



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2022 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	14
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	32
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	36
6. RISKS	40
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION (ONLY FOR PROJECTS THAT HAVE CONDUCTED AN MTR)	54
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	55
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	57
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	61
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	63
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT.....	66
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	67

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 SIRAP Pacific (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 (years):	Sixty (60) months / 5 years																			
Project coordinates:	<p>Taking into account the adjustments that were made to the polygon's boundaries of the Farallones – Calima and Tatamá – Serranía de los Paraguas MUCBs (Biodiversity Use and Conservation Mosaic - Acronym in Spanish), as requested by the institutional project stakeholders as well as its respective approval in the past project Steering Committee, the Implementation Unit proceeded to corroborate the centroid for the 5 MUCBs with the following results:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>MUCB</th> <th colspan="2">Location Coordinates</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Katíos – Caoba</td> <td>7.608803</td> <td>-77.201286</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tatamá – Serranía de los Paraguas</td> <td>4.958208</td> <td>-76.268514</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Farallones – Calima</td> <td>3.649208</td> <td>-76.888983</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Munchique – Río Saija</td> <td>2.750128</td> <td>-77.228678</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cabo Manglares – Familia Awá</td> <td>1.399803</td> <td>-78.537611</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In addition, the project completed the new Geocoding Guidance for FAO-GEF projects in the link provided for this purpose: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1qHJeri5clz1hBsrJKx-LcoZEX1QKdYHOFYUsIHEYk/edit#gid=0</p>		MUCB	Location Coordinates		Katíos – Caoba	7.608803	-77.201286	Tatamá – Serranía de los Paraguas	4.958208	-76.268514	Farallones – Calima	3.649208	-76.888983	Munchique – Río Saija	2.750128	-77.228678	Cabo Manglares – Familia Awá	1.399803	-78.537611
MUCB	Location Coordinates																			
Katíos – Caoba	7.608803	-77.201286																		
Tatamá – Serranía de los Paraguas	4.958208	-76.268514																		
Farallones – Calima	3.649208	-76.888983																		
Munchique – Río Saija	2.750128	-77.228678																		
Cabo Manglares – Familia Awá	1.399803	-78.537611																		

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	April 12, 2019
----------------------------------	----------------

¹ Acronym in Spanish.

² Acronym in Spanish.

³ Acronym in Spanish.

Project Implementation Start Date/EOD:	November 30, 2019
Project Implementation End Date/NTE⁴:	November 30, 2024
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ⁵	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	7,562,558
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁶:	31,394,186
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)⁷:	1,431,350
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022⁸	10,313,663

M&E Milestones

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	March 18, 2022
Expected Mid-term Review date⁹:	October – December, 2022
Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):	
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date¹⁰:	March – November, 2024
Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	Yes, Tracking Tools are currently being updated and will be completed before MTR. The final version of the TT will be provided as an Annex for the next PIR, after having been jointly validated in the MTR.

Overall ratings

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

⁴ As per FPMIS

⁵ If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF CU.

⁶ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

⁷ For DEX projects, the GEF Coordination Unit will confirm the final amount with the Finance Division in HQ. For OPIM projects, the disbursement amount should be provided by Execution Partners.

⁸ Please refer to the section 12 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

⁹ The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2nd PIR, around half-point between EOD and NTE. The MTR report in English should be submitted to the GEF Secretariat within 4 years of the CEO Endorsement date.

¹⁰ The Terminal Evaluation date should be discussed with OED 6 months before the project's NTE date.

Overall risk rating:	Moderate
-----------------------------	----------

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	Moderate
---	----------

Status

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

Project Contacts

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

2. Progress towards Achieving Project Objective(s) (Development Objective)

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

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ¹¹	Baseline	Mid-term Target ¹²	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹³ since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating ¹⁴
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	Outcome 1.1 The territorial and environmental management and planning instruments are harmonized with the instruments developed by the black communities and indigenous peoples to safeguard biological,	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	Progress 20% 2,891,313.96 hectares have been characterized and mapped, corresponding to the 5 prioritized MUCBs. In addition, progress has been made in the modeling of its socio-ecosystem connectivity priorities as well as in the identification, coordination, and implementation of actions with key actors. Furthermore, 1,182,721.42 hectares have been identified, agreed, and prioritized with the institutional and community stakeholders of the Project, as focused	S

¹¹ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

¹² 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.

¹³ Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic Co-benefits as well.

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

global and local environmental benefits and supporting the peace process	cultural, and ecosystem services diversity, leading to a general reduction in potential threats from development-oriented activities				(direct total area)	operating windows for the project's intervention, within the project MUCBs.	
		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	0	N/A	b) 210,193 hectares of strategic importance for biodiversity conservation outside PAs	<p>Progress 15%</p> <p>A reference framework for the harmonization of territorial and environmental management planning instruments with ethnic community planning instruments was elaborated, socialized, and fed back with the SIRAP Pacific Institutional Technical Committee.</p> <p>The characterization of planning instruments for the Katíos – Caoba, Cabo Manglares – Familia Awá and Farallones – Calima MUCBs (which will be mentioned later in the Implementation Progress of the Output 1.1.2) was prepared.</p> <p>A preliminary proposal for guidelines on harmonization of ethnic territory planning instruments with OT territorial instruments of prioritized municipalities was socialized and fed back with the SIRAP Pacific Institutional Technical Committee.</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%	<p>Progress 30%</p> <p>The SIRAP Pacific's management capacities were strengthened with the recruitment and renewal for 1 more year of a Technical Secretariat for the Subsystem.</p>	S

						<p>In addition, the Pacífico Biocultural Project¹⁵ has supported the SIRAP Pacific looking to promote its stakeholders' participation through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 meeting of the SIRAP Pacific Regional Technical Committee. - 9 meetings of the SIRAP Pacific Regional Technical Roundtable. <p>These have led to progress in the definition of strategic project results and outputs, among which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The baseline for the financial sustainability strategy for the SIRAP Pacific was established as part of the update of its design, process under which the SIRAP Pacific action plan was adjusted to 2030. - The training and capacity-building plan for SIRAP Pacific stakeholders was designed with strategic partners and the subsystem Regional Technical Roundtable. - A proposal for an information dissemination plan for the SIRAP Pacific structures was designed. 	
	Outcome 2.1 Reduction of pressures and threats to	Management effectiveness of PAs measured by the METT	Katíos NNP: 66 Farallones NNP: 67	Katíos NNP: 71 Farallones NNP: 72	Katíos NNP: 76 Farallones NNP: 77	Progress 40% PAs management plans and the results of the AEMAPPS tool (applied in 2021 by the	S

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 "*Pacífico 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 public.

	biodiversity and ecosystem services in 581,859 ha of existing PAs and their buffer zone		Tatamá NNP: 68	Tatamá NNP: 73	Tatamá NNP: 78	<p>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, to increase the management effectiveness of PAs.</p> <p>With the 6 PAs prioritized in the PRODOC and 4 additional PAs agreed with the institutional partners of the project, the following actions have been carried out to increase its management effectiveness:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acquisition of equipment and supplies for the management of PAs: the delivery of equipment and materials to PAs for 2021 was carried out and the process of implementation of the agreed procurement plan for 2022 began. 2. Activities related to the implementation of PAs management plans (for example, research and monitoring; prevention, surveillance, and control; among others): the development of actions of the PAs of 2021 was financed and began the implementation process of the agreed procurement plan for 2022. 3. Support for the strengthening governance of mechanisms in the PAs: the project supported the consolidation process of the 6 governance instances prioritized in the project.
			Munchique NNP: 68	Munchique NNP: 73	Munchique NNP: 78	
			Cabo Manglares Bajo Mira and Frontera IMND: 40	Cabo Manglares Bajo Mira and Frontera IMND: 43	Cabo Manglares Bajo Mira and Frontera IMND: 48	
			Río Bravo RFPR: 40	Río Bravo RFPR: 45	Río Bravo RFPR: 50	

	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 <i>Calle Santa Rosa</i> . - 39,792 ha from <i>Serranía de los Paraguas</i> (in the department of Valle del Cauca). Work plans were agreed with Codechocó for the implementation of new PAs under declaration route for the following priority conservation areas: <i>Relictos de Caoba</i> ; <i>Serranía de los Paraguas</i> in the department of Chocó; and in the case of the <i>Paramo del Duende</i> , support to the formulation of the management plan of the area under declaration process.	S
		Area (ha) sustainably managed through the communal CCS	0	62,268 ha	210,193 ha ¹⁷	Progress 15% The identification and preliminary characterization of the Other Conservation Strategies - OECs in each of the 5 MUCBs was complemented, through the updating of the database with communal CCS mapping that had been provided by the	

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-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).

						<p>SIRAP Pacific and with the inputs collected at meetings with institutional stakeholders in territory.</p> <p>To date, 3 OECs have been selected¹⁸ to support its consolidation, which total 9,365 ha for conservation.</p>	
	<p>Outcome 3.1 Biodiversity and ecosystem services are sustainably utilized in forest-based productive systems and generate multiple environmental and socio-economic benefits</p>	Area (ha) under sustainable production systems	0	At least 3,500 ha	10,000 ha	<p>Progress 10%</p> <p>In partnership with other stakeholders, agreements are currently being made in the territories of the 5 MUCBs to strengthen sustainable production systems linked to UAVs (for example, <i>naidí</i> in Buenaventura and cacao in Tumaco)</p> <p>Methodology, tools, and mechanisms are available to begin in August 2022, it is planned to reach out communities to characterize and prioritize the areas of direct intervention of the <i>Pacífico Biocultural Project</i>.</p>	MS
		Proportion of SFM initiatives and production systems led by women	0	10%	40%	<p>Progress N/A</p> <p>Progress will be measured once the beneficiary population is characterized.</p> <p>From August 2022, this type of diagnostics and characterizations will be carried out with <i>Corporación Biocomercio Sostenible</i>, <i>Bioinnova</i>, the green business professional and the professional in Sustainable Forest Management of the project.</p>	

¹⁸ The reserve *+nkal Awá La Nutria "Piman"* in the Community *Resguardo* El Gran Sábalo; the ethnic conservation area of *"Alto Amurrupá"* in the Communal Council of Santa Cecilia; and the ethnic conservation area of *"Alto Lloradó"* in the Major Communal Council of Alto San Juan (ASOCASAN).

	<p>Outcome 3.2 Products and services derived from biodiversity have value added and their value chains duly strengthened</p>	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)	<p>Progress N/A</p> <p>Progress will be measured once the beneficiary population is characterized.</p> <p>Diagnoses of the current state and requirements of the 4 Value Addition Units – UAV (Acronym in Spanish) selected to date were made (<i>Naidí del Pacífico SAS, AMUCIB, Procacao y Raíces del Manglar</i>), as a basis for the definition of the business plan and the operation model for the UAV.</p>	MS
	<p>Outcome 4.1 Project monitored and evaluated with a results-based management approach, and communication of lessons learned</p>	Progress made in project implementation	0%	35-50%	100%	<p>Progress 23,6%</p> <p>The Pacífico Biocultural project has organized 2 Steering Committees; carried 4 Technical Committees; 1 MUCB Technical Committee; and prepared:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 Project Implementation Report (PIR). - 4 Project Progress Reports (PPR). - 24 monthly dashboards. <p>The major challenges and external factor for delays the project has experienced during its implementation 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 Colombia since April 28, 2021, affected the mobility and supply of the whole country and thus, have slowed the progress of the Project. 	S

						<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 3.1 Biodiversity and ecosystem services are sustainably utilized in forest-based productive systems and generate multiple environmental and socio-economic benefits	1. Prioritize the 17 Green Business initiatives that are pending to be selected	NPC, LTO, BH, Nacional Director (ND), Project Coordinator (PC), Green Business Professional (GBP), MUCB Technical Supervisor and MUCB Local Professionals	From July 2022 to December 2022
	2. Initiate the accompaniment of the Green Business, through the implementation of actions for the fulfillment of the improvement plan of each Green Business initiative	NPC, LTO, BH, Nacional Director (ND), Project Coordinator (PC), GBP and MUCB Local Professionals	From October 2022 to March 2023
	3. Select communities and sites to implement the SFM initiatives and sustainable production systems	NPC, LTO, BH, ND, PC, GBP, Professional in Sustainable Forest Management (PSFM), Professional in Geographic Information Systems – GIS (PGIS) and MUCB Local Professionals	From August 2022 to December 2022
	4. Carry out the diagnosis and design the Farmers Field School (ECA) according to each selected production system	NPC, LTO, BH, ND, PC, GBP, PSFM and MUCB Local Professionals	From October 2022 to June 2023
Outcome 3.2 Products and services derived from biodiversity have value added and their value chains duly strengthened	1. Complete the selection process for the Value Addition Units – UAV to be benefited	NPC, LTO, BH, ND, PC, GBP and MUCB Local Professionals	From July 2022 to December 2022
	2. Initiate the accompaniment of the UAV, through the implementation of actions for the fulfillment of the improvement plan for the existing UAVs or the development plan for the UAVs being created.	NPC, LTO, BH, ND, PC, GBP and MUCB Local Professionals	From October 2022 to March 2023
	3. Carry out the diagnosis of the community-based nature tourism initiatives	NPC, LTO, BH, ND, PC, GBP, Green Business Professional with a focus on Nature Tourism (GBP+NT) and MUCB Local Professionals	From August 2022 to December 2022
	4. Implement prioritized accompanying actions to strengthen community-based nature tourism initiatives	NPC, LTO, BH, ND, PC, GBP, GBP+NT and MUCB Local Professionals	From November 2022 to June 2023

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as per the Implementation Plan/Annual Workplan)

Outcomes and Outputs ¹⁹	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ²⁰ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ²¹ in delivering outputs
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, and ecosystem services diversity, leading to a general reduction in potential threats from development-oriented activities				
Output 1.1.1 A Diagnosis and Strategic Assessment of the ecosystem services in the Pacific Region	Number of analyses and strategic assessments of ecosystem services for four MUCBs	4 (Katíos – Caoba, Farallones – Calima, Cabo Manglares – Familia Awá, Munchique – Río Saija).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The first diagnostic workshops were carried out within the framework of the implementation of the Diagnosis and Strategic Assessment of the ecosystem services in the Pacific Region (VISE) with representatives of the communities of the ethnic territories prioritized in the project within the 4 MUCBs in which the VISE is being carried out (Katíos – Caoba; Farallones – Calima; Munchique – Río Saija; and Cabo Manglares – Familia Awá). The progress of the consolidated deliverables as of April 2022 was reviewed and an amendment proposal was discussed for an extension in time and resources of the same, within the framework of the 2nd meeting of supervision of the progress in the implementation of the Letter of Agreement – LoA with WWF Colombia for the development of the VISE. 	

¹⁹ Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

²⁰ Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Workplan. Please be concise (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.

			Cumulative progress: 50%.	
<p>Output 1.1.2 Agreed guidelines on harmonization of departmental/municipal territorial plans and Indigenous Peoples'/black communities' instruments²², with a gender approach</p>	<p># of guidelines # of planning instruments included #of pilot areas Degree of gender mainstreaming</p>	<p>One (1) guideline document under development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reference framework for the harmonization of land-use planning, management and development instruments with ethnic communities planning instruments, was socialized and feedback provided by the SIRAP Pacific Regional Technical Roundtable. • The pilot municipalities were selected and the characterization of its land-use planning, management and development instruments was carried out. • The ethnic communities planning instruments to be harmonized with prioritized land-use planning instruments were selected, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In the Katíos – Caoba MUCB: the life plan of the Arquía Indigenous Reservation with the EOT of Unguía and the ethno-development plan of the Community Council of Cacarica with the EOT of Riosucio. ○ In the Cabo Manglares – Familia Awá MUCB: the ethnodevelopment plan of the Community Council Bajo Mira y Frontera with the POT of the municipality of Tumaco and the life plan of the El Gran Sábalo Indigenous Reserve with the PBOT of the municipality of Barbacoas. ○ In the Farallones – Calima MUCB: the natural resource management and administration plans of the Community Councils of Yurumanguí and Cajambre with the POT of the municipality of Buenaventura and the resource management and administration plan natives of the Alto Anchicayá Community 	

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

			Council with the PBOT of the municipality of Dagua. Cumulative progress: 30%.	
<p>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</p>	SIAT-PC strengthened	SIAT-PC under strengthening process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In coordination with the IIAP and the project stakeholders, the 2 SIAT-PC secondary nodes to be strengthened (Tumaco and Buenaventura) were selected. In addition, an agreement was established to also support the consolidation of the Central Node in Quibdó. • The hardware, software and spatial information management in the Colombian Pacific requirements were defined to identify the areas to work for the capacities strengthening processes and the purchase plan was implemented through the acquisition of goods, equipment and materials identified for the headquarters of the SIAT-PC secondary nodes in Tumaco and Buenaventura and the central node in Quibdó. • The “Spatial Information Management Diagnosis for the Colombian Pacific within the framework of the GEF Pacífico Biocultural project” was carried out, based on which progress is being made in the preparation of the protocol for spatial information management for the Colombian Pacific. <p>Cumulative progress: 40%.</p>	
<p>Output 1.1.4: Forest zoning and management plans (POFs) outside the PAs developed, updated, and implemented in a participatory way,</p>	Number of POFs for 65,000 ha ²³ following MADS guidelines	Zero (0)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An agreement was reached with the CRC and MinAmbiente to support the implementation of some POF actions already formulated for the hydrographic subzone of the Saija River within the Munchique – Río Saija MUCB. • An agreement was reached with Corponariño and MinAmbiente to support the formulation of the POF for the hydrographic subzone of the Mira River, in 	There is still the challenge to consolidate agreements with the CARs (Corponariño and CRC) to define the scope of the support to be provided by the Pacífico Biocultural Project.

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

<p>promotes socio-ecosystem connectivity at the MUCB level</p>	<p>Area (ha) with forest management plans and with support for their implementation</p>	<p>Zero (0)</p>	<p>the territories of the Community Councils of Bajo and Alto Mira y Frontera and areas added with the closure of the perimeter for the Cabo Manglares – Familia Awá MUCB. Cumulative progress: 20%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The criteria to prioritize the areas in which the Forest Management Plans – PMF will be implemented in each MUCB were agreed and addressed, according to the following info: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the Tatamá – Serranía de los Paraguas MUCB, a preliminary proposal was made by the project's technical team to guide the forest harvesting process with the loggers' association of the Communal Council of Santa Cecilia. ○ In the Katíos – Caoba MUCB, the implementation of Forest Management actions in the collective territory of the Communal Council of the Cacarica River watershed. ○ In the Farallones – Calima MUCB, a roadmap was built, in coordination with the <i>Forestería Comunitaria</i> project of FAO and MinAmbiente, to continue the implementation of the PMF of the Communal Council of the Yurumanguí river. ○ In the Cabo Manglares – Familia Awá MUCB, it was decided to work the PMF with the collective territory of the Communal Council of Bajo Mira and Frontera, under the community forestry approach. <p>Cumulative progress: 15%.</p>	
<p>Outcome 1.2 Improved stakeholders' capacity and participation to support the enforcement of harmonized planning and environmental management in the MUCBs</p>				

<p>Output 1.2.1: Six (6) SIRAP Pacific participation and decision-making structures, strengthened and with enhanced capacities to apply harmonized guidelines (see output 1.1.2)</p>	<p>Number of participatory and decision-making structures within the framework of the SIRAP Pacific strengthened through the project</p>	<p>Six (6) in process</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A preliminary proposal of the training and strengthening of capacities plan of the social and institutional stakeholders linked to the implementation of the Pacifico Biocultural project (SIRAP Pacific and its prioritized instances) was prepared, which was socialized and fed back by the SIRAP Pacific Regional Technical Roundtable. • A proposed road map for the construction of the Outreach Plan was developed and subsequently validated with the SIRAP Pacific Regional Technical Roundtable, with which it is sought to optimize the two-way flow of information between the participatory and decision-making structures that make up the SIRAP Pacific. • A characterization document of the participatory and decision-making structures of the operational structure of the SIRAP Pacific was prepared. • The 6 participatory and decision-making structures to be supported in their consolidation were selected together with the institutional partners: <i>Mesa Local Pacífico Oeste</i> (for the Farallones – Calima MUCB), <i>SIDAP Nariño</i> with emphasis on the work plan for the Coastal Foothills (in the Cabo Manglares – Familia Awá MUCB), <i>Mesa Subregional Darién</i> (in the Katíos – Caoba MUCB), <i>Comité de Gestión RFPR Kokoi Euja</i> (Munchique – Río Saija), <i>SIDAP Risaralda</i> (Pueblo Rico and Mistrató, in the Tatamá – Serranía de los 	
---	--	---------------------------	---	--

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, Acaandí, Unguía, Carmen de Atrato, Nuquí, Tadó; Local conservation actions of bio-cultural diversity of Pacific region per department; one (1) 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).

			Paraguas MUCB) and in the regional scale the SIRAP Pacific Regional Technical Roundtable. Cumulative progress: 25%.	
Output 1.2.2: Five (5) local community participatory structures, strengthened and with enhanced capacities to comply with harmonized guidelines (see 1.1.2)	Number of local participatory structures ²⁵ strengthened for ensuring compliance with guidelines, using a gender-based approach	At least five (5) in process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The local community participatory structures that will be strengthened by the project were selected and characterized. As follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At the Cabo Manglares – Familia Awá MUCB: the environmental committee of the Communal Council of Bajo Mira and Frontera; and the environmental governance group of the Community <i>Resguardo</i> El Gran Sábalo. ○ At the Katíos – Caoba MUCB: the environmental committee of the Communal Council of the Cacarica River watershed; and the selection and characterization of the instance of the Major Communal Council of the Lower Atrato (COCOMAUNGUÍA) and the Community <i>Resguardo</i> of Arquía is pending. ○ In the MUCB Munchique – Río Saija: the governing board of the councils of the Community <i>Resguardo</i> of Calle Santa Rosa. ○ In the Farallones – Calima MUCB: the village committees of the Communal Council of the Yurumanguí river. ○ In the Tatamá – Serranía de los Paraguas MUCB: pending to be clarified in the Communal Council of Santa Cecilia and Major Communal Council of Alto San Juan (ASOCASAN). • A preliminary proposal of the training and strengthening of capacities plan of the social and institutional stakeholders linked to the 	

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.

			<p>implementation of the Pacifico Biocultural project (SIRAP Pacific and its prioritized instances) was prepared, which was socialized and fed back by the SIRAP Pacific Regional Technical Roundtable.</p> <p>Cumulative progress: 10%.</p>	
<p>Outcome 2.1 Reduction of pressures and threats to biodiversity and ecosystem services in 581,859 ha of existing PAs and their buffer zone</p>				
<p>Output 2.1.1: Management plans and governance mechanisms developed and/or adopted include support for the implementation of priority actions in the selected areas</p>	<p>Number of hectares (ha) under management plans developed and/or adopted with support for the implementation of priority actions</p>	<p>190,282 ha²⁶</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery of the 6 management plans formulated and/or updated for the PAs prioritized by the project (which were not formulated by the Implementation Unit, but by the PNNC and the CVC for the corresponding PAs, which are in effect to date) was formalized. • Project resources supported the implementation of the actions prioritized by the SPNNC area teams for 2021 and the 1st semester of 2022 (environmental education activities, monitoring, community consultation spaces, among others). • The implementation of actions to support the processes of adoption, socialization and/or implementation of actions of the Management Plans of 6 PAs was arranged and initiated. In addition, progress was made in the delivery of goods, equipment and materials prioritized in the agreed procurement plan, based on the needs for improving management effectiveness. • The implementation of actions foreseen in the 3 components of the monitoring program of the <i>DNMI Cabo Manglares Bajo Mira y Frontera – CMBMYF</i> management plan (marine-coastal component) began, an exercise led by INVEMAR, in coordination with the team of the DNMI CMBMYF and the Pacifico Biocultural project. • The investment plans for the <i>RFPR Kokoi Euja</i> (La Rana Dorada) and the <i>DRMI Serranía de los Paraguas</i> 	

²⁶ Corresponds to Cabo Manglares- Bajo Mira IMND.

			<p>were agreed upon and are in the process of implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress was made in the process of coordinating actions to support the formulation of the <i>RFPN Río Nembí</i> management plan and the expansion process of the <i>RFPN La Planada</i>. <p>Cumulative progress: 40%.</p>	
	Number of governance mechanisms ²⁷ under implementation as a result of the project	At least two (2) under implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 protected areas (PA) governance instances were supported through technical assistance and logistical contributions for the development of their meetings, specifically: the <i>Comité de Cogestión del DRMI Serranía de los Paraguas</i>; the <i>Mesa de Uso, Ocupación y Tenencia (UOT)</i> of the Farallones NNP; the <i>Mesa Local de Concertación con Comunidades Negras</i> adjoining the Farallones NNP; and the <i>Comité de Coadministración y Manejo del DNMI Cabo Manglares Bajo Mira y Frontera</i>; the <i>Comité institucional y comunitario</i> for the management of the <i>RFPR La Rana Dorada</i>; and the <i>Mesa del pacto por la conservación</i> of the Los Katíos NNP. The work plans for the year 2022 with the PAs prioritized by the project were formulated and its implementation, in which the needs and support required to strengthen the governance mechanisms in the PAs were identified. <p>Cumulative progress: 40%.</p>	
Output 2.1.2: One financial sustainability strategy designed and implemented for ensuring participation within	Financial strategy for the SIRAP Pacific action plan	Financial strategy for the SIRAP Pacific designed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The baseline was established within the framework of the design of the financial sustainability strategy and other proposals for financial sustainability strategies (SIRAP Pacífico, SAMP, SIDAPs, SINAP, etc.). Workspaces were held with the SIRAP Pacific Regional Technical Roundtable, the UNDP BIOFIN 	

²⁷ 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.

<p>the SIRAP Pacific framework</p>			<p>program, and members of the GEF SINAP team (which supports and implements the SINAP policy), in which progress was made reviewing and updating the SIRAP Pacific action plan based on the updated version of the SINAP action plan and updating the financial gap, as steps prior to updating the financial sustainability strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process of formulating a project for the general royalty's system was accompanied by the SIRAP Pacific Regional Technical Roundtable in coordination with the UNDP BIOFIN program. • A working alliance is being negotiated with the Pacific RAP to stimulate the formulation and management of projects, with the purpose of contributing to close the financial gap within the framework of the implementation of the SIRAP Pacific action plan. <p>Cumulative progress: 40%.</p>	
	<p>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</p>	<p>- General assembly: 0% - Regional Technical Committee: 80% - Regional Technical Roundtable: 80%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SIRAP Pacific general assembly of has not met, due to a decision of the subsystem. Cumulative progress: N/A. • Support was provided for 1 meeting of the SIRAP Pacific Regional Technical Committee on June 29-30 and July 1, 2022, to apply the management effectiveness tool at a system scale and update the SIRAP Pacific action plan. Cumulative progress: 95% of the level of participation in the Committee held to date (only Codechocó did not attend). • Support was provided for the holding of 9 meetings of the SIRAP Pacific Regional Technical Roundtable, namely: on April 21, 2021; on July 19, 2021; on August 19, 2021; on October 20, 2021; on December 6, 2021; on February 17, 2022; on March 31 and April 1, 2022; on May 5, 2022; and June 24, 2022. 	

			Cumulative progress: 87.5% of the level of participation in the Committees held to date (only Codechocó does not attend).	
<p>Output 2.1.3: Forest restoration and soil recovery plans for PAs, buffer zones, connectivity areas, and corridors are developed and implementation is kick-started in a participatory manner</p>	Carbon captured (tCO ₂ -eq) through soil ecological restoration and recovery as a result of the project	0 tCO ₂ -eq	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Up to date, no progress is reported on the indicator “Carbon captured (tCO₂-eq) through soil ecological restoration and recovery as a result of the project” for this output, which is scheduled to be achieved in the last years of the project. <p>Cumulative progress: 0%.</p>	
	Area (ha) restored with the project’s support	Zero (0)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Up to date, the process of identification and selection of the areas to design and implement the respective ecological restoration and soil recovery plans, is presented as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Katíos – Caoba MUCB it was decided to carry it out in the Communal Council of the Cacarica River watershed, linked to the PMF. In the Tatamá – Serranía de los Paraguas MUCB, it was defined to implement it in the Communal Council of Santa Cecilia, linked to the PMF output. In the Farallones – Calima MUCB, an agreement was established to carry it out in the collective territories of the Community Councils of Cajambre, Mayorquín, Taparal Humanes and actions in Punta Soldado. In the Cabo Manglares – Familia Awá MUCB, it was decided to develop them in the <i>DNMI Cabo Manglares Bajo Mira y Frontera</i> and the Community <i>Resguardo El Gran Sábalo</i>. At the MUCB Munchique – Río Saija, a proposal was agreed with the CRC pending to be validated in July 2022 with the community. <p>Cumulative progress: 10%.</p>	
<p>Outcome 2.2</p>				

New PAs and CCSs receive support for management planning and implementation				
<p>Output 2.2.1: Planning and management instruments developed, with priority actions implemented in CCSs, by the forest-dependent communities</p>	<p>Number of planning and management instruments with early implementation actions in CCSs as a result of the project</p>	<p>At least two (2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress has been made in the general characterization of the Other Conservation Strategies – OECs in each of the 5 MUCBs, with a new update of the information that had been provided by the SIRAP Pacific and the inputs collected in the meetings with the stakeholders in the territory. • Up to date, the following OECs have been selected to support their consolidation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At the Cabo Manglares – Familia Awá MUCB: the reserve <i>+nkal Awá La Nutria "Piman"</i> of the Community <i>Resguardo El Gran Sábalo</i>. ○ In the Tatamá – Serranía de los Paraguas MUCB: the ethnic conservation areas of <i>"Alto Amurrupá"</i> in the territory of the Communal Council of Santa Cecilia and <i>"Alto Llorudó"</i> in the territory of the Major Communal Council of Alto San Juan (ASOCASAN). ○ In the Katíos – Caoba MUCB: it is initially planned to select an ethnic conservation area in the collective territory of the Communal Council of the Cacarica River watershed. <p>Cumulative progress: 15%.</p>	
<p>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</p>	<p>Document with technical guidelines as support for regulations to formalize the CCSs in the Pacific region</p>	<p>Technical guidelines under development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project team reviewed progress in the conceptualization and implementation of the OMEC in the country. In coordination with stakeholders, a conceptual change from Complementary Conservation Strategies – CCSs for Other Conservation Strategies – OECs was agreed, which is more appropriate for their identification and characterization as well as for considering the processes that are currently being developed in territory. 	

with the national process			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a route which was socialized and provided feedback by the SIRAP Pacific Regional Technical Roundtable to advance in the agreement of the technical guidelines as a contribution of the Pacific region to the national process that seeks the recognition and formalization of the OECs as part of the SINAP. <p>Cumulative progress: 5%.</p>	
<p>Output 2.2.3: Priority areas for conservation are assessed and steps towards their declaration as formal PAs are taken</p>	Number of new PAs progressing towards their declaration as a result of the project	- Regional public governance: Three (3) (Caoba, Serranía de los Paraguas, and Calle Santa Rosa)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Up to date, 2 formal declaration processes have been carried out as Protected Areas of the priority areas for conservation identified in the project formulation phase, namely: <i>Calle Santa Rosa</i> by the CRC in 2020 within the Munchique – Río Saija MUCB; and <i>Serranía de los Paraguas</i> by CVC in 2019 within the Tatamá – Serranía de los Paraguas MUCB (in the department of Valle del Cauca). Work plans were agreed with Codechocó, which will be developed together with Corparien for the implementation of the route for the declaration of new SINAP Protected Areas for the following priority areas for conservation: <i>Relictos de Caoba</i> and <i>Serranía de los Paraguas</i> in the department of Chocó; and in the case of the <i>páramo del Duende</i>, support for the formulation of the management plan for the area in the process towards its declaration, a planning instrument that will be included in the prior consultation exercise with the communities of the <i>El Litoral de San Juan</i> municipality. <p>Cumulative progress: 66.7%.</p>	
<p>Outcome 3.1 Biodiversity and ecosystem services are sustainably utilized in forest-based productive systems and generate multiple environmental and socio-economic benefits</p>				
<p>Output 3.1.1: Green Business action plan(s) harmonized and</p>	Number of green business plans that safeguard cultural, biological, and	Three (3): Nariño, Cauca, Risaralda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To date there is a preliminary document for the update of the Departmental Green Business Plan of Nariño, which was prepared in coordination with Corponariño and GGGI. 	

<p>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>	<p>ecosystem services' diversity</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CRC has a preliminary document of the Departmental Green Business Plan of Cauca, updating and adoption process for which the project is defining its participation, as well as to conduct socialization workshops of the plan in the territories within the Munchique – Río Saija MUCB. • With Codechocó, the project agreed to hold 3 workshops of training and diagnosis of green business initiatives in Acandí, Riosucio and Tadó as part of the process to update the Departmental Green Business Plan of Chocó • Given that MinAmbiente is currently conducting the process for updating the National Green Business Plan, it was defined with the Green Business offices of the CARs to postpone the update of their Green Business Departmental Plans for the last quarter of 2022. <p>Cumulative progress: 10%.</p>	
	<p>Number of green business initiatives with priority actions supported (in the MUCBs)</p>	<p>Ten (10)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selection criteria for Green Business initiatives were developed by the Implementation Unit were elaborated, which were socialized, discussed, and adjusted, in accordance with the proposals that emerged in meetings with the partner CARs of the project. • The inventory of Green Businesses by MUCB was updated, in which 192 initiatives were pre-identified and of which, to date: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At the Cabo Manglares – Familia Awá MUCB: 5 Green Business initiatives were selected²⁸: 1) <i>Corporación de Servicios y</i> 	

²⁸ It should be noted that the minutes of the meeting defined:

"Finally, it was reiterated that these initiatives will be visited to corroborate the criteria of mandatory compliance, that of location within the MUCB, which is from natural resources, which does not have sanctioning processes with the Environmental Authority, which includes gender equity and that is operating, that is, producing and selling its products.

If one of the five selected initiatives do not meet this criterion the project will discard it for accompaniment and will consider the initiative that followed in higher score, in this case Tumacoco SAS".

			<p><i>asistencia Técnica las varas – Corpoteva; 2) Corporación Técnica para el Desarrollo del Pacífico – CORTEPAZ; 3) Asociación de organizaciones productoras de cacao de Tumaco – Chocolate Tumaco; 4) Asociación de hoteleros y pescadores de Bocagrande; and 5) Asociación de productores y comercializadores de cacao de la ensenada de Tumaco – Asprocent.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At the Tatamá – Serranía de los Paraguas MUCB: 3 Green Business initiatives have been selected: 1) <i>Asociación de desplazados Sueños de Paz Sin Fronteras</i>; 2) <i>Asociación de Mujeres Cafeteras Agropecuarias y Ambientales del municipio del Versalles – AMCAVER</i>; and 3) <i>Asopri – Asociación de paneleros de Pueblo Rico</i>. <p>Cumulative progress: 8%.</p>	
<p>Output 3.1.2: SFM initiatives and sustainable production systems implemented incorporating good soil and biodiversity-friendly practices, with gender approach</p>	<p>Number of plans for SFM initiatives and sustainable production systems as a result of the project</p>	<p>One (1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A roadmap was built with the criteria for prioritizing the areas for the participatory development of Sustainable Forest Management Plans – SFMP and Sustainable Production Systems – SPS. <p>Cumulative progress: 3%.</p>	<p>UNIDO was unable to exercise its role as a GEF implementing agency of the Pacífico Biocultural project and FAO had to act as the only GEF implementing agency of the project, carrying out the activities UNIDO was responsible for, including some activities of this output.</p>
<p>Outcome 3.2 Products and services derived from biodiversity have value added and their value chains duly strengthened</p>				
<p>Output 3.2.1 Value addition units of biodiversity-derived products created and strengthened, with technical and</p>	<p>Number of value addition units strengthened and created for biodiversity-derived products with technical and</p>	<p>- Five (5) value addition units in the process of strengthening - Two (2) value addition units in</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A call for the selection of Value Addition Units – UAV was made: 20 UAV initiatives applied, of which 9 met the enabling criteria; recognition and characterization visits were made to the initiatives to make the qualification of the selection criteria; finally, the following 4 UAVs were selected to be strengthened by the project: 	<p>UNIDO was unable to exercise its role as a GEF implementing agency of the Pacífico Biocultural project and FAO had to act as the only GEF implementing agency of the project, carrying out the</p>

management training that safeguard cultural, biological, and ecosystem services' diversity	management capacity as a result of the project	the process of being created	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Farallones – Calima MUCB: <i>Naidí del Pacífico SAS</i> and <i>AMUCIB</i> – Association of peasant, black and indigenous women of Buenaventura. ○ Cabo Manglares – Familia Awá MUCB: <i>Procacao</i> and the <i>Raíces del Manglar</i> association. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A systematization document of the call and a document for each of the 4 selected UAVs (4 of the 5 existing ones; 4 of the 7 in total) were prepared. • Progress was made in the preparation of an investment plan for each UAV. <p>Cumulative progress: 15%.</p>	activities UNIDO was responsible for, including this output.
Output 3.2.2: Biodiversity-derived products with market access and/or enhance compliance with quality requirements, MADS green business criteria, and other standards for market access	Number of biodiversity-derived products with formal market access and complying with quality requirements, green business criteria of MADS and other standards for markets access	At least two (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work was carried out with the CARs and the stakeholders in the territory in the identification of initiatives around emblematic products of the Pacific (<i>naidí, piangua, viche, cocoa, papachina</i>, etc.), to be supported by the project in their positioning in the market. • Once the UAVs and the Green Business initiatives have been selected, a decision will be made on the emblematic products derived from the biodiversity of the Colombian Pacific with market access. <p>Cumulative progress: 10%.</p>	UNIDO was unable to exercise its role as a GEF implementing agency of the Pacífico Biocultural project and FAO had to act as the only GEF implementing agency of the project, carrying out the activities UNIDO was responsible for, including this output.
Output 3.2.3: Community-based nature tourism initiatives strengthened with government and non-government support that safeguard cultural, biological, and ecosystem services' diversity	Number of community-based nature tourism initiatives strengthened that safeguard cultural, biological, and ecosystem services' diversity	Four (4) under development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the following community-based nature tourism initiatives was agreed with the project's institutional stakeholders in each MUCB: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In the Katíos – Caoba MUCB: the "<i>Atrato-Darién</i>" tourist corridor was selected. ○ In the Farallones – Calima MUCB: the nature tourism processes in San Cipriano and Aguaclara in the Anchicayá basin were selected. ○ In the Tatamá – Serranía de los Paraguas MUCB: nature tourism initiatives were 	UNIDO was unable to exercise its role as a GEF implementing agency of the Pacífico Biocultural project and FAO had to act as the only GEF implementing agency of the project, carrying out the activities UNIDO was responsible for, including this output.

			<p>selected in the civil society reserve “<i>Serraniagua</i>” in Valle del Cauca and the Communal Council of Santa Cecilia in Risaralda.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In the MUCB Cabo Mangroves – Familia Awá: within the framework of the MUCB Technical Committee, support to the consolidation of the Piedmont-Coastal Zone Birdwatching Corridor was validated and ratified, articulated to an initiative for planning and promoting whale watching in the marine-coastal zone. <p>Cumulative progress: 20%.</p>	
<p>Outcome 4.1 Project monitored and evaluated with a results-based management approach, and communication of lessons learned</p>				
<p>Output 4.1.1. Five participatory action plans for the prioritized MUCBs</p>	<p>Number of action plans</p>	<p>Five (5), 1 per MUCB</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The methodology for the development of the Comprehensive Participatory Action Plans (PPIA) in the 5 prioritized MUCBs was socialized and validated by the project stakeholders. • The process of setting up the MUCB Technical Committees began, within the framework of which it is planned to carry out the validation and coordination of the corresponding PPIA. This process that was carried out for the Cabo Manglares – Familia Awá MUCB in June 2022 and for the month of July of this year, the process is scheduled to be carry out in the other 4 MUCBs. <p>Cumulative progress: 20%.</p>	
	<p>Number of participation agreements at the MUCB level for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity</p>	<p>Five (5), 1 per MUCB</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9 Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) were obtained with the following ethnic territories to implement the project in the 5 MUCBs, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At the Katíos – Caoba MUCB with the Communal Council of the Cacarica River watershed and the Major Communal Council of the Lower Atrato (COCOMAUNGUÍA); and the Community <i>Resguardo</i> of Arquía. 	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At the Cabo Manglares – Familia Awá MUCB with the Communal Council of Bajo Mira and Frontera; and the Community <i>Resguardo</i> El Gran Sábalo. ○ At the MUCB Munchique – Río Saija with the Community <i>Resguardo</i> of Calle Santa Rosa. ○ At the Tatamá – Serranía de los Paraguas MUCB with the Major Communal Council of Alto San Juan (ASOCASAN) and the Communal Council of Santa Cecilia. ○ At the Farallones – Calima MUCB with the Communal Council of the Yurumanguí river. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The "Installation and Commitments Act" of the MUCB Technical Committee of Cabo Manglares – Familia Awá MUCB was signed as an agreement of willingness to the participation of strategic stakeholders at the MUCB level for conservation, sustainable use of the territory and biological and cultural diversity. <p>Cumulative progress: 20%.</p>	
Output 4.1.2 An online M&E platform	Online monitoring platform	One (1) online monitoring platform being designed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The project has been permanently monitored, within the framework of which the following have been prepared: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1 Project Implementation Report (PIR), which was prepared by FAO, validated by MinAmbiente in its capacity as the GEF Operational Focal Point - OFP in Colombia and approved by the GEF in September 2021. ○ 4 Project Progress Reports (PPR). ○ 24 monthly project Dashboards. ● The design of an online M&E platform proposal was designed by FAO with the "Power BI" tool, which is yet to be socialized with the project stakeholders. ● The Pacifico Biocultural project website is currently under construction. 	

			Cumulative progress: 40%.	
Output 4.1.3: One communication strategy for development implemented	Communication strategy	One (1) communication strategy designed and in early stages of implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The communication strategy for development was socialized with 9 community stakeholders belonging to the 5 MUCBs of the project. In the implementation of the strategy, communication actions and products have been carried out to accompany the project implementation process, informing the stakeholders about its progress, disseminating relevant results or issues to be highlighted aimed at external audiences and generating agreements with both institutional and community stakeholders to support internal communication processes of the project and/or community. 	
Output 4.1.4: One Mid-term Review (MTR) and one Terminal Evaluation (TE)	One Mid-term Review and one Terminal Evaluation	Mid-term Review report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Mid-Term Review (MTR) will be conducted during the second semester of 2022 and the Terminal Evaluation (TE) is scheduled to be carried out in the final year of the project (2024). 	
			Cumulative progress: 35%.	
			Cumulative progress: N/A.	

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcome of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR.

- The Pacífico Biocultural project has organized 2 Steering Committees, carried 4 Technical Committees and 1 MUCB Technical Committee. This indicates that the project's governance and decision-making mechanisms are currently operating normally.
- The official launch event or inception workshop of the Pacífico Biocultural Project took place in Tumaco on 15 October 2021.
- The Pacífico Biocultural Project has carried out consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the 9 ethnic communities that will directly participate in the project.
- A Diagnosis and Strategic Assessment of the ecosystem services in the Pacific Region for 4 MUCBs is currently being implemented, through a Letter of Agreement – LoA with WWF Colombia.
- With the 6 PAs prioritized in the PRODOC and 4 additional PAs agreed with the institutional partners of the project, the following actions have been carried out to increase its management effectiveness:
 - Acquisition of equipment and supplies for the management of PAs.
 - Activities related to the implementation of PAs management plans.
 - Support for the strengthening governance of 6 mechanisms in the PAs.
- Diagnoses of the current state and requirements of the 4 Value Addition Units – UAV (Acronym in Spanish) selected to date were made.
- 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 by CRC in 2020 within the MUCB Munchique – Río Saija.
 - 39,792 ha from Serranía de los Paraguas (in the department of Valle del Cauca) by CVC in the year 2019 within the Tatamá – Serranía de los Paraguas MUCB.
- The characterization of planning instruments for the Katíos – Caoba, Cabo Manglares – Familia Awá and Farallones – Calima MUCBs was prepared.
- The delivery of the 6 management plans formulated and/or updated by the PAs prioritized by the project was formalized (which were not carried out directly by the Implementation Unit, but by PNNC and CVC for the corresponding PAs, which are in effect to date).
- The Project Implementation Unit's staff was recruited and is working towards the achievement of the objectives, results, and outputs of the project.
- The SIRAP Pacific's management capacities were strengthened with the recruitment and renewal for 1 more year of a Technical Secretariat for the Subsystem. In addition, the Pacífico Biocultural Project has supported the SIRAP Pacific looking to promote its stakeholders' participation through 1 meeting of the SIRAP Pacific Regional Technical Committee; and 9 meetings of the SIRAP Pacific Regional Technical Roundtable.

- The training and capacity-building plan for SIRAP Pacific stakeholders was designed with strategic partners and the subsystem Regional Technical Roundtable.

Challenges

The major challenges and external factor for delays the project has experienced during its implementation phase were:

- 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 Colombia since April 28, 2021, affected the mobility and supply of the whole country and thus, have slowed the progress of the Project.
- 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.
- Despite the above, the project is currently fully operative.
- Given the results of the presidential elections that took place in Colombia on June 19, 2022, it is necessary to hold joint meetings between the interlocutors with the project of the outgoing government and the incoming government. The implementation unit will promote a meeting between both governments' teams.

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. For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

	FY2022 Development Objective rating²⁹	FY2022 Implementation Progress rating³⁰	Comments/reasons³¹ justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	<p><i>In the process of overcoming the Covid-19 pandemic, the project has managed to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the 9 ethnic communities that will directly participate in the project and has begun the installation of the 1st MUCB Technical Committee. Once the installation of the other 4 MUCB Technical Committees has been completed, sufficient information will be available for the investment plan of this and next year; in this way, it will be possible to have an updated work plan agreed with the institutional and community stakeholders in territory.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, for FY 2022 the project has made substantial progress on products such as: the Diagnosis and Strategic Assessment of the ecosystem services in the Pacific Region; implementation of PA management plans and governance mechanisms; harmonization of instruments; among others.</i></p> <p><i>In conclusion, the Project Implementation Unit has been implementing an action which has managed to recover a significant part of the arrears.</i></p>
Budget Holder	S	S	<p><i>The Covid-19 pandemic delayed the start of fieldwork, so the project had a slow beginning phase. Having said that and comparing the cumulative progress of the project according to the last PIR with this one, now the project is on its way to put its activities on track as it was presented on the point “3. Implementation progress”. Also, it is important to present this project to the new government when</i></p>

²⁹ **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.

For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

³⁰ **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project’s components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

³¹ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

			<i>they assume its new positions, to show them the importance of its objectives on the framework of the development of the pacific Region of Colombia.</i>
GEF Operational Focal Point³²	MS	MS	<i>The Operational Focal Point considers that the project implementation is up to date especially considering the special conditions due to the COVID-19 pandemic and some social situations in the country. The project implementation unit has had a close relationship to the OFP which is appreciated, however some of the technical directions have expressed concern over the lack of participation in some spaces of the project. In general, the project can work in improving communication with the Ministry in general.</i>
Lead Technical Officer³³	S	S	<i>The project has faced difficulties in initiating actions, which has caused a delay with respect to the original schedule. However, different contingency plans have been generated and currently the actions are progressing at a good time. In the next two months it will be essential to formalize the pending agreements with the participating institutions, as well as to finalize the targeting of the communities and families that will be beneficiaries.</i>
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	MS	<i>The project has made important advances that reflect its progress to the achievement of the committed results. As reported in the present PIR, there are delays in the implementation at the output level, especially considering that the project is nearing its mid-term evaluation. The delays have been caused by external factors out of control of the project, such as the Covid19 pandemic, social unrest in the country and the transfer of responsibilities from the co-implementing agency UNIDO to FAO. The project has taken measures to mitigate the effects of the delays and it is expected that by the following reporting period important progress at the outputs level will be reported.</i>

³² In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

³³ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made complying with the approved ESM plan. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Add new ESS risks if any risks have emerged during this FY.

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 may be implemented within protected areas or buffer zones</p> <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 – Familia Awá), and partial intervention in two mosaics (Serranía de Paraguas – Tatamá and Munchique – 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</p>	<p>With the 6 PAs prioritized in the PRODOC and 4 additional PAs agreed with the institutional partners of the project, the following actions have been carried out to increase its management effectiveness:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acquisition of equipment and supplies for the management of PAs. 2. Activities related to the implementation of PAs management plans. 	<p>Continue supporting management plans and governance mechanisms in the selected PAs.</p> <p>Initiate the development of planning and management instruments of the conservation strategies (OEC) identified.</p> <p>Design of technical guidelines to formalize the CCSs in the Pacific region.</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>

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
	conservation will be assessed and necessary steps towards their declaration as formal PAs will be taken.	3. Support for the strengthening governance of 6 mechanisms in the PAs.	3 priority area for conservation will be assessed and necessary steps towards their declaration as formal PAs will be taken, in coordination with Codechocó.	
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
<p>Project activities could take place where indigenous peoples live</p> <p>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</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>An autonomous election of the new ethnic delegates was facilitated and supported to represent indigenous communities in the Project Steering Committee. Achieving the election of José Domingo Mejía, Indigenous Eperara Siapidara representative of the Calle Santa Rosa <i>Resguardo</i> and Bellanire Sinisterra, 'Afro-descendant' of the Communal Council of Bajo Mira and Frontera, who participated with voice and vote in the 2nd</p>	<p>The active participation of ethnic communities in the installation of the other 4 MUCB Technical Committees and in the formulation of the participatory action plans – PPIA will be encouraged.</p> <p>In the next months, a MUCB Local Facilitator will be hired for each of the ethnic communities that will directly participate in the project.</p>	<p>The Project Coordinator and the Professional in participation and “<i>differential approach</i>” are responsible for this ESS, with the support of the Project Implementation Unit.</p>

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
		<p>Project Steering Committee.</p> <p>To date the Pacífico Biocultural Project has carried out consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the 9 ethnic communities that will directly participate in the project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Communal Council of the Cacarica River watershed. 2. Major Communal Council of the Lower Atrato (COCOMAUNGUÍA). 3. Major Communal Council of Alto San Juan (ASOCASAN). 4. Communal Council of Santa Cecilia. 5. Communal Council of the Yurumanguí river. 6. Communal Council of Bajo Mira and Frontera. 7. Community <i>Resguardo</i> of Arquía. 		

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
		8. Community <i>Resguardo</i> of Calle Santa Rosa. 9. Community <i>Resguardo</i> El Gran Sábalo.		

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate if the initial Environmental and Social (ESS) Risk classification is still valid; if not, what is the new classification and explain.

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ³⁴ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Moderate	Yes. ESS risks have been reduced due to the support in the PAs management plans, including the strengthening governance of mechanisms in the PAs that have facilitated dialogue and consultation processes with communities. As well as obtaining the FPIC with the 9 ethnic communities that will directly participate in the project in which the agreements have been clarified and with the installation of the MUCB Technical Committees that have promoted community participation.

<i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i>
No.

³⁴ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation (including COVID-19 related risks). The last column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in the project, as relevant.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ³⁵	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	<p>Political risk</p> <p>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	Y	<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, sub-national agencies, and other stakeholders, informed on project progress, achievements, and challenges.</p> <p>The relationship has strengthened: an extraordinary project steering committee will be held at the middle of the year and meetings with the SIRAP Pacific has been increased.</p> <p>The key project stakeholders have remained committed to the project and new allies such WWF Colombia and Fundación Trópico have been included.</p>	<p>Given the elections that took place in Colombia on June 19, 2022, it is necessary to hold joint meetings between the interlocutors with the project of the outgoing government and the incoming government. The implementation unit will promote a meeting between both governments.</p>

³⁵ Risk ratings means a rating of accesses the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ³⁵	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
2	<p>Political risk</p> <p>Local authorities show limited interest in the project and reflect a lack of willingness to take part in project activities</p>	Medium	Y	<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 promoted and encouraged participation and discussion spaces with project stakeholders through the Project Steering Committee, Project Technical Committee and the MUCB Technical Committees.</p> <p>The project has implemented a participatory approach, through the SIRAP Pacific structures and other mechanisms.</p> <p>Local stakeholders have been part of agreements to formulate and implement the participatory action plans – PPIA.</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> <p>The project can strengthen the relationship with the sub-directorate of education and participation, considering that this sub-directorate can support the accompaniment with ethnic groups.</p>

	Type of risk	Risk rating ³⁵	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
3	Political risk Project co-financiers do not comply with the co-financing commitments	Low	Y	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.	The project has kept its co-financiers permanently informed regarding their financial commitments to the project. Constant communication with stakeholders has been maintained to request the report of its co-financing commitments. Some stakeholders have delivered it.	Steps have been taken, but it is a potential risk that will remain until the end of the project or until the co-financing contributions target is accomplished. UNIDO was unable to exercise its role as a GEF implementing agency of the Pacifico Biocultural project and FAO had to act as the only GEF implementing agency of the project. UNIDO's co-financing amount confirmed at CEO endorsement was reviewed and they will not provide co-financing certification.

4	<p>Social risk</p> <p>Lack of interest and low participation by traditional authorities, local communities, and community leaders</p>	Medium	Y	<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</p>	<p>The Pacifico Biocultural Project has carried out consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the 9 ethnic communities that will directly participate in the project.</p> <p>The project has promoted and there has been an active participation of ethnic communities in the installation of the MUCB Technical Committees and in the formulation of the participatory action plans – PPIA, with a particular focus on women, youth, and the elderly.</p>	<p>The Pacifico Biocultural project had the participation of the ethnic delegates at the 2nd Project Steering Committee: José Domingo Mejía, Indigenous Eperara Siapidara representative of the Calle Santa Rosa <i>Resguardo</i> and Bellanire Sinisterra, 'Afro-descendant' of the Communal Council of Bajo Mira and Frontera.</p>
---	--	--------	---	--	---	---

			<p>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 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</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

	Type of risk	Risk rating ³⁵	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
				<p>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> <p>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.</p>		

	Type of risk	Risk rating ³⁵	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
5	<p>Social risk</p> <p>Low participation of women, youth, and the elderly</p>	Low	Y	<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>The project has applied a gender-sensitive approach, it has sought to encourage their participation in the project's activities and products.</p> <p>In addition, 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 conduct gender analysis.</p> <p>Local community participatory structures have larger councils, which are consulted and participate in decision-making.</p> <p>Governance and communication activities and products are being implemented mainly with young people.</p>	<p>The Project is still in an initial phase, but there is no evidence to date of low participation of women, youth, or the elderly.</p> <p>The project implementation unit has 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>

	Type of risk	Risk rating ³⁵	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
6	Environmental risk The sequence of climate change events affects vital areas for conservation, productive landscapes, and beneficiary communities	Medium	Y	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.	The Pacifico Biocultural project has promoted a socio-ecosystem connectivity approach.	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> " and which will last until August 2022, according to the IDEAM. This has been the longest phenomenon.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ³⁵	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
7	Environmental risk Socio-environmental conflicts: Extraction activities and territorial conflicts	Medium	Y	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.	The Output 1.1.1, which is related to a Diagnosis and Strategic Assessment of the ecosystem services in the Pacific Region for 4 MUCBs is currently being implemented, through a Letter of Agreement – LoA with WWF Colombia.	The only problem that has been perceived is that the project has not been able to work in <i>El playón</i> of the Siguí River due to the problem of illegal mining and disruption of public order.

<p>8</p>	<p>Security risk Armed conflict, disruption of public order, and problems related to security</p>	<p>Medium-high</p>	<p>Y</p>	<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 conducted on a permanent basis by the security FAO focal point in coordination with UNDSS, paying particular attention to the focused operating windows within the MUCBs.</p> <p>The has sought to maintain a permanent communication and generation of early warnings in this regard.</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 MUCBs there has been no problems related to security that have directly affected the safety of Project staff (as of the date of this report).</p> <p>As mentioned before, the only problem that has been perceived is that the project has not been able to work (and most likely will not) in <i>El playón</i> of the Siguí River due to the problem of illegal mining.</p>
----------	--	--------------------	----------	---	---	--

	Type of risk	Risk rating ³⁵	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
9	Institutional risk The institutional post-conflict structure and roles and responsibilities have only recently been defined, which may limit the impact of the project	Low	Y	Not defined in the Prodoc.	N/A.	To date, there has been no impact in this regard.
10	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	Low	N	In 2023, once the newly elected governments are known (that will begin their administration in 2024), the project will promote dialogue based on 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 Pacífico Biocultural project identifies this as a new risk considering the regional and local elections in Colombia to be held in 2023.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ³⁵	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
11	Health risk Worldwide emergency situation due to the Covid-19 pandemic	Medium-high	N	Adapt presential meetings to virtual means, adjust the project strategy to teleworking and train the project team in biosafety protocols.	The MUCB professionals were selected and are coordinating actions and meetings in territory since July 2021. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, the project has not been able to have the pace expected for the implementation of fieldwork. Institutional meetings have been conducted in a virtual manner and the Project has assumed teleworking as the way to conduct the work by the Implementation Unit.	The Covid-19 pandemic has definitely been the main reason for delays on the activities and progress in the implementation of the project. In order to have an interlocutor, a MUCB Local Facilitator will be hired for each of the ethnic communities that will directly participate in the project.

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

FY2021 rating	FY2022 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Moderate	Moderate	The risk level associated mainly with external factors to the Pacifico Biocultural project remains the same. It is considered that the security risk is the only one that could directly affect the project's implementation, due to the armed conflict. However, so far, the staff of the project has not had security issues or situations directly since we work and-in-hand with the communities in territory.

7. Follow-up on Mid-term review or supervision mission (only for projects that have conducted an MTR)

If the project had an MTR or a supervision mission, please report on how the recommendations were implemented during this fiscal year as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
Recommendation 1:	N/A
Recommendation 2:	N/A
Recommendation 3:	N/A
Recommendation 4:	N/A

Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe	
---	--

8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines³⁶. Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories. And, provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework	N/A		
Components and cost	N/A		
Institutional and implementation arrangements	At the request of MinAmbiente, a Project Operating Manual was designed. This document compiles the main clarifications, details and/or updates regarding the institutional and implementation arrangements regarding the content of the PRODOC, for example, the conformation of the Project Steering Committee and the definition of how their respective delegates are elected.	Since March 2021	Project Steering Committee
Financial management	Considering the request of MinAmbiente, the authorization by the GEF and the fact that UNIDO was unable to exercise its role as a GEF implementing agency of the Pacifico Biocultural project, FAO had to carry out a budget revision process to include in FPMIS the amount of USD \$1.942.669 that UNIDO was responsible for	May 2022	Project Task Force (PTF)
Implementation schedule	To date, implementation schedule has not been modified. The MTR will evaluate if the current timelines are adequate or if an extension is recommended.		
Executing Entity	N/A		
Executing Entity Category	N/A		
Minor project objective change	N/A		
Safeguards	N/A		
Risk analysis	2 new risks have been identified by the project: the lack of willingness of subnational and local authorities and private sector to apply the guidelines for	Since March 2020 and continues in force to date	1 st PIR

36 Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

	harmonization of territorial and environmental management planning instruments that safeguard cultural, biological, and ecosystem services' diversity; and the worldwide emergency situation due to the Covid-19 pandemic.		
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	N/A		
Co-financing	UNIDO was unable to exercise its role as a GEF implementing agency of the Pacífico Biocultural project and FAO had to act as the only GEF implementing agency of the project. UNIDO's co-financing amount confirmed at CEO endorsement was reviewed and they will not provide co-financing certification.	June 16, 2021 August 30, 2021	GEF MinAmbiente and FAO
Location of project activity	Adjustments were made to the polygon's boundaries of the Farallones – Calima and Tatamá – Serranía de los Paraguas MUCBs, as requested by the institutional project stakeholders	March 18, 2022	Project Steering Committee
Other			

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

Please report on progress and results and challenges on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan) included at CEO Endorsement/Approval during this reporting period.

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government Institutions			
Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MinAmbiente)	Executing agency of the project and GEF focal point.	<p>During the project implementation process MinAmbiente has provided its expertise on biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, land use, economic tools, and incentives.</p> <p>The project has had a close relationship with: the Directorate of Forests, Biodiversity and Ecosystemic Services; the Office for Green and Sustainable Business; and the Office for International Affairs.</p> <p>MinAmbiente has also participated actively in the project Steering Committees, Technical Committees and in the inception workshop.</p>	The project can strengthen the relationship with the sub-directorate of education and participation, considering that this sub-directorate can support the accompaniment with ethnic groups.
National Natural Parks of Colombia (PNN)	Project partner. The director of the Pacific Territorial Directorate – DTPA was appointed by MinAmbiente as the National Project Director (NPD), who is responsible for the execution and coordination of the project.	<p>PNN has contributed with its extensive experience in working with communities, building consensus, and participating in dialogues through its permanent presence in the territory, in addition to being a conservation leader.</p> <p>The project has provided support for managing the PAs to increase the management effectiveness of PAs, through the acquisition of equipment and supplies for the</p>	Initially the communication with the PAs was through the DTPA and currently, there is a more fluid relationship at the MUCB local level.

		<p>management of PAs; activities related to the implementation of PAs management plans; and support for the strengthening governance mechanisms in the PAs.</p> <p>PNN has also participated actively in the project Steering Committees, Technical Committees and in the inception workshop.</p>	
<p>Regional Autonomous Corporations (CARs): CODECHOCÓ CARDER CVC CRC CORPONARIÑO</p>	<p>CARs play a beneficiary and partner role providing support to all the outputs.</p>	<p>For this project, CARs are the target of actions to strengthen capacity that will improve their technical and operational capacities so that biodiversity-friendly production systems can be sustainable over time, in addition to strengthening their forest planning and management capacities.</p> <p>CARs have also participated actively in the project Steering Committees and Technical Committees.</p>	<p>The Covid-19 pandemic delayed the start of fieldwork and virtuality was a challenge for dialogue with them.</p>
Private sector entities			
BIOINNOVA	<p>BIOINNOVA will provide support to the execution of project Outcome 3.2.</p>	<p>BIOINNOVA and FAO are currently in negotiations of a Letter of Agreement – LoA so that BIOINNOVA can provide support to the execution of project Outcome 3.2.</p>	<p>Considering that UNIDO was unable to exercise its role as a GEF implementing agency of the Pacífico Biocultural project, FAO had to resume dialogues and negotiations with BIOINNOVA to be able to achieve an execution agreement.</p>
<i>Corporación Biocomercio Sostenible</i>	<p>The organization will take part in the execution of project Outcome 3.2.</p>	<p><i>Biocomercio</i> and FAO are currently in negotiations of a Letter of Agreement – LoA so that <i>Biocomercio</i> can take part in the execution of project Outcome 3.2.</p>	<p>Considering that UNIDO was unable to exercise its role as a GEF implementing agency of the Pacífico Biocultural project, FAO had to resume dialogues and negotiations with <i>Biocomercio</i> to be able to achieve an execution agreement.</p>

Others[1]			
SIRAP Pacific	Project beneficiary and partner.	<p>The SIRAP Pacific constitutes an articulation scenario for linking environmental officials (CARs and PNN), MinAmbiente, research institutions (INVEMAR and IIAP), institutional regional stakeholders, and ethnic (indigenous and Black) and rural communities with local conservation processes in the region.</p> <p>The SIRAP Pacific participates in all the project's outcomes and products and within the framework of its participation structures, the different actions of the project have been disseminated, socialized and/or agreed.</p> <p>The SIRAP Pacific has also participated actively in the project Steering Committees, Technical Committees and in the inception workshop.</p>	<p>The Covid-19 pandemic delayed the start of fieldwork and virtuality was a challenge for dialogue with institutional and community partners.</p>
Institute of Environmental Research of Pacific (IIAP) John von Neumann	The IIAP is part of the SIRAP Pacific and is a project beneficiary and partner.	The IIAP has engaged in different ways: served as the SIRAP Pacific technical secretariat; has also participated actively in the project Steering Committees and Technical Committees; has played a significant role in developing Output 1.1.3, as this is a regional node of Colombia SIAT; and in supporting all the outcomes and results.	N/A.
Institute of Marine and Coast Research José Benito Vives de Andreis (INVEMAR)	INVEMAR is part of the SIRAP Pacific and is a project beneficiary and partner.	INVEMAR initiated the implementation of actions foreseen in the 3 components of the monitoring program of the <i>DNMI Cabo Manglares Bajo Mira y Frontera</i> management plan.	N/A

[1] They can include, among others, community-based organizations (CBOs), Indigenous Peoples organizations, women's groups, private sector companies, farmers, universities, research institutions, and all major groups as identified, for example, in Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and many times again since then.

		INVEMAR has also participated actively in the project Technical Committees.	
Indigenous <i>Resguardos</i> and Communal Councils	Ethnic communities constitute relevant stakeholders in project implementation, and they will be direct beneficiaries and partners.	To date the Pacífico Biocultural Project has carried out consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the 9 indigenous communities and ethno-territorial authorities that will directly participate in the project. Delegates have participated in the project Steering Committees, inception workshop and in the MUCB Technical Committees.	The Covid-19 pandemic delayed the start of fieldwork and virtuality was a challenge for dialogue with them.
<i>New stakeholders identified/engaged</i>			
WWF Colombia	Project partner.	WWF Colombia is the Non-Government Organization (NGO) that was chosen as a project partner for the implementation of the Output 1.1.1: A Diagnosis and Strategic Assessment of the ecosystem services in the Pacific Region in 4 MUCBs.	N/A.

10. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) <u>during this reporting period.</u>		
Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	Yes	In addition to the gender analysis made at formulation stage, during the project implementation, 5 context analysis were prepared for each of the MUCBs, documents that give an account of the socio-economic conditions of the inhabitants of the project areas of intervention.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	The methodology for formulating the participatory action plans – PPIA 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.
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Yes	Women have been promoted and empowered, 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. For instance, opportunities for the active participation of <i>Eperara Siapidara</i> indigenous women in the Diagnosis and Strategic Assessment of the ecosystem services at the Munchique – Río Sajja MUCB were promoted.
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	Within the methodology for formulating the participatory action plans – PPIA, the participation of ethnic women was recommended in the MUCB Technical Committees, 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.
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	Among the selection criteria for value addition units and green business initiatives, a scoring criterion

		<p>related to the number of women participating in the initiative was included.</p> <p>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).</p>
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	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 conduct gender analysis.
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	<p>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.</p> <p>Missionary Professional specialized in participation and “differential approach”: Danny Daniel Herrán Acero email: danny.herranacero@fao.org</p>
Any other good practices on gender		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 <i>resguardos</i> for the 5 MUCB. In this way, the election of a woman as delegate was achieved: Bellanire Sinisterra, ‘ <i>Afro-descendant</i> ’ of the Communal Council of Bajo Mira and Frontera, who participated with voice and vote in the 2 nd Project Steering Committee.

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Within the framework of the communication strategy for development, the project designed a knowledge management strategy to systematise experiences and lessons learned from all the activities that the project implements in the MUCBs. This methodology is being fed from a toolbox that FAO is building.</p> <p>Moreover, the methodology is being validated within the Implementation Unit, in which information is collected, analysed, and systematized to manage the knowledge generated from the experiences in the MUCBs and in the agreements established with the project partners.</p> <p>Some of the relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publications have been produced such as the project’s basic concept book, which has promoted knowledge and clarity of different topics to community (leaders) and institutional stakeholders. • 2 project bulletins have been published to disseminate the implementation progress of the project on a biannual basis. • Finally, the publication of the results of the Diagnosis and Strategic Assessment of the ecosystem services in the Pacific Region is contemplated.
<p>Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.</p>	<p>The successes of the communication strategy for development are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The official launch event or inception workshop of the Pacifico Biocultural Project that took place in Tumaco on 15 October 2021. - Socialization, validation, and feedback of the communication strategy with community and institutional stakeholders was carried out. - Publication of 2 project bulletins to disseminate the implementation progress of the project on a biannual basis. - Design of the project identity manual and consolidate the project’s image and its use to position it among stakeholders. - From the consolidation of the project’s implementation progress, it has also been possible to begin with the dissemination and positioning of the project among stakeholders. <p>Challenges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Initiate capacity building with 3 community communication groups in the project.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support clear and effective communication of agreements and progress of actions with partners and thus contribute to their effective participation in the project. - To have a participatory construction of the information dissemination plan for the SIRAP Pacific structures.
<p>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. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.</p>	<p>Mr. Víctor Miguel Moreno, legal representative of the Communal Council of Santa Cecilia (from Pueblo Rico, Risaralda), shared his perception of the experience exchange to the San Cipriano Protected Forest Reserve, in which ethnic leaders visited San Cipriano to learn about its nature tourism process. He said it was a moment he did not expect as that experience is something like what they want to implement in their community. Although the video was not published, it was sent so that the community of Santa Cecilia could receive this message from their leader who represented them on this tour, which can be viewed on: https://youtu.be/eMOjZdIaQlg</p>
<p>Please provide links to related website, social media account</p>	<p>FAO Colombia Twitter: https://twitter.com/fao_colombia YouTube account of the Pacifico Biocultural project: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UChkUAWyvT1dGDBtAW56C5ag In addition, the Pacifico Biocultural project website is currently under construction.</p>
<p>Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • https://www.infobae.com/america/colombia/2021/10/16/pacifico-biocultural-una-apuesta-por-el-uso-sostenible-de-los-recursos-naturales/ • https://www.minambiente.gov.co/bosques-biodiversidad-y-servicios-ecosistemicos/pacifico-biocultural-una-apuesta-por-la-conservacion-y-el-uso-sostenible-de-los-recursos-naturales/ • https://www.fao.org/colombia/noticias/detail-events/es/c/1454803/ • https://youtu.be/USDJeP-UdAo • https://corponarino.gov.co/corponarino-convocatoria-iniciativas-productivas-proyecto-pacifico-biocultural/ • https://www.codechoco.gov.co/convocatoria-iniciativas-productivas/ • https://colombia.un.org/es/149306-el-proyecto-pacifico-biocultural-abre-convocatoria-de-iniciativas-productivas • https://www.fao.org/colombia/noticias/detail-events/en/c/1418161/ • https://www.fao.org/colombia/noticias/detail-events/es/c/1467653/ • https://www.fao.org/colombia/noticias/detail-events/en/c/1492474/ • https://youtu.be/UkwrmBGCR6Q • https://www.parquesnacionales.gov.co/porta/es/inicio-expedicion-cientifica-en-busqueda-del-poderoso-jaguar-y-otros-mamiferos-en-el-parque-nacional-natural-los-katios/ • https://www.fao.org/colombia/noticias/detail-events/es/c/1459775/
<p>Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details</p>	<p>Missionary Professional specialized in Communication: Claudia Marcela Ayala Afanador Email: marcela.ayala@fao.org</p>

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples and local communities involved in the project (as per the approved Project Document)? If yes, please briefly explain.

If applicable, 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 ethnic communities are considered strategic stakeholders of the Pacífico Biocultural project.

To date the Pacífico Biocultural Project has carried out consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the 9 indigenous communities and ethno-territorial authorities that will directly participate in the project:

1. Communal Council of the Cacarica River watershed.
2. Major Communal Council of the Lower Atrato (COCOMAUNGUÍA).
3. Major Communal Council of Alto San Juan (ASOCASAN).
4. Communal Council of Santa Cecilia.
5. Communal Council of the Yurumanguí river.
6. Communal Council of Bajo Mira and Frontera.
7. Community *Resguardo* of Arquía.
8. Community *Resguardo* of Calle Santa Rosa.
9. Community *Resguardo* El Gran Sábalo.

Do indigenous peoples and or local communities have an active participation in the project activities? If yes, briefly describe how.

The methodology for formulating the participatory action plans – PPIA includes the consultations to obtain FPIC and the active promotion of their participation in the project activities, as articulating axes of the actions to be carried out in the MUCB, in coordination with the institutions of the SIRAP Pacific.

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 MUCBs. Achieving the election of José Domingo Mejía, indigenous Eperara Siapidara representative of the Calle Santa Rosa *Resguardo* and Bellanire Sinisterra, 'Afro-descendant' of the Communal Council of Bajo Mira and Frontera, who participated with voice and vote in the 2nd Project Steering Committee.

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ³⁷	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	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	163,756.9	N/A	1,548,715
Research Institute	IIAP	In-kind	484,838	1,436,336.0	N/A	1,436,336
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	3,888,230.4	N/A	3,888,230.4
		Cash	504,823			
Local Government	Gobernación de Nariño – Secretaría de	In-kind	4,189,000	0	N/A	4,189,000

³⁷ 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.

2022 Project Implementation Report

	Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural					
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	4,130,918.6	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
Non-governmental organization	Fundación Ecohabitats	In-kind	0	247,628.2	N/A	247,628.2
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-	Consejo Comunitario	In-kind	157,611	0	N/A	157,611

Black communities	Bajo Mira y Frontera					
Non-governmental organization	Corporación Biocomercio Sostenible - CBS Colombia	In-kind	395,926	0	N/A	395,926
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	UNIDO	In-kind	800,000	0	N/A	0
		Cash	2,423,765			
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	510,000	227,464.0	N/A	1,710,000
		Cash	1,200,000			
TOTAL			31,394,186	10,313,663	N/A	31,394,186³⁸

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 was unable to exercise its role as a GEF implementing agency of the Pacífico Biocultural project and FAO had to act as the only GEF implementing agency of the project, carrying out the activities

³⁸ While by the time of this report some partners have provided more co-finance than originally expected, other partners have delivered at a slower pace. In this context, the project prefers to keep the expected total co-finance disbursement from the CEO endorsement.

UNIDO was responsible for, especially those regarding for project Outcome 3.2. Once the transfer of the project to FAO was fully formalized, UNIDO's co-financing amount confirmed at CEO endorsement was reviewed and the project confirmed that they will not provide co-financing certification. However, the USD \$3,223,765 that UNIDO had confirmed at CEO endorsement, have already been "replenished" by extra co-financing from other stakeholders (IIAP, *Gobernación de Nariño – Secretaría de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible*, *Fundación Ecohabitats* and *Fundación Trópico*).

- The change in local and regional authorities as from January 2020 has also had an impact on the report, considering that the previous administrations were the ones that signed the co-financing letters and commitments to the Project. Therefore, the times to prepare the reports have been delayed.
- The social and economic situation due to 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 Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
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. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project’s components and activities is in compliance with the project’s approved implementation plan.	
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.

Risk rating. It should assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:	
High Risk (H)	There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks
Moderate Risk (M)	There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.
Low Risk (L)	There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.