



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2021 – Revised Template



Period covered: 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Latin America and the Caribbean																				
Country (ies):	Colombia																				
Project Title:	Contributing to the Integrated Management of Biodiversity of the Pacific Region of Colombia to Build Peace																				
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP /COL/061/GFF																				
GEF ID:	9441																				
GEF Focal Area(s):	Land Degradation, Biodiversity and Sustainable Forest Management																				
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development National Natural Parks Pacific SIRAP (Institute of Environmental Research of the Pacific – IIAP ¹ , Institute of Marine and Coastal Research José Benito Vives de Andreis - INVEMAR ² , Regional Autonomous Corporation – CARS ³)																				
Project Duration:	Sixty (60) months																				
Project coordinates: (Ctrl+Click here)	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 30%;">Mosaic</th> <th colspan="2">Location Coordinates</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Katíos – Caoba</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7°35'57.12"N</td> <td style="text-align: center;">77°10'50.69"W</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Serranía de los Paraguas – Tatamá</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5° 3'41.96"N</td> <td style="text-align: center;">76°10'59.26"W</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Farallones – Calima</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3°45'53.55"N</td> <td style="text-align: center;">76°46'6.72"W</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Munchique – Río Saija</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2°42'29.59"N</td> <td style="text-align: center;">77°18'9.46"W</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cabo Manglares – Gran Familia Awá</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1°17'24.25"N</td> <td style="text-align: center;">78°32'15.40"W</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Mosaic	Location Coordinates		Katíos – Caoba	7°35'57.12"N	77°10'50.69"W	Serranía de los Paraguas – Tatamá	5° 3'41.96"N	76°10'59.26"W	Farallones – Calima	3°45'53.55"N	76°46'6.72"W	Munchique – Río Saija	2°42'29.59"N	77°18'9.46"W	Cabo Manglares – Gran Familia Awá	1°17'24.25"N	78°32'15.40"W
Mosaic	Location Coordinates																				
Katíos – Caoba	7°35'57.12"N	77°10'50.69"W																			
Serranía de los Paraguas – Tatamá	5° 3'41.96"N	76°10'59.26"W																			
Farallones – Calima	3°45'53.55"N	76°46'6.72"W																			
Munchique – Río Saija	2°42'29.59"N	77°18'9.46"W																			
Cabo Manglares – Gran Familia Awá	1°17'24.25"N	78°32'15.40"W																			

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	April 12, 2019
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD:	November 30, 2019

¹ Acronym in Spanish.

² Acronym in Spanish.

³ Acronym in Spanish.

Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE⁴:	November 30, 2024
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable)⁵	N/A
Actual Implementation End Date⁶:	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	7,562,558
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁷:	31,394,186
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2021 (USD m):	436,015
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2021⁸	1,539,257.8

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	February 23, 2021
Expected Mid-term Review date⁹:	July – December, 2022
Actual Mid-term review date:	
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022)¹⁰:	No
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date:	March – November, 2024
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022):	No

⁴ As per FPMIS

⁵ In case of a project extension.

⁶ Actual date at which project implementation ends - only for projects that have ended.

⁷ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

⁸ Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

⁹ The MTR should take place about halfpoint between EOD and NTE – this is the expected date

¹⁰ Please note that the FAO GEF Coordination Unit should be contacted six months prior to the expected MTR date

Tracking tools/ Core indicators required¹¹	Yes
--	-----

Ratings

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

Status

Implementation Status <i>(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):</i>	1 st PIR
--	---------------------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Óscar Antonio Álzate Arbeláez Project Coordinator (FAOCO)	oscar.alzatearbelaez@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Marcos Rodríguez Fazzone Lead Technical Officer (FLCOL)	marcos.rodriguezfazzone@fao.org
Budget Holder	Alan Jorge Bojanic Helbingen Representative FAO Colombia (FAOCO)	alanjorge.bojanic@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Lorenzo Arturo Campos Aguirre FAO GEF Unit RLC	lorenzo.camposaguirre@fao.org

¹¹ Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also, projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

2. Progress Towards Achieving Project Objectives and Outcome (DO)

(All inputs in this section should be cumulative from project start, not annual)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ¹²	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹³	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ¹⁴
Objective(s): To mainstream the sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity and the provision of ecosystem services that support human welfare and vulnerable landscapes of the Colombia's Pacific region in view of generating global and local environmental benefits and supporting the peace process						
Outcome 1.1 The territorial and environmental management planning instruments are harmonized with the instruments developed by the black communities and indigenous peoples to safeguard biological, cultural,	a) Project targeted area (hectares – ha) for reducing current and potential pressures from competing land uses and forest degrading land-uses.	0	N/A	a) 44,084,957 ha (marine area: 34,762,783 ha; continental area: 9,322,174 ha) corresponding to the SIRAP Pacific management area (indirect target landscape) of which at least 1,061,655 ha (direct total area).		S

¹² This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

¹³ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

¹⁴ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory** (HS), **Satisfactory** (S), **Marginally Satisfactory** (MS), **Marginally Unsatisfactory** (MU), **Unsatisfactory** (U), and **Highly Unsatisfactory** (HU).

<p>and ecosystem services diversity, leading to a general reduction in potential threats from development-oriented activities</p>	<p>b) Hectares of strategic importance for biodiversity conservation outside PAs that apply guidelines and are managed to be included in the planning instruments under improved management.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>b) 210,193 hectares of strategic importance for biodiversity conservation outside PAs</p>	<p>Progress 3%</p> <p>2.606,447.44 hectares have been characterized and mapped, corresponding to the 5 prioritized MUCBs (Biodiversity Use and Conservation Mosaic - Acronym in Spanish). In addition, progress has been made in the modeling of its connectivity priorities as well as in the identification and coordination of actions with key actors.</p> <p>Furthermore, 860,400.19 hectares have been pre-identified as focused operating windows for the project's intervention, within the project Mosaics.</p> <p>A diagnosis of the plans and instruments in the 3 prioritized Mosaics was made. It is important to consider that the project is at an early stage of implementation.</p>	
---	--	----------	------------	--	--	--

Outcome 1.2 Improved stakeholders' capacity and participation to support the enforcement of harmonized planning and environmental management in the MUCBs	Increase of the SIRAP Pacific's management capacities measured through the GEF Development Capacity Scorecard	Capacity in SIRAP Pacific: - Regional Technical Roundtable: 29%	Capacity in SIRAP Pacific: - Regional Technical Roundtable: 34%	Capacity in SIRAP Pacific: - Regional Technical Roundtable: 44%	Progress 3% The SIRAP Pacific's management capacities were strengthened with the recruitment, induction and start-up of a Technical Secretariat for the Subsystem. In addition, the Pacifico Biocultural Project ¹⁵ has supported the SIRAP Pacific's Regional Technical Roundtable, looking to promote its stakeholders' participation.	S
Outcome 2.1 Reduction of pressures and threats to biodiversity and ecosystem services in 581,859 ha of existing PAs and their buffer zone	Management effectiveness of PAs measured by the METT	Katíos NNP: 66 Farallones NNP: 67 Tatamá NNP: 68 Munchique NNP: 68 Cabo Manglares Bajo Mira and Frontera IMND: 40 Río Bravo RFPR: 40	Katíos NNP: 71 Farallones NNP: 72 Tatamá NNP: 73 Munchique NNP: 73 Cabo Manglares Bajo Mira and Frontera IMND: 43 Río Bravo RFPR: 45	Katíos NNP: 76 Farallones NNP: 77 Tatamá NNP: 78 Munchique NNP: 78 Cabo Manglares Bajo Mira and Frontera IMND: 48 Río Bravo RFPR: 50	Progress 1% PAs management plans and the results of the AEMAPPS tool (applied in 2021 by the PNN) were reviewed and analyzed, as an input for decision-making to define the actions to be carried out, according to the baseline results of the Tracking Tools, in order to increase the management effectiveness of PAs	MS

¹⁵ A voting process was conducted among the members of the Steering Committee to choose a strategic name for the project. The results showed that 40% of the votes were for the proposal "*Pacifico Biocultural: tradición y vida*". The idea is: first, to incorporate and appropriate this name within the partners and stakeholders; after that, it should be positioned during the implementation of the project among the different external actors, allies, participants and the general public.

Outcome 2.2 New PAs and CCSs receive support for management planning and implementation	Area (ha) of new PAs under declaration process (three public PAs).	0	3,356 ha	258,603 ha ¹⁶	Progress 19,9% 51,433 ha of new PAs declared, corresponding to: - 11,641 ha from Calle Santa Rosa - 39,792 ha from Serranía de los Paraguas	S
	Area (ha) sustainably managed through the communal CCS	0	62,268 ha	210,193 ha ¹⁷	Progress 1% A review and analysis of secondary information related to previous communal CCS mapping developed by SIRAP Pacific was conducted.	MS

¹⁶ These data correspond to the addition of hectares covered by the new areas identified for MUCBs, consisting of Relictos de Caoba Juradó (63,686 ha) for Katíos – Caoba MUCB, Serranía de los Paraguas (191,561 ha) in Serranía Paraguas – Tatamá MUCB; and Calle Santa Rosa (3,356 ha) in the Munchique – Río Saija MUCB.

¹⁷ The area of 210,193 ha refers to conservation priorities (whose use is proposed for protection and restoration for conservation) located in at least one Community Council (CC) and one Indigenous Reserve (IR) in each MUCB as follows: a) Katíos-Caoba MUCB: Cacarica River CC (41,405 ha), Salaquí River CC (14,421 ha), and Salaquí and Pavarandó IR (30,580 ha); b) Farallones-Calima MUCB: middle, lower, and coastal zone of San Juan "ACADESÁN" CC (20,276 ha), Cuenca Baja of Calima River CC (5,117 ha), and Yu Yic Kwe IR (1,467 ha); c) Cabo Manglares-Gran Familia Awá MUCB: Bajo Mira and Frontera CC (32,867 ha), El Gran Sabalo IR (8,001 ha), and La Turbia IR (16,206 ha); d) Munchique-Saija River MUCB, El Playón of Siguí River CC (17,043 ha), Lower Saija River CC (4,745 ha), and Calle Santa Rosa Saija River IR (3,356 ha); e) Tatamá-Serranía de Paraguas MUCB: middle, lower, and coastal zone of San Juan "ACADESÁN" CC (2,314 ha), and Unificado Chamí of San Juan River IR (1,395 ha).

Outcome 3.1 Biodiversity and ecosystem services are sustainably utilized in forest-based productive systems and generate multiple environmental and socio-economic benefits	Area (ha) under sustainable production systems	0	At least 3,500 ha	10,000 ha	Progress 1% To date, focused operating windows for the project's intervention have been pre-identified for each of the 5 Mosaics. Methodology, tools and mechanisms are available to begin in August 2021, it is planned to reach out communities to characterize and prioritize the areas of direct intervention of the Pacifico Biocultural Project	MS
	Proportion of SFM initiatives and production systems led by women.	0	10%	40%	Progress N/A Progress will be measured once the beneficiary population is characterized	S
Outcome 3.2 Products and services derived from biodiversity have value added and their value chains duly strengthened	Annual average income of beneficiary communities, maintained or increased	Average of USD \$1,240 per year per family (COP \$3,600,000 per year per family)	Average of USD \$1,302 per year per family (5% increase)	At least an average of USD \$1,364 per year per family (at least 10% increase)	Progress N/A Progress will be measured once the beneficiary population is characterized	S

<p>Outcome 4.1 Project monitored and evaluated with a results-based management approach, and communication of lessons learned</p>	<p>Progress made in project implementation</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>35-50%</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>Progress 7,8%</p> <p>The Pacífico Biocultural project has: organized 1 Steering Committee; carried out different Technical Committees; and prepared 2 Project Progress Reports (PPR).</p> <p>It is important to consider that the project is still at an early stage of implementation, but the Annual Work Plan and Budget adopted by the end of March 2021 leads us towards the achievement of the objectives, outcomes and outputs of the project.</p> <p>The major challenges and external factor for delays the project has experienced during its inception phase were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Covid-19 pandemic, that has definitely been the main reason for delays on the activities and progress in the implementation of the Pacífico Biocultural project. • The national strike and blockades that have occurred in 	<p>S</p>
--	--	-----------	---------------	-------------	--	----------

					<p>Colombia since April 28, 2021 have affected the mobility and supply of the whole country and thus, have slowed the progress of the Project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The defining process of members for the conformation of the Project Steering Committee and its delegates that was not clear for all the institutional stakeholders. It was necessary to design an autonomous election process for ethnic delegates. <p>Despite the above, the project is currently fully operative.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 2.1 Reduction of pressures and threats to biodiversity and ecosystem services in 581,859 ha of existing PAs and their buffer zone	1. Carry out workshops to identify and prioritize the investment needs to increase the variables for which the selected PAs have low values, according to the goals established in the GEF's PA Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT)	NPC, LTO, BH, Nacional Director (ND), Project Coordinator (PC), MUCB Technical Supervisor	From July 2021 to December 2021
	2. Formulate the investment plan for the selected PAs, based on the inputs from the prioritization of investments and consensus meetings	NPC, LTO, BH, ND, PC, MUCB Technical Supervisor	From July 2021 to December 2021
	3. Support the processes of socialization, consultation and coordination of the Management Plan with the communities	NPC, LTO, BH, ND, PC, MUCB Technical Supervisor, Professional in PAs (PPAs), MUCB Local Professionals	From August 2021 onwards
	4. Implement the investment plan for the selected PAs, according to the inputs of the assessment to identify needs to strengthen their governance mechanisms	NPC, LTO, BH, ND, PC, MUCB Technical Supervisor, Administrative Professional, Financial Professional, PPAs	From November 2021 onwards
Outcome 2.2 New PAs and CCSs receive support for management planning and implementation Outcome 2.2. – Progress has been delayed in the indicator “Area (ha) sustainably managed through the communal CCS”.	1. Identify CCSs in the Pacific region	NPC, LTO, BH, ND, PC, Professional in instruments for strategic planning and assessment of ecosystem services (PISP&AES), PPAs	In July of 2021
	2. Carry out workshops with indigenous, Black, and rural communities to validate the identification of CCSs in the Pacific region	NPC, LTO, BH, ND, PC, PISP&AES, PPAs	From September 2021 to December 2021
	3. Carry out meetings with the SIRAP Pacific to validate the identification of CCSs in the Pacific region	NPC, LTO, BH, ND, PC, PISP&AES, PPAs	From September 2021 to June 2022
	4. Prioritize, and select the CCSs that will receive the project support within the Katíos–Caoba, Farallones–Calima, and Cabo Manglares–Gran Familia Awá MUCBs	NPC, LTO, BH, ND, PC, PISP&AES, PPAs	From December 2021 to June 2022
Outcome 3.1 Biodiversity and ecosystem services are	1. Perform Socio-Ecosystem Connectivity analysis to identify the sites with higher connectivity potential in each MUCB	NPC, LTO, BH, ND, PC, Professional in Geographic Information Systems – GIS (PGIS)	From June 2021 to October 2021

sustainably utilized in forest-based productive systems and generate multiple environmental and socio-economic benefits	2. Set up the MUCB Technical Committees	NPC, LTO, BH, ND, PC, Professional in participation, ethnicity and gender (PPEG), PGIS, Professional in Sustainable Forest Management (PSFM), Professional in Sustainable Production and Soil Management Systems (PSP&MS), MUCB Local Professionals, Green Business Professional (GBP)	From September 2021 to December 2021
	3. Select communities and sites to implement the SFM initiatives and sustainable production systems	NPC, LTO, BH, ND, PC, PPEG, PGIS, PSFM, PSP&MS, MUCB Local Professionals, GBP	From December 2021 to June 2022

3. Progress in Generating Project Outputs (Implementation Progress, IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as planned in the Annual Work Plan)

Outputs ¹⁸	Expected completion date ¹⁹	Achievements at each PIR ²⁰					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments Describe any variance ²¹ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Component 1: Institutional strengthening to support pro-conservation and sustainable use in the Pacific region of Colombia								
<u>Output 1.1.1:</u> A Diagnosis and Strategic Assessment of the ecosystem services in the Pacific Region.	Q3 Y2	The Diagnosis and Strategic Assessment is in its recruitment phase. A conceptual and technical framework for its development was defined with the project stakeholders. Progress on output indicator Number of analyses and strategic assessments of ecosystem services for four MUCBs: 0.					Progress 5%	
<u>Output 1.1.2:</u> Agreed guidelines on harmonization of departmental/ municipal territorial plans and Indigenous Peoples'/black communities' instruments ²² , with a gender approach.	Q2 Y5	A diagnosis of the plans and instruments in the 3 prioritized Mosaics was made and were classified by type. In the Katíos–Caoba MUCB, 22 instruments were identified; in the Farallones–Calima MUCB, 103 instruments were identified; and in the Cabo Manglares–Gran Familia Awá MUCB, 50 instruments were identified Progress on output indicator 1 # of guidelines: One (1) guidelines document under development. Progress on output indicator 2 # of planning instruments included: Zero (0). Progress on output indicator 3 # of pilot areas: Zero (0).					Progress 3%	

		Progress on output indicator 4 Degree of gender mainstreaming: Zero (0).						
Output 1.1.3: A tailor-made and open-access SIAT_PC (integrated with the Environmental Information System of Colombia - SIAC) - strengthened to harmonize the existing planning mechanisms in the Pacific Region.	Q2 Y4	A matrix of criteria for the selection of the 2 SIAT-PC secondary nodes to be strengthened was developed, in coordination with the IIAP and project stakeholders. Progress on output indicator SIAT-PC strengthened: SIAT-PC under strengthening process.					Progress 5%	
Output 1.1.4: Forest zoning and management plans (POFs) outside the PAs	Q2 Y5	The Saija River POF (Munchique – Río Saija MUCB) was reviewed; the concertation of actions with CRC has been initiated to define possible actions for its implementation.					Progress 2%	Challenge: to consolidate synergies with the CARs (Corponariño and CRC) to define the scope of the support to be provided by the Pacífico Biocultural Project.

¹⁸ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

¹⁹ As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

²⁰ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

²¹ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

²² The aim of output 1.1.2 is to safeguard ecosystem services, cultural and biological diversity

developed, updated, and implemented in a participatory way, promotes socio-ecosystem connectivity at the MUCB level.		<p>The project has begun the concertation of actions with Corponariño for the formulation of the POF for a basin of the Cabo Manglares –Gran Familia Awá MUCB.</p> <p>Progress on output indicator 1 Number of POFs for 65,000 ha²³ following MADS guidelines: Zero (0).</p> <p>Progress on output indicator 2 Area (ha) with forest management plans and with support for their implementation: Zero (0).</p>						
<u>Output 1.2.1:</u> Six (6) SIRAP Pacific participation and decision-making structures, strengthened and with enhanced capacities to apply	Q3 Y5	<p>A matrix of criteria for the selection of the institutional SIRAP Pacific participation and decision-making structures was developed.</p> <p>A document was prepared with the construction background of the SIRAP Pacific participation strategy, which has the agreement of its governance structure.</p> <p>Progress on output indicator Number of existing²⁴ participatory and decision-making structures within the</p>					Progress 3%	

²³ Area corresponding to a basin selected in the CORPONARIÑO zoning plan, it refers to the Mira River basin (65.000 ha).

²⁴ Priority participatory structures will be supported within the framework of the SIRAP Pacific operational structure; this structure has platforms that correspond to 4 levels: regional, departmental, sub-regional, and local. One (1) SIRAP Pacific Regional Roundtable (General Assembly and Technical Committee); five (5) Roundtables of Departmental PA Systems (SIDAP): Risaralda, Nariño, Cauca, Valle del Cauca, and Chocó; two (2) SIDAP Nariño Sub-regional Roundtables: Pacific and Coastal Foothills; one (1) SIDAP Cauca Sub-regional Roundtable: Pacific Roundtable; two (2) SIDAP Valle del Cauca Local Roundtables: East Pacific and West Pacific; five (5) SIDAP Chocó Sub-regional Roundtables: Pacific Coast, Atrato, Baudó, San Juan, and Darién; six (6) Local PAs Systems–SILAP of SIDAP Chocó: San José del Palmar, Acandí, Unguía, Carmen de Atrato, Nuquí, Tadó; Local conservation actions of bio-cultural diversity of Pacific region per department; one (1)

harmonized guidelines (see output 1.1.2).		framework of the SIRAP Pacific strengthened through the project: Zero (0).						
<u>Output 1.2.2:</u> Five (5) local community participatory structures, strengthened and with enhanced capacities to comply with harmonized guidelines (see 1.1.2)	Q2 Y5	A preliminary prioritization of local stakeholders was made, with which the local community participatory structures in the Mosaics could be strengthened. Progress on output indicator Number of local participatory structures ²⁵ strengthened for ensuring compliance with guidelines, using a gender-based approach: Zero (0).					Progress 1%	
Component 2: Integrated management of PAs, buffer zones and CCS								
<u>Output 2.1.1:</u> Management plans and governance mechanisms developed and/or adopted include support for the implementation of priority actions in the selected areas.	Q2 Y5	The requirements of 5 out of the 6 PAs selected were identified and investment plan for each one was developed to support the updating and/or implementation of the management plans of the PAs. Progress on output indicator 1 Number of hectares (ha) under management plans developed and/or adopted with support for the implementation of priority actions: Zero (0). Progress on output indicator 2					Progress 2%	

Thematic Sub-system of protected marine areas: SAMP (articulated to the SIRAP Pacific and SIRAP Caribbean). In total, there are 71 delegates within these platforms (Vásquez, 2015).

²⁵ One prioritized platform will be supported in each MUCB. Around 140 local participation platforms are estimated among indigenous cabildos' assemblies, communal councils' assemblies and regional associations' assemblies, in addition to local participation platforms of civil society organizations.

		Number of governance mechanisms ²⁶ under implementation as a result of the project: Zero (0).						
<u>Output 2.1.2:</u> One financial sustainability strategy designed and implemented for ensuring participation within the SIRAP Pacific framework	Q4 Y5	<p>A preliminary version of the financial sustainability strategy was designed by the SIRAP Pacific Technical Committee.</p> <p>Other financial sustainability strategies for similar sub-systems and/or part of the SIRAP Pacific, such as SAMP, SIDAP Valle del Cauca and SIRAP Eje Cafetero were reviewed.</p> <p>Progress on output indicator 1 Financial strategy for the SIRAP Pacific action plan: Financial strategy for the SIRAP Pacific under design.</p> <p>Progress on output indicator 2 Level of participation of members of the SIRAP Pacific with resources from the project and as a result of implementing part of the SIRAP financial sustainability strategy: - General assembly: 0% - Regional Technical Committee: 70% - Regional Technical Roundtable: 68%.</p>					Progress 3%	
<u>Output 2.1.3:</u> Forest restoration and soil recovery plans for PAs, buffer zones, connectivity areas, and corridors are developed and	Q4 Y5	<p>No progress to date on this output, which is programmed to be achieved by the last year of the project.</p> <p>Progress on output indicator 1 Carbon captured (tCO₂-eq) through soil ecological restoration and recovery as a result of the project: 0 tCO₂-eq.</p> <p>Progress on output indicator 2</p>					Progress 0%	

²⁶ For example: The local roundtable of use, occupancy, and ownership of the Munchique NNP, the co-management roundtable that will be created within the management process framework of the new Cabo Manglares IMND, the technical committees of the CVC PAs, among other spaces existing in the framework of PNN use and management agreements.

implementation is kick-started in a participatory manner.		Area (ha) restored with the project's support: Zero (0)						
Output 2.2.1: Planning and management instruments developed, with priority actions implemented in CCSs, by the forest-dependent communities.	Q2 Y5	A preliminary diagnosis of CCSs strategies was made in each MUCB, based on information provided by the SIRAP Pacífico. Progress on output indicator Number of planning and management instruments with early implementation actions in CCSs as a result of the project: Zero (0)					Progress 5%	
Output 2.2.2: One Technical guidelines as support for the regulatory process to formalize the CCSs in the Pacific region considering ethnic/cultural aspects and in line with the national process.	Q2 Y5	No progress to date on this output, which is programmed to be achieved by the last year of the project. Progress on output indicator Document with technical guidelines as support for regulations to formalize the CCSs in the Pacific region: Zero (0).					Progress 0%	
Output 2.2.3: Priority areas for conservation are assessed and steps towards their declaration as formal PAs are taken.	Q2 Y5	2 declaration as formal PAs processes have been carried out, from the PAs identified in the project design. From the Project Implementation Start Date, the dialogue with the CARs made it possible to ensure that they could make progress towards their declaration as formal PAs and the project pledged to					Progress 66,7% 2 new PAs were declared, corresponding to: - Calle Santa Rosa - Serranía de los Paraguas	

		<p>support the implementation of the management plans of these PAs.</p> <p>Progress on output indicator Number of new PAs progressing towards their declaration as a result of the project: Two (2), corresponding to Serranía de los Paraguas, and Calle Santa Rosa.</p>						
Component 3: Sustainable production practices as alternatives for local development, biodiversity protection and peace process support								
<p><u>Output 3.1.1:</u> Green Business action plan(s) harmonized and under implementation for fostering and developing diversified production systems are agreed upon and modalities adapted to local conditions, for supporting food security, sustainable livelihoods, landscape-level connectivity and forest rehabilitation</p>	Q4 Y4	<p>A call to identify green business in the Mosaics was prepared and approved, pending public launch, which was delayed by the disruption of public order in the country and the Covid-19 pandemic.</p> <p>164 green business initiatives identified in database.</p> <p>Arrangements were made with the CARs (CRC and Corponariño) for the Green Business departmental plans.</p> <p>Progress on output indicator 1 Number of green business plans that safeguard cultural, biological, and ecosystem services' diversity: Zero (0).</p> <p>Progress on output indicator 2 Number of green business initiatives with priority actions supported (in the MUCBs): Zero (0).</p>					Progress 5%	
<p><u>Output 3.1.2:</u> SFM initiatives and sustainable production systems implemented incorporating good soil and biodiversity-</p>	Q4 Y5	<p>No progress to date on this output, which is programmed to be achieved by the last year of the project.</p> <p>Progress on output indicator Number of plans for SFM initiatives and sustainable production systems as a result of the project: Zero (0)</p>					Progress 0%	

friendly practices, with gender approach								
<u>Output 3.2.1</u> Value addition units of biodiversity-derived products created and strengthened, with technical and management training that safeguard cultural, biological, and ecosystem services' diversity.	Q4 Y5	<p>A document with agreed criteria for prioritizing value addition units was prepared.</p> <p>A call to identify green business in the Mosaics was prepared and approved, pending public launch, which was delayed by the disruption of public order in the country and the Covid-19 pandemic.</p> <p>164 Productive initiatives identified in database.</p> <p>A document of lessons learned from the implementation of productive projects was developed.</p> <p>Progress on output indicator Number of value addition units strengthened and created for biodiversity-derived products with technical and management capacity as a result of the project: Five (5) value addition units being selected</p>					Progress 10%	
<u>Output 3.2.2:</u> Biodiversity-derived products with market access and/or enhance compliance with quality requirements, MADS green business criteria, and other	Q4 Y5	<p>3 value chains (oils and fats, dyes and food) with general characterization.</p> <p>27 types of products for identified species of interest.</p> <p>29 processors identified for market surveys.</p> <p>Progress on output indicator Number of biodiversity-derived products with formal market access and complying with quality requirements, green business</p>					Progress 10%	

standards for market access.		criteria of MADS and other standards for markets access: Zero (0)						
<u>Output 3.2.3:</u> Community-based nature tourism initiatives strengthened with government and non-government support that safeguard cultural, biological, and ecosystem services' diversity.	Q4 Y4	1 document with agreed criteria for selection was prepared. 4 community-based nature tourism initiatives were selected to be strengthened. FAO is reviewing the possibility to support some of these initiatives through its Digital Villages Project. Progress on output indicator Number of community-based nature tourism initiatives strengthened that safeguard cultural, biological, and ecosystem services' diversity: Four (4) selected					Progress 13%	
Component 4: Knowledge management and project M&E								
<u>Output 4.1.1.</u> Five participatory action plans for the prioritized MUCBs.	Q4 Y4	A methodology for the development of the participatory action plans for the prioritized MUCBs was designed. Progress on output indicator 1 Number of action plans: Zero (0) Progress on output indicator 2 Number of participation agreements at the MUCB level for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity: Zero (0)					Progress 5%	
<u>Output 4.1.2</u> An online M&E platform	Q4 Y5	The project has prepared a M&E plan with the project's protocols. Periodic monitoring has been carried out and 2 PPR have been presented. An online M&E platform proposal was designed, based on the "Power BI" tool. Progress on output indicator					Progress 15%	

		Online monitoring platform: One (1) online monitoring platform being designed						
<u>Output 4.1.3:</u> One communication strategy for development implemented	Q4 Y5	The Project Implementation Unit has designed a communication strategy for development, which was socialized and validated by the institutional stakeholders. Progress on output indicator Communication strategy: One (1) communication strategy designed and in early stages of implementation					Progress 10%	
<u>Output 4.1.4:</u> One Mid-term Review (MTR) and one Terminal Evaluation (TE)	Q4 Y5	The Mid-term Review (MTR) will be conducted on July – December, 2022. Progress on output indicator One Mid-term Review and one Terminal Evaluation: N/A					Progress N/A	

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

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

- 2 declaration as formal PAs processes have been carried out, from the PAs identified in the project design corresponding to:
 - 11,641 ha from Calle Santa Rosa
 - 39,792 ha from Serranía de los Paraguas.
- 80% of the Project Implementation Unit's staff was recruited and is working towards the achievement of the objectives, results and outputs of the project.
- Administrative, financial and operational matters:
 - The approval of the first Annual Work Plan and Budget by the Project Steering Committee was achieved by the end of March 2021.
 - Operational Project Manual validated and approved by institutional stakeholders.
 - Technical committee operating.
- A communication strategy for development was designed by the Project Implementation Unit, socialized and validated by the institutional stakeholders.
- A M&E plan was prepared by the Project Implementation Unit, with the project's protocols.
- The study is in its recruitment phase. A conceptual and technical framework for its development was defined with the project stakeholders.
- A call to identify green business in the Mosaics was prepared and approved. Is ready to be launched.
- The SIRAP Pacific's management capacities were strengthened with the recruitment, induction and start-up of a Technical Secretariat for the Subsystem. In addition, the Pacífico Biocultural Project has supported the SIRAP Pacific's Regional Technical Roundtable, looking to promote its stakeholders' participation.
- The project is working in the identification of new stakeholders in the 5 MUCBs of the Pacífico Biocultural; consultation processes with institutional stakeholders and cooperation in the field is under way.
- PAs management plans and the results of the AEMAPPS tool (applied in 2021 by the PNN) were reviewed and analyzed, as an input for decision-making to define the actions to be carried out, according to the baseline results of the Tracking Tools, in order to increase the management effectiveness of PAs.

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?

- Maintain field work actions, articulation with institutional stakeholders and strategic actors, within the framework of the national public health contingency due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Right now, the Project Implementation Unit is taking actions to make up or recover times and delays.
- The defining process of members for the conformation of the Project Steering Committee and its delegates was not clear for all the institutional stakeholders. It was necessary to design an autonomous election process for ethnic delegates.
- The national strike and blockades that have occurred in Colombia since April 28, 2021 have affected the mobility and supply of the whole country and thus, have slowed the progress of the Project.
- Modernize communications with local communities, adapting traditional forms to virtuality.
- The Project Implementation Unit had to be trained in biosafety protocols for field missions.
- Strengthen and improve recruitment mechanisms with local-based organizations, allowing for greater administrative and financial efficiency, as well as improving the administrative capacity of local organizations.
- It is important to mention that the portion of the project that was designed to be implemented by UNIDO, will be transferred to FAO by request of the OFP and in concurrence with the GEF. In this regard, the full project will be implemented by FAO.

Development Objective (DO) Ratings, Implementation Progress (IP) Ratings and Overall Assessment

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence and progress reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR.

	FY2021 Development Objective rating²⁷	FY2021 Implementation Progress rating²⁸	Comments/reasons²⁹ justifying the ratings for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	<i>Project Implementation Unit is executing an action plan to catch up, in particular: preparing intervention methodologies and designing tools to be able to deliver the project objective, results and outputs on time, as foreseen in the work plan in the Project Preparation Grant (PPG) phase. In this regard, it is important to consider that the Covid-19 pandemic has required adaptations, especially having to do telework and not been able to properly initiate the implementation of fieldwork. The Project Implementation Unit has been conducting trainings to be prepared in the incorporation of biosafety protocols when required for field missions</i>
Budget Holder	S	S	<i>Despite de COVID-19 pandemic, the Pacífico Biocultural project has continued its implementation with some delays on the activities, in which the Unit is already working on to catch up. I would also like to point out that to date, 80% of the Project Implementation Unit's staff was recruited and is working towards the achievement of the objectives, results and outputs of the project.</i>

²⁷ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

²⁸ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

²⁹ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

<p>GEF Operational Focal Point</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>S</p>	<p><i>The Operational Focal Point considers that the project implementation preparations are up to date especially considering the special conditions due to the COVID-19 pandemic.</i> <i>The project implementation unit has had a very close relationship to the OFP which is greatly appreciated.</i> <i>The transfer of resources and responsibilities to FAO are key to the development of the project and this issue must be a top priority in order to accomplish the outcomes agreed in the projects document.</i></p>
<p>Lead Technical Officer³⁰</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>S</p>	<p><i>It is important to consider that the project is at an early stage of implementation, and that it has had to deal with different challenges encountered since its EOD, such as the Covid-19 pandemic, changes in the Project Coordinator and not having an Annual Work Plan and Budget approved by the Project Steering Committee just in March.</i></p>
<p>FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>S</p>	<p><i>The project had to go through a challenging initial implementation period due to the social unrest and outbreak in the country, and the posterior Covid19 pandemic, which has caused restrictions and presented difficulties in coordination with the institutions and local stakeholders. Nonetheless, the project has successfully established a government structure and has recruited most of the project staff, is advancing the articulation with relevant stakeholders and has also supported the identification of areas of work and even the creation of new protected areas, contributing already to the achievement of global environmental benefits that can be reported in this first PIR.</i></p>

³⁰ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

This section of the PIR describes the progress made towards complying with the approved ESS plan, when appropriate. In case the project did not have that plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate if the initial ESS classification is still valid; if not, what is the new classification and explain. Please add recommendations to improve the implementation of the ESS plan, when needed

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
<p>The project will intervene in five Biodiversity Use and Conservation Mosaics (MUCB) in the Pacific Region of Colombia. Those MCUB have been prioritized by using a multicriteria analysis approach (see Appendix 11). A <i>conservation mosaic</i> is a network of protected areas and complementary landscapes that include national parks, marine and terrestrial production landscapes, and territories of collective ethnic property. This mosaic approach will support integrated landscape management in three mosaics (i) Katíos – Caoba; ii) Farallones – Calima; and iii) Cabo Manglares – Gran Familia Awá), and partial intervention in two mosaics (Serranía de Paraguas – Tatamá and Muchique – Rio Saija). Appendix 8 includes maps of the MUCBs. The project will intervene in 82 protected areas overall.</p>	<p>The project aims to reduce pressures and promote the integrated management of protected areas and buffer zones through conservation and sustainable use measures. Component 2 will support the effective management of protected areas (PAs), buffer zones and complementary conservation strategies (CCSs). In order to do so, planning and management instruments will be developed, and technical guidelines to formalize the CCSs in the Pacific region will be designed. Moreover, priority areas for conservation will be assessed and necessary steps towards their</p>	<p>Progress was made in the diagnosis of the plans and instruments in the 3 prioritized Mosaics.</p> <p>2 declaration as formal PAs processes have been carried out, from the PAs identified in the project design.</p> <p>PAs management plans and the results of the AEMAPPS tool were reviewed to define the actions to be carried out, according to the baseline results of the Tracking Tools, in order to increase the management effectiveness of PAs.</p>	<p>Planning and management instruments will be developed, and technical guidelines to formalize the CCSs in the Pacific region will be designed.</p> <p>1 priority area for conservation will be assessed and necessary steps towards their declaration as formal PAs will be taken. As well as support the PAs management plans implementation</p>	<p>The Project Coordinator, the MUCB Technical Supervisor, the Professional in instruments for ecosystem services planning and assessment and the Professional in PAs and CCSs are responsible for this ESS, with the support of the Project Implementation Unit.</p>

	declaration as formal PAs will be taken.			
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
During full project preparation, 58 indigenous reserves have been identified in the five MUCBs, as belonging to Embera, Embera Katío, Embera Chamí, Embera Dobida, Eperara Siapidara, Waunan, Kuna Tule, Nasa, Coconuco, Pasto, Kamentsa, Coreguaje, and Awá populations	The project includes a Stakeholder Engagement Plan for indigenous peoples, black communities, and rural communities within the Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) framework. The Plan will ensure the active participation and local ownership of beneficiary communities, including women, youth, and the elderly. Furthermore, this Plan foresees that all relevant ethnic groups and organizations are duly consulted and involved in project implementation activities.	The autonomous election of ethnic delegates was facilitated to represent indigenous communities in the Project Steering Committee with Carlos Quiro, indigenous Eperara Siapidara representative of the Calle Santa Rosa <i>Resguardo</i> and José Aristarco Mosquera, 'Afro-descendant' of the Mayor Communal Council of Alto San Juan. Furthermore, in the methodology for the formulation of the participatory action plans for the MUCBs includes all the necessary steps to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with each indigenous community that has specific actions in the focused operating windows in the 5 MUCBs.	In the next months, the methodology to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with each indigenous community that has specific actions in the focused operating windows in the 5 MUCBs.	The Project Coordinator and the Professional specialized in participation and " <i>differential approach</i> " are responsible for this ESS, with the support of the Project Implementation Unit.

6. Risks

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE

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

	Risk	Risk rating ³¹	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ³²	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	<p>Political risk Political instability: change of government and senior officials' turnaround in national, regional, and local agencies (ministries, departmental and municipal administrations, and environmental authorities).</p>	Medium	<p>The project will keep the representatives from key national authorities (MADS, PNN), sub-national agencies (CARs, SIRAP Pacific), departmental and municipal territorial entities, informed on project progress, achievements, and benefits.</p> <p>Roles and responsibilities during project implementation will be re-validated at inception and monitored on yearly basis.</p> <p>If there is a change of government, the Project Team will re-visit the agreement with the new administration.</p> <p>The key project stakeholders (PNN, CODECHOCO, CARDER, CVC, CRC, CORPONARIÑO, IIAP, INVEMAR, MADS, and the Departmental Governments of Chocó and Nariño) have committed co-financing to materialize their interest in the project.</p>	<p>The project kept the representatives from key national authorities (MinAmbiente, PNN), sub-national agencies (CARs, SIRAP Pacific), and other stakeholders, informed on project progress, achievements, and challenges.</p> <p>The key project stakeholders have remained committed to the Pacífico Biocultural project.</p>	<p>There have been changes of Environment and Sustainable Development Minister (October-2020) and at vice-ministerial level, as well the director of PNN (January-2021).</p> <p>Despite the above, permanent dialogues were continued with the new managers and it was precisely with the new administration that the approval of the 2021 Annual Work Plan and Budget was achieved, inter alia.</p>

³¹ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

³² If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high-risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

	Risk	Risk rating ³¹	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ³²	Notes from the Project Task Force
2	<p>Political risk Local authorities show limited interest in the project and reflect a lack of willingness to take part in project activities</p>	Medium	<p>The project will generate participation and discussion spaces with project stakeholders through the Project Steering Committee (PSC), Project Technical Committee (PTC), and MUCB Technical Committees.</p> <p>Local stakeholders will be part of agreements to implement MUCB action plans. They will be periodically reviewed and adjusted to keep up the local interest.</p> <p>The project will promote institutional strengthening and will develop capacities of local technical teams and local communities to harmonize planning instruments. This will contribute to maintaining interest in the project at the local level.</p> <p>The project will adopt a participatory approach, through SIRAP Pacific structures and other mechanisms.</p> <p>The economic incentives and production alternatives will encourage the participation of municipal authorities in project activities.</p>	<p>The Pacifico Biocultural project has generated participation and discussion spaces with project stakeholders through the Project Technical Committee (PTC) and Project Steering Committee (PSC).</p> <p>The project has implemented a participatory approach, through SIRAP Pacific structures and other mechanisms. For instance, the participation of the local ethnic-territorial authorities in the PTC and the PSC was guaranteed with the of Carlos Quiro, indigenous Eperera Siapidara representative of the Calle Santa Rosa <i>Resguardo</i> and José Aristarco Mosquera, 'Afro-descendant' of the Mayor Communal Council of Alto San Juan.</p> <p>The methodology for the formulation of the participatory action plans for the MUCBs includes the strengthening of the technical capacities of the key stakeholders in the Mosaics.</p>	<p>So far this attitude of the local authorities has not been perceived.</p> <p>On the contrary, they have continued with the interest to take part in the project activities and willing to accelerate the implementation of fieldwork.</p>

	Risk	Risk rating ³¹	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ³²	Notes from the Project Task Force
3	<p>Political risk Project co-financiers do not comply with the co-financing commitments.</p>	Low	<p>The project will keep co-financiers informed regarding their financial commitments to the project. Within the framework of the PSC, matters related to co-financing contributions will be coordinated to ensure these commitments are included in the annual budgetary allocations of the partner entities. The PC will provide advice to the project Executing Stakeholders in reporting in-kind and cash co-financing provided by co-financiers and eventually other stakeholders not foreseen in the Project Document.</p>	<p>The project has kept its co-financiers permanently informed regarding their financial commitments to the project.</p> <p>Constant communication with stakeholders has been maintained to request the report of its co-financing commitments. Some stakeholders have delivered it.</p>	<p>It is necessary to consider that the Project is still in an initial stage, in which some of the stakeholders have not yet carried out co-financiers' activities, but it is expected that they can be collected smoothly.</p>

<p>4</p>	<p>Social risk Lack of interest and low participation by traditional authorities, local communities, and community leaders</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>The project includes a Stakeholder Engagement Plan for indigenous, black, and rural communities within the Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) framework. The plan implementation will ensure the active participation and local ownership by beneficiary communities, including women, youth, and the elderly.</p> <p>Project activities are gender-sensitive and have been designed to promote the participation of beneficiary communities in meetings and roundtables, and in workshops to develop capacities.</p> <p>The project will promote the application of sustainable production practices, and access to economic incentives and markets for local biodiversity-based products. New business models are expected to generate an improvement in local living conditions (Component 3). Additionally, the project will strengthen and ensure respect for and recognition of the traditional knowledge systems associated with biodiversity. Traditional authorities, local communities, and community leaders will obtain tangible social, economic, and environmental benefits, which will contribute to promoting interest in the project.</p> <p>To avoid delays, the PSC, PTC, and MUCB committees will be established at project inception, ensuring the early engagement of project stakeholders, including</p>	<p>The methodology for the construction stages of the participatory action plans for the prioritized MUCBs that was formulated contains all the phases to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), ensuring the participation of indigenous peoples from the focused operating windows (project intervention areas) with a particular focus on women, youth, and the elderly.</p>	<p>The Pacífico Biocultural project had the active participation of the ethnic delegates at the meetings of the PTC and the PSC: Carlos Quiro, indigenous Eperara Siapidara representative of the Calle Santa Rosa <i>Resguardo</i> and José Aristarco Mosquera, 'Afro-descendant' of the Mayor Communal Council of Alto San Juan.</p>
----------	---	---------------	--	--	--

		<p>representatives and leaders of beneficiary black, indigenous, and peasant communities, which will be key to supporting the implementation of activities in the field (i.e., MUCBs).</p> <p>Stakeholders and project stakeholders will be informed on their roles in these committees and the decision-making processes.</p> <p>In line with the project M&E plan, PSC meetings will be held periodically to define the Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP/B) and review the Project Progress Report (PPR) and PIR, allowing the close monitoring of the implementation of project activities.</p> <p>Mechanisms for fair and equitable distribution of project socio-economic and environmental benefits will be defined at inception.</p> <p>Benefits are detailed as follows: organizational strengthening and capacity building of beneficiary local communities, participation strategies, harmonization of life/ethno development plans, support for the CCSs, community-based monitoring of SFM plans, improvement of household incomes through the marketing of biodiversity-derived products and the promotion of eco-tourism initiatives, and improved knowledge-sharing and information access for decision-making).</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

	Risk	Risk rating ³¹	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ³²	Notes from the Project Task Force
			The project formulation phase was compliant with initial FPIC requirements. In PY1 agreements will be set and signed with ethnic representatives of local beneficiary communities for implementing the MUCB action plans, in the framework of FPIC.		
5	<p>Social risk Low participation of women, youth, and the elderly.</p>	Low	<p>The project will apply a gender-sensitive approach and will ensure fair and equitable distribution of project benefits among women and men.</p> <p>The project will enhance participation of organizations of women, youth, and the elderly in decision-making processes, training events, and access to economic incentives.</p> <p>Additionally, as part of the project M&E strategy, gender-based indicators are included to evaluate benefits and collect gender-disaggregated data on gender mainstreaming.</p> <p>Likewise, the project implementation team will include an expert in participation, ethnic and gender approaches as part of the strategy to ensure the active participation of women, youth, and the elderly.</p>	<p>In the methodology for the formulation of the participatory action plans for the MUCBs is intended to apply a gender-sensitive approach in its participatory construction.</p> <p>The M&E system has gender-disaggregated data to be able to follow-up, monitor and track implementation progress from a gender perspective as well as to be able to carry out gender analysis, such as to evaluate benefits and collect gender-disaggregated data on gender mainstreaming.</p>	The Project is in an initial stage, but there is no evidence to date of low participation of women, youth, or the elderly.

	Risk	Risk rating ³¹	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ³²	Notes from the Project Task Force
6	<p>Environmental risk The sequence of climate change events affects vital areas for conservation, productive landscapes, and beneficiary communities.</p>	Medium	<p>To reduce the impact of climate change, the project incorporates a socio-ecosystem connectivity approach and activities related to harmonization of planning instruments, PAs and CCSs planning and management, SFM, and sustainable production initiatives. The project activities related to biodiversity conservation include sustainable production practices, forest cover improvement, and native vegetation rehabilitation, which will contribute to increasing resilience to climate change and climate variability. In addition, the project will strengthen and improve the adaptation capacity and social resilience of local communities to climate change by respecting and recognizing their traditional knowledge of biodiversity management and the promotion of sustainable production practices.</p>	<p>The Pacífico Biocultural project has promoted a socio-ecosystem connectivity approach.</p>	<p>In the course of the Project to date, no major environmental effects have been observed in the intervention areas, despite having gone through a cyclical oceanic-climate phenomenon known as “<i>La Niña</i>”.</p>

	Risk	Risk rating ³¹	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ³²	Notes from the Project Task Force
7	<p>Environmental risk Socio-environmental conflicts: Extraction activities and territorial conflicts.</p>	Medium	<p>Output 1.1.1, which is related to analysis and strategic assessment of ecosystem services in the Colombian Pacific region will provide information for identifying socio-environmental conflicts. The project will foster a monitoring system with periodic reports, including identification and tracking of potential socio-environmental conflicts in each MUCB. Potential socio-environmental conflicts will be discussed within the framework of the PSC, PTC, and the committees of each MUCB so that these are considered in the planning and implementation of project activities.</p>	<p>A draft of the Terms of Reference – TOR for the Output 1.1.1 validated by stakeholders and approved by FAO is available for publication no later than July 2021</p>	<p>There have not yet been any major actions on the field, thus it has not been perceived that Socio-environmental conflicts are affecting the implementation of the project</p>

	Risk	Risk rating ³¹	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ³²	Notes from the Project Task Force
8	<p>Security risk Armed conflict, disruption of public order, and problems related to security.</p>	Medium-high	<p>One of the factors for defining and prioritizing the MUCBs was the situation of security and public order. Areas where the main efforts for building peace are concentrated were selected. Likewise, the security criteria will be considered in selecting the areas for implementation of pilot activities and during the Technical Committee meetings of each MUCB. The security measures required by the United Nations system will be applied in such cases. The United Nations Department of Safety and Security (UNDSS) periodically evaluates the risks of the country and the specific risks for those operating in the field, by sharing this information with all the United Nations system agencies. Additionally, the Department of Protection of Citizens' rights puts an Early Warning System at the disposal of communities and institutions that monitors the risk situations due to the armed conflict. The project will strictly follow the advice of the UNDSS concerning all matters related to security of the United Nations and project staff working on activities involving the locations of offices, movement, and participation of populations in remote areas.</p>	<p>The monitoring of problems related to security, including armed conflict and disruption of public order, has been carried out on a permanent basis by the security FAO focal point in coordination with UNDSS, paying particular attention to the in the focused operating windows within the Mosaics.</p>	<p>Although the Pacific Region of Colombia is experiencing an increase in armed conflict, violence, forced displacement and insecurity, it should be noted that in the focused operating windows within the Mosaics there has been no direct problems related to security on the Project (as of the date of this report).</p> <p>The national strike and blockades that have occurred in Colombia since April 28, 2021 have affected the mobility and supply of the whole country and thus, have slowed the progress of the Project. However, at the date of this report, the country has begun to have significant changes to return to a situation of relative normality.</p>
9	<p>Institutional risk The institutional post-conflict structure and roles and responsibilities have only recently been defined, which may limit the impact of the project.</p>	Low	<p>Not defined in the Prodoc.</p>	N/A	<p>To date, there has been no impact in this regard.</p>

	Risk	Risk rating ³¹	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ³²	Notes from the Project Task Force
10	<p>Political-institutional risk Lack of willingness of subnational and local authorities and private sector to apply the guidelines for harmonization of territorial and environmental management planning instruments that safeguard cultural, biological, and ecosystem services' diversity</p>	Low	In 2023, once the newly elected governments are known (that will begin their administration in 2024), the project will promote dialogue on the basis of government plan plans to ensure harmonization to ensure harmonization	Mitigation actions will be implemented from 2023	To date, there has been no impact in this regard but the Pacifico Biocultural project identifies this as a new risk taking into account the regional and local elections in Colombia to be held in 2023
11	<p>Health risk Worldwide emergency situation due to the Covid-19 pandemic</p>	Medium-high	Adapt presential meetings to virtual means, adjust the project strategy to teleworking and train the project team in biosafety protocols.	<p>Progress was made in the selection of the Mosaic professionals, who will coordinate actions and meetings in territory (they are expected to be hired in early or mid-July 2021).</p> <p>Institutional meetings have been carried out in a virtual manner. The Project has assumed teleworking as the way to carry out the work by the Implementation Unit and training has been carried out to be prepared in the incorporation of biosafety protocols when required for field missions.</p>	<p>The Covid-19 pandemic, an unexpected risk that has emerged, has definitely been the main reason for delays on the activities and progress in the implementation of the Pacifico Biocultural project.</p> <p>Due to the contingency measures decreed by the National Government of Colombia in regard to the pandemic, within which the mandatory preventive isolation stands out (since March 2020 and continues in force to date), the project has not been able to properly initiate the implementation of fieldwork.</p>

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

FY2020 rating	FY2021 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
N/A	Medium	<p>The risk level associated mainly with external factors to the Pacífico Biocultural project remains the same as at the Project Preparation Grant (PPG) phase. From the initially identified, it is considered that the security risk is the only one that could directly affect the project's implementation, due to the armed conflict and because of the strike-blockades. This could be perceived when direct field actions are being undertaken on the Mosaics.</p> <p>A new risk has been identified by the project, which refers to the lack of willingness of subnational and local authorities and private sector to apply the guidelines for harmonization of territorial and environmental management planning instruments that safeguard cultural, biological, and ecosystem services' diversity. Although to date, there has been no impact in this regard taking into account that the newly elected governments will be known in 2023 (to begin their administration in 2024).</p> <p>Another unexpected risk has emerged: the worldwide emergency situation due to the Covid-19 pandemic. This situation has generated changes in the implementation of the project from March 2020: it has become necessary to adjust the project strategy to teleworking, maintaining the work and institutional coordination through virtual means. However, the project has addressed this unexpected risk by moving forward in the selection of the Mosaic professionals, who will coordinate actions and meetings in territory (they are expected to be hired in early or mid-July 2021) and while the Covid-19 vaccination programme advances in the country, the project has integrated into its work methodology and project team the necessary capacities, required protocols and adjustments to minimize the impacts from the Covid-19 pandemic.</p>

7. Adjustments to Project Strategy – Only for projects that had the Mid-term review (or supervision mission)

If the project had a MTR review or a supervision mission, please report on how the MTR recommendations were implemented as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented
Recommendation 1:	N/A
Recommendation 2:	N/A
Recommendation 3:	N/A
Recommendation 4:	N/A

Adjustments to the project strategy.

Please note that changes to outputs, baselines, indicators or targets cannot be made without official approval from PSC and PTF members, including the FLO. These changes will follow the recommendations of the MTR or the supervision mission.

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outputs	N/A	N/A
Project Indicators/Targets	N/A	N/A

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

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

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	Original NTE: November 30, 2024 Revised NTE: N/A Justification: N/A

8. Stakeholders Engagement

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

Stakeholders of the Pacifico Biocultural project:

Category	Stakeholder
National Government	MinAmbiente
National Government	PNN
Research Institute	IIAP
Research Institute	INVEMAR
Local Government	Gobernación de Nariño – Secretaría de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible
Local Government	Gobernación de Nariño – Secretaría de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural
Local Government	Gobernación del Chocó
Local Government	CARDER
Local Government	CVC
Local Government	CORPONARIÑO
Local Government	CODECHOCÓ
Community organizations- Black communities	Consejo Comunitario Mayor del Alto San Juan - ASOCASAN
Community organizations- Black communities	Consejo Comunitario de la Cuenca del Río Cacarica - Chocó
Community organizations- Indigenous reserves	Resguardo Comunidad La Sierpe Resguardo Calle Santa Rosa
Community organizations- Black communities	Consejo Comunitario Bajo Mira y Frontera
Non-governmental organization	Corporación Biocomercio Sostenible - CBS Colombia
Non-governmental organization	BIOINNOVA
Non-governmental organization	Fundación San Cipriano
Non-governmental organization	Fundación Trópico
GEF Agency	ONUDI
GEF Agency	FAO

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

- The project is working in the identification of new stakeholders in the 5 MUCBs of the Pacifico Biocultural, it is expected that the results of the negotiations can be presented in the next PIR reports.

If a stakeholder engagement plan was not requested for your project at CEO endorsement stage, please

- list all stakeholders engaged in the project;
- Please indicate if the project works with Civil Society Organizations and/or NGOs
- briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.

N/A.

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

Category	Stakeholder
BIOINNOVA	BIOINNOVA's main role is to connect science with traditional knowledge, creating territorial ownership. It works in the following areas: (1) identification of potentialities, product research and development; (2) community innovation and education; (3) implementation of conservation initiatives; (4) development of biodiversity-derived products; and (5) knowledge platform. It has extensive experience in BIO production startups, creation of companies, and successful experiences in creating local development models, valuation proposals, and knowledge transfer. BIOINNOVA will provide support to the execution of project Outcome 3.2.
Corporación Biocomercio Sostenible	Its main role in the project is to promote the sustainable use of biodiversity through identifying and prioritizing products, determining key aspects for their development, strengthening producers' networks, and supporting inclusive market participation. It has wide experience in promissory products identification, supporting the communities in developing business plans, market research, territorial marketing, etc. In addition, Corporación Biocomercio Sostenible will develop activities related to corporate management, environmental services, strengthening of networks, value chains, and consolidation of local innovation at the regional or national scale. The organization will take part in the execution of project Outcome 3.2.

9. Gender Mainstreaming

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

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

A gender analysis was undertaken at the formulation stage, which noted that some of the gender differences identified are:

1. "Women's economic participation is lower than men's; this situation is more present in rural areas than in urban areas".
2. Also, it is important to note that, in most of the departments analysed, the illiteracy rate is higher for women than for men.

3. In terms of demographic, “in most of the departments the female population is slightly larger with the exception of Nariño and Cauca”.

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

Yes, the M&E system has gender-disaggregated data to be able to follow-up, monitor and track implementation progress from a gender perspective as well as to be able to carry out gender analysis. The methodology for formulating the participatory action plans for the prioritized MUCBs incorporates gender-disaggregated variables as a determining factor in overcoming the gaps, initially ensuring their active participation in the construction of the plans, with particular emphasis on access and control over natural resources.

Does the project staff have gender expertise?

Yes, the Pacífico Biocultural Project Implementation Unit has a professional specialized in “*differential approach*”, with specific experience in gender and ethnicity in the Colombian Pacific territories.

Missionary Professional specialized in participation and “*differential approach*”: Danny Daniel Herrán Acero
email: danny.herranacero@fao.org

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

- **closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources: Yes**
It is planned to promote and empower women, in order to ensure the impact of their participation in the different structures for the construction and formulation of plans in access to and control over natural resources.
- **improving women’s participation and decision making: Yes**
It is envisaged to promote, strengthen, empower, improve and guarantee women’s participation in the decision-making in community structures and institutional bodies for the governance of environmental resources.
- **generating socio-economic benefits or services for women: Yes**
The project includes socio-economic benefits, such as incentives and economic supports to green business initiatives, SFM initiatives and sustainable production systems, Value addition units of biodiversity-derived products, biodiversity-derived products and community-based nature tourism initiatives where women can generate and obtain socio-economic services to improve their conditions. In fact, one of the project targets is that 40% of SFM initiatives and production systems led by women (Outcome 3.1).

Additionally, in order to contribute to gender equality, during the Project Preparation Grant (PPG) phase it was designed a Gender Mainstreaming Plan (see figure 2 of the “Appendix 13. Gender Mainstreaming Roadmap” from the Prodoc), which contains the priority activities by component in this regard.

10. Knowledge Management Activities

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

- **Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.**

The project has a knowledge management strategy within the communication strategy for development. Its proposal is to systematise, disseminate and exchange lessons learned of successful experiences as tools and methodologies which contribute to strengthen knowledge management permanently between the different social actors, institutions that are part of the project and stakeholders that join the process.

Constant dialogue is promoted for the joint construction to strengthen local communities' capacities in Field Schools (ECAS), communication both within the Project Implementation Unit and the other stakeholders, in the framework of the project actions with the SIRAP Pacific and its participation and decision-making structures.

It also promotes constant communication and agreements between the project and the communities as well as other stakeholders, to be able to contribute to the construction of synergies and coordination between them, that allows dialogue at different levels.

Within the communication strategy for development, there is also an editorial plan, which documents and consolidates lessons learned from the project.

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

The project has a communication strategy for development, which was proposed by the Implementation Unit of the project, socialized and endorsed by its stakeholders. Its general objective is to generate a communication process for development that encourages the participation of community social actors, institutions and citizen, in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in 5 conservation mosaics of the Colombian Pacific to contribute to peace-building.

Its specific objectives are:

1. Promote recognition and ownership of the project and its progress by stakeholders.
2. Positioning the project and its progress, mainstreaming the sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity products and services.
3. Contribute to knowledge management activities to value the sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity.
4. Systematize the project experience to promote analysis through the lessons learned and an editorial plan.

Successes:

- Strategy formulation and approval with institutional stakeholders.
- Project products began to be consolidated in relation to stakeholders, planning, dissemination of processes and articulation meetings.

Challenges:

- Have proposals for effective participation and joint planning with stakeholders (especially local communities) in the virtuality given the global situation of the Covid-19 pandemic.

- Having the Annual Work Plan and Budget adopted just by the end of March 2021 and travel restrictions due to the Covid-19 pandemic, has not allowed to improve the Communications diagnosis.
- **Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected global environmental benefits. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.**

Human-interest stories of project Pacifico Biocultural beneficiaries are not yet available because the COVID-19 pandemic has imposed restrictions on field travels and the Project Steering Committee has just met this year to approve the first annual budget of the Pacifico Biocultural.

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

Useful links:

- First biannual newsletter of the Pacific Biocultural project (December 2020): <https://unfao.sharepoint.com/:b:/s/faoCO/EZdkKUApfIFGu4VfCZVFjTUBajJybyq95KQk9jyWLbfyzCA?e=eVNbkZ>
- Video of the Pacific Biocultural project: <https://unfao.sharepoint.com/:v:/s/faoCO/EcKCctAQ9UpPqHWjRYPPoeABiMLbu9efPa9pvsWLon9IGw?e=aEMDWx>

In addition, it is important to mention that the kick-off project event is expected to take place in August of 2021, depending on the agendas of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development.

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

Missionary Professional specialized in Communication: Claudia Marcela Ayala Afanador
email: marcela.ayala@fao.org

11. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

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

The indigenous communities are directly involved in the project from its Project Preparation Grant (PPG) phase, in which they participated actively. Since a large part of the territories and areas to be intervened are of a collective-ethnic character, the indigenous communities are considered strategic stakeholders of the Pacifico Biocultural project.

In this sense, the construction stages of the participatory action plans for the prioritized MUCBs consider the respective consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with each indigenous community that has specific actions in the focused operating windows. The identification of the authorities and ethnic communities with whom FPIC will develop has already been carried out, therefore the current status of the process is on-going.

In addition, as part of the process for the conformation of the members of the Project Steering Committee, an autonomous selection process was carried out for the delegate of community councils and the representative of indigenous *resguardos* for the 5 MUCB. Achieving the election of Carlos Quiro, indigenous Eperara Siapidara representative of the Calle Santa Rosa *Resguardo* and José Aristarco Mosquera, 'Afro-descendant' of the Mayor Communal Council of Alto San Juan, who participated with voice and vote in the Technical Committee and the first Project Steering Committee.

12. Innovative Approaches

Please provide a brief description of an innovative³³ approach in the project / programme, describe the type (e.g. technological, financial, institutional, policy, business model) and explain why it stands out as an innovation.

The project is innovative in the concept, methodology and process taking into account that the general project strategy is based on conservation mosaics and a green business approach. In the former, this approach will enable the integrated management of a geographical area by implementing actions to reduce ecosystem fragmentation and degradation, as well as building social bridges for the effective management and administration of protected areas (PAs) and complementary conservation strategies (CCSs). The green business approach will allow a linkage of biodiversity-derived products with markets (subnational, national, and international), creating sustainable economic alternatives for the communities and promoting biodiversity conservation and sustainable forest and land management.

Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, the Pacifico Biocultural project has been immersed in innovation processes to strengthen teamwork, for instance: taking advantage of virtuality and teleworking, making more participatory the meetings with the Technical Committee as well as making the construction of documents more democratic.

In addition, we would like to highlight a methodological innovation related to the work approach of community promoters (referred to in the Prodoc as MUCB Local Facilitators). Their work was adjusted considering specific activities and products to be carried out with ethnic-territorial communities in the Project MUCB, strengthening governance processes of local and community-based organizations as well as increasing flexibility during the project implementation.

³³ Innovation is defined as *doing something new or different in a specific context that adds value*

13. Possible impact of the Covid-19 on the project

Please indicate any implication of the Covid-19 pandemic on the activities and progress of the project. Highlight the adaptative measures to continue with the project implementation.

The Covid-19 pandemic has definitely been the main reason for delays on the activities and progress in the implementation of the Pacífico Biocultural project.

Due to the contingency measures decreed by the National Government of Colombia in regard to the pandemic, within which the mandatory preventive isolation stands out (since March 2020 and continues in force to date), the project has not been able to properly initiate the implementation of fieldwork. However, progress was made in the selection of the Mosaic professionals, who will coordinate actions and meetings in territory (they are expected to be hired in early or mid-July 2021).

Institutional meetings have also been affected by the Covid-19 pandemic, although efforts have been made to carry them out in a virtual manner. The Project has assumed teleworking as the way to carry out the work by the Implementation Unit and training has been carried out to be prepared in the incorporation of biosafety protocols when required for field missions.

14. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ³⁴	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2021	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National Government	MinAmbiente	In-kind	1,196,757	0	N/A	1,196,757
National Government	PNN	In-kind	1,548,715	96,442.3	N/A	1,548,715
Research Institute	IIAP	In-kind	484,838	467,120.4	N/A	484,838
Research Institute	INVEMAR	In-kind	41,143	0	N/A	147,943
		Cash	106,800			
Local Government	Gobernación de Nariño – Secretaría de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible	In-kind	26,227	0	N/A	531,050
		Cash	504,823			
Local Government	Gobernación de Nariño – Secretaría de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural	In-kind	4,189,000	0	N/A	4,189,000

³⁴ Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

2021 Project Implementation Report

Local Government	Gobernación del Chocó	In-kind	72,012	0	N/A	168,845
		Cash	96,833			
Local Government	CARDER	In-kind	274,264	0	N/A	410,088
		Cash	135,824			
Local Government	CVC	Cash	5,871,918	709,185.3	N/A	5,871,918
Local Government	CORPONARIÑO	In-kind	93,429	0	N/A	6,640,426
		Cash	6,546,997			
Local Government	CODECHOCÓ	Cash	3,547,790	0	N/A	3,547,790
Community organizations-Black communities	Consejo Comunitario Mayor del Alto San Juan - ASOCASAN	In-kind	170,010	0	N/A	170,010
Community organizations-Black communities	Consejo Comunitario de la Cuenca del Río Cacarica - Chocó	In-kind	118,748	0	N/A	118,748
Community organizations-Indigenous reserves	Resguardo Comunidad La Sierpe Resguardo Calle Santa Rosa	In-kind	40,500	0	N/A	40,500
Community organizations-Black communities	Consejo Comunitario Bajo Mira y Frontera	In-kind	157,611	0	N/A	157,611
Non-governmental organization	Corporación Biocomercio	In-kind	395,926	0	N/A	395,926

	Sostenible - CBS Colombia					
Non-governmental organization	BIOINNOVA	In-kind	731,768	0	N/A	731,768
Non-governmental organization	Fundación San Cipriano	In-kind	108,488	0	N/A	108,488
Non-governmental organization	Fundación Trópico	In-kind	0	219,329.4	N/A	219,329.4
GEF Agency	ONUDI	In-kind	800,000	0	N/A	3,223,765
		Cash	2,423,765			
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	510,000	47,180.3	N/A	1,710,000
		Cash	1,200,000			
		TOTAL	31,394,186	1,539,257.7	N/A	31,613,515.4

Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement

- The most important change in project co-financing since Project Document signature is that UNIDO and the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development were unable to sign the project agreement, a necessary condition for implementing and executing a GEF project in Colombia. Consequently, UNIDO cannot continue to exercise its role as a GEF implementing agency of the Pacífico Biocultural project and FAO will act as the only GEF implementing agency of the project, carrying out the activities UNIDO was responsible for, especially those regarding for project Outcome 3.2. Once the transfer of the project to FAO has been fully formalized, UNIDO's co-financing amount confirmed at CEO endorsement will be reviewed and reported in the next PIR.
- The change in local and regional authorities as from January 2020 has also had an impact on the report, taking into account that the previous administrations were the ones that made the co-financing letters and commitments to the Project. Therefore, the times to prepare the reports have been extended.
- The social and economic situation presented as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic also affects the report since most entities have adapted their work according to the authorities' guidelines.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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