



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2023 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE) 6	6
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)	21
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	39
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS).....	43
6. RISKS	51
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION (ONLY FOR PROJECTS THAT HAVE CONDUCTED AN MTR)	62
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	63
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT	64
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING.....	69
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	73
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT.....	78
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE.....	79

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP)
Country (ies):	India
Project Title:	Green-Ag: Transforming Indian agriculture for global environmental benefits and the conservation of critical biodiversity and forest landscapes
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/IND/183/GFF
GEF ID:	9243
GEF Focal Area(s):	Multi-Focal Area
Project Executing Partners:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Madhya Pradesh Operational Partner: Farmers Welfare and Agriculture Development Department, Government of Madhya Pradesh 2. Mizoram Operational Partner: Department of Agriculture (Crop Husbandry), Government of Mizoram 3. Odisha Operational Partner: Institute on Management of Agricultural Extension (IMAGE), Government of Odisha 4. Rajasthan Operational Partner: Department of Agriculture, Government of Rajasthan 5. Uttarakhand Operational Partner: Department of Watershed Development, Government of Uttarakhand
Initial project duration (years):	7 years
Project coordinates: <i>This section should be completed ONLY by:</i> <i>a) Projects with 1st PIR;</i> <i>b) In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.</i>	No <i>[Projects in a) and b) categories should indicate YES here and provide the geocoded data in Annex 2]</i>

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	May 18, 2018
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD:	April 1, 2019
Project Implementation End Date/NTE1:	March 31, 2026
Revised project implementation End date (if approved) 2	

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 33,558,716
Total Co-financing amount (USD)3:	USD 868.39 million

¹ As per FPMIS

² If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit.

³ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO Document/Project Document.

Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	USD 4,747,587.89
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)⁴:	USD 3,823,031
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023⁵	USD 15,897,278

⁴ The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

⁵ Please refer to the Section 13 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	A National Project Steering Committee (NPSC) was held on 15 th March 2023 under the chairmanship of Secretary DA&FW. The last meeting of the National Project Monitoring Committee (NPMC) was held on 15 th May 2023. During the current reporting period, two NPMC meetings were held.
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	June-July 2023
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	N/A
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	<i>December 2025</i>
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	<i>[It is mandatory for projects to update the TT or CI before Mid-Term or Terminal Evaluation stage. For projects that have a planned MTR or TE in the next fiscal year, please indicate YES here and provide the updated TT or CI as Annex.] YES</i>

Overall ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	<i>MS</i>
Overall implementation progress rating:	<i>MS</i>
Overall risk rating:	<i>Moderate</i>

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	<i>Moderate</i>
---	-----------------

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	Mr. R.B. Sinha, Project Director, Green-Ag Project	Rakesh.Sinha@fao.org
Budget Holder (BH)	Mr. Takayuki Hagiwara, FAOR	Takayuki.Hagiwara@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)	Mr. Neelesh Kumar Sah, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change	sahnk@cag.gov.in

⁶ The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2nd PIR, around half-point between EOD and NTE. The MTR report in English should be submitted to the GEF Secretariat within 4 years of the CEO Endorsement date.

⁷ The Terminal Evaluation date should be discussed with OED 6 months before the project's NTE date.

<p>Lead Technical Officer (LTO)</p>	<p>Ms. Sheila Avelina Wertz-Kanounnikoff, Senior Forestry Officer Mr. Pierre Ferrand, Agriculture Officer</p>	<p>Sheila.Wertz@fao.org Pierre.Ferrand@fao.org</p>
<p>GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)</p>	<p>Mr. Sameer Karki, Technical Officer, CBC</p>	<p>Sameer.Karki@fao.org</p>

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

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

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹¹²
To catalyze a transformative change of India's agricultural sector to support the achievement of national and global environmental benefits and	Outcome 1						
	Outcome 1.1. National and state-level institutional, policy, and program frameworks strengthened to integrate environmental	1. Number of new policy recommendations approved by multi-stakeholder platforms of policy makers to strengthen agroecological approach in agriculture and	0	3	12 (at least 2 per State and 2 at the national level)	0 (0%)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) (Planned from Project Year 3). National level- NPMU has planned to develop the draft policy advisory notes from the recommendations of the national dialogue, conducted by the FAO India Office in March 2022, in alignment with the project objectives. These recommendations

⁸ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic co-benefits as well.

¹² Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**, **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**. Refer to Annex 1.

<i>conservation of critical biodiversity and forest landscapes”</i>	priorities and resilience into the agriculture sector to enhance the delivery of global environmental benefits (GEB) across landscapes of highest conservation concern	allied sectors at national and State levels					are part of the book, Indian Agriculture Towards 2030. The draft policy advisory notes will be presented during the policy dialogue for input from wider stakeholders. State level- Mizoram and Odisha have identified topics for state policy dialogue. There is not much progress in the thematic papers in Mizoram. In Odisha, an agency is being hired to prepare thematic papers. Uttarakhand has organized a pre-dialogue consultation to identify themes for policy dialogue.
		2. Number of national and State plans to continue the Green Landscape approach at five landscapes and expand beyond project targeted landscapes endorsed by multi-stakeholders and with financing committed	0		6 (1 national and 5 states)	0 (0%)	N/A (Planned in PY6)
	Outcome 1.2. Cross-sectoral knowledge management and decision-making systems at national and state levels to support the	3. Number of protected areas in five target landscapes with threat landscape-level reduction monitoring protocols and indicators (such		0	3	7 (Desert National Park, Corbett, Rajaji, Similipal, Chambal, Dampa, and Thorangtlang)	0 (0%)

	<p>development and implementation of agro-ecological approaches at landscape levels that deliver global environmental benefits as well as socioeconomic benefits enhanced</p>	<p>as hunting, and encroachment) integrated into protected area management and monitoring in five target landscapes</p>					<p>(NTCA) for collaboration in three project landscapes: Dampa landscape, Mizoram; Similipal landscape, Odisha; and Rajaji-Corbett landscape in Uttarakhand</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. A template of monitoring tool was developed by the IT team of the Forest Department, Madhya Pradesh with substantial inputs from the Green-Ag Project for developing online monitoring system of Protected Area. 3. The Forest Officials from Dampa landscape, Mizoram; Similipal landscape, Odisha; Desert Landscape, Rajasthan; and Rajaji-Corbett landscape, Uttarakhand are willing to examine and consider adoption of the tool being developed by Madhya Pradesh, as per their local needs.
		<p>4. Number of stories published in newspapers and other media reports on the Green Landscape approach, highlighting the importance of agroecological approaches in the agriculture sector for multiple benefits (within the 5 states and at</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>15</p>	<p>At least 30 including national and state level</p>	<p>111 (>100%) Current reporting period: 54 Madhya Pradesh: 6 Mizoram: 11 Odisha: 21 Rajasthan: 2 Uttarakhand: 12</p>	<p>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</p>

		the national level)					
		5. Number of local plans (including Gram Panchayat/ Village Council/ Community level) developed based on spatial decision support systems in five landscapes	0	8	At least 20	0 (0%)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) (Planned from PY2 onwards) Significant work was done towards the development of SDSS framework. During the reporting period it was integrated with soil and water conservation (SWC) criteria for all the five landscapes. Validation of agriculture planning is going on, which is taking more time than planned. Further to earlier unexpected delays, SDSS finalization is now targeted to become functional by December 2024.
		6. Number of lessons learned reports published on different themes (environmental, economic, social) documenting relevant lessons learned	0	3	12	0 (0%)	Unsatisfactory (U) (Planned from PY2 onwards). The field implementation of the project started only in November 2022. The field activities are being observed and recorded, and lessons can be drawn only after this year's field activities.
		Outcome 2					
	2.1 Institutional frameworks, mechanisms and capacities at District and Village levels strengthened to support decision-making and	7. Number of Green Landscape management plans promoting agro-ecological approaches, with clear environmental targets and sustainable	0	5 plans covering 350 000 ha	5 plans covering at least 1 800 000 ha	60% and 33% 3 plans covering 116 193 ha	Moderately Satisfactory (MS) GLMP in Uttarakhand, Mizoram and Odisha have been developed for Rabi 2022-23 and Kharif 2023-24 and endorsed by their respective TSGs. GLMP development for Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh is in process. With the efforts of the NPMU, the fieldwork in alignment

	stakeholder participation in Green Landscape planning and management	livelihoods, gender and social inclusion considerations included, and synergistic to protected areas management plans within the landscape endorsed (developed) and under implementation by stakeholders.					with the project objective is in progress in these two states, namely Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh with state government resources.
		8. Number of district level agencies (line departments) using Green Landscape plans to realign multi-sectoral investments in project areas.	0	15	25 (at least 5 in each Landscape)	30 (>100%) but in only 3 of the 5 landscapes Line departments that have aligned their investment in the project area through the GLMPs; Odisha 8, Mizoram 10, and Uttarakhand 12-line departments	Satisfactory (S) Contingent on delivery of Outcome 2.7.
		9. Amount (Percentage) of Government's agriculture sector investment at district levels realigned to	0	To be determined upon completion of Landscape Assessment/Approval of Green Landscape Management Plans.	To be determined upon approval of Green Landscape Management Plans and its	Percentage of Government's agriculture sector investment at district levels	GLMP plans for Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan are in the process of development.

		support objectives of Green Landscape plans in five landscapes per annum			actual implementation at the field level.	aligned in GLMP plans: Odisha – 95.12% Mizoram – 78.68% Uttarakhand - 65.43% (As per projections in approved GLMP)	
	Outcome 2.2 - Households and communities able and incentivized to engage in agro-ecological practices that deliver meaningful GEB at the landscape level in target high conservation priority landscapes	10. Number of households that have adopted sustainable agriculture practices on their farms, including agrobiodiversity conservation measures	0		Rajasthan: 3162 Odisha: 37500 Uttarakhand: 14700 Mizoram: 5490 Madhya Pradesh: 7500 (Total – 68352)	0 (0%)	N/A (Planned from PY6 onwards)
		11. Number of households involved in community natural resources management plans development and implementation	0	30 000	185 000	20 496 (11%) (Mz- 5 190 HHs Od- 11 911 HHs Uk- 3 395 HHs)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)

		in line with overall Green Landscape management objective/s					
		12. Number of new value chains and associated business plans developed for landscape products, linked to agro-ecological farming and sustainable natural resources management in target areas, and under implementation	0	5	At least 20 value chains	0 (0%)	Unsatisfactory (U) As part of the changed strategy, the project has initiated the process of designing community-based enterprise. The first step in this direction is developing a curriculum for training the master trainers. Commodities (agriculture and livestock) have also been identified during the community consultations for which business plans will be developed.
		13. Number of households implementing improved livestock management – including nutrition and fodder management (e.g. community fodder banks) – contributing to the conservation of global environmental values	0	5 000	Madhya Pradesh: 8 000 Odisha: 22 500 Rajasthan: 6 000 Uttarakhand: 10 000 (Total – 46 500)	6 870 (15%) Madhya Pradesh 1 110 HHs (Vaccination, poultry distribution and medicines to farmers Mizoram- 435 HHs (Distribution of rainbow rooster and its scientific management & Capacity building on management	Highly Satisfactory (HS)

						<p>of rainbow rooster - 100 HHs; Vaccination of pig- 335)</p> <p>Odisha- 4 485 HHs (Vaccination of cow and buffaloes- 2 800; Vaccination of goat- 936; Vaccination of poultry- 749)</p> <p>Uttarakhand- 840 HHs (Goatery unit- 10; Backyard poultry- 23; Cattle vaccination- 802, including Livestock insurance at 2 HHs; Goat shed- 5;)</p>	
		<p>14. Number of women participating in and benefitting from female cohort-specific Green-Ag (agro-ecological) Farmer Field Schools</p>	0	5 000	<p>Rajasthan: 3 000 Odisha: 12 000 Uttarakhand: 19 000 Mizoram: 2 000 Madhya Pradesh: 4 000</p>	<p>308 (6%) Uttarakhand- 308 females (155 in session 1 in 10 Field Schools; 153 in session 2 in 8 Field schools)</p>	<p>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</p>

					(Total - 40 000 females)		
--	--	--	--	--	--------------------------	--	--

Measures taken to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings on Section 2

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<p>Outcome 1.1 National and state-level institutional, policy, and program frameworks strengthened to integrate environmental priorities and resilience into the agriculture sector to enhance the delivery of global environmental benefits (GEB) across landscapes of highest conservation concern</p>	<p>New policy recommendations approved by multi-stakeholder platforms Actions: At national level: i. NPMU to prepare draft policy advisory notes for new policy recommendations from the way forward session of the National Policy Dialogue conducted by FAO India Office in March 2022. The draft policy advisory notes should be presented during the policy dialogue to gather input from wider stakeholders. At state level: ii. SPMUs to identify topics for the policy recommendations: a. In Mizoram, efforts should be made to progress on thematic papers to ensure substantial progress aligning with the identified topics. b. In Odisha, an agency should be hired to prepare thematic papers that address the identified topics. c. In Uttarakhand, pre-dialogue consultations should continue to identify relevant themes for the policy dialogue.</p>	<p>i. NPMU ii. SPMUs</p>	<p>i. June 2024 ii. July 2024</p>
<p>Outcome 1.2. Cross-sectoral knowledge management and decision-making systems at national and state levels to support the development and implementation of agro-ecological approaches at landscape levels that deliver global environmental benefits as</p>	<p>Number of protected areas in five target landscapes with threat landscape-level reduction monitoring protocols and indicators (such as hunting, and encroachment) integrated into protected area management and monitoring in five target landscapes. Actions: i. Follow up regularly with the Madhya Pradesh Forest Department to ensure the</p>	<p>Project Director, State Forest Department Officials</p>	<p>October 2023 for Madhya Pradesh The follow-up and sharing of the monitoring system should be done in a timely manner to facilitate the adoption and integration of threat landscape-level reduction protocols and indicators into protected area management and monitoring.</p>

well as socioeconomic benefits enhanced	<p>progress and development of the monitoring tool for protected area monitoring.</p> <p>ii. Share the monitoring system developed by Madhya Pradesh with the Forest Departments of other states to promote the development of equivalent tools.</p>		
	<p>Number of local plans (including Gram Panchayat/ Village Council/ Community level) developed based on spatial decision support systems in five landscapes.</p> <p>Action:</p> <p>i. SDSS Finalization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation of final report on Soil and Water Conservation • Speed up developing landscape-specific crop criteria matrix and its ground truthing. 	<p>Project Director, Technical Experts related to SDSS in collaboration with State Project Management Unit (SPMU) & Green Landscape Implementation Unit (GLIU) Teams.</p> <p>Active participation of District Nodal officers, Technical Support Group (TSG), and Village Implementation Committee (VIC)</p>	<p>December 2024</p> <p>The period of completion of the development of the Green Landscape Management Plan (GLMPs) using SDSS will vary in each state since all the states have different challenges and are at different stages of implementation. Given the unforeseen challenges and delays being encountered by the NPMU, the development of the local-level plans using SDSS may be initiated from December 2024.</p>
	<p>Number of lessons learned reports published on different themes (environmental, economic, social) documenting relevant lessons learned.</p> <p>Action:</p> <p>i. Train the team to capture and prepare the lessons learned from the field implementation.</p> <p>ii. Prepare documents and publish the lessons learned reports</p>	<p>i. NPMU, GLIU, and SPMU</p>	<p>i. December 2023</p>
Outcome 2.2 - Households and communities able and incentivized to engage in agro-ecological practices that deliver meaningful GEB at the landscape level	<p>Households involved in community natural resources management plans development and implementation.</p> <p>Green Landscape Management Plans (GLMPs) have been approved in three States, Mizoram, Odisha, and Uttarakhand in the current reporting</p>	<p>i. Technical Support Group (TSG) with support from Village Implementation Committee (VIC), GLIU, and SPMU.</p>	<p>i. December 2023</p> <p>ii. July-August 2023</p>

in target high conservation priority landscapes	<p>period. GLMPs are to be developed and approved in Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan. In Mizoram and Odisha, several community resource management activities have been approved in the GLMPs, however, its implementation has not yet been initiated.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Expedite development and approval of Green Landscape Management Plans in Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan. ii. Expedite initiation of implementation of community natural resource management plans approved in Mizoram and Odisha. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> ii. TSG with support from VIC and GLIU 	
Outcome 2.2 - Households and communities able and incentivized to engage in agro-ecological practices that deliver meaningful GEB at the landscape level in target high conservation priority landscapes	<p>Value chain and associated business plans.</p> <p>Value chain analysis has been completed in Mizoram and Madhya Pradesh. Further, to community feedback and FAO internal consultations, the focus is now on developing community and commodity-based enterprises. As part of the changed strategy, the project has initiated the process of designing community-based enterprise. The first step in this direction is developing a curriculum for training the master trainers. The curriculum for developing business models is in the final stages of development. State teams will be trained in this curriculum through the Field School approach. However, since the cropping season is underway in all landscapes, this training will be done when the field activity is not at its peak. Value chain experts are to be hired to oversee and support the process of enterprise/business in each landscape.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Finalize the curriculum for developing business models. ii. Expedite the Training of Trainers. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. NPMU experts ii. NPMU experts iii. OP with support from NPMU iv. GLIU team with support from SPMU, NPMU, and Value chain expert 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. September 2023 ii. October 2023 iii. August-December 2023 iv. March 2024

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Expedite hiring of value chain experts. iv. Develop enterprise/business plans. 		
<p>Outcome 2.2 - Households and communities able and incentivized to engage in agro-ecological practices that deliver meaningful GEB at the landscape level in target high conservation priority landscapes</p>	<p>Women participating in and benefitting from female cohort-specific Green-Ag (agro-ecological) Farmer Field Schools.</p> <p>Curriculum Development Workshop has been completed for four States, except Rajasthan. There has been a delay in finalizing the curriculum since the FFS expert at NPMU resigned due to personal compulsions from the project in March 2023. Later, the FFS expert rejoined the project in May 2023. Additionally, there is no position of Agronomy specialist in the NPMU which has also become a handicap in developing technical material for the field school. All this has led to delays in developing training material and imparting training to the Master trainers. Currently, training materials are being developed by the FFS expert for four landscapes, except Rajasthan. This will be followed by training of the trainers.</p> <p>Farmer Field School on Sustainable Agriculture has been initiated in Uttarakhand and Madhya Pradesh in the current reporting period. Uttarakhand undertook the training of trainers with support from experts at the local <i>Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK)</i>.</p> <p>The Field Schools for Madhya Pradesh and Odisha started in June 2023 and the teams have conducted one session on Land preparation. Mizoram team is translating the documents into the local language and shall initiate the same next month.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Expedite organizing Curriculum Development Workshop in Rajasthan ii. Finalize curriculum for Rajasthan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. State team ii. NPMU FFS expert with support from the GLIU team iii. NPMU FFS expert iv. NPMU FFS expert v. GLIU team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. July 2023 ii. July-August 2023 iii. June 2023 onwards iv. June 2023 onwards v. June- July 2023 onwards

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">iii. Finalize training materials for Field Schooliv. Expedite the Training of Trainers on Sustainable Agriculture.v. Expedite implementation of Farmer Field School on Sustainable Agriculture.		
--	---	--	--

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs ¹³	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹⁴ (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁵ in delivering outputs
Outcome 1.1				
Output 1.1.1	National and state-level inter-sectoral coordinating committees were established and institutionalized to facilitate cross-sectoral support to mainstream environmental priorities in the agriculture sector		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One NPSC was held in the current reporting period • Two NPMC meetings were held in the current reporting period • SSC Meetings: Madhya Pradesh :1 Odisha: 1 Rajasthan: 1 Uttarakhand:1 	<p>Mizoram: The SSC meeting is being delayed due to the unavailability of the chairperson (Secretary, Agriculture) as the concerned Official is on medical leave for a long time. It was advised to have the SSC reconstituted and have the Chief Secretary as the chairperson of the SSC. .</p> <p>Odisha: In Odisha, only one SSC meeting was held during the current reporting period. The delay in scheduling the SSC meeting was due to the vacant post of the Agriculture Production Commissioner (APC), who is the</p>

¹³ Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

¹⁴ Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Workplan. Please be concise (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

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

				chairman of the SSC for the state. To overcome the delay, it was decided to convene the meeting under the chairpersonship of the Chief Secretary; however, the meeting was postponed several times due to the unavailability of the Chief Secretary.
<u>1.1.1-I1</u>	Number of National and state-level inter-sectoral coordinating committees established	National level-1 State level-5 (This activity is to be completed in PY1.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of National level inter-sectoral coordinating committees established – 1 • Number of State level inter-sectoral coordinating committees established –6 	NA
<u>1.1.1-I2</u>	Number of National and state-level inter-sectoral coordinating committees institutionalized	National level-1 State level – 5 National level-1 State level-5 (This activity is to be completed in PY1.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of National level inter-sectoral coordinating committees institutionalized– 1 • Number of State level inter-sectoral coordinating committees institutionalized–6 	NA
<u>Output 1.1.2</u>	Policy Dialogues are established to inform and facilitate discussion of priority issues related to the agricultural environment and development	National Level – 0 State level - 5 (project target)	<p>Identification of topics is one of the first steps towards convening the policy dialogues. The States of Mizoram and Odisha have identified two topics for policy dialogue. These are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mizoram- (a) State Policy Dialogue on Agriculture, (b) Natural Resource Management (NRM). The drafting of a background paper on the NRM policy dialogue is currently in progress. <p>Odisha- (a) State Policy Dialogue on Agrobiodiversity conservation and promotion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Mizoram, on SSC's recommendations, an inter-department committee has been constituted to undertake state level dialogue; as a suitable agency could not be identified in the State. The committee is working on the same. - Further, the preparation of background papers for policy dialogue on NRM

			<p>of indigenous varieties, (b) State policy dialogue on promotion and conservation of indigenous livestock breeds. The team is in the process of identifying the agency for undertaking the policy dialogues.</p>	<p>has been going on for quite a long time. Despite receiving extensive assistance from the NPMU and the GLIU team, the consultant/agency hired to prepare the background paper for policy dialogue on NRM is unable to complete the task.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Odisha, the procedure of hiring the agency has taken longer than anticipated. The process of selection of the agency was being looked after by the operational partner (IMAGE). As per the advice of the Principal Secretary, Govt. of Odisha, the SPMU is working on a revised process of hiring the agency which is also going on for quite a long time (almost a year) - In Rajasthan, the fully functional team is still not in place. This has been delaying the process of carrying out the activities such as identifying the topics for the policy dialogues, preparing ToRs, etc.
--	--	--	--	---

<u>1.1.2-II</u>	Number of Policy dialogues at national and state-level	National dialogue 0 State dialogue– 5 (These are the total project target not midterm target)	Same as reported above	- Same as reported above
<u>Output 1.1.3</u>	Policy briefs, advocacy, and awareness-raising materials developed to inform discussions and decision-making on priority issues related to agriculture, environment, and development	Studies – 10 State inception workshop – 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Madhya Pradesh: The state identified the following study topics and drafting of the TOR for hiring an agency to conduct the studies is underway <p>1. Optimal Ravine Management. 2. Human-Wildlife Conflict.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mizoram: The final report of the study, Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC) is submitted to the LTOs. • Odisha: Two topics for study have been approved by the SSC: (a) Assessment of water yield eco-system services affecting agriculture practices and on-farm livelihoods in Similipal Tiger Landscape, Odisha, and (b) Studies on ITK and BD conservation. The State is in the process of identifying the agency/consultant to undertake the studies. • Rajasthan: Two topics for studies have been approved by the SSC: (a) Local procurement for social safety net program and (b) Environmentally/GEB-friendly locust control measure. • Uttarakhand: Three studies i.e. 1- Human-Wildlife Conflict, 2- Sustainable Energy Alternatives, and 3- Incentives for reviving 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Rajasthan: The reason is the same as mentioned for the output 1.1.2 • Odisha: Reason as mentioned for the output 1.1.2 • Uttarakhand: The state couldn't identify any agency for the studies within the allocated limited budget.

			agrobiodiversity are currently underway in the State. The primary draft report of the human-wildlife conflict study has been completed. The state is in the process of identifying the agency for undertaking the remaining two studies.	
<u>1.1.3-II</u>	Number of knowledge products developed	National – Annual State- Biannual	Same as reported above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as reported above •
<u>Output 1.1.4:</u>	"Green Landscape" mainstreaming strategies developed to promote environmental protection as part of broader sustainable agriculture and natural resource management.	National – 1 State-level - 5 <i>These are the project targets and not annual targets.</i>	Not planned for the reporting period	Green landscape Mainstreaming strategies are to be undertaken in the later part of the project implementation.
<u>1.1.4-II</u>	Number of "Green Landscape" mainstreaming strategies developed to promote environmental protection	National – 1 State-level - 5 <i>These are the project targets and not annual targets.</i>	Not planned for the reporting period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as reported above
<u>Output 1.2.1:</u>	Spatial decision support system and tools, and compilation of existing land use information from international, national, and state-level sources, developed and institutionalized, and users trained in their use.	.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil and water conservation (SWC) criteria measures were developed and integrated with the SDSS for all five landscapes. • Agriculture planning – Crop matrix – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed in Mizoram. • Ground truthing is ongoing in Odisha. • Matrix being prepared in consultation with agronomy scientists at <i>Krishi Vigyan Kendra</i> (KVK) in Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan. 	SDSS is a collaborative process with continuous interactions with the SPMU and GLIU teams. Developing crop criteria matrix has been observed to be a major challenge in developing the SDSS, as the landscapes are very different from each other agro-ecologically and therefore the crops and their varieties as well. Further, no reliable information is

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Uttarakhand, a matrix is being prepared in consultation with Professor from Agricultural University Findings from Geospatial analysis (Mizoram, Odisha, and Rajasthan) integrated with the SDSS portal 	available for indigenous crop varieties and their agronomic practices. However, the project team has been engaging with local-level specialists knowing how to overcome these challenges
1.2.1-II	Number of National level Spatial decision support systems	1 (<i>This is the project target and not the annual target.</i>)	1; detail as above	Validation of SWC, and crop matrix is taking more time than anticipated. Also, limited information is available for indigenous crop varieties.
Output 1.2.2:	Green Landscape monitoring program (monitoring system and protocols) to assess the health/status of the target Green Landscapes and evaluate progress towards delivery of GEBs and social and economic impacts established and implemented.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPMU has developed a project monitoring system in-house in consultation with the OPs. The system captures the physical progress, including training/capacity building, through different modules that capture the state-specific activities/interventions. All landscapes have their respective dedicated log-in and monitoring system, which is centrally managed and regular technical support, including capacity building of state teams, is provided for maintaining the systems properly. The system has a module for monitoring community involvement in free prior informed consent to the project. Criteria to capture the social and economic impacts of project activities are being integrated into the MIS system. The MIS is being integrated with the M&E framework for the project. 	The protocols need to be developed to assess and monitor the over health/status of green landscapes in all states, which captures relevant issues for monitoring based on the project's results framework and other priority issues identified through discussions with project stakeholders (policymakers, community, researchers). A monitoring program is being developed on the existing monitoring work being undertaken by different environment-related and agriculture-related agencies. These protocols to assess and monitor the health of the landscapes will be embedded into the existing MIS system.
1.2.2-II	Number of Green Landscape monitoring systems established	1 National & 5 Landscapes (<i>These are</i>	Established one national and 5 landscape level Green Landscape monitoring systems integrated into one MIS framework. The MIS	Monitoring system and protocols) to assess the health/status of the target Green Landscapes and

		<i>project targets and not annual targets.)</i>	framework is now integrated with the M&E framework of the project to monitor the progress and overall health of the landscapes.	evaluate progress towards delivery of GEBs and social and economic impacts needs to be developed for the Green Landscape and shall be integrated with the existing MIS framework.
Output 1.2.3:	Communication strategy and plan designed and implemented		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPMU, Madhya Pradesh, Mizoram, Odisha, Rajasthan, and Uttarakhand have functional communication teams. In Rajasthan, a government official was given the additional charge of communication officer on 31 May 2023 only. State-specific communications plans (Mizoram, Odisha, Uttarakhand) were developed in sync with the national communication strategy. In Madhya Pradesh, the plan is being developed. The project website, hosted on the domain of the Government of India is regularly updated with partner communication, news, and knowledge products for wider dissemination. 	The field implementation could only be initiated in winter cropping season in 2022 and it is early to report on any best practices and lessons from the field.
1.2.3-II	Number of Communication platforms and plans designed and implemented	1 National & 5 Landscape <i>(These are project targets and not annual targets.)</i>	Odisha has developed its state-specific communication plan. Communication products of the landscapes are regularly uploaded on the project website.	Madhya Pradesh is developing its state-specific communication plan. Rajasthan do not have a dedicated communication staff until 30 May 2023. The NPM is in contact with the new person for communication activities and the State inception workshop report is being developed.
<u>Outcome 2.1</u>				
<u>Output 2.1.1</u>	Institutional frameworks, mechanisms and	TSG Meetings-32	1. The financial MIS is updated by the state partners, except Rajasthan. For the	1. The MIS entry is not updated regularly by the partners,

	<p>capacities at District and Village levels to support decision-making and stakeholder participation in Green Landscape planning and management strengthened</p>	<p>VIC meetings - 240 (assuming 20VIC/landscape meeting monthly)</p>	<p>physical data entry, the NPMU has given training to the GLIU staff on how to fill in the information. Data in training, meetings, workshops, household survey, and agriculture pages are being updated by the states.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. NPMU has identified 10 topics for lessons learnt from the implementation of the project, listed under the Knowledge Management section. The outline of the document was finalized and till reporting four (4) drafts have been prepared. All the documents shall be final by November 2023 3. Capacity development on incorporating gender and FPIC issues was done for the Madhya Pradesh GLIU team during the district-level project inception workshop. NPMU gave refresher training on FPIC to Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh SPMU and GLIU teams in December 2022. 4. Mid-term evaluation of the project started on 1 June 2023. 5. A total of 15 TSG meetings were held; 4 in Madhya Pradesh and 5 in Mizoram and 2 each in Odisha, Rajasthan, and Uttarakhand. 6. Apart from the formal TSG meetings, the Project Director along with AFAOR visited the states of Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh Uttarakhand, Mizoram, and Odisha. 7. 173 VICs are constituted covering all states. 638 VIC meetings were held, however only at Mizoram, Uttarakhand, 	<p>especially the physical data. There is a backlog of data entry, due to which NPMU has difficulty monitoring progress.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. State teams are not conducting TSG regularly. 3. Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan have to initiate regular VIC meetings. 4. FPIC process is pending in Rajasthan.
--	---	--	--	---

			<p>and Odisha. No VIC meeting was held in Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>State</th> <th>VIC established</th> <th>VIC meetings held</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Madhya Pradesh</td> <td>16</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mizoram</td> <td>17</td> <td>177</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Odisha</td> <td>66</td> <td>330</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rajasthan</td> <td>30</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Uttarakhand</td> <td>36</td> <td>131</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>173</td> <td>638</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>8. Since the Sarpanch is the head of the VIC, the Gram Panchayat Support Group will become redundant. It can, however, may be formed on a need basis.</p> <p>9. FPIC was completed in all the high-priority villages in Mizoram and Odisha. Uttarakhand has no tribal population in the project landscape, so no FPIC will be done there. In Madhya Pradesh, only 4 villages-high priority villages out of 25 have tribal populations and the process was completed here. FPIC in Rajasthan is pending due to a change in the CRP team.</p> <p>10. FPIC report of one village from Mizoram was submitted to the LTO and is cleared. The team is translating and preparing the report for the remaining villages. The same report is being used in Odisha and Madhya Pradesh for translating the process into a report.</p>	State	VIC established	VIC meetings held	Madhya Pradesh	16	0	Mizoram	17	177	Odisha	66	330	Rajasthan	30	0	Uttarakhand	36	131	Total	173	638	
State	VIC established	VIC meetings held																							
Madhya Pradesh	16	0																							
Mizoram	17	177																							
Odisha	66	330																							
Rajasthan	30	0																							
Uttarakhand	36	131																							
Total	173	638																							
2.1.1-II	Number of inter-sectoral institutional mechanisms (Technical Support Group) at district, inter-	8 mechanisms (<i>This is a project targets and not annual target</i>)	Description of activities done in reporting period as above.	As mentioned above.																					

	district and sub-district (District and Gram Panchayat/ Village Council) levels established			
<u>Output 2.1.2</u>	Key local decision-makers from each target Gram Panchayat/Village Council trained in Green Landscape governance through Field schools (to make collective, evidence-based decisions for effective Green Landscape governance of areas within their responsibility)		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NPMU developed the curriculum for the Field School on Landscape Governance. The curriculum was designed into 3 modules – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Module I: Landscape Delineation, Climate, & Natural Resources ○ Module II: Demography, Livelihoods, Community Institutions, & Social and Productive Infrastructure ○ Module III: Green Landscape Governance Mechanisms 2. Capacity building workshops were virtually conducted for SPMU, GLIU, and CRPs in three sessions each separately for each state from 24 April 2023 to 12 May 2023. 3. The curriculum development workshop was not conducted as this is a new area and states have limited capacity to provide inputs in the curriculum. NPMU prepared the curriculum in-house with its own experience. 4. The implementation of the Field School on Landscape Governance with the VIC members who are the local decision-makers of the village/gram panchayat level, has been completed in Mizoram and Odisha. Uttarakhand has completed module I and II in 3 clusters. Madhya 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is decided that the curriculum development workshop will be held in the latter part of the year after the implementation of the first field school on landscape governance to collect feedback from the states for improving and finalizing the curriculum. • In Madhya Pradesh, the field school on landscape governance will be conducted after finishing the community consultation.

			<p>Pradesh and Rajasthan have not initiated the field schools until reported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Odisha conducted 66 field schools on landscape governance covering 1212 VIC members consisting of 520 women and 692 men. ○ Mizoram conducted 17 field schools on landscape governance covering 443 VIC members consisting of 155 women and 288 men. ○ Uttarakhand conducted 3 field schools on landscape governance for module I and II only, covering 69 VIC members consisting of 35 women and 34 men. Module III is in progress. 	
<u>2.1.2-II</u>	Number of Field schools on Green Landscape Governance implemented	490 (MP-60, Mz-60, Od-150, Rj-20, Uk-200) <i>(These are project targets and not annual targets.)</i>	Progress as mentioned above	Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh yet to initiate in the FFS or Green landscape governance.
<u>Output 2.1.3</u>	District level technical and extension staff from different government sectors trained in Green Landscape approaches (to enable them to support local communities and farmers to implement agro-ecological practices)		The field implementation of FFS has now started and NPMU will plan for technical backstopping missions.	
<u>2.1.3-II</u>	Number of District level technical and extension	80 individuals <i>(These are</i>	Same as above	NA

	staff trained in Green Landscape approaches (8 districts)	<i>project targets and not annual targets.)</i>		
Output 2.1.4	Green Landscape Assessment reports/ findings available with social, economic, institutional, biophysical aspects of target areas	5 assessment reports <i>These are project targets and not annual targets</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Baseline reports of Mizoram, Odisha, Rajasthan, and Uttarakhand were submitted to LTO and received their reviews. NPMU is preparing a response to the LTO remarks. The baseline of Madhya Pradesh will be finalized after receiving their geospatial analysis report. As agreed with LTO, the baseline reports will consist of three parts: Part 1 will have summary of secondary literature and geospatial reports, Part 2 will consist of community consultation, and Part 3 will include the Household Survey analysis. 2. For geospatial analysis, Madhya Pradesh has signed a MoU with the National Remote Sensing Centre (NRSC) and two meetings were conducted with them in the presence of NPMU and SPMU. 3. Uttarakhand will do the value chain analysis during the later part of the year. 4. An Android application for household data collection has been developed. A user manual for the application has been developed and posted on the project website. Household survey data collection was completed in Mizoram, Odisha, and Uttarakhand. The SPMU, GLIU, and CRPs in Madhya Pradesh were trained on household surveys on 12 June 2023. In Rajasthan, all the CRPs who were trained were removed from their job by the state partner. A fresh 	<p>The geospatial report in Madhya Pradesh is expected to be available by September 2023.</p> <p>Due to the delayed recruitment of CRPs in Madhya Pradesh, the community consultations and household surveys were delayed. However, the state team has completed the community consultation and the report is being finalized. The household surveys are also expected to be completed by August 2023.</p> <p>In Rajasthan, the complete team of CRP was removed by the state partner and there was no SPMU. The work is now assigned to agriculture officers of the state on 1 June 2023. So NPMU is scheduling fresh training on FPIC, community consultation, and household survey for the team.</p>

			<p>training for the new staff on board from 1 June 2023 is being planned for the last week of June 2023.</p> <p>5. Community consultation training was given to all five states. The community consultation was completed in three states, Mizoram, Odisha, and Uttarakhand. During the consultations, the findings from the geospatial assessments and secondary literature review were presented to the communities (group of 3-4 villages). The communities identified major challenges and priority issues and suggested priority actions to address the issues. The GLMPs were developed based on the results of community consultations in these three states.</p>	
<u>2.1.4-II</u>	Number of Green Landscape Assessment reports	5 (one per landscape) <i>These are project targets and not annual targets</i>	Progress as above	
<u>Output 2.1.5</u>	District level ‘convergence plans’ align Govt. programmes and investments with Green Landscape management objectives, which incentivize agro-ecological approaches	8 convergence plans (one in a district) <i>These are project targets and not annual targets.</i>	<p>The convergence plans are part of the GLMP, and 4 plans have been developed during the current reporting period in Mizoram (2), Odisha (1), and Uttarakhand (1). These 4 plans have been endorsed and approved by their respective TSGs.</p> <p>Two plans each are in different development stages in Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan. Based on the secondary literature reviews and consultations with the line department and district officials, priority actions have been</p>	GLMP is not developed in Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan and is expected to be completed by June 2023.

			<p>identified in both these states. The state teams are seeking convergence and finalizing the GLMP plans.</p> <p>The priority actions identified through the community consultations were mapped with the existing schemes of the Government programs in the State and district. In the convergence process, the gap funding in meeting the targets was covered from the project fund keeping the focus on the sustainability of resources after the project life. As a sustainable action, farmers will be contributing either individually or collectively for the resources along with project funds for the gap funding.</p>							
2.1.5-II	Number of convergence plans developed (8 districts)	8 Convergence plans	Same as above	Same as above						
Outcome 2.2										
Output 2.2.1:	Farmers trained through FFS on sustainable agriculture, with modules adapted to the specific needs of farmers near PAs and other high ecological value areas, including on management of livestock.	To be determined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farmers trained through FFS: Uttarakhand- 545 farmers (237 men and 308women) <table border="1" data-bbox="940 1024 1438 1227"> <tr> <td>Session 1 (10 Field Schools)</td> <td>144 men</td> <td>155 women</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Session 2 (8 Field School)</td> <td>93 men</td> <td>153 women</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training of Master Trainers held for FFS on Sustainable Agriculture held 	Session 1 (10 Field Schools)	144 men	155 women	Session 2 (8 Field School)	93 men	153 women	The Farmer Field School was targeted to be initiated for all landscapes for the reporting period. However, there were delays in organizing the curriculum development workshop in some landscapes owing to the non-availability of experts at the proposed dates and sometimes due to other engagements of FFS experts at NPMU. However, Curriculum Development Workshop on Sustainable Agriculture has been completed for all landscapes,
Session 1 (10 Field Schools)	144 men	155 women								
Session 2 (8 Field School)	93 men	153 women								

			<p>in Mizoram (2 female and 6 male participants)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training of trainers initiated in Odisha and Madhya Pradesh 	<p>except Rajasthan to date. There were delays in getting the curriculum vetted from the nodal departments in the landscape. Further, the FFS expert at NPMU resigned from the project due to personal compulsions in March 2023, however, rejoined the project in May 2023. Currently, the expert is not working as a full-time expert on the project. All this has led to delays in developing training material and undertaking training of master trainers.</p> <p>In Uttarakhand, since the planting season for several horticulture crops was about to be initiated they took the support of experts at local KVK and developed a curriculum and training material for finger millet, ginger, onion, and turmeric. Further, the implementation of Field School has started in Uttarakhand.</p> <p>The implementation of field schools in Madhya Pradesh has also been initiated.</p> <p>The implementation of field schools in the other two states (Mizoram and Odisha) is targeted to be initiated between June-July 2023.</p>
2.2.1-I1	Number of District level technical and extension staff trained on SA & ILM (8 districts)	To be determined	0	The field schools on sustainable agriculture and livestock have been initiated in the last few months of the current reporting

				period. As part of field schools, curriculum development workshops on sustainable agriculture have been conducted in four states except Rajasthan. Similarly, curriculum development workshop on livestock management has been completed in four states except Odisha in current reporting period. The training of district level technical and extension staff will be undertaken in the next reporting period.
Output 2.2.2:	Local stakeholders trained in Green Value Chain development through FFS with Green Value Chains developed and promoted.	To be determined	Several commodities have been identified during community consultations in the states for developing enterprises. NPMU is currently finalizing the curriculum for developing an enterprise/business model. Once the curriculum is in place, the Master trainers will be trained for developing the business models. These Master trainers will further train the local stakeholders in the development of value chains in the landscape.	As part of the changed strategy, Green Value Chains will be part of enterprise-based FFS.
2.2.2-I1	Number of local stakeholders trained in Ecotourism	To be determined	N/A	Activity planned from next reporting period onwards.
2.2.2-I2	Number of local stakeholders trained in Green Value Chains	To be determined	0	As reported previously, Green Value Chains will be part of enterprise-based FFS. Hence this activity will be initiated once the business plans have been developed which is targeted for the next reporting period.
Output 2.2.3:	Wider community-level awareness-raising	Madhya Pradesh – 40;	Madhya Pradesh- 84 eco-clubs (21 schools with 4 to 5 eco-clubs in each school)	The activity of mobilizing eco-clubs in the landscapes has been

	campaigns to ensure wider stakeholder support for Green Landscape management	Mizoram – 30; Odisha – 100; Rajasthan – 25; Uttarakhand – 98 (targets for both eco-clubs and information platforms)	Mizoram- 6 eco-clubs Odisha- 30 eco-clubs Uttarakhand- 43 eco-clubs	initiated since April 2023. SDSS is a key component for planning. SDSS will be operational by Dec 2023. After this, the Green Landscape Information Platforms will be established for community-level awareness-raising and planning.
2.2.3-II	Number of eco-clubs and information platforms (one per GP) established	Same as reported above	Same as reported above	Same as reported above
Output 2.2.4:	Community-based natural resources management plans designed and under implementation in target Green Landscapes, including community grassland/ ravines/forests/watershed management	Number: To be determined	4 plans (One plan for each district, Mz- 2 plans; Od- 1 plan, Uk- 1 plan)	In Mizoram and Odisha, several community resource management activities have been approved in the GLMPs, however, its implementation has not yet been initiated. GLMPs are to be developed and approved in Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan.
2.2.4-II	Number of community-based natural resources management plans designed and implemented	To be determined	Same as reported above	Same as reported above
Output 2.2.5:	On-farm agro-ecological management measures, including livestock management, to improve productivity and profits while reducing threats to GEBs identified, designed, and promoted.		Mizoram- 7 practices (Post harvest management of Mizo chilli; Seed treatment & storage (for popular seeds cultivated); MiSALT; Green house cultivation; Biofertilizer, Vaccination of pig; Rainbow rooster management) Odisha- 2 practices (Cultivation of nitrogen-fixing crops, lentils, and chickpea; Vaccination of cow, buffalo, goat, and poultry)	There were delays in developing the Green Landscape Management Plans. The main challenge was developing the convergence plan as part of the GLMP. Initially, it took time for the GLIU team to understand how to develop a convergence plan. Further, the discussions with other line departments for a convergence plan and agreeing upon the targets

			Uttarakhand- 4 practices (Use of local varieties/improved varieties derived from local varieties; Irrigation tanks; playhouse; vermicomposting bed)	and funding took a good amount of time. Additionally, there have been delays in initiating field schools on agriculture and livestock in the landscapes. The causes for these delays have been mentioned in the report previously.
2.2.5-I1	Number of households implementing improved livestock management – including nutrition and fodder management (e.g. community fodder banks) –contributing to conservation of global environmental values	46,500 households MP – 8000; OD- 22,500; RJ- 6,000;UK-10,000	6870 HHs (<i>Details in Section 2, Outcome 2.2, Indicator 13</i>)	
2.2.5-I2	Number of households that have adopted sustainable agriculture practices on their farms, including agrobiodiversity conservation measures	68,352 (RJ- 3,162; OD- 37,500; UK- 14,700; MZ- 5,490; MP- 7,500)	N/A	Planned from PY6 onwards

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges, and outcomes of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR (max 400 words)

Progress:

Baseline reports based on the findings of the geospatial analysis and secondary literature review have been completed for four states except Madhya Pradesh, where the geospatial analysis is currently underway. FPIC has been completed in Madhya Pradesh, Mizoram and Odisha and reports are being finalized. Household surveys have been completed in Mizoram, Odisha, and Uttarakhand, data is being analysed and report writing underway. Community consultations have been completed in Mizoram, Odisha, and Uttarakhand based on which the Green Landscape Management Plans have been developed and approved by TSGs. In Madhya Pradesh, the community consultations have been completed in the last week of June 2023 and data is being collated which will be followed by development of GLMPs.

NPMU has developed curriculum for Field School on Landscape Governance, master trainers have been trained in all landscapes. Field school is being implemented in Mizoram, Odisha and Uttarakhand.

Curriculum development workshop on sustainable agriculture completed in all states except Rajasthan and training of master trainers initiated. Field School Implementation initiated in Uttarakhand. Curriculum development workshop on livestock management completed in Madhya Pradesh, Mizoram Rajasthan, and Uttarakhand.

In Mizoram, only one study has been completed out of three. The second study report is under review and the third awaiting finalization from the State team. In Uttarakhand, out of three studies, the report of one study is under review by NPMU, and comments are shared with the State team. Platform of Soil and Water Conservation measures SDSS for all states have been developed and ground-truthed. Crop criteria matrix is under different stages of development in all States. M&E framework has been mapped with the MIS. Pages for capturing the physical progress in the MIS is under development. Pages for 57 out of 73 physical activities have been developed.

Challenges:

Regular meetings of NPMC, SSC, and TSGs are not being conducted even after repeated requests and follow-ups from NPMU. In certain states, like Rajasthan, TSG meetings are being convened without the NPMU's prior knowledge, leading to their absence. Similarly, state teams from Madhya Pradesh and Uttarakhand tend to notify the NPMU about meetings only at the last moment. Given that most of these meetings are conducted in-person, it hinders the NPMU's ability to participate. Such communication gaps ultimately compromise the effectiveness of the outcomes.

Frequent changes in officials at the state and district level are negatively impacting project implementation and delivery. All these new officials have to be oriented about the project.

In Madhya Pradesh, fully functional team has been on board in the last week of May 2023. Mizoram state team were suggested by NPMU in May 2022 to hire CRPs speaking local language Bru and Chakma, as field activities were not being initiated due to this language barrier. However, the

state team recruited the CRPs in May 2023. Community Institution and Livelihood expert at GLIU, Mizoram resigned in December 2022, and a new expert was on board in May 2023. Three CRPs posts in Mz are vacant since Jan 2023 and are proposed to be filled in June 2023. In Odisha 6 posts at GLIU were vacant since Nov 2022 and were filled up in May 2023. In Rajasthan, a full-fledged SPMU is still not in place. The Government officials were assigned the additional responsibility of SPMU and OP has reallocated charges to different Government officials (as of 31.05.2023). Now this new staff needs to be oriented on the project. The recruitment of the GLIU team and CRPs was completed in Rajasthan by a third-party agency. However, except for a few positions, most of the experts at GLIU have resigned due to non-timely payment of remuneration by the third party. In GLIU, six positions out of ten are vacant. All the CRPs have been removed from their posts owing to their non-professional and non-work ethics. Recently, OP has assigned the task of field implementation of the project to a few agriculture extension officers. All this is severely impacting the project implementation in the state. All this has is negatively impacting the project implementation at field.

For policy dialogues, two topics in Mizoram and four topics in Odisha have been approved in over two years, however, no policy dialogue has been conducted to date. In other three states as well there is no progress.

The Mizoram team has not been able to finalize the study reports in over two year's team even after support from NPMU. In Odisha six topics for studies have been approved in over two years, however, no study has been initiated to date. In Uttarakhand two studies are to be initiated.

The NPMU team is forced to provide support to the state teams on almost everything due to the lack of capacity of the SPMU/GLIU staff.

Audits/Spot checks are carried out by international audit firms who has LTA arrangements with FAO HQRS, however, these audit firms do not have the expertise/experience to audit Government Departments that are our OPs.

It has been observed that for a diverse country like India, no one-size-fits-all solution works. The OPIM modality has been experienced as challenging, and it falls short of allowing the Budget Holder/Project Manager to make essential changes across budgetary heads to reflect local needs/circumstances, for example. Aside from that, minor changes to the OP agreement, such as changing the OP's banking details, require clearance from the FAO Headquarters in Rome. Furthermore, all authorities are centralized for engaging in any partnerships and signing any Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) or agreement. This not only slows down the process but also erodes trust.

Development Objective (DO) Ratings, Implementation Progress (IP) Ratings and Overall Assessment

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence and progress reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR. For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

	FY2023 Development Objective rating¹⁶	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating¹⁷	Comments/reasons¹⁸ justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	<i>After the initial setback for the impact of COVID-19, project implementation has started looking up in most of the states. However, despite the best efforts from our end, it has not picked up the way it should have been. Ops are being regularly encouraged and handholding is also being provided by NPMU to speed up the implementation. But the project has done some of the original work like the development of the SWC matrix and Crop matrix on the SDSS which has been taken up by GEF 7 team at Hqrs for being implemented in the Food Systems IP.</i>
Budget Holder	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	<i>Despite the best efforts by the FAOIN and NPMU, the project progress in the states needs to pick up. More efforts are needed by the Operational Partners to expedite the implementation of the Green Landscape Management Plans and facilitate better convergence with ongoing Government programs. The project requires more attention from key government officials at state and district levels, but frequent transfers of key officers undermine this. FAOIN is committed to improving project implementation and delivery. Aside from constant follow-up with states to expedite implementation, we plan to use innovative investment mechanisms and digital tools for sustainable solutions at the community level.</i>

¹⁶ **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁷ **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁸ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁹			<i>Ratings/comments</i>
Lead Technical Officer²⁰	MS	MS	<i>The project has shown progress in areas like baseline reports, geospatial analysis, FPIC, household surveys, community consultations, and training for field schools. However, it has also faced challenges, including operational and coordination issues, frequent turn over of government and counterparts, delayed recruitments, and certain delays in policy dialogues and studies. Given India's diversity, a tailored approach is crucial over a one-size-fits-all strategy. Overcoming these challenges and refining processes is vital to enhance project execution and attain the set goals.</i>
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	MS	MS	<p><i>The project has shown variable progress against different Outcomes and progress has also not been similar in all of the States –with some States showing more progress than others. It would be good to have breakdown of State level progress by Outcomes in future PIRs – maybe as an Annex, so that we can also support State level actions as needed. The project has shown good progress in focusing on gender issues and this needs to be further strengthened. I am also happy that the project has contributed and actively participated in possible field testing of a global methodology being developed by FAO on participatory integrated landscape restoration (PILA). I believe both the methodology developers and the project will greatly benefit from this partnership. The project can also further contribute to global learning and sharing, and we will need to work collectively to identify such opportunities to showcase the project's tools and learning.</i></p> <p><i>The key priorities for the project before the next PIR will be to complete the independent mid term review of the project and to develop appropriate actions in response to the review's recommendations.</i></p>

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

²⁰ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

This section is under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

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

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
The proximity of project locations to protected areas	The project envisages reducing threats to protected areas, and this is noted in the results framework indicator “3 under Outcome 1.2.	1. Uttarakhand organized a workshop on the man-wildlife conflict, forest, and wildlife in Gram Panchayat Kimsar and Dharkot of development block Yamkeshwar and Gram Panchayat Ramni and Umraila of development block Yamkeshwar on December 20 and 21, 2022. School children, the local community, and people's representatives on security, etc. participated in the workshop. This was conducted in	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Functional online system in Madhya Pradesh 2. Adoption of the system by other states 	Technical Experts at NPMU, with the support of the Project Director in close coordination with operational partners, technical Experts SPMU, GLIU.

		<p>collaboration with the Sanchar Jan Chetna Trust, WWF-India, and the Forest Department through their involvement in a puppet drama and the distribution of books and posters on man-animal conflict.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Green Landscape Management Plans were developed in Uttarakhand and Odisha with due consideration to include priority actions to the persistent threats to the Protected Areas 3. In Madhya Pradesh, NPMU participated in the meeting organized by the Forest Department for strategizing the development of an online system to monitor threats and conflicts. 4. States of Mizoram, Odisha, Rajasthan, and Uttarakhand have requested to share the online system being developed by Madhya Pradesh so that the same can be adopted for their state-specific needs. 		
<p>ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</p>				

ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
ESS 7: Decent Work				
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
Presence of indigenous peoples in the project area	1. National PMU will include a dedicated staff on Gender and FPIC.	NPMU has a dedicated staff on gender since November 2022.	Completed	Project Director
	2. The budget for FPIC and gender orientation from NMPU to State PMUs have been included to ensure continuous support and backstopping from the national expert. This has been included under the training budget entitled “Capacity building of State level project implementation units on incorporating gender and FPIC issues”	Orientation of SPMU and GLIU staff on Gender and FPIC has been completed in all 5 states. In addition, refresh training was conducted for the GLIU staff of Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan in December 2022.	Completed	Project Director and NPMU Experts
	3. The Project design (refer to Section 2.3.3 of Pro Doc) embeds FPIC to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The modules to guide the FPIC consultation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPMU and GLIU teams in Rajasthan, to map the indigenous 	State teams with technical

	<p>integrate the voices, choices, and concerns of Scheduled Tribes and local communities into the project activities, implementation, and monitoring.</p> <p>4. FPIC will be embedded in all aspects of project implementation throughout the life of the project. Local communities will be made aware of the requirement for the project to obtain FPIC for planned activities, and if they feel this is not being sought, they will be made aware of the project’s grievance mechanism.</p>	<p>process were posted on the project website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GLIU teams in Odisha and Mizoram have completed the FPIC process in all the high-priority villages, with 4-5 meetings in each village with the tribal communities residing in the project landscape: 3 tribes in Mizoram and 15 tribes in Odisha. • The grievance mechanism was shared with the communities before signing the consent form. • FPIC report from one village of Mizoram was cleared by LTO in April 2023. • GLIU teams in Odisha and Mizoram are accordingly translating the FPIC reports for their landscapes. • NPMU gave refresher training to the GLIU team in Madhya Pradesh (MP) for conducting FPIC with a focus on documentation in December 2022. • MP GLIU team has completed the 	<p>people in the landscape.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of FPIC in high-priority areas in Rajasthan. • Independent assessment of the FPIC process to be done by the project and evidenced by FPIC reports for each sites 	<p>backstopping of NPMU</p>
--	--	--	--	-----------------------------

		<p>mapping of indigenous communities. Tribal communities are residing only in 4 high-priority villages out of 25 villages.</p> <p>GLIU has completed the FPIC process in MP and translation of documentation in English is going on.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPMU gave refresher training to the CRPs and GLIU team in Rajasthan in December 2022; however, the Operation Partner removed all the CRPs in January due to functional irregularities. Agriculture Supervisors have been appointed in May 2023, and NPMU has given training to them on the FPIC process. • After the stakeholder mapping in Uttarakhand, it was found that the project landscape does not have any indigenous population, and those residing during the earlier census (Census 2011) have migrated. So, no FPIC will be 		
--	--	--	--	--

		conducted in Uttarakhand.		
	5. The project shall inform all the communities, including indigenous communities in the target landscapes, about the grievance mechanism as outlined under the project's 1.7.7 Grievance Mechanisms.	The grievance mechanism developed by NPMU was explained to the communities in Madhya Pradesh, Mizoram, and Odisha in their local language. The mechanism has the government officials and FAO staff responsible for receiving and handling grievances, throughout the project cycle.	Dissemination of the mechanism in the communities together with the FPIC consultation process in Rajasthan.	Gender and Social inclusion experts from FAO as well as designated officials from the government.
	6. Government agencies related to indigenous communities' development and empowerment have been included in the State Steering Committees of the project to ensure that all government agencies take this concern as an important issue.	Local people residing in the landscape have been recruited as Community Resource Persons (CRPs) in Madhya Pradesh, Mizoram, Odisha, and Uttarakhand. communities. However, in Mizoram, there are two villages in the priority villages where only local dialects Bru and Chakma are spoken and none of the local CRPs knew these dialects. The team had to engage with a translator in these two villages for communicating with the tribal communities. In Rajasthan, the agriculture supervisors belonging to the landscape district have been given	The project presently ensures and will continue ensuring the continuous participation of officials from these government agencies in future meetings, putting forth the concerns and issues related to indigenous communities and women.	State Operational Partners as well as designated officials from the government

		additional charge of the project activities.		
	7. Role of project personnel clearly notes their leadership to ensure FPIC (see Table 30: Key NPMU personnel and their responsibilities, which includes Gender and FPIC experts and Table 32: Key GLIU personnel and their responsibilities.	FPIC-specific roles and responsibilities have been included in the job descriptions of Gender and Social Inclusion experts at NPMU and GLIU. All landscapes have dedicated experts in their GLIU teams.		NPMU, State teams
	8. Inclusion of FAO's Indigenous Peoples team in the Project Task Force (PTF)	Mr. Guido Agostinucci, FPIC Coordinator, FAO IP Unit, Rome is a member of the PTF.		Budget Holder, and Lead Technical Officer
	9. Independent assessment FPIC by project	As the FPIC process was delayed due to COVID-19 and the delay in staff recruitment, the independent assessment of FPIC may be taken up after all the states have completed the FPIC.	Tentatively planned for August/September 2023.	State teams with guidance from NPMU
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate:

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²¹ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.	
	Moderate	Still valid

²¹ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit (Esm-unit@fao.org) should be contacted. The project shall prepare or amend an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) or other ESS instruments and management tools based on the new risk classification (please refer to page 13 <https://www.fao.org/3/cb9870en/cb9870en.pdf>)

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.

--

6. Risks

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²²	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
	Project Start-Up					

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²²	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Delay in securing Government Approvals amid stringent protocols for direct receipt of funds due to change in the fund transfer mechanism	Moderate	N	FAOIN to undertake frequent and multiple follow-ups with top bureaucrats at state and national levels to expedite project start-up	FAO/NPMU is working in close coordination with MoA&FW to sensitize senior government officials of respective state Governments to support streamlining process for smooth project implementation. However, frequent change of officials at the MoA&FW has undermined the coordination. Regular follow-up by the Project Director, NPMU with designated officials of the OP on the project progress, and issues, if any for timely redressal	Required Govt. Approvals have been secured and OP Agreements have been signed. This has been resolved.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²²	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
2	Recruitment of quality personnel due to limited experience of OPs in hiring interdisciplinary teams at State and District levels	Moderate	N	FAOIN to share Terms of Reference (ToRs) for various positions with OPs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard ToRs developed which have been duly approved by LTO. Subsequently, these have been shared with all the OPs. Recruitment protocols finalized by FAO which include SOPs for recruitment, evaluating written assessments, and participating in candidate interviews. These have been shared with the OPs. 	NPMU is doing its best with regular follow-up. NPMU is participating in the recruitment interviews, as per the request of the OP. FAOR and National Technical Coordinator have personally met with the Chairs of the NPSC and SSCs to request support for expediting implementation. Also, the issue has been raised in the NPSC and SSCs.
Project Implementation						

3	Recovery of unwarranted expenditure due to advance transfer of funds to the OPs	Low	N	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. FAOIN to build capacities of state OPs on Annual Work Plans & Budget (AWPB) and Standard Operating Procedures; Design a real-time Financial Management System for monitoring project expenditures. 2. Commission audits and spot checks of OPs. 3. FAOIN has developed an Operations Manual to provide implementation guidance to the state partners. 	<p>A robust real-time online accounting and financial MIS system have been operationalized. Data is being regularly updated by the staff at SPMU and GLIU. This provides timely, reliable, and comprehensive reports for informed decision-making, controlling, monitoring, and execution of the budget at the National and State levels. Training on FMIS has been imparted to the OPs in the 5 states.</p> <p>2. Audits have been completed for all five OPs. As per the audit report, the In-eligible expenditures have been recovered from the OP Mizoram. For other OPs the audit report is being finalized. Spot checks have been initiated for the OPs.</p> <p>3. Operations manual has been shared with the state partners for necessary action.</p>	<p>A robust real-time online accounting and financial MIS system have been operationalized. Recovery of unwarranted expenditure has been effective. The financial MIS will be operationalized in other FAO-GEF projects.</p>
---	---	-----	---	--	--	--

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²²	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
4	Establishing interdepartmental institutional mechanisms at State and district levels	Low		<p>FAOIN to work in close collaboration with MoA&FW to sensitize senior government officials of respective state governments for their active participation in project implementation.</p> <p>FAOIN to undertake frequent and multiple follow-ups with the OPs to conduct SSC and TSG meetings at regular intervals to discuss the project's progress and how each of these Govt. Depts. can collaboratively contribute to the project, overcoming their sectoral silos</p>	<p>15 TSG meetings were held during the current reporting period.</p> <p>Multiple follow-ups with Operational Partners and visits to the States, participation in SSC and TSG meetings either physically or virtually.</p>	NPMU continues to follow up closely with OPs for regular conduct of the SSC and TSG meetings.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²²	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
5	Inadequate attention to the project by Govt. officials due to their preoccupation with the implementation of Govt. programs/ schemes, with higher budgets when compared to the project's funds	Moderate	N	<p>1. FAOIN to work in close collaboration with MoA&FW to sensitize senior government officials of respective state Governments for their active participation in project implementation.</p> <p>2. Support required from RAP/ HQ – Important to sensitize the GEF Secretariat on the challenges and level of effort required from the FAO Country Office to increase Country ownership, particularly in diverse and large countries like India</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One NPSC and 2 NPMC meeting has been held in this reporting period. • Regular follow-up by the Project Director, NPMU with designated officials of the OP on the project progress, and issues, if any try for timely redressal 	FAOIN and NPMU continue to follow up closely with OPs and meet with senior government officials of respective state Governments. This has started yielding results. The NPMC and NPSC are being scheduled in a timely manner.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²²	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
6	Frequent transfers of Govt. officials	Moderate	N	<p>1. The Project Director and other officials from FAOIN undertake frequent missions to orient the new staff regarding the project and apprise them of the latest developments in the project.</p> <p>2. FAO keeps on bringing this issue to the notice of the Secretary, DA&FW. At the state level also, the issue is brought to the notice of the Chair, SSC for their intervention.</p>	<p>Multiple visits and meetings were undertaken for completing the recruitment of the GLIU team and Community resource Persons in Madhya Pradesh. Additionally, to avoid any further delays in the recruitment of the state teams, FAOIN took up the matter with Additional. Chief Secretary, Agriculture, Government of Madhya Pradesh.</p> <p>Subsequently, NPMU brought this issue to the knowledge of the Chair of NPMC and NPSC meetings. The Representative from MP assured that the vacant positions in GLIU and recruitment of CRPs would be completed by the end of January 2023. However, the recruitment is complete, and the complete team is on board as of May 2023 only.</p>	Coordinating with 5 OPs and State Governments takes considerable amount of time and efforts.

7	Rigid Rules and Procedures of Operational Partners Implementation Modality and FAO Rules/regulations	Moderate	N	<p>FAOIN to have regular follow-ups with Headquarters to expedite the approval process to avoid delays in the transfer of funds.</p> <p>Support required from RAP/ HQ The concerned officials within RAP and HQ sensitize the OPIM unit on the need for greater flexibility in project implementation and increase delegation of authority to FAO representatives.</p> <p>Support approval process and systems-related issues to ensure that funds are released to the OPs in time. Centralized systems of approvals for fund disbursement to OP in Uttarakhand have been another challenge the project has faced during this reporting period. The PD along with AFAOR had to repeatedly follow up with colleagues at RAP to expedite the approval process. Subsequently, the funds were released to the OP</p>	<p>The Administration and Operations Officer has closely followed up with counterparts at FAO Headquarters to expedite the approval process and seek operational guidance on amendments to OP Agreement and changes in the project’s budget to reflect local needs/requirements.</p> <p>Similarly, the PD and the Communications Specialist worked closely with the Legal and OCCI of FAO Rome to finalize the implementation agreement with NTCA but it took a long time.</p>	Requires consideration at appropriate level.
---	--	----------	---	---	--	--

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²²	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
				<p>but not before the OP had put in repeated reminders via email. This entire process took about 2 months.</p> <p>Additionally, the OP in Uttarakhand changed the bank where the project funds are transferred by FAO. This too led to further delays due to official banking formalities.</p>		

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²²	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
8	<p>COVID-19 Pandemic:</p> <p>The country experienced a spike in COVID-19 cases since December 2021. Once again, this put the project on the back foot as far as implementation is concerned.</p>	Substantial	N		<p>1. The NPMC and the NPMU are closely monitoring the implementation of the project and are formulating strategies to see that the timelines as agreed in the approved risk mitigation strategy are met. However, still, the project is facing substantial lags and delays.</p> <p>2. Joint Review Meetings were held with all OPs to discuss the risk mitigation measures adopted in the wake of the pandemic and the project's progress in the states.</p> <p>3. Virtual meetings and orientation workshops were conducted. Capacity enhancement and training were also imparted virtually to the state teams.</p>	COVID-19 is under control in the country during the reporting period.

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

FY2022 rating	FY2023 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Medium	Moderate	No change from the previous rating

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

If the project had an MTR or a supervision mission, please report on how the recommendations were implemented during this fiscal year (1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023) as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year (1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023)</u>
Supervision Mission²³ Recommendation 1: The country office will be responsible for initiating the recruitment of an evaluator for the mid-term review, and share the TORs with the PTF (LTO) for comments	The country office developed the ToRs and RFP for hiring of the agency to undertake the Mid-term review of the project. These documents were shared with relevant officials in the GEF unit at FAO along with LTO. The feedback and recommendations received were appropriately addressed. The country office also hired an MTR manager and M&E specialist to handle the MTR process.
Supervision Mission²⁴ Recommendation 2: detailed planning to be undertaken by GreenAg team for the preparation of mid-term review	The project team has prepared for the mid-term review. The relevant reports and documents to be shared with the MTR manager for sharing with the MTR team. The MTR manager was also briefed by the project team. He also visited one of the landscapes to have a better understanding of the project architecture and current status.
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation.....	
Recommendation.....	

Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize	
---	--

²³ Recommendations from the supervision mission of the LTO, 4-9 September 2022

²⁴ Recommendations from the supervision mission of GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO),

21- 25 November 2022

8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines²⁵. Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories and provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework			
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management			
Implementation schedule			
Executing Entity			
Executing Entity Category			
Minor project objective change			
Safeguards			
Risk analysis			
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%			
Co-financing			
Location of project activity			
Other minor project amendment (define)			

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

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

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

Stakeholder name	Type of partnership	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
<i>Government institutions</i>			
<p>Operational Partners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directorate of Farmers Welfare and Agriculture Development, Government of Madhya Pradesh • Department of Agriculture (Crop Husbandry), Government of Mizoram • Institute on Management of Agricultural Extension (IMAGE), Government of Odisha • Department of Agriculture, Government of Rajasthan • Watershed Management Directorate, Government of Uttarakhand 	<p>FAO has signed an agreement with the Operational Partner (OP) in each State using the OPIM modality. The Operating partners are responsible for the implementation and day-to-day management of the project in Rajasthan, Odisha, Uttarakhand, Mizoram, and Madhya Pradesh.</p>	<p>4 SSC meetings were held, one each in Madhya Pradesh, Odisha, Rajasthan, and Uttarakhand. One meeting is planned for July 2023 in Mizoram.</p> <p>15 TSG meetings were held during the current reporting period.</p> <p>Joint review meetings have been conducted between FAOIN and the OPs in all the states during the reporting period.</p>	<p>Madhya Pradesh: In Madhya Pradesh, frequent staff turnover resulted in high transaction costs borne by the NPMU. Upon repeated follow up by NPMU, the State finally recruited a fully functional SPMU team. The GLIU team and the Community resource persons recruitment has been completed in May 2023 only.</p> <p>Geospatial assessment as part of landscape assessment has been completed in all states except Madhya Pradesh.</p> <p>Odisha: In Odisha, the state nodal officer and district nodal officer superannuated on 30th April 2023. The Govt. Officials have been given additional charge of these posts and this is hampering the implementation of the project.</p> <p>Rajasthan: In Rajasthan, there has a lack of consensus in the OP regarding recruitment to SPMU and GLIU positions. Currently, the</p>

			<p>state is facing challenges in running the project as the SPMU staff are overburdened with their core departmental work. Recently (May 2023) a new set of government officials was put in place and this team needs to be oriented afresh about the project and which will add to further delay in project implementation. The GLIU team, including CRPs, were recruited through a third-party agency. However, due to non-timely payment of remuneration by the third-party agency to the GLIU and CRPs, many experts at GLIU have resigned from their posts. NPMU has flagged this issue of non-timely payment of remuneration at various meetings wherein senior officials were involved, however, despite this no solution was found to deal with the third-party agency and as a result, several experts, including the Team Leader, who was trained by NPMU during the inception workshop and were guided by NPMU about the project resigned from their posts. Now the GLIU team has only four team members out of ten. Recently, the OP removed all the CRPs from their posts owing to their non-serious attitude and no dedication to the project work and their work has been allocated to</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>agriculture extension staff under the agriculture department. Further, the state has informed the NPMU that they are not going to hire any community resource persons.</p>
<p>Department of Agriculture, and Farmers Welfare (DA&FW) in Ministry of Agriculture and Farmer’s Welfare (MoA&FW), Government of India</p>	<p>The National Executing Agency. It monitors project implementation and is responsible for providing general oversight in the project execution</p>	<p>Engagement with DA&FW has been facilitated as follows:</p> <p>Through National Project Monitoring Committee (NPMC) meetings</p> <p>The NPMC monitors project implementation and provides general oversight in the project execution. It is chaired by the Joint Secretary (RFS Division), DA&FW, MoA&FW. The Joint Secretary (RFS), DA&FW, MoA&FW is the Chair and the Additional Commissioner (NRM), DAC&FW acts as Member Secretary. In the current reporting period, three NPMC meetings have been conducted.</p> <p>Through National Project Steering Committee (NPSC) meetings</p> <p>NPSC will provide overall guidance and strategic leadership to create synergies for multi-sectoral coordination during project implementation; and facilitate the ‘mainstreaming’ of relevant project findings and recommendations into national policies, strategies, and action plans. The Secretary,</p>	<p>The frequent changes in officials chairing NPMC in the Department of Agriculture and Farmers’ Welfare, Govt. of India have continued to undermine regular coordination between the National Committee and the Operational Partners and derailed the process of periodic review of OPs.</p>

		Department of Agriculture, and Farmers' Welfare (DA&FW), the Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers' Welfare (MoA&FW) chairs the National Project Steering Committee (NPSC). The Secretary, DA&FW, MoA&FW is the Convener, and the Joint Secretary (NRM&RFS), DA&FW acts as Member Secretary to this Committee. During this reporting period, one NPSC meeting was held.	
Wildlife Institute of India (WII)	Conducting a study on Human-Wildlife Conflict in Uttarakhand.	The state has requested the Wildlife Institute of India (WII) to undertake this study in the field. ToR has been drafted by the state in consultation with NPMU. The draft report for the study has been submitted.	NA
ICAR (Indian Council of Agricultural Research) - CRIDA (Central Research Institute for Dryland Agriculture)	Guiding to scale up National Innovation on Climate Resilient Agriculture (NICRA) project learnings and technologies in all the project landscapes. <i>(The NICRA project aims to enhance the resilience of Indian agriculture to climate change and climate vulnerability through strategic research and technology demonstration)</i>	The ICAR advised all the KVKs (Krishi Vigyan Kendra) in the Green-Ag project districts or nearby districts where the NICRA Technology Demonstration Component (TDC) is operational to guide or support the scale-up of NICRA technologies in the project districts.	NA
NGOs²⁶			

²⁶ Non-government organizations

Hoi Philoi, Mizoram	The NGO has been hired by the state team to conduct a study on Human-wildlife conflict and state policy dialogue on NRM	The state identified the NGO to conduct the study on Human-Wildlife Conflict and policy dialogue on Natural Resource Management. The final report for the human-wildlife conflict study has been submitted.	Despite receiving extensive assistance from the NPMU and GLIU, the agency took almost two years to finalize the human-wildlife conflict study report, and the state policy dialogue on NRM is not completed yet.
<i>Private sector entities</i>			
<i>Others²⁷</i>			
<i>New stakeholders identified</i>			

²⁷ They can include, among others, community-based organizations (CBOs), Indigenous Peoples organizations, women’s groups, private sector companies, farmers, universities, research institutions, and all major groups as identified, for example, in Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and many times again since then

10. Gender Mainstreaming

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

Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period.
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	Yes	<p>The country in general and the project landscapes have low participation of women in agriculture due to societal configuration and social norms. During the stakeholder mapping, community consultations, FPIC process, village implementation committee formation, and household survey special efforts were made by the teams for women's participation. The teams were guided by NPMU to ensure at least 30% participation of women in all activities. For this, the GLIU teams conducted regular awareness and open discussion meetings with the village heads and other influential representatives of villages in Uttarakhand, Mizoram, and Odisha. Madhya Pradesh has also started these activities with assured women's participation. In Madhya Pradesh, Mizoram, Odisha, and Uttarakhand, with the team's efforts, more than 40% of women participated in all the project activities and consultations held in the reporting year. In Mizoram and Uttarakhand, women are proactive in income-generating activities and decision-making. In Odisha, the tribal women are more active during the consultations and voice their opinions. More than 40% of women are part of the Village Implementation Committees in all the states.</p> <p>Communication plans at the national and state levels have considered gender as a key element in communication products and care has been taken that all communication from the project will be gender sensitive. At Mizoram, Odisha, and Uttarakhand, community consultations were done at the cluster level having 3-4 villages in each cluster, where 10-12 members from each village irrespective of caste, gender & class participated to discuss the problems and their priority actions for the preparation of the landscape-level plan. While in Mizoram both men and women participated in equal numbers, in Odisha and Uttarakhand women were more active and forthcoming in discussions. They were more aware of the local conditions. The community consultations discussed the role of men and women in agriculture activities and decision-making in it.</p> <p>The gender related data from these consultations were analyzed and the data were used for designing</p>

		<p>gender-specific activities in the Green Landscape Monitoring Plans (GLMP) in Mizoram, Odisha, and Uttarakhand. The same process will be initiated in Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan.</p> <p>The household survey has gender-disaggregated questions and the survey is complete in Mizoram, Uttarakhand, and about to be finished in Odisha. Survey data is being analyzed. The team was trained to include the women-headed households in the sample size. The survey will be initiated in Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan now.</p> <p>Stakeholder mapping has been completed in Uttarakhand, Mizoram, and Odisha to identify the important stakeholders of the project as per their priority and influence over the project. Special focus was given to Women Self Help Groups.</p>
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	<p>FPIC process, Household survey, Stakeholder mapping, and community consultations are ensuring at least 30% participation of women and also record the voice of women and indigenous communities so that their concerns are incorporated in the project implementation through GLMPs. GLMP prepared in Mizoram, Odisha, and Uttarakhand have gender-specific action plans.</p> <p>The participant attendance is disaggregated by gender and is captured in the MIS system of the project for each training, meeting, workshop, and consultation in each landscape.</p> <p>The teams have ensured that during the formation of Village Implementation Committees (VIC), at least 30% of members are women and other marginalized communities.</p> <p>The curriculum for Farmer Field School for sustainable agriculture has a dedicated section on women's needs in agriculture. Similarly, the curriculum on Livestock has included the role of women in sustainable livestock management.</p> <p>The project is making regular efforts through TSG meetings to improve access of the local community, specifically women and indigenous community, to existing government programs, schemes, and services on forest management, sustainable agriculture production, marketing, livestock management, etc.</p>
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Yes	The data on access to and control over natural resources is collected through the Household Survey in each village of the project landscape. The Household survey has been completed in Mizoram,

		Odisha and Uttarakhand and the data is being analyzed.																																			
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	<p>The staff in Madhya Pradesh was oriented on gender and social inclusion, including FPIC during the SPMU and GLIU level orientation workshops in August 2022 and October 2022 respectively. The SPMU and GLIU Team in Madhya Pradesh was given refresher training in December 2022 to roll out the FPIC process in the landscape. Similarly, training was given to Rajasthan GLIU and CRPs, however, all the staff has since been removed by the OP and there is no SPMU/GLIU. A second refresher training will be scheduled when the new staff will be onboard.</p> <p>The household survey questionnaire has captured gender-disaggregated data with a dedicated section on gender roles and responsibilities. Household Survey was completed in Uttarakhand and Mizoram states and its data is being analysed. The Odisha state will finish its household survey by the end of June 2023. Training on the household survey was given to the GLIU team of Madhya Pradesh in mid of June and a second training for new staff of Rajasthan is scheduled for the end of August 2023.</p>																																			
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes																																				
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	<p>The monitoring system of all training, workshops, consultations, etc. in the project landscape captures the gender-disaggregated data of the participants. The FPIC monitoring protocol has also generated results on the participation and inclusion of women from indigenous communities in project activities, and how the project incorporates their feedback and redresses their grievances.</p> <p>The system can generate a report of participation in the project. The project outreach disaggregated by gender is as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>SN</th> <th>Activity</th> <th>Men (number)</th> <th>Women (number)</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Meetings</td> <td>2201</td> <td>1989</td> <td>4190</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Workshops</td> <td>908</td> <td>493</td> <td>1401</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>VIC</td> <td>1101</td> <td>905</td> <td>2006</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Farmers implementing GLMP activities</td> <td>835</td> <td>2094</td> <td>2929</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>House Hold survey (HH Heads)</td> <td>963</td> <td>117</td> <td>1080</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>FFS Sustainable Agriculture</td> <td>243</td> <td>310</td> <td>553</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	SN	Activity	Men (number)	Women (number)	Total	1	Meetings	2201	1989	4190	2	Workshops	908	493	1401	3	VIC	1101	905	2006	4	Farmers implementing GLMP activities	835	2094	2929	5	House Hold survey (HH Heads)	963	117	1080	6	FFS Sustainable Agriculture	243	310	553
SN	Activity	Men (number)	Women (number)	Total																																	
1	Meetings	2201	1989	4190																																	
2	Workshops	908	493	1401																																	
3	VIC	1101	905	2006																																	
4	Farmers implementing GLMP activities	835	2094	2929																																	
5	House Hold survey (HH Heads)	963	117	1080																																	
6	FFS Sustainable Agriculture	243	310	553																																	

		FS on 7 Landscape Governance	1014	710	1724
		Total	7265	6618	13883
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	<p>A Gender and FPIC expert at NPMU and five Gender and Social Inclusion Experts at the Green Landscape Implementation Units are responsible for gender analysis and mainstreaming in the project. They ensure the inclusion of gender aspects in all stages of project planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. Additionally, gender-related tasks and responsibilities are included in the Terms of Reference of key project personnel, wherever relevant.</p> <p>GLIU in Madhya Pradesh, Mizoram, Odisha, Rajasthan, and Uttarakhand have all appointed staff with gender expertise.</p> <p>At the NPMU level, the staff with specialized Gender expertise is on board since November 2022 and provides regular support to the state teams. The State and GLIU level workshops in all 5 project states have oriented the staff on Gender Mainstreaming.</p>			
Any other good practices on gender	Yes	<p>The community consultation has a detailed section to capture the role of men and women in agriculture and livestock management. This information has been very useful in identifying the issues and planning the priority actions for GLMP development.</p>			

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval, during this reporting period.

<p>Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.</p>	<p>Green-Ag project's knowledge management (KM) strategy is in-line with GEF's Knowledge Management Approach Paper 2015 and focuses on <u>knowledge generated</u> through targeted research, and documentation of good practices, lessons learned, and innovations.</p> <p>It was intended to start in PY3; however, the field implementation could be initiated only during November 2022, because of delays in staff recruitment and completion of primary activities for GLMP planning due to the spike in COVID-19 cases during January 2022.</p> <p>The field implementation has now started and the GLIU teams are observing and keeping track of good practices and lessons learnt.</p> <p>Based on activities undertaken so far, the team is developing lessons learnt document to capture the project implementation strategies, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. COVID-19 Risk Mitigation Strategy 2. Promoting convergence through inter-sectoral bodies, 3. Policy dialogues at the national and the state level, 4. Usage of Spatial Decision Support System (SDSS) for green landscape planning and management, 5. Mainstreaming agrobiodiversity in the guidelines of different programs and schemes of DA&FW 6. Mainstreaming gender aspects in activity planning, prioritization, and implementation through village implementation committees. 7. FPIC process across different landscapes 8. Green Landscape Management Plan (GLMP) preparation, including community engagement, convergence plans, finalization of GLMPs, and engagement of TSG to facilitate the institutionalization of the GLMPs. 9. Green-Ag Farmer Field School Approach 10. Management Information System (MIS) for the project <p>These and other emerging good practices and lessons learnt will be identified and documented by SPMU and GLIU staff with guidance from NPMU.</p>
<p>Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.</p>	<p>NPMU has developed a communication strategy for the project to guide staff on various communication and awareness generation activities. The strategy is based on an assessment of target audiences, their information needs, and communication channels.</p> <p>Mizoram, Odisha, and Uttarakhand have developed their state-specific communication plans in sync with the NPMU's communication strategy. A communication plan for Madhya Pradesh is being developed.</p> <p>Below are some of the communication successes during this reporting period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GLIU Inception Workshop was held in Madhya Pradesh and was widely covered in the local media. • The OP Uttarakhand organized a workshop on awareness of the man-animal conflict mitigation measures in December 2022. • Reports on the State Inception Workshop in Odisha and Uttarakhand are available on the project website. • The State Inception Workshop report for Madhya Pradesh is final and its final layout is being done. GLIU Inception workshop for Odisha is also final and its final layout is being done. • The Mizoram GLIU team has developed five communication products for the farmers in Mizo and English languages.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Odisha state has developed its brochure in Odia and the English language. • Odisha has installed project sign boards in each village of the landscape to raise awareness about the project. • Mizoram has installed signboards at the MiSALT demonstration plots. • Photo gallery and videos developed for Mission LiFE from project activities. • Eco Club guidelines were prepared for the team for developing state-specific brochures. <p>Green-Ag website, www.greenag.nmsa.gov.in is regularly updated with the project activities, meetings, review visits, and reports. All the presentations made by NPMU during the state and GLIU inception workshops have been updated on the website.</p> <p><u>Photographs:</u> GLIU teams are instructed to collect high-resolution field implementation photographs in-line with FAO’s photo guidelines. These will be saved in the Google server and can be accessed through the MIS system of the project. The MIS linkage is in the final testing stages.</p> <p>Challenges:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Change in the communication officer in Madhya Pradesh slowed down the work in progress and delayed the development of communication products. 2. Rajasthan does not have a dedicated staff, and on May 30, 2023, the government staff has been given additional responsibility. 3. The states require documents in the local language, however, NPMU can provide technical support for English versions only. State teams are required to draft two versions of the same document. There is no way to check the quality of local language documents. 4. The CRPs, transfer the photos from field locations through WhatsApp resulting in low-resolution photos. The field locations do not have high internet facilities and large files can’t be transferred easily. 5. The teams have limitations with the use of the English language, which results in overwork for NPMU to review, edit and finalize the documents.
<p>Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people’s livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related</p>	<p>The project has initiated field activities from the winter sowing season in 2022. It is early to assess the improvement in people’s livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected global environmental benefits.</p>

photos and photo credits.	
Please provide links to related website, social media account	<p>Project website: www.greenag.nmsa.gov.in</p> <p>Green-Ag Project, Mizoram social handles are: Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=100083942149142 Instagram: https://www.instagram.com/greenag_mz/</p> <p>Media Coverage:</p> <p><u>Madhya Pradesh</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. District-Level Inception Workshop <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Krishak Jagat, Hindi News Paper, Date- 10-10-2022 (Epaper- Krishakjagat) ii. Patrika, Hindi News Paper, Date- 10-10-2022 iii. Aditya Express, Hindi NP, Date- 11-10-2022 iv. Patrika, Hindi News Paper, Date- 11-10-2022 2. Project Director's Meeting with District Collector, Morena & Sheopur <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Patrika, Hindi News Paper/ Epaper, Date- 11-10-2022 (Rajasthan Patrika ePaper: Hindi) 3. TSG Meeting, Morena <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Ajay Bharat, Hindi News Paper, Date- 06-01-2023 <p><u>Mizoram</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 4th TSG meeting <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. LPS Timeframe- (10:15-12:00) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BG3KkuKvdhM ii. DI&PR: https://dipr.mizoram.gov.in/post/lunglei-ah-green-ag-project-4th-technical-support-group-meeting-neih-a-ni iii. Orissadiary https://orissadiary.com/mizoram-green-landscape-implementation-unit-3rd-technical-support-group-meeting-held/ iv. Lenkaw: https://lenkaw.khampat.com/2022/08/green-ag-project-hmalakna-tur-thlirhona.html 2. CDW-Sustainable Agriculture Workshop <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Covered by Local newspaper Vanglaini: Images link (IMG_20221117_101555.jpg) (IMG_20221117_101555_2.jpg) 3. PHM (Mizo Chill) CRP Training at Lunglei. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Zonet (Lunglei) (timeline: 13:57): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SLEg8pr81wY 4. NPMU Visits <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Visit to KVK, MAMIT, Covered b DIPR: https://dipr.mizoram.gov.in/post/fao-un-ten-kvk-mamit-tlawh ii. DDK AIZAWL COVERAGE on NPMU Field Visit to KVK Lengpui, Mamit District on 12th December 2022: (Time-frame 06:00 – 06:45) https://youtu.be/JLw5TChggXU <p>Mamit Times coverage of the meeting at the conference hall, DC Office, Mamt: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1_cDKHClusEhtsDLa1J6jW6whXhhVZv07/view?usp=sharing</p> <p>5.5. Curriculum Development Workshop on Livestock Management</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. I&PR Dept.: https://dipr.mizoram.gov.in/post/vawk-leh-ar-vulh-dan-tha-zawk-inkawhmunaworkshop-neih-a-ni ii. LPS Chibai Mizoram: (time frame 12:40 - 14:10) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZdbO453Q3I0 <p><u>Odisha:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. District-Level Technical Support Group (TSG) Meeting <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sakala, Odia News Paper, Date-21.07.2022 ii. Sambad, Odia News Paper, Date-22.07.2022 iii. Prameya, Odia News Paper , Date -22.07.2022 iv. Pragatibadi , Odia News Paper , Date – 28.03.2023 v. Odisha News Network, English News Paper / E-paper – 26.03.2023 vi. Nitidina, Odia News Paper – 27.03.2023 vii. Sakala - https://www.sakalaepaper.com/view/5928/mayurbhanj/9 viii. Prameya - https://youtu.be/4kPaME7KEIk ix. Pragatibadi - https://pragativadi.com/epaper/media/news_map/1679951880_7640.jpg

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> x. http://nitidinepaper.com/ArticlePage/APpage.php?edn=Balasore&articleid=NITIDIN_BLS_20230Nitidin-327_9_9&artwidth=179px xi. Sakala - https://www.sakalaepaper.com/view/9079/mayurbhanji/13 <p>2. State Steering Committee (SSC) Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Samaja, Odia News Paper, Date – 05.05.2023 ii. Samaja - https://samajaepaper.in/imageview_53_55202334223173_4_71_05-05-2023_4_i_1_sf.html <p>3. Visit by FAO-RAP office</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Samaya , Odia News Paper, Date-10.09.2022 ii. Pragatibadi, Odia News Paper, Date-10.09.2022 iii. Sambad , Odia News Paper , Date – 10.09.2022 iv. Dumani Mail, English Newspaper / E-paper – 11.09.2023 v. The News Insight – English Newspaper - 11.09.2023 vi. Sambad - https://m.sambadepaper.com/imageview_4721_182177_4_75_10-09-2022_3_i_1_sf.html vii. The News Insight - https://enewsinsight.com/green-ag-project-gets-fao-nod-in-similipal-periphery/ <p>4. NPMU Review visit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Odia Kalinga TV – media interface on Green- Ag Project – Dr. Konda Reddy https://youtu.be/MmErInRnID4 <p>5. Communication / Knowledge Products</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Brochure on Village Implementation Committee (VIC) in English and Odia language ii. Fact Sheet on Green- Ag project in English and Odia language iii. Revised Brochure on Green- Ag Project in the English language. iv. Revised generic banner and sign board prototype v. Handouts on the Community Consultation process for the preparation of the Green Landscape Management Plan (GLMP) in Odia. <p>Rajasthan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conservation of biodiversity of Desert National Park - Rajasthan: Raj Patrika, Jaisalmer, dated 21-7-2022 2. Suggestion and discussion for development work in DNP area: Rajasthan Patrika – dated 23-09-2022 <p>Uttarakhand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. APC's meeting with Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun on 21 Nov 2022 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Times of India, Dehradun edition, Dated 22 Nov 2022 ii. Amar Ujala, Dated 22 Nov 2022 iii. https://pahadkasach.in/five-villages-identified-for-human-wildlife-conflict-pilot/ 2. Workshop on awareness on man-animal conflict mitigation measures. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Daink Hindustan 30 December 2022 ii. Amar Ujala 30 December 2022 iii. https://www.livehindustan.com/uttarakhand/pauri/story-information-on-wildlife-protection-7543318.html iv. https://discoveruttarakhand24.com/jalagam-launched-public-awareness-campaign-in-rural-areas/ 3. Community sensitization on Human-Wildlife conflict mitigation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Amar Ujala, Dated 3 March 2023 4. TSG Meeting 14-02-2023 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. K3 India News https://k3india.com/?p=15422 5. Green-Ag activities, Village I-Vanas Malla, Block –Yamkeshwar- A report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Discover Uttarakhand24 https://youtu.be/a9y6w4g6oS8 6. SHG activities under Green-Ag, Vill-Ramjiwala, Block -Yamkeshwar - A report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Discover Uttarakhand24; https://youtu.be/qFXZblqu8RM 7. Convergence with Department of Forest under Green Ag Uttarakhand- A report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Discover Uttarakhand24; https://fb.watch/ibHpxdXRK/?mibextid=6IxyOt
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other	<p>Below are some of the publications which have been prepared during this reporting period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Communications plan for Mizoram, Odisha Uttarakhand - Brochure on Post-harvest management of Mizo Chilli in Mizo language - Handouts on VIC (Brochure) English & Odiya - Guiding documents on the process of Community Consultation Process in Odia - Fact sheet (Brochure) English & Odiya - MiSALT (English and Mizo),

<p>communications assets published on the web.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tomato production in the greenhouse (in Mizo language) - State Inception Report for Madhya Pradesh - GLIU Inception Report for Odisha - Management of Rainbow Rooster in English and Mizo for Mizoram <p>The following products are currently being developed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications plan and Brochure for Madhya Pradesh • Eco Club brochures for each landscape • Nutri-garden poster/flip chart for Odisha
<p>Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details</p>	<p>Green-Ag has communication and knowledge management focal points at NPMU and SPMUs in Madhya Pradesh, Mizoram, Odisha, Rajasthan, and Uttarakhand.</p> <p>In the absence of a Communication Specialist, project communication was handled by the Value Chain Specialist till November 2022 and then by Gender and Social Inclusion Specialist at NPMU till 5 June 2023. The dedicated Communication Specialist is now on board since June 2023</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Lilly Paul, Communication and Research Specialist (since 5 June 2023) NPMU, New Delhi. Email: Lilly.Paul@fao.org • Ms. Mily Mishra (April 2023 onwards) and Ms. Raksha Tanwer (from August 2022 to March 2023) Communications Officer, SPMU, Madhya Pradesh. Email: milymishra91@gmail.com • Mr. Jerry Vanlalremruata, Communication Officer, SPMU, Mizoram, Email: coms.green.ag.spmu@gmail.com • Ms. Silla Pattanayak, Communication Officer, SPMU, Odisha, Email: silla.pattanayak@gmail.com • Dr. J. C. Pandey, State Technical Coordinator, SPMU, Uttarakhand Email: dr.jagdishpandey@gmail.com • Assistant Agricultural Research Officer (Additional Charge), SPMU, Rajasthan

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples and local communities involved in the project (as per the approved Project Document)? If yes, please briefly explain.

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

FPIC consultations have been completed in three states, Madhya Pradesh, Mizoram, and Odisha. In Madhya Pradesh, 4 villages out of 25 high-priority villages have tribal communities belonging to the Saharia tribe. In Mizoram, 17 villages (all high-priority villages) are the residence of three tribes, Mizo, Bru, and Chakma, and in Odisha 66 villages (all high-priority villages) are home to 15 indigenous communities, namely, Bhatudi, Bhumija, Bhuinya, Dehuri, Gond, Kolha, Khadia, Khandual, Mahali, Majhi, Matia, Munda, Santal, Saunti, Ujia. In Odisha and Mizoram, the tribals have their indigenous language, so the local residents were taken on board as the community resource persons in the village.

At least 4-5 FPIC consultations per village were held with the village heads (Sarpanch/Panch) and the indigenous communities, including women. The project team sensitized the tribal communities about the Green-Ag project, its objectives, activities, focus, and need for data collection. The project factsheet in their local languages was shared with the communities. All the consultations were held in their local dialect with the help of the Community Resource Persons (CRPs). The FPIC process and the consent needed from the indigenous communities were also explained to them in detail. All the steps of the FPIC process, including Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) were documented and shared with the communities for their validation. The communities were given ample time to discuss things among themselves and raise queries that were satisfactorily clarified by the project team. Their concerns were also included in the consent form.

All 19 communities, as above, from 87 villages provided their consent after internal consensus for the project activities. Their selected representatives signed the consent document between the communities and the Green-Ag project, both in the local language and English.

A grievance redressal mechanism (GRM) is established in each of the landscapes, and the communities were informed about its structure which is a hybrid of government staff and FAO staff responsible for receiving and responding to any grievance within the dedicated time. Communities in each village have selected their communication contact point for the project. Communication products for FPIC in local languages have been developed and shared with the communities.

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

The Green-Ag project actively seeks the participation of indigenous people in project planning, implementation, and monitoring. The project includes several mechanisms, at various levels, to ensure the representation of ethnic minority communities, specifically Scheduled Tribes in project oversight and monitoring mechanisms at various levels. The SSC and TSG at the state and landscape levels have representation from the Tribal and Social Welfare Department to safeguard the interests of the Schedule Tribes and social inclusion. The indigenous communities have adequate representation in Village Implementation Committees (VICs) in Mizoram, Madhya Pradesh, Odisha, and Uttarakhand. Locals residing in the landscapes are recruited as CRPs to ensure sensitivity to local concerns, identification of issues, and their resolution in consonance with local cultural ethos.

On average 37% of women participated during each step of FPIC consultations with the indigenous communities. The project has involved the local communities through community consultations, a value chain assessment process, a household survey, stakeholder mapping, and village implementation committee formation. For involving the local communities, the teams are using the tools of key informant interviews, focus group discussions, open forums, one-on-one discussions, etc. The meetings are organized as per the time availability of the local communities, their local beliefs and at a location suitable for them, especially women.

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁸	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ²⁹	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National and State Government	Government of Madhya Pradesh and Government of India (GoI):	i) Government Schemes ii) State Project Director/Deputy Project Director's time	US\$ 199.36 million	US\$ 2,298,021		
National and State Government	Government of Mizoram and GoI:	i) Government Schemes ii) State Project Director/Deputy Project Director's time	US\$ 61.93 million	US\$ 153,851		
National and State Government	Government of Odisha and GoI:	i) Government Schemes ii) State Project Director/Deputy Project Director's time	US\$ 131.16 million	US\$ 502,143		

²⁸Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

²⁹Grant, Loan, Equity Investment, Guarantee, In-Kind, Public Investment, Other (please refer to the *Guidelines on co-financing* for definitions)

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_FI_GN_01_Cofinancing_Guidelines_2018.pdf

National and State Government	Government of Rajasthan and GoI: *	i) Government Schemes ii) State Project Director/Deputy Project Director's time	US\$ 193.53 million	US\$ 42,281		
National and State Government	Government of Uttarakhand and GoI:	i) Government Schemes ii) State Project Director/Deputy Project Director's time	US\$ 279.21 million	US\$ 12,088,795		
UN Agency	FAO		US\$ 3.5 million	US\$ 812,187		
		TOTAL	US\$ 868.39 million	US\$ 15,897,278		

- **Govt. Of Rajasthan did not provide Co-Financing information for the reporting period June 2022-July 2023**

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 Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
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 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. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project’s components and activities is in compliance with the project’s approved implementation plan.	
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.

Risk rating will assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:	
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.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, 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 moderate risk
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 low risks

Annex 2.

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](#) or [GeoNames](#) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#)

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location & Activity Description

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