

Project Performance Report

Overview

Period of Report (Dates)	4/17/2025 - 4/16/2026
Project Title	Dairy Modernization and Market Access: Adaptation Component (DiMMAdapt)
Project Summary	
Database Number	AF00000181
Implementing Entity (IE)	International Fund Agricultural Dev
Type of IE	Multilateral Implementing Entity
Country(ies)	Georgia
Relevant Geographic Points (i.e. cities, villages, bodies of water)	Imereti, Samegrelo-Zemo-Svaneti and Samtskhe-Javakheti regions.
Name of Implementing Entity Focal Point	Khafiz Atymtay, Climate Programme Officer

Project Milestones	
AFB Approval Date	10/11/2019
IE-AFB Agreement Signature Date	4/8/2020
Start of Project/Programme	4/16/2021
Actual Mid-term Review Date (if applicable)	9/9/2024
Original Completion Date	4/16/2025
Revised Completion Date after approval of extension request (if applicable)	10/15/2026

Were there any approval condition for this Project?

Yes

List each approval condition, if any, and report on the status of meeting them	
Category of condition	Environmental and Social Safeguards
Condition or Requirement	The agreement should include a commitment from IFAD that, prior to signing the agreement, IFAD will submit the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) for each unidentified sub-project (USP) and relevant knowledge management outputs under component one to the secretariat. (Decision B.34/5)
Current Status	Condition met and cleared by the AFB Sec
Planned actions, including a detailed time schedule	For each village in which the Pasture Management Plans (PMPs) will be implemented, the project team will conduct and Environment and Social Impact screening with mapping, mitigation measures and recommendations.

List (only) inception report/ extension request(s)/ MTR that have been prepared for the project and provide date(s) of submission for each

The MTR was prepared in September 2024 and submitted on 15 October 2024 to the AF. The same communication included a restructuring proposal with extension request of the completion date from 16 April 2025 to 30 June 2026. The restructuring proposal and extension request were approved by the April Board of the AF in 2025.

List the Website address (URL) of project

<https://www.adaptation-fund.org/project/dairy-modernization-and-market-access-adaptation-component-dimmadapt/>

Project Contacts			
National/Regional Project Manager/Coordinator	Name	Email	Date
Coordinator	Mariam Bakhtadze	marika.bakhtadze@mepa.gov.ge	4/16/2026

Financial Data

Disbursement of AF grant funds	
Cumulative total disbursement from Trustee to IE as of date (\$)	\$4,644,794.00
Estimated cumulative total disbursement from IE to EEs as of date (\$)	\$2,838,818.36
Project disbursement rate (%)	100
Project execution rate (%)	65.61
Add any comments on AF Grant Funds	
Investment Income (\$)	\$0.00
Cumulative Investment Income since inception (\$)	\$0.00

Expenditure Data	
Output	Amount (\$)
Output 1.1.1: Climate resilient and DRR solutions for pasture rehabilitation and increased productivity promoted. 144,645.00	\$5,455.16
Output 1.2.1: Implementation of climate resilient and ecosystem-based adaptive pastoral grants.	\$14,787.60
Output 1.2.2: Consultancy services for GHG emission calculations.	\$0.00
Output 2.1.1 Climate-smart technologies promoted though on-farm demonstrations.	\$0.00
Output 2.1.2: Alternative non-extractive livelihoods	\$0.00
Output 1.1.2 (NEW): Inventory and Registration of Pasturelands.	\$418,700.60
IE fee (\$)	\$0.00
Execution cost (\$)	\$57,511.00

Planned Expenditure Schedule		
Output	Projected Cost (\$)	Estimated Completion Date
Output 1.1.1: Climate resilient and DRR solutions for pasture	\$15,896.19	6/30/2026

rehabilitation and increased productivity promoted.		
Output 1.1.2 (NEW): Inventory and Registration of Pasturelands.	\$375,419.40	10/15/2026
Output 1.2.1: Implementation of climate resilient and ecosystem-based adaptive pastoral grants.	\$392,689.00	10/15/2026
Output 1.2.2: Consultancy services for GHG emission calculations.	\$40,000.00	6/30/2026
Output 2.1.1 Climate-smart technologies promoted through on-farm demonstrations.	\$465,685.00	10/15/2026
Output 2.1.2: Alternative non-extractive livelihoods	\$514,837.00	10/15/2026
IE fee (\$)		\$35,267.18
Execution cost (\$)		\$167,106.41

Actual co-financing (if the MTR or TE have not been undertaken this reporting period, do not report on actual co-financing)

Does this Project have Co-Financing ?	No
How much of the total co-financing as committed in the Project Document has actually been realized? (\$)	\$0.00
Estimated cumulative actual co-financing as verified during Mid-term Review (MTR) or Terminal Evaluation (TE). (\$)	\$0.00
Add any comments on actual co-financing in particular any issues related to the realization of in-kind, grant, credits, loans, equity, non-grant instruments and other types of co-financing.	

Risk Assessment

Identified Risks

List all Risks identified in project preparation phase and what steps are being taken to mitigate them

Identified Risk	Current Status	Steps taken to mitigate risk
Low interest and capacity of smallholder dairy producers to adopt new climate smart approaches and technologies.	Low	The programme pays a special attention to technical and environmental capacity building and training as a key factor in the upgrading process. It has a set of activities on demonstrations, raising general environmental and climate change awareness and training of farmers on the economic and environmental benefits for the adoption of systems and new technologies.
The current policy and regulatory environment for pasture does not encourage the sustainable management of collective pasture, leading to degradation of this resource.	High	Due to the absence of a pasture law, the official registration of Pasture User Unions (PUUs) is currently not possible. As an interim solution, it has been proposed to designate one municipality as a pilot. Under this approach, pasture plots would be registered by the land agency, and the use rights would be transferred to the selected municipality for a period of 10 years. Once the pasture law is enacted, legally established PUUs will be able to obtain formal use rights over pasture lands.
Climatic shock: the main effect of	Low	The programme is introducing climate smart infrastructure

climate change on weather patterns is the increased occurrence of extreme weather events: droughts and flooding in particular. These weather shock can have a direct impact on animals but also contribute to the emergence of diseases.		and ensuring that climate adaptation measures are implemented. It is in particular ensuring that breeds used in crossbreeding strategies are resilient to climate shocks (utilization of rustic breeds); Promotion of fodder conservation and of use of concentrate feeds will contribute to improving resilience; to drought; Surveillance of emerging diseases is also taken into account as mentioned above.
Insufficient capacities to appropriately manage the day-to-day implementation of the project.	Low	The DiMMAdapt project coordinator is supported by the DiMMA project technical and administrative staff.

Critical Risks Affecting Progress (Not identified at project design)

Are there any critical risks with a 50% or > likelihood of affecting progress of project? Yes

Identify Risks with a 50% or > likelihood of affecting progress of project

Identified Risk	Current Status	Steps taken to mitigate risk
The absence of a Law on Pastures does not allow to grant the ownership over pastures to pasture user unions (PUUs). This might jeopardize the sustainability of the future investments.	High	As the absence of a pasture law does not allow official registration of PUUs. As an intermediate solution, it was proposed to select one municipality as a pilot. The feasibility study showed that it has around 21,000 ha of unregistered but de-facto used pastures. Currently the service provider is working on this pilot to identify, categorise and register the pasture plots in the land agency. It is planned that after this, the right-to-use will be transferred to the municipality and when the law will be in place, these rights will be transferred to the final owners, legally established PUUs. The restructuring proposal was submitted to the AF on 15 October 2024 and approved by the AF Board in April 2025, which envisages inclusion of a new output on building the capacity of the Land Agency, which is responsible for identification, categorisation and registration of pastures. The draft Pasture law was initiated by the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture (MEPA) of Georgia and submitted for review to the Government Committee. Initial comments were received in March 2026, after which the draft was revised accordingly and resubmitted to the relevant ministries for approval. Once inter-ministerial approval is obtained, the draft law will be submitted to the Parliament of Georgia for consideration. It is expected that the law will be introduced during the Spring Session of Parliament.
Limited number of local organizations with adequate knowledge and experience in implementing pasture management activities.	High	The Program engaged local NGO - REC Caucasus to lead the identification, categorization, and preparation of pasture management plans. These plans were subsequently reviewed and refined by an international expert to ensure quality, alignment with best practices, and effective transfer of knowledge to local stakeholders. In parallel, four villages in the Samtskhe-Javakheti region were selected as pilot sites, enabling the Program to test methodologies and inform future scale-up based on lessons learned. Furthermore, targeted capacity-building and on-the-job training will be delivered to pasture users across 15 selected villages by David Roberts. This approach will strengthen local capacities and contribute to the long-term sustainability of project interventions.

Risk Measures

Were there any risk mitigation measures employed during the current reporting period? If so, were risks reduced? If not, why were these risks not reduced?

ESP Compliance

Section 1: Identified ESP Risk Management

Was the ESP risks identification complete at the time of funding approval? No

1.Compliance with the law

Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	

2.Access and equity

Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	There may be a slight risk that some project activities may exacerbate existing inequalities, through targeting some support to "lead farmers", generally better off than their peers.
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact	Project planning and designing is done in consultation and agreement with vulnerable groups.

that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	The project will ensure the selection process will be conducted without discrimination nor favouritism. It will focus on targeting the most vulnerable categories in society with quotas ensuring women participation across all activities as well as youth participation. The project will also directly target those climate vulnerable regions that are identified as being inhabited only by rural poor smallholder farmers
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Farmers (number of women, and youth).
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	The project is ensuring the selection process being conducted without discrimination nor favouritism by the grant managing entity (RDA). It is focusing on targeting the most vulnerable categories in society with quotas ensuring women participation across all activities as well as youth participation.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	There may be a slight risk that some project activities may exacerbate existing inequalities, through targeting some support to "lead farmers", generally better off than their peers.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	Project planning and designing was done in consultation and agreement with vulnerable groups. It will continue ensuring the selection process being conducted without discrimination nor favouritism by the grant managing entity (RDA) throughout the implementation phase. The project will continue on targeting the most vulnerable categories in society with quotas ensuring women participation across all activities as well as youth participation. The beneficiaries are smallholder farmers with herds comprising less than 25 cows. The project operates in those climate vulnerable regions that are identified as being inhabited only by rural poor smallholder farmers.

3.Marginalized and vulnerable Groups

Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	

State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
4.Human rights	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
5.Gender equality and women's empowerment	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring	

indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
6.Core labour rights	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Beneficiaries may be exposed to the risk of accidents while engaging in project implementation activities.
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	Activities under project will create employment enabling marginalised and vulnerable groups including unemployed youth and women to raise their income. - The relevant national laws guided by the ILO labour standards will be followed throughout project implementation. - Positive discrimination in favour of women will be used to provide fair and equal opportunity to women who seek employment as labour and gain from wages earned. - The project will not engage child labour in any of its activities. The prohibition of child labour will be part of the agreement with the beneficiaries and will be a nonnegotiable provision of the agreement.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	No of women beneficiaries; % of agreements with beneficiaries that exclude child labour
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0; 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	No safeguard measures implemented during the reporting period
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Beneficiaries may be exposed to the risk of accidents while engaging in project implementation activities.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will abide by the national labour laws and ILO labour standards. The project will undertake positive discrimination in favour of women and will not engage child labour (will be specified in the provisions of the agreements).
7.Indigenous people	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	

List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
8.Involuntary resettlement	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
9.Protection of natural habitats	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard	There is a low risk that Project activities may be

measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	conducted in protected natural habitats.
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	Screen the project areas against the list of national protected areas to ensure there is no overlap and for each affected critical natural habitat in the project areas (if any), the PMU will provide an analysis on the nature and the extent of the impact including direct, indirect, cumulative, or secondary impacts; the severity or significance of the impact; and a demonstration that the impact is consistent with management plans.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	% of project areas screened against the list of natural protected areas; % of analysis on the nature and the extent of the impact for each affected natural protected habitats in the project area
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0; 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	The selected 4 pilot village Pasture Management Plans (PMPs) were properly mapped and checked if located nearby any protected areas.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	None of the pilot sites are located within, or in the vicinity of, any designated protected areas, including Emerald Network sites or other legally protected zones. Therefore, there is a low risk that project activities may result in adverse impacts on biodiversity, critical habitats, or environmentally sensitive areas.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The Project Management Unit (PMU) will systematically screen all project areas against the national list of protected areas to ensure there is no spatial overlap. In cases where critical natural habitats are identified within or near project areas, the PMU will conduct a detailed assessment of the nature and extent of potential impacts. This assessment will include analysis of direct, indirect, cumulative, and secondary impacts, as well as evaluation of the severity and significance of such impacts. In addition, the PMU has developed Environmental Management Plans for the villages where Pasture Management Plans will be implemented. Where relevant, the PMU will also ensure that all proposed activities are fully consistent with applicable management plans for the respective protected or sensitive areas, thereby ensuring that appropriate mitigation measures are applied and that residual impacts are avoided, minimized, or adequately managed.
10.Conservation of biological diversity	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable	Yes

impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	There is a low risk that Project activities may have an adverse impact on critical biodiversity in the project areas.
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	The project will screen the project areas for critical biodiversity risks to ensure there is no overlap and the PMU will identify and exclude protected areas as detailed in Principle 9 and will furthermore only utilise indigenous species, hereby mitigating any risk of species invasion.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	% of project areas screened against the list of critical biodiversity areas; % of analysis on the nature and the extent of the impact for each affected critical biodiversity areas in the project area
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0; 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	The selected 4 pilot village Pasture Management Plans (PMPs) were properly mapped and checked if located nearby any critical biodiversity areas.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	There is a low risk that Project activities may have an adverse impact on critical biodiversity in the project areas.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will screen the project areas for critical biodiversity risks to ensure there is no overlap and the PMU will identify and exclude protected areas as detailed in Principle 9 and will furthermore only utilise indigenous species, hereby mitigating any risk of species invasion.
11.Climate change	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	There is no risk associated with DiMMAdapt, but with DiMMA activities, which may result in increase of GHG emissions.
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	DiMMAdapt has developed a ESMP (in output 1.2.2 and ESP11 in annex 3) to monitor and report on any changes in GHG emissions and take corrective action should they be seen to increase.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Herd numbers; Net GHG emissions in tCO2-eq
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0;0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	No safeguard measures implemented during the reporting period
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	The risk does not pertain to DiMMAdapt but rather to the DiMMA activities, which may potentially

	impact GHG emissions.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The GHG monitoring is already in place, with the first comprehensive assessment completed in 2023 and second in 2025 using the FAO's Global Livestock Environmental Assessment Model-interactive (GLEAM-i). This assessments revealed that DiMMA activities have not contributed to increased GHG emissions. Instead, due to enhanced feeding and breeding practices, these activities have managed to mitigate some GHG emissions. A final assessment is scheduled for June 2026, when most field activities under DiMMA-Adapt will be nearing completion. At that time, the expectation is that pasture interventions and non-extractive livelihoods activities will further amplify mitigation effects.

12.Pollution prevention and resource efficiency

Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	

13.Public health

Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact	

that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
14. Physical and cultural heritage	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	There is a low risk that Project activities may be conducted in cultural heritage sites.
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	The project will ensure whether there will be any national cultural heritage sites in the project areas and propose measures to avoid any alteration, damage, or removal of physical cultural resources, cultural sites, and sites with unique natural values
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	% of project areas screened against the list of cultural heritage sites; % of analysis on the nature and the extent of the impact for each affected cultural heritage sites in the project area
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0; 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	The selected 4 pilot village Pasture Management Plans (PMPs) were properly mapped and checked if located nearby any cultural heritage sites.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	There is a low risk that Project activities may be conducted in cultural heritage sites.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will ensure whether there will be any national cultural heritage sites in the project areas and propose measures to avoid any alteration, damage, or removal of physical cultural resources, cultural sites, and sites with unique natural values
15. Lands and soil conservation	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	

List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	

Section 2: Monitoring for unanticipated impacts / corrective actions required

Has monitoring for unanticipated ESP risks been carried out?	Yes
Have unanticipated ESP risks been identified during the reporting period?	Yes
If unanticipated ESP risks have been identified, describe the safeguard measures that have been taken in response and how an ESMP has been prepared/updated	An implementation support mission conducted by the International Fund for Agricultural Development in November 2025 identified unanticipated environmental and social (ESP) risks. It was observed that in some cases reconstructed livestock barns were located in close proximity to rivers, with liquid waste being discharged directly into adjacent water bodies. PIU developed a Manure Monitoring Plan to address identified risks related to water pollution. In parallel, the PIU conducted a screening of Rural Development Agency (RDA) monitoring reports and identified approximately 200 sites located in close proximity to rivers. Following this, the PIU initiated field visits to the identified sites and began the implementation of the Manure Monitoring Plans to strengthen environmental compliance and reduce the risk of surface water contamination.

Section 3: Categorisation

Is the categorisation according to ESP standards still relevant?	Yes
If No, please describe the changes made at activity, output or outcome level, approved by the Board, that resulted in this change of categorization.	

Section 4: Implementation arrangements

What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to implement the required ESP safeguard measures?	The Implementing Entity used the ESMP developed at design to implement the ESP safeguard measures, which is kept as a "living document". During the
---	---

	reporting period, the Implementing Entity strengthened its capacity to implement the required Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) safeguard measures by hiring a Project Coordinator with demonstrated experience in environmental and social compliance.
Have the implementation arrangements been effective during the reporting period?	Yes
What arrangements have been put in place by each Executing Entity during the reporting period to implement the required ESP safeguard measures?	PMU holds overall responsibility for the implementation of the ESMP. All project contracts are systematically screened against the 15 AF ESP principles to ensure compliance. During the reporting period, the first batch of four pilot villages was selected for the implementation of Pasture Management Plans (PMPs). First batch of 4 pilot villages for the implementation of Pasture Management Plans (PMPs) were selected in previous reporting period (PPR4), and an ESMP's were prepared for each site. Of the four villages, pasturelands in three were successfully registered and transferred to the Samtskhe-Javakheti municipality under 10-year use rights. However, in one case (Andriatsminda village), the pastureland registration process experienced significant delays, and the transfer to the municipality could not be finalized within the required timeframe. As a result, it was decided to exclude Andriatsminda village from the current phase of implementation. GIS assessment revealed that none of the 4 villages are bordering neither of the protected areas, sensitive biodiversity areas, or cultural heritage sites.
Have the implementation arrangements at the EEs been effective during the reporting period?	Yes

Section 5: Projects/programmes with unidentified sub-projects (USPs). This section needs to be completed only if the project/proramme includes USPs.

Have the arrangements for the process described in the ESMP for ESP compliance for USPs been put in place?	Yes
Is the required capacity for ESMP implementation present and effective with the IE and the EE(s)? Please provide details.	Yes
Have all roles and responsibilities adequately been assigned and positions filled?	Yes
Has the overall ESMP been updated with the findings of the USPs that have been identified in this reporting period?	Yes

Identified USPs in the reporting period	Application of ESMP to the USP	ESP risks identified for the USP	Has an impact assessment been carried out?	Consultation held for risks and impacts identification	Gender disaggregation to identify risks and impacts	Safeguard measures identified for the USP	Monitoring indicator(s) for each impact
---	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	--	--	---	---	---

				for USP			
Mugareti village	Yes	ESPS 9, 10 and 14	Yes	Yes	Yes	GIS mapping	% of project areas screened against the list of natural protected areas; critical biodiversity areas; and cultural heritage sites
Andriatsminda village	Yes	ESPS 9, 10 and 14	Yes	Yes	Yes	GIS mapping	% of project areas screened against the list of natural protected areas; critical biodiversity areas; and cultural heritage sites
Tkemlana village	Yes	ESPS 9, 10 and 14	Yes	Yes	Yes	GIS mapping	% of project areas screened against the list of natural protected areas; critical biodiversity areas; and cultural heritage sites
Khaki village	Yes	ESPS 9, 10 and 14	Yes	Yes	Yes	GIS mapping	% of project areas screened against the list of natural protected areas; critical biodiversity areas; and cultural heritage sites

Section 6: Grievances

Was a grievance mechanism established capable and known to stakeholders to accept grievances and complaints related to environmental and social risks and impacts?	Yes
Were grievances received during the reporting period?	No

List all grievances received during the reporting period regarding environmental and social impacts; gender related matters; or any other matter of project/programme activities	For each grievance, provide information on the grievance redress process	Provide the status/outcome
--	--	----------------------------

Comments

During the reporting period, the Project ensured systematic implementation of ESP requirements through strengthened institutional capacity and targeted field-level actions. A Project Coordinator with experience in environmental and social compliance was engaged to oversee safeguard implementation, while all project activities and contracts were screened against AF ESP principles. ESMPs were prepared and applied for pilot Pasture Management Plans (PMPs), supported by GIS-based screening to avoid sensitive areas. In addition, a Manure Monitoring Plan was developed and field visits were initiated to address identified risks related to livestock waste management, ensuring improved environmental compliance and mitigation of potential impacts on water resources.

GP Compliance

Section 1: Quality at entry

Was an initial gender assessment conducted during the preparation of the project/programme's first submission as a full proposal? Yes

Does the results framework include gender-responsive indicators broken down at the different levels (objective, outcome, output)? Yes

List the gender-responsive elements that were incorporated in the project/programme results framework

Gender-responsive element	Level	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Rated result for the reporting period
Enhancing the resilience to Climate Change of vulnerable dairy producers.	Objective	Number of hectares of pasture rehabilitated restored or protected	0	1,000 ha (out of 3,800 ha) rehabilitated, restored and protected	Poor
Alternative, complementary, non-competitive, non-extractive livelihood jobs created.	Output	Number of households benefiting from alternative non-extractive industry activities.	0	262 jobs (69 women, 161 men and 115 youth) will be created for the market vulnerable beneficiaries.	Satisfactory

Climate-smart technologies and alternative livelihood measures promoted.	Output	Number of households benefiting from alternative non-extractive industry activities.	0	151 primary producers /farmers to receive climate-smart demonstrations	Satisfactory
Climate resilient and DRR solutions for pasture rehabilitation and increased productivity promoted.	Output	Number of households benefiting from alternative non-extractive industry activities.	0	870 farmers (261 women, 609 men and 435 youth) are to receive awareness raising demonstrations	Satisfactory
Enhancing the resilience to Climate Change of vulnerable dairy producers.	Objective	Number of households benefiting from climate resilient improvements	0	1,283 households (4,876 people) will benefit from climate resilient improvements.	Satisfactory

Section 2: Quality during implementation and at exit

List gender equality and women's empowerment issues encountered during implementation of the project/programme. For each gender equality and women's empowerment issue describe the progress that was made as well as the results.

Gender equality and women's empowerment issues	Rated result for the reporting period	Provide justification of the rating provided
--	---------------------------------------	--

Section 3: Implementation arrangements

What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP	the Implementing Entity has prioritized compliance with the Gender Policy by ensuring that the allocation of grants under Component 2 gives preference to women and youth. To this end, measures are being taken to expedite the rollout of grants for non-extractive activities, particularly greenhouses, which directly target young beneficiaries. In parallel, the project is applying a prioritization system in the selection process to increase the share of women and youth among grant recipients, thereby supporting inclusive access to resources and contributing to more equitable project outcomes at completion.
Have the implementation arrangements at the IE been effective during the reporting period?	Yes
What arrangements have been put in place by each Executing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP?	The PMU increase the pace of allocation of grants for non-extractive activities (greenhouses in particular) which are the ones specifically targeting youth.
Have the implementation arrangements at the EE(s) been effective during the reporting period?	Yes
Have any capacity gaps affecting GP compliance been identified during the reporting period and if so,	No

what remediation was implemented?	
-----------------------------------	--

Section 4: Grievances

Was a grievance mechanism established capable and known to stakeholders to accept grievances and complaints related to gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes
Were grievances received during the reporting period?	No

List all grievances received through the grievance mechanism during the reporting period regarding gender-related matters of project/programme activities [6]	For each grievance, provide information on the grievance redress process used	Provide the status/outcome
---	---	----------------------------

Comments

Rating

Implementing Entity					
Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Comments	Rating
Component 1: Climate-proofing pastoral ecosystem services	Outcome 3	Following the approved restructuring, most of the originally planned Pasture User Association demonstration activities were cancelled or reduced, as they were no longer feasible in the absence of the adopted Pasture Law and completed pasture registration and transfer processes. The project was expected to refocus on activities that remain technically and institutionally feasible, including pasture planning, targeted training, and selected practical demonstrations.	Delayed	Original PUA demonstration activities could not proceed as planned due to unresolved legal and administrative constraints related to pasture governance.	Marginally Satisfactory
Component 1: Climate-proofing pastoral ecosystem services	Outcome 2	Pasture Management Plans were expected to be developed for 15 selected villages and used as the basis for practical training, field mobilization and improved pasture management. This	Ontrack		Satisfactory

		includes strengthening the capacity of pasture users and municipalities to apply rotational grazing and other climate-resilient pasture management practices.			
Component 1: Climate-proofing pastoral ecosystem services	Outcome 5	The project was expected to advance practical adaptation measures, including improved pasture management and targeted pasture rehabilitation in selected villages, as well as climate-smart technology demonstrations and alternative livelihood measures through matching grants, including renewable energy, greenhouses and other non-extractive livelihood activities.	Delayed	Preparatory work advanced, but physical implementation was affected by unresolved implementation arrangements and the need to reassess the modality after the initially contracted service provider withdrew.	Marginally Satisfactory
Component 2: Supporting the climate resilience of market vulnerable smallholders	Outcome 6	A new output on inventory and registration of pasturelands was introduced through the restructuring. The activity is expected to pilot the forthcoming national pasture inventory and registration process in Ninotsminda municipality, covering approximately 106,163 ha, and to support the foundations for improved pasture governance and future sustainable pasture management.	Ontrack		Satisfactory

Please provide the Name and Contact information of the person(s) responsible for completing the Rating section

Name	Email
Khafiz Atymtay, Environment and Climate Programme Officer, IFAD	k.atymtay@ifad.org

Please justify your rating. Outline the positive and negative progress made by the project since it started. Provide specific recommendations for next steps.

The overall rating is Marginally Satisfactory, reflecting mixed progress and continued implementation risks. Since project start, the project has faced significant delays, particularly under Component 1, mainly due to the delayed adoption of the Pasture Law and unresolved pastureland registration, categorization and transfer processes, which affected the feasibility of the original design, including Pasture User Association demonstrations and large-scale pasture rehabilitation. Following the MTR and approved restructuring, the project has been refocused toward more feasible and strategically relevant activities, including the preparation of Pasture Management Plans for 15 villages, development of training materials, practical capacity-building support for pasture users, and the newly introduced output on inventory and registration of pasturelands, which is progressing well and directly addresses a key structural bottleneck for sustainable

pasture governance. However, the rating remains marginal because physical pasture rehabilitation works are still delayed and the fifth matching grant call has been put on hold pending resolution of fiduciary and implementation arrangements for some time. The next steps are to accelerate implementation of PMPs and related field training, finalize and launch the revised modality for pasture rehabilitation works, clarify the way forward for the matching grant call, maintain strong coordination with the Land Agency and municipalities, and strengthen monitoring of revised targets, safeguards, grievance redress and beneficiary engagement to ensure measurable adaptation results before project completion.

Executing Entity / Project Coordinator

Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Rating	
Component 1: Climate-proofing pastoral ecosystem services	Outcome 3	As part of the approved restructuring, most of the originally planned Pasture User Association (PUA) demonstration activities were cancelled, as the implementation of Pasture Management Plans (PMPs) in selected villages now inherently serves a demonstrative function. The practical rollout of these activities provides a more context-specific and participatory learning process for pasture users, rendering standalone demonstrations redundant.	Delayed	Delays are mainly due to the cancellation or restructuring of originally planned PUA demonstration activities, as the enabling legal and institutional conditions for formal pasture user associations and pasture transfer were not yet in place. The activity has been refocused through PMP-based training and practical demonstrations for pasture users	Marginally Satisfactory
Component 1: Climate-proofing pastoral ecosystem services	Outcome 2	Pasture Management Plans (PMPs) were developed for 15 selected villages. An international service provider, an international consultant, has been engaged to deliver practical, on-site training on PMP implementation, including the demonstration of best practices to pasture users. In addition, tailored learning	Ontrack		Satisfactory

		materials were developed to support training activities and ensure effective knowledge transfer and long-term application of improved pasture management practices.			
Component 1: Climate-proofing pastoral ecosystem services	Outcome 5	Pasture Management Plans (PMPs) were prepared, and an initial batch of four villages was pre-selected for implementation. Pasture plots were identified and, in three cases, successfully transferred to the respective municipalities under 10-year use rights. The transfer process for one village is still ongoing; Thus, a decision was made to proceed with PMP implementation in the three villages. A service provider was initially contracted to implement the physical restoration works of pasturelands; however, the contract was subsequently terminated due to underperformance. PIU is currently assessing alternative approaches and next steps to ensure timely and effective implementation.	Delayed	Preparatory work has advanced, including PMP preparation and identification of pasture plots in selected villages. However, physical pasture rehabilitation works have been delayed due to pending land transfer processes and the need to revise the implementation modality following the withdrawal of the initially contracted service provider.	Marginally Satisfactory
Component 2: Supporting the climate resilience of market vulnerable smallholders	Outcome 5	The implementation of the 5th matching grant call (climate-smart technology demonstrations) has been temporarily placed on hold following the suspension of the partnership with the Rural Development Agency. This development is linked to an investigation initiated in 2024 by the Investigation Service of the Ministry of Finance of Georgia concerning the management of IFAD and AF projects funds. The Project continues to closely monitor the situation and will determine the appropriate way	Delayed	The fifth matching grant call has been delayed following the temporary suspension of cooperation with the Rural Development Agency. The project is monitoring the situation and will determine the most	Satisfactory

		forward once further clarity is obtained.		appropriate implementation arrangement once fiduciary and operational clarifications are completed.	
Component 1: Climate-proofing pastoral ecosystem services	Outcome 6	A new activity has been introduced under the ongoing project as Output 1.1.2: Inventory and Registration of Pasturelands. This output aims to pilot the forthcoming nationwide pasture inventory and registration process, thereby laying the foundation for improved pasture governance and supporting the effective implementation of the new pasture law. The Ninotsminda municipality was selected as pilot, covering approximately 106,163 hectares of pastureland. The National Agency of Sustainable Land Management and Land Use Monitoring (LA) is coordinating the identification, surveying, and registration of pasture areas in the selected locations.	Ontrack		Highly Satisfactory

Please provide the Name and Contact information of the person(s) responsible for completing the Rating section

Name	Email	Institution
Mariam Bakhtadze	marika.bakhtadze@mepa.gov.ge	MEPA PMU

Please justify your rating. Outline the positive and negative progress made by the project since it started. Provide specific recommendations for next steps.

The Executing Entity assesses project performance as mixed but improving following restructuring. Several original activities under Component 1 remain delayed, particularly those linked to Pasture User Associations and physical pasture rehabilitation, mainly due to the delayed adoption of the Pasture Law and the unresolved registration, categorization and transfer of pasturelands. However, important preparatory progress has been made, including the development of Pasture Management Plans for 15 villages, training materials for pasture users, and initial steps toward implementation in selected villages. The strongest progress is reported under the newly introduced output on inventory and registration of pasturelands, which is assessed as on track and highly satisfactory. This output directly responds to the main institutional bottleneck identified by the MTR and restructuring proposal and is expected to lay the foundation for improved pasture governance and future scale-up. The main next steps are to accelerate practical implementation of PMPs and pasture restoration works, resolve the delayed matching grant process, maintain close coordination with the Land Agency and municipalities, and ensure that the new inventory and registration work is completed within the remaining project period.

Other				
Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Rating
Please provide the Name and Contact information of the person(s) responsible for completing the Rating section				
Name		Email		
Please justify your rating. Outline the positive and negative progress made by the project since it started. Provide specific recommendations for next steps.				

Overall Rating
Overall rating Marginally Satisfactory Please justify your rating. Outline the positive and negative progress made by the project since it started. Provide specific recommendations for next steps. The overall rating is Marginally Satisfactory, reflecting mixed progress across the project portfolio and the limited time remaining for completion. Since project start, implementation has been affected by significant delays, particularly under Component 1, due to the delayed adoption of the Pasture Law and unresolved pastureland registration, categorization and transfer processes, which reduced the feasibility of several activities included in the original design. Following the MTR and approved restructuring, the project has taken relevant corrective measures and refocused implementation on activities that are feasible within the remaining period, including the implementation of Pasture Management Plans for 15 villages, practical pasture management training, the newly introduced inventory and registration of pasturelands, and completion of already signed matching grant agreements. These activities are considered feasible because key preparatory steps have already been completed: the pastureland inventory service provider has been contracted and initial tranches have been disbursed, while the grants have already been awarded and now mainly require final installation, verification of completed works and payment to service providers. However, the overall rating remains marginal because physical pasture rehabilitation works are still delayed and the fifth matching grant call was on hold pending resolution of fiduciary and operational issues. The next steps are to accelerate PMP implementation and related field activities, finalize the modality for pasture rehabilitation works, finalize the payments under the matching grant call, maintain close coordination with the Land Agency and municipalities, and closely monitor procurement, verification, disbursement, safeguards, grievance redress and beneficiary engagement to ensure delivery of measurable adaptation results before completion.

Project Indicators

List of indicators

Type of Indicator (indicators towards Objectives, Outcomes, etc...)	Indicator	Baseline	Progress Since Inception	Target for Project End
---	-----------	----------	--------------------------	------------------------

Objectives	Enhancing the resilience to Climate Change of vulnerable dairy producers. Number of hectares of pasture rehabilitated, restored or protected	0	0	1,000 ha (out of 3,800 ha) rehabilitated, restored and protected
Objectives	Enhancing the resilience to Climate Change of vulnerable dairy producers. Number of households benefitting from climate resilient improvements	0	548	1,283 households (4,876 people) will benefit from climate resilient improvements.
Outputs	Output 1.1.1: Climate resilient and DRR solutions for pasture rehabilitation and increased productivity promoted. Number farmers receiving pasture management, silage and fodder conservation demonstrations.	0	398	870 farmers (261 women, 609 men and 435 youth) are to receive awareness raising demonstrations
Outputs	Output 1.1.1: Climate resilient and DRR solutions for pasture rehabilitation and increased productivity promoted. Number of PUA's receiving training	0	4	15 PUUs (Informally mobilized de-facto pasture users) to receive capacity building in pasture management.
Outputs	Output 1.2.1: Climate resilient and ecosystem-based adaptive pastoral investments implemented. Number of hectares of pasture land rehabilitated, improved or protected.	0	0	1,000 ha (out of 3,800 ha) rehabilitated, restored and protected
Outputs	Output 1.2.1: Climate resilient and ecosystem-based adaptive pastoral investments	0	0	590 households will benefit from Climate resilient and ecosystem-based adaptive pastoral

	implemented. Number of households benefiting from pasture rehabilitation.			investments and pastures improved management
Outputs	Output 1.2.2 GHG from DiMMA cattle increases offset tCO2eq resulting from DiMMA cattle numbers	0	0	Offsetting of 150,000 tCO2eq from DiMMA
Outputs	Output 2.1.1 Climate-smart technologies and alternative livelihood measures promoted. Number of farmers exposed to climate smart technology demonstrations in milk-precooling, AI and crossbreeding and solar power.	0	86	151 primary producers /farmers to receive climate-smart demonstrations
Outputs	Output 2.1.2 Alternative, complementary, non-competitive, non-extractive livelihood jobs created. Number of households benefiting from alternative non-extractive industry activities.	0	100	262 jobs (69 women, 161 men and 115 youth) will be created for the market vulnerable beneficiaries.
Objectives	Enhancing the resilience to Climate Change of vulnerable dairy producers. Number of hectares of pasture brought under improved management	0	2478	3,800 hectares pastures under improved management (through PMPs preparation and Field mobilization and training of de-facto pasture users on rotational grazing)
Objectives	Enhancing the resilience to Climate Change of vulnerable dairy producers. Area of pastures registered.	0	22,379	At least 15,900 ha (15% of 106,163 ha) pastures are registered

Outputs	Output 1.1.1: Climate resilient and DRR solutions for pasture rehabilitation and increased productivity promoted. Area of pasture inventoried	0	54,800	106,163 ha of pastures in Ninotsminda municipality is inventoried
Outputs	Output 1.1.1: Climate resilient and DRR solutions for pasture rehabilitation and increased productivity promoted. National level document produced	0	0	1 national level document produced (Concept document for identification, surveying and registration of pastures developed)
Outputs	Output 1.2.1: Climate resilient and ecosystem-based adaptive pastoral investments implemented. Number of households benefiting from pasture rehabilitation. Number of hectares of pasture under improved management	0	2478	3,800 hectares pastures under improved management (through PMPs preparation and Field mobilization and training of defacto pasture users on rotational grazing)

Comments

in Output 1.1.1: Climate resilient and DRR solutions for pasture rehabilitation and increased productivity promoted. Area of pasture inventoried: 106,163 ha were assessed (vegetation condition, overgrazing, land degradation was studied) in Ninotsminda municipality, out of which 54,800 ha were inventoried

Lessons Learned

Implementation and Adaptive Management		
Describe any changes undertaken to improve results on the ground or any changes made to project outputs (i.e. changes to project design)	Challenges & Opportunities	To improve results on the ground and ensure the full achievement of project objectives, a no-cost extension has been requested. While overall progress has been satisfactory, several factors have led to delays in implementation. These include the temporary suspension of the partnership with the Rural

		Development Agency, which affected the implementation of the 5th matching grant call. In addition, progress on Pasture Management Plan (PMP) implementation and pasture restoration activities has been slower than anticipated due to challenges in identifying qualified service providers and overall implementation constraints. The absence of a comprehensive pasture law has also created uncertainty in the legal framework, further affecting timely execution. As a result, several ongoing activities require additional time to be completed effectively, and a portion of the project financing remains undisbursed. The requested no-cost extension will allow the project to address these delays, complete key activities, and ensure that intended results and impacts are fully realized.
Have the environmental and social safeguard measures that were taken been effective in avoiding unwanted negative impacts?	Challenges & Opportunities	Yes. All activities during the reporting period were screened in accordance with the project's Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP). A potential risk of water pollution from manure management practices was identified. To address this risk, a Manure Management Plan was developed, and field-level monitoring activities were initiated. In addition, Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) were prepared for the villages where Pasture Management Plans (PMPs) are planned for implementation. Community consultations were conducted in these villages prior to PMP preparation to ensure informed participation and community consent.
How have gender considerations been taken into consideration during the reporting period? What have been the lessons learned as a consequence of	Challenges & Opportunities	Gender was integrated primarily through grant targeting and participation in trainings. However,

inclusion of such considerations on project performance or impacts? List lessons learned specific to gender, detailing measures and project/programme-specific indicators highlighting the role of women as key actors in climate change adaptation.		participation of women in pasture-related trainings remains limited. Future outreach will emphasize culturally appropriate strategies to increase female engagement in PMP activities and decision-making.
Were there any delays in implementation? If so, include any causes of delays. What measures have been taken to reduce delays?	Challenges & Opportunities	Yes, there have been delays in implementation, primarily affecting the rollout of Pasture Management Plans (PMPs). While PMPs were successfully prepared and an initial batch of four villages was pre-selected, challenges related to pasture land ownership have slowed progress. Of the selected sites, pasturelands in only three villages were formally transferred to the respective municipalities under use rights, while the fourth village (Andriatsminda) remains under consideration. As a result, a decision was made to proceed with implementation activities in the three villages with completed registration. Additional delays have been caused by the limited availability of qualified service providers with relevant expertise in pasture restoration. This constraint is partly due to the absence of a comprehensive regulatory framework governing pasture management in the country, which has limited the development of local technical capacity. In this context, a service provider initially contracted to carry out physical restoration works under the PMPs was unable to meet performance expectations, leading to contract termination and further delays. To address these challenges, the Project has adjusted its implementation approach by reassessing procurement strategies, and strengthening technical oversight.
What implementation issues/lessons,	Challenges & Opportunities	One of the key implementation

either positive or negative, affected progress?		issues affecting progress is the absence of a comprehensive pasture law in the country. As a result, formal pasture user associations or farmer unions are not legally established, which limits organized and sustainable collective management of pasture resources. This institutional gap has created challenges in mobilizing pasture users, ensuring accountability, and implementing coordinated pasture management measures. At the same time, this has highlighted an important lesson learned: there is a strong need to support the gradual establishment of sustainable, community-based pasture user groups and governance mechanisms, even in the absence of a formal legal framework. The project has therefore adopted a more facilitative approach, working directly with local communities to build awareness, strengthen cooperation among pasture users, and introduce good management practices that can later be formalized once the legal framework is in place. This experience underscores the importance of aligning technical interventions with institutional development and policy progress, as well as the need for flexibility in project design to adapt to evolving regulatory conditions.
--	--	---

Has the project already reached mid term or project completion?(yes/no).

Yes

Climate Resilience Measures	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing climate adaptation measures that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes for enhanced resilience to climate change?	Project experience has shown that climate adaptation interventions, particularly those related to sustainable pasture management, are significantly more effective when implemented through organized user groups with clear rights, responsibilities, and governance structures. Where such collective structures are weak

	or informal, implementation tends to rely more heavily on external facilitation. A positive lesson is that even in the absence of a formal legal framework, early-stage facilitation of community cooperation can help build the foundations for future farmer unions. Future programmes should therefore place stronger emphasis on supporting the gradual formation and institutionalization of farmer/pasture user groups, alongside with supporting policy dialogue.
What is the potential for the climate resilience measures undertaken by the project/programme to be replicated and scaled up both within and outside the project area?	
Readiness Interventions (Applicable only to NIEs that received one or more readiness grants)	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in accessing and implementing climate finance readiness support that would be relevant to the preparation, design and implementation of future concrete adaptation projects/programmes?	N/A
How have the outputs (such as manuals, guidelines, procedures or the experience from providing peer support, etc) from employing readiness grants been used to inform institutional capacity needs, gender issues, and environmental and social aspects in developing and implementing concrete projects/programmes for enhanced resilience to climate change?	N/A
Concrete Adaptation Interventions	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing concrete adaptation interventions that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes implementing concrete adaptation interventions?	A key lesson learned from implementing concrete adaptation interventions is that technical measures alone are not sufficient unless supported by strong institutional and governance arrangements. In the case of pasture management and restoration activities, the absence of a comprehensive pasture law and formally established farmer/pasture user unions has limited the effectiveness and scalability of interventions, as long-term maintenance arrangements remain weak or informal. On the positive side, pilot-based implementation has proven effective in testing approaches and building local ownership, and generating practical lessons before scaling up. The on-the-ground training has been particularly valuable in improving understanding of improved practices among pasture users. Another important lesson is the need for flexible implementation arrangements and adaptive management. Delays in land registration processes and limited availability of qualified service providers demonstrated that implementation capacity in emerging technical areas can be a binding constraint. This highlights the importance of investing early in capacity building, engaging experienced international experts for knowledge transfer and systematic

	pearing of international and local experts to strengthen .
What is the potential for the concrete adaptation interventions undertaken by the project/programme to be replicated and scaled up both within and outside the project area?	
Knowledge Management	
How has existing information/data/knowledge been used to inform project development and implementation? What kinds of information/data/knowledge were used?	
Has the existing information/data/knowledge been made available to relevant stakeholder? If so, what chanel of dissemination have been used?	
Please list any knowledge products generated and include hyperlinks whenever posssible (e.g. project videos, project stories, studies and technical reports, case studies, tranining manuals, handbooks, strategies and plans developed, etc.)	
If learning objectives have been established, have they been met? Please describe.	
Describe any difficulties there have been in accessing or retrieving existing information (data or knowledge) that is relevant to the project. Please provide suggestions for improving access to the relevant data.	
Has the identification of learning objectives contributed to the outcomes of the project? In what ways have they contributed?	
Innovation	
Describe any innovative practices or technologies that figured prominently in this project.	
Complementarity/ Coherence with other climate finance sources	
Has the project been scaled-up from any other climate finance? Or has the project build upon any other climate finance initiative?	Yes
If you answered yes, kindly specify the name of the Fund/Organization.	Yes. The project builds on IFAD's Agriculture Modernization, Market Access and Resilience (AMMAR) project and is now directly informing the approved DiMMAdapt+ project, which will scale up pasture interventions nationwide.

Results Tracker

Goal: Assist developing-country Parties to the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change in meeting the costs of concrete adaptation projects and programmes in order to implement climate-resilient measures.

Impact: Increased resiliency at the community, national, and regional levels to climate variability and

change.

Is this the mid-term or terminal project performance report? Midterm

Impact: Increased resiliency at the community, national, and regional levels to climate variability and change

Core Indicator: No. of beneficiaries

		Total	% of female beneficiaries	% of Youth beneficiaries
Baseline information	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project			
Baseline information	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project			
Baseline information	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	0	0	0
Target performance at completion	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	870	30	50
Target performance at completion	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project			
Target performance at completion	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	870	15	25
Performance at mid-term	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	51	14	29
Performance at mid-term	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project			
Performance at mid-term	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	51	7	14.5
Performance at completion	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project			
Performance at completion	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project			
Performance at completion	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	0	0	0

Outcome 1: Reduced exposure to climate-related hazards and threats

Indicator 1: Relevant threat and hazard information generated and disseminated to stakeholders on a timely basis

	Number of targeted	Number of targeted	Hazards	Overall
--	--------------------	--------------------	---------	---------

	stakeholders - Total	stakeholders - % of female targeted	information generated and disseminated	effectiveness
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

Output 1.1 Risk and vulnerability assessments conducted and updated

Indicator 1.1: No. of projects/programmes that conduct and update risk and vulnerability assessments

	No. of projects/programmes that conduct and update risk and vulnerability assessments	Sector	Scale	Status
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

Output 1.2 Targeted population groups covered by adequate risk reduction systems

Core Indicator 1.2: No. of Early Warning Systems

	No. of adopted Early Warning Systems	Category targeted	Hazard	Geographical coverage	Number of municipalities
Baseline information					
Target performance at completion					
Performance at mid-term					
Performance at completion					

Outcome 2: Strengthened institutional capacity to reduce risks associated with climate-induced socioeconomic and environmental losses

Indicator 2: Capacity of staff to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate-related events from targeted institutions increased

	Number of staff	Number of staff	Sector	Capacity level
--	-----------------	-----------------	--------	----------------

	targeted - Total	targeted - % of female targeted		
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion	1283	30	Disaster risk reduction	3: Medium capacity
Performance at mid-term	177	65	Disaster risk reduction	3: Medium capacity
Performance at completion				

Output 2.1 Strengthened capacity of national and sub-national centres and networks to respond rapidly to extreme weather events

Indicator 2.1.1: No. of staff trained to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate-related events

	Total staff trained	% of female staff trained	Type
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Indicator 2.1.2: No. of targeted institutions with increased capacity to minimize exposure to climate variability risks

	Type	Scale	Sector	Capacity Level
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

Output 2.2. Increased readiness and capacity of national and sub-national entities to directly access and program adaptation finance

Indicator 2.2.1: No. of targeted institutions benefitting from the direct access and enhanced direct access modality

	Number of beneficiaries	Scale	Sector	Capacity Level
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

Outcome 3: Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes

Indicator 3.1: Increase in application of appropriate adaptation responses

	Percentage of targeted population applying adaptation measures	Sector
Baseline information		
Target performance at completion	50	Agriculture
Performance at mid-term	50	Agriculture
Performance at completion		

Output 3.1: Targeted population groups participating in adaptation and risk reduction awareness activities

Indicator 3.1.1: Percentage of targeted population awareness of predicted adverse impacts of climate change, and of appropriate responses

	No. of targeted beneficiaries	% of female participants targeted	Level of awareness
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion	435	30	4: Mostly aware
Performance at mid-term	126	65	4: Mostly aware
Performance at completion			

Output 3.2: Strengthened capacity of national and subnational stakeholders and entities to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning

Indicator 3.2.1: No. of technical committees/associations formed to ensure transfer of knowledge

	No. of technical committees/associations	% of women represented in committees/associations	Level of awareness
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion	15	20% to 39%	4: Mostly aware
Performance at mid-term	0	20% to 39%	1: Aware of neither
Performance at completion			

Indicator 3.2.2: No. of tools and guidelines developed (thematic, sectoral, institutional) and shared with relevant stakeholders

	No. of tools and guidelines	Type	Scale
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			

Performance at completion			

Outcome 4: Increased adaptive capacity within relevant development sector services and infrastructure assets

Indicator 4.1: Increased responsiveness of development sector services to evolving needs from changing and variable climate

	Project/programme sector	Geographical scale	Response level
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion	Agriculture	Sub-National	3: Moderately responsive (Some defined elements)
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Core Indicator 4.2: Assets produced, developed, improved or strengthened

	Sector	Targeted asset	Changes in asset (quantitative or qualitative)
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Indicator 4.1.1: Vulnerable development sector services and infrastructure assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability

Indicator 4.1.1: No. and type of development sector services to respond to new conditions resulting from climate variability and change

	Number of services	Type	Sector
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Outcome 5: Increased ecosystem resilience in response to climate change and variability-induced stress

Indicator 5: Ecosystem services and natural resource assets maintained or improved under climate change and variability-induced stress

	Natural resource improvement level	Sector	Type
--	---	---------------	-------------

Baseline information			
Target performance at completion	3: Moderately effective	Agriculture	Land
Performance at mid-term	2: Partially effective	Agriculture	Land
Performance at completion			

Output 5: Vulnerable ecosystem services and natural resource assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability

Core Indicator 5.1: Natural Assets protected or rehabilitated

	Natural asset or Ecosystem (type)	Total number of natural assets or ecosystems protected/rehabilitated	Unit	Effectiveness of protection/rehabilitation
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion	Rangelands	1000	ha rehabilitated	2: Partially effective
Performance at mid-term	Rangelands	0	ha rehabilitated	1: Ineffective
Performance at completion				

Outcome 6: Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas

Indicator 6.1: Increase in households and communities having more secure access to livelihood assets

	No. of targeted households	% of female headed households	Improvement level
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion	151		
Performance at mid-term	75		
Performance at completion			

Indicator 6.2: Increase in targeted population's sustained climate-resilient alternative livelihoods

	No. of targeted households	% of female headed households	% increase in income level vis-à-vis baseline	Alternate Source
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

Output 6 Targeted individual and community livelihood strategies strengthened in relation to climate change impacts, including variability

Indicator 6.1.1: No. and type of adaptation assets created or strengthened in support of individual or community livelihood strategies

	Number of Assets	Type of Assets	Sector	Adaptation strategy
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

Core Indicator 6.1.2: Increased income, or avoided decrease in income

	Number of households (total number in the project area)	Income source	Income level (USD)
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion	870		
Performance at mid-term	177		
Performance at completion			

Outcome 7: Improved policies and regulations that promote and enforce resilience measures

Indicator 7: Climate change priorities are integrated into national development strategy

	Integration level
Baseline information	
Target performance at completion	
Performance at mid-term	
Performance at completion	

Output 7: Improved integration of climate-resilience strategies into country development plans

Indicator 7.1: No. of policies introduced or adjusted to address climate change risks

	No. of Policies introduced or adjusted	Sector	Scale	Type
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

Indicator 7.2: No. of targeted development strategies with incorporated climate change priorities

enforced			
	No. of Development strategies	Regulation	Effectiveness
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Outcome 8: Support the development and diffusion of innovative adaptation practices, tools and technologies

Indicator 8: Innovative adaptation practices are rolled out, scaled up, encouraged and/or accelerated at regional, national and/or subnational level

	Sector of innovative practice	Geographic Scale	Type
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Output 8: Viable innovations are rolled out, scaled up, encourages and/or accelerated

Indicator 8.1: No. of innovative adaptation practices, tools and technologies accelerated, scaled-up and/or replicated

	No. of innovative practices/ tools technologies	Sector	Status	Effectiveness
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

Indicator 8.2: No. of key findings on effective, efficient adaptation practices, products and technologies generated

	No. of key findings generated	Type	Effectiveness
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			