



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2023 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	4
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	20
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	28
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	32
6. RISKS	34
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	38
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	39
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	40
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	42
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	44
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT.....	46
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	47

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Latin America and Caribe
Country (ies):	Nicaragua
Project Title:	Strengthening the Resilience of Multiple-use Protected Areas to Deliver Multiple Global Environmental Benefits
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/NIC/049/GFF
GEF ID:	5277
GEF Focal Area(s):	Climate Change, Biodiversity, Land Degradation
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources (MARENA)
Initial project duration (years):	5 years

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	September 11, 2019
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	January 18, 2020
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	December 31, 2024
Revised project implementation End date (if approved) ²	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	5,885,515
Total Co-financing amount (USD)³:	19,919,718
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	2,709,198
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)⁴:	1,629,721
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023⁵	364,256.35

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	June 2021
---	-----------

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.

Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	September 2022
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	March 2023
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	September 2024
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):	<i>Moderately Satisfactory</i>
Overall implementation progress rating:	<i>Moderately Satisfactory</i>
Overall risk rating:	<i>Low</i>

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	Low
---	-----

Status

Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	3rd PIR
--	---------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	Maria de los Angeles Boedeker	mboedeker@marena.gob.ni
Budget Holder (BH)	Ivan León Ayala	Ivan.leon@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)	Javier Gutiérrez	xaviergut@gmail.com
Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Raixa Elena Llauger	Raixa.Llauger@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	Nadia Mujica	Nadia.mujica@fao.org

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.

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

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

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹																																				
Strengthened management effectiveness of the Multiple Use Protected Areas (MUPAs) and the sustainable use of dry and humid forests in the wider landscape in western and north-central Nicaragua to ensure the flow of multiple ecosystem	Outcome 1 Multiple-use protected areas in dry forests and humid, semi-humid and cloudy landscapes of western and central-northern Nicaragua have improved their capacity	Indicator 1. Change in the capacity of MARENA staff, measured by capacity development indicators (UNDP Capacity Scorecard: 30 officials trained, including 30% of women) a. Capacity for participation b.	MARENA: a: 51% b: 47% c: 78% d: 83% e: 83% T: 81% <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Rivas</th> <th>Jinotega</th> <th>Boaco</th> <th>Chontales/Ju</th> <th>Chinandega</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a</td> <td>67 %</td> <td>78 %</td> <td>22 %</td> <td>44 %</td> <td>44 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b</td> <td>53 %</td> <td>47 %</td> <td>47 %</td> <td>47 %</td> <td>40 %</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Rivas	Jinotega	Boaco	Chontales/Ju	Chinandega	a	67 %	78 %	22 %	44 %	44 %	b	53 %	47 %	47 %	47 %	40 %	Not defined in Prodoc	<u>MARENA:</u> a: 66% b: 62% c: 90% d: 90% e: 90% T: 90% <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Rivas</th> <th>Jinotega</th> <th>Boaco</th> <th>Chontales/Jui</th> <th>Chinandega</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a</td> <td>67 %</td> <td>78 %</td> <td>22 %</td> <td>44 %</td> <td>44 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b</td> <td>53 %</td> <td>47 %</td> <td>47 %</td> <td>47 %</td> <td>40 %</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Rivas	Jinotega	Boaco	Chontales/Jui	Chinandega	a	67 %	78 %	22 %	44 %	44 %	b	53 %	47 %	47 %	47 %	40 %	Capacity-building for 240 MARENA technicians (49% are women) at the central and territorial levels on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of methodologies for the formulation/updating of PA management plans (contributing to the formulation/updating of 13 management plans for protected areas) Diploma course on biodiversity, landscape management and restoration (contributing to the design of strategies to conserve biodiversity in situ for the restoration and recovery of ecosystems in fragmented landscapes; as well as to the identification of 	MS
	Rivas	Jinotega	Boaco	Chontales/Ju	Chinandega																																						
a	67 %	78 %	22 %	44 %	44 %																																						
b	53 %	47 %	47 %	47 %	40 %																																						
	Rivas	Jinotega	Boaco	Chontales/Jui	Chinandega																																						
a	67 %	78 %	22 %	44 %	44 %																																						
b	53 %	47 %	47 %	47 %	40 %																																						

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.

services, ensuring biodiversity conservation, SLM, and climate change mitigation from land use change	for planning, monitoring, collaborative management, and financial management	Capacity for the creation of, access to, and use of information and knowledge c. Capacity for the development of strategies, policy, and legislation d. Capacity for management and implementation e. Capacity for monitoring and evaluation T = total	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>c</td> <td>67%</td> <td>67%</td> <td>44%</td> <td>67%</td> <td>67%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d</td> <td>67%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>e</td> <td>67%</td> <td>67%</td> <td>67%</td> <td>67%</td> <td>67%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>T</td> <td>62%</td> <td>60%</td> <td>44%</td> <td>53%</td> <td>51%</td> </tr> </table>	c	67%	67%	44%	67%	67%	d	67%	50%	50%	50%	50%	e	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%	T	62%	60%	44%	53%	51%		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>c</td> <td>67%</td> <td>67%</td> <td>44%</td> <td>67%</td> <td>67%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d</td> <td>67%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>e</td> <td>67%</td> <td>67%</td> <td>67%</td> <td>67%</td> <td>67%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>T</td> <td>62%</td> <td>60%</td> <td>44%</td> <td>53%</td> <td>51%</td> </tr> </table>	c	67%	67%	44%	67%	67%	d	67%	50%	50%	50%	50%	e	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%	T	62%	60%	44%	53%	51%	<p>sustainable economic alternatives in the territories, which then became subprojects)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership, self-development and self-motivation (thus achieving the integration of the project staff into the MARENA territorial delegations as well as its central level, to facilitate the work processes) <p>10 project technicians (45% of them women) were trained for the identification and prioritization of sites in the biological corridors within the project area of influence, in which the Strategy for the Restoration of Degraded Landscapes will be implemented.</p> <p>In May 2023, an agreement was signed between MARENA and the National Agrarian University (UNA) for the implementation of a capacity-building plan for MARENA technicians on Sustainable Land Management (SLM), as well as a certification course for forest rangers.</p>	
			c	67%	67%	44%	67%	67%																																															
d	67%	50%	50%	50%	50%																																																		
e	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%																																																		
T	62%	60%	44%	53%	51%																																																		
c	67%	67%	44%	67%	67%																																																		
d	67%	50%	50%	50%	50%																																																		
e	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%																																																		
T	62%	60%	44%	53%	51%																																																		
		Indicator 2. Change in the financial gap (USD) to cover the basic management costs for 13 MUPAs as a result of new financial resources after 5 years	\$1,968,039 USD	Not defined in Prodoc	USD \$610,667	<p>A proposal has been developed to reform the Rules and Regulations of the National Environment Fund (FNA) so as to guarantee the allocation of budget funds for the administration of protected areas (implementation of Management Plans) at the national level.</p> <p>The proposal is currently being reviewed by the MARENA Senior Management.</p>	MU																																																

		<p>Indicator 3. Total budget (USD) per year available for the management of 13 MUPAs by financial source after 5 years</p>	<p>National government: \$100,861.95 Local government: \$280,282 Generated revenues (visitor fees): \$0 Private sources (NGO, private sector, etc.): \$7,000</p>	<p>Not defined in Prodoc</p>	<p>National government: \$121,034 (increase in 20% after 5 years) Local government: 336,338 (increase in 20% after 5 years) Generated revenues (visitors fees): \$300,000 after 5 years (average of \$60,000/year) Private sources (NGO, private sector, others): \$600,000 USD after 5 years (average of \$120,000/year)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Government: \$ 38,293 - Municipalities: data not available - Protected area entrance fees: data not available - Private sector (NGOs, others): data not available 	<p>U</p>												
		<p>Indicator 4. Change in the forested area in the MUPAs (per type of ecosystem) by project end</p>	<p>Dry forest: 104,233 ha Humid, semi-humid, and cloud forest: 21,436 ha</p>	<p>Not defined in Prodoc</p>	<p>Dry forest: 129,233 ha Humid, semi-humid, and cloud forest: 51,436 ha</p>	<p>Through the implementation of 125 farm plans and 20 subprojects, the accumulated restored area has reached 6,338.42 ha (6% of the project's final goal):</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1465 808 1940 1019"> <thead> <tr> <th>Forest Type (Ha)</th> <th>Farm Plan (Ha)</th> <th>Sub project (Ha)</th> <th>Total (Ha)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Dry</td> <td>600.02</td> <td>482.00</td> <td>1,082.02</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rainforest, moist and cloud forests</td> <td>1,495.26</td> <td>3,761.14</td> <td>5,256.4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>MARENA has defined a new landscape restoration strategy that includes the implementation of Sustainable Landscape Restoration Initiatives and the payment for results as regards restoration activities. The purpose of the strategy is as follows: a) to increase areas of restoration per initiative; b) to apply new criteria for the selection of protagonists; c) to demarcate prioritised landscapes according to the degree of overexploitation of soils; d) to</p>	Forest Type (Ha)	Farm Plan (Ha)	Sub project (Ha)	Total (Ha)	Dry	600.02	482.00	1,082.02	Rainforest, moist and cloud forests	1,495.26	3,761.14	5,256.4	<p>U</p>
Forest Type (Ha)	Farm Plan (Ha)	Sub project (Ha)	Total (Ha)																
Dry	600.02	482.00	1,082.02																
Rainforest, moist and cloud forests	1,495.26	3,761.14	5,256.4																

						increase the participation of women; and e) to formulate research initiatives regarding the conservation objectives of multi-purpose protected areas.	
		<p>Indicator 5. Change in number of hectares of illegal logging of highvalue timber in two (2) MUPAs</p>	<p>Cerro Kilambé NR: Sweetgum (<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>) and mahogany (<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>) Volcán Cosigüina NR: White Mangrove (<i>Laguncularia racemosa</i>) (the baseline will be established during the first year of project implementation, the species to be assessed are included)</p>	Not defined in Prodoc	Baseline - 10% (deforestation declines each year by 2.5%)	<p>The update of the Closed Season System published in the Nicaraguan Official Gazette No. 26 declares that the indicated species are currently under protection.</p> <p>It can therefore be stated that there is no evidence of illegal extraction of sweet gum trees (<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>), as this is a species found in primary forests only.</p> <p>As concerns mahogany (<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>), there is currently no evidence of illegal extraction, as a result of compliance with the ban on its harvesting.</p> <p>There is no evidence of illegal extraction of <i>Laguncularia racemosa</i>, as a result of compliance with the ban on its harvesting.</p> <p>The presence of the following species was observed, as well as evidence found of their natural regeneration: <i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i> in the Kilambé and Macizo de Peñas Blancas Nature Reserves - <i>Laguncularia racemosa</i> in the Cosigüina Volcano Nature Reserve.</p>	S
		<p>Indicator 6. Change in the trade of vulnerable or endangered species as measure by number of</p>	<p>Orange-fronted parakeet (<i>Aratinga canicularis</i>): 35 individuals seized /year Pacific parakeet (<i>Aratinga strenua</i>): 41 individuals seized /year. Black iguana (<i>Ctenosauria similis</i>): 51 individuals seized /year</p>	Not defined in Prodoc	Orange-fronted parakeet (<i>Aratinga canicularis</i>): 17 individuals seized /year Pacific parakeet (<i>Aratinga strenua</i>): 20 individuals seized /year. Black iguana (<i>Ctenosauria similis</i>): 25 individuals seized /year	<p>According to the update of the Closed Season published in the Official Gazette, Minutes of the Government Congress, No. 26, the listed species are currently under protection and their hunt is prohibited. No confiscation of the indicated species from hunters has been reported.</p>	S

		individuals seized as recorded by PA rangers in each MUPA per year																	
		Indicator 7. Change in the number of forest fires reported in the dry forest MUPAs	109 events/year	Not defined in Prodoc	87 events/year (reduction by 20%)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Season (January – May)</th> <th>Registered wildfires</th> <th>Affected area (ha)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2021</td> <td>38</td> <td>4,534.64</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2022</td> <td>13</td> <td>277.88</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2023</td> <td>39</td> <td>550.61</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Season (January – May)	Registered wildfires	Affected area (ha)	2021	38	4,534.64	2022	13	277.88	2023	39	550.61	S
Season (January – May)	Registered wildfires	Affected area (ha)																	
2021	38	4,534.64																	
2022	13	277.88																	
2023	39	550.61																	
		Indicator 8. Continued presence of indicator species for biological groups (birds and plants)	<u>Dry forest</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds: 2 species (Procnias tricarunculata, Calocitta formosa) • Plants: 2 species (Albizia saman, Laguncularia racemosa) Humid, semi-humid, and cloud forest <u>Humid, semi-humid, and cloud forest</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds: 2 species (Pharomachus mocinno, Vermivora chrysoptera) Plants: 2 species (Quercus pubescens, Swietenia macrophyll) 	Not defined in Prodoc	<u>Dry forest</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds: 2 species (Procnias tricarunculata, Calocitta formosa) • Plants: 2 species (Albizia saman, Laguncularia racemosa) Humid, semi-humid, and cloud forest <u>Humid, semi-humid, and cloud forest</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds: 2 species (Pharomachus mocinno, Vermivora chrysoptera) Plants: 2 species (Quercus pubescens, Swietenia macrophyll) 	<p>During the period from 2020 – June 2021 the first phase in the updating of the bird biodiversity baseline showed the following results: - In the dry forest were found two (2) species of the corvidae family: Calocitta formosa (white-throated magpie jay) and Psilorhinus morio (brown jay) - There were no sightings of Procnias tricarunculata (threewattled bellbird) - In the wet forest there were no sightings of the species Pharomachus mocinno (resplendent quetzal) and Vermivora chrysoptera (goldwinged warbler)</p> <p>During the period from July 2021 – June 2022 the second phase in the updating of the bird and plant biodiversity baseline showed the following results: Dry forest - birds: - Procnias tricarunculata were sighted in the PA of the Cerro Saslaya National Park and the Kilambé Natural Reserve. - Calocitta formosa was sighted only in two PAs (Cerro Saslaya National Park and the Peñas Blancas Natural Reserve).</p>	MS												

						<p>Dry forest - plants: - The presence of Albizia saman (rain tree) was reported in five PAs (Estero Real, Volcán Madera, Apacunca, Istián and Padre Ramos) - Laguncularia racemosa (White mangrove) was reported in two PAs (Padre Ramos and Estero Real)</p> <p>Wet forest – birds: - Pharomachrus mocinno was sighted in Cerro Saslaya National Park and the Kilambé and Peñas Blancas natural reserves; the species Vermivora chrysoptera was sighted only in the Peñas Blancas Natural Reserve. Wet forest - plants: Swietenia macrophyll (Honduras mahogany) found in Cerro Kilambé National Park and the Estero Padre Ramos Natural Reserve. No Quercus pubescens (oak) were found (the natural distribution of this species is in central and southern Europe).</p> <p>In the period between July 2022 and June 2023, Pharomachrus mocinno was observed in the Macizo de Peñas Blancas Nature Reserve.</p> <p>The process to hire a biodiversity specialist to design and implement the community-based and institutional biodiversity monitoring protocol has been started. The purchase of equipment and materials needed for the monitoring actions (camera traps, binoculars, photo cameras, GPS) is in process.</p>	
		Indicator 9. Number of hectares in good	0 ha	Not defined in Prodoc	2,500 ha in agroforestry and silvopastoral systems (the target will be established during the first	The accumulated intervention area is 2,421.32 ha, including forest conservation and rehabilitation areas, as well as areas to establish LULUCF good practices.	MS

		management practices in LULUCF adopted in buffer zones of 13 MUPAs		year of project implementation)	<p>Good practices have been achieved in 525.66 ha, distributed as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1465 256 1921 586"> <thead> <tr> <th>FOREST TYPE</th> <th>Agroforestry system</th> <th>Silvopastoral system</th> <th>Men</th> <th>Women</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>BS</td> <td>89.27</td> <td>148.76</td> <td>100</td> <td>27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BH</td> <td>161.41</td> <td>126.22</td> <td>191</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTALES</td> <td>250.68</td> <td>274.98</td> <td>291</td> <td>87</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In the Protected Areas, the systems are distributed as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1465 683 1921 1421"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name of Protected Area</th> <th>Agroforestry system</th> <th>Silvopastoral system</th> <th>M</th> <th>W</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Cerro Cumaica - Cerro Alegre</td> <td>16.11</td> <td>55.58</td> <td>22</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cerro Mombachito - La Vieja</td> <td>5.95</td> <td>15.46</td> <td>10</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Macizo de Peñas Blancas</td> <td>31.40</td> <td>2.11</td> <td>34</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cerro Kilambé</td> <td>27.30</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>26</td> <td>13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Serranía de Amerrisque</td> <td>24.05</td> <td>53.07</td> <td>47</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Peña Inculca - Humedal Istiám</td> <td>22.71</td> <td>7.03</td> <td>21</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Volcán Maderas</td> <td>28.40</td> <td>36.57</td> <td>38</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Volcán Concepción</td> <td>16.50</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>11</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cerro Saslaya</td> <td>56.60</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>52</td> <td>13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Volcán Cosigüina</td> <td>6.00</td> <td>13.00</td> <td>10</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Apacunca</td> <td>6.66</td> <td>65.06</td> <td>13</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	FOREST TYPE	Agroforestry system	Silvopastoral system	Men	Women	BS	89.27	148.76	100	27	BH	161.41	126.22	191	60	TOTALES	250.68	274.98	291	87	Name of Protected Area	Agroforestry system	Silvopastoral system	M	W	Cerro Cumaica - Cerro Alegre	16.11	55.58	22	3	Cerro Mombachito - La Vieja	5.95	15.46	10	0	Macizo de Peñas Blancas	31.40	2.11	34	19	Cerro Kilambé	27.30	0.00	26	13	Serranía de Amerrisque	24.05	53.07	47	12	Peña Inculca - Humedal Istiám	22.71	7.03	21	6	Volcán Maderas	28.40	36.57	38	2	Volcán Concepción	16.50	0.00	11	0	Cerro Saslaya	56.60	0.00	52	13	Volcán Cosigüina	6.00	13.00	10	1	Apacunca	6.66	65.06	13	3
FOREST TYPE	Agroforestry system	Silvopastoral system	Men	Women																																																																																	
BS	89.27	148.76	100	27																																																																																	
BH	161.41	126.22	191	60																																																																																	
TOTALES	250.68	274.98	291	87																																																																																	
Name of Protected Area	Agroforestry system	Silvopastoral system	M	W																																																																																	
Cerro Cumaica - Cerro Alegre	16.11	55.58	22	3																																																																																	
Cerro Mombachito - La Vieja	5.95	15.46	10	0																																																																																	
Macizo de Peñas Blancas	31.40	2.11	34	19																																																																																	
Cerro Kilambé	27.30	0.00	26	13																																																																																	
Serranía de Amerrisque	24.05	53.07	47	12																																																																																	
Peña Inculca - Humedal Istiám	22.71	7.03	21	6																																																																																	
Volcán Maderas	28.40	36.57	38	2																																																																																	
Volcán Concepción	16.50	0.00	11	0																																																																																	
Cerro Saslaya	56.60	0.00	52	13																																																																																	
Volcán Cosigüina	6.00	13.00	10	1																																																																																	
Apacunca	6.66	65.06	13	3																																																																																	

						<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Delta Estero Real</td> <td>5.50</td> <td>27.10</td> <td>7</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Estero Padre Ramos</td> <td>3.50</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTALES</td> <td>250.68</td> <td>274.98</td> <td>291</td> <td>87</td> </tr> </table> <p>Currently, MARENA has mandated the implementation of a new landscape restoration strategy through sustainable restoration initiatives and restoration activities with payments for results.</p> <p>In order to increase areas with investments, new criteria will be used for the selection of protagonists, in addition to the demarcation of prioritized areas according to the degree of overexploitation of soils.</p>	Delta Estero Real	5.50	27.10	7	5	Estero Padre Ramos	3.50	0.00	0	10	TOTALES	250.68	274.98	291	87	
Delta Estero Real	5.50	27.10	7	5																		
Estero Padre Ramos	3.50	0.00	0	10																		
TOTALES	250.68	274.98	291	87																		
<p>Outcome 2: The SFM and SLM outside between MUPAs generated multiple global environmental benefits</p>	<p>Indicator 10. Area (ha) of biological corridors consolidated to improve connectivity between existing MUPAs and endangered tropical forest habitat in productive landscapes</p>	<p>Dry forest: 0 ha Humid, semi-humid, and cloud forest: 0ha</p>	<p>Not defined in Prodoc</p>	<p>Dry forest: 25,000 ha (including 1,000 ha rehabilitated, and 1,250 in agroforestry and silvopastoral systems)</p> <p>Humid, semi-humid, and cloud forest: 30,000 ha (including 1,000 ha rehabilitated, 1,250 in agroforestry and silvopastoral systems, and 399.55 ha of avoided deforestation)</p>	<p>The accumulated area of influence is 606.21 hectares and the accumulated area of intervention is 164.07 hectares, distributed as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Forest Type (Ha)</th> <th>Farm Plan (Ha)</th> <th>Subproject (Ha)</th> <th>Total (Ha)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>DF</td> <td>24.00</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>24.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HSF</td> <td>90.07</td> <td>50.00</td> <td>140.07</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>A new landscape restoration strategy has been formulated, based on the analysis of the project area as to overexploitation of soils, determining areas to be intervened and actions to be implemented (agroforestry systems, silvopastoral systems and forest management and conservation).</p>	Forest Type (Ha)	Farm Plan (Ha)	Subproject (Ha)	Total (Ha)	DF	24.00	0.00	24.00	HSF	90.07	50.00	140.07	<p>MU</p>				
Forest Type (Ha)	Farm Plan (Ha)	Subproject (Ha)	Total (Ha)																			
DF	24.00	0.00	24.00																			
HSF	90.07	50.00	140.07																			

						23 field visits were made to identify areas to be rehabilitated in: Cerro Cumaica-Cerro Alegre Nature Reserve, Mombachito-La Vieja Nature Reserve, Cerro Kilambé Nature Reserve, Serranía de Amerrisque Nature Reserve, Cerro Saslaya National Park, and Volcán Cosigüina Nature Reserve.	
		<p>Indicator 11. Continued presence of indicator species in the biological corridors</p>	<p><u>Dry forest</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Golden-mantled Howling , Monkey (Alouatta palliata), Black Iguana (Ctenosaura similis) <p><u>Humid, semi-humid, and cloud forest</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quetzal (Pharomachrus mocinno) Tapir (Tapirus bairdi) 	Not defined in Prodoc	<p><u>Dry forest</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Golden-mantled Howling Monkey (Alouatta palliata) Black Iguana (Ctenosaura similis) <p><u>Humid, semi-humid, and cloud forest</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quetzal (Pharomachrus mocinno) Tapir (Tapirus bairdi) 	<p>The second phase of the biodiversity baseline for 11 PAs has been completed. The findings were as follows:</p> <p>Dry forest - fauna: - Alouatta palliata (mantled howler monkey) found in nine (9) PAs: Cerro Saslaya National Park and Cerro Kilambé, Peñas Blancas, Mombachito La Vieja, Cerro Cumaica-Cerro Alegre, Estero Real, Volcán Concepcion, Volcán Madera and Istián wetlands natural reserves. - Ctenosaura similis found in four (4) PAs: Estero Real, Llanos de Apacunca, Estero Padre Ramos and Istián wetlands natural reserves. - Pharomachrus mocinno found in three (3) PAs: Cerro Saslaya National Park and Cerro Kilambé and Peñas Blancas natural reserves. - Tapirus bairdi (Baird’s tapir) present in two (2) PAs: Cerro Saslaya National Park and Cerro Kilambé Natural Reserve.</p> <p>Dry Forest - flora: - Guazuma ulmifolia (West Indian elm) found in seven (7) PAs: Peñas Blancas, Volcán Concepción, Volcán Madera, Apacunca, Istián wetlands, Padre Ramos and Cerro Cumaica natural reserves. - Ceiba pentandra (kapok tree) found in six (6) PAs: Peñas Blancas, Volcán Concepción, Apacunca, Istián wetlands,</p>	MS

						<p>Padre Ramos and Cerro Cumaica natural reserves.</p> <p>Rainforest, semi-humid tropical forest and cloud forest - fauna: - Pharomachrus mocinno found in three (3) PAs: Cerro Saslaya National Park, Cerro Kilambé and Peñas Blancas natural reserves. - Tapirus bairdi present in two (2) PAs: Cerro Saslaya National Park and Cerro Kilambé Natural Reserve.</p> <p>Swietenia macrophylla found five (5) PAs: Cerro Saslaya National Park and Cerro Kilambé, Peñas Blancas, Mombachito La Vieja and Estero Padre Ramos natural reserves.</p> <p>The process to hire a biodiversity specialist to design and implement the community-based and institutional biodiversity monitoring protocol has been started. The purchase of equipment and materials needed for the monitoring actions (camera traps, binoculars, cameras, GPS) is in process.</p>									
		<p>Indicator 12. Restored carbon stocks of threatened tropical forests at the end of 5 years *Natural rehabilitation of degraded areas</p>	<p>Dry forest: 0 tCO2-eq (0 ha)</p> <p>Humid, semi-humid, and cloud forest: 0 tCO2-eq (0 ha)</p>	<p>Not defined in Prodoc</p>	<p>• Dry forest: 26,862 tCO2-eq (1,000 ha rehabilitated)</p> <p>Humid, semi-humid, and cloud forest: 35,816 tCO2-eq (1,000 ha rehabilitadas)</p>	<p>The accumulated progress of rehabilitated areas is 2,552.80 ha:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1501 1128 1890 1299"> <thead> <tr> <th>Forest type</th> <th>Ha. under management</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Dry Forest</td> <td>480.79</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rainforest</td> <td>2,072.01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>2,552.8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Forest type	Ha. under management	Dry Forest	480.79	Rainforest	2,072.01	Total	2,552.8	<p>S</p>
Forest type	Ha. under management														
Dry Forest	480.79														
Rainforest	2,072.01														
Total	2,552.8														
		<p>Indicator 13. Flow (m3 /sec) in 10 prioritized</p>	<p>1. Istiam River (Basin 69): 8.18 m3/s</p>	<p>Not defined in Prodoc</p>	<p>Target equal to the baseline.</p>	<p>A method has been developed to measure water flow rates.</p>	<p>U</p>								

	watersheds as measured by water gauges to be installed in the prioritized rivers during the first year of the project	2. Mayales River (Basin 69): 0. 66 m3/s 3. Fonseca River (Basin 69): 0. 30 m3/s 4. Estero Real River (Basin 58): X 5. Tuma River (Basin 55): 2.67 m3/s. 6. Cúa River (Basin 53): 1.77 m3/s 7. Bocay River (Basin 53): X 8. Aquespalapa River (Basin 58): X 9. Viejo River (Basin 64): X 9. El Obraje River (Basin 64): X 10. Yaoska River: 0.18m3/s			Measures taken: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">River</th> <th colspan="3">Measure (m3/s)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>PIR 1</th> <th>PIR 2</th> <th>PIR 3</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>8.18</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td></td> <td>0. 66</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td></td> <td>0. 30</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td></td> <td>2.67</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>2.67</td> <td>1.77</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>9</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>0.18</td> <td>0.18</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Special equipment was purchased to measure water flow rates, and trainings on the use of this equipment are being coordinated with the National Water Authority (ANA).</p>	River	Measure (m3/s)			PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	1		8.18		2		0. 66		3		0. 30		4		2.67		5	2.67	1.77		6				7				8				9				10	0.18	0.18		
River	Measure (m3/s)																																																				
	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3																																																		
1		8.18																																																			
2		0. 66																																																			
3		0. 30																																																			
4		2.67																																																			
5	2.67	1.77																																																			
6																																																					
7																																																					
8																																																					
9																																																					
10	0.18	0.18																																																			
	Indicator 14. Number of hectares protected through REDD+ practices during a 5-year period	0	Not defined in Prodoc	30,000 ha (Year 1 – Reference emission levels established –; Year 2 – MRV system in place; Year 5 – Verification of emission reductions)	The formulation of the REDD+ initiative by a multidisciplinary team is in process, with a set of criteria for the selection of prioritized areas for forest restauration and the reduction of emissions from deforestation and degradation. In addition, criteria for the selection of protagonists for the incentive programme have been identified. The definition of administrative processes for the award of ex ante and ex post incentives is in the process of being analysed. A multi-criteria spatial analysis for intervention proposals is under development. This includes gathering	U																																															
	Indicator 15. Avoided deforestation (ha) at the end of the project	0	Not defined in Prodoc	399.55 ha																																																	
	Indicator 16. Number of sustainable production initiatives (beneficiaries differentiated	0	Not defined in Prodoc																																																		

		by gender, including 30% of women) that contribute to the reduction of deforestation for the GEF-funded ENDEREDD+ pilot project				statistics on current soil use, areas of intervention in the communities, and estimates on the number of protagonists who are to participate.	
		Indicator 17. Change in the capacity of the municipal staff and communities measured by capacity development indicators (UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard: 270 municipal officials and local communities trained, including 40% of women) a. Capacity for participation b. Capacity for the creation of, access to, and use of information and knowledge c.	Municipalities (average for 16 municipalities, individual scores are included in Annex 8.8): a: 43% b: 30% c: 50% d: 52% e: 10% T: 37% Local communities (average for 16 CSOs individual baseline scores are included in Annex 8.8): a: 17% b: 17% c: 31% d: 0% e: 0% T: 15	Not defined in Prodoc	Municipalities : a: 53% b: 40% c: 60% d: 62% e: 30% T: 47% Local communities: a: 27% b: 27% c: 41% d: 15% e: 15% T: 30%	Capacities of municipal government and MARENA territorial delegation officials have been strengthened as to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow-up on good practices and evaluation of environmental variables, using geographic information systems – GIS (identification of areas with the highest levels of degradation and development of monitoring processes for changes of land use and plant cover, to inform about the progress made towards the achievement of the conservation and restoration targets proposed by the project); 90 technicians (30% of them women). • Establishment of seed gathering techniques and nurseries to provide genetic material for protected areas; 480 technicians. • Identification of indicator species, with the participation of 55 sentinel observers. • Technical staff for the prevention and control of forest and agricultural fires (31 brigades, composed of 10 community members on average). 	MS

		<p>Capacity to develop strategies, policies, and legislation d. Capacity for management and implementation e. Capacity for monitoring and evaluation T = Total</p>			<p>In the period from July 2022 to June 2023, knowledge was exchanged about practices of protected area management and landscape restoration in the following events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 873 protagonists (42% of them women) through environmental fairs; • 1,686 protagonists (45% of them women) through workshops and exchanges. • 211 protagonists (42% of them women) through capacity-building in collaborative management 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Measures taken to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings on Section 2			
Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1: Multiple-use protected areas in dry forests and humid, semi-humid and cloudy landscapes of western and central-northern Nicaragua have improved their capacity for planning, monitoring, collaborative management, and financial management	Indicator 1. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application of the measuring tool for capacity-building of the MARENA technicians (tool to measure changes in the target group's capacities) Design of training plan for the technical staff in accordance with the analysis of skills in and knowledge regarding biodiversity conservation, sustainable forest management /REDD+, sustainable land management and climate change, based on the results of the capacity measuring tool Implementation of the training activities foreseen in the agreement signed with UNA. Registration of the collected information on the OnTracks platform for GEF projects 	Project Coordination Team	September – December 2023
	Indicator 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation of a proposal for the adjustment of the FNA Rules and Regulations to the Follow-Up Committee composed of the Ministry of the Treasury and Public Credit (MCHP), MARENA and FAO, as a mechanism to define the road map to achieve its approval and implementation 	Project coordinator	August 2023
	Indicator 3. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Registration of the collected information on the On Tracks platform for GEF projects 	Project Coordination Team	July 2023 – June 2024
	Indicator 4. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of the new landscape restoration strategy promoted by MARENA: selection of protagonists, design, approval and implementation of sustainable initiatives and payments for results in prioritized areas Multi-temporal analysis of the soil cover to evaluate the degree of changes in the forest area according to the type of ecosystem Graphic monitoring of the interventions with georeferenced data Registration of the collected information on the On Tracks platform for GEF projects 	Project Coordination Team	August 2023 – June 2024
	Indicator 8. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design of protocol for community-based and institutional monitoring of wildlife species Training technical staff and protagonists on the application of the species monitoring tool Implementation of the protocol for the monitoring of indicator species (birds, mammals, reptiles and plants) Registration of the collected information on the On Tracks platform for GEF projects Registration of the collected information on the On Tracks platform for GEF projects 	Biodiversity specialist	September 2023 - December 2024
	Indicator 9. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definition of the target number of hectares under management based on LULUCF good practices 	Project Coordination Team	July 2023 – June 2024

Measures taken to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings on Section 2			
Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring of the hectares managed under the landscape restoration strategy Graphic monitoring of interventions with georeferenced data Registration of the collected information on the On Tracks platform for GEF projects 		
Outcome 2: The SFM and SLM outside between MUPAs generated multiple global environmental benefits	Indicator 10. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of the landscape restoration strategy promoted by MARENA: selection of protagonists, design, approval and implementation of initiatives for the sustainable restoration of prioritized areas Monitoring of the hectares managed under the landscape restoration strategy Graphic monitoring of interventions with georeferenced data Registration of the collected information on the On Tracks platform for GEF projects 	Project Coordination	August 2023 – June 2024
	Indicator 11. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training technical staff and protagonists on the application of the species monitoring tool; registration in the KOBO form for the data base, and subsequent entry into the On Track monitoring tool for GEF projects Implementation of the monitoring tool for indicator species (birds, mammals, reptiles and plants) Graphic monitoring of interventions and their documentation 	Biodiversity specialist	September 2023 - December 2024
	Indicator 12. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring of the areas to be established Practices of measuring avoided carbon emissions Graphic monitoring Registration of the collected information on the On Tracks platform for GEF projects 	Project Coordination Team	September 2023 – June 2024
	Indicator 13. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training technical staff on how to measure water flow rates and how to use the purchased current meter Conclusion of the base line measurement and establishment of the measurement frequency to feed the indicator (twice in the dry season and twice in the rainy season) First measurement of water flow rate in coordination with the National Water Authority (ANA) Registration of the collected information on the On Track platform for GEF projects 	Project Coordination Team	July 2023 – June 2024
	Indicators 14, 15 and 16. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of the pilot programme for the reduction of emissions in prioritized territories of the North Caribbean Autonomous Region: application of the Landscape 	MARENA-FAO	July 2023 – June 2024

Measures taken to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings on Section 2			
Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
	Restoration Strategy with REDD+ approach, selection of protagonists and incentive mechanisms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Registration of the collected information on the On Tracks platform for GEF projects 		
	Indicator 17. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application of the UNDP tool for the measurement of Capacity Development (to measure changes in the capacities of target group) • Design and implementation of the training plan for municipalities and local communities on sustainable land management, sustainable forest management, climate change mitigation techniques, based on the results obtained by the UNDP tool. • Registration of the collected information on the On Tracks platform for GEF projects 	Project Coordination Team	September 2023 – June 2024

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: Multiple-use protected areas in dry forests and humid, semi-humid and cloudy landscapes of western and central-northern Nicaragua have improved their capacity for planning, monitoring, collaborative management and financial management.				
Outputs 1.1: Planning and monitoring capacities developed for the management of 12 MUPAs	Indicator 4. Change in the forested area in the MUPAs	13 cards Tracking Tool BD, REDD+, CC and LD. 2 sessions of the Steering Committee 3 monitoring sessions of the Steering Committee Formulation of 23 subprojects and 86 farm plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cards for 13 Multiple-Purpose Protected Areas were updated • 2 sessions of the Steering Committee were held (in December 2022 and February 2023) • 1 of 3 monitoring visits to the PAs by the Steering Committee to demonstrate the advances made in the project implementation has taken place. 	<p>Only 1 of the 3 programmed visits was made, due to the difficulty of the Steering Committee members to coordinate their work agendas. The remaining visits have been reprogrammed for the second half of 2023.</p> <p>The variation in the formulation of subprojects is due to the change of project implementation strategy regarding the establishment of investments on farms, due to: i) the review and broadening of selection criteria for protagonists, ii) the inclusion of a higher number of female</p>

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.

		<p>Consolidation of CMC</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MARENA has mandated the implementation of a new landscape restoration strategy through sustainable restoration initiatives, with the aim of increasing areas with investments. Protagonists will be selected according to new criteria, and areas prioritized according to the degree of overexploitation of soils will be demarcated. • So far, 125 farm plans and 20 subprojects have been approved in total • 10 agreements were signed with the CMC of 10 protected areas (Macizo de Peñas Blancas Nature Reserve, Cerro Kilambé Nature Reserve, Cerro Saslaya National Park, Volcán Maderas National Park, Peña Inculca – Humedal Istián Wildlife Reserve, Volcán Cosigüina Nature Reserve, RRG Apacunca Genetic Reserve, Delta del Estero Real Nature Reserve, Estero Padre Ramos Nature Reserve, Volcán Concepción Nature Reserve), and 3 agreements that were signed with PRODEP III are being followed-up upon. • A proposal for a handbook for the creation of Collaborative Management Committees has been prepared and will be validated with the territorial delegations, field technicians and protagonists of the committees. • A documentary was created to inform about the management of protected areas. 	<p>protagonists, iii) the analysis of the overexploitation of soils.</p> <p>A landscape restoration strategy for GEF projects is in place.</p>
	<p>Indicator 7. Change in the number of forest fires</p>	<p>27 training workshops for the forest fire</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 fire brigades have been trained in 9 training events, which were organized and implemented in the framework of the 	<p>It was not possible to hold all training events as the establishment of nurseries was prioritized and required high level of</p>

	reported in the dry forest MUPAs	prevention and control brigades.	collaboration between the institutions of the National System of Production, Consumption and Commerce. In total, 660 protagonists (487 men and 173 women) of the 10 protected areas participated.	participation from technicians and protagonists of the communities.
Outputs 1.2: Management and enforcement framework in place for 13 MUPAs	Indicator 1. Change in the capacity of MARENA staff, measured by capacity development indicators (UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard: 30 officials trained, including 30% of women). a. Capacity for participation (66%) b. Capacity for the creation of, access to, and use of information and knowledge (62%) c. Capacity for the development of strategies, policy, and legislation (90%) d. Capacity for management and implementation (90%) e. Capacity for monitoring and evaluation (90%) T = (90%)	3 training courses with diplomas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An agreement was signed with the National Agrarian University (in May 2023) for the implementation of a training plan for Marena's technical staff on Sustainable Land Management and Sustainable Forest Management. A course will also be offered to certify forest rangers of the protected areas. 	Their implementation has been reprogrammed for the second half of 2023 in the framework of the agreement between MARENA and UNA.
	Indicator 8. Continued presence of indicator species for biological groups (birds and plants)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the period from July 2022 to June 2023, the hiring process for a biodiversity specialist was started. This specialist will design and implement the protocol for community-based and institutional monitoring. In addition, the purchase of equipment and materials needed for the monitoring actions (camera traps, binoculars, photo cameras, GPS) is also in process. 	

		8 patrols	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 patrols were made for purposes of community-based monitoring, verification and control of biodiversity and environmental incidents (Cerro Saslaya National Park, Serranías de Amerrisque Nature Reserve, Mombachito – La Vieja Nature Reserve, Volcán Madera National Park, Espero Padre Ramos Nature Reserve, Macizo de Peñas Blancas Nature Reserve). During the report period (third PIR), the species <i>Pharomachrus mocinno</i> (quetzal) was observed in the Macizo de Peñas Blancas Nature Reserve.. 	Not all planned patrols could take place, as the establishment of nurseries was prioritised to guarantee plant material for the protagonists of farm plans and subprojects.
	Indicator 9. Number of hectares in good management practices in LULUCF adopted in buffer zones of 12 MUPAs	109 subprojects and farm plans in total	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the report period, 24 farm plans and 20 subprojects were approved: At present, MARENA has mandated the implementation of a new landscape restoration strategy through sustainable restoration initiatives. With the purpose of increasing areas with investments, new criteria will be used for the selection of protagonists, and areas prioritized according to the degree of overexploitation of soils will be demarcated. 	The variation is due to the change of implementation strategy.
Outputs 1.3. Financing capacities and financing management in place for 12 MUPAs:	Indicator 3. Total budget (USD) per year available for the management of 12 MUPAs by financial source after 5 years.		Government of Nicaragua \$ 38,293 Municipal governments – no information available Private sector – no information available	<p>The Government’s contribution has been calculated on the basis of human resources associated to the project, infrastructure of MARENA territorial delegations and operative expenses.</p> <p>It is necessary to advance with the calculation of the contributions of municipal governments and the private sector (including the protagonists).</p>

			102 visits were made to farmers who are protagonists of the plans for farm and subproject management in the area encompassed by the project	
Outputs 2.2: Integrated farm management delivers multiple global environmental benefit	Indicator 10. Area (ha) of biological corridors consolidated to improve connectivity between existing MUPAs and endangered tropical forest habitat in productive landscapes	1 Updated strategy 23 visits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A new landscape restoration strategy was formulated after an analysis of the overexploitation of soils in the project area, thereby determining the areas to be intervened and actions to be taken (agroforestry system, silvopastoral system, forest management and conservation). In addition, the farmer typology was analysed with the purpose of defining criteria for the selection of protagonists. 23 field visits were made to identify areas to rehabilitate in Cerro Cumaica-Cerro Alegre Nature Reserve, Mombachito-La Vieja Nature Reserve, Cerro Kilambe Nature Reserve, Serranía de Amerrisque Nature Reserve, Cerro Saslaya National Park, and Volcán Cosigüina Nature Reserve 	No variation
	Indicator 11. Continued presence of indicator species in the biological corridors	7 patrols	<p>The process for the hiring of a biodiversity specialist to design and implement the community-based and institutional biodiversity monitoring protocol has been started. The purchase of equipment and materials needed for the monitoring actions (camera traps, binoculars, cameras, GPS) is in process.</p> <p>During the report period, no observations of indicator species were made in the monitoring activities.</p>	Not all planned patrols could take place, as the establishment of nurseries was prioritised to guarantee plant material for the protagonists of farm plans and subprojects.
	Indicator 13. Flow (m ³ /sec) in 10 prioritized watersheds as measured by water gauges to be	2 measurements in each of the watersheds	A current meter was purchased to measure water flows, and a dialogue was started with the National Water Authority (ANA) to train the technical team on the use of the current meter	The planned measurements did not take place. Negotiations with the National Water Authority (ANA) have taken longer than foreseen in the work plan

	installed in the prioritized rivers during the first year of the project			
Outputs 2.3: Performancebased compensation mechanism for the wider landscape in place	Indicator 14. Number of hectares protected through REDD+ practices during a 5- year period	1 strategy formulated	The REDD+ pilot initiative is in the process of being formulated by a multidisciplinary team, with a set of selection criteria to prioritize areas for forest restoration and the reduction of emissions from deforestation and degradation.	No variation. Some progress was made in the identification of territories with the highest potential for emissions reduction inside the Peñas Blancas-Kilambé biological corridor.
	Indicator 15. Avoided deforestation (ha) at the end of the project		Criteria for the selection of protagonists for the incentive programme have been defined.	
	Indicator 16. Number of sustainable production initiatives (beneficiaries differentiated by gender, including 30% of women) that contribute to the reduction of deforestation for the GEF-funded ENDEREDD+ pilot project		The definition of administrative processes for the award of ex ante and ex post incentives is in the process of being analysed. A multi-criteria spatial analysis for intervention proposals is under development. This includes gathering statistics on current soil use, areas of intervention in the communities, and estimates on the number of protagonists who are to participate.	
	Indicator 17. Change in the capacity of the municipal staff and communities measured by capacity development indicators (UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard: 270 municipal officials and local communities trained, including 40% of women) a. Capacity for participation b. Capacity for the creation of, access to, and use of information and knowledge c. Capacity to develop strategies,		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 873 protagonists (42% women) in environmental fairs • 1,686 protagonists (45% women) in workshops and exchanges of experiences • 211 protagonists (42% women) trained on collaborative management 	

	policies, and legislation d. Capacity for management and implementation e. Capacity for monitoring and evaluation T = Total			
--	---	--	--	--

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)

The main achievement during the report period were:

- Implementation of 125 farm plans (with a 13% participation of women) and 20 subprojects (with a 31% participation of women)
- Incentives have been partially awarded to 125 protagonists of farm plans and 183 protagonists of 15 subprojects. The remaining equipment will be awarded starting in August 2023.
- The operational rules and regulations of the project were signed by FAO and MARENA, which has helped to accelerate some processes.
- An agreement was signed (in May 2023) with the National Agrarian University (UNA) to implement a capacity-building process for MARENA's technical staff on sustainable land management and sustainable forest management. Additionally, a certification course will be offered for rangers of protected areas.
- A socioeconomic analysis including the identification of gender roles was started, with the participation of protagonists and project technicians, in the framework of the MARENA Institutional Gender Strategy.
- The number of field technicians was doubled, with the purpose of strengthening technical assistance services, trainings and exchanges of experiences, as well as to ensure an agile and timely monitoring system for strategic decisions.
- The work process articulating MARENA with the SNPCC and the 21 municipal governments in the territory has been strengthened. These actors are kept informed about the project actions and participate in the formulation of subprojects and initiatives.
- A Landscape Restoration Strategy is in place to orient project investments on the basis of landscape zones, typology of protagonists and land potential.
- The formulation of the REDD+ pilot initiative is in progress: i) a set of criteria is in place for the prioritization of intervention areas for forest restoration and reduction of emissions due to deforestation and degradation, ii) selection criteria for protagonists.

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 rating¹⁵	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	MS	MS	<p>We are carrying out actions to strengthen the capacities of MARENA and municipal government officials and community members; the restoration process of degraded areas has started, although to a lesser degree than established in the target for the area of influence and intervention.</p> <p>A new landscape restoration strategy was mandated, which includes the implementation of several sustainable initiatives for landscape restoration and payment for results of restoration activities. The purpose of the strategy is to increase the restoration areas per initiatives with investments, applying new criteria for the selection of protagonists, to demarcate landscape areas that are prioritized according to the degree of overexploitation of soils and ecosystem degradation, to increase women's participation, and to develop initiatives for the research of conservation objects in multi-purpose protected areas.</p> <p>In addition, protocols for biodiversity monitoring and projected targets for the indicators until the end of the project are under preparation</p>
Budget Holder	MS	MS	<p>The project prompted the review and updating of key instruments for its implementation:</p> <p>a) landscape restoration strategy that includes the implementation of sustainable initiatives for landscape restoration and payment for results through restoration activities in areas prioritized by the on land use. With this, the increase in restoration areas by initiative is expected, the development of research initiatives based on the conservation objectives of the APUM and the increase in the participation of women;</p> <p>b) a proposal to reform the Regulations of the National Environmental Fund (FNA) was prepared to guarantee the budget allocation for the administration of protected areas</p>

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

			<p>(implementation of Management Plans) at the national level, this proposal is under review by the Senior Management of MARENA; c) the formulation of the REDD+ pilot initiative is in process through a multidisciplinary team, there is a set of selection criteria for the areas to be prioritized for forest restoration and the reduction of emissions from deforestation and degradation, in addition, the selection criteria of protagonists to be part of the incentive program.</p> <p>A cumulative intervention area of 2,421.32 ha has been reached, which includes forest conservation areas, forest rehabilitation areas and establishment of good LULUCF practices and 606.21 ha in biological corridors.</p> <p>The project also contributed to the strengthening of the capacities of 10 technicians (45% women) of the project for the identification and prioritization of sites in the biological corridors of the project's area of influence, in which the Degraded Landscape Restoration Strategy will be implemented. At the community level, knowledge on management practices of protected areas and landscape restoration was exchanged with 873 protagonists (42% women) with the development of environmental fairs, 1,686 protagonists (45% women) with the development of workshops and exchanges, and 211 protagonists (42% women) in strengthening collaborative management. Finally, an agreement was signed between MARENA and the National Agrarian University (UNA) for the implementation of a capacity building plan for MARENA's technical staff in Sustainable Land Management (MST) and Sustainable Forest Management (MSB), as well as the development of a course for the certification of park rangers.</p> <p>During the first semester of 2023, the mid-term review was carried out, identifying that the indicators present low levels of compliance in relation to the goals. However, it recognizes that the Project has promoted processes and obtained some products that have the potential to contribute to the fulfillment of its objectives, among which are the updating of PA management plans, the formation of collaborative management committees as a governance instance and main support for the implementation of management plans. Likewise, it provided a series of recommendations aimed at directing the project towards the achievement of its objectives. The response to the administration and action plan is being formulated by MARENA and FAO.</p>
GEF Operational focal Point¹⁸	MS	MS	Taking into consideration that the project is in its middle execution stage, and that in this evaluated fiscal period operational actions began in the field complying with the project

¹⁸ In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

			<p>indicators, it is necessary to work on a proposal for an efficient and affective technical and operational improvement plan.</p> <p>It is important that the role of the implementing agency be examined to determine the appropriate technical advice and the issues that it has not been able to perform, since this is the guarantor of accompanying the country to achieve the expected results.</p>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	MS	MS	<p>Although the strategic relevance of the project continues to be high, according with the MTR, it is necessary to promote strategies to increase the execution of resources more quickly through the programming of purchases, linking the interventions with the different protagonists with a landscape scale, in line with MTR recommendations. In addition, it is necessary to ensure that activities related to gender equality and work with indigenous peoples, are systematically and adequately reported. In this sense, it is recommended to create an FAO/MARENA instance, with the objective of evaluate the advances in these issues and looking at how to improve the report in these areas in future periods, as well as ensuring the deepening of the work on these issues.</p>
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	MS	MS	<p>The project has advanced in the development of an implementation strategy that will allow advances in the field activities and reduce pressure on protected areas, promoting a clear vision of biological corridors and sustainable landscapes. It is necessary to work on accelerating the delivery of project resources with better planning in the purchasing and contracting processes in order to generate an improvement in the efficiency in the execution of the project, according to the findings indicated by the RMT. It is also recommended, to check gender and indigenous people activities and asses if it is necessary to develop an indigenous people and gender action plan for the rest of the project implementation stage, to set specific actions, targets, budget and activities for those issues.</p>

¹⁹ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

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.
Low	The environmental and social risk classification granted during the formulation and approval of the project is maintained.

<i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i>
None

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	Limited benefits to farmers from conservation and SFM and SLM sustain pressure on PAs from competing land uses	M	Y	To mitigate this risk, the project will make use of conservation-based and SFM-based incentives (including performance-based payment plans) to promote the implementation of sustainable production practices. Farmers participating in these activities will be properly informed about the benefits of conservation and SFM and SLM and will benefit from related training. In addition, farmers will receive assistance from the project for the development of integrated farm management plans that will specify the spatial and temporal arrangements of different land uses across farms, allowing farmers to improve on-farm sustainability.	In order to mitigate this risk, 134 farm plans and 20 subprojects have been approved as incentives for restoration and sustainable management. They were designed in accordance with the protected area management plans created/updated by the project.	

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	Failures in the functioning of relations between PA staff and municipal authorities limits the integration of PA management with conservation efforts in the wider landscape	L	Y	To promote collaboration between PA staff and municipal authorities, the project will make use of collaborative agreements that allow the joint management of PAs. By doing so, municipal authorities will be able to more easily integrate conservation efforts within and from outside of the PAs, while PA authorities will have a chance to buffer PAs more effectively. Both PA staff and municipal authorities will have access to information and monitoring systems that will facilitate the exchange of information and enable joint decision-making. Furthermore, the project will involve both parts in all stages of the project's design phase as a way to promote early collaboration and to build trust. During project implementation, the joint development and application of work plans and indicators will be promoted.	<p>A handbook for the creation and activities of collaborative management committees has been made, and community members and municipal government representatives have been trained on the following topics: i) legal framework for the management of protected areas, ii) fire prevention and control, iii) national strategy for environmental monitoring and establishment of nurseries.</p> <p>The technical staff of municipal governments and institutions of the National System of Production, Consumption and Commerce has participated actively in the formulation of farm plans and subprojects.</p>	

	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
3	Poorly developed tenure conditions limit producers' eligibility for REDD+ and other incentives	M	Y	In order to reduce the risk related to the lack of clarity regarding land property and use rights, the project will work closely with local governments to coordinate land titling, respecting all existing forms and regulations that guarantee those rights. In the cases where there is little clarity or conflict exists regarding property and use rights, the project will assume a conciliatory approach in order to arrive at the best solution possible for all parties without compromising the achievement of the project's outcomes.	In addition, criteria for the selection of protagonists for the incentive programme have been identified.	

	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	Degradation of the tropical dry forest and loss of forest coverage as a consequence of extreme climatic events	L		The risks related to climate change may include more intense dry seasons and/or torrential rains associated with tropical storms and hurricanes. This could lead to increased forest degradation, including changes to plant communities or forest/ecosystem cover due to landslides, accelerated loss of soil, and desertification. The project's actions for sustainable forest and ecosystem management will translate into more solid and increased coverage, as well as healthier forests (for example, diversity of age classes and greater regenerative capacity) that are resilient to climate variability. In addition, there will be greater protection of the soil and regulation of hydric cycles that generate stable microclimatic conditions with benefits for their associated species and forests, as well as a reduction of vulnerability of local communities to climate change.	The strategy for assistance, training, and production of seedlings of native species in several communities of the project area of influence has been implemented, establishing 130 community nurseries in total with protagonists of farm plans and subprojects.	

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
M	Low	Risk has been managed with timely mitigation measures

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

During the report period (in March 2023), the Mid-Term Review (MTR) was carried out with the help of the FAO GEF Coordination Unit, to independently evaluate the strategic relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, incorporation of cross-cutting approaches (gender, indigenous peoples, knowledge management, safeguards), as well as to assess the probabilities that the impacts obtained since the start of the project implementation can be sustained beyond its finalization (sustainability). The MRT analysed the results obtained to this date in the execution period, identified lessons learnt and offered eight recommendations for the achievement of the project objectives and targets.

Two of the recommendations by the MTR aim at consolidating two processes started by MARENA and FAO in the first half of 2023: a) the definition of a new landscape restoration strategy which considers the demarcation of areas prioritized according to the degree of overexploitation of soils, in order to increase the landscape restoration areas as well as the number of beneficiaries, setting a special emphasis on women and research initiatives, and b) the design of an automatized platform for the follow-up to and management of GEF-financed projects, and road map for their validation and implementation (trial run).

At the time the PIR is presented, the final reviewed MTR report is under review. the response to the administration is under preparation. The next PIR (July 2024) will present the progress made in the implementation of the action plan to comply with the MTR recommendations.

<p>Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize</p>	<p>No</p>
--	-----------

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 Guidelines²². 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	Hiring of additional technical staff (7 field technicians) to guarantee the implementation of activities of the Project Steering Committee.	March 2023	Steering Committee
Financial management			
Implementation schedule			
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			
MARENA	Executing agency	<p>Through its territorial delegations, MARENA has ensured the participation of protagonists in the project activities.</p> <p>It guarantees articulation with other institutions with presence in the territory (municipal governments and the System of Production, Consumption and Commerce).</p>	Ensuring ownership and participation of protagonists and territorial institutions in actions aimed at the sustainability of protected areas.
Member institutions of the System of Production, Consumption and Commerce (INAFOR, INTA, INTUR, MEFCCA)	Co Executors	<p>They are members of the Project Steering Committee.</p> <p>Participation in environmental fairs and training processes in PAs</p> <p>They are members of the CMC of PAs.</p> <p>INTA: participates in training processes and provides technical assistance for the implementation of farm plans.</p> <p>INAFOR: offers assistance to organisational and training processes of the brigades for the fire prevention and control.</p>	
MINED	Co Executors	Participates in environmental education actions promoted by the project	
Nicaraguan Army	Co Executors	The Nicaraguan Army Ecological Battalion participates in field monitoring and patrols.	

NGOs²³			
Private sector entities			
Guardianes del Bosque	Protagonists	Participate in the formulation of farm plans and subprojects as well as fairs	
Others²⁴			
Drinking Water and Sanitation Committees	Co Executors	They are members of the CMC of protected areas and actively participate in training processes and activities described in the PA management plans.	
Municipal Governments (Altagracia, Comalapa, El Cua, El Tuma La Dalia, El Viejo, Juigalpa, La Libertad, Moyogalpa, Puerto Morazán, Rancho Grande, San Francisco de Cuapa, San José de los Remates, San Pedro de Lóvago, Santa Lucia, Siuna, Somotillo, Villa Nueva, San José de Bocay, Camoapa, Chinandega and Wiwilí de Jinotega)	Co Executors	They are members of the CMC and participate in the formulation of farm plans and subprojects, the establishment of community nurseries, and trainings and exchange events. They contribute funds for the administration of protected areas and repair access roads to protected areas..	
New stakeholders identified			

²³ Non-government organizations

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

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.	Update in process	The socioeconomic analysis and identification of gender roles is being updated together with protagonists and project technicians, according to the framework of the MARENA’s Institutional Gender Strategy.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women’s empowerment?	Yes	<p>Greater inclusion of women as protagonists in sustainable restoration initiatives: in the framework of the new landscape restoration strategy, the selection criteria for protagonists have been broadened, so as to increase participation of women as direct beneficiaries of the environmental incentives awarded by the project. 125 plans (13% of participants are women) and 20 subprojects (31% of participants are women) are currently under implementation. In total, 87 women have received environmental incentives from the project.</p> <p>Capacity-building processes: on average, 42% of the protagonists in the communities who participate in trainings and knowledge exchanges about management practices in protected areas and landscape restoration are women. They contribute to the application of conservation and restoration practices in their farming units, to the production of native plants and the collaborative management of protected areas.</p> <p>117 women are integrated in the 10 community-based fire brigades created during the report period (participation of women: 26%).</p> <p>At the technical level, 30% of the trained staff, of MARENA as well as the municipal governments, are women. They have contributed to the updating of the PA management plans, the design of strategies and the identification of sustainable economic options to be promoted in the project areas of influence. They will also contribute to remote monitoring of land use changes and plant cover, in order to inform about the progress towards the achievement of the project’s conservation and restoration targets.</p> <p>Participation of women in the governance of protected areas: the project promotes the integration of women in the CMC (participation of women: 34%), community boards of directors and community organisations. In the present year, 201 women have so far participated in trainings on collaborative PA management.</p>

Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):

a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Yes	125 farm plans (13% of participants are women) and 20 subprojects (31% of participants are women) are being implemented.
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	In the framework of the new landscape restoration strategy, the selection criteria for protagonists have been broadened in order to increase the participation of women as direct beneficiaries of the environmental incentives awarded by the project.
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	On average, 22% of the women participating in farm plans and subprojects have received economic incentives to establish landscape restoration areas and implement productive activities to generate income (for example, bee-keeping).
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	Field monitoring forms for the collection of information of the protagonists' gender are in place and will be automatized through the GEF OnTrack monitoring platform.
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	The Project Management Unit includes a gender and indigenous peoples' specialist.
Any other good practices on gender	Yes	A gender awareness process with men and women is currently being developed together with the project staff, in order to facilitate their understanding of topics of gender equity and equality, and their approach in the implementation of the project.

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval, <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.	<p>There is no plan in place. Activities have been implemented through MARENA strategies; social media and the website are actively used to publish stories with comments by individual protagonists or groups from the project area.</p> <p>The joint work with the National Forestry Institute (INAFOR) for the organisation and training of fire brigades has been a good practice; women actively participate in them, making up 26% of their members.</p> <p>Another good practice has been the review and broadening of the criteria to select participants in the project activities, with the purpose of increasing the number of women.</p>
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year .	<p>The project has a communication and visibility strategy that is aligned with MARENA’s strategy and implemented through local and national media, using the webpage and social network as tools.</p> <p>Challenges identified in the implementation of the strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of participatory documentation of the life stories of men and women implementing landscape restoration activities. • Developing the skills of the technical staff to capture visual material and testimonials with the purchased devices.
Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people’s livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.	<p>Video “Let’s Conserve Teocintle – Apacunca”</p> <p>Conservamos el Maíz Teocinte en Apacunca, Chinandega. - YouTube</p>
Please provide links to related website, social media account	<p>https://www.marena.gob.ni/ https://www.facebook.com/marenanicaragua/ https://twitter.com/MarenaNicaragua https://www.instagram.com/marenanicaragua/ https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCaO7XFv8JSVTNZxMwDH60yQ</p>
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	

<p>Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details</p>	<p>Project communications staff: -</p> <p>Jaros J Calix, MARENA Press and Dissemination Unit MARENA jcalix@marena.gob.ni</p> <p>Enmanuel Castro, Press and Dissemination Unit FAO enmanuel.castromunoz@fao.org</p>
---	--

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

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

The action plan for indigenous peoples was updated in line with the strategy of the Government of Nicaragua on the matter.

The strategic lines to develop are:

- i) Develop capacities in the MARENA technical field team on ethnicity and interculturality, as well as the identification of the role of women in indigenous communities.
- ii) Carrying out a rapid participatory documentation or diagnosis process in the communities to achieve a greater understanding of the worldview (traditions, festivities, representative dishes, typical costumes for dances, dances and raising stories of myths and legends) in traditional productive activities
- iii) Implement a training plan for project field technicians, indigenous community members, and indigenous leaders.
- iv) Implement actions to systematize and communicate the learning obtained during the project by indigenous community members in the execution of landscape restoration initiatives.
- v) Document research processes on ancestral worldview issues of indigenous communities (lessons, learning and innovations).

In Nature Reserve Cerro Saslaya, during the reporting period, 20 farm plans and 2 subprojects were approved. The subproject called "Community management center for the management of forest and water resources in the Mayangna Sauni Bas indigenous territory, made up of a total of 12 Mayangna indigenous protagonists, of which 7 are men and 5 women.

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 US\$	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National government	MARENA	In-Kind		340,307.37		
	MEFCCA	In-Kind		1,247.17		
	INAFOR	In-Kind		5,130.39		
	MINED	In-Kind		5,037.55		
	Fire brigade	In-Kind		3,086.98		
	Nicaraguan Army	In-Kind		3,317.46		
				358,126.92		
Local government	Municipal mayor's offices	In-Kind		6,129.43		
				TOTAL	364,256.35	

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

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

²⁶Grant, 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
Delta Estero Real	12.92058	-87.36315	3617081	
Estero Padre Ramos	12.78091	-87.48321	3617401	
Volcán Cosigüina	12.98155	-87.56703	3620255	
Volcán Concepción	11.53831	-85.62178	3620299	
Volcán Maderas	11.44554	-85.51577	3617800	
Humedal Istiam Peña Inculca	11.49741	-85.56388	3617424	
Cerro Cumaica – Cerro Alegre	12.638	-85.76852	3620937	
Cerro Mombachito – La Vieja	12.40658	-85.54975	3617623	
Sierra Amerrisque	12.2	-85.31667	3620906	
Cerro Saslaya	13.76896	-85.03449	3616325	
Cerro Kilambé	13.58153	-85.69335	3618854	
Macizos de Peñas Blancas	13.28724	-85.67243	3620690	
Reserva Genética de Apacunca	12.92971	-87.17744		
Restauración ambiental de áreas degradadas en la comunidad Los Álvarez	12.54776084270	-85.70617253600		Subproyecto
Restauración de paisaje natural en comunidad Malacatoya	12.59419416070	-85.71727116360		Subproyecto
Restauración de áreas degradadas en la comunidad Mombachito	12.41251120260	-85.58034326710		Subproyecto
Restauración y conservación de bosque de galería en zona de recarga hídrica del Río Gusanera	13.27788671880	-85.71689204940		Subproyecto
Rehabilitación de la microcuenca El Maleconcito	13.56603499600	-85.74798122990		Subproyecto
Rehabilitación de bosques de galería en 11 fincas de la microcuenca Los Ángeles	13.53405975070	-85.56148402590		Subproyecto
Restauración de Paisajes degradados en las comunidades de Quebrantadero y Piedras grandes #3	12.16448213410	-85.32698000470		Subproyecto

Restauración de Paisajes degradados en la comunidad Piedras Grandes #2	12.13483944970	-85.30890115260		Subproyecto
Rehabilitación de Áreas Degradadas en Ecosistema Pantanoso	11.48593222380	-85.57497969280		Subproyecto
Restauración de Áreas Degradadas en Comunidad Tilgue	11.52511995840	-85.56926441570		Subproyecto
Conservación y Restauración Ecológica en la comunidad San Bartolo	12.10661427380	-85.21738493210		Subproyecto
Conservación y Restauración de Paisajes en la comunidad de San Francisco del Gamalote – Cosmatillo	12.23647953650	-85.28382866840		Subproyecto
Protección de las fuentes hídricas mediante el mejoramiento del Sistema de Tratamiento de Aguas Residuales del Beneficio Húmedo de Café	13.22266966840	-85.69060549580		Subproyecto
Restauración Ambiental en la microcuenca Los Ángeles.	13.34770173320	-85.65501798730		Subproyecto
Restauración de Paisaje en Áreas Degradadas en Comunidad Balgüe	11.48866380040	-85.51186363580		Subproyecto
Restauración de áreas degradadas en Comunidad San José del Sur	11.48880526050	-85.65252634600		Subproyecto
Fomento de la Conservación de Paisajes Natural mediante monitoreo comunitario comunidad rancho alegre	13.66785932640	-85.02833062440		Subproyecto
Restauración de áreas degradadas en la zona de recarga hídrica de la microcuenca del río Wany en las comunidades Wany y Hormiguero	13.74534440720	-84.90055556460		Subproyecto
Centro de Gestión Comunitaria para el Manejo de los Recursos Forestales y Agua en Territorio Indígena Mayangna Sauni Bas, SIKILTA	13.83501422360	-84.86222075930		Subproyecto
Restauración de áreas degradadas en comunidad Las Pozas, Municipio de El Viejo	13.02296959570	-87.53989182950		Subproyecto
Restauración del paisaje natural productivo en comunidad Apacunca en la Reserva de Recursos Genéticos Apacunca	12.87691867130	-86.96140820320		Subproyecto
Restauración de áreas degradadas en comunidad Palacio, Municipio de Puerto Morazán	12.84084669550	-87.19901346750		Subproyecto
Restauración de paisaje natural en comunidad Kilaquita, Municipio El Viejo,	12.83965414490	-87.48848165900		Subproyecto
Federico Antonio Suarez Aguilar	12.56313081330	-85.66204764680		Plan de manejo de finca
Silverio Jarquín Jarquín	12.56509761030	-85.66485375290		Plan de manejo de finca
Ramón Rosa Ortiz Martínez	12.56560658490	-85.66539413510		Plan de manejo de finca
Fernando Emilio Chavarría Valle	12.56637617680	-85.66562025340		Plan de manejo de finca
Francisco Javier Jarquín	12.56716632310	-85.66634326170		Plan de manejo de finca
Neftaly Rocha Mendoza	12.54540518830	-85.65367266760		Plan de manejo de finca
Pedro Armengol Paz Trujillo	12.42982787920	-85.57765538580		Plan de manejo de finca
Martin Antonio Paz Trujillo	12.43075866170	-85.58102616330		Plan de manejo de finca
Marvin Antonio Jarquín Murillo	12.42674779190	-85.57473786860		Plan de manejo de finca
Luis Alberto Paz Trujillo	12.42675886020	-85.57856430990		Plan de manejo de finca
José Catalino Trujillo Montenegro	12.42523956580	-85.57675130580		Plan de manejo de finca
Ignacio Escoto Suarez	12.42523956580	-85.57675130580		Plan de manejo de finca
Juan Ramón Cárdenas García	13.65896404950	-85.02235130440		Plan de manejo de finca
Catalina Díaz Alarcón	13.66127061990	-85.00905173570		Plan de manejo de finca
José Antonio Zamora Mendoza	13.66405063570	-85.01876925710		Plan de manejo de finca
Leonida Ramos Mercado	13.65696980430	-85.01142594160		Plan de manejo de finca
Deyvin Blandón	13.66439196550	-85.02871065650		Plan de manejo de finca

Moisés Adán Sánchez Herrera	13.66208512910	-85.02615137430		Plan de manejo de finca
Carmenza Torrez Ortiz	13.65828946980	-85.02049012200		Plan de manejo de finca
Heyling Blandón	13.66387774340	-85.02768908440		Plan de manejo de finca
José Efraín Muñoz Cruz	13.66500513960	-85.01833615440		Plan de manejo de finca
Henry Natividad Mendoza Molina	13.66127061990	-85.00905173570		Plan de manejo de finca
Jorge Raul Jarquin López	13.67984547500	-84.97156599460		Plan de manejo de finca
Miguel Perez Obando	13.68452429960	-84.98011211090		Plan de manejo de finca
Denis Orlando Solano Zeledón	13.67927741220	-84.97061891560		Plan de manejo de finca
Jose Armando Jarquin Arceda	13.68019615870	-84.97135041940		Plan de manejo de finca
Carlos Donald Gonzalez Jarquin	13.68470959330	-84.98732889310		Plan de manejo de finca
Alejandro Hernandez Martinez	13.67929238030	-84.97023985780		Plan de manejo de finca
Juan Reyes Murio	13.70872181870	-84.97740047370		Plan de manejo de finca
Lorenzo Castillo Cruz	13.70192565480	-84.97737544750		Plan de manejo de finca
Oswaldo José Chavarría Centeno	13.67593250650	-84.97378987790		Plan de manejo de finca
Danilo Manzanares Flores	13.69601420470	-84.97613201230		Plan de manejo de finca
Oscar Rivera Martínez	13.55389008630	-85.55627364700		Plan de manejo de finca
Digna Duarte Olivas	13.55463609860	-85.55866227790		Plan de manejo de finca
Max Gregorio Sevilla Montes	13.54927757060	-85.55588570320		Plan de manejo de finca
Jacinta Mairena	13.55243311490	-85.55756677730		Plan de manejo de finca
José Luis Olivas Flores	13.54734926850	-85.54915243260		Plan de manejo de finca
Santiago Hernández Postran	13.60080403850	-85.74076536240		Plan de manejo de finca
Carmenza de Jesús Castro Ruíz	13.60428661890	-85.74834426150		Plan de manejo de finca
Teófilo Silvio Castro Ruíz	13.60336417850	-85.74289607320		Plan de manejo de finca
Silvio Antonio Castro Gutiérrez	13.60140176450	-85.75175136670		Plan de manejo de finca
José Hernández Pastrana	13.59998173480	-85.74262740770		Plan de manejo de finca
Cecilio Peralta Meza	13.60199117950	-85.75210873240		Plan de manejo de finca
Elixa Janeth Sevilla	13.60530396920	-85.75471625860		Plan de manejo de finca
Amanda Rosa Castro Ruíz	13.60582792740	-85.75463957900		Plan de manejo de finca
Bernardina del Socorro Sevilla	13.60278664180	-85.74489547980		Plan de manejo de finca
Santos Inocencio Reyes Rizo	13.59939379030	-85.74974706490		Plan de manejo de finca
Victoria González	13.23811728390	-85.61141933200		Plan de manejo de finca
Freddy Antonio Cortedano Ocampo	13.25163444980	-85.61347448590		Plan de manejo de finca
Roberto Blandón Talavera	13.25184694250	-85.61099080750		Plan de manejo de finca
María Luisa Morales Zeledón	13.23256213600	-85.59735998780		Plan de manejo de finca
Pedro Rafael Robles Mena	13.24526872020	-85.61653741120		Plan de manejo de finca
Marvin Domingo Narváez	12.87474291190	-87.49128686110		Plan de manejo de finca
Manuel Toledo	12.82699105520	-87.20176712770		Plan de manejo de finca
Nenry Suarez Marín	12.17694713920	-85.25244781080		Plan de manejo de finca
Maynor Misael Suarez Amador	12.17777135180	-85.25413307310		Plan de manejo de finca
Leoncio Rocha Marín	12.17717456580	-85.25553359860		Plan de manejo de finca
Rene Alfonso Suarez Alvarez	12.18436789080	-85.26236886430		Plan de manejo de finca
Lester Giovany Alvarez García	12.17977818820	-85.26130530530		Plan de manejo de finca
Elvin José Gonzalez Romero	12.17867446250	-85.26403225970		Plan de manejo de finca

Oscar Bayardo Cárdenas	12.19080666810	-85.24850699600		Plan de manejo de finca
Lucila Medina	12.32446717930	-85.33741831790		Plan de manejo de finca
Andrés Abelino Meneses	12.32620359830	-85.33162445070		Plan de manejo de finca
Andrés Abelino Meneses Martínez	12.32604763300	-85.33272869590		Plan de manejo de finca
José Aníbal Marín	12.33051335910	-85.32684390950		Plan de manejo de finca
Gerardo Velásquez M	11.47521487200	-85.48642356350		Plan de manejo de finca
Filiberto Ríos	11.48330795790	-85.55064685510		Plan de manejo de finca
Gustavo Flores Monge	11.48263672880	-85.53212515080		Plan de manejo de finca
Manuel A Cruz Rosales	11.47344398230	-85.54515174790		Plan de manejo de finca
Diego R Carrillo Barrios	11.44769069950	-85.54971945590		Plan de manejo de finca
Enor Albirez	11.46964467750	-85.48255966070		Plan de manejo de finca
Felipe Alvarez H	11.47959478550	-85.50989465000		Plan de manejo de finca
Alberto A Flores	11.42741031130	-85.54945608160		Plan de manejo de finca
Félix Pascual Morales H	11.48788917820	-85.49131310490		Plan de manejo de finca
José Antonio López	11.47842279920	-85.49995564340		Plan de manejo de finca
Leda Velásquez	11.47531747220	-85.49209853140		Plan de manejo de finca
Manuel S Otero	11.48754658990	-85.51350661010		Plan de manejo de finca
José de la Cruz Ríos	11.48367491620	-85.55171744870		Plan de manejo de finca
Ronald Castillo Rosales	11.48719435600	-85.52694087860		Plan de manejo de finca
Gustavo A Mendoza García	11.47647166270	-85.53770251490		Plan de manejo de finca
Catalino Mairena González	11.49297536400	-85.47322268910		Plan de manejo de finca
Alberto Lanuza Mora	11.45575646250	-85.54812938820		Plan de manejo de finca
Alexis Ríos Rodríguez	11.48284402660	-85.55189584980		Plan de manejo de finca
Gloria Elena Guadamúz P	11.45274690100	-85.54835188190		Plan de manejo de finca
José Bismark Boza	11.45558172840	-85.54753452430		Plan de manejo de finca
Bernardo Adán Membreño Estrada	13.33763691840	-85.68896429390		Plan de manejo de finca
José Alfredo Cruz	13.33712714030	-85.68828387270		Plan de manejo de finca
Santiago de Jesús Mairena Centeno	13.33580136550	-85.68540141870		Plan de manejo de finca
Pablo Cruz Blandón Pastora	13.33226678690	-85.68543898530		Plan de manejo de finca
Santos Abelino Blandón Pastora	13.33478945800	-85.69251547680		Plan de manejo de finca
Bismark González Rodríguez	11.49653303200	-85.55937025490		Plan de manejo de finca
Jefferson Condega Alemán	11.48921794840	-85.56837237010		Plan de manejo de finca
Lester Adrián Paisano	11.50058294770	-85.55379999270		Plan de manejo de finca
Dyner Alonso Vanegas Hernández	11.49995830720	-85.56093964350		Plan de manejo de finca
Abelardo Flores	11.41198491610	-85.50594136630		Plan de manejo de finca
Alexander Cajina Flores	11.40704172280	-85.50814819100		Plan de manejo de finca
Elí Álvarez	11.48449867390	-85.47562400720		Plan de manejo de finca
Luis German Jarquín	11.40399478200	-85.50811827810		Plan de manejo de finca
Ariel Iván Gutierrez Espinoza	13.66551066450	-85.03643687230		Plan de manejo de finca
Ignacio Cruz Barrera	13.66666125190	-85.02088232650		Plan de manejo de finca
Lester Gutierrez Espinoza	13.66455400540	-85.03318239440		Plan de manejo de finca
Marcial Herrera Ramos	13.66584153460	-85.02802394040		Plan de manejo de finca
Mercedes Muñoz Olivas	13.66839895040	-85.03254975650		Plan de manejo de finca

Salvador Zeledón López	13.66801367870	-85.03183207460		Plan de manejo de finca
Santos Virgilio Gutierrez Espinoza	13.66479067300	-85.03567575430		Plan de manejo de finca
Uber Gutierrez Canales	13.66752955990	-85.03346269310		Plan de manejo de finca
Cándido Burgos	12.65767659720	-85.69991261070		Plan de manejo de finca
Felicidad Urbina	12.64965183610	-85.67857543240		Plan de manejo de finca
Isabel Espinoza	12.65663251990	-85.69901562000		Plan de manejo de finca
José Vicente Alcántara	12.63011798560	-85.68472411560		Plan de manejo de finca
Juana Chavarría	12.64048519910	-85.66420558810		Plan de manejo de finca
Oswaldo Huete	12.62969168140	-85.67895419930		Plan de manejo de finca
Vidal Urbina	12.64248456720	-85.68264467120		Plan de manejo de finca
Buenaventura Enrique Alcántara	12.63201091040	-85.68908728540		Plan de manejo de finca
Benedicto Miranda	12.10971604120	-85.27333443420		Plan de manejo de finca
Juan Ubaldo Suarez	12.15055541030	-85.35773591860		Plan de manejo de finca
Gustavo Orozco	12.10953514230	-85.26606941750		Plan de manejo de finca
Juan Rolando Suarez Guerra	12.15070004320	-85.35773503150		Plan de manejo de finca
Adrián Venancio Lindo Maradiaga	12.85972313760	-86.93521776290		Plan de manejo de finca
Carlos Marcial Montes	12.89824392780	-86.98390566450		Plan de manejo de finca
Simón Anastasio Benavides	12.86476980040	-86.93844227960		Plan de manejo de finca
Nilson Guillermo Martínez Romero	12.88049106560	-86.96488253390		Plan de manejo de finca
Presentación de la Concepción Peralta Madrigales	12.88418095050	-86.96820025400		Plan de manejo de finca
Felipe Méndez Pastrán	12.85601905070	-86.95123661690		Plan de manejo de finca

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