FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report
2020 – Revised Template
Period covered: 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020

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:	1. Madhya Pradesh Operational Partner: The Farmers Welfare and Agriculture Development Department, Government of Madhya Pradesh 2. Mizoram Operational Partner: The Department of Agriculture (Crop Husbandry), Government of Mizoram 3. Odisha Operational Partner: The Institute on Management of Agricultural Extension (IMAGE), Government of Odisha 4. Rajasthan Operational Partner: The Department of Agriculture, Government of Rajasthan 5. **Uttarakhand Operational Partner: The Department of Watershed Development, Government of Uttarakhand**
Project Duration:	7 Years
Project coordinates: (**Ctrl+Click here**)	Chambal Landscape : 26.251096, 77.284137; Dampa Landscape: 23.338379, 92.464996; Similipal Landscape: 21.905225, 86.378380; Desert Landscape: 26.931509,70.809442; Corbett Landscape: 29.756917, 78.560805 *Source: google.com/maps/*

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	May 18, 2018
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	August 09, 2019
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE[1]:	August 08, 2026

---

[1] As per FPMIS

Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) [2]	
Actual Implementation End Date[3]:	

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 33 558 716
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc[4]:	USD 868.39 million
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2020 (USD m):	*[GEF Coordination Unit will confirm the final amount with CSF team]*
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2020[5]	US$ 163 719

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	National Project Monitoring Committee (NPMC) met on March 04, 2020. NPSC was to be apprised with the record of proceedings.
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	N/A
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	N/A
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2020 – June 2021).	**No**
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2020 – June 2021).	**No**
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required[6]	**No**

---

[2] In case of a project extension.

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

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

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

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

Ratings

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

Status

Implementation Status *(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):*	1st PIR

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Mr. R.B. Sinha, Project Director, Green Ag Project	Rakesh.Sinha@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Mr. Thomas Hofer, Senior Forestry Officer, RAP	Thomas.Hofer@fao.org
Budget Holder	Mr. Tomio Shichiri, FAO Representative in India	Tomio.Shichiri@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Mr. Sameer Karki, Technical Officer, CBC	Sameer.Karki@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Mr. Chris Dirkmaat, Executive Officer, CBC	Chris.Dirkmaat@fao.org

2. Progress Towards Achieving Project Objectives and Outcomes (Cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)[7]	Baseline level	Mid-term target[8]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2020	Progress rating [9]
Objective(s): *To catalyse transformative change of India's agricultural sector to support achievement of national and global environmental benefits and conservation of critical biodiversity and forest landscapes*						
Outcome 1.1. National and state level institutional, policy and programme frameworks strengthened to integrate environmental priorities and resilience into the agriculture sector to enhance delivery of Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) across landscapes of highest conservation	1. Number of new policy recommendations approved by multi-stakeholder platforms of policy makers to strengthen agroecological approach in agriculture and allied sectors at national and State levels	0	3	12 (at least 2 per State and 2 at the national level)	0	N/A (Planned from Project Year 3 (PY3) onwards)
	2. Number of national and state plans to continue Green Landscape approach at five landscapes and expand beyond project targeted landscapes	0	0	6 (1 national and 5 state)	0	N/A (Planned from PY3 onwards)

---

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

[8] Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)[7]	Baseline level	Mid-term target[8]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2020	Progress rating [9]
concern	endorsed by multi-stakeholders and with financing committed					
Outcome 1.2. Cross-sectoral knowledge management and decision-making systems at national and state levels to support development and implementation of agro-ecological approaches at landscape levels that deliver global environmental benefits as well as socioeconomic benefits enhanced	3. Number of protected areas in five target landscapes with landscape level threat reduction monitoring protocols and indicators (such as hunting, encroachment) integrated into protected area management and monitoring in five target landscapes	0	3	7 (Desert National Park, Corbett, Rajaji, Similipal, Chambal, Dampa and Thorangtlang)	0	N/A (Planned from PY3 onwards)
	4. Number of stories published in newspapers and other media reports on Green Landscape approach, highlighting the importance of agroecological approaches in the agriculture sector for multiple benefits (within the 5 states and at the national level)	0	15	At least 30 including national and state level	9	Highly Satisfactory (HS)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)[7]	Baseline level	Mid-term target[8]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2020	Progress rating [9]
	5. Number of local plans (including Gram Panchayat (GP)/ Village Council (VC)/ Community level) developed based on spatial decision support systems in five landscapes	0	8	At least 20	0	N/A (Planned from PY2 onwards)
	6.Number of lessons learnt reports published on different themes (environmental, economic, social) documenting relevant lessons learnt	0	3	12	0	N/A (Planned from PY2 onwards)
Outcome 2.1 – Institutional frameworks, mechanisms and capacities at District and Village levels to support decision-making and stakeholder participation in Green Landscape planning and management strengthened, with Green Landscape	7.Number of Green Landscape management plans promoting agroecological approaches, with clear environmental targets and sustainable livelihoods, gender and social inclusion considerations included, and synergistic to protected areas management plans within the	0	5 plans covering 350 000 Ha	5 plans covering at least 1 800 000 ha	0	N/A (Planned from PY2 onwards)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)[7]	Baseline level	Mid-term target[8]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2020	Progress rating [9]
Management Plans developed and under implementation for target landscapes	landscape endorsed and under implementation by stakeholders					
	8. Number of district level agencies using Green Landscape plans to realign multi-sectoral investments in project areas	0	15	25 (at least 5 in each Landscape)	0	N/A (Planned from PY2 onwards)
	9. Amount of Government's agriculture sector investment at district levels realigned to support objectives of Green Landscape plans in five landscapes per annum	0	To be determined up on completion of Landscape Assessment/Approval of Green Landscape Management Plans.	To be determined up on approval of Green Landscape Management Plans.	0	N/A (Planned from PY2 onwards)
Outcome 2.2 - Households and communities able and incentivized to engage in agro-ecological practices that deliver meaningful GEB at	10. Number of households that have adopted sustainable agriculture practices on their farms, including agrobiodiversity conservation measures	0	10 500	- Rajasthan: 3 162 - Odisha: 37 500 - Uttarakhand: 14 700 - Mizoram: 5 490 - Madhya Pradesh: 7 500 (Total - 68 352)	0	N/A (Planned from PY6 onwards)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)[7]	Baseline level	Mid-term target[8]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2020	Progress rating [9]
the landscape level in target high conservation priority landscapes	11.Number of households involved in community natural resources management plans development and implementation in line with overall Green Landscape management objective/s	0	30 000	185 000	0	N/A (Planned from PY2 onwards)
	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	N/A (Planned from PY2 onwards)
	13. Number of households implementing improved livestock management – including nutrition and fodder management (e.g. community fodder banks) –contributing to conservation of global environmental values	0	5 000	Madhya Pradesh: 8 000 Odisha: 22 500 Rajasthan: 6 000 Uttarakhand: 10 000 (Total – 46 500)	0	N/A (Planned from PY2 onwards)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)[7]	Baseline level	Mid-term target[8]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2020	Progress rating [9]
	14. Number of women participating in and benefitting from female cohort specific Green-Ag (agro ecological) Farmer Field Schools (FFS)	0	5 000	40 000 females: • Rajasthan: 3 000 • Odisha: 12 000 • Uttarakhand: 19 000 • Mizoram: 2 000 • Madhya Pradesh: 4 000	0	N/A (Planned from PY2 onwards)

2020 Project Implementation Report

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1.2. Cross-sectoral knowledge management and decision-making systems at national and state levels to support development and implementation of agro-ecological approaches at landscape levels that deliver global environmental benefits as well as socioeconomic benefits enhanced	Spatial decision support system was to be made operational in PY1, which ends on Aug 08, 2020. Process has been initiated to develop this at National level. However, being a collaborative process it requires inputs from Operational Partners (OPs), some of which are still in the process of establishing SPMUs and GLIUs. Action: Follow up with OPs to expedite setting up of SPMUs and GLIUs, and complete project staff recruitment.	Project Director	Regular follow up is being done. SPMUs and GLIUs are functional in Mizoram and Uttarakhand. In Odisha, recruitment process is ongoing. In Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh, recruitment process has been initiated.

---

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

3. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs[11]	Expected completion date [12]	Achievements at each PIR[13]					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance[14] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
Output 1.1.1: National and state level inter-sectoral coordinating committees established and institutionalized to facilitate cross sectoral support to mainstream environmental priorities in agriculture sector	Q4 PY7	• One National Project Steering Committee (NPSC) and one National Project Monitoring Committee (NPMC) established • Two NPMC meetings completed • National Project Inception Workshop was held at Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh, from November 07-09, 2019 • State Steering Committee (SSCs) established in five states					35%	State Steering Committee (SSCs) were set up in all the project states. First SSC Meetings were held in the states of Mizoram, Uttarakhand, and Odisha. However, SSC meetings were delayed in two states, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan as they could not complete the requisite formalities for setting-up of a separate project bank account and signed the Operational Partner Agreement (OPA) only in

---

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

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

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

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

Outputs[11]	Expected completion date [12]	Achievements at each PIR[13]					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance[14] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
		• SSC meetings held in three states—Mizoram, Odisha, & Uttarakhand						January 2020. Restrictions on mobility due to COVID-19 caused further delay.
Output 1.1.2: Policy Dialogues established to inform and facilitate discussion of priority issues related to agriculture environment and development.	Q4 PY6						0%	None of the policy dialogues were initiated due to the delay in the signing of the OPAs, which further delayed the setting up of State Project Management Units (SPMUs) and Green Landscape Implementation Units (GLIUs). Onset of COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent restrictions on mobility caused further delay.
Output 1.1.3: Policy briefs, advocacy and awareness-raising materials developed to inform discussions and decision making on priority issues related to agriculture, environment and development	Q1 PY5	One national level project inception workshop was organized in Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh from November 07 to 09, 2019.					5%	Same as above
Output 1.1.4: "Green Landscape"	Q4 PY6	Not planned for this reporting period					0%	

Outputs[11]	Expected completion date [12]	Achievements at each PIR[13]					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance[14] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
mainstreaming strategies developed to promote environmental protection as part of broader sustainable agriculture and natural resource management.								
Output 1.2.1: 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.	Q2 PY1	Baseline geospatial data collection on land use information at the landscape initiated in three states- Mizoram, Odisha and Rajasthan					5%	Spatial decision support system was to be made operational in PY1, which ends on Aug 08, 2020. Process has been initiated to develop this at National level. However, being a collaborative process it requires inputs from OPs, some of which are still in the process of establishing SPMUs and GLIUs.
Output 1.2.2: Green Landscape monitoring programme (monitoring system and protocols) to assess the health/status of the	Q3 PY2	N/A					N/A	

Outputs[11]	Expected completion date [12]	Achievements at each PIR[13]						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance[14] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR		2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
target Green Landscapes and evaluate progress towards delivery of GEBs and social and economic impacts established and implemented.									
Output 1.2.3: Communication strategy and plan designed and implemented	Q4 PY7	• Communication professionals in place at NPMU, Mizoram and Uttarakhand • National Inception Workshop had a good media coverage • Project visibility in national media						5%	Delay in the signing of the OPA further delayed the setting up of SPMU and GLIU teams
Output 2.1.1: Institutional frameworks, mechanisms and capacities at district and village levels to support decision making and stakeholder participation in Green Landscape planning	Q4 PY7	• Orientation on Project Implementation Structure, Roles and Responsibilities, Reporting requirements undertaken in the National Project Inception Workshop • Technical Support Groups (TSGs) constituted in all landscapes • Capacity development of						5%	District level institutional frameworks in place in all landscapes. However, sub-district institutional frameworks yet to be initiated due to delay in the signing of the OPAs, which further delayed the setting up of SPMUs and GLIUs. Onset of COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent

Outputs[11]	Expected completion date [12]	Achievements at each PIR[13]					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance[14] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
and management strengthened		NPMU staff on Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) completed						restrictions on mobility caused further delay.
Output 2.1.2: Key local decision-makers from each target Gram Panchayat/Village Council trained in Green Landscape governance through Field schools.	Q4 PY6	N/A					N/A	
Output 2.1.3: District level technical and extension staff from different government sectors trained in Green Landscape approaches.	Q2 PY5	N/A						
Output 2.1.4: Green Landscape Assessments undertaken, with social, economic, institutional, biophysical aspects of target areas.	Q1 PY5	• Geospatial assessment, first step for social and Biodiversity assessment, has been initiated for three states- Mizoram, Rajasthan and Odisha. • Terms of Reference (ToR) has been finalized and a technical team was hired to conduct geo-spatial					5%	Process has been initiated. However, delays in setting up of SPMUs and GLIUs, and the onset of COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent restrictions on mobility further delayed progress

Outputs[11]	Expected completion date [12]	Achievements at each PIR[13]					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance[14] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
		assessment in three states.						
Output 2.1.5: District level 'convergence plans' that align government programmes and investments with Green Landscape management objectives and which incentivize agro-ecological approaches at landscape levels produced.	Q3 PY1	Not initiated					0%	Activities under this output require functional teams at the landscape level. Delay in the signing of the OPAs delayed the setting up of SPMUs and GLIUs. Onset of COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent restrictions on mobility caused further delay.
Output 2.2.1: Farmers trained through FFS on sustainable agriculture, with modules adapted to the specific needs of farmers near PAs and	Q3 PY7	N/A						

Outputs[11]	Expected completion date [12]	Achievements at each PIR[13]						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance[14] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR		2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
other high ecological value areas, including on management of livestock.									
Output 2.2.2: Local stakeholders trained in Green Value Chain development through FFS with Green Value Chains developed and promoted.	Q3 PY6	N/A							
Output 2.2.3: Wider community level awareness-raising campaigns to ensure wider stakeholder support for Green Landscape management.	Q4 PY6	N/A							
Output 2.2.4: Community based natural resources management plans designed and under implementation in target Green Landscapes, including community grassland/	Q4 PY6	N/A							

Outputs[11]	Expected completion date [12]	Achievements at each PIR[13]					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance[14] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
ravines/forests/watershed management.								
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.	Q4 PY7	N/A						

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

Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):
Max 200 words:

The National Project Management Unit (NPMU) has been operational since October 2019. All the States have complied with the revised fund transfer mechanism finalized by the Govt. of India (GoI) and signed the Operational Partner Agreements (OPAs). Project partners have been oriented on project implementation structure, roles and responsibilities, and reporting requirements.

National and state level institutional, policy and programme frameworks have been established. The National Project Steering Committee (NPSC) is functional with representation from relevant national stakeholders and ministries and is chaired by the Secretary Agriculture. The National Project Monitoring Committee (NPMC) chaired by the Joint Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Cooperation & Farmers Welfare (DAC&FW) has met twice during the reporting period. State Steering Committees (SSCs) have been constituted in all partner states. A National Inception Workshop was organized with participation from relevant national and state stakeholders, including the Union Minister for Agriculture and Rural Development.

Work has been initiated to set up the project monitoring systems for establishment of the decision-making support system. Project received good media coverage.

Institutional frameworks and mechanisms have been established at the district-level in all project landscapes with the constitution of the Technical Support Groups (TSGs), chaired by the respective District Magistrates/ Deputy Commissioners having representation of all relevant departments and stakeholders. Landscape assessments have been initiated in three landscapes.

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?
Max 200 words:

The Dept. of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance, Govt. of India (GoI) changed the fund transfer mechanism for Grant Funded projects. They instructed direct transfer of funds to the Operational Partners deviating from the established process of routing funds through the Comptroller of Aid Accounts and Audit (CAAA). Changes in the fund transfer mechanism led to considerable delays, as the State Operational Partners (OPs) had to secure requisite approvals and streamline processes for direct receipt of funds. This delayed the signing of the OPAs.

Lack of experience and established recruitment protocols for recruiting interdisciplinary teams delayed recruitment of technical staff by the OPs.

The onset of COVID-19 pandemic led to health and safety concerns and restrictions on movement. The GoI announced complete lockdown from March 23, 2020 onwards and it continued till June 03, 2020. Currently, the Country is under Unlock 2.0. Restrictions for internal travel and quarantine measures are in place in all the states. Similarly, restrictions are in place for meetings and gatherings and night curfew is in force across the country. Apart from the above, organizing virtual meetings/training continues to be a challenge because of poor internet connectivity in the project landscapes.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2020 Development Objective rating[15]	**FY2020 Implementation Progress rating[16]**	**Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2020 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period**
Project Manager / Coordinator	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	*Mandatory Ratings/Comments* 2020 being the first year of project implementation, no comments are needed
Budget Holder	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	*Mandatory Ratings/comments* 2020 being the first year of project implementation, no comments are needed
Lead Technical Officer[17]	**Moderately Satisfactory**	**Moderately Satisfactory**	*Mandatory Ratings/comments* The moderately satisfactory progress is to a large extent due to the COVID-19 pandemic as well as to the delay in the operational procedures (establishing the institutional mechanisms, setting up of separate bank accounts in the States, signature of the operational partner agreements, etc.). The project team has been doing great efforts under the prevailing difficult conditions.
GEF Operational Focal Point			*Optional Ratings/comments*

---

[15] **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

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

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

FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	*Mandatory Ratings/comments* The project has had a slow start – mostly due to delays in setting up agreements with some of the State Governments finalized. The project had a very good launch, with excellent participation of all involved State governments, who reiterated their strong support to the project. We expected to see real progress with the project by second PIR – especially with a strong national project management unit already in place. However, the COVID pandemic has also had impacts on implementation of this project. Therefore, the project team needs to ensure that appropriate planning is in place to greatly accelerate its work, when the situation allows.

5. Risks

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

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid[18]. If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Moderate	Still valid

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

Risk ratings

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

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

---

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

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

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

	Risk	Risk rating[19]	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions[20]	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Presence of Indigenous Peoples in the project area	Moderate	1. NPMU will include a dedicated staff for mainstreaming Gender and FPIC in project design and implementation. The ToR of this staff is listed under Table 30 of the full project document.	1. The NPMU has a full time Gender and Social Inclusion Expert.	
			2. The budget for FPIC and gender orientation from NMPU to SPMUs has been included to ensure continuous support and backstopping from the national expert. This has been included under training budget entitled "Capacity building of State level project implementation units on incorporating gender and FPIC issues".	2. Yes. The NPMU Team has been trained on the FPIC process by the FAO Indigenous Peoples (IP) Unit, Rome. Three members of the Mizoram SPMU also participated in this training. Training of SPMU and GLIU Teams will be scheduled after recruitment of teams in respective project states.	
			3. The project design (refer to Section 2.3.3 of Pro Doc) embeds FPIC to integrate the voices, choices and concerns of Scheduled Tribes and local communities into the project activities, implementation and monitoring.	3. Landscape assessment has been initiated in three landscapes. The assessment process has slowed down with the onset of COVID-19 because of health and safety concerns and restrictions on movement. After restoration of normalcy, the landscape assessment and planning will be completed in all the project landscapes in a participatory manner and final plans and proposed actions will be based on full free prior consent by the relevant communities – including women and youths of the target locations.	
			4. FPIC will be embedded in all aspects of project implementation throughout the	4. A detailed stakeholder mapping will be undertaken during the ongoing landscape	

	Risk	Risk rating[19]	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions[20]	Notes from the Project Task Force
			life of the project. Local communities will be made aware on 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 on the project's grievance mechanism.	assessment to identify the Indigenous Peoples, their representatives, document geographic and demographic information, share project information in a transparent manner, undertake iterative discussions to identify and document their concerns, develop strategies to address them, and agree upon feedback and complaints mechanisms.	
			5. All communities, including indigenous communities, will be made aware on grievance mechanism as outlined under the project's 1.7.7 Grievance Mechanisms.	5. A draft grievances redressal plan has been developed. All Grievances will also be recorded by FAO India. The grievance redressal process will be instituted and shared widely amongst all project stakeholders	
			6. Government agencies related to indigenous communities' development and empowerment have been included in SSCs of the project to ensure that all government agencies take this concern as an important issue.	6. At the district and state level, Tribal and Social Welfare Department is represented in the TSG and SSC to safeguard the interests of the Scheduled Castes and Schedule Tribe. Further, persons residing in the landscapes are being recruited as Community Resource Persons (CRPs) to ensure sensitivity to local concerns, identification of issues and their resolution in consonance with local cultural ethos.	
			7. Inclusion of FAO's Indigenous Peoples team in the Project Task Force (PTF)	7. Guido Agostinucci, FPIC Coordinator, FAO IP Unit, Rome is a member of the PTF.	

	Risk	Risk rating[19]	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions[20]	Notes from the Project Task Force
			8. Independent assessment of how the project is using FPIC will also be commissioned in year 3 of the project.	8. N/A	
2	Proximity of project locations to protected areas	Moderate	1. The project envisages to reduce threats to protected areas, and this is noted in the results framework indicator "3 under Outcome 1.2.	N/A for this reporting period as implementation in the landscape has not been initiated.	

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

FY2019 rating	FY2020 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2020 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Medium	Medium	No change from the previous rating.

6. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months[21]

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

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

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

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	Original NTE: March 31, 2026 Revised NTE: August 08, 2026 Justification: The Government Cooperative Programme (GCP) Agreement with the DAC&FW, Ministry of Agriculture and Farmer's Welfare (MoA&FW) was signed on March 19, 2019. However, changes in fund transfer mechanism led to considerable delays for the State OPs to secure requisite approvals and streamline processes for direct receipt of funds. This delayed preparation of the Annual Work Plan Budget (AWPB). The NPMC on behalf of NPSC approved the Consolidated AWPB for Project Year 1 on August 09, 2019. Hence, this date is considered as the project implementation start date/ EOD.

---

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

7. Gender Mainstreaming

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

Was a gender analysis undertaken or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages? Please briefly indicate the gender differences here.

Gender equality and women empowerment are integral to the project. Socio-economic and gender analysis was conducted at the project formulation stage to inform the project design. Some of the existing gender differences, found during the gender analysis conducted at project formulation stage, included in the Pro Doc as Annex-9: Outline of Strategies for Gender and Social Inclusion, that the project intends to address are as follows:

- Despite significant economic growth, India is lagging behind most of the neighboring countries in achieving gender equality. According to the Gender Inequality Index (GII, 2016) of United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), India is ranked 125 out of 159 countries.
- In India, over 65.5 per cent of economically active women are engaged in agriculture; they constitute about 37 per cent of the total agricultural work force. But, only 12.69 per cent of the operational landholders are women (Census 2011) who are legally recognised as farmers and have access to government schemes, programmes, trainings and information.
- Unbalanced participation and decision making in environmental planning and governance at all levels: Women, and particularly women headed households often lack equitable access to decision-making, and capacity building opportunities. They are not equitably represented in the institutions and processes of knowledge generation and dissemination in relation to agriculture, biodiversity, land development and forest management. Women are often excluded from financial decision making in the household, community and in the other local bodies. Women are the custodian of indigenous knowledge but are not part of knowledge management system. Women, according to various researches, are under-represented in decision-making at the household and community levels.
- Uneven access to socio-economic benefits and services: Rural women also have limited access to other productive resources and services, including water, agricultural extension services, technological inputs, knowledge of value addition techniques, training and finance, including formal sources of credit. Due to lack of collaterals, women own only 11 per cent of total deposit accounts and 19 per cent of borrowing accounts in scheduled banks. Women are often subsumed within the household and thus excluded from social benefits under major government interventions.

The project design envisages a detailed socio-economic and gender analysis as part of the landscape assessment, an entry point activity at the community level that will inform the project implementation and will integrate concerns of local communities, specifically women and other marginalized groups, in project activities. GEF policy on Gender Equality, 2017 will be used as the basic guidance document for designing the socio-economic and gender assessment. In addition, the project will follow Socio-economic and Gender Analysis (SEAGA), an approach elaborated by FAO in partnership with the International Labour Organization (ILO), for conducting socio-economic and gender analysis as part of landscape assessment, prior to the project activities designing and execution. SEAGA is a multi-scale approach, in which development problems are analyzed at three different levels (field, intermediate and macro-level), and is based on the guiding principles that gender roles are key, that disadvantaged people are priority, and that participation is essential.

The GLIU gender experts, with the guidance of NPMU gender and Social Inclusion expert, will lead the socioeconomic and gender assessments in the five Green Landscapes, with support from the TSGs and OPs. Gender assessments will include secondary research, household survey, Focus Group Discussion (FGD), and Key

Informant Interviews (KII) to assess:
- Household level resource distribution and asset ownership between man and woman;
- Participation in household and society level decision making;
- Access to and control over natural resources by man and woman;
- Difference in man and woman's engagement and priority in natural resource based livelihood activities and alternative livelihoods;
- Access to agriculture tools, technology, information, trainings, services and market; and
- Access to social security services and safety nets, government schemes, and programmes.

This activity was expected to be executed in the PY1, but due to delay in signing of OPAs, establishment of SPMU and GLIU teams, and restricted mobility induced by COVID-19, gender and socio-economic analysis will be carried out in the PY2.

Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data? How is the project tracking gender results and impacts?

The project has adapted various approaches to ensure integration of gender concerns in the project monitoring and evaluation. Some of the key strategies adapted are:
- Integrating gender concerns in the Results Framework: The project includes a dedicated gender outcome indicator (under Outcome 2.2) i.e. 40 000 women will be trained on sustainable agroecological practices. In addition, other gender sensitive indicators are included against outputs and activities to measure gender achievements such as – number of men and women with improved knowledge on livestock management, number of men and women engaged in green value chain etc.
- Collecting of Gender-Disaggregate Data against activities, output, and outcome indicators, wherever possible: Gender-disaggregated data will be collected against the indicators, wherever possible. MIS system and monitoring protocol will be developed to collect and track gender indicators on a periodic basis.
- Producing gender analysis reports: Gender analysis reports will be produced, based on gender-disaggregated data collected, and will be disseminated.

Does the project staff have gender expertise?

The project design includes one Gender and Social Inclusion Expert at the NPMU level and five Gender Experts at the landscape level who will be responsible to lead the socio-economic and gender assessment at the ground level, prepare the gender integration strategy based on the assessment, and implement it with the support of GLIU and SPMU teams. The Gender and Social Inclusion Expert has been recruited in November 2019 and is working at the NPMU. One Gender Expert has been recruited for Mizoram landscape and recruitment process has been initiated in Odisha, Rajasthan, and Uttarakhand.

Besides, following the gender integration strategies, the project includes activities like capacity building of implementation teams—NPMU, SPMU and GLIU; and other governing bodies such as TSG and local communities on gender issues. The activity was planned for execution on PY1, but due to aforementioned reasons, the gender training is delayed and is planned to be initiated in July 2020.

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:
- **closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;**
- **improving women's participation and decision making; and or**
- **generating socio-economic benefits or services for women**

Considering the project objectives and design and FAO's Corporate Policy on Gender Equality adapted on 2012, the project will contribute to gender equality on the following areas:
- Improving women's participation and decision making; and
- Generating socio-economic benefits or services for women.

Some of the key objectives of FAO's Corporate Policy on Gender Equality that directly align with the above mentioned areas are:

- Women participate equally with men as decision-makers in rural institutions and in shaping laws, policies and programmes.
- Women and men have equal access to goods and services for agricultural development, and to markets.
- Women's work burden is reduced by 20 percent through improved technologies, services and infrastructure.

FAO and the GoI, under this project, are committed to improve status of women through increasing their participation and decision-making at the household and community level by increasing their access to knowledge, information and technology through Farmer Field Schools (FFS). Voice of women and indigenous communities will be incorporated in the project implementation through the FPIC process. Their participation and decision-making in the Village Implementation Committees (VICs) and Gram Panchayat Support Units (GPSUs) will be ensured by reserving certain percentage for women and other marginalised communities. The project through TSG meetings will improve access of local community, specifically women and indigenous community, to existing government programmes, schemes and services on forest management, sustainable agriculture production and marketing, livestock management etc.

8. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

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

In India, the phrase "Indigenous Peoples" is not formally used. The Constitution of India has recognized special groups of people as "Scheduled Tribes" and a 2011 Supreme Court ruling has equated these as Indigenous Peoples of India. As noted in the project document, diverse ethnic minority communities including scheduled tribes inhabit the five project landscapes.

The project design embeds the key principle of FPIC to integrate the voices, choices and concerns of Scheduled Tribes and local communities into the project activities, implementation and monitoring. The Project Document envisages FPIC as an integral element of landscape assessment. Landscape assessment has been initiated in three landscapes—Mizoram, Odisha, and Uttarakhand. The assessment process has slowed down with the onset of COVID-19 because of health and safety concerns and restrictions on movement. After restoration of normalcy, the landscape assessment and planning will be completed in all the project landscapes in a participatory manner and final plans and proposed actions will be based on full free prior consent by the relevant communities – including women and youths of the target locations.

The project had completed a preliminary stakeholder, socio-economic and natural resources base mapping of Indigenous Peoples and local communities in the project design phase. However in keeping with the principles of FPIC, a detailed stakeholder mapping will be undertaken during the ongoing landscape assessment to identify the Indigenous Peoples, their representatives, document geographic and demographic information, share project information in a transparent manner, undertake iterative discussions to identify and document their concerns, develop strategies to address them, and agree upon feedback and complaints mechanisms.

Landscape management will be a participatory process engaging local communities in data collection, dissemination, analysis, and making informed decisions on management plan and monitoring mechanisms. A formal consent will be obtained from the Indigenous Peoples and local communities, following which they will implement, monitor and evaluate its effectiveness.

Additionally, the project includes several mechanisms, at various levels, to ensure representation and redress concerns of ethnic minority communities, specifically Scheduled Tribes. At the district and state level, Tribal and Social Welfare Department is represented in the TSG and SSC to safeguard the interests of the Scheduled Castes and Schedule Tribes. Further, persons residing in the landscapes are being recruited as Community Resource Persons (CRPs) to ensure sensitivity to local concerns, identification of issues and their resolution in consonance with local cultural ethos.

Capacity building workshops are being organized for project staff—NPMU, SPMU, and GLIU—on FPIC, gender and social inclusion to sensitize and increase their awareness on Indigenous people and local community issues. Further, the workshops will also include discussions on strategies and mechanisms to operationalize FPIC and address gender and social inclusion concerns.

---

9. Stakeholders Engagement

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

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

The project has a detailed stakeholder management plan with a list of key stakeholders and engagement strategies, included at CEO endorsement stage. This will guide the project in stakeholder engagement for effective and efficient implementation, sustainability and replicability of outcomes and results. Inclusive and meaningful consultation; forging stronger partnerships, particularly with civil society, Indigenous Peoples, communities and the private sector; and harnessing the knowledge and expertise of stakeholders are key guiding principles of the stakeholder engagement strategy. Some of the key strategies laid out by the stakeholder management plan are:

- Engagement with community: Direct consultation with community institutions and members through consultations—individually/ with their representatives, and focus group discussions as part of landscape assessment. Use of FFS for gender specific cohorts, as needed, and implementation of FPIC.
- Engagement with other key stakeholders: Inter-sectoral working groups have been established at different levels to facilitate convergence with ongoing initiatives, provide guidance on implementation and policy support, monitor and review implementation, evaluate project learning and incorporate into policies for mainstreaming into programs for enhanced delivery of GEBs.

New stakeholders identified in the reporting period, aside from those identified during project formulation, include:
- Directorate of Soil Conservation and Watershed Development, Odisha has been identified as an implementing partner in Odisha, to leverage their extensive experience and field presence in the project landscape, and for better convergence with ongoing government programs related to natural resources conservation.
- State Planning Commission/Board/Department coordinates the formulation of State Plans for the development of all government sectors and is the focal point for monitoring achievement of SDGs in each state.

Challenges the project encountered in engaging stakeholders during the current reporting period are:

- Delay in the signing of the OPAs delayed the setting up of SPMUs and GLIUs. Further, the onset of COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent restrictions on mobility undermined engagement with all stakeholders, including local communities. As a result, the project was not able to organise any dialogue with relevant stakeholders.

If a stakeholder engagement plan was not requested for your project at CEO endorsement stage, please
- **list all stakeholders engaged in the project;**
- **Please indicate if the project works with Civil Society Organizations and/or NGOs**
- **briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.**

As mentioned above, the project has a detailed stakeholder management plan with a list of key stakeholders and engagement strategies, included at CEO endorsement stage.

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

Private sector engagement is an integral part of the project design. Within the identified ecologically important landscapes, Green-Ag project investments intend to catalyse the alignment of the much larger government, donor and private sector investments to promote and incentivize wide adoption of new agroecological practices to reverse the negative impacts of current unsustainable agriculture and land use policies, plans and practices, to maximize multiple Global Environmental Benefits (biodiversity, sustainable land management, greenhouse gas emission reduction, and maintenance of high conservation value forests) without compromising farmers' incomes.

The private sector will be engaged in policy dialogues and various other multi-stakeholder platforms at the state and national level to influence policies and investments. Specific project activities such as development of green value chains and eco-tourism, particularly, will engage private sector actors for branding, marketing, and infrastructure support. During the landscape assessment, a comprehensive stakeholder engagement plan specific to each landscape, will be prepared for private sector engagement as well.

10. Knowledge Management Activities

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

---

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.

The project acknowledges that knowledge, in the GEF partnership, is a key asset that could support achievement of its strategic objectives and create a lasting impact and thus, puts a lot of emphasis on knowledge management strategy from the project formulation stage. The project, in the formulation stage, following the GEF Knowledge Management Approach Paper 2015, has included a detailed discussion on knowledge management and communication strategy to collect, document and disseminate good practices across the project landscapes and beyond. The project, as mentioned in the Pro Doc, will focus on generating and sharing knowledge within the five project States, between the project states involved, and with other stakeholders nationally and internationally. This strategy includes "identifying key stakeholders and target audiences, identifying their communication needs, and designing appropriate communication mechanisms to enable them to access and utilize knowledge generated". The strategy necessitates technical staff working closely with the communication team to prepare products on sustainable forest management, agroecological practices, improved livestock management and other sustainable natural resource management practices that are comprehensible to relevant stakeholders, specifically local communities and extension agents, having varied understanding of technical issues. Capacity of the existing government extension institutions and systems such as Agriculture Technology Management Agency (ATMA), Krishi Vigyan Kendras (KVK) will be strengthened as part of the knowledge management strategy to ensure community's access to technology and information beyond the project duration. The best practice and learning documents will be mainstreamed into policies and will influence investments at national, state, district and village levels. The project will also commission thematic learning documents, for instance, viz. impact of Jhum cultivation in the North East Indian states, for building deeper understanding about the landscape for effective implementation.

According to the strategy, the project communication team, with the guidance of the Rainfed Farming Systems (RFS) division of DAC&FW is expected to design and operationalize the knowledge management plan. Finalization of the knowledge management plan and its operationalization is planned in PY2.

Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.

In line with the GEF communication strategy[22] to engage with multiple stakeholders and to embed GEF message at country and regional level, Green-Ag project developed a comprehensive communication strategy to document and disseminate good practices and learning effectively within the project landscapes and beyond. The project's communication strategy includes:

- *Project Progress Reporting and Updates* for ensuring access of target audiences to required information regularly. Project documents such as annual report will highlight lessons learned and present "how decision-making at national, state, district, and village level may be improved to incentivize the adoption of agricultural practices that will deliver GEBs". Relevant communication methods and media, including vernacular media, will be used to disseminate the project learning with communities and other key stakeholders.

- *Media Outreach*: Project will use varied communication media such as print, electronic and social

---

[22] http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/C.36.Inf_.5_GEF_Communications_Strategy_Implementation_Report.FINAL__4.pdf

media to disseminate the project learning with key stakeholders. A web-based knowledge sharing platform is being designed to disseminate project findings, learning and good practices with key stakeholders including government departments, extension agencies, civil society organizations and private stakeholders. The creation of web-based knowledge platform has been initiated which will become functional in PY2. The team will build upon and incorporate, existing electronic knowledge and capacity building tools such as "Farmers' Portal" (a national government website that provides a 'one stop shop for farmers'), "Digital India" (a flagship government programme designed to promote e-Governance),"Kisan Call Centres" (a national toll-free call in number that links farmers with national agricultural specialists), and "Digital Green" (an NGO that links technology and social organizations to improve agriculture, health and nutrition)".

- ▪ *Workshops and Exposure Visits:* Learning and sharing workshops are planned in each project year across the landscapes at the national, state and landscape level for sharing the learning and good practices.

As part of the communication strategy, establishment of communication team at the landscape and NPMU level has been planned and operationalised. The NPMU and Mizoram SPMU have recruited communication experts. Recruitment of communication teams in has been initiated in other landscapes.

During PY1, the project gained considerable media attention during the National Project Inception Workshop. The National Project Inception Workshop held at Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh in November 2019 was covered by nine national and state media sources (links to the media coverage and screen-shots are enclosed as annexes). The media coverage, successfully presented the project purpose, outreach and problems the project intends to address. The project theme of conserving critical agro-biodiversity and forest landscapes for sustainability of agriculture in long run, were captured by several news media.

Challenges the project experienced in communication are:

- ▪ Delay in the signing of the OPAs delayed the setting up of SPMUs and GLIUs. Further, the onset of COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent restrictions on mobility undermined engagement with all stakeholders, including local communities. As a result, the project was not able to organise any dialogue with relevant stakeholders.

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. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.

No field activity has been planned in PY1. So, no human interest story was captured.

Please provide links to publications, leaflets, video materials, related website, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.

- ▪ National Project Inception Workshop Report: A detailed report documenting the workshop proceedings has been prepared (Annexure 1)

- ▪ Links and snapshots of the media coverage are attached as (Annexure 2)

- ▪ Leaflet: A two-page leaflet on Green-Ag Project innovativeness was published in January 2020 (attached as an Annexure 3)

- ▪ A web-based knowledge platform, for sharing learning and good practices with key stakeholders and other relevant audience, is initiated. The GoI has agreed to provide its domain space for web hosting. The initial webpages have been developed and designed by an in-house team and uploaded on the GoI staging server for audit.

Does the project have a communication and/or knowledge management focal point? If yes, please provide their names and email addresses

Communication Experts have been recruited at NPMU and in Mizoram. They will serve as respective focal

points:

- ▪ Mr. Jitendra Choubey, Communication Expert- NPMU, New Delhi; Email : GreenAg-India@fao.org

- ▪ Mr. Jerry Vanlalremruata, Communication Officer - SPMU, Mizoram; Email: coms.green.ag.spmu@gmail.com

11. Innovative Approaches

Please provide a brief description of an innovative[23] approach in the project / programme, describe the type (e.g. technological, financial, institutional, policy, business model) and explain why it stands out as an innovation.

The Green-Ag project is innovative in several ways, which are described below.

- *Multi-sectoral approach to mainstreaming:* Firstly, this is the first GEF funded project in India that will work from the national to local levels to synergize investments in agriculture and environment and thereby, mainstream environmental concerns into the agriculture sector. To ensure that the sector has access to necessary technical support, as well as continuous strong cross sectoral advocacy to integrate environmental concerns into its policies, plans and actions, strong inter-sectoral approach has been embedded in its implementation arrangements at all levels. The environment and other development sectors will also play crucial roles to support strengthening and implementation of the agriculture sector's environmental commitments. The involvement of the development sector is considered critical in this project, as the agriculture sector responds strongly to demands and incentives from these sectors. Therefore, although the primary focus of the project is to mainstream environmental concerns in the agriculture sector, it will also help mainstream environmental concerns and priorities in other development sectors by mobilizing their incentives (such as the rural employment guarantee scheme) that are linked to the agriculture sector. Therefore, the project is supporting the development of "convergence plans" at local levels to ensure strong coherence between different sectors' plans and investments – so that they are aligned to landscape management objectives. The project will mobilize incentives and programmes from all relevant sectors to incentivize sustainable agriculture and natural resources practices.

- The project's approach of promoting environmental considerations into the agriculture sector at *landscape level* also adds an innovative dimension to the project. Many projects have focused on farm-level "greening" but it is critical for the agriculture planners, promoters, and farmers to understand and take on-board farm and wider landscape interactions. Whilst pollution from agriculture, and encroachment of farming into natural ecosystems are well understood threats to the environment, there are also additional impacts of agriculture that are related to its placement in landscape. For example, an organic farm or a farm conserving agrobiodiversity on its own may be considered more environmentally friendly. However, if its location interferes with connectivity between protected areas and is preventing wildlife movement between protected areas, then its impact will still not be positive in the perspective of ensuring Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs). Therefore, landscape level approach is a critical additional dimension for the agriculture sector to ensure that its impacts are overall positive to global environmental values, ecosystem services, livelihoods and long-term resilience of these to climate change.

- The project aims to enhance *multiple global environmental benefits* at critical landscapes through synergizing investments in agriculture and environment sectors, which adds a strong economic

---

[23] Innovation is defined as *doing something new or different in a specific context that adds value*

perspective to this project. The project aims to build economic case for this to be scaled up – and thus is an innovative approach to this mainstreaming effort.

- The project's work in *five different States and five agroecologically distinct landscapes* is expected to generate some common lessons that can provide stronger framework for national replication of the idea.

- *Use of innovative tools and approaches* – such as Collect Earth, promotion of dialogue platforms at National and State levels to discuss and prioritise issues on agriculture, environment and development to promote sustainable agriculture policies and practices; and embedding outcome based planning over input based planning in agriculture are some additional innovative aspects of this project.

In summary, the Green-Ag project is highly innovative in its focus on integrated approach to mainstream global environmental concerns into agriculture policies, programmes, capacity building and critical landscape management. This will include creating an improved management regime designed for maintaining ecosystem services at scale. The project will work to achieve multiple environmental benefits in more unified way to deliver greater cumulative impact. This will be a "first" in regard to the strategic convergence within the agricultural sector to achieve Biodiversity (BD), Land Degradation (LD), Sustainable Forest Management (SFM), and Climate Change Mitigation (CCM) benefits while simultaneously improving livelihoods and food security. This will be done through community-based approach designed to address past challenges related to disconnect between "good policy" and "poor implementation".

12. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing[24]	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2020	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$ 8 920.60		
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$ 18 088.06		
National and State Government	Government of Odisha and GoI:	i)Government Schemes	US$ 131.16 million	US$ 38,551.19		

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

		ii)State Project Director/Deputy Project Director's time				
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$ 6 986.76		
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	USD$ 75 475.79		
UN Agency	FAO		US$ 3.5 million	US$ 128 830		
		TOTAL	US$ 868.39 million	US$ 276 852		

Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement The co-financing figures are based on written communication from respective state Governments. This is initial stage of project implementation. Therefore, it will be premature to comment on this aspect.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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