Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

global environment facility
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2023 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

Table of contents

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Latin America and the Caribbean
Country (ies):	Uruguay
Project Title:	Strengthening Capacities for the Sound Management of Pesticides Including POPs (MSP)
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/URU/031/GFF
GEF ID:	5144
GEF Focal Area(s):	Chemicals & Waste
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Environment (MA) – (formerly MVOTMA)
Initial project duration (years):	3,5 years
Project coordinates: *This section should be completed ONLY by:* a) *Projects with 1st PIR;* *b) In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.*	*[Projects in a) and b) categories should indicate YES here and provide the geocoded data in Annex 2]*

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	9 March, 2015
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	4 January, 2016
Project Implementation End Date/NTE[1]:	31 December, 2022
Revised project implementation End date (if approved) [2]	31 December, 2023

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	1,874,028
Total Co-financing amount (USD)[3]:	7,258,000
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	1,868,153
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)[4]:	1,800,132
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023[5]	10,057,900

[1] As per FPMIS

[2] If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit.

[3] This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO Document/Project Document.

[4] The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

[5] Please refer to the Section 13 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	24 Dec, 2020
Expected Mid-term Review date[6]:	Non applicable
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	June 2018
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date[7]:	31 Jul, 2023
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	Yes

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	*Low*

Status

Implementation Status ***(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):***	7th (Final PIR)

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	Sebastian Viroga, National Project Coordinator	Sebastian.viroga@ambiente.gub.uy
Budget Holder (BH)	Gonzalo Kmid, Assistant FAOR Programme, FAO Representation in Uruguay (FAOUY).	gonzalo.kmaidricetto@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)	Robert Bouvier, Environment Minister	Secretaria.ministro@ambiente.gub.uy

[6] 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.

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

Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Oxana Perminova, Agricultural Officer, AGPM FAO	Oxana.Perminova@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	Valeria Gonzalez-Riggio, Natural Resources Officer, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit (OCB)	Valeria.gonzalezriggio@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[8]	Baseline	Mid-term TargetMid-term Target[9]	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress[10] since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating[11]
To safely dispose of obsolete pesticides including POPs and containers, and to strengthen the lifecycle management of pesticides in Uruguay	**Outcome 1.1:** Risks to human health and the environment reduced through safe disposal of POPs and obsolete pesticides and through built capacities on remediation of pesticide-contaminated soil.	Waste management plans to prevent further accumulation of pesticide stockpiles and empty pesticide containers. Management Plans budgeted and implemented.	Management plans have been developed.		Management Plans budgeted and implemented.	**100%** Development and implementation of one Environmental Management Plan (EMP) was delivered to DINAMA (now DINACEA) in 2017 by the civil organization "Campo Limpio" (CL). In February 2020 the EMP was signed and notified to CL. During 2020 and 2021, CL negotiated with different service providers to be able to implement the EMP with the priority of being able to disposal obsolete pesticides locally, avoiding export. This entire process involved negotiations and monitoring by the Ministry of Environment (MA). The possibility of elimination at the local level implies that the companies involved in the execution of the EMP, need to be authorized by the MA to carry out this process.	**Satisfactory** (S)

[8] This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

[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] Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic co-benefits as well.

[11] 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). Refer to Annex 1.

						In June 2021, the Ministry of the Environment approved request EM2021/14000/003824 that enables the storage authorization for obsolete stocks presented by CL. In October 2022, the Ministry of the Environment enabled the environmental authorization to KRILE S.A. (VEOLIA S.A), this local company has the appropriate furnace for the elimination of obsolete materials within the framework of the PGEO (approved in February 2020). Finally, the Letter of Agreement with Campo Limpio was signed to execute the Project funds. These delays and adjustments in logistics caused the Project to request an extension until the end of the Letter of Agreement in December 2023.	
		Obsolete pesticides, including POPs pesticides, disposed of in an environmentally sound manner.	0 Tons		160 Tons.	**7% - 11.2 Tons eliminated** As already reported, the elimination of 160 tons obsolete pesticides will not be completed in the project lifetime. However, the approval of the EMP (as a requirement of the Decree 152/13) obliges the private sector - through CL – to handle the sound elimination of obsoletes, and represents a guarantee that the stock detected by the survey will be disposal in the near future. The LoA signed are still ongoing as support and impulse the execution of the EMP. The LoA has 3 products; 1- Selection of the obsoletes to eliminate. 2- Collection and storage of these obsoletes 3- Elimination of the obsoletes.	

						The EMP have started. Up to the date of this report, **more than 11 tons** have been eliminated, increasing this number by the end of the project because the EMP is been implemented nationally. Currently, products 2 and 3 are being fulfilled simultaneously until reaching the prioritized tons to be eliminated. It is the first experience in the country carrying out obsolete disposal following an official Environmental Management Plan (EMP) that provides a permanent national solution.	
		Risk level: Medium-High risk (according to DINAMA and MSP assessment)	Risk level: High risk (according to DINAMA and MSP assessment)		Risk level: Medium-High risk (according to DINAMA and MSP assessment)	**Risk Level is Medium-Low.** Based on the evidence listed below, it is understood that the Risk Level is Medium-Low. Strengthening of the Container Plan and the NGO CL (Product 1.15). Environmental Management Plan (EMP) was approved. Obsolete survey (Synthesis inventory survey carried out in 2020) identifies that 88% of the surveyed stocks are in good condition, loss (1%), unknown (11%). The execution of the EMP has been started. Finally, everything mentioned above is supported by Decree 152/013.	
	Outcome 1.2: Capacities developed for site remediation.	Enhanced capacities of private sector organizations.	No capacity building programme in place		Enhanced capacities of private sector organizations.	**100%** In Uruguay, spills and contaminated sites are managed by the operations of National Direction of the Firefighters and are not handled by the private sector. Hence, CL was not going to deal with highly deteriorated stockpiles. In 2017 it was decided to focus this objective at the farm level, dealing with situations that can be managed by producers and workers.	**Satisfactory** (S)

						During 2018-19 the "*Guide for prevention and action facing incidents / accidents in the manipulation of agricultural pesticides*" was developed. It presents tools for the prevention and mitigation of possible risky events. It was validated by the counterparts of the project. (Link) Starting from the second half of 2019, training courses were implemented to disseminate such tools. Between **2019 and 2020**, **127 farmers** and rural students have been trained with significant results. The Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (MGAP) included the Guide in the training courses that it provides to the private sector. During 2022 the MGAP have trained more than 500 workers working in the pesticides application.	
	Outcome 2.1: Legislative and regulatory framework for the environmentally sound management of POPs and pesticides is improved.	Pesticides or POPs pesticides regulations in place. Regulation is enforced with corresponding Budget.	Pesticides or POPs pesticides regulations in place. Regulation adopted but is not enforced		Pesticides or POPs pesticides regulations in place. Regulation is enforced with corresponding Budget	**100%** Proposals for improvement of regulations were developed and delivered for **4** out of the **5 stages** of the pesticide's life cycle: Use / Application, Storage, Transportation, Import (proposal for the improvement of pesticides registration). As additional activities that contribute to the outcome, two proposals (not initially planned) were elaborated: two studies for the search and selection of Biomarkers of pesticides exposure, and the development of a Surveillance Program for Workers who were exposed to agricultural pesticides. The Uruguayan authorities now have got a proposal for the improvement of the National Registry of Pesticides (include the Environmental Risk Evaluation). In 2021 the Minister of MGAP and MA agreed to implement the Environmental Risk.	**Satisfactory** (S)

						Evaluation in the Registry of Pesticides. Such a proposal will imply a significant change in the way the pesticides that enter the country are evaluated and authorized. The attainment of this collaborative working experience, involving the Ministries of Agriculture and Environment on such a controversial matter, and the development of a proposal for registry improvement with the support of the FAO international consultant, were important challenges and represent relevant achievements. In addition, the Ministry of Agriculture has begun some actualizations, based on the proposals that were delivered. (Link) It is highlighted that the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) is responsible for the delivery of technical inputs and normative proposals, while normative approval is a political decision.	
	Outcome 3.1 The use of toxic pesticides reduced through the adoption of IPM and other alternatives.	200 tons of reduced toxic pesticides			200 tons of reduced toxic pesticides	Different management strategies have been evaluated to reduce the use of pesticides, and the impact on environment and health without negatively affecting the production. The project is reporting that it does not present the tools to ensure the sustainability of the producer`s adherence to these alternative practices validated. Because on one hand, these changes involve longer processes than the life cycle of a project and on the other hand, the project proposed achieve this results only through training and dissemination of strategies validated in the field. So, we cannot guarantee the reduction quantitatively. The Project **has not directly measured this result indicator,** for the reasons mentioned above. However, the project generated information that allows us to affirm that progress was made towards achieving this result. Based on that, we consider this result as "Satisfactory" because: (1) the evaluation of the strategies showed that the goal can be achieved by implementing them in approximately 10% of the planting area at the	**Satisfactory** (S)

						national level; the strategies do not have any negative impact on production and their costs of implementation is equal to or cheaper than chemical alternatives; (2) the project realized a interviews to "qualified actors" of the agricultural sector to indirectly estimate the adherence of the producers to the developed practices: the experts agreed that there is an increasing interest for applying these tools and that there is an increasing number of producers innovating on their implementation (e.g: Link) (3) both the Academy and the Agricultural Research Institute (INIA) continue to work on cover crops and rolling, and other organizations have started an adoption process; (Link); (Link); (Link) (4) the Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries in 2020 presented a Conceptual Note to continue deepening the changes initiated with this project. In summary, the project has generated information and evidence that show that a process of change has been triggered towards the achievement of the indicator result; as has already been reported, for these kinds of transformations that imply cultural changes and are voluntary, longer processes are expected and longer timings are needed to see the final results. The interest of the government, the Academy and the private sector to continue to work on these topics ensures the sustainability of the achievement in the future, although it is a process that has just begun. The progress in rolling, bio-inputs, plant covers and biological beds stands out. (Link); (Link) For example in October 2021 in the "IV National Symposium on Agriculture" one of the main blocks of the event was dedicated to Service Crops. All the	

						information exposed there was generated within the framework of the project together with the Faculty of Agronomy (Link). This event is the most important biannual technical event in the country about agricultural sector, showing the relevance that has gained the topic and the positive impact of the project activities. Based on these results, trainings and dissemination activities are being developed to promote these tools. Training events in field days and theoretical expositions were held in the country. Until the date of this report **more than 1200** people have been trained in promoting good agricultural practices that encourage (among other things) a reduction in the use of pesticides. Based on the observations made by the Final Evaluators and with the aim of not reporting the same information in two different products, the previously reported activities were divided between product 3.1.3 and 3.2.1. It should be noted that although the change was agreed, this criterion is not shared by the PCU or by the project counterparts, because all the activities carried out contribute incrementally to the achievement of both outcomes, since the training is also considered an instance of awareness and dissemination.	
	Outcome 3.2 Increased awareness on the effects of conventional pesticides and on alternatives available	Medium-level (as assessed by DINAMA)	Low level awareness (as assessed by DINAMA)		Increased awareness as perceived by officials and producers	**100%** This indicator is qualitative and subjective, because it depends on the opinion of one of the interested parties. This was a limitation to measure it. As a strategy to overcome this limitation, inputs were generated that allow a qualitative approach to the situation and to be able to make an approximation that reasonably allows us to say that objective 3.2 has been met.	

						Surveys of the training and dissemination activities were analyzed and through interviews with "qualified experts" in relation with your perception about the topic in relation with the project actions and their impact. Based in the result of this analysis, we could say, that the awareness on the effects of conventional pesticides and on alternatives available was increased. The communication was focused to producers. This has the advantage of raising awareness with transferring technological development findings. Technical and economic factors drive them to change practices and their awareness is increased. Along the project **980 people** were participate in specific training module developed in 3.2.1 output. But **more than 2200 people** were participated in different project activities in relation with Good Practices in Agriculture, Manage pesticides and the risk associated (output 3.1.3 and 3.2.1) In addition, very useful materials were elaborated to work on the increase of awareness to support trainings and dissemination activities. Those items, such as publications, videos, leaflets and guides, will remain available to local institutions for their use in future activities. For instance; (link); (link); (link); (link); (link).	
	Outcome 4.1 Enhanced capacity for monitoring and timely response to Pesticide risks to human health and the environment.	Medium-level of capacities (as measured by DINAMA and MSP)	Medium-low level of capacities (as measured by DINAMA and MSP)		Medium-level of capacities (as measured by DINAMA and MSP)	**100%** The laboratories of MA and DGSA serve for different purposes however they developed and validated multi-residue methods and were accredited for the analysis of pesticides residues in environmental matrices (DINAMA) and food like cereals and grains (DGSA). They were ready to be accredited in the ISO 17.025 standard. This gives a level of harmonization in their work. The variety of pesticides that could be detected by the method was increased considerably during the Project span.	**Highly Satisfactory** (HS)

						In 2021 the DINAMA Laboratory was accredited in the ISO 17025 standard, 27 pesticides in the water matrice. The monitoring activity in "Laguna del Cisne", performed in coordination with the National University and MA generated baseline information for the watershed. More than 84 pesticides were monitored during one year; besides, the knowledge on pesticides dynamics was deepened with the aim of improving environmental monitoring in the future. Finally, a protocol for analytical procedures was developed, including methodological as well as logistic aspects, to coordinate future action of different institutions at the field and analysis levels. These lessons learned are being applied in the second monitoring in the San Salvador (Soriano) basin, which has a final date in July 2023 with the delivery of the final report.	

Measures taken to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings on Section 2

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

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs[12]	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements[13] (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance[14] in delivering outputs
Outcome 1.1				
Output 1.1.2 Staff of DINAMA, MGAP, FAGRO and local governments are trained in obsolete pesticides and contaminated sites	80 people	-	100 %	No change from previous report.
Output 1.1.3 Completed inventory of stocks of obsolete pesticides, including POPs.	Annual inventory completed The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) proposed	1	100% 100%	No change from previous report. No change from previous report.
Output 1.1.4	160 Tons of obsolete pesticides including POPs, disposed of in accordance with the Basel and Stockholm Conventions		7%	A Letter of Agreement (LoA) is ongoing to execute the funds

[12] Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

[13] 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)

[14] Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

Strengthened capacity of the private sector for the elimination of obsolete pesticides, including POPs and empty containers				foreseen by the project as support and impulse the execution of the Environmental Management Plan during 2022 y 2023. The LoA has 3 products; 1-Selection of the obsoletes to eliminate. 2-Collection and storage of these obsoletes 3-Elimination of the obsoletes. Until now, the Product 1 it was completed. Products 2 and 3 are being fulfilled simultaneously, it is estimated that the 14 tons will be eliminated by December 2023 As mentioned above, It is the first experience in the country carrying out obsolete disposal following an official Environmental Management Plan (EMP) that provides a national solution.
	30 members of producer organizations and commercial companies of agrochemicals trained in obsolete management (annually)		100%	No change from previous report.
	30 operators and technicians trained in packaging management (annually)		100%	No change from previous report
Output 1.1.5 Empty Container management strengthened, extending the	50% of empty containers treated and recycled		80%	No change from previous report.
	12 fully operational, well-equipped and staffed collection centers		100%	No change from previous report.

network of collection centers and recycling facilities	Tools for the collection of containers from producers with low access to Collection Centers (mobile chipper)		100%	During 2022 (October-November), 4 Container Collection Days in Canelones and Montevideo were held, where in addition to collecting the kilos of containers to be recycled, they generate in their area and surroundings, awareness of the environmentally appropriate handling and destination of the containers.
Outcome 1.2: Capacities developed for site remediation				
Output 1.2.1 Guidelines for private sector, including specific site remediation proposals	Guidelines for the development of site-specific proposals	1	100%	No change from previous report.
Outcome 2.1				
Output 2.1.1 Pesticide regulations reviewed and updated	A proposal to update the legislation and regulation developed Updating of the existing regulation	1	100%	No change from previous report.
Output 2.1.2 Current registration and authorization system assessed, gaps and capacity building needs identified and measures implemented	Proposal submitted for registration	1	100%	No change from previous report.
Output 2.1.3	At least 10 operators and technicians from DINAMA and MGAP trained in ERA.		0%	This activity depends on output 2.1.2 because the new registration proposal will include

ERA models included in the training of institutions	General ERA training plan designed. 6 operators and technicians from different laboratories that work in pesticides trained in the value and application of ERA as support for residue analysis.		an Environmental Risk Assessment (ERA) model. 0% 0%	No change from previous report. No change from previous report.
Output 2.1.4 Adoption of the Environmental Risk Assessment (ERA) tool to support the registration of pesticides	ERA included in the registry proposal for improvement Ecotoxicity parameters from ERA models added to pesticide registration.	1 1	100% 100%	No change from previous report No change from previous report
Output 2.1.5 ERA performed to assess at least three highly used active ingredients	ERA used for the evaluation of at least three highly used active ingredients.	1	0%	No change from previous report. This activity depends on the previous one.
Outcome 3.1				
Output 3.1.1 IPM strategies and other alternatives for priority crops developed and field tested	Strategies developed and validated		100%	No change from previous report
Output 3.1.2 Two alternatives to highly toxic pesticides identified, evaluated, tested, including IPM and ICM	Studies completed to identify alternatives to major pesticides Number of demonstration areas applying alternatives to highly toxic pesticides		100% 100%	No change from previous report No change from previous report
Output 3.1.3 Training in practices of IPM and application of	1,200 producers and workers trained		100%	No change from previous report e.g: (Link); (Link);

alternatives to toxic pesticides delivered to agriculture workers, and farmers/producers				
Outcome 3.2				
Output 3.2.1 A communication strategy developed and implemented to raise awareness on the effects of pesticides on human health and the environment and support dissemination of good practices	Communication strategy created Publication and video developed Training module developed		100% 100% 100%	No change from previous report.
Outcome 4.1				
Output 4.1.1 A coordination mechanism for environmental monitoring and response to pesticide risks established	Inter-institutional agreement between MGAP, DINAMA, LATU, UdelaR and departmental authorities Pesticides monitoring plans prepared, implemented and monitored		100% 60%	No change from previous report The second pesticide monitoring program in the San Salvador (Soriano) basin carried out all the monitoring, only subtracting the delivery of the final report for July 2023. It should be noted, it is the first time that a Pesticide Monitoring is carried out in the main agricultural basin of the country.
Output 4.1.2 Harmonized technical and	Trained laboratory staff		100% 100%	No change from previous report No change from previous report

analytical requirements for monitoring pesticide contaminants in environmental matrices (soil, water, sediments and biota) defined	Laboratories in DINAMA and DGSA working in an effective and coordinated way Harmonized analytical requirements		100%	No change from previous report
Output 4.1.3 Detailed action protocol for responding to contamination risks and events developed	Systems and protocols for receiving complaints, including citizen control. New action plan	1 1	100% 0%	No change from previous report No change from previous report
Output 4.1.4 Strengthened institutional capacity for environmental monitoring of pesticides	Operators and technicians from DINAMA, MGAP, & Departmental Governments are trained for environmental monitoring of pesticides	40	100%	No change from previous report
Output 4.1.5 Sites in at least 3 watersheds selected for monitoring and analysis of pesticide contamination	Pesticide contamination levels measured as part of the environmental plan in 3 river basins		60%	The second pesticide monitoring program in the San Salvador (Soriano) basin. The work involved 4 field campaigns to obtain all the samples (biological and environmental) that were subsequently analyzed at the laboratory level, leaving only the analysis of the data obtained to the final report for July 2023.
Output 4.1.6 Measures to minimize pesticide contamination in watersheds	Updated guides for producers to incorporate pesticide use and management		0%	No change from previous report.

identified and implemented				

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcomes of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR (max 400 words)
Most of the activities have finished, remaining only: **Component 1**, involves a Letter of Agreement (LoA) with Campo Limpio for the elimination of obsolete pesticides at the national level. It is estimated that the 14 tons will be eliminated by December 2023, currently there are 11 tons eliminated. As mentioned above, it is the first experience in the country carrying out obsolete disposal following an official Environmental Management Plan (EMP) that provides a national solution. We would like to highlight that the plan was approved by the government, being managed and implemented by private sector (importers, producers, distributors) being in long term operation. **Component 4**, involves a Letter of Agreement (LoA) with FUNDACIBA that generated the second baseline from priority watersheds at the national level, allowing the development of unprecedented pesticide protocols, which allow them to be applied in future monitoring within the surveillance plans that the Ministry of Environment implements in the country. Finally, as a result of these achievements, Uruguay was invited to be part of the “Financing Agrochemical Reduction and Management” (FARM) Program (UNEP-FAO): ***"Strengthening of investment for the adoption of alternatives and sustainable management of agrochemicals and agroplastics in Africa and Latin America through pilots in Kenya and Uruguay***". The government committed for 5 years to advance on the subject, taking as a starting point the important inputs that are available from this project.

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.

	FY2023 Development Objective rating[15]	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating[16]	Comments/reasons[17] justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	**Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**	**Satisfactory (S)**	The project has completed most of the field activities, significant results stand out in technical and institutional terms, always considering that it was a context of complex execution by the actors and the subject matter involved. The PCU has constantly encouraged the Ministries to take more ownership of the issues and advance in the integration of the proposals generated into their public policies. As a result of these achievements, Uruguay was invited to be part of the "Financing Agrochemical Reduction and Management" (FARM) Program: ***"Strengthening of investment for the adoption of alternatives and sustainable management of agrochemicals and agroplastics in Africa and Latin America through pilots in Kenya and Uruguay***". The government committed for 5 years to advance on the subject, taking as a starting point the enriching inputs that are available from this project. As of the date of this report, it was approved and its start is estimated for September 2023.
Budget Holder	**Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**	**Satisfactory (S)**	The project had some delays, however, the results are satisfactory. One of the key issue was to align the activities and expected results to the new environment that became form the global crisis including the COVID-19. Important to note that highly engagement of the stakeholder with the project.

[15] **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.
[16] **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.
[17] Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

GEF Operational Focal Point[18]			The project helped to move forward in developing solutions and policies on a sensitive topic such as pesticide management. Additionally, it made important contributions to the construction of a common vision between the Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries, on the inclusion of environmental aspects in national production and its development. Besides this it has enhanced coordination among stakeholders through different activities and trainings. During the lifetime of the project, capacity building at national level regarding monitoring and analytical capacities have increased. The monitoring of the San Salvador basin is in its final stage. This monitoring has evolved in comparison to the previous one. The matrices covered are increased as well as the impact assessment of new and additional pesticides. As part of the San Salvador basin new monitoring efforts, pesticide testing in fish will be developed. About the stockpile's elimination, Campo Limpio started the elimination in a local incineration facility approved by the Environment Ministry, as the starting point for the sound management of the Obsolete Pesticide under the Environmental Plan of Component 1. Uruguay was included as LATAM pilot country for the FARM program to keep on working on pesticides and agriplastics, after the assessment of the progress made during the implementing activities of the project since its beginning.
Lead Technical Officer[19]	**Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**	**Satisfactory (S)**	Despite the delays in the implementation of some activities the project delivered satisfactory results. A lot of effort from the project team has being made to align initially planned activities to changed environment, including COVID 19 situation. All stakeholders were fully engaged regarding all components of the project. Overall With the extension of the project positive results were achieved under all components. The project is ready for finally closed by 31 December 2023.
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	**MS**	**S**	The project has achieved most of its targets, and helped build bridges between the ministries of environment and agriculture. The catalytic role of GEF funding has been clear,

[18] In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.
[19] The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

			and opportunities for scaling out, picked up by the new FARM program (UNEP-FAO). By December 2023, the project team, the government and FAO in Uruguay may wish to identify chances for funding under Target 7 of the Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF), and the new GBF Fund launched at the GEF Assembly in August 2023.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

This section is under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made to comply 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. Please indicate if new 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 1: Natural Resource Management				
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
ESS 7: Decent Work				
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan **at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate:**

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	**Current ESS risk classification** Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid[20]. If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Medium	N/A

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.

[20] **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit (Esm-unit@fao.org) should be contacted. The project shall prepare or amend an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) or other ESS instruments and management tools based on the new risk classification (please refer to page 13 https://www.fao.org/3/cb9870en/cb9870en.pdf)

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified during the 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[21]	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Delays in the adoption of updated norms and procedures, and lack of inter-institutional coordination.	Low	Y	The mitigation strategy has had results. 4 of 5 proposals of the life cycle stages that emerged from the working groups have been presented. Although they have not yet been approved, it is considered an achievement to have presented them, due to this point depend of the national authorities and not for the project.	This risk does not present changes.	

[21] Risk ratings means a rating of 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[21]	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
2	Limited collaboration of the private sector and the producers to support the project, in particular shipping containers to collection centers, and identification of stocks of obsolete pesticides and any eventual contaminated sites.	Low	Y	Complementing the activities developed during the execution of the project, significant efforts were made to transfer the tools and evidence obtained by the project to improve the management of pesticides and thus increase the adherence to these Good Agricultural Practices by the producers. The commercial sector actively participated in the generation of regulatory proposals and expressed its support for the improvement objectives for the Pesticide Registry.	This risk does not present changes.	
3	The budget available is not enough for the environmentally sound disposal of identified stockpiles of obsolete pesticides.	Low	Y	According to current regulations, importers and formulators of pesticides will be responsible for the disposal of obsolete stocks. So, the private sector is responsible for the proper storage of pesticides and covering its elimination through the obsolete management plan (Decree 152/013).	This rick does not present changes	

	Type of risk	Risk rating[21]	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
4	Low level of commitment of the authorities (National Directors), as well as the members of the meeting groups of each component	Low	Y	As a mitigation strategy, the PCU regularly proposed to the Project Steering Committee the lines of work to be developed for each year, in order to obtain formal responses (validation), avoiding delays and also allowing them to decide in which activities they want to participate in the project and in which ones not.	This risk does not present changes.	
5	Resistance in the integration of improvements in the registry and evaluation ERA by authorities.	Low	Y	Although the strategy originally proposed achieved some results, the risks are still present given the political burden of this output. The decision regarding the implementation or not, of the proposed improvements for the ERA and Registration passes through political decisions, which are beyond the scope of the project. For this reason, it is proposed to adapt the strategy and accept the risk considering the output to be not as the implementation but as the proposals presented to the authorities.	This risk does not present changes.	

	Type of risk	Risk rating[21]	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
6	Not being able to meet the target of eliminating 160 tons of obsoletes pesticides during the execution of the project.	Substantial	N	The PCU informs the authorities that although the EMP was approved, the environmental authorization for the local company was delayed, slowing down all logistics.	The previously reported letter of agreement with Campo Limpio is moving forward. Products 2 and 3 are being executed in parallel, it is estimated that the 14 tons will be eliminated by December 2023, being the first experience at the national level.	

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

FY2022 rating	FY2023 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Medium	Medium	As mentioned in the previous report, the project has had to adapt to the new post-pandemic realities. This scenario generated delays and slowdowns in the execution of several of the project's products, some of which were directly associated with the lack of definition on the part of the authorities regarding some of the key products, which ended up affecting the achievement of the results. The challenges, which in some way have been repeated throughout the project, have been partly overcome by the strategies implemented towards the end of the project.

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 during this Fiscal Year
Recommendation 1:	
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation…..	
Recommendation…..	

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

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 Guidelines[22]. 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			
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management			
Implementation schedule	NTE extended until 31 December 2023		
Executing Entity			
Executing Entity Category			
Minor project objective change			
Safeguards			
Risk analysis			
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%			
Co-financing			
Location of project activity			
Other minor project amendment (define)			

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

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	Type of partnership	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government institutions			
National Directorate of Environment (DINACEA) – MA	Leading national partner. Coordinate project implementation and project management along with the GEF Agency (FAO).	Ensured the close collaboration with other ministries and participating entities. Led the project and was an essential part of its achievements. Also a work plan was executed with its laboratory and it was incorporated more than 100 new assets in water samples, as well as validation and adjustments of analytical methodologies with multiple pesticide residues (participates in all outcomes).	
General Directorate of Agricultural Services (DGSA) – MGAP	Support project implementation and co-leading in the project steering committee.	In close collaboration with DINACEA, FAO and other ministries and participating entities, it was part of the activities of the project. As achievements of the three ministries, the updating, search and improvement of the registration in the theme of the environment was given. This was a challenge for the authorities to accept and continue that line to concretely implement the proposed changes.	
Ministry of Public Health (MSP)	Support project implementation and co-leading in the project steering committee	In close collaboration with DINACEA, FAO and other ministries and participating entities, it was part of the activities of the project. As achievements of the three ministries, the updating, search and improvement of the registration in the theme of the environment was given. This was a challenge for the authorities to accept and continue that line to concretely implement the proposed changes.	
Other MGAP's agencies and projects (General Directorate of Horticulture - DIGEGRA, National Institute of Agricultural Research -INIA)	Participate in project implementation	They were participated in project implementation by providing inputs and experiences on the adaptation and adoption of technologies related to the rational use of pesticides at general and sector level (participates in 2.1 and 3.1).	
NGOs[23]			

[23] Non-government organizations

Latin American Network for Action against Pesticides (RAPAL)	Civil society organizations aimed at promoting viable alternatives for the development of socially just, ecologically sustainable and economically viable agriculture.	They participated in project implementation with specific contributions to the role of civil society in the use and sound management of pesticides (participates in 3.1). In the last period of time they had passive participation in the reception and dissemination of the results of the project.	
Network of Environmental NGOs (CEUTA, Net of Agroecology)			
Private sector entities			
Commerce Chamber of Agrochemical Products (CAMAGRO, CANAFFI, civil association "CampoLimpio" and Others recycling companies)	They represented the companies involved in the manufacture, formulation, import or trade of phytosanitary products. Establish relations with public and private organizations, at national or international level, which promote the responsible and effective use of agrochemicals.	They participated in all the working groups and were active players in matters related to the Pesticide Registry. CampoLimpio is a key actor with which progress was made in Empty Container management Plan and the EMP.	
Private Companies: AUSID and Oilseeds Technological Bureau, Rural communities: producers and their organizations, SOFOVAL, FADISOL, Barraca ERRO, and others private companies	They supported the implementation of the project activities related to IPM (Participates in the trainings 3.1 and 3.2).	They were clue actors in the field, working with the farmers. They organized a lot of activities with the project for technicians, producers and operators.	
Others[24]			
University of the Republic (UdelaR) –School of Chemistry, School of Sciences , School of Engineering, School of Agronomy, Eastern Regional Centers (CURE), School of Medicine (CIAT)	Participate in project implementation with specific contributions to the role of academy	They participated in 2.1, 3.1 and 4.1. The proposed new lines of work were continued by the institutions that will continue once the project ends. They were clue actors in the validation and development of strategies with scientific support.	
Producers and technicians in the area of influence of demonstration sites	The urban population associated with the area and local social organizations are direct beneficiaries of the project	In every field action (despite the constraints), we have received a very positive feedback indicating that these have a positive impact on the target audience (participates in 2.1 and 3.1). It is a challenge for the project that producers continue to adhere to the practices and lines of work started by the project.	

[24] 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

	actions, either through targeted training or dissemination of activities.		
New stakeholders identified			

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) during this reporting period.

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.	No	As previously reported, although gender mainstreaming was not included in the Project Document
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	The exchanges carried out with the MGAP gender consultancy, generated a document that despite not being able to be implemented by the end of the project (as well as the pandemic that has not allowed training with rural women), intends to leave some main lines of work on the subject to include in future projects, seeking to improve in this regard.
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	No	
b) improving women's participation and decision making	No	
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	No	
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	No	*Please provide progress on gender sensitive indicators of the project results framework.*
Staff with gender expertise	No	
Any other good practices on gender	No	

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval, during this reporting period.

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.	Yes, the Project has implemented several strategies such as Lessons Learned, change control, monthly reviews and results evaluations to follow up on the activities carried out, as well as document good practices to implement in future projects.
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges **this year**.	Yes, it has involved a communication strategy that varied based on the interests of the public throughout the Project. However, in particular this year no new communication strategy was applied.
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.	During this period and since the Project is closing there is currently no activity of this type, but we do have examples that have been reported in previous PIRs. For example, what is related to biological beds: Link, Link
Please provide links to related website, social media account	https://www.gub.uy/ministerio-ambiente/plaguicidas
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	https://www.gub.uy/ministerio-ambiente/plaguicidas https://www.fao.org/uruguay/videos-publicaciones-y-boletines/boletines/proyecto-plaguicidas/es/
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details	

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.
There are no indigenous people involved in the project.

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing[25]	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing[26]	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Agency	FAO	In-kind	300,000	389,500	102,000	389,500
Local Government	MA	In-kind and grant	2,008,000	3,254,400	800,000	3,254,400
Local Government	MGAP	In-kind	1,080,000	1,592,000	490,000	1,592,000
Civil Society Organization	Campo Limpio	In-kind	2,620,000	4,720,000	890,000	4,720,000
Local Government	OSE	In-kind	1,250,000	0	0	0
Local Government	MSP	In-kind	0	102,000	29,000	102,000
		TOTAL	**7,258,000**	**10,057,900**	**2,311,000**	**10,057,900**

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

It should be noted that co-financing was over-fulfilled.

The Ministry of the Environment, through Project UTF/URU/035/URU, which originally planned to contribute USD 400,000, was increased to USD 1,069,544 to support project activities. In particular, the Pesticide Monitoring Plan in priority basins and the project technical team support.

[25]Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

[26]Grant, Loan, Equity Investment, Guarantee, In-Kind, Public Investment, Other (please refer to the *Guidelines on co-financing* for definitions

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_FI_GN_01_Cofinancing_Guidelines_2018.pdf

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 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 will 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

Annex 2.

GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as OpenStreetMap or GeoNames use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: https://coordinates-converter.com Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking here

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location & Activity Description
Camas Biol ´1	34°34'5.53"S -34.5682	55°54'48.19"O -55.91338	Camas Biol ´1	Sitios Proyecto.kmz
Sitio 2 INIA	34°17'36.02"S -34.29333	57° 4'1.89"O -57.06719	Sitio 2 INIA	
INIA 4	33°52'35.75"S -33.87659	57°50'39.17"O -57.84421	INIA 4	
F.AGRO 1	32°22'8.74"S -33.60112	58° 3'53.95"O -58.01319	F.AGRO 1	
F.AGRO 2	33°37'32.55"S -33.6257	58°10'27.02"O -58.17417	F.AGRO 2	

Productor 1 - Arnaldo Sibille	34°20'49.65"S -34.34712	57°16'38.54"O -57.27737	Productor 1 - Arnaldo Sibille	
Productor 2 – Elsa Caffarel	34°21'9.27"S -34.35257	57°15'46.73"O -57.26298	Productor 2 – Elsa Caffarel	
Productor 3 - Ruben Malán	34°21'6.00"S -34.35166	57°15'42.10"O -57.26169	Productor 3 - Ruben Malán	
Inia Sitio 1	34°19'52.87"S -34.33135	57°43'3.34"O -57.71759	Inia Sitio 1	
INIA 3	33°53'1.48"S -33.88374	57°45'42.74"O -57.76187	INIA 3	
Entoagro EENN 1	33°24'25.73"S -33.40714	58° 7'25.05"O -58.12362	EENN 1	
Entoagro EENN 2	33°38'48.05"S -33.64668	58° 5'53.51"O -58.09819	EENN 2	
Establecimiento La Media Lucha - Km 34.5	33°37'27.04"S -33.62417	58°10'36.73"O -58.17687	Establecimiento La Media Lucha - Km 34.5	

Establecimiento Andrés Alayón - F.AGRO 1ER AÑO	33°34'41.62"S -33.57822	58° 7'50.21"O -58.13061	Establecimiento Andrés Alayón - F.AGRO 1ER AÑO	
Establecimiento El Chaja - FAGRO. 1ER AÑO	33°36'4.03"S -33.60112	58° 0'47.49"O -58.01319	Establecimiento El Chaja - FAGRO. 1ER AÑO	
Establecimiento El Chaja - F.AGRO 1	32°22'8.48"S -32.36902	58° 3'54.50" -58.06513	Establecimiento El Chaja - F.AGRO 1	
Establecimiento El Chaja - ACB 1	34°38'45.05"S -34.64584	56°11'20.11"O -56.18892	Establecimiento El Chaja - ACB 1	
Establecimiento El Chaja - ACB 2	34°28'19.78"S -34.47216	55°57'41.38"O -55.96149	Establecimiento El Chaja - ACB 2	
Establecimiento El Chaja - ACB 3	34°28'1.86"S -34.46718	55°57'59.36"O -55.96648	Establecimiento El Chaja - ACB 3	
Establecimiento El Chaja - ACB 3	34°27'5.80"S -34.45161	55°44'38.64"O -55.74406	Establecimiento El Chaja - ACB 3	
Establecimiento La Media Agua – km 47.5	33°30'35.01"S	57°54'41.86"O	Establecimiento La Media Agua – km 47.5	

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate.