



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

# SGP Country Programme Strategy for utilization of OP5 grant funds

-----

**Country:** **GEORGIA**  
**Resources to be invested:** **USD 750,000 (core grant)<sup>1</sup>**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Small Grants Program (SGP) is a country-driven and effective delivery mechanism of funds to poor and vulnerable communities enabling them to transform global environmental policies into concrete local actions and vice versa through provision of lessons and knowledge from local projects to policy makers. SGP supports innovative piloting and demonstration of new methods and models at local level and scaling up, replication and mainstreaming of global environmental benefits into local development proactive by providing financial support to communities to carry out innovative projects in line with the strategic priorities of the GEF and local sustainable development objectives.

Over the past 20 year, SGP's support in over 120 countries. Currently there are participating countries in the GEF SGP in five world regions: Africa, Asia/Pacific, Arab States, Europe/CIS and Latin America/Caribbean.

The Government of Georgia has submitted an application with the endorsement of the UNDP Country Office for the country's participation in the GEF Small Grants Programme. The GEF SGP Steering Committee made a decision to start up a GEF SGP Georgia for Operational Phase 5 (2011-2014) with GEF Council approving the GEF SGP OP5 PIF incorporating this decision. The SGP country programme was officially launched in Georgia with appointment of the National Coordinator in November 2012.

---

<sup>1</sup> The level of SGP OP5 resources is an estimated total of the GEF core grant allocation, anticipated STAR resources, as well as other sources of third party co-financing.

Programme allocated US 750,000 for next two years from GEF global fund in grants to Civil Society organizations; in addition to the grant funds, Country Operating Budget (COB) will be allocated for covering salaries and country operations.

The country has formed its own GEF SGP National Steering Committee (NSC) with representatives from government, civil society, academia and UNDP.

## **2. ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS IN GEORGIA AND SGP STRATEGIES**

### **Biodiversity**

#### **Improve sustainability of protected areas and indigenous and community conservation areas through community-based actions**

Establishment of protected areas (PAs) is one of the most important instruments for effective biodiversity conservation. In Georgia the first nature reserve was established in 1912 in Lagodekhi. Currently there are 50 protected areas covering 7.1% of the territory of Georgia. Although the primary function of Protected Areas is to ensure biodiversity conservation, they also have a great scientific research and socio-economic value for the country, especially for development of national and international tourism. One of the main gaps of the PAs System is the lack of a unified PA network. Not all sensitive areas in the country are designated as PAs of Georgia. Lack of global and trans-boundary PAs categories and the low number of ecological corridors should also be emphasized. Another noteworthy problem in the system is ineffective management of PAs, represented by a lack of management plans, incomplete data bases, and ineffective monitoring systems shortcomings in legislation. In addition, the lack of qualified human resources and insufficient equipment and supplies contribute to the problem. Illegal use of natural resources is also among the most important problems in PAs. This illegal use is primarily due to difficult socio-economic, existing conflicting interests among different stakeholders and a low environmental awareness of the population. Most of the problems identified in the PA system are also exacerbated by insufficient funding of the system. Although there is a strong commitment of the Government of Georgia to allocate funds to PAs, reflected in the positive trend of PA budget, existing financing falls far short of the amount required for effective management of the existing protected areas, let alone for the expansion of the system to meet conservation priorities and CBD targets. Apart from inadequate legal, institutional and policy settings, there is a culture-driven disbelief to adopt innovative tools that never demonstrated success in local circumstances at the site level.

GEF SPG in Georgia will promote the participation and capacity building of local communities in the design, implementation, and management of protected area projects. GEF SGP will also promote protected area co-management between government and local communities where such management models are appropriate. GEF SGP will also encourage national policy reform and incentives to engage the private sector and other

stakeholders to improve protected area financial sustainability. GEF SGP will support projects that aim to improve the management effectiveness of existing protected areas. This could include support to transboundary protected areas.

### **Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes and sectors through community initiatives and actions**

As part of the Caucasus eco-region, Georgia represents one of the biodiversity “hotspots” (currently, by “Conservation International” there are identified 34 biodiversity “hotspots” in the world, which have unique biodiversity and are simultaneously under the significant threat). At the same time according to the World Wild Fund (WWF), the Caucasus is an eco-region of global importance characterized by species diversity, a high degree of endemism, diversity of vegetation types and rare biomass at global level. Degradation of habitats and loss of endangered species, ineffective fishing and hunting practices, ineffective management of the protected areas, lack of a unified protected areas network, absence of proper databases for biodiversity conservation and sustainable management are the major problems in the field of biodiversity in Georgia. Besides, overgrazing is one of the most significant factors deleteriously affecting biodiversity. Overgrazing is most acute on sub-alpine and alpine pastures of the highlands and in arid ecosystems of southeast Georgia, where numerous domestic livestock (especially sheep) and unregulated grazing have resulted in soil erosion, and reduction of plant cover composition and productivity, which creates ideal conditions for spreading invasive plants. Despite measures undertaken to support sustainable fishery and hunting, high levels of illegal fishing and hunting, the incomplete monitoring system and lack of competent staff in these sectors still remain an acute problem. The existing assessment system for fish stock and hunting species and additional establishment of fishing and hunting quotas needs to be improved. Lack of data complicates defining concrete measures to support sustainable fishing and hunting. These factors are causing a rapid decline in the number of game species and individual populations. Degradation of the Black Sea marine and coastal biodiversity is another issue that needs to be addressed. Fish resources have also significantly decreased in the inland waters of Georgia where invasive species are a major problem. The current state of most fish species (except for sturgeon and the Black Sea salmon species), including endemic forms in inland waters, is still unknown. Despite measures undertaken to support a sustainable fishery, illegal fishing is still an acute problem.

GEF SGP Georgia will promote measures to help reduce the negative impacts that productive sectors exert on biodiversity, particularly outside of protected areas. GEF SGP will support the development of regulatory and management frameworks to prevent control and manage invasive alien species. GEF SGP will also help to remove the barriers to enhancing, scaling up, replicating, and extending environmental certification systems in productive landscapes and seascapes. GEF SGP will support the development and implementation of policy and regulatory frameworks that provide incentives for private actors to align their practices and behavior with the principles of sustainable use and management. To this end, GEF SGP interventions will remove critical knowledge barriers and develop requisite institutional capacities. This will include support for sub-national and local level applications--where implementation can be more effective--of spatial land-use planning that incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem service valuation.

## Climate Change

### **Promote the demonstration, development and transfer of low carbon technologies at the community level**

CC related problems in Georgia are of greatest concern in those areas being most vulnerable to CC. It remains unclear what the potential CC impacts are on other regions and specific sectors of Georgia.

Economic growth of the country will inevitably cause increases of GHG emissions. Significant growth is expected in the energy sector, from heat and hot water supply systems. Emissions from industry and agriculture are likely to increase as well. Reducing GHG emissions at the national level by supplying them with internally generated “clean energy,” Georgia can make an important contribution to the CC mitigation process.

GEF SGP Georgia will step up its efforts in promoting the demonstration, development and transfer of innovative low-carbon technologies that could have significant impact in the long-run in reducing GHG emissions. GEF SGP intervention under this objective will include technical assistance for creating an enabling policy environment for technology transfer, institutional and technical capacity building, and establishment of mechanisms for technology transfer. Project activities will also include developing local capacity to adapt exogenous technologies to local conditions and to integrate them with endogenous technologies.

### **Promote and support energy efficient, low carbon transport at the community level**

The biggest increase in GHG emission is expected to come from motor transportation in Georgia. Consequently, it is very important to use the GHG emission reduction mechanisms and implement relevant measures in Georgia and especially in big municipalities.

Bicycle roads and promotion of their use, in addition several innovative initiatives e.g. promoting of energy efficient practices and technologies will be considered by GEF SGP in Georgia. GEF SGP will also focus on viable ideas that can receive support of investors and government. GEF SGP will also focus on advocacy efforts both at local and national level influencing policy development in the area of low emission transportation options.

### **Support the conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks through sustainable management and climate proofing of land use, land use change and forestry**

The major share of GHG emissions in developing countries results from land-use change, such as deforestation, and the degradation of soils, forest lands, and other high carbon-sequestering ecosystems. Engaging community-level partners to combat unsustainable land management is critical, as they are the direct users and beneficiaries of well-functioning ecosystems, and are the most affected by climate change. Limited number of community-level stakeholders, CBOs and NGOs has adequate capacity to address Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF) issues. The recent increases in the

number of geologically related natural disasters occurring in Georgia is thought to have been caused by the effects of global climate change, in particular increased rainfall, temperature and humidity, which can initiate or aggravate geological events such as mudflows, soil erosion etc. In assessments made under Georgia's Second National Communication (SNC) to the United Nations Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the regions of particular vulnerability to CC have been identified. These regions are the Black Sea coastal zone, semi-arid regions (especially, agricultural lands/croplands and grasslands in these regions) and highlands/mountainous areas. The Black Sea coastal zone is affected by several geophysical processes (tectonic movements, sea level rise, storms, floods, underwater flows, sedimentation at the inflows of rivers, etc). In semi-arid regions adverse impacts of CC are revealed in increased frequency and strength of droughts, changes in temperature regimes and precipitation totals. Because of these events, agricultural productivity has significantly decreased. Such an abrupt decrease of productivity may seriously threaten food security, a major component of national security. In the highlands, increasing frequency and intensity of flashfloods, landslides and mud-streams/mudflows has caused serious damage to agriculture, forestry, roads and other infrastructure. In the SNC the focus was on the vulnerability assessment of various systems and economic sectors and the elaboration of adaptation projects and strategies; In response to the CC adaptation strategies, identified in the SNC, there is an on-going project, financially supported by the German government, focusing on the rehabilitation of degraded landscapes and windbreaks through reforestation activities in the Dedoplistskaro region. Georgia is now in the process of developing Third National Communication for UNFCCC; the assessments are underway but initial findings once again confirm the vulnerability of Black Sea coastal zone and Achara region to land degradation, agriculture and extreme events.

The lack of awareness regarding CC issues and their insufficient integration into development plans of various sectors impedes finding and implementing effective ways of addressing the problem.

In OP5 SGP Georgia will support reduction of deforestation, community level reforestation/afforestation efforts and peatland restoration activities. GEF SGP will support to develop and build the capacity of civil society stakeholders in participatory monitoring and empower them to engage in national policy and formulation of the national emission recounting initiatives. All This will assist in developing the capacity of NGOs/CBOs and community-level stakeholders to address LULUCF issues.

## **Land Degradation**

### **Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem and forest ecosystem services to sustain livelihoods of local communities**

Forests are the most common habitat type in Georgia, covering 39.9 % of the total area of the country. Forests are found throughout the country, with the exception of the Javakheti plateau. Khevi and mountainous Tusheti are relatively poor in forests. Oriental beech (*Fagus orientalis*) tends to be the dominant species, although there are many other tree species present in the forests. Although Georgia belongs to the number of countries rich

in forests, average forest stand density for considerable part of the forests has reached a critical threshold. Currently, the country's forests are threatened by unsustainable forest use (logging), overgrazing and not environmentally sound forest practices. Grazing levels in forests around settlements are in the most instances far above carrying capacity. Overgrazing prevents regeneration of herb, shrub and tree layers and causes permanent damage to soils. Lack of regeneration and the gradual disappearance of protective vegetation lead to soil erosion, land slide and forest habitat loss. Rural poverty, lack of awareness among graziers, and the lack of alternative livelihood opportunities contributes to the problem a lot. Rural households are driven by poverty, lack of alternative energy supplied and lack of alternative livelihoods to cut or purchase fuel wood and use forests illegally for grazing their livestock. Current levels of illegal logging, and unsustainable forest exploitation is causing irreversible degradation of the forest ecosystem. Furthermore, there is a lack of public participation in forest management and decision making. Given this situation, there is little control over the use of forest resources, and rate of unsustainable exploitation is increasing. In order to apply an ecosystem approach to forest management close cooperation is required between the various agencies involved in decision making, and more up to-date scientific information.

In general, unsustainable agricultural activities cause many types of land degradation with wide variety of underlying causes. Land degradation, lack of efficient land resource management practices, limited access to appropriate information and technology, and weak institutional communication between various stakeholders (which makes a decision-making process ineffective) are the major land resource management challenges in Georgia.

GEF SGP will focus on areas where agriculture and rangeland management practices underpin the livelihood of poor rural farmers. GEF SGP will also support technical and institutional capacity development, community-based agricultural management initiatives. In particular, sustainable land use, land use charge and forestry management and climate proofing practices will be adopted at the community level for forest and non-forest land use types.

### **Reduce pressures at community level from competing land uses (in the wider landscapes)**

Historically, Georgia has been an agricultural country. Even today according to official statistics 53% of employed people are involved in the agricultural sector. Georgia has the potential to produce high-quality agricultural products, which are extremely important for food security and economic growth, as well as to increase the country's export capacity. Land degradation, lack of efficient land resource management practices, limited access to appropriate information and technology, and weak institutional communication between the various stakeholders (which makes a decision-making process ineffective) are the land resource management major problems Georgia faces. Land degradation is one of the important issues in Georgia. Overgrazing and uncontrolled grazing, loss of forest covers and unplanned urban sprawl is the major causes of the land degradation in Georgia. Soil erosion processes are natural phenomena, but they are exacerbated by all kinds of unsustainable human uses. Soil fertility is dependent on the degree of salination and acidification processes also. In addition, frequent agricultural soil contamination is

caused by the inappropriate use of chemicals (herbicides, insecticides and fertilizers), oil spills, improper irrigation methods and uncontrolled disposal of waste. Although a number of organizations and agencies collect and hold various statistical and spatial data, no detailed data regarding degraded lands, the extent of contamination, or land use are available. Lacking this information, effective planning and decision-making are extremely difficult, if not impossible. In addition, data exchange among agencies and ministries is limited and unsystematic, with no clear delineation of roles and responsibilities. The rights and responsibilities are dispersed among a large number of local and central authorities. Scientific knowledge and existing expertise is rarely applied in decision-making, mainly due to limited communication among scientific and executive institutions. This communication is critical for effective decision-making.

GEF SGP activities under this objective will focus on harmonized sector policies and coordinated institutions constituting an enabling environment between sectors and the large-scale application of good management practices on integrated land use planning. At the same time financing instruments and mechanism that provide incentives for reducing the pressures and competition between land use systems will be explored.

## **International Waters**

### **Support transboundary water body management with community-based initiatives**

Effective approaches to transboundary water body management require multi-government solutions at the policy level, but must also include implementation at the community level. In Georgia, water is managed according to a model based on administrative boundaries. National water policies defined by numerous legislative acts and water-related responsibilities are scattered among various state institutions. Both horizontal and vertical cooperation and coordination between these institutions needs to be strengthened. In order to effectively manage water quality, it is necessary to regularly collect monitoring data and assess water quality status in water bodies. This information is essential for planning measures to improve water quality where needed. The scarcity of basic hydrological and water pollution data in Georgia does not allow for drawing a comprehensive picture of surface water conditions. For the transboundary problem deterioration of water quality in the Kura-Aras River Basin, the threats are: risks to public health through contaminated drinking water and agricultural products with an increase in potential for water borne illnesses; the degradation of aquatic ecosystems; and an anticipated decline in bio-resources including fish stocks. Transboundary ecosystem degradation including increased trends of biodiversity loss, deforestation, and land degradation are observed throughout the basin. The decline of species has intensified over the last few decades, due to a large extent by habitat fragmentation and degradation.

There is on-going UNDP/GEF project “Reducing Trans-Boundary Degradation in the Kura-Aras Basin”, in frame of which Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) is being up-dated. Once the TDA Gap Analysis is completed, the results will be examined in light of the development of National IWRM plans and capacity building needs, and the demonstration project activities. Through the iterative process of filling critical gaps in the

TDA - the final TDA will serve as the basis for the regional Strategic Action Programme to be developed by the countries in the region.

The Black Sea is a significant water body for Georgia. By signing the Black Sea Biodiversity Protocol of the Convention on the Protection of the Black Sea against Pollution in 2009, Georgia has officially declared importance of Black Sea biodiversity protection at the international level. It has the largest specific drainage basin in the world, which drains over two million square kilometers and covers almost one third of continental Europe. These natural characteristics make the Black Sea ecosystem outstanding in terms of biodiversity. Its huge catchment area and semi-enclosed nature have made the Black Sea highly sensitive to a variety of anthropogenic impacts. The Black Sea faces the following main problems: (I) decline in commercial marine living resources, (II) degradation of the Black Sea marine and coastal biodiversity and habitats, and (III) eutrophication. Ineffective management of the coastal zone contributes to the degradation of the Black Sea marine and coastal biodiversity and habitats.

The goal of the international waters focal area is the encouragement of collective management for transboundary water systems and subsequent implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services.

In GEF OP5 SGP Georgia will support transboundary water body management with community-based initiatives, including community-level linkages for implementation of Strategic Action Programs (SAPs). GEF SGP initiatives will focus on results-based management means and on such initiatives which will create enabling environment for adopting Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) plans and policies.

## Chemicals

### **Promote and support phase out of POPs and chemicals of global concern at community level**

Pollution of the environment by wastes and chemicals is one of the environmental problems in Georgia, such as residues of agrochemicals (including pesticides) or household chemicals, or their packaging materials contaminated by the chemicals; transport wastes (accumulators, tires, contaminated oils), electrical and other wastes containing heavy metals and toxic substances). The problem is complex, comprised of littering of the environment, environmental pollution from landfills, and issues related to the management of hazardous and accumulated wastes. Presently, the regular collection of household waste is carried out only in big cities and district centers. In many settlements (especially villages) the residents have to solve the waste problem themselves. Usually they dump the wastes in nearby ravines, along road sides, or onto river banks. Eventually, these dumps are converted into small, uncontrolled “landfills”. The environment is significantly affected by air, groundwater and surface water pollution from improperly constructed official municipal landfills. Most of the 63 official municipal landfills operational today do not have a groundwater protection barrier and a leachate collection/ treatment system. There is no operating landfill for hazardous wastes



in Georgia. Industrial, medical and veterinary, as well as other hazardous wastes often are disposed in the municipal landfills with no treatment representing therefore an important source of environmental pollution.

Georgia's reporting and control systems for production, transfer, treatment or disposal of the industrial, medical/veterinary and other hazardous wastes need improvement. Approximately 2,700 tons of hazardous chemicals are located in the damaged waste-burial pit at Ialguja hill. About 230 tons of obsolete pesticides were collected from the storehouses of former *kolkhozes* and *sovkhoses* all over Georgia and have been temporarily stored at the Ialguja burial. Their subsequent environmentally sound recovery and disposal is necessary. In addition, hazardous waste is produced as a result of agricultural activities, (empty containers of pesticides, agrochemicals, and obsolete pesticides from markets) and this issue needs to be adequately addressed.

In 2003-2007, Government of Georgia with assistance of GEF/UNDP developed a draft National Implementation Plan for the implementation of POPs Stockholm convention, under which the reduction of releases of POPs pesticides from small storages and from the Ialguja dump was identified as one of the top priorities. The Plan now is under the process of formal endorsement by the government. Although, Georgia with its own resources and donor (Dutch) assistance was able to start implementation of some NIP activities, e.g. collection of about 235 tons of non-soil mixed pesticides at purposefully built storage; still, there are a number of barriers impeding the full-scale implementation of the NIP measures and sound management of POPs pesticides in general. In the frame of UNDP/GEF "Disposal of POPs Pesticides and Initial Steps for Containment of Dumped POPs Pesticides in Georgia" project technical guidelines on safety procedures for POPs pesticides handling, transport and storage (disposal) has been developed; besides, draft legislation packages on particular needs of POPs has been designed; furthermore preparation of new legislation on waste management including hazardous and solid waste is underway in the frame of the Twining project. Government entities were trained in pesticide site investigation and risk assessment, management option screening for creating a buyer competence for such services. However, there is still need of training in following directions: hazardous waste export procedures, safe disposal of POPs pesticides, contaminated site assessment, etc. Furthermore, regardless of some government and donor funding available for safe disposal of POPs pesticides there is still lack of needed funding for these purposes.

GEF SGP will support POPs and other harmful chemicals phase out initiatives at the community level. This would include introduction of POPs substitutes, and the promotion of environmentally friendly practices of pest management. Raising awareness of the techniques of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and demonstrating their application would be strongly encouraged.

## Capacity Building

**Enhance and strengthen capacities of CSOs (particularly community-based organizations and those of indigenous peoples) to engage in consultative processes,**

**apply knowledge management to ensure adequate information flows, implement convention guidelines, and monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends**

GEF’s strategic priorities are tightly linked to the international conventions supported by the Facility. It is believed that implementation of these conventions will strengthen the ability of GEF to deliver environmental impacts and Global Environmental Benefits. In order to promote attainment of conventions objectives, SGP will support developing capacities of the civil society organizations to implement conventions guidelines. As the latter is critical among SGP’s primary stakeholders, the country programme will also invest in capacity development of community-level stakeholders (especially those in poor rural areas) to self-organize and respond to key environmental problems. In OP5 the country programme will apply “learning by doing” approach. SGP in Georgia will fund projects on supporting CSOs capacity to engage in consultation processes, knowledge management to ensure adequate information flow, effective monitoring and evaluation.

### **Livelihoods and Gender**

#### **Poverty reduction, livelihoods and gender**

Along with the environmental benefits, SGP will contribute to *reduction of local poverty* through introduction of sustainable livelihoods that are in harmony with environmental conservation. With SGP’s support, civil society and community-based organizations will develop the capacity to improve conservation and sustainable use efforts and ensure local benefits, contributing to long-term sustainability. Performance of the SGP projects will be assessed in terms of their effects on income generation.

GEF SGP understands the importance of *gender* equality and women’s empowerment as essential elements to achieve sustainable development and project impacts for the GEF. As such, gender issues are well mainstreamed throughout the SGP and incorporated within the SGP project cycle. Gender is one of the mandatory cross-cutting requirements in the SGP grant-making criteria.

## **3. SGP COUNTRY PROGRAMME NICHE**

Until now Georgia has ratified and signed numerous international multilateral environmental agreements (Conventions and Protocols); most of them are linked to the GEF strategic priorities. The list of relevant Rio Conventions ratified by Georgia and national planning frameworks are listed in the Table 1 below.

Table 1. List of relevant conventions and national/regional plans or programmes

<b>Rio Conventions + national planning frameworks</b>	<b>Date of ratification / completion</b>
UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)	2 June, 1994
CBD National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)	Work on the NBSAP was initiated in 1998; document was created in 2003, later update in

	2005 and currently process is underway for NBSAP up-date
UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)	16 May, 1994
UNFCCC National Communications (1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 3 <sup>rd</sup> )	1 <sup>st</sup> submitted in 1999, 2 <sup>nd</sup> submitted in 2009, 3 <sup>rd</sup> National Communication is underway of elaboration
UNFCCC Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMA)	Feb, 2010 (letter submitted to secretariat)
UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)	23 July, 1999
UNCCD National Action Programmes (NAP)	Submitted in April, 2003
Stockholm Convention (SC)	April 11, 2006
SC National Implementation Plan (NIP)	2012
World Bank Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP)	N/A
GEF National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA)	N/A
GEF-5 National Portfolio Formulation Exercise (NPFE)	N/A
Strategic Action Programmes (SAPs) for shared international water-bodies	Black Sea Strategic Action Program – 2009  Kura-Aras Strategic Action Programme – planned  The Convention on the Protection of the Black Sea Against Pollution (Bucharest Convention) – date of ratification - 21 April, 1992

SGP Georgia will use OP5 resources to support implementation of national priorities in relation to GEF-5 strategic framework and help the country achieve the objectives of the global conventions. Table 2 indicates national priorities and SGP's niche.

Table 2. Consistency with national priorities

OP5 project objectives	National priorities	SGP niche
SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 1: Improve sustainability of protected areas and indigenous and community conservation areas through community-based actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop a unified and effective protected areas network (NEAP 2012-2016)</li> <li>- Develop a protected areas system to ensure conservation and sustainable use of biological resources (NBSAP, 2005)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improve capacity and management of PAs (e.g. law enforcement, monitoring etc.) with active involvement of local community</li> <li>- Initiate co-management practices at certain PAs and support</li> </ul>

		<p>the diversification of PA Governance types</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assist PA network establishment</li> <li>- Support of PAs conservation and sustainable management</li> <li>- Support locals for proper natural resource management initiatives at supporting zones around PAs</li> <li>- Support of PAs corridor management</li> <li>- Promotion of sustainable eco-tourism at PAs also aimed at local livelihood improvement</li> </ul>
<p><u>SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 2:</u> Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes and sectors through community initiatives and actions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Create proper databases for biodiversity conservation and sustainable management of biological resources through developing the relevant bio-monitoring system. (NEAP 2012-16)</li> <li>- Develop a biodiversity monitoring system and an active and integrated biodiversity database to ensure sustainable use and conservation of biological resources. (NBSAP, 2005)</li> <li>- Rehabilitate, protect and conserve viable populations of selected endangered species and habitats; (NEAP 2012-16)</li> <li>- Maintain and restore Georgia's habitats, species and genetic diversity through in-situ, ex-situ and inter-situ conservation measures, and through sustainable use of biological resources (NBSAP, 2005)</li> <li>- Improve of effectiveness of hunting and fishery management to ensure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support research activities on endangered and vulnerable species, including support of local species and their habitat maintenance</li> <li>- Support recovery and conservation of agro-biodiversity of Georgia</li> <li>- Support development of eco-systems services (including black sea biodiversity)</li> <li>- Support research on the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity research</li> <li>- Support awareness raising initiatives about Ramsar convention and wetlands importance</li> </ul>

	<p>sustainable use of fauna resources; (NEAP 2012-16)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Promote sustainable hunting and fishing through adequate planning, restoration and protection of key biological resources (NBSAP, 2005)</li> </ul>	
<p><u>SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 3:</u> Promote the demonstration, development and transfer of low carbon technologies at the community level</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implement adaptation measures in regions vulnerable to CC (NEAP 2012-16)</li> <li>- Create favorable conditions for reduction of GHG emissions (NEAP 2012-16)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support alternative energy efficient and renewable energy technologies application at local level (specifically at vulnerable areas of Georgia e.g. Dedoplistskaro, Black Seas coastal zone and Svaneti)</li> <li>- Support knowledge management and skill development initiatives toward promotion of alternative energy sources</li> <li>- Support capacity building/awareness raising activities for promotion of new and energy efficient technologies</li> <li>- Support promotion of energy efficient building initiatives at local level</li> </ul>
<p><u>SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 4:</u> Promote and support energy efficient, low carbon transport at the community level</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Limit vehicle emissions through introduction of relevant instruments based on international experience and national specifics (NEAP-2012-16)</li> <li>- Reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions caused by city energy usage (Sustainable Energy Action Plan City of Tbilisi For 2011-2020)</li> <li>- Rehabilitate and develop transport infrastructure (Sustainable Energy Action Plan City of Tbilisi For 2011-2020)</li> <li>- Increase the share of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support promotion of the clean transportation at dig municipalities, such as Tbilisi, Batumi, Kutaisi and etc.</li> <li>- To support the commitments of Covenant of Mayors implementations (including elaboration and application of green transportation mechanisms for urban area of Georgia)</li> </ul>

	<p>public transportation within a total passenger turnover (Sustainable Energy Action Plan City of Tbilisi For 2011-2020)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Decrease the mobility of private cars and encourage low emission cars by means of various restrictions and incentives (Sustainable Energy Action Plan City of Tbilisi For 2011-2020)</li> <li>- Harmonize transport legislation basis and standards with the European Legislation (Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper Progress Report, 2006)</li> </ul>	
<p><u>SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 5:</u> Support the conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks through sustainable management and climate proofing of land use, land use change and forestry</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduce unsustainable and illegal forest use (NEAP 2012-16)</li> <li>- Establish prerequisites for sustainable forest management system (NEAP 2012-16)</li> <li>- Conserve forest biodiversity through sustainable forest management (NBSAP, 2005)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support community-based activities aimed at sustainable forest management, including reforestation, cleaning and rehabilitation of degraded ecosystems</li> <li>- Support sustainable land management (including soil regeneration) activities</li> <li>- Support developing the capacity of NGOs/CBOs and community-level stakeholders to address LULUCF issues.</li> </ul>
<p><u>SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 6:</u> Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem and forest ecosystem services to sustain livelihoods of local communities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conserve Georgian agrobiodiversity through ensuring its sustainable use and by promoting of ex-situ and in-situ conservation measures (NBSAP, 2005)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support community based and sustainable agriculture and forest management practices to reduce negative impact of agro and forest ecosystems</li> <li>- Raise awareness of native and locally adapted crops and breeds</li> </ul>

<p><u>SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 7:</u> Reduce pressures at community level from competing land uses (in the wider landscapes)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduce degraded land areas, improve the soil quality and minimize soil contamination (NEAP 2012-16)</li> <li>- Enhance the existing capacity of the spatial-land information system to ensure improved management of land resources through application of modern tools and technologies (NEAP 2012-16)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Work with local municipalities and community for application of the innovative management methods and practices to reduce negative impact in land and forest use</li> <li>- Support advocacy of land regulation initiatives at local level</li> </ul>
<p><u>SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 8:</u> Support transboundary water body management with community-based initiatives</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Establish an effective water management system (NEAP 2012-16)</li> <li>- Establish effective pollution prevention and water abstraction control mechanisms (NEAP 2012-16)</li> <li>- Reduce water pollution from untreated municipal wastewater (NEAP 2012-16)</li> <li>- Reduce pollution from diffuse sources in agriculture (NEAP 2012-16)</li> <li>- law harmonized at the regional level with the purpose to have a unified policy for the whole region (BS SAP)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support integrated water resource management for transboundary river basins</li> <li>- Support and promote community based and sustainable water resource management initiatives at local level in area of transboundary water basins<sup>7</sup></li> <li>- Introduce Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) approaches and protect the coastal zone from degradation</li> </ul>
<p><u>SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 9:</u> Promote and support phase out of POPs and chemicals of global concern at community level</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduce environmental pollution from accumulated wastes (NEAP 2012-16)</li> <li>- Improve household and hazardous waste management (collection, transport, disposal) (NEAP 2012-16)</li> <li>- Develop the POPs related legislation (NIP)</li> <li>- Build capacity in the fields of risk assessment and management (NIP)</li> <li>- Develop the monitoring system (NIP)</li> <li>- Develop efficient public awareness raising program on the adverse impact of POPs in human health and environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support local farmers in phase out of POPs and other pollutants and support Integrated Pest Management</li> <li>- Support awareness raising initiative about POPs harmful chemicals and other pollutants (specifically on basic sanitation norms, law enforcement initiatives and alternative sources) at local level</li> <li>- Support nationwide assessment</li> </ul>

	<p>(NIP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Resolve problems in the field of management of hazardous chemical substances (Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper Progress Report, 2006)</li> </ul>	<p>initiatives on identification of chemicals harmful to environment and human health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support POP communication action plan implementation initiatives</li> </ul>
<p><u>SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 10:</u> Enhance and strengthen capacities of CSOs (particularly community-based organizations and those of indigenous peoples) to engage in consultative processes, apply knowledge management to ensure adequate information flows, implement convention guidelines, and monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Raise public awareness of biodiversity issues and to encourage public participation in the decision making process. (NBSAP, 2005)</li> <li>- Improve the effectiveness of PAs management through the capacity building of its administrations and introduction of financial sustainability Mechanisms (NEAP 2012-16)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support locals empowerment and involvement at environmental decision making processes, specifically on environmental impact assessment initiatives</li> <li>- Support Aarhus convention obligations enforcement in Georgia</li> </ul>
<p><u>Cross-Cutting Results:</u> Poverty reduction, livelihoods and gender</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Integrate environmental activity into the process of social-economic development of the country (Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper Progress Report, 2006)</li> <li>- Promote gender equality and empower women (MDG) Support Equal Participation of Men and Women at All Levels of the Decision Making Process on the Issues of Environment Protection (Resolution of the Parliament of Georgia About Approving “2011-2013 Action Plan for Implementation of Gender Equality”)</li> <li>- Foster economic and social development in the regions and reduce regional and social disparities, with a focus on the integration of vulnerable groups. (European Neighborhood and Partnership Instrument 2011-13)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support gateway community livelihood improvement at certain municipalities</li> <li>- Eradicate conflict between humans and wildlife for poverty eradication and livelihood improvement</li> <li>- Support local farmers livelihood improvement through agro-tourism development and applications of sustainable agro management practices</li> </ul>



	- Stimulate economic opportunities and cooperation between regions in Georgia and the EU. (European Neighborhood and Partnership Instrument 2011-13)	
--	--	--

Specifically, through active public outreach and liaise with vibrant civil society and capable NGOs working directly with the communities, programme will encouraged them to learn about the potential opportunities offered by the program; furthermore, GEF SGP will help facilitate communities’ access to funds and implement innovative projects ideas in accordance of national CPS and SGP OP5 global targets.

Despite the facts, that Georgia has made significant progress towards achieving many of its National Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), poverty reduction and employment generation still remain the main priorities of the government. Therefore, strong focus on livelihoods would be the key to achieving sustainability of projects and producing environmental benefits, within the scope of the GEF thematic areas on country level.

### Geographic focus

Georgia covers an area of 69,7 square kilometers. It is bounded to the west by the Black Sea, to the north by Russia, to the south by Turkey and Armenia, and to the east by Azerbaijan (please see map below).

Having in mind the size of the Georgia, the whole country shall be considered as one geographic area; hence there will be no specific geographic focus in implementing SGP, apart from encouraging SGP projects throughout the country in the following focal areas: biodiversity conservation, climate change, combating land degradation, protection of international waters, the reduction and / or elimination of the chemicals.



## 4. CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT, POVERTY REDUCTION AND GENDER RESULTS FOR SGP

The cross-cutting objective of the SGP in Georgia will be to enhance and strengthen capacities of CSOs (particularly community-based organizations) to actively engage and involve locals in consultative processes, apply knowledge management to ensure adequate information flows, implement convention guidelines, and monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends. Furthermore, poverty reduction, livelihood and gender empowerment will be one of the core objectives for SGP funded initiatives.

During projects preparation and review processes and later in their implementation NSC and project team will focus and support such initiatives which will assist local NGOs and CBOs in capacity development, their livelihood improvement and production of economic benefits. In order to ensure the strong ownership of the activities and result in direct socio-economic benefits, hence overall achievement of global environmental benefits, it is important to support such initiatives which are locally driven and focused on local specifics. In order to sustain the developed capacity, NSP and project team will be consistently engaged with local communities involved in SGP supported activities.

Furthermore program will support gender empowerment initiatives, that benefit both men and women within the same communities equally, advocating for and encouraging women to be actively involved in environmental decision making processes and projects implementation activities.

## 5. OP5 COUNTRY OUTCOMES, INDICATORS AND ACTIVITIES

Table 3. Results Framework

<b>SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 1: Improve sustainability of protected areas and indigenous and community conservation areas (ICCAs) through community-based actions</b>			
<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Activities</b>
<b>SGP BD Outcome 1.1:</b> Improved community-level actions and practices, and reduced negative impacts on biodiversity resources in and around protected areas, and indigenous and community conservation areas	Number of Hectares of local community conserved areas (ICCAs) influenced  Number of Hectares of protected areas influenced	GEF SGP database, project reports and monitoring visits  SGP case studies  SGP grantee data	At least 4 ICCAs and PAs related projects will be supported for this and objective below <sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> The estimated number of OP5 projects should distinguish between the utilization of core grants (which can apply across GEF focal areas) and non-core GEF resources (which need to be directly linked to the relevant GEF focal areas). In accordance with the GEF Steering Committee decision (March 2010), up to 20% of non-core GEF resources mobilized may be used for secondary focal areas.

<p><b>SGP BD Outcome 1.2:</b> Benefits generated at the community level from conservation of biodiversity in and around protected areas and indigenous and community conservation areas</p> <p><b>SGP BD Outcome 1.3:</b> Increased recognition and integration of indigenous and community conservation areas in national protected area systems</p> <p><b>SGP BD Outcome 1.4:</b> Increased understanding and awareness at the community-level of the importance and value of biodiversity</p>	<p>Number of Hectares of significant ecosystems with improved conservation status</p>		
<p><b>GEF-SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 2: Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes and sectors through community initiatives and actions</b></p>			
<p><b>Outcomes</b></p>	<p><b>Indicators</b></p>	<p><b>Means of verification</b></p>	<p><b>Activities</b></p>
<p><b>SGP BD Outcome 2.1:</b> Improved community-level sustainable use of biodiversity in production landscapes / seascapes through community-based initiatives, frameworks and market mechanisms, including recognized environmental standards that incorporate biodiversity considerations</p> <p><b>SGP BD Outcome 2.2:</b> Increased understanding and awareness of sustainable use of biodiversity</p>	<p>Number of Hectares of production landscapes / seascapes applying sustainable use practices</p> <p>Number of significant species with maintained or improved conservation status</p> <p>Total value of biodiversity products/ecosystem services produced (US dollar equivalent)</p>	<p>GEF SGP database, project reports and monitoring visits</p> <p>SGP case studies</p> <p>SGP grantee data</p>	<p>See objective 1 above</p>
<p><b>GEF-SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 3: Promote the demonstration, development and transfer of low carbon technologies at the community level</b></p>			
<p><b>Outcomes</b></p>	<p><b>Indicators</b></p>	<p><b>Means of verification</b></p>	<p><b>Activities</b></p>

<p><b>SGP CC Outcome 3.1:</b> Innovative low-GHG technologies deployed and successfully demonstrated at the community level</p> <p><b>SGP CC Outcome 3.2:</b> GHG emissions avoided</p>	<p>Tonnes of CO2 avoided by implementing low carbon technologies:</p> <p>Number of community members demonstrating or deploying low-GHG technologies</p> <p>Total value of energy or technology services provided (US dollar equivalent)</p>	<p>GEF SGP database, project reports and monitoring visits</p> <p>SGP case studies</p> <p>SGP grantee data from innovative monitoring approaches</p>	<p>At least 2 projects to demonstrate low GHG Technologies and capacity building initiatives</p>
<p><b>GEF-SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 4: Promote and support energy efficient, low carbon transport at the community level</b></p>			
<p><b>Outcomes</b></p>	<p><b>Indicators</b></p>	<p><b>Means of verification</b></p>	<p><b>Activities</b></p>
<p><b>SGP CC Outcome 4.1:</b> Low-GHG transport options demonstrated at the community level</p> <p><b>SGP CC Outcome 4.2:</b> Increased investment in community-level energy efficient, low-GHG transport systems</p> <p><b>SGP CC Outcome 4.3:</b> GHG emissions avoided</p>	<p>Tonnes of CO2 avoided by implementing low carbon technologies:</p> <p>Total value of transport services provided (US dollar equivalent)</p>	<p>GEF SGP database, project reports and monitoring visits</p> <p>SGP case studies</p> <p>SGP grantee data from innovative monitoring approaches</p>	<p>At least 2 policy advocacy and law GHG transport options demonstration projects</p>
<p><b>GEF-SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 5: Support the conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks through sustainable management and climate proofing of land use, land use change and forestry</b></p>			
<p><b>Outcomes</b></p>	<p><b>Indicators</b></p>	<p><b>Means of verification</b></p>	<p><b>Activities</b></p>
<p><b>SGP CC Outcome 5.1:</b> Sustainable land use, land use change, and forestry management and climate proofing practices adopted at the community level for forest and non-forest land-use types</p> <p><b>SGP CC Outcome 5.2:</b> Restoration and enhancement of carbon stocks in forests and non-forest lands, including peatland</p> <p><b>SGP CC Outcome 5.3:</b></p>	<p>Hectares of land under improved land use and climate proofing practices</p> <p>Tonnes of CO2 avoided through improved land use and climate proofing practices</p>	<p>GEF SGP database, project reports and monitoring visits</p> <p>SGP case studies</p> <p>SGP grantee data from innovative monitoring approaches</p>	<p>At least 2 community level projects focusing on SLM and forests management / restoration</p>

GHG emissions avoided			
<b>SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 6: Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem and forest ecosystem services to sustain livelihoods of local communities</b>			
<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Activities</b>
<p><b>SGP LD Outcome 6.1:</b> Improved community-level actions and practices, and reduced negative impacts on agro-, and forest ecosystems and ecosystem services demonstrated to sustain ecosystem functionality</p> <p><b>SGP LD Outcome 6.2:</b> Community-based models of sustainable forestry management developed, and tested, linked to carbon sequestration for possible up-scaling and replication where appropriate, to reduce GHG emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and enhance carbon sinks from land use, land use change, and forestry activities</p>	<p>Hectares of land applying sustainable forest, agricultural and water management practices</p> <p>Hectares of degraded land restored and rehabilitated</p>	<p>GEF SGP database, project reports and monitoring visits</p> <p>SGP case studies</p> <p>SGP grantee data from innovative monitoring approaches</p>	<p>At least 2 Community based LD and advocacy projects supported</p>
<b>GEF-SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 7: Reduce pressures at community level from competing land uses (in the wider landscapes)</b>			
<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Activities</b>
<p>SGP LD Outcome 7.1: Improved community-level actions and practices, and reduced negative impacts in land use frontiers of agro-ecosystems and forest ecosystems (rural/urban, agriculture/forest)</p>	<p>Number of communities demonstrating sustainable land and forest management practices</p>	<p>GEF SGP database, project reports and monitoring visits</p> <p>SGP case studies</p> <p>SGP grantee data from innovative monitoring approaches</p>	<p>At least 2 projects demonstrating sustainable land and forest management practice ; at least in 1 community PAs corridor management initiated</p>
<b>GEF-SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 8: Support transboundary water body management with community-based initiatives</b>			
<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Activities</b>
<p><b>SGP IW Outcome 8.1:</b> Effective and climate resilient community-based actions and practices</p>	<p>Hectares of river/lake basins applying sustainable management</p>	<p>GEF SGP database, project reports and monitoring visits</p> <p>SGP case studies</p>	<p>Integrated and sustainable water resource management practices are demonstrated at least in 2 communities for trans-boundary river basins</p>

supporting implementation of SAP regional priority actions demonstrated	practices and contributing to implementation of SAPs	SGP grantee data from innovative monitoring approaches	
<b>SGP IW Outcome 8.2:</b> Synergistic partnerships developed between SGP stakeholders and transboundary water management institutions and structures supporting implementation of SAP regional priority actions	Hectares of marine/coastal areas or fishing grounds managed sustainably  Tonnes of land-based pollution avoided		
<b>GEF-SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 9: Promote and support phase out of POPs and chemicals of global concern at community level</b>			
<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Activities</b>
SGP CH Outcome 9.1: Improved community-level initiatives and actions to prevent, reduce and phase out POPs, harmful chemicals and other pollutants, manage contaminated sites in an environmentally sound manner, and mitigate environmental contamination	Tons of solid waste prevented from burning by alternative disposal  Kilograms of obsolete pesticides disposed of appropriately  Kilograms of harmful chemicals avoided from utilization or release	GEF SGP database, project reports and monitoring visits  SGP case studies  SGP grantee data from innovative monitoring approaches	At least 2 POPs projects contributing to the implementation of national plans and policies to address POPs, harmful chemicals and other pollutants
<b>GEF-SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 10: Enhance and strengthen capacities of CSOs (particularly community-based organizations and those of indigenous peoples) to engage in consultative processes, apply knowledge management to ensure adequate information flows, implement convention guidelines, and monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends</b>			
<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Activities</b>
<b>SGP CD Outcome 10.1:</b> Active participation of NSCs and NFGs in GEF focal areas at the national level  <b>SGP CD Outcome 10.2:</b> Improved information flows to/from CBOs and CSOs in SGP countries regarding good practices and lessons	Number of community-based monitoring systems demonstrated  Number of national policies influenced (NIP, NBSAP etc.)  Number of people trained on: project development,	GEF SGP database, project reports and monitoring visits  SGP case studies  SGP grantee data from innovative monitoring approaches	At Least 15 CBOs and CSOs Capacities strengthened and motivated to be actively involved in environmental decision making processes

<p>learned, and application of such practices</p> <p><b>SGP CD Outcome 10.3:</b> Increased public awareness and education at the community-level regarding global environmental issues</p> <p><b>SGP CD Outcome 10.4:</b> Capacity of CBOs and CSOs strengthened to support implementation of global conventions</p> <p><b>SGP CD Outcome 10.5:</b> Increased application of community-based environmental monitoring</p> <p><b>SGP CD Outcome 10.6:</b> Evaluation of SGP projects and programs against expected results strengthened, including increased capacity of CBOs and CSOs to apply relevant evaluation methodologies</p>	<p>monitoring, evaluation etc.</p>		
<b>Cross-Cutting Results: Poverty reduction, livelihoods and gender</b>			
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Activities</b>
<p>SGP's Results Framework for OP5, as approved by the SGP Steering Committee, does not include specific objectives on livelihoods and gender. Nonetheless, SGP does produce positive results in these areas, which contribute to the overall achievement of Global Environmental Benefits through sustainable development. Generally, SGP seeks to improve livelihoods through</p>	<p><b>Livelihoods &amp; Sustainable Development:</b></p> <p>Number of participating community members (gender disaggregated)</p> <p><b>Empowerment:</b></p> <p>Number of NGOs/CBOs formed or registered</p> <p>Number of women-led</p>	<p>GEF SGP database, project reports and monitoring visits</p> <p>SGP case studies</p> <p>SGP grantee data from innovative monitoring approaches</p>	<p>100% of projects with appropriate gender balance of participants and target beneficiaries</p> <p>15 community members with sustained livelihood improvement through GEF-SGP support</p>

increasing local benefits generated from environmental resources, and mainstream gender considerations in community-based environmental initiatives.	projects supported		
--	--------------------	--	--

## 6. MONITORING & EVALUATION PLAN

All GEF-SGP projects will be expected to incorporate a detail Monitoring & Evaluation plan with appropriate indicators in the project document before approval. The involvement of the key stakeholders in monitoring and assessment will contribute to community ownership. Besides, granted NGO/CBOs will be obliged to submit periodic progress reports and Final report. These reports will be signals for NC and NSC for grants disbursement.

M&E plan will be also designed by NC in order to oversee the implementation of each of the projects in the country portfolio. This plan will be coordinated with the NGO/CBOs work-plan. In addition, periodic site visit will be organized by NC to the projects sites; which will not be less than two times during the project life time; as necessity and possible, respective members of the NSC will also participate at site visits. After each site visit the NC/NSC member(s) will prepare a monitoring record, record will include information about changes in the indicators established for project monitoring.

The country programme will also engage independent experts to monitor and/or evaluate GEF-SGP project as appropriate.

NC will update the on-line project database - accounts of lessons learned, case studies and programme level resource mobilization should be entered and maintained. Table below in details presents the M&E activities at the project level to be undertaken by whom and when.

Table 4. M&E Plan at the Project Level

SGP Individual Project Level		
M&E Activity	Responsible Parties	Timeframe
Participatory Project Monitoring	Grantees	Duration of project
Baseline Data Collection <sup>3</sup>	Grantees, NC	At project concept planning and proposal stage
Two or Three Project Progress and Financial Reports ( <i>depending on agreed disbursement schedule</i> )	Grantees, NC, PA	At each disbursement request

<sup>3</sup> Capacity-development workshops and M&E trainings may be organized in relation to innovative techniques for community monitoring, including new technologies (i.e. GPS-enabled cameras, aerial photos, participatory GIS, etc.); as well as in response to guidelines for “climate proofing” of GEF focal area interventions; REDD+ standards; and/or other specific donor/co-financing requirements.



Project Workplans	Grantees, NC, PA	Duration of project
NC Project Proposal Site Visit (as necessary / cost effective <sup>4</sup> )	NC	Before project approval, as appropriate
NC Project Monitoring Site Visit (as necessary / cost effective)	NC	On average once per year, as appropriate
NC Project Evaluation Site Visit (as necessary / cost effective)	NC	At end of project, as appropriate
Project Final Report	Grantees	Following completion of project activities
Project Evaluation Report (as necessary / cost effective)	NC, NSC, External party	Following completion of project activities
Prepare project description to be incorporated into global project database	PA, NC	At start of project, and ongoing as appropriate

NC will also provide UNOPS with quarterly spreadsheet reports on expenses. Besides, NC will report on annual bases on technical and substantive projects and programme progress (Performance and Review Assessment). Thus, GEF SGP database will be updated on monthly bases by NC on following topics: projects selection process, NSC meetings conducted, project monitoring and evaluation activities including site visits, relationship with project stockholders, resource mobilization efforts, public outreach and etc.

In general country programme strategy (CPS) will constitute the basis for the assessment and for programme reviews report development. CPS will be living document which will be reviewed and revised jointly by NC and NSC in agreement with CPMT. NC will have a leading role for preparing Programme Review Report; however NSC will be closely involved in assessment of country programme performance.

Table below in details presents the M&E activities at the programme level to be undertaken by whom and when.

Table 5. M&E Plan at the Programme Level

SGP Country Programme Level		
M&E Activity	Responsible Parties	Timeframe
Country Programme Strategy Review	NSC, NC, CPMT	Start of OP5
Strategic Country Portfolio Review	NSC, NC	Once during OP5
NSC Meetings	NSC, NC, UNDP CO	Minimum twice per year
Performance and Results Assessment (PRA) of NC Performance	NC, NSC, UNDP CO, CPMT, UNOPS	Once per year

<sup>4</sup> To ensure cost-effectiveness, project level M&E activities, including project site visits, will be conducted on a discretionary basis, based on internally assessed criteria including (but not limited to) project size and complexity, potential and realized risks, and security parameters.

Country Programme Review resulting in Annual Country Report <sup>5</sup>	NC presenting to NSC and CPMT	Once per year
Financial 4-in-1 Report	NC/PA, UNOPS	Quarterly

Table 3, describes the logical framework approach of the CPS both at programme and project levels which provides the basis for M&E. It indicates expected results at the programme level along with respective Outcome target indicators and means of verification. It also specifies approximate number of projects and features project activities planned under respective Outcome.

## 7. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Projects will document lessons learned about the SGP programme/project development, implementation and oversight and best practices identifies through the country portfolio of SGP projects with civil society, government and other related stakeholders. As a result, project periodically will collect, synthesize and disseminate SGP results, bests practices and lessons learnt with SGP, GEF and other regional and global networks. Besides, NC will be personally responsible to develop and publish SGP knowledge products for contributing to wider GEF knowledge products.

The collection and consolidation of the experiences and knowledge gained are assumed on the Program level in the form of booklets, brochures, reports, video materials, films and etc. One of the main mechanisms to collect the information are the project site visits that provide the opportunity to obtain and learn the practical knowledge and experiences gained in the course of the project activities. Besides, grantees would be responsible for collection, preparation and districting knowledge products in agreement with NC. The great attention will be paid to the dissemination of experiences gained at the seminars, meetings and workshops, by electronic delivery via electronic and information networks, publication of information materials etc. The great role in the knowledge management aspect are played by training programs organized within each individual project including workshops, training etc. any training products would be accessible for wider public. Besides, SGP database, photo gallery linked to the good practices section will be regularly maintained. At the end of the working year the special brochure summarizing SGP activities in Georgia as well as focusing on environmental risks and community level solutions will be produced and distributed.

Project will actively participate in the SGP knowledge network for learning and knowledge dissemination purposes; besides, NC will be responsible to collect knowledge information as inputs to the wider GEF knowledge products and policy papers and to participate in and present in SGP in regional/international meeting and seminars as required.

One of the opportunities for influencing policy at local and national level will be organizing press conferences and/or workshops with the participation of the key stakeholders as well as media for discussing the role of SGP in Georgia and finding solutions how to solve numerous environmental problems in connection with the implementation of UN Conventions at local/national level and for achieving global environmental benefits.

---

<sup>5</sup> The annual Country Programme Review exercise should be carried out in consultation with the national Rio Convention focal points and the associated reporting requirements.

Project will actively participate in and be engaged with CO Energy and Environmental portfolio activities, such as retreats and related projects/programmers events for knowledge dissemination and experience sharing purposes. Besides, the SGP Georgia Strategy for replication and up-scaling good practices and lessons learned will be focused on support of such projects proposals and initiatives that can be easily used by other NGOs/CBOs on their territories. That is why in each SGP projects it will be foreseen to publish and disseminate good results and lessons learnt for targeting relevant groups and regional authorities for helping them in replication of these results on their territories. In addition, for dissemination of best practices and lessons learnt of SGP Georgia the SGP staff meetings with locals and regional authorities will start with informing them about the results achieved in SGP projects.

## **8. RESOURCE MOBILIZATION PLAN**

NC will ensure development and regular update of an SGP Resource mobilization strategy and implementation plan, she will be responsible to identify and seek opportunities for project co-financing and take follow up actions; for this, regular workshops and seminars will be organized to advocate for GEF SGP activities and raise awareness among lead donors, international partners and private sector.

In OP5, projects funded by SGP Georgia are expected to ensure 1:1 co-funding ratio (50% in cash and 50% in-kind). However, once adequate level of financial resources is mobilized at the country programme level, cash co-financing component can be reduced or not be applied for projects supporting initiatives in poor and vulnerable communities.

Partnerships are critical for SGP successful implementation both in term of technical and financial perspective, the country programme will strive to maintain and expand existing partnership relations with bilateral and multilateral agencies (such as UNDP, World Bank, USAID, GIZ, WWF, IUCN) private sector and government for complementarily and cost-sharing opportunities for addressing GEF OP5 project objectives. Projects will ensure active liaison with Ministry of the Environmental Protection for achieving GEF OP5 objectives within the context of national priorities.

The country project will seek to establish strong relationships with all operating bilateral and multilateral agencies as well as national and international NGOs and foundations through active participation in mutual interest programmes and initiatives to act jointly for achieving global environmental benefits and effective knowledge/information sharing.

Some private sector organizations are active in support of NGOs' development activities and interested in livelihood enhancement of local communities. GEF-SGP will ensure its visibility to such private organizations for resource mobilization for achieving GEF-SGP's goals and project sustainability.

## ANNEX 1: GEF SGP OP 5 PROJECT LEVEL INDICATORS

<b>SGP OP5 results indicators</b>	
<b>Biodiversity (BD)</b>	
<b>BD1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Hectares of indigenous and community conserved areas (ICCAs) influenced</li> <li>○ Hectares of protected areas influenced</li> <li>○ Hectares of significant ecosystems with improved conservation status</li> </ul>
<b>BD2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Hectares of production landscapes / seascapes applying sustainable use practices</li> <li>○ Number of significant species with maintained or improved conservation status</li> <li>○ Total value of biodiversity products/ecosystem services produced (US dollar equivalent)</li> </ul>
<b>Climate Change (CC)</b>	
<b>CCM1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> avoided by implementing low carbon technologies:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Renewable energy measures (please specify)</li> <li>○ Energy efficiency measures (please specify)</li> <li>○ Other (please specify)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Number of community members demonstrating or deploying low-GHG technologies</li> <li>○ Total value of energy or technology services provided (US dollar equivalent)</li> </ul>
<b>CCM4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> avoided by implementing low carbon technologies:</li> <li>○ Low carbon transport practices (please specify)</li> <li>○ Total value of transport services provided (US dollar equivalent)</li> </ul>
<b>CCM5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Hectares of land under improved land use and climate proofing practices</li> <li>○ Tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> avoided through improved land use and climate proofing practices</li> </ul>
<b>Land degradation (LD) &amp; Sustainable Forest Management (SFM)</b>	
<b>LD1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Hectares of land applying sustainable forest, agricultural and water management practices</li> <li>○ Hectares of degraded land restored and rehabilitated</li> </ul>
<b>LD3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Number of communities demonstrating sustainable land and forest management practices</li> </ul>
<b>International Waters (IW)</b>	
<b>IW</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Hectares of river/lake basins applying sustainable management practices and contributing to implementation of SAPs</li> <li>○ Hectares of marine/coastal areas or fishing grounds managed sustainably</li> <li>○ Tonnes of land-based pollution avoided</li> </ul>
<b>Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)</b>	
<b>POPS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tons of solid waste prevented from burning by alternative disposal</li> <li>○ Kilograms of obsolete pesticides disposed of appropriately</li> <li>○ Kilograms of harmful chemicals avoided from utilization or release</li> </ul>
<b>Capacity Development, Policy and Innovation (all focal areas)</b>	
<b>CD</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Number of consultative mechanisms established for Rio convention frameworks (please specify)</li> <li>○ Number of community-based monitoring systems demonstrated (please specify)</li> <li>○ Number of new technologies developed /applied (please specify)</li> <li>○ Number of local or regional policies influenced (level of influence 0 – 1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5)</li> <li>○ Number of national policies influenced (level of influence 0 – 1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5)</li> <li>○ Number of people trained on: project development, monitoring, evaluation etc. (to be specified according to type of training)</li> </ul>

<b>SGP OP5 results indicators</b>	
<b>Livelihoods, Sustainable Development, and Empowerment (all focal areas)</b>	
<b>Cross-cutting</b>	<p><b>Livelihoods &amp; Sustainable Development:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Number of participating community members (gender disaggregated) (Note: mandatory for all projects)</li> <li>○ Number of days of food shortage reduced</li> <li>○ Number of increased student days participating in schools</li> <li>○ Number of households who get access to clean drinking water</li> <li>○ Increase in purchasing power by reduced spending, increased income, and/or other means (US dollar equivalent)</li> <li>○ Total value of investments (e.g. infrastructure, equipment, supplies) in US Dollars (Note: estimated economic impact of investments to be determined by multiplying infrastructure investments by 5, all others by 3).</li> </ul> <p><b>Empowerment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Number of NGOs/CBOs formed or registered</li> <li>○ Number of indigenous peoples directly supported</li> <li>○ Number of women-led projects supported</li> <li>○ Number of quality standards/labels achieved or innovative financial mechanisms put in place</li> </ul>