape with business management, digital information system, and RA-SAS certification.

Under component 3, preparation for market value chain study for selected crops scoped to enable sustainable sourcing from the landscapes. Five FPOs were identified to initiate sustainable sourcing.

Discussions were initiated with private sector players and Non Banking Financial Companies (NBFCs)

for credit financing to the farmers adopting sustainable agricultural practices.

The Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) system was developed and put into place under component 4. This encompassed the creation of a results framework, formulation of the MEL plan, training of both staff and project partners in the MEL process, finalisation of indicators and data collection methodologies, maintenance of evidence-based progress monitoring via a SharePoint-based Project Management (PMP) system, and the preparation of a five-year project plan as well as a detailed annual plan. The Project Steering Committee and UNEP subsequently approved these plans.

The overall project management risks remained on the lower side, apart from the little risk in the implementation schedule and the capacity to deliver. The project partners' presence in the area and the project's conscious efforts reduced the social risks and created an enabling environment to ease the execution. The market volatility and no addition in the area under certified products in the year marginally increased the market risks by enhancing the possibility that other market forces will influence farmers' uptake of Sustainable Land Management practices. Developing value-added food products for the domestic market and promotion of coffee and spices in international and domestic markets were prioritised to reduce the risk. The immediate strategies for the little risk in the implementation schedule and capacity to deliver emerged to bridge the gaps in human resources engagement and adjustment in approach on the farm-level work and develop a network of Associated Trainers to support farmers foreseen to be carried out by a technical partner.

2.4 Co-finance

EA: Planned Co-finance

68590000

EA: Actual to date:

32269027

EA: Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges.

N/A

2.5. Stakeholder

EA: Date of project steering committee meeting

24-08-2021
06-07-2022
09-06-2023

EA: Stakeholder engagement
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

The project team dedicated substantial efforts to engage stakeholders at different levels. It fostered collaboration among nodal Ministries, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), implementation and executing partners, and the community. Regular meetings and consultations were the means to maintain open communication lines and promote a sense of ownership and inclusivity among stakeholders. In addition to routine interactions at the Project Management Unit (PMU) level, an Inception workshop and three Project Steering Committee (PSC) meetings were convened to gather invaluable inputs that shaped the project's direction and refined its strategy.

In the first PSC meeting held on 24th August 2021, prior to the commencement of the project, several key decisions were made. It was decided to include a private investor and co-financer, a financial service provider, and a technical expert on landscapes and agroforestry. Additionally, the Terms of Reference for the project steering committee were shared, discussed, and agreed upon. Please refer to Annexure: **PIR 1_Project 10204_STEP 1_2.5_Annexure 1a _ Minutes of first PSC**, for details. Based on the decisions made in the first steering committee meeting, the Project Steering Committee (PSC) now consists of representatives from MoAFW, UNEP, IUCN, RA, RySS, Tata-Coffee, and other key stakeholders, who provide strategic guidance for the project

In the second and third PSC meetings, detailed discussions were held on strategic issues such as finalizing the work plan, results framework, and budget for the project's duration. The strategy was fine-tuned to ensure alignment with the project objective, and the PMU's major responsibilities were outlined. Additionally, the PSC discussed the project's convergence with different programs and the project communication plan and conducted in-depth reviews at the mid-term and end of the project. Please refer to Annexure: **PIR 1_Project 10204_STEP 1_2.5_Annexure 1b _ Minutes of second PSC**, and Please refer to **Annexure: PIR 1_Project 10204_STEP 1_2.5_Annexure 1c_ Minutes of third PSC**, for details. These deliberations aimed to enhance the project's effectiveness and ensure its successful implementation.

In addition to the Project Steering Committee (PSC), regular monthly engagements are maintained with project partners in the Project Management Unit (PMU) led by RA. Furthermore, the formation of the Technical Coordination Committee (TCC) will include additional technical partners to provide their expertise and contribute to the project's implementation. These arrangements ensure continuous collaboration and technical input from relevant stakeholders throughout the project.

TM: Does the project have a gender action plan?



Yes

2.6. Gender

EA: Gender mainstreaming
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

The project adheres to the 2018 GEF Policy on Gender Equality, addressing gaps and empowering women through planned activities. It commits to gender mainstreaming, empowering women, and enhancing resource ownership and management. The project team integrated the gender mainstreaming action plan into the Results Framework before the project started. Gender-responsive strategies were implemented in capacity-building activities, empowering farmers in sustainable farming practices like Andhra Pradesh Community Managed Natural Farming (APCNF) and Rainforest Alliance-Sustainable Agriculture Standards (RASAS) Certification. The APCNF program targeting women farmers in the Andhra Pradesh landscape ensured their maximum participation. It empowers them through identification, capacity building, and on-field guidance by Community Resource Persons (CRPs). In the coming years, APCNF has the potential to serve as a benchmark for women's empowerment in the agricultural sector. It emphasizes mobilizing and motivating many women to help as Lead Farmers and Internal Community Resource Persons (ICRPs) through collaboration with RySS. Plan ensures that 50 percent of the project's trainers are women. In the programme women are supported in roles such as mentors, farmer scientists, and model makers.

During the landscape profiling and validation, the project team used a participatory approach and group discussions to identify landscape-level issues. The landscape profiling tool played a crucial role in identifying and analysing gender-related issues within the project. This comprehensive tool examines various aspects such as daily activity schedules, women's overall status in the micro landscapes, and access to resources, technologies, finance, health, and nutrition. It also considers the challenges they encounter. Health Sub Committees, comprised of women members, have been established in targeted micro-landscapes such as D. Gonduru and Jaderu. These committees oversee health and nutrition aspects, including women's involvement in crop production planning, promoting local consumption of natural farming (NF) food, and establishing connections with Anganwadi Centres and schools to facilitate NF commodity supply chains.

Implementing partners underwent a two-day training program on gender and inequality that helped them understand gender concepts, sensitization processes, and the vital role of women in the APCNF program and Community-Based Organizations. Gender sensitization campaigns are organized on relevant special days, while a national campaign addressing violence against women witnessed significant participation from the micro-landscapes.

In conclusion, the project's first year has provided valuable insights into the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders regarding gender considerations in Micro Landscapes. The active involvement of Women Self Help Groups (SHGs) and Village Organizations has been significant. The project is dedicated to gender mainstreaming, prioritizing women's empowerment throughout the implementation process. The plan supports women's leadership in Micro Landscape Management Boards (MSLMBs), Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs), and sub-committees. The project aims for at least 50% representation of women in the project cadre, aligning with RySS's vision and project plans.

The gender mainstreaming action plan will be further strengthened in year-2 of the project

TM: Was the project classified as moderate/high risk at CEO Endorsement/Approval Stage?
TM: If yes, what specific safeguard risks were identified in the SRIF/ESERN?

▼

TM: Have any new social and/or environmental risks been identified during the reporting period?
TM: If yes, please describe the new risks, or changes

▼

TM & EA: Has the project received complaints related to social and/or environmental impacts (actual or potential) during the reporting period?

▼

TM & EA: If yes, please describe the complaint(s) or grievance(s) in detail including the status, significance, who was involved and what actions were taken.

EA: Environmental and social safeguards management
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

During the PPG (Project Preparation Grant) phase of the project, the UN Environment Programme conducted an Environmental, Social, and Economic Review based on its Sustainability Framework. However, this process was later replaced by the UNEP Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF). The assessment conducted using SRIF indicates that there are no major risks associated with the project, and overall, it is expected to have significant positive impacts on reducing land degradation. In the PIF (Project Identification Form) submission, two risks were identified and rated as Medium. These risks were related to Safeguard Standard 5 concerning Indigenous Peoples and Safeguard Standard 6 regarding Labour and Working Conditions. During the PPG phase, both risks were further investigated through research and consultation and were subsequently downgraded to Low. The details of the status of these risks can be found in sections 4.2 and 4.3 of this document.

The project actively engages with tribal communities, in the Andhra Pradesh Landscape, and micro-landscapes have been planned in consideration of the tribal population. In the Kodagu district of Karnataka, where indigenous people reside, Rainforest Alliance has been working for over a decade, and even one micro-landscape is aligned with their needs. Regarding Safeguard Standard 6, a potential risk related to child and forced labour was identified during the PPG phase. The risk arises from the increasing cost and scarcity of labour in the agricultural sector, especially during harvest times. However, since the project primarily works with smallholder farmers, this risk is mitigated. Both Rainforest Alliance and RySS explicitly prohibit the use of child or forced labor on farms.

Rainforest Alliance's 2020 Sustainable Agriculture Standard (SAS), requires producers to assess the risk of child labour and establish an Assessment Committee to review and take appropriate actions if a risk is identified. Auditors review the documentation when farms or smallholder groups apply for certification. The established systems for farm training, technical assistance, and monitoring by both organizations ensure that farms receiving the project's services are regularly visited by trained personnel to record their practices, preventing any exploitation of labour.

We are maintaining alignment with the checklist developed during the PPG phase, and the project will address any additional requirements that may arise.

EA: Knowledge activities and products
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

A comprehensive project brochure was designed and released for widespread distribution among stakeholders during the project inception workshop. The brochure encompasses the project's context, objectives, and deliverables, including the intended outcomes and outputs. Please refer to Annexure **PIR 1_Project 10204_STEP 1_2.8_Annexure 2a _ Project Brochure** for detail.

To raise awareness about biodiversity on International Biodiversity Day, an event was organized in the Eastern Ghats Landscape of Andhra Pradesh. A diverse range of participants, including the Paderu district collector, field cadre, farmers, stakeholders, herbal healers, and nature enthusiasts, united with a common objective of conserving and appreciating biodiversity. Speakers shared their experiences, addressing crucial subjects such as deforestation, climate change, indigenous community engagement, and policy considerations in the event. Participants expressed their concerns through an interactive dialogue session followed by a commitment to adopt sustainable practices and support local conservation initiatives. Please refer to **Annexure PIR 1_Project 10204_STEP 1_2.8_Annexure 2b _Biodiversity Day news clipping and posters** for details. Additionally, the proposal to establish Multi-Stakeholder Landscape Management Bodies (MSLMBs) was introduced, aiming to enhance collaboration and coordination among stakeholders, thus strengthening the overall implementation of the project.

Please attach a copy of any products

1. Integrated Landscape Management (ILM) requires a shift in thinking and active participation of stakeholders from different disciplines for sustainable development: ILM recognizes that sustainable development goes beyond individual sectors or projects and requires a holistic approach. It involves integrating various environmental, social, and economic elements to achieve long-term sustainability. Active involvement of stakeholders from different disciplines, including government agencies, communities, NGOs, and academia, is crucial for effective implementation and decision-making.

2. Profiling and planning exercises in the Eastern Ghats Region of Andhra Pradesh and Western Ghats Region of Karnataka brought stakeholders together, fostering consensus-building and collective decision-making processes: These exercises provided a platform for stakeholders to come together, share their knowledge and perspectives, and collaborate in analysing the landscape's resources and challenges. Through discussions and participatory processes, consensus was built, and collective decisions were made, considering various stakeholders' diverse interests and concerns. This inclusive approach enhances the chances of sustainable development outcomes that are accepted and supported by the stakeholders involved.

3. Developing a systems approach and operational framework addressed identified gaps and promoted collaboration among individuals and institutions for sustainable management: The systems approach and operational framework provide a structured framework for addressing the identified gaps and challenges within the landscape. It encourages collaboration among individuals and institutions by integrating information from multiple sources and disciplines. This collaborative approach fosters a shared understanding of the interdependencies and interactions between different landscape components, leading to more effective and coordinated management actions.

4. Technology-enabled functions and Multi-Stakeholder Landscape Management Bodies (MSLMBs) can bridge knowledge, communication, social, institutional, resource, and policy gaps in ILM and support ecosystem services: Technology is vital in facilitating knowledge sharing, communication, and data management in ILM. By utilizing technology-enabled functions, stakeholders can access and exchange information, enhancing their understanding of the landscape and its challenges. Additionally, establishing MSLMBs at the micro-landscape level enables coordinated efforts and decision-making among stakeholders, bridging gaps between other sectors and ensuring ecosystem services that benefit the community and the environment.

These learnings highlight the importance of collaborative approaches, comprehensive planning, and integrating various stakeholders and technological tools in achieving sustainable landscape management.

2.9. Stories

EA: Stories to be shared
(section to be shared with communication division/
GEF communication)

In the Eastern Ghats landscape of Andhra Pradesh, farmers were facing the issue of being unable to obtain the correct market price for their products and sell them conveniently. To address this problem, farmers joined together in five Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs) even before the inception of the project. These FPOs consisted of farmers from intervention areas of different plantation programs where production was guaranteed. These farmers were interested in selling their products at a good price and convenience. This project provided additional support to empower farmers through synchronized production and organized marketing. Rainforest Alliance, as a lead partner in the project, facilitated the RA-SAS certification for these five covering an area of 3508 hectares of coffee farm. Please refer to Annexure ***PIR 1_Project 10204_STEP 1_2.9_Annexure 3a for the Case studies of FPOs.***

The other story attached as Annexure ***PIR 1_Project 10204_STEP 1_2.9_Annexure 3b _ Nutrition Garden*** focuses on a nutrition garden model being promoted across the APCNF landscapes to improve nutritional intake at the family level. Nutrition gardens encompass dietary diversity and aim to provide a planned supply of nutritious food to respective families. The model primarily aims to enhance food security and combat malnutrition.

3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE

3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes (Development Objectives)

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	EA: Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	TM: Progress rating
Objective							
Objective: To reduce land degradation and conserve biodiversity in agricultural landscapes in the states of Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka, by promoting sustainable agricultural production, supply chains and public- private finance	O1. Area of landscapes under improved management aimed at achieving Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) and biodiversity conservation (qualitative assessment, non-certified) (GEF 4.1) (excludes value of GEF 4.4)	0 Ha.	40000 Ha.	135000 Ha.	0	The target encompasses 60,000 hectares of on-farm land with RA-SAS non-certified area and 75,000 hectares of off-farm area. The sample-based third-party survey of practices for on-farm areas is currently underway and will be repeated at the mid-term and end of the project. According to the project's design, the management of off-land areas will begin once the Multi-Stakeholder Landscape Management Bodies (MSLMBs) are established to ensure protection and planned management.	S
	O2. Area of landscapes certified under RA SAS standard, including new requirements for farm planning and climate risk assessments (GEF 4.2) (excludes value of GEF 4.3)	39527 Ha.	55000 Ha.	75000 Ha.	0	Before the start of the project, the total area under certification in Karnataka was 39,257 hectares. In the first year of the project in Karnataka, out of these 39,257 hectares, 33,001 hectares have transitioned, while the remaining area is currently transitioning.	S
	O3. Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems, not yet certified (GEF 3.1 + 4.3)	107098	475000	1015000	245994	The indicator represents GEF 3.1 and GEF 4.3. GEF 3.1 refers to 15,000 hectares of land restored on RA-SAS farms and 60,000 hectares under the RySS 365 days soil cover system. GEF 4.3 represents 940,000 hectares of APCNF. As of December 2022, additional progress of 138,896 hectares has been made for APCNF. The MIS information for the remaining period of the year, from January to June 2023, is currently being consolidated and will be reported in the upcoming reporting period. It is worth mentioning that RySS aims to achieve the conversion to APCNF of 600,000 hectares out of a total farm area of one million hectares, along with the restoration of 60,000 hectares, as endorsed by the CEO.	S
	O4. Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided (GEF 4.4)	0	5000 Ha.	25000 Ha.	0	The project team is currently exploring the High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) areas within and around the micro landscapes and will commence their management activities starting from year 2.	S

Outcome 1.1

Outcome 1.1 SLM and biodiversity conservation in production landscapes are successfully integrated into fiscal and agricultural policy instruments and planning processes implemented by key central and State level government agencies and ministries	1.1.1 Number of policy briefs provided relating to agricultural subsidies, commodity production and ecosystem conservation that increase integration of SLM into agriculture production landscapes.	0	0	3	0	The draft policy research document is currently being circulated for finalization, and it will serve as the foundation for policy briefs in the upcoming years	\$
	1.1.2 Number of convergence opportunities between the State governments and the project generated by the project, that are taken up by State government programmes	0	2	2	0	The Sustainable Landscape Management Plans (SLMPs) will be created once the Multistakeholder Landscape Management Bodies (MSLMBs) are established. The creation of SLMPs is scheduled for year-2 of the project, and once they are developed, respective opportunities for convergence will be explored	\$
	1.1.3 Research-based evidence of the relationship between fiscal incentives in present agricultural policies and application of agrochemicals leading to land degradation	0	1	1	1	Draft document in circulation for peer review	\$
Outcome 1.2							
Outcome 1.2 Integrated development of productive agriculture and SLM enabled in two States, through multi-stakeholder participatory landscape planning	1.2.1 Number of agreements in place with local governments to establish MSLMBs in micro-landscapes	0	8	10	8	The project team discussed with five district administrations regarding the formation of 8 MSLMBs in those five districts, with one in each micro landscape. The discussions are currently progressing at the Mandal levels, involving all relevant stakeholders. In principle, all the district administrations have agreed to the proposal.	\$
	1.2.2 Number of MSLMBs established and formally recognized with a mandate to plan and implement SLM and biodiversity conservation at micro-landscape scale	0	8	10	0	In 9 out of 10 micro landscapes where profiling exercises have been completed, community mobilization and discussions with relevant stakeholders to form MSLMBs are underway. Preparatory meetings are currently ongoing in the Andhra Pradesh Landscape for eight micro landscapes	\$
Outcome 2.1							
	2.1.1 Number of farmers and farm workers applying sustainable agriculture practices, in project landscapes (Gender- and youth-disaggregated.)	233916	375000	765000	572117	There are two agricultural practices planned for the project: RA-SAS and APCNF. The RA-SAS practice targets 65,000 farmers and farm workers, while the APCNF practice targets 700,000 farmers and farm workers. The progress in year-1 led to the additional involvement of 338,201 (572117-233916) farmers and farm workers, including 326,630 females and 11,571 males.	\$
	2.1.2 Percentage of farmers reporting increased satisfaction in project landscapes from application of sustainable agricultural practices (disaggregated by gender, youth, and cause of satisfaction)	0	0	80	0	The assessment will be conducted at the end of the project through a survey of farmers on a representative sample of certified farms that are implementing RA-SAS and CNF practices in the project landscapes.	\$

Outcome 2.1 Land degradation reduced, biodiversity conserved, and increased farmer satisfaction achieved on farms through adoption of sustainable agricultural practices based on CNF and RA-SAS in the project landscapes.	2.1.3 Number of hectares of farmland in project landscapes (certified and non-certified) applying RA-SAS practices to conserve biodiversity and reverse land degradation .	39527	75000	150000	0	It is important to note that a positive change is expected in year-2 of the project as the planned efforts are aligned for both certified and non certified area.	\$
	2.1.4 Number of hectares of farmland in project landscapes (certified and non-certified) under CNF to conserve biodiversity and reverse land degradation including 365-days soil cover system	107098	400000	1000000	245994	The indicator represents a portion of GEF 3.1, specifically 60,000 hectares related to RySS's 365-day soil cover system, as well as GEF 4.3. The additional progress (conversion to CNF) made for GEF 4.3 until December 2022 is 138,896 hectares. The MIS information for the period from January to June 2023 is currently being consolidated and will be reported in the upcoming reporting period. Furthermore, it is important to note that as per the CEO endorsement, RySS aims to accomplish the conversion to CNF of 600,000 hectares (out of a total farm area of one million hectares) and restore an additional 60,000 hectares.	\$
	2.1.5 Number of farmers in project landscapes adopting agri-technologies for the first time to reduce dependence on labour, water and agro-chemicals. (Gender- and youth- disaggregated.)	0	500	1000	550	A total of 550 farmers, consisting of 335 females and 215 males, have adopted agricultural technologies such as pulpers, water lifting devices, gravity flow-based irrigation systems, milling processing machines, cycle weeders, and grain threshers. This progress is from Andhra Pradesh and in year-2 the programme intensification happens in Karnataka similar focus will be brought in the Western Ghats landscape.	\$
	2.1.6 Number of FPOs with strengthened business management, including a digital information system	0	4	10	5	Five Farmer Producer Organisations (FPOs) are strengthened in the Eastern Ghats Landscape with business management, digital information system, and RA-SAS certification.	\$
	2.1.7 Estimated likely annual GHG emissions reductions up to the end of the project, from adopted best agricultural practices, especially from reduced use of agrochemicals, and achieved restoration on farm and off-farm in KA and AP (tCO2e)	TBD	2000000	5601545	0	The GHG estimation procedure is currently being discussed and will be put into action soon. The two on-farm programmes, CNF and RA-SAS, are the main focus.	\$

Outcome 2.2

Outcome 2.2 Multi-stakeholder landscape management bodies (MSLMBs) plan and implement off-farm sustainable lands management (SLM) activities that restore degraded land and conserve biodiversity	2.2.1 Number of hectares of land incorporated into sustainable landscape management plans (SLMPs) that integrate land use for restoration and biodiversity conservation and HCVFs.	0	10000	100000	0	The MSLMB formation process is under process, and once the MSLMBs are formed, they will be capacitated to create SLMPs integrating restoration, biodiversity conservation, and management of HCVFs	\$
	2.2.2 Number of people in micro-landscapes represented in activities undertaken	0	1000	5000	0	This activity will commence once the SLMPs are created	\$
	2.2.3 Number of Business Plans for sustainable growth in micro-landscapes through public-private finance, presented for blended finance	0	1	2	0	Scheduled activity will commence in year-3 of the project	\$

and high conservation value forest (HCVF).	2.2.4 Number of MSLMBs with an assigned and implemented LandScale-based performance monitoring system to record and report changes in landscape performance	0	3	10	0	Preparations are currently underway to pilot the LandScale-based performance monitoring system in one micro-landscape, and it will be scaled up to three micro-landscapes by the mid-term	\$
	2.2.5 Number of new initiatives undertaken to reduce human-wildlife conflict	0	1	1	0	The project team is in discussions with the Karnataka Biodiversity Board regarding the Tithimathi area of Karnataka. The initiative will become fully operational once an MSLMB is formed for the Tithimathi micro-landscape	\$
Outcome 3.1							
Outcome 3.1 Companies increase their buying of commodities sourced from sustainably managed landscapes.	3.1.1 Number of buying companies making new commitments to responsible sourcing from farmers in project landscapes	0	10	20	0	Market and value chain study commissioning process in underway Discussion with 3 companies – Akay , Verstegen spices, Phalada Agro underway to facilitate sourcing.	\$
	3.1.2 Number of FPOs reporting sales increases of at least 10% resulting from project activities	0	3	10	0	Initially, five Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs) have been targeted from the Eastern Ghats landscape of Andhra Pradesh (AP), while the identification of the remaining FPOs is still ongoing. Once identified, they will be supported through sustainable sourcing of produce.	\$
Outcome 3.2							
Outcome 3.2 Private and public institutions make investments to incentivize scaled-up adoption of sustainable agricultural practices and landscape-scale SLM, contributing to LDN, biodiversity conservation and human well-being	3.2.1 Value (US\$) invested through private and blended financing mechanisms in project landscapes	0	1000000	5000000	0	Discussions are underway with Samunnati and Heifer International. Samunnati is willing to provide credit support, while Heifer International is willing to provide a grant.	\$
	3.2.2 Number of FPOs in project landscapes accessing loan capital to invest in sustainable agricultural practices	0	2	5	0	Especially for RA-SAS practices, the team is currently exploring viable loan capital opportunities in the Eastern Ghats landscape of Andhra Pradesh. The same strategy will be replicated in the Western Ghats landscape of Karnataka.	\$
Outcome 4							
Outcome 4.1 Scale-up of project experience is enabled by key decision makers convinced by the evidence-based Monitoring, Evaluation &	4.1.1 IAs confirm that project management is served by high quality of data from MEL system	0	2	4	1	In the first year of the project, the Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) system was designed and operationalized. This involved the establishment of a results framework, development of the MEL plan, training of staff and project partners on the MEL process, finalization of indicators and data collection methodology, maintenance of evidence-based progress monitoring through the SharePoint-based Project Management (PMP) system, preparation of a five-year project plan, and detailed annual plan, which were approved by Project Steering Committee and UNEP. Consequently, the progress is marked as 1 (successfully completed a year) with the successful design and implementation of the MEL process, as confirmed by the completion of these documents and processes.	\$

Learning (MEL) system of the environmental, technical and socio-economic benefits from application of SLM and landscape approaches and of the strategies to achieve that.	4.1.2 Percentage of participating farmers with positive cost-benefit, from the application of sustainable agricultural practices	TBD	50	80	0	The baseline study is currently underway, and the TBD value will be confirmed based on the findings	S
	4.1.3 Project activities have led to improved restoration and conservation in project landscapes	0	0	Data from landscapes shows increase in vegetation	0	For vegetation changes NDVI indices and remote sensing analysis for spatially extensive and continuous information on vegetation changes are being used using high-resolution satellite imagery for the landscape areas from the beginning of the project. The results will be produced at the end of the project	S
	4.1.4 Project results and learning about project approach success factors convincingly showcased to provoke replication through new programme investment by government and financial service organisations.	0	10 media products and events	20 media products, publications and events	3	The celebration of Biodiversity Day in the AP landscape was covered in the Times of India and two local Telugu newspapers	S

For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.

3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs (Implementation Progress)

Output	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2022 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2023 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	EA: Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	TM: Progress rating
Under Comp 1					
Output 1.1.1 Proposals developed and advocated to lead Government agencies and key landscape stakeholders to improve policy coordination and better integrate SLM and biodiversity conservation in project landscapes.	31-May-27		30%	Two activities were planned for the first year: one focusing on maintaining sensitization dialogue with key government officials, and the other aiming to produce a research report demonstrating that agricultural subsidies contribute to increased land degradation. For the first activity (1.1.1.1), dialogues have been initiated with the Rural Development Department of Andhra Pradesh for land restoration through MGNREGS. In Karnataka	S
Output 1.2.1 Micro-landscapes agreed in consultation with representatives from Gram Panchayats and representatives of all key stakeholders, and structures established to enable multi-stakeholder planning and management of SLM at landscape scale.	30-Sep-23		29%	The detailed participatory micro-landscape profiling work has been completed in nine out of ten micro-landscapes, with eight in Andhra Pradesh and one in Karnataka. The process of landscape profiling begins with boundary delineation and validation by stakeholders, followed by detailed profiling, which includes a general profile, problem analysis, and the development of a perspective plan. However, the ten Multi-Stakeholder Landscape Management Bodies (MSLMBs) planned in year-1 have not been formed yet. Discussions are currently underway with all relevant stakeholders, and the formation of MSLMBs is rescheduled to take place in year-2 and year-3.	S
Under Comp 2					
Output 2.1.1 Capacity building and technology transfer delivered towards successful adoption of CNF and RA-SAS practices by 765,000 farmers and farm workers	30-Jun-24		62%	In the 1st year plan, a total of 81 trainings were scheduled, targeting 840 trainers, lead farmers, staff, and cadres. However, the actual number of conducted training amounted to 128, reaching 6,091 lead farmers, cadres, and staff. Furthermore, 415 trainers have been successfully trained. As a result, the completion rate for year-1 reached 100% of the target, while it represents 62% of the total training planned for the project. The training includes for both CNF and RA-SAS.	S

Output 2.1.2 Innovations in agri-tech and digital information systems tested for scaling up adoption of sustainable agriculture and directly benefitting 1000 farmers.	31-Dec-24		0%	Planned from year-2 onwards	S
Output 2.1.3 Farmer organizations' capacities strengthened in business management and product development to drive adoption of sustainable agriculture by 3,000 farmers on 10,000 ha of farmland	31-Dec-25		0%	Planned from year-2 onwards.	S
Output 2.2.1 Technical support provided to the MSLMBs to develop a Sustainable Landscape Management Plan in each micro-landscape.	30-Sep-24		0%	Planned from year-2 onwards	S
Output 2.2.2 Landscape management bodies guided and mentored to implement their SLMPs at landscape scale to conserve 25,000 ha of HCVF	31-May-27		0%	Planned from year-2 onwards	S
Output 2.2.3 Technical support provided to micro-landscapes with potential for scale to develop comprehensive business plans for their effective and sustainable operation and implementation of their SLMPs.	31-May-26		0%	Planned from year-2 onwards	S
Under Comp 3					
Output 3.1.1 Private sector engaged and incentivized through improved producer organization and increased sustainability of supply to strengthen its commitment to responsible sourcing.	31-Dec-23		0%	Discussion with 3 companies – Akay , Versteegen spices, Phalada Agro underway to facilitate sourcing.	S
Output 3.2.1 Portfolio of feasible impact investments and financial instruments developed and negotiated with financial services providers, combining investment in SLM at farm and landscape scales.	30-Jun-26		0%	Planned from year-3 onwards	S
Under Comp 4					
Output 4.1.1 MEL system implemented to track project progress and measure performance against targeted outputs, outcomes, GEF Core Indicators and GEBs.	31-May-27		30%	In the first year of the project, the Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) system was designed and operationalized. This involved the establishment of a results framework, development of the MEL plan, training of staff and project partners on the MEL process, finalization of indicators and data collection methodology, maintenance of evidence-based progress monitoring through the SharePoint-based Project Management (PMP) system, preparation of a five-year project plan, and detailed annual plan, which were approved by Project Steering Committee and UNEP. Consequently, the progress is marked as 1 (successfully completed a year) with the	S
Output 4.1.2 Evaluations of cost-benefit undertaken on the economic returns to farmers from adoption of sustainable agricultural practices, as well as environmental benefits on- and off-farm, and improvements in human well-being in the project landscapes	31-Dec-26		10%	The baseline survey for RA-SAS is currently in progress, and the baseline survey for CNF is about to commence. Similar surveys will be conducted at the mid-term and end of the project. In addition to these surveys, there will be studies involving crop-cutting experiments to evaluate the field performance of CNF. These studies will assess and analyse productivity, costs, incomes, and other benefits derived from the application of CNF. The environmental benefits both on- and off-farm, as well as improvements in human well-being	S

Output 4.1.3 Learnings from project and conditions for scalability prepared and presented to central and State governments and target financial services organizations and companies and disseminated through selected events and publications.

31-May-23

0%

Planned at the 4th and 5th years of the project.

S

Under Comp 5

The Task Manager will decide on the relevant level of disaggregation (i.e. either at the output or activity level).

Policy risk	Outcome 2.1	L	L							=	Government policy is favourable to the project's nature-based solutions approach to agricultural growth. In particular, Central and Andhra Pradesh State governments support Community Managed Natural Farming (APCNF) with resources and top government level pronouncements.
Legal risk	Outcome 1.2, 2.1, 2.2	L	L							=	The two identified potential risks during the PPG phase were "the rights of indigenous peoples on lands and territories on land on which the project will work", and "child or adult forced labour occurring in the project landscapes." Both risks are very closely monitored by the project's field teams and are unlikely to occur in the areas where the project operates. A new legal risk became evident as PPG phase closed. The government's 2020 amendment to the 2010 Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act affected the project's plan for partnership with Indian CSOs, requiring in particular the identification of a new technical partner in Karnataka. This has not yet been resolved.
Land use risk	Outcome 2.1, 3.1, 3.2	M	M							=	The risk issue is agricultural land being converted to other uses. See Table C for the mitigation strategy
Forest conversion risk		M	M							=	Agriculture is the largest cause of forest conversion globally, and hence this is a risk area. But it is deemed only moderate because of the focus of the project on agricultural land. See Table C for the mitigation strategy
Climate Change risk		M	M							=	Climate change carries many risks for farmers, as has been evidenced in crop losses and landslides, caused by prolonged periods of drought and torrential rains in southern India over recent years.
Finance risk		H	H							=	The project aims to attract new public and private finance to farms and to the MSLMBs in the micro-landscapes to demonstrate that SLM can be a financially viable concept. See Table C for the mitigation strategy
Attitudinal risk		M	M							=	Farmers may lack motivation or be fearful of changing their traditional farm practices. See Table C for mitigation strategy.
Social risk		M	L							↓	Equity and social justice are made possible by the project partners' presence in the area and the relationships that they have developed with the Gram Panchayats, Integrated Tribal Development Agencies (ITDAs) and 16 district administrations. Gender sensitization activities are incorporated into all community-level connections, such as the participatory profiling process, the establishment of MSLMBs, and activity planning, as mandated by the gender mainstreaming action plan. All frontline staff are from the community.

Market risk	L	M								↑	The marginal decline in the area of certified product in Year 1 indicates the volatility of markets and justifies increasing the risk category, while recognizing that many other factors than markets will also influence uptake of SLM by farmers. See Table C for mitigation strategy
COVID-19 risk	H	L								↓	The risk of COVID-19 has been significantly lowered through medical advancements, widespread vaccination in different phases in India, and awareness, allowing for regular social and economic activity to be resumed.
Implementation schedule			M								The project got off to a fast start, thanks to RA hiring all the team at its cost before the contract with UNEP was signed. The change of Project Coordinator did not cause much disturbance, but the loss of the Sr Technical Officer in Karnataka in month 9 has caused a loss of momentum in the State, as has the lack of a technical partner. It has not been possible to build the next stage of the landscape management process following the profiling, nor to consolidate State government relationships. As a result, much more progress has been made in Year 1 in Andhra Pradesh.
Capacity to deliver			M								The risk is related to the Implementation schedule risk and refers primarily to the capacity gap over the last quarter of Year 1 in Karnataka. See Table C for mitigation strategy

Consolidated project risk  M  This section focuses on the variation. The overall rating is discussed in section 2.3.

4.3 Table C. Outstanding Moderate, Significant, and High risks

List here only risks from Table A and B above that have a risk rating of **M** or higher in the current PIR

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIR-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	Additional mitigation measures for the next periods		
			What	When	By whom
Land use risk		Making crop production more profitable and secure for farmers is the most important project activity to mitigate this risk. Support is being provided to Farmer Producer Organizations (FPOs) dealing with cash crops to access reliable supplies through responsible sourcing. Five FPOs in the Eastern Ghats landscape are now sourcing Rainforest Alliance certified crops, which improves market conditions for the farmers. Training in APCNF techniques enables farmers to reduce nut costs and diversify production.	<p>Training and technical support to APCNF farmers and Coffee and Spices farmers in KA</p> <p>Business plan development of FPOs</p>	<p>Year-2, Year-3 Year-4 and Year-5</p> <p>Year-2 and Year-3</p>	<p>RySS and Partners in AP and Associated Trainers Network in KA</p> <p>Specialist partner</p>

Forest conversion risk		<p>The project is working with all relevant stakeholders to develop Multi-Stakeholder Landscape Management Bodies (MSLMBs) to take responsibility for ensuring that no conversion of forest land to agriculture takes place. As the MSLMBs become more established over the next two years, they will design and implement Sustainable Landscape Management Plans (SLMPs) to ensure the protection of common lands, including forests and HCVF. RA-SAS and APCNF have been introduced for the farm scale. These systems have the inherent design to value forests and biodiversity. Robust M&E is strengthened by the certification audit, where farms are certified. The risk is estimated to reduce during the project's life.</p>	<p>Enable sustainable land management practices in micro landscapes through MSLMBs</p> <p>Preparation of SLMPs including forest and HCVF</p>	<p>Year-2 and Year-3</p> <p>Year-2 and Year-3</p>	<p>RySS and Partners in AP and Rainforest Alliance and partners in KA</p> <p>RySS and Partners in AP and Rainforest Alliance and partners in KA</p>
Climate change risk		<p>The two sustainable farming systems, APCNF and RA-SAS incorporate measures to build climate change resilience, while the landscape-scale approach, initiated in both the landscapes, eastern and western Ghats, incorporates conservation and restoration.</p>	<p>Scale up APCNF and RA-SAS in the project landscapes</p>	<p>Year-2, Year-3 Year-4 and Year-5</p>	<p>RySS and Partners in AP and Rainforest Alliance and partners in KA</p>
Finance risk		<p>The project has made progress in Year 1 in attracting new donor income and building a foundation with State level government for public funding convergence. Progress in attracting private investment is targeted for Year 3. The aim is to develop blended models of finance in which both private investment and public funding play a key part.</p>	<p>Enable SHGs and their apex bodies to avail private and commercial bank finance to adopt CNF.</p> <p>Help FPOs to develop business plans and raise finance from the Market</p> <p>Explore convergence opportunities for SLMPs with government Programmes</p> <p>Explore blended financial mechanisms for at least two micro landscapes and create a scalable model</p>	<p>Year-2, Year-3, Year-4 and Year-5</p> <p>Year-2 and year-3</p> <p>Year-2 and Year-3</p> <p>Year-3, Year-4 and year-5</p>	<p>RySS and partners</p> <p>RA, RySS and partners</p> <p>FES, RA, RySS and partners</p> <p>RA</p>
Attitudinal risk		<p>The project's interactions with farmers are raising their awareness of the importance of biodiversity for long-term productivity, nutritional requirements, and overall well-being of the family. The training and technical assistance is delivering them value in building their knowledge and delivering solutions to their problems. Their perception of value generates a positive attitude, so the project expects that this risk will be decreased by continuing this approach in the coming years.</p>	<p>Raising farmers' awareness, mobilising them, and offering them technical assistance and support</p>	<p>Year-2, Year-3, Year-4 and Year-5</p>	<p>RA, FES, RySS and partners</p>
Market risk		<p>Rainforest Alliance is very strong in international markets and through its presence in India has now built relationships in the domestic market. It will give increased attention to market development in Year 2, in line with the work plan. The World Coffee Congress will enable RA to increase its profile as it has negotiated a major role with the Coffee Board of India, including highlighting the importance of sustainability.</p>	<p>Promotion of coffee and spices in international and domestic markets; development of value added food products for the domestic market</p>	<p>Year-2, Year-3, Year-4 and Year-5</p>	<p>RA (lead), RySS</p>

Implementation risk		The urgent task is to recruit a new Sr Technical Officer for Karnataka- a task that has proved challenging to date to find the right quality candidate. Once in place, the State government will be re-engaged, and the micro-landscape development process in Thithimathi taken forward. It is also planned in Year 2 to identify and profile a second micro-landscape to achieve the project target of 10.	Develop second micro-landscape; facilitate MSLMBs in both to develop SLMPs	Year-2, Year-3, Year-4 and Year-5	RA, FES
Capacity to deliver risk		To address the current gap in Karnataka, RA will adjust its approach on the farm-level work and develop a network of Associated Trainers to undertake the support to farmers foreseen to be carried out by a technical partner. Associated Trainers may be individuals or technicians working with another institution or a company. RA will train and support them.	Maintain and support Associated Trainer Network	Year-2, Year-3, Year-4 and Year-5	RA

High Risk (H): There is a probability of greater than 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.

Significant Risk (S): There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.

Moderate Risk (M): There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.

Low Risk (L): There is a probability of up to 25% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.

Project Minor Amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines. Please tick each category for which a change occurred in the fiscal year of reporting and provide a description of the change that occurred in the textbox. You may attach supporting document as appropriate.

5.1 Table A: Listing of all Minor Amendment (TM)

Minor amendments	Changes	Minor amendments
Results framework	Yes	One modification has been made to the Results Framework to ensure alignment with the CEO endorsement. Specifically, a portion of indicator O1, which pertains to the target of 60,000 hectares for the RySS 365 days soil cover system, has been relocated to O3. Conversely, the target of 60,000 hectares for RA-SAS has been shifted from O3 to O1. Correspondingly, the respective Means of Verification have been adjusted. Despite these adjustments, the overall targets in the Results Framework remain unchanged. A copy of the Results Framework is attached to this report as Annexure PIR_1_Project 10204_STEP 4_5.1_Annexure 4 _ Amended Results Framework for reference.
Components and cost	No	
Institutional and implementation arrangements	No	
Financial management	No	
Implementation schedule	Explain in table B	
Executing Entity	No	
Executing Entity Category	No	
Minor project objective change	No	
Safeguards	No	
Risk analysis	No	
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	No	
Co-financing	No	
Location of project activity	No	
Other	No	

5.2 Table B: History of project revisions and/or extensions (TM)

Version	Type	Signed/Approved by UNEP	Entry Into Force (last signature Date)	Agreement Expiry Date	Main changes introduced in this revision
Original Legal Instrument					
Amendment 1					
Extension 1	Extension				

GEO Location Information:

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as OpenStreetMap (<https://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=4/21.84/82.79>) or GeoNames(<http://www.geonames.org/>) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking here (<https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx>)

Location Name Required field	Latitude Required field	Longitude Required field	Geo Name ID Required field if the location is not an exact site	Location Description Optional text field	Activity Description Optional text field
D.Gonduru	18.064531	82.631973		D Gonduru Micro Landscape (Location of Villages)	
Kokkellu	18.061177	82.63598			
Karakaputtu	18.060887	82.644061			
Sukuruputtu	18.059725	82.640951			
Gurram Panuku	18.061383	82.62957			
Palamanu Chilaka	18.062267	82.626081			
Vakapalli	18.066103	82.62041			
Madudulabanda	18.066847	82.628771			
Marripalem	18.072178	82.628263			
Boddumamidi	18.056024	82.619372			
Doddipalli	18.051822	82.626779			
Bakkalapanuku	18.052054	82.631605			
Borra Mamidi	18.050631	82.635671			
Goppalapalem	18.046124	82.642735			

Kothuru	18.04601	82.644551	
Korruptu	18.048314	82.645819	
M Nittaputtu	18.018054	82.498045	
Rolangiputtu	18.011511	82.490325	
Bharam	18.011435	82.486696	
Rachapalli	18.01351	82.51251	
Karmikalanka	18.023962	82.513794	
Singarbha	18.025059	82.519445	
Buruguveedi	18.047279	82.524708	
Kambalabayalu	18.031869	82.532933	
Ubhalagaruv	18.041614	82.534276	
Mondikota	18.040252	82.530604	
Chepalli	18.032441	82.527774	
Portu	18.039237	82.514169	
Nimmaweedi	18.050226	82.526688	
G Nittaputtu	18.042216	82.538648	
Madhumamidi	18.028485	82.533419	
Goddubusulu	18.02458	82.527629	
Poolagondi	18.027732	82.498835	
Sankulamidde	18.022489	82.494441	
Pinakota	18.080146	82.950874	
Borrapalem	18.08691	82.964902	
Chintapakka	18.056475	82.951873	
Velagalapadu	18.049085	82.946897	
Vajangi	18.063945	82.926332	
Bakkalagaruvu	18.060365	82.936149	
Mallampeta	18.060144	82.942635	
Armengaruvu	18.098742	82.950379	
Kurmagondi	17.492535	81.949373	
Chedipalem	17.434986	81.959908	
Yettipalli	17.482568	81.949373	
Jaderu	17.481168	81.953323	
Bairluty Gudem	15.865579	78.708698	
Nagalooty Gudem	15.884689	78.707414	
Sanjeeva Nagar Thanda	15.869279	78.68659	
Z.Kothapalli	14.713603	78.917818	
D.Agraharam	14.718957	78.941616	
T. Ramapuram	14.718298	78.952138	
Vampalli Cheruvu	14.718521	78.975096	
Pathuru	18.06661	83.081255	
K.G Pudi	18.069638	83.072994	
kotayyagaruvu	18.070656	83.053976	
Sontivanipalem	18.077589	83.07671	
Chittivanipalem	18.084055	83.078788	
Saravanipalem	18.074669	83.070354	
Sangamvalasa	18.073773	83.066861	
Bangarayyapeta	18.086736	83.090299	
SKSR Puram	18.071686	83.091576	
Kondabari	18.934956	83.679304	
Battiguda	18.956302	83.665912	
Gunjarada	18.951729	83.67325	
Urudi	18.938652	83.670389	
Tummikamanuguda	18.945562	83.677458	
Karimanuguda	18.943127	83.681089	
Kondavariguda	18.944989	83.681305	
Rayimanuguda	18.927762	83.684691	
Boddamanuguda	18.927057	83.689207	
Pallambari	18.935422	83.697469	
Santhinagar	18.929518	83.694086	

M Nittaputtu Micro Landscape
(Location of Villages)

Pinakota Micro Landscape
(Location of Villages)

Jaderu Micro Landscape
(Location of Villages)

Bairluty Micro Landscape
(Location of Villages)

Rekalakunta Micro Landscape
(Location of Villages)

KG Pudi Micro Landscape
(Location of Villages)

Kondabari Micro Landscape
(Location of Villages)

Here is the list of villages and GPS coordinates, categorized by micro-landscape, where participatory profiling works have been completed. These eight micro-landscapes are from the Eastern Ghats Micro Landscapes of Andhra Pradesh. The shape files and delineation steps for micro-landscape are attached separately for reference

Kothaguda	18.938738	83.681117	
Singanguda	18.939935	83.685314	
Nokya	12.21378	75.995591	
Siddapura	12.191	76.01061944	
Hebballe	12.2172864	75.96538611	
Arekeri Forest I	12.2314	76.0290722	
Arekeri Forest III	12.20380556	76.05921389	
Devamachi Forest I	12.2593722	75.99981944	

Titimathi Micro Landscape
(Location of Villages)

Here is the list of villages and GPS coordinates for the Titimathi micro-landscape, where participatory profiling works have been completed. Titimathi micro-landscape is in the Western Ghats landscape of Karnataka. The shape files and delineation steps for micro-landscape are attached separately for reference

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

[Annex any linked geospatial file]