



**FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review
2019 – Revised Template**

Period covered 1 July 2018 - 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information:

Region	Latin America
Country	Chile
Project Title	Strengthening the Adaptive Capacity to Climate Change in the Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector of Chile
FAO Project Symbol	GCP/CHI/039/SCF
GEF ID	6955
GEF Focal Area(s)	Special Climate Change Fund
Project Executing Partners	Undersecretariat of Fisheries and Aquaculture (SUBPESCA); Ministry of Environment (MMA)
Project Duration	42 months

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date	August 4 th , 2016
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD	February 1 st , 2017
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹	July 31 st , 2020
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable)²	N/A
Actual Implementation End Date³	N/A

Funding:

GEF Grant Amount (USD)	USD 2,500,000
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴	USD 15,737,793
Total Project Cost:	USD 18,237,793
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m)	USD 1,738,590

¹ As per FPMIS.

² In case of a project extension.

³ Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

⁴ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document / Project Document.

Total estimated co-financing as of June 30, 2019⁵	USD ⁶ 15,193,278
---	-----------------------------

Review and Evaluation

Date of most recent Project Steering Committee	16 May 2019
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable)	September 2019
Mid-term review/evaluation actual	N/A
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020)	Yes (August 2019)
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020)	No
Terminal Evaluation date actual:	NA
Tracking tools / Core indicators required⁷	N/A

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes	Satisfactory (S)	
Overall implementation progress rating	Satisfactory (S)	
Overall risk rating	Low (L)	

Status

Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	2 nd PIR
--	---------------------

⁵ Please see Section 7 of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

⁶ 679 USD, July 2019.

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Mr. Félix Inostroza Cortes, Project Coordinator	felix.inostrozacortes@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Mr. Alessandro Lovatelli, RLC Fisheries and Aquaculture Officer	alessandro.lovatelli@fao.org
Budget Holder	Ms. Eve Crowley, FAO Representative	eve.crowley@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Climate and Environment Division CBC	Mr. Hernán González, Technical Officer María Mercedes Proaño, RLC GEF Project Task Manager	Hernan.gonzalez@fao.org Mariamercedes.proano@fao.org

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁸	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹⁰
Objective(s):						
OUTCOME 1: Strengthened public and private institutional capacities to implement/improve CC adaptation actions in fisheries and aquaculture (at national and local levels).	<p>Indicator 9 (CCA-2): Number of people trained to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and evaluate adaptation strategies and measures.</p> <p>Indicator 10 (CCA-2): Capacities of regional, national and sub-national institutions to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and evaluate adaptation strategies and measures.</p>	0	--	Target: 100 government officials, 60 national experts, and 240 decision-makers from national, regional and municipal level.	<p>The following advances are reported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training of government officials started in August 2019 • 55 national experts • 70 decision makers at national, regional and municipal level. • Global participation: 35% women. 	Satisfactory (S)
OUTCOME 2: Local stakeholders have established adaptive systems and invest in innovative adaptation	Indicator 2 (CCA-1): Type and extent of assets strengthened and/or better managed to withstand	0 linear kilometers of coastline managed to address the effects of climate change.	--	709,3 linear km of coastline managed to address the effects of climate change.	The joint work with beneficiary partners and regional authorities has allowed the effective engagement with fishers and small-scale fish farmers, covering about 60 % (426 km) of the coverage area	Satisfactory (S)

⁸ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)**, **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁸	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹⁰
technologies at local level.	<p>the effects of climate change.</p> <p>Indicator 3 (CCA-1): Population benefiting from the adoption of diversified, climate-resilient livelihood options.</p>	0	--	4,550 (at least 25% women)	<p>established in the ProDoc. Adaptive and Innovative production systems are under full implementation with the participation of the beneficiaries in all four pilot project sites.</p> <p>To date an estimated 50 % of the target population (2,040 pers.) have benefited from implementation of specific project activities on livelihood diversification (35 % are women) increasing community resilience.</p>	
OUTCOME 3: Local coastal communities are aware, knowledgeable and prepared to cope with climate change effects on fisheries and aquaculture.	<p>Indicator 5 (CCA-1): Public awareness activities carried out and population reached</p>	--	--	22,594 beneficiaries by communication and awareness-raising activities (5 % of the total population from the pilot sites – Total population of the 4 towns/cities: 451,878 inhabitants – 50 % women)	<p>The project has been constantly targeting and delivering to the pilot site communities' messages related to climate change matters (with a specific focus to the fishery sector) particularly, but not only, through press releases, local radio & television interviews. Given the coverage of these media in the four pilot locations, it is estimated that the messages are currently reaching to a population of over 25,000 people, of which 50 % are women. The review of finalized and ongoing field project activities including trainings, a number of actions with schools, interviews with trade (e.g. fishing coops,</p>	Satisfactory (S)

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁸	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹⁰
					associations) and community reps, etc., clearly indicate that the overall community awareness on the effects of climate change and the urgency with regards to the adoption of adaptation measures has increased notably.	
OUTCOME 4: Project implemented, lessons learned and best practices documented and disseminated.	Outcomes of the project showing sustainability	--	52% outreach in outcomes attainment	100% outreach in outcomes attainment	All practices envisaged by the project are in execution. Partial results are available for a number of initiatives. Considering the progress with respect to the goals set for results 1, 2 and 3, an overall progress of 40 % is estimated in achieving the expected results.	Satisfactory (S)

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹¹

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
N/A			

¹¹ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹²	Expected completion date ¹³	Achievements at each PIR ¹⁴				Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁵ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 th PIR	4 th PIR		
Output 1.1.1: Coordinating/advisory bodies on climate change, fisheries and aquaculture working at national, regional and local level*.	Q2 Y4	Constitution of 02 Regional Interinstitutional Working Groups (IWG): one in the Region of Tarapacá (constituted and functioning); 01 in Region of Los Lagos (constituted and in process of formalization); and 01 Local IWG in the Commune of Hualaihue (constituted and functioning).	Establishment of 01 National IWG (constituted and functioning); and 04 Regional IWG in the Regions of Tarapacá, Coquimbo, Biobío and Los Lagos (constituted and functioning); and 01 Local IWG in the Commune of Hualaihué, Los Lagos Region (constituted and functioning). Three of the Regional IWG in the process of consolidating and finalizing their annual work plans.			70 %	
Output 1.1.2: Interoperable information base system that integrates fisheries, aquaculture and climate change data, to generate information for end-users and decision-makers.	Q2 Y4	Activities under implementation by IFOP (Letter of Agreement signed and in process of execution).	To date, the following key actions have been implemented and/or well underway: 1) the Group of Climate Change Experts has been constituted and regular working meetings held; 2) the Group of Information Systems Managers (i.e. representatives of key institutions that maintain climate change related databases - Subpesca, MMA,			35 %	Given the delay in the development of this output (mainly because of changes in institutional authorities over the past year and complexity of the activity itself), regular meetings have been held with the service provider (i.e. IFOP) to reschedule

¹² Outputs as described in the project log frame or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

¹³ As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 Y3).

¹⁴ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁵ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting..

* This will be integrated into to the structure proposed by the National Adaptation Plan

			SERNAPESCA, SHOA-CONA and IFOP) has been constituted and regular working meetings held; 3) Key and measurable climate change variables discussed, identified and agreed; 4) Data collection initiated to populate database; 5) Discussions on the identification of key climate change indicators in process.				activities and deadlines. It is foreseen that the project activity will be finalized according to the agreed deadline unless further complications emerge resulting in action delays.
Output 1.1.3: Capacity development programme for public officials, national experts, and regional and local decision-makers	Q1 Y4	Consultancy. In the process of formalizing contracts. Workshop on vulnerability assessment for decision makers.	To date, the following advances have been achieved with regards to this output: 1) 14 local authorities (Commune level) (50 % women), 48 regional authorities (40 % women) and 55 local and national experts (27 % women) have received training; 2) training for decision makers and budget holders is scheduled to commence during the second semester of 2019. During this training phase, Project target is to train a total of 340 authorities, experts, and public officials.			30 %	
Output 2.1.1: Pilot programme to strengthen and develop adaptive capacities of fisheries and aquaculture communities and organizations in four coves (Riquelme, Tongoy, Coliumo and El Manzano-Hualaihue).	Q1 Y4	Consultancy contracted and formalized. Activities started in June 2018.	Training courses concluded. Final evaluation phase, instrument preparation, scaling-up plan and final support documents (manuals and final report) under preparation. The program trained 22 environmental monitors (55 % women) and 85 fishers and fish farmers (52 % women) exceeding project target.			80 %	

<p>Output 2.1.2: Pilot programme to monitor climate change adaptation in four coves.</p>	<p>Q4 Y3</p>	<p>Consultancy contracted and formalized. Activities started in June 2018. Quick vulnerability assessments carried out in the four pilot sites.</p>	<p>Activities carried out as of 30 June 2019: 1) Environmental variables and indicators identified in close collaboration of the fishing communities; 2) identification, purchase and installation of field data collection equipment and instruments; 3) Sampling plan of environmental parameters (variables) established in all four pilot sites; 4) Training of beneficiary partners completed. Technical support actions ongoing.</p> <p>The monitoring program has been designed and under implementation. Data collection at the local level in operation.</p>			<p>60 %</p>	
<p>Output 2.1.3: Strengthened programmes for development and productive diversification with a climate change adaptation approach (in four pilot coves).</p>	<p>Q1 Y4</p>	<p>The preparation of technical and administrative bases for all the adaptation practices to be developed in the pilot sites have been completed. Bidding processes started.</p>	<p>Originally, 31 specific and local adaptation practices were planned for the four pilot sites. Because of the current scenario and needs of the small-scale fishing and aquaculture sector, eight of the originally identified actions were rejected by the beneficiary organizations and replaced with five alternative practices, which resulted in the implementation of a total of 28 local practices, distributed in the four pilot coves.</p> <p>Although no medium-term goals have been established for the period, it is important to note that, to date: 1) 93 % of these local practices (26 out of a total of 28) are in execution and the</p>			<p>30 %</p>	<p>The majority of these practices are currently under implementation. The results and final product outputs that will allow their scaling-up in other fishing communities along the coast of Chile will be prepared once the experiences have been completed.</p>

			remaining under preparation. 2) 978 fishers and fish farmers are benefiting from the implementation of these adaptation practices (about 21 % women). 3) Six fishing adaptation practices are in execution; and 4) eight aquaculture practices are in execution. 5) Twelve alternative and complementary livelihood practices under implementation.				
Output 3.1.1: Project communication strategy, designed and implemented.	Q1 Y4	Consultancy in the process of formalizing contracts. In parallel, 11 bulletins have been edited / disseminated; 4 awareness startup workshops have been carried out (one in each pilot cove). Press coverage in the events carried out by the project secured.	<p>As of 30 June 2019 the following actions have been secured: 1) 24 national newsletters drafted, finalized and distributed in collaboration with the communication offices of the project partners. 2) One basic guide on climate change, for distribution at the rural community level and schools, drafted. 3) One children (family) didactical game under development (replaces the originally foreseen book for children). 4) Although the radio campaigns are scheduled for the second half of 2019, the project secured large visibility through radio coverage in all four regions. 5) One information climate change leaflet prepared, finalized and ready for printing (replaces the originally planned poster).</p> <p>During the reporting period, 14 workshops have been carried out in the communities and schools of the four pilot sites to discuss climate change issues and adaptation measures. The workshops have allowed to sensitize 316</p>			50 %	

			individuals of which 250 students (46 % women).				
Output 3.1.2: Mecanismo de difusión de las medidas de adaptación en el terreno implementado	Q2 Y4	N/A Product scheduled for the last semester of Year-4	N/A Product scheduled for the last semester of Year-4				
Output 4.1.1: Project management, monitoring and evaluation system operating and providing systematic information on progress in reaching expected outcomes and targets	Q2 Y4	Realization of three biannual progress reports and an annual report.	Five biannual project progress reports and two project implementation review (this one included)			100 %	
Output 4.1.2: Mid-term Evaluation and final evaluations, implementation and sustainability strategies adjusted to the recommendations	Q2 Y4	N/A	N/A				Mid-Term Evaluation scheduled to take place in September 2019.
Output 4.1.3: Publication of best practices and lessons learned	Q2 Y4	1 st Technical Report in preparation and publications in specialized magazines	2nd Technical Report (Technical Report summarizing the progress and partial results of the project, obtained to date) in preparation and publications in specialized magazines			40 %	

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

Main significant results:

During the reporting period, the Project has initiated the following actions/activities: Constitution and functioning of coordinating entities and advisors (Interinstitutional Working Groups – IWG), Fisheries-aquaculture-climate change information system, Institutional Training Programmes, Coastal Communities Training Programmes, Local Monitoring of Climate Change Indicators, implementation of a series of local adaptation practices, and the Implementation of the Communication & Information Strategy.

Main progress:

- 96 % of the activities contemplated in the Project are in execution, according to the plans established in the annual work plan and budget, and approved by the Project Steering Committee.
- There is a great involvement in the project, by the beneficiary partners, with a large participation of local stakeholders in the different adaptation practices.
- The executing and strategic partners have been actively incorporated into all project activities, mainly in relation to institutional strengthening (Inter-Institutional Working Groups, expert meetings and training of authorities and public institutions).
- With the exception of the northern part of the country (the Riquelme fishing cove), the participation of women is exceeding expectations.
- According to the partial results obtained from ongoing adaptation practices, encouraging results are being observed (mainly in the capture of mussel seed, the cultivation of Pacific oysters, and the implementation of tourism activities).
- Awareness of climate change in coastal communities also shows progress, mainly at school levels where students have internalized the problem of climate change.
- La sensibilización al cambio climático de comunidades costeras también muestra progresos, principalmente a niveles de escuelas donde los estudiantes han internalizado la problemática del cambio climático.

Major challenges during this reporting period:

- Maintain and increase the interest of the key beneficiary and strategic partners and increase the involvement of executing partners.
- Increase the participation of women in the Riquelme Fishing Cove, Tarapacá Region, where fishing and aquaculture activities are mostly carried out by men, with low women participation.
- Recover the time lost because of changes in government authorities (2018 elections) which has made it difficult to maintain the original deadlines established in the ProDoc.
- Full and timely implementation of the 46 project initiatives (44 currently under execution).

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating¹⁶	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating¹⁷	Comments/reasons justifying the rating for FY2018 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	<p>In accordance with the project annual work plan 2018-2019 and 2019-2020, the Project has initiated 95% of the activities reflected in the results matrix and, although to date it is possible to observe some partial results, the initial tangible results will be available from the second semester of 2019.</p> <p>The achievement of the outputs maintains a slight delay as compared to previous report, mainly due to the change faced of the national and regional authorities and partly due to excessive processing times in the formalization of technical and administrative matters. This delay was partly reduced during the current reporting period.</p>
Budget Holder	Moderate satisfactory	Moderate satisfactory	<p>The project is developing Moderately Satisfactory. The participation of institutions and stakeholders has gradually improved, especially in the areas where the pilots are being developed. Implementation of adaptive systems is planned for the next quarters of the project, with a slight delay over the original planning. During the same period, knowledge dissemination activities will be significantly strengthened through the hiring of a specialist consultant company.</p>

¹⁶ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁷ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1

Lead Technical Officer¹⁸	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	The national authorities engaged in the Project have been supportive concerning the objectives and implementation of the Project. Their participation and engagement is interpreted positively in terms of Project progressing towards achieving its objectives and outcomes. The implementation of all project activities are progressing well. Almost all of the planned activities under the project are currently being executed after an initial planning and logistical phase. By the Project NTE, all activities are expected to be completed.
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	In spite of a slow start, the project seems to have been able to catch up on delay activities, with almost 95% of activities under execution. A possible extension may be required and attention needs to be paid to project delivery, which is 35%.

3. Risks

Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid¹⁹. If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Moderate	Valid

Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
<i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant. The “Notes” column has one section for the BH and PMU and one for the LTO.</i>

¹⁸ The LTO will consult the HQ Technical Officer and all other supporting Technical Units.

¹⁹ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

	Risks	Risk rating ²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Institutional risk Changes in institutional and organizational administrations could affect the prioritization of commitments or development objectives and affect the continuity of the adaptation measures implementation.	M	Awareness campaigns with the new authorities	The engagement level of the authorities has been recovered	The change and installation of the institutional administrations (new authorities), due to the change or decisions of government in the country, they are considerably slower than expected, which generates delays in the implementation or development of the initiatives programmed.
2	Institutional risk: Change of priorities among public and private institutions, to share and/or provide access to information available on climate change.	L	Topic included in awareness campaigns to new authorities	No change in institutional priorities	Even though the installation process of the new authorities has been slow, at present there are no changes in the priorities.
3	Institutional risk: Insufficient interinstitutional coordination, both at national and local levels, and poor cooperation mechanisms with the private sector and artisanal fishers.	L	Strengthening of the Inter institutional Working Groups	There are improvements in institutional coordination processes	
4	Political-institutional risk: Financial sustainability, to scaling climate change adaptation measures (developed in the pilot project areas)	M			It does not present modifications with respect to what was identified in the ProDoc.
5	Social risk: Lack of interest or skepticism of artisanal fishers and small-scale aquaculture farmers in the pilot coves.	L	Incorporate local stakeholders in the implementation of practices	There is a greater engagement of fishers and fish farmers	
6	Economic risk: Presence of (national and/or international) economic crisis could reduce institutional budgetary allocations and the participation of various stakeholders.	L			It does not present modifications with respect to what was identified in the ProDoc.

²⁰ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²¹ If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period”.

	Risks	Risk rating ²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
7	Weather contingencies risk: Possibility of extreme events (El Niño) and natural disasters (tidal waves, storms, earthquakes, tsunamis, climate variability and others) throughout the development of the Project, implying significant changes in the conditions of natural baseline of the project.	M			It does not present modifications with respect to what was identified in the ProDoc.
8	Social risk: Indigenous peoples participating in fishers organizations and living outside direct Project intervention areas refuse project activities.	L			The occurrence of this risk has been minimized as the project organizations involved have formally accepted and compromised their participation in the Project. In this context, representatives of the indigenous communities have been incorporated into the different actions carried out by the project. The acceptance and commitment of the indigenous communities, was formalized by representatives of these communities.

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
ML	L	With the exception of the situation generated by the change in institutional administrations, the Project maintains a general risk condition at a Low level.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²²

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	No	
Project Outputs	No	

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

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

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	No adjustments are contemplated

5. Gender Mainstreaming

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

The Project has carefully mainstreamed gender issues in all of its Components. For this, the Project emphasizes the participation of women, empowering them to improve their participation in planning and decisions making; improve their productivity, income and livelihood. Women participation is promoted in all the workshops and during all consultation and validation processes carried out as part of project intervention strategy. In the earlier stages of the Project, a background check was carried out regarding the percentage of women associated with the pilot sites, determining the existence of different realities, with shares that fluctuate between 5% and 30%. The project has incorporated aspects of gender, establishing a minimum level of women participation in the different activities of the project (recorded in the participants list of all Project activities). It should be noted that such practices refer mainly to access and control of natural resources, productive diversification, development of complementary activities, support productive activities and participation in planning and decision making. It is also important to highlight that the Project considers initiatives mainly directed to women.

²² Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

Are indigenous peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.

Of the four pilot sites, only El Manzano-Hualaihue has a presence of indigenous peoples. In this locality members of these indigenous communities engaged in fishing and/or aquaculture activities, belong to the fishers organizations operating in the cove of El Manzano-Hualaihue and consequently, they are integral part and beneficiaries of all the Project activities implemented in this pilot site. However, joint work was carried out with the local organizations of native peoples to ensure their active participation in all of the activities planned to be executed by the Project in the area. Furthermore, the organizations of native peoples formally agreed and declared their support for the Project and expressed their interest in actively participating in the actions carried out by the Project.

7. Stakeholders Engagement

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

There are no variations with respect to the stakeholders identified in the ProDoc with whom, the Project Team has maintained and maintains a permanent and fluid communication in order to exchange information, technical consultations and support for the formation of the Inter-institutional Working Groups (IWG).

It is important to note that the Executing Partners (Ministry of the Environment and Undersecretariat of Fisheries and Aquaculture) have key, active and permanent roles in:

- The Project Steering Committee;
- Participation in the Technical Management Committee of the Project
- Presidency and secretariat of the Inter-institutional Working Groups (National and regional), GTI.
- Participation in technical evaluation panels of different project activities, and
- Various instances of decision making associated with the execution of the project
- Among others

- Ministry of Environment
- Undersecretariat for Fisheries and Aquaculture

- Artisanal fishermen and small-scale aquaculturists, of the coves Riquelme (Tarapacá), Tongoy (Coquimbo); Coliumo (Biobio) y El Manzano-Hualaihue (Los Lagos)

Executing partners, whose participation has been mostly in consultation, information and decision making through: Project Steering Committee (PSC); Technical Project Management Committee (TPMC), Inter-Institutional Working Groups (IWG) in 7 locations of the country; Technical Meetings and Workshops (start-up and specific ones); Training Processes, others; developed during project execution

Permanent participation in all the activities of Component 2, related to the strengthening of local capacities, mainly in the execution 26 of local adaptation practices in the field of fisheries, aquaculture and other livelihoods

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fisheries Development Institute - National Fisheries and Aquaculture Service - Fisheries Development Institute - Marine Authority - Hydrographic and Oceanographic Service of the Chilean Navy - National and Regional Organizations of Small-scale Artisanal Fisheries and Aquaculture - Organizations of the Private Sector of Fisheries and Industrial Aquaculture - Academic Institutions and Research Centers - Municipalities of Hualaihue and Tome - National Tourism Service - Non-Governmental Organizations 	<p>Organizations that participate in information delivery, coordination and advise to regional / local authorities, mainly through participation in the Inter-Institutional Working Groups (IWG) or through the contribution of information required by the project.</p>
---	--

8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

In the ProDoc preparation process three barriers were detected that made it difficult to adapt Chilean fisheries and aquaculture to climate change (CC). Such barriers referred to: i) Weakness of the institutional framework to face Climate Change issues; ii) Limited experience and availability of technologies and application of local adaptation practices of the coastal communities; and iii) Limitations of information and knowledge about Climate Change, at community level.

The Project simultaneously addresses the three levels indicated, carrying out actions aimed at improving institutional capabilities, increasing the capacities of the engaged fishing and aquaculture organizations and raising general awareness among the coastal communities. In this way, the Project is addressing the problem of adapting to climate change in a comprehensive and integrated manner, increasing capacities at all levels, which should contribute to reducing the overall vulnerability in the sector and thereby improving the livelihoods of the fishers, small-scale fish farmers and their respective families.

The Project feels that achieving a sense of belonging and empowerment (at all levels) is of great importance and, for this reason, both public and private institutions have been grouped around Interinstitutional Working Groups (IWG) and supported comprehensive training for decision makers and public officials. Furthermore, targeted training actions have also been developed for the fishing communities along with local adaptation practices (jointly identified been executed with the local trade organizations). Likewise, at the community level, workshops on impacts of Climate Change to the fishery sector and the communities have helped increase awareness among local civil society organizations and schools.

Thus, in addition to achieving the overall objective of improving adaptive capacities, the active incorporation of institutions, fishers, farmers and coastal communities to the different actions supported by the Project, has reinforced a sense of belonging that will certainly increase the chances of replication and escalation of all the initiatives under execution by the Project.

9. Co-Financing Table

Materialized Co-financing – Mandatory for projects that are completing the Mid-term review or ending operations within this reporting period (June 2017-june 2018). Recommended for all projects.

Sources of Co-financing ²³	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019- Highly recommended but not mandatory	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team) Mandatory for projects that has completed an MTR or closure	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project (or Actual Amount Materialized at Closing) Highly recommended but not mandatory
National Government	Subpesca	CASH	Us\$570,464	USD 315,182		USD 570,464
		IN KIND	US\$14,219,548	USD 14,306,152		USD 14,306,152
National Government	MMA	CASH	US\$513,976	USD341,944		USD 513,976
		IN KIND	US\$332,445	USD150,000		USD 332,445
GEF Agency	FAO	CASH	US\$101,361	USD 80,000		USD 101,361
		TOTAL		USD 15,193,278		USD 15,824,398

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

²³ 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.

Annex 1. GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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