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**Joint Programme Document and Fund Transfer Request**

Georgia - UNDP, UNECE, ILO, FAO

**Development Emergency Modality – Response to the Global Crisis on Food, Energy, Finance**

**Eligibility Check**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Does the proposal address one or more of the following sectors affected by the global crisis? Select all relevant sectors. | Food  Energy  Finance |
| What are the areas of intervention that will be implemented by this proposal? Select all relevant intervention areas. | Data collection/analytics  Analysis and forecasting  Help devise comprehensive preventative package of response measures  Testing / catalysing new integrated policies, financing solutions, programmes |
| Is the proposal developed under the RC leadership to mobilize the UNCT to effectively and efficiency respond to the crisis? | Yes  No |
| Does the proposal contribute to results in the UNSDCFs? | Yes  No |
| Is the proposal building on and topping up an existing joint programme supported by the Joint SDG Fund? | Yes  No |

**Cover-page**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MPTFO Project Reference Number** | *(Leave blank, for automatic population in Atlas)* |
|  |  |
| **Country** | Georgia |
| **Region** | RBEC |
|  |  |
| **Joint programme title:** | **Strengthening Georgia’s food and energy resilience** |
| Outcomes(s): <*verbatim from CF*> | UNSDCF Georgia 2021-2025:  Outcome 3: By 2025, all people without discrimination benefit from a sustainable, inclusive and resilient economy in Georgia.  Outcome 5: By 2025, all people, without discrimination, enjoy enhanced resilience through improved environmental governance, climate action and sustainable management and use of natural resources in Georgia. |
| Duration: | 6 months |
| Anticipated start and end dates: | 07/2022 to 12/2022 |
| **Short description** | The overall aim of the programme will be strengthening Georgia’s resilience to food and energy crises and protection of the livelihoods of those most vulnerable to the impact of these crises. This will be attained by joint UN support towards the following outcomes: (1) Strengthened systemic capacity of Government of Georgia to conduct and make use of sound data collection and analysis for designing effective food and energy crisis mitigation responses; and (2) Improved access of vulnerable people to the food and sustainable, affordable energy sources. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Resident Coordinator | Sabine Machl, sabine.machl@un.org |
| UN Joint Program RCO focal point | Anna Platonova, Head of RC Office, anna.platonova@un.org, +995595576873 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| UNDP JP Focal point | Giorgi Nanobashvili, george.nanobashvili@undp.org |
| Other PUNOs JP focal point | FAO, Jumber Maruashvili, jumber.maruashvili@fao.org |
|  | ILO, Mikhail Pouchkin, pouchkin@ilo.org |
|  | UNECE, Oleg Dzioubinski, oleg.dzioubinski@un.org |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Total budget:** | $319,344 |
| **Source of funds:** |  |
| * UN Joint SDG Fund | $249,994 |
| * ILO | $9,000 |
| * UNDP | $60,350 (Source TRAC 3 and donor funded project) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SDG Targets directly addressed by the Joint Programme** | Min 2 max 5 SDG targets  SDGs 1 (targets 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.A, 1.B), SDG 2 (targets 2.1, 2.B, 2C), SDG 7 (targets 7.2, 7.3. and 7.a), SDG 13 (target 13.2.2) and SDG 10. |
| [**Gender Marker**](https://unsdg.un.org/resources/gender-equality-marker-guidance-note) | Select only one from the options below  GEN3: Have gender equality/women empowerment as the primary or principal objective.  GEN2: Make a significant contribution to gender equality/women empowerment.  GEN1: Make a limited contribution to gender equality/women empowerment  ☐ GEN0: Make no contribution to gender equality/women empowerment |

**JOINT PROGRAMME DESCRIPTION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Situation Analysis** | Georgia’s GDP growth averaged 4 percent annually between 2011 and 2021. Nevertheless, critical structural challenges remain, including weak productivity, skills mismatch on the labour market, poor learning outcomes, slow job creation and limited availability of decent jobs. In addition, Georgia’s trade openness, and reliance on income from tourism, remittances, make it vulnerable to external shocks. Still, the swift post-pandemic rebound (economy growing at 10.4 percent in 2021: surpassing its pre-COVID output) has demonstrated the growing resilience of Georgia’s economy. Economic recovery also supported a reduction in poverty: in 2021 absolute poverty was reduced to lower rates than in pre-COVID 2019, especially among women (by 2.3 percentage points). However, in conjunction with post-COVID global crisis and global supply chain disruptions, rising inflation on food/energy commodities is further exacerbated by Russian aggression in Ukraine. Georgia’s inflation remained high at 13 percent, as of end-May 2022. Households, especially those in rural areas and vulnerable, have been experiencing pressures mainly from higher food and fuel prices. For example, price index for food and beverage category rose by 21 percent y-o-y when 47% of Georgian household’s monthly expenses are spent on food.  As Georgia has significant economic ties with both Ukrainian and Russian economies, the adverse impact is felt through trade, remittances, FDI, commodity prices, and logistics. Both Russia and Ukraine are among Georgia’s top 10 trading partners and a key destination for exports. For example, Georgia exports close to 60 percent of its wine and 40 percent of its mineral water to Russia. Ukraine is also an important export market for some Georgian products, including alcohol, mineral water, and fertilizers. There is limited potential to divert some of the affected exports to alternative markets in the short term. In addition, Georgia is reliant on Ukraine and Russia for key imports. For instance, Georgia imports 94% of wheat and 86% of sunflower oil from Russia (2020). According to Geostat, between 52%-65% of daily calories in Georgia, come from wheat products. Georgia imports almost all (97.8%) of its oil and oil products and significant proportion of country’s expenditure on energy imports is spent on oil and gas. Drop in the arrival of Russian and Ukrainian tourists (21 percent of visitors in 2021), is also putting further strain on a sector that is still reeling from the COVID-19 pandemic. The remittances from Russia and Ukraine (over 20 percent of total remittances in pre-conflict period) may also decline as the crisis continues, further decelerating economic growth. The double shock of food and fuel price increases pose an immediate danger to groups of the population who are already in/at risk of poverty.  In addition to market diversification, Georgia is looking inwards and seeks to bolster food security self-reliance through domestic production. This strategy requires a clear understanding of agricultural production and its potential for growth in the short-term. Unfortunately, information currently available to policy makers is unreliable for this purpose and needs to be improved. Significant energy price increases are having a negative impact on production capabilities and costs for producers, especially from rural areas. They, consequently, may result in the weakening of the competitiveness of these producers and increasing their vulnerability. Reducing energy consumption can be achieved by improving the efficiency of the food production. Food producers and processors can ensure food safety while being energy-wise and reducing their carbon footprint.  As Georgia’s growth forecast for 2022 has been downgraded to 2.5 percent from 5.5 percent projected (World Bank, May 2022), the poverty impact is expected to be significant and fiscal pressures from rising social assistance are expected to further increase. These in turn are challenging the Georgia’s path towards achievement of SDGs and calling for increased food and energy resilience. |
| **Programme Strategy** | The substantial economic costs of the war in Ukraine and elevated uncertainty add to the challenges already facing Georgia from rising inflationary pressures and the imbalanced recovery from the pandemic. Faced with an adverse supply shock of uncertain duration and magnitude from higher food and fuel prices, Georgia’s government could consider, timely and well-targeted fiscal measures, where feasible, to cushion the immediate impact of the crisis, especially for vulnerable. Regulatory and policy measures, to improve market systems in order to enhance security and competitiveness, could potentially also help strengthen energy and food markets and reduce disruptions in the mid-terms.  As Georgian households spend the highest share of their incomes on energy and food, the Government of Georgia may consider temporary, short-term support (such as food and energy vouchers) to the most in need. To keep costs feasible, and avoid distorting price signals, such support to offset the further price rises should be also well targeted. As Georgia’s experience from COVID-19 crisis shows, price caps on basic food and households’ energy costs subsidies also benefit higher-income households. Some alternatives (e.g., cash transfers) may be considered to have higher multiplier effects. In medium term, Georgia could strengthen resilience to external shocks through higher degree of export/import market diversification, for instance by building ties with Kazakhstan for wheat and with Turkey for sunflower oil imports, improving logistics for exporting through tourism and others. Moreover, in the long term, Georgia could also reduce its overall reliance on fossil fuel imports by providing appropriate incentives to move away from fossil fuels and investing increasingly in clean energy and energy efficiency, while Leaving No One Behind.  Currently, UNDP supports the Government of Georgia at the request of the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development in the analysis of implications of the war in Ukraine and sanctions poverty and vulnerability. UNDP’s support tackles enhancing the existing economic growth forecasting model for accommodating Social Accounting Matrix and Poverty Module to measure the impact. The proposed joint programme will be built on the upcoming results and enhance the econometric model toward measuring the impact of food and energy prices on poverty and vulnerability and the impact on progress towards selected SDG targets.  To respond with policy and programme remedies to address (1) food and nutrition security; and (2) and energy security and poverty of the poorest and most vulnerable people (esp. women), the proposed joint programme will: *assist Government of Georgia in relevant analysis and forecasting, increase capacity and help in designing policy relevant options and risk mitigating actions, such as targeted social protection interventions, acceleration of renewable energy investments, unlocking energy efficiency potential, diversification of trade markets, among others*. To this end, technical assistance will be provided to the Government of Georgia to build capacity in food and energy security policymaking. This entails two major components (1) advancing analytical and forecasting performance, initially trough combination and application of two: National Institute Global Econometric Model (NiGEM) and Food Security Monitoring Systems (FSMS) (of WFP), where the former with include energy security diagnostics to promote green transition and incorporate principles and standards of Gender Equality Maker; and (2) as needed, technical support in design short and medium terms policy solutions for pressing needs of most vulnerable due to food and energy resource crisis. This second component of the programme will stimulate Government of Georgia’s medium-term policy development and/or financing solutions for preventing and mitigating the negative impact beyond the current food and energy crisis.  The overall aim of the programme is strengthening Georgia’s resilience to food and energy crises and protection of the livelihoods of those most vulnerable to the impact of these crises. This will be attained by joint UN support towards the following outcomes: (1) Strengthened systemic capacity of Government of Georgia to conduct and make use of sound data collection and analysis for designing effective food and energy crisis mitigation responses; and (2) Improved access of vulnerable people to the food and sustainable, affordable energy sources. Intended corresponding outputs are: for Outcome 1 - 1.1 Tool developed for analysis and forecasting potential impacts of food and energy crisis on vulnerable groups enabled by ; 1.2 Assessment of the institutional formation and function capacities for utilizing agreed analytical tools; 1.3 Governmental agencies received technical assistance to successfully apply analytical instruments to redesign programmes and ensure progress toward SDGs; 1.4 Enhanced capacity of small business to introduce energy efficiency measures in rural areas. And for Outcome 2 – 2.1 Mitigative interventions developed countering adverse impact of the food and energy crisis. (This could include adjustment of the existing state programme to meet SDG targets and do not necessarily mean design of the new programmes); 2.2 - IT software designed enabling registration of agricultural workers, and economic units enabling access to social protection and formalization of labour relations; 2.3 Social protection scheme (re)designed with recommendations for extension to workers in agriculture.  The programme will contribute to the achievement of:   * SDGs, in particular: SDGs 1 (targets 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.A, 1.B), SDG 2 (targets 2.1, 2.B, 2C), SDG 7 (targets 7.1, 7.2, 7.3. and 7.a), SDG 13 (target 13.2.2) and SDG 10. * UNSDCF Georgia’s (2021-2025), esp.: Outcome 3 - By 2025, all people without discrimination benefit from a sustainable, inclusive and resilient economy in Georgia and Outcome 5 - By 2025, all people, without discrimination, enjoy enhanced resilience through improved environmental governance, climate action and sustainable management and use of natural resources in Georgia.   The proposed joint programme will focus on low-income vulnerable households (esp. with children, single mothers, persons with disabilities, and others) that are in/at the margins and risk of poverty; and will proactively engage partners beyond governmental agencies in design and implementation of the solutions. Such partners will potentially include international financial institutions (WB, ADB, EBRD, EIB), bilateral agencies for development and private sector (e.g., food importers and producers; providers of energy efficiency and renewable energy products and services) and self-governments of 5 major cities (as they have relatively large resources and capacities for social assistance on local governments level). Some of the key risks associated with the proposed programme are: (a) high turnover of government staff and management will decrease effectiveness of capacity development measures. Response: Effective planning and delivery of capacity development measures; (b) reluctance and inability of governmental agencies and other institutions, as well as lack of state funding in design and use of measures for food and energy security. Response: Targeted TA and capacity development measures for replication analysis performance piloted. |
| **Governance and implementation arrangements** | The joint programme will be implemented by UNDP, FAO, ILO and UNECE, with UNDP as the lead agency and under the overall coordination of the UN RC Office. The UNCT has agreed deliberately and consciously to the participation of a relatively large number of entities, owing to the importance of ensuring a truly multi-sectoral response to the impact of war in Ukraine on food, energy and social inclusion systems in Georgia.    The four PUNOs will be fully responsible for their components of the project, but plan and manage their component in close coordination and cooperation with each other and the RCO. The lead agency will also be responsible for the coordination of joint programmatic activities and narrative reporting. All PUNOs will provide inputs to narrative reports, which will be coordinated by the lead agency, and reviewed and approved by the members of the Steering Committee before submission to the Fund through UN RCO.    Strategic guidance for the programme and effective monitoring of its implementation will be provided by the **Programme Steering Committee (PSC)** chaired by the UN RC and comprised of representatives of UNDP, FAO, ILO and UNECE responsible on implementation of the activities envisaged within the programme. The main functions of the PSC are:   * to analyze the programme progress and guide it strategically * to discuss jointly any critical issues or bottlenecks for further project implementation * to propose and discuss relevant actions to be taken to address problems * to endorse programme reports and other key documentation   The PSC meetings will be organized once in a month during project lifetime and/or upon the request of one of its members. Representatives of MoESD and MEPA will be invited to the meetings when needed.    PUNOs will comply with Joint SDG Fund brand guidelines, which includes information on donor visibility requirements. Each PUNO will take appropriate measures to publicize the Joint SDG Fund and give due credit to the other PUNOs.  To ensure joint learning and potential UN joint workplan revisions, updates on key findings and overall progress of the joint programme will be a regular agenda item for UNCT monthly meetings, with UN RCO support. The RC will be responsible for communication and coordination with the Administration of the Government and the international partners to ensure complementarity and synergy of interventions, and to seek additional support to any follow-up measures. |
| **Legal context** | Agency name:  The United Nations Development Programme  Agreement title:  Standard Basic Assistance Agreement [https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/migration/ge/sba-GE.pdf](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.undp.org%2Fsites%2Fg%2Ffiles%2Fzskgke326%2Ffiles%2Fmigration%2Fge%2Fsba-GE.pdf&data=05%7C01%7Cgiorgi.tsimintia%40undp.org%7Cc8409d1f9f2744ff815e08da4933b14e%7Cb3e5db5e2944483799f57488ace54319%7C0%7C0%7C637902783603980448%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=QpRYuh1fTicE2W3ohqhj%2BHipwh2ZCeNVpNeZ6KPyT9g%3D&reserved=0)  Agreement date:  1994  Agency name:  The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Representation to Georgia  Agreement title:  Country Programming Framework for Georgia  Agreement date:  March 2022  Agency name:  United Nations Economic Commission for Europe  Agreement title:  United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (2021-2025)  Agreement date:  October 2020  *Terms of Reference of the Commission serve as a general framework/basis for activities in the countries. Assistance to the Government is made available in accordance with the relevant and applicable resolutions and decisions of UNECE governing structures.*  Agency name:  The International Labour Organization  Agreement title:  United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (2021-2025)  Agreement date: October 2020  *Assistance to the Government is made available in accordance with the relevant and applicable resolutions and decisions of ILO governing structures.* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Workplan** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 1** | | *Strengthened systemic capacity of the Government of Georgia to conduct and make use of sound analysis for designing effective food and energy crisis mitigation responses* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Target/s** | **List of activities** | **Months** | | | | | | **PLANNED BUDGET** | | | | **PUNO/s involved** | **Implementing partner/s involved** |
|  |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | **Overall budget description** | **Joint SDG Fund (USD)** | **PUNO Contributions (USD)** | **Total Cost (USD)** |  |
|  |
| **Output 1.1 – Tool developed for analysis and forecasting potential impacts of food and energy crisis on vulnerable groups** | Adapted analytical tools  Dashboard for food and energy security analysis (with focus on women and vulnerable population) and forecasting  Identification of imminent food security risks | Econometric model for assessment of impact of food and energy prices and other factors on vulnerable population and achieving SDG targets 1 and 2 and capacity development of GoG staff |  |  | X | X | X | X | International and National consultants | 21,100 | 60,350 |  | UNDP | Administration of the Government of Georgia (SDG Council Secretariat)  Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development (MoESD)  Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture (MEPA)  Ministry of Finance (MoF)  Five Major Cities’ Major Offices  GEOSTAT  IFIs  Major food producers and import associations  Renewable energy / energy efficiency service and products suppliers |  |
| Rapid assessment of existing data collection and analysis tools and resources for crop monitoring | X |  |  |  |  |  | National Consultants and field trips | 10,000 | 0 | **146,450** | FAO |  |
| Adapting NiGEM, FSMS and other tools, incl.  elaboration of methodological guidelines for agricultural outlook |  | X |  |  |  |  | National Consultants | 45,000 | UNDP, FAO |  |
| Discussing and agreeing final adapted tools for food and energy security diagnostics. A multi-stakeholder workshop for building consensus on imminent risks, including the identification of critical data for decision making | X |  |  |  |  |  | Two-day workshop, with circa 20 participants from key stakeholder groups, including from the private sector | 10,000 | FAO, UNDP, UNECE |  |
| **Output 1.2 – Assessment of the**  i**nstitutional formation and function capacities for utilizing agreed analytical tools** | Assessment reports (two) of Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture (MEPA) and Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development (MOESD) capacities in relations to food/energy security management | Mobilization and design  Conducting the process; and summarizing and assessing the results |  | X |  |  |  |  | National Consultants | 15,000 | 0 | **15,000** | UNDP |  |
| **Output 1.3 - Governmenta**l **agencies received technical assistance to successfully apply analytical instruments** | Improved coordination between Geostat and MEPA  Improved Institutional Capacities for effective data collection and analysis | Training of MEPA and GEOSTAT Staff in data collection and analysis |  | X | X |  |  |  | Training sessions (collective and individual) for GEOSTSAT, MEPA/RDA staff | 10,000 |  | **26,000** | FAO |  |
| Establishment of an Interagency Coordination Group for analysis and exchange of operative and official data |  |  |  |  |  | X | Develop TOR for the Interagency Coordination Group and approve it by MEPA/GEOSTAT. | 1,000 |  | FAO |  |
| Conducting coaching sessions |  | X | X |  |  |  | Up to 15 coaching/training sessions to government staff engaged in the analytics | 15,000 |  | UNDP, FAO, UNECE |  |
| **Output 1.4 - Enhanced capacity of small business to introduce energy efficiency measures in rural areas** | Improved knowledge of national stakeholders on energy efficient solutions for small businesses in rural areas | Assessment of energy consumption by small business in rural areas of Georgia | X | X | X |  |  |  | National/international consultants | 39,000 |  | **56,000** | UNECE |  |
| Recommendations developed to reduce energy costs and improve energy efficiency by small business in rural areas |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| Case study with targeted assistance for small businesses in a selected rural area to introduce energy efficiency measures |  |  |  |  | X | X | 17,000 |  |
| **Outcome 2** | | *Improved access of vulnerable people to food and sustainable, affordable energy sources* | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| **Output** | **Target/s** | **List of activities** | **Months** | | | | | | **PLANNED BUDGET** | | | | **PUNO/s involved** | **Implementing partner/s involved** |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | **Overall budget description** | **Joint SDG Fund (USD)** | **PUNO Contributions (USD)** | **Total Cost (USD)** |  |
|  |
| **Output 2.1 - Mitigative interventions developed countering adverse impact of the food and energy crisis** | Recommendations for at least 4 state program/interventions developed (new programs/adjustment of existing) | TA for drafting/adjusting program designs |  |  |  |  | X |  | National consultants | 5,000 | 0 | **5,000** | UNDP | Administration of the Government of Georgia  Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development (MoESD)  Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture (MEPA)  The Ministry of Internally Displaced Persons from the Occupied Territories*,*Labour,Health and Social Affairs  Ministry of Finance  Five Major Cities  GEOSTAT  IFIs  Major food producers and import associations  Renewable energy / energy efficiency service and products suppliers  Social partners |  |
| Facilitating finalization of the program designs |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| **Output 2.2 - IT software designed enabling registration of agricultural workers, and economic units enabling access to social protection and formalisation of labour relations** | Software enabling registration of agricultural workers, and economic units | Mapping existing IT data bases to establish their functionality and interoperability | X |  |  |  |  |  | * + a) Contract national and international consultants to conduct mapping;   + b) Design of a mobile app   + c) Facilitate consultative meetings with relevant line ministries, agencies and social partners   + d) Design of public announcement info campaign to agricultural workers and awareness raising meetings | 30,500 | 5,000  (in kind-contribution- staff time and expertise) | **35,500** | ILO |  |
| Developing software that enables registration of informal agricultural workers and economic units |  | X | X | X |  |  |  |
| Developing a telephone app that enables registration of labour relations of informal agricultural workers and inform about their rights and responsibilities |  | X | X |  |  |  |
| Targeted outreach campaign about benefits of formalization and support for registration |  | X | X | X |  |  |
| **Output 2.3 - Social protection scheme (re)designed with recommendations for extension to workers in agriculture** | Assessment report of existing social protection regulatory framework and development of options to extend coverage with social protection schemes | Assessment of existing social protection regulatory framework and development of options to extend coverage with social protection schemes (maternity, sickness, pension) to agricultural workers |  | X | X | X | X |  | National/international consultants for assessment and development of options, including options for financing | 25,000 | 4,000  Form core ILO budget | **29,000** | ILO |  |
|  | | Final Programme Workshop to present results, recommendations and way forward |  |  |  |  |  | X | Workshop with participation of government staff and other relevant stakeholders | 4,500 |  | **4,500** | FAO, UNDP, UNECE, ILO |  |

**Monitoring, accountability, financial management, and public disclosure**

Reporting on the Joint SDG Fund will be results-oriented, and evidence based. **The Convening/Lead Agent will develop a simple final narrative report and submit it to the Joint SDG Fund Secretariat, through the Resident Coordinator no later than two (2) months after the operational closure of the programme activities.**

The Resident Coordinator will be required to monitor the implementation of the joint programme, with the involvement of Joint SDG Fund Secretariat to which it must submit data and information when requested. Additional insights (such as policy papers, value for money analysis, case studies, infographics, blogs) might need to be provided, per request of the Joint SDG Fund Secretariat.

PUNOs will be required to include information on complementary funding received from other sources (both UN cost sharing, and external sources of funding) for the activities supported by the Fund, including in kind contributions and/or South-South Cooperation initiatives, in the reporting.

PUNOs at Headquarters level shall provide the Administrative Agent with the following statements and reports prepared in accordance with its accounting and reporting procedures, consolidate the financial reports, as follows:

* Annual financial reports as of 31st December each year with respect to the funds disbursed to it from the Joint SDG Fund Account, to be provided no later than four months after the end of the applicable reporting period; and
* A final financial report, after the completion of the activities financed by the Joint SDG Fund and including the final year of the activities, to be provided no later than 30 April of the year following the operational closing of the project activities.

The Project will be using a pass-through fund management modality where UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office will act as the Administrative Agent. The programmatic UN entity of the Facility shall assume full programmatic and financial accountability for the funds disbursed to it by the Administrative Agent of the Joint SDG Fund (Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office). Such funds will be administered by each UN Agency, Fund, and Project in accordance with its own regulations, rules, directives and procedures. The entity shall establish a separate ledger account for the receipt and administration of the funds disbursed to it by the Administrative Agent.  Indirect costs of the Participating Organizations recovered through project support costs will be 7%. All other costs incurred by each PUNO in carrying out the activities for which it is responsible under the Fund will be recovered as direct costs. Procedures on financial transfers, extensions, financial and operational closure, and related administrative issues are stipulated in the Operational Guidance of the Joint SDG Fund. PUNOs and partners must comply with Joint SDG Fund brand guidelines, which includes information on donor visibility requirements.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Management**   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Risks** | **Risk Level:** | **Likelihood:** | **Impact:** | **Mitigating measures** | **Responsible Org./Person** | | (Likelihood x Impact, as per instructions) | Certain - 5 | Essential – 5 | |  | Likely - 4 | Major - 4 | |  | Possible - 3 | Moderate - 3 | |  | Unlikely - 2 | Minor - 2 | |  | Rare – 1 | Insignificant - 1 | | **Contextual risks** | | | | | | | Further deepening of food and energy crisis | Very high | P=3 | I=5 | Progressive modification of program objectives and scope as relevant to the context | UNDP, ILO, FAO, UNECE | | Availability of required data for assessment of energy consumption by small business in rural areas | Medium | P=3 | I=3 | Data collection will be ensured in close cooperation with Governmental institutions operating in the agricultural sector as well as data collection from international organizations and other independent sources | UNECE | | Informality in agriculture have a reduced attraction and interest among government and private sector in general, due the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic, making outcomes more difficult to achieve. | High | P=3 | I=4 | Increasing awareness regarding negative effects of informality among government, and target group in agriculture.  Advocacy and technical assistance to Government to prepare the concept of strategy for transition from informal to formal economy | ILO | | Recurrent COVID 19 restrictions on movement could affect normal operation activities | Medium | P=3 | I=3 | To some extent, most activities could be carried out remotely | UNDP, ILO, FAO, UNECE | | **Programmatic and institutional risks** | | | | | | | High turnover of government staff and management will decrease effectiveness of capacity development measures | High | L=3 | I=4 | Effective planning and delivery of capacity development measures | UNDP, ILO, FAO, UNECE | | Availability of national expertise/lack of capacity among implementing agencies will limit project in achievement of outcome targets | Medium | P=3 | I=3 | Strong relationship based on trust, competitive selection and motivation. | UNDP, ILO, FAO, UNECE | | Reluctance and inability of governmental agencies and other institutions, as well as lack of state funding in design and usage of measures for food and energy security. | High | L=3 | I=4 | Targeted TA and capacity development measures for replication analysis performance piloted | UNDP, ILO, FAO, UNECE | |

**Budget per UNSDG Categories**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **UNSDG BUDGET CATEGORIES** | | **UNDP** | | **FAO** | | **UNECE** | | **ILO** |
| Joint SDG Fund (USD) | PUNO Contribution (USD) | Joint SDG Fund (USD) | PUNO Contribution (USD) | Joint SDG Fund (USD) | PUNO Contribution (USD) | Joint SDG Fund (USD) | PUNO Contribution (USD) | |
| 1. Staff and other personnel | | 0 | 60,350 (Source TRAC 3 and donor funded project) | 31,078 |  | 22,000 |  |  | 9,000 | |
| 2. Supplies, Commodities, Materials | | 0 | 744 | 0 | 11,000 |
| 3. Equipment, Vehicles, and Furniture (including Depreciation) | | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 4. Contractual services | | 65,100 |  | 31,000 | 41,500 |
| 5.Travel | | 0 | 2,170 | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| 6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts | | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 7. General Operating and other Direct Costs | | 0 | 23,549 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total Direct Costs** | | **65,100** | **57,541** | **56,000** | **55,500** |
| 8. Indirect Support Costs (Max. 7%) | | *4,020* | *4,028* | *3,920* | *3,885* |
| **TOTAL Costs** | | **69,120** | **60,350** | **61,569** | **0** | **59,920** | **0** | **59,385** | **9,000** | |
| **Signature of Joint Programme document and Fund Transfer Request as per UNSDG budget categories.**  I hereby confirm that the funds requested are in accordance with the approved Work Plan & Joint Programme Document. \* I also certify that the copy transmitted to the MPTF Office is a true copy of the original which is secured by the RC Office. I have received documentation from Participating Organizations demonstrating Commited amounts where applicable. I also confirm that the PUNOs' indirect cost does not exceed 7%. | | | | | | | | |
| **RESIDENT COORDINATOR**  **SIGNATURE** | **Name:**Sabine Machl  8 June 2022 **Text, whiteboard  Description automatically generated** | | | | |  |  |  |  |
| **FAO Representative**  **SIGNATURE** | **Name, Title:** Raimund Jehle, FAO Representative in Georgia  8 June 2022 | | | | |  |  |  |  |
| **UNECE Representative**  **SIGNATURE** | **Name, Title:** Alan Esser, Officer-in-Charge, Executive Office, Programme Management & Support Services Division (PMSSD), United Nations Economic Commission for Europe  8 June 2022 | | | | |  |  |  |  |
| **UNDP Representative**  **SIGNATURE** | **Name, Title:** Nick Beresford, Resident Representative in Georgia  8 June 2022 | | | | |  |  |  |  |
| **ILO Representative**  **SIGNATURE** | **Name, Title:** Olga Koulaeva, Director, ILO Decent Work Technical Support Team and Country Office for Eastern Europe and Central Asia  8 June 2022 | | | | |  |  |  |  |