

Reporting Agency: UNDP
Country: Armenia

STANDARD PROGRESS REPORT

No. and title: The Global Environment Facility's Small Grants Programme
Reporting period: January – November 2018

I. PURPOSE

In 2018 the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Small Grants Programme (SGP) contributed to meet objectives related to poverty reduction and local empowerment as integral aspects of sustainable development and environmental protection. Conforming to the Country Programme Document strategic results and UNDAF Outcomes 7, the SGP focused on supporting sound management of natural resources and contribute to reduction of local poverty in accordance with the SDGs and Sustainable Development Program.

The SGP supports grassroots initiatives in the GEF focal areas of biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation, protection of international waters, prevention of land degradation and safe management of POPs and other harmful chemicals. The SGP is implemented in decentralized, democratic, transparent and country-driven manner.

The National Steering Committee (NSC), the central element of the programme, is composed of a national government representative, UNDP Country Office Swiss Agency for Development and Co-operation and civil society members representing NGOs, academia and science, with a majority of them coming from non-governmental sector.

II. RESOURCES AND FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

Country Operating Budget (SGP)

The administrative support to the SGP country programme in Armenia is provided through Country Operating Budget (COB). The operational budget for the SGP country programme in Armenia for 2018 calendar year made up US\$25,400.

UNDP TRAC Allocation

As part of the commitment to the SGP global, UNDP CO allocated US\$8,000 to the SGP country programme for 2018.

Grant Allocation to the Country Programme

SGP Armenia was allocated US\$ 632,000 from OP6 STAR BD and CC focal areas.

III. RESULTS, PROGRESS

Within January-December 2018 the SGP held two NSC meetings, having approved 8 projects in the total amount of US\$338,742. In terms of resource mobilization, the country programme succeeded to mobilize the total of US\$267,404, out of which US\$126,860 in cash and US\$140,544 in-kind. Moreover, the Municipalities of Lernantsk, Katnajur and Gogaran communities of Lori region have channeled through SGP project ARM10 component their funds in the amount of US\$35,453 to co-finance two projects on introduction of "green" backyard gardening practices and sustainable use of water resources.

During the reporting period 26 projects were under implementation out of which 4 projects were successfully completed and 1 project was terminated. The reasons for project termination were low capacities of the NGO team to plan and carry out the envisaged activities, which could put at risk the overall project implementation.

The progress in implementation and country level results achieved so far include:

- *Collaboration with GEF TF and REDD+-funded Mainstreaming Sustainable Land and Forest Management in Mountain Landscapes of North-eastern Armenia (SLM/SFM) project on use of SGP delivery mechanism has resulted in commitment of other 2 grant projects in the total amount of US\$70,699.*
- *Based on successful experimentation of the pilot irrigation system supplying fish-farm discharge waters for irrigation in Hayanist, a set of policy recommendations was developed and submitted to the*

ministries of Nature Protection; Agriculture; Territorial Administration and Development; and State Committee of Water Economy of the Republic of Armenia.

- A model energy-efficient heating and cooking stove piloted by the SGP, due to the application of a sink fund modality ensured manufacturing of 50 additional stoves (in addition to the initially envisaged 238 stoves). The model EE stove introduced by the project ensured saving of at least 20% of woodfire.
- As part of complementarity and synergy of its strategic directions with UNDP/UN System, donor-funded and NGO-led initiatives, SGP facilitated experience and knowledge exchange of SGP projects with the UNDP projects; provided parallel funding to establish PV power systems in 3 community pre-schools being established by the UNICEF-Armenia and came to an initial agreement with Coca-Cola HBC Armenia to co-finance the project on promotion of waste separation and recycling culture in Armenia.
- The article highlighting the SGP-funded project on wild berry collection and cultivation by women groups in Berd district of Tavush region was posted at UNDP Armenia website.

The NC continued holding a series of negotiations with donors, state agencies and public organizations for potential complementarities and partnerships for the pipelined SGP projects. Thus, initial and actual co-financing agreements were reached with a number of government partners and donors, such as WWF, UNICEF, USAID, Swiss Development Agency and others.

The ongoing projects have been monitored according to the set schedule, as well as upon necessity. The NSC members are actively involved in the monitoring, ex-post monitoring and pre-assessment of projects and regularly updated on the project progress and issues. The SGP M&E framework, which is laid down in the Country Programme Strategy, adopts participatory monitoring approach. In line with this principle, project community administration, local beneficiaries, project partners and stakeholders (representatives of respective donor organizations and state agencies) were also involved in the participatory monitoring.

The SGP team and the NSC members continued the consultation process with potential proponents and assisted in development of proposals. During consultations, the operational frameworks for the GEF SGP-Armenia including principles and procedures of the SGP implementation, selection criteria, grant application package and other relevant documents were presented.

Global and national SGP websites were regularly updated.

IV. GENDER MAINSTREAMING RESULTS

100% of SGP-funded projects addressed gender equity issues as a mandatory cross-cutting requirement. A designated gender focal point on the NSC provided expertise on gender issues and facilitated review of any gender components of projects. Out of 26 on-going projects, 13 are implemented by women-led NGOs.

V. RISKS LOG

See attached.

VI. LESSONS LEARNED

Indicate lessons learned. What is now done differently and why. Keep optimal size and number.

VII. EVALUATIONS

N/A

VIII. INTERNATIONAL, BILATERAL COLLABORATION WITH OTHER COUNTRIES

N/A

IX. PRODOC CHANGES, HORIZON SCANNING

N/A

X. ANNUAL VALIDATION OF RESULTS (FIELD VISIT) AND QUALITY ASSURANCE

See attached

XI. FUTURE WORK PLAN

The SGP Armenia will move ahead with the GEF-6 grant-making process which includes the following major steps:

- Continuous support to project proponents (NGOs/CBOs) through project concepts development and formulation (with NSC involvement)

- *Oversight and monitoring of the ongoing SGP projects (with NSC involvement)*
- *Continuous technical assistance and advise to the SGP on-going projects (with NSC involvement)*
- *Review and acceptance of grantees' progress and financial reporting*
- *Undertaking monitoring visits to the project sites and preparing subsequent monitoring records (with NSC involvement)*
- *Resource mobilization through partnership and co-funding opportunities from both traditional and nontraditional sources as follows:*
- *Assessment of interests and priorities of international donor and development agencies and identification of opportunities for partnership and co-financing;*
- *Attraction of private sector in SGP projects co-financing, also as a part of corporate social responsibility;*
- *Involvement of Armenian Diaspora in SGP projects co-financing;*
- *Mainstreaming SGP projects with UN agencies and GEF-funded larger projects;*
- *Exploring opportunities for complementarities and cost sharing with state-funded projects and initiatives at local level.*

Output Verification Template

Field Visit Report Format

The content of the field visit report varies depending on the purpose of the visit. At a minimum, any field visit report must contain an analysis of the progress towards results, the production of outputs, partnerships, key challenges and proposed actions. **This format may be changed to suit local needs.**

Date of visit: _____

Subject and venue of visit: 00054966 - The GEF Small Grants Programme
[Project number(s) and title(s), venue visited]

Purpose of the field visit:

| Outcomes | Update on outcomes | Outputs | Update on outputs | Reasons if progress below target | Update on partnership strategies | Recommendations and proposed action |
|---|--------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|--|--|
| By 2020 Sustainable Development principles and good practices for environmental sustainability resilience building, climate change adaptation and mitigation, and green economy are introduced and applied. | | New production and consumption patterns are introduced; new “green” jobs are created | 8 new projects commenced and are committed through MOAs; 3 SGP good practices are replicated and scaled-up | N/A | Serving as a delivery mechanism for GEF FS SLM/SFM project; resource mobilization from partner organizations and businesses to replicate and scale-up SGP successful initiatives through a range of strategic partnerships | During the OP7 portfolio planning exercise negotiate for Climate Change Mitigation and Land Degradation (instead of Biodiversity Conservation) thematic areas of GEF STAR funds. This is conditioned by the upcoming EUR 23 mln grant allocation for biodiversity conservation from KfW Bank to be utilized through an 8-year project. |

PROJECT PERFORMANCE—IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

N/A

PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS

During the reporting period the SGP managed to achieve the set targets.

LESSONS LEARNED

The practice of involving UNDP colleagues/experts, community heads/administration and partners proved to be very efficient for identifying and addressing project implementation issues and enhancing synergism with the UNDP implemented and pipelined projects.

Participants in the field visit:

Prepared by (Project Coordinator): _____
Hovhannes Ghazaryan, SGP National Coordinator

Approved by: _____
Armen Martirosyan, SGR Portfolio Analyst

Results Framework¹ - PUT UPDATED PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK FROM PRODOC

| Intended Outcome as stated in the UNDAF/Country [or Global/Regional] Programme Results and Resource Framework: By 2020 Sustainable Development principles and good practices for environmental sustainability resilience building, climate change adaptation and mitigation, and green economy are introduced and applied. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|-------------|----------|------|---|--------|--------|--------|----------|---------------------------------|-------|
| Outcome indicators as stated in the Country Programme [or Global/Regional] Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Applicable Output(s) from the UNDP Strategic Plan: New production and consumption patterns are introduced; new “green” jobs are created | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project title and Atlas Project Number: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EXPECTED OUTPUTS | OUTPUT INDICATORS ² | DATA SOURCE | BASELINE | | TARGETS (by frequency of data collection) | | | | | DATA COLLECTION METHODS & RISKS | |
| | | | Value | Year | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year ... | | FINAL |
| Output 1 | I.1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | I.2 | | | | | | | | | | |

¹ UNDP publishes its project information (indicators, baselines, targets and results) to meet the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) standards. Make sure that indicators are S.M.A.R.T. (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time-bound), provide accurate baselines and targets underpinned by reliable evidence and data, and avoid acronyms so that external audience clearly understand the results of the project.

² It is recommended that projects use output indicators from the Strategic Plan IRRF, as relevant, in addition to project-specific results indicators. Indicators should be disaggregated by sex or for other targeted groups where relevant.

| # | Description | Risk Category | Impact & Probability | Risk Treatment / Management Measures | Risk Owner |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| | GUIDANCE: Enter a brief description of the risk. Risk description should include future event and cause. Risks identified through HACT, SES, Private Sector Due Diligence, and other assessments should be included. | Social and Environmental Financial Operational Organizational Political Regulatory Strategic Other Subcategories for each risk type should be consulted to understand each risk type (see Enterprise Risk Management Policy) | Describe the potential effect on the project if the future event were to occur. Enter probability based on 1-5 scale (1 = Not likely; 5 = Expected) Enter impact based on 1-5 scale (1 = Low; 5 = Critical) | What actions have been taken/will be taken to manage this risk. | The person or entity with the responsibility to manage the risk. |
| 1 | CSO applicants capacities and expertise are insufficient for proposal development in line with GEF-SGP requirements | Social and Environmental Financial Operational Organizational Political Regulatory Strategic Other | Low participation of rural NGOs and community-based organizations (CBOs) in the SGP country programme for regular GEF funding P = I = | Enhanced programme outreach through intensive consultations and project pre-assessment visits in regions. SGP-Armenia will use technical and human resources of the regional resource centers to facilitate access of the regional NGOs/CBOs to the country programme. | |
| 2 | Reduction of UNDP TRAC funds allocated in support of the programme administration and projects co-financing may affect smooth operation of the SGP. | Social and Environmental Financial Operational Organizational Political Regulatory Strategic Other | 1. Reduced support to the SGP country programme administration; 2. Limited support to the local initiatives in need of cash co-financing. P = I = | Risk remains unchanged. | |
| 3 | The internal political crisis which led to significant changes in Government, may cause delays in project implementation and delivery. | Social and Environmental Financial Operational Organizational Political Regulatory Strategic Other | Project implementation delays and revision of project activities. | Programme management is continuously monitoring grantees' projects progress, with consideration of also some implementation delays. | |

OFFLINE RISK LOG – Include updated risk log from Prodoc and include also SESP risks

INDICATE YEAR e.g., 2019 Work Plan ³⁴ - PUT UPDATED PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK FROM PRODOC

All anticipated programmatic and operational costs to support the project, including development effectiveness and implementation support arrangements, need to be identified, estimated and fully costed in the project budget under the relevant output(s). This includes activities that directly support the project, such as communication, human resources, procurement, finance, audit, policy advisory, quality assurance, reporting, management, etc. All services which are directly related to the project need to be disclosed transparently in the project document.

| EXPECTED OUTPUTS | PLANNED ACTIVITIES | Planned Budget by Year | | | | RESPONSIBLE PARTY | PLANNED BUDGET | |
|--|---|------------------------|----|----|----|-------------------|--|------------------------------|
| | | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | Y4 | | Funding Source | Budget Description Amount |
| Output 1: The GEF Small Grants Programme | 1.1 Supporting NGOs/ CBOs in new project concepts development and formulation | | | | | UNDP | 71400 - Contractual services – Individuals | 8,000 |
| | 1.2 Oversight and monitoring of the SGP projects with NSC involvement | | | | | | 71600 - Travel 72400 - Communication & Audio-Visual Equip. 74500 - Miscellaneous (incl. DPC) | 2,000 300 1700 |
| | MONITORING | | | | | | | - |
| | Total for Output 1 | | | | | | | 12,000 |
| | EVALUATION | | | | | | | - |
| | General Management Support | | | | | | | - |
| | TOTAL | | | | | | | 12,000 |

³ Cost definitions and classifications for programme and development effectiveness costs to be charged to the project are defined in the Executive Board decision DP/2010/32

⁴ Changes to a project budget affecting the scope (outputs), completion date, or total estimated project costs require a formal budget revision that must be signed by the project board. In other cases, the UNDP programme manager alone may sign the revision provided the other signatories have no objection. This procedure may be applied for example when the purpose of the revision is only to re-phase activities among years.