



## 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) .....	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	11
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS .....	21
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS) .....	24
6. RISKS .....	26
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION .....	29
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS .....	30
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	31
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING .....	32
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES .....	33
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT.....	35
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE .....	36

## 1. Basic Project Data

### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	Latin America and the Caribbean
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Bolivia
<b>Project Title:</b>	Conservation and sustainable use of agrobiodiversity to improve human nutrition in five macro-regions
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP / BOL / 046 / GFF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	4577
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Biodiversity
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	Ministry of Environment and Water (Vice Ministry of Environment, Biodiversity, Climate Change and Forest Development); and Ministry of Rural Development and Lands
<b>Initial project duration (years):</b>	6 years
<b>Project coordinates:</b> <i>This section should be completed ONLY by:</i> a) <i>Projects with 1st PIR;</i> b) <i>In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.</i>	

### Project Dates

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	April 16, 2014
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	January 14, 2016
<b>Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	December 31, 2020
<b>Revised project implementation End date (if approved) <sup>2</sup></b>	June 30, 2022

### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	2,600,000.00 USD
<b>Total Co-financing amount (USD)<sup>3</sup>:</b>	14,115,021.00 USD
<b>Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):</b>	2,598,494 USD
<b>Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)<sup>4</sup>:</b>	2,600,000.00 USD
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023<sup>5</sup></b>	8,966,425.00 USD

<sup>1</sup> As per FPMIS

<sup>2</sup> If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit.

<sup>3</sup> This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO Document/Project Document.

<sup>4</sup> The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

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

**M&E Milestones**

<b>Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:</b>	May 31, 2023
<b>Expected Mid-term Review date<sup>6</sup>:</b>	June 2020
<b>Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):</b>	August 2020
<b>Expected Terminal Evaluation Date<sup>7</sup>:</b>	June 2022
<b>Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)</b>	Updated BD-GEF Tracking Tool See Annex [BD-Tracking TOOL]

**Overall ratings**

<b>Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):</b>	<i>Satisfactory</i>
<b>Overall implementation progress rating:</b>	<i>Satisfactory</i>
<b>Overall risk rating:</b>	<i>n/a</i>

**ESS risk classification**

<b>Current ESS Risk classification:</b>	<i>Low (L) – Section 5</i>
---	----------------------------

**Status**

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

**Project Contacts**

<b>Contact</b>	<b>Name, Title, Division/Institution</b>	<b>E-mail</b>
<b>Project Coordinator (PC)</b>	Boris Fernandez, National	<a href="mailto:Boris.Fernandez@fao.org">Boris.Fernandez@fao.org</a>
<b>Budget Holder (BH)</b>	Rodrigo Roubach FAOBO Representante del Programa FAO en Bolivia	<a href="mailto:Rodrigo.Roubach@fao.org">Rodrigo.Roubach@fao.org</a>
<b>GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)</b>	Mr. Carlos David Guachalla Terrazas Viceministro de Planificación y Coordinación Ministerio de Planificación del Desarrollo	

<sup>6</sup> The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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.

<sup>7</sup> The Terminal Evaluation date should be discussed with OED 6 months before the project's NTE date.

<b>Lead Technical Officer (LTO)</b>	Ana Posas, Agricultural Officer, FAORLC	<a href="mailto:Ana.posasguevara@fao.org">Ana.posasguevara@fao.org</a>
<b>GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)</b>	Hernan Gonzalez, Technical Officer, FAO- GEF Coordination Unit	<a href="mailto:hernan.gonzalez@fao.org">hernan.gonzalez@fao.org</a>

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

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

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

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term Target/Mid-term Target <sup>9</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>10</sup> since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating <sup>11</sup>
<p><b>Project Objective:</b> Administer and use agro-biodiversity sustainably to improve food and nutrition security by ensuring Indigenous and local communities' access to a nutritious and diversified diet through in situ conservation</p>	<p><b>Outcome 1.1</b> Increasingly available and easily accessible data on agro biodiversity, food consumption and local native crop species resilient to climate change grouped from the macro-regions policy makers, consumers and local communities</p>	<p>1,000 new documents / data gathered and uploaded to the National Information System of native agro-biodiversity, nutritional value and capacity to adapt to climate change</p>	<p>No existen datos ni información sistematizados centralizados y con fácil acceso acerca de la agrobiodiversidad relacionada con el consumo de alimentos y resistencia al cambio climático</p> <p>No data of information available centralized nor easily accessible systematized</p>	-	<p>1,000 new documents / data gathered and inserted to the National Information System of native agro-biodiversity, nutritional values and adaptability to climate change.</p>	<p><b>1105 documents</b> compiled and entered into the <b>National Agrobiodiversity Information System</b> designed, implemented and made available on servers of the Ministry of environment and Water (MMAyA) of the Plurinational State of Bolivia.</p> <p>-Web address: <a href="#">Agrobiodiversity Information System MM - MMAyA - SIARH</a></p> <p>-ID Proyectofao &amp; Password Proyectofao2022.</p> <p><b>(100% completed at the end of the project)</b></p>	HS

<sup>8</sup> This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

<sup>9</sup> 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.

<sup>10</sup> Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic co-benefits as well.

<sup>11</sup> 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.

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

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term Target/Mid-term Target <sup>9</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>10</sup> since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating <sup>11</sup>
and sustainable scaling up of the production of ecotypes of plants/crops selected for their nutrition values and adaptability to local climate variability and scenarios, and links to the market boosted by agro-biodiversity and nutritional labelling.			information on agrobiodiversity related to the consumption of food and climate change resilience.				
	<b>Outcome 2.1</b> In situ conservation of selected local ecotypes important for food and nutritional security, it is practiced in 50 communities covering 6 000 ha in five macro-regions (indirectly 125 communities covering 15 000 ha will be impacted by the end of the project through its expansion)	In situ conservation of 15 selected species on 6,000 hectares in the 5 microregions identified for the replication of the implementation of Agrobiodiversity Management Plans and partner ministries committed to their implementation.	There are some unrelated agrobiodiversity conservation in situ experiences at the sites selected by the project that have not been systematized	-	In situ conservation of the selected species practiced on 6 000 hectares.  15 000 hectares have been identified to replicate the experience in the Agro-biodiversity Management Plans. The related ministries will be committed to implementing the plans.	<b>-67,093.16 hectares of the in situ conservation.</b> <b>-66,337 ha.</b> covered in 9 Integrated Management Plans in <b>31 communities</b> whose agro-biodiversity will be conserved and managed: <u>Castaña, Majo, Asaí, Guapurú, Sahuinto, Cupesí, Mistol, Algarrobo, Nogal, Janchicoco, Chirimoya Crespa y Almendra Chiquitana.</u> <b>-756.16 ha</b> conserved <i>in situ</i> by planting agro-biodiversity species in <b>97 communities</b> ( <u>255 ha</u> in the 2019 campaign and <u>501.16 ha</u> in the 2020 campaign) <b>-217,876 ha</b> identified for integrated and sustainable management in the National Sustainable Management of Agro-biodiversity Programme	HS

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

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term Target/Mid-term Target <sup>9</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>10</sup> since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating <sup>11</sup>
						in 357 communities in 96 municipalities. <b>(100% completed at the end of the project)</b>	
	<b>Outcome 2.2a</b> Income would be generated for men and women (approximately USD 500/year/family representing an annual increase in income of 25%) in the participating communities for the production, processing, and marketing of agro-biodiversity products with nutritional labelling of crop ecotypes/ selected plants.	The income of farming families (headed by men or by women) has increased because of strengthening production and marketing capacities, including agro-biodiversity and nutritional labelling (assessed by means of ex-ante and ex-post socioeconomic surveys, disaggregated by gender, on farmers' income generation)	The average household income is USD 2,000/year/family	-	The income of 2 300 farming families (men and women) has increased by approximately \$ 216/year/family (representing a 5% increase in annual income) as a result of strengthening production, processing and marketing capacities, including agro-biodiversity and nutritional labelling	<b>\$ 316 /year/family average income for 2,660 families at the different links in the production chain.</b> Disaggregated data: <b>a)</b> 26% are processing families (51% women) have seen their income from commercializing their produce increase by an average of <b>\$ 323/year/family.</b>  <b>b)</b> 74% are families (44% women) that gather and harvest agro-biodiversity species have seen an average increase in their income of <b>\$ 309/year/ family.</b>  <b>(100% completed at the end of the project)</b>	S
	<b>Outcome 2.2b</b> Areas for agro-biodiversity production and	N° of hectares under agro-biodiversity production	There are no areas subject to agro-biodiversity and	-	At least 1 000 hectares under agro-biodiversity production	<b>967.17 ha certified as ecological</b> in 75 communities through 7 Participatory Guarantee Systems (PGS)	HS

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

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term Target/Mid-term Target <sup>9</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>10</sup> since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating <sup>11</sup>
	<p>nutritional labelling are standardized (monitored through the application of the GEF BD2 monitoring tool)</p> <p>Partner ministries committed to facilitate the extension of the areas at the end of the project</p>	<p>standards and nutritional labelling (monitored through the application of the GEF BD-2 tracking tool)</p> <p>Partner ministries commit to facilitate extension to an additional area of 2 500 hectares in the proposed National Agro-biodiversity Programme.</p>	nutritional labelling production standards		<p>standards and nutritional labelling (monitored through the application of the GEF BD-2 tracking tool)</p> <p>By means of agreements, partner ministries commit to facilitate extension to 2 500 additional hectares in the proposed National Agro-biodiversity Programme</p>	<p>that ensure agro-biodiversity species are ecologically produced, fulfilling all requirements as set by the GEF's BD-2 tool to track agro-biodiversity species.</p> <p><b>-Additionally, through this process, an area of <u>939.62 hectares of family farming that do not belong to species prioritized by the project</u> has been certified.</b></p> <p>-The <b>hectares comply</b> with the monitoring requirements established in the BD-GEF2 monitoring tool for agrobiodiversity species.</p> <p><b>-3,688 ha identified</b> for production in the National Sustainable Management of Agro-biodiversity Programme in 357 communities in 96 municipalities.</p> <p><b>(100% completed at the end of the project)</b></p>	
	<b>Outcome 3.1</b> Conserving and Sustainable Measures for the	Scores obtained within the frame of policies that incorporate agro-	4 points out of 12 (out of 24) over		The score of the policy frameworks that incorporates the conservation	<b>17 public policies passed by the relevant authority.</b> - When assessing the COMAN laws, the GEF BD-2	HS



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

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term Target/Mid-term Target <sup>9</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>10</sup> since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating <sup>11</sup>
	agro biodiversity are incorporated into agriculture, nutrition, health, education and food security policies, programmes, and regulatory frameworks	biodiversity and conservation monitored using the GEF BD-2 tracking tool rises to 10 (of possible 12 points)	policy frameworks that incorporate the conservation of agro-biodiversity in the GEF tracking tool		of agro-biodiversity in the GEF monitoring tool increases to 10 (from 12 possible points)	tracking tool scored 4 out of 6 -Biodiversity mentioned in policy -There is specific legislation -Legislation is being implemented -Legislation is monitored  <b>(100% completed at the end of the project)</b>	
	<b>Resultado 4.1</b> Increased awareness of the conservation, sustainable use, and nutritional benefits of agrobiodiversity (measured through surveys, disaggregated by gender).	30% of which 50% are women from institutional staff, consumers, and producers, who were the target groups of the awareness campaigns and training courses, are aware of the nutritional benefits of local agrobiodiversity, measured through two studies disaggregated by gender in a sample group.	There is little awareness in Bolivia of agrobiodiversity as a resource for food and nutritional security; There are no stakeholders (local institutions or communities) trained in the linkages between agrobiodiversity conservation and food and nutrition security;	-	30% of institutional personnel (50% women), consumers and farmers targeted by the awareness-raising campaigns and training courses are aware of the nutritional benefits of the local agrobiodiversity, measured by two surveys of a sample group divided by gender group, showing the level of	<b>37% of institutional staff surveyed (34% Women)</b> and 43% of producers and consumers surveyed (23% women), has been evidenced: a) 100% of people recognized the term agrobiodiversity (8% increased over previous CAP2020) b) 54% of those surveyed consider that women's participation is present and essential in all production links. c) 64% consider that family farming (harvesting and gathering) is the main source of income, 21%	S

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

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term Target Mid-term Target <sup>9</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>10</sup> since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating <sup>11</sup>
					awareness among the groups targeted by the awareness-raising campaign and those that participated in the training courses in the 9 departments of Bolivia.	consider that it is an essential component for feeding families and 15% that it is a secondary work activity. <b>(98.7% completed at eh end of the project)</b>	
	<b>Outcome 5.1.</b> Project execution based on results-oriented management and application of project findings and lessons learned in future operations	Project results achieved and demonstrated sustainability.	-	-	Project results achieved and demonstrated sustainability.	-External evaluations of the Project (Mid-term and Final) satisfactorily completed. -Semiannual reports through the monitoring system. -Information generated by the project inserted in the National Agrobiodiversity Information System. <b>(100% completed at eh end of the project)</b>	S

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

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

### 3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements <sup>13</sup> (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> in delivering outputs
<b>Outcome1.1</b> Increased and easy available data, grouped by macro-region for policy makers, consumers and local communities on agrobiodiversity, food consumption and local native crop species resilient to climate change	1 000 new documents / data gathered and uploaded to the National Information System of native agro-biodiversity, nutritional value and capacity to adapt to climate change	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–
<b>Output 1.1.1</b> A National Information System on native agrobiodiversity, nutritional value and adaptability to climate change easily accessible and available to policy makers, consumers, and local communities	Information platform on native agrobiodiversity, nutritional value, and adaptability to climate change easily accessible and available to policy makers, consumers, and local communities.  Number of documents/data collected and systematized in a database in the fourth year of the Project inserted and entered into the Information Platform.  Number of agreements with institutions to share data and information on climate change resilience,	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–

<sup>12</sup> Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

<sup>13</sup> 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)

<sup>14</sup> Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

Outcomes and Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements <sup>13</sup> (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> in delivering outputs
	erosion, genetics, conservation, and others related to agrobiodiversity.			
<p><b>Output 1.1.2</b></p> <p>Food sources of agrobiodiversity assessed using gender disaggregated nutrition indicators for biodiversity (a. food composition d. consumption).</p>	<p>Number of food chemical composition and nutritional value databases for 50 foods (10 c/MR). Percentage increase in food consumption in 5 communities (50% women) where diets based on agrobiodiversity have been diversified and are part validated methodology (potential articulation and/or agreement with SEDES).</p> <p>Number of results of compositional analysis (physical, chemical and nutritional) of food for agrobiodiversity carried out.</p> <p>Number of baselines with their respective structured databases on biodiversity nutrition indicators developed from systematization of nutritional and consumption surveys (nutritional assessment, consumption, species consumption and food purchase, nutritional deficiencies).</p>	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–
<p><b>Output 1.1.3</b></p> <p>10 ecotypes of local plants/crops important for food and nutrition security selected (with a gender-sensitive participatory approach) in each macro eco-region and their characteristics analysed in relation to nutritional content, resistance to climate change and threats of genetic erosion.</p>	<p>Nº of ecotypes of local plants/crops important for food and nutrition security selected (with a gender-sensitive participatory approach) in each macro region and their characteristics analysed in relation to nutritional content, resistance to climate change and threats of genetic erosion.</p> <p>Nº of validated technical data sheets and samples of agro-biodiversity foods analysing the wildlife and crop species</p> <p>Nº of reports and notes from validation workshop with attendance lists</p> <p>Nº of technical reports that justify the 4 species chosen to be grown and commercialised (2 cultivated and 2 wild) per macro region</p>	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–

Outcomes and Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements <sup>13</sup> (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> in delivering outputs
<p><b>Output 1.1.4</b></p> <p>Database developed on the nutritional content of agro-biodiversity, in accordance with international standards and standards (INFOODS - FAO)</p>	<p>Database developed on the nutritional content of 50 agro-biodiversity species (from the 5 macro-regions) in accordance with international standards and standards (INFOODS - FAO) linked to the MMAyA agro-biodiversity database and the FAO/INFOODS database on the make-up of biodiversity foods accessible to the general public.</p> <p>International workshop on: FAO/INFOODS standards, agro-biodiversity nutritional content, nutritional indicators, research methods and monitoring</p>	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–
<p><b>Outcome 2.1</b></p> <p>In situ conservation of selected local ecotypes important for food and nutritional security, it is practiced in 50 communities covering 6,000 ha in five macro-regions (indirectly 125 communities covering 15,000 ha will be impacted by the end of the project through its expansion)</p>	<p>In situ conservation of 15 selected in 6,000 ha in the five macro-regions</p> <p>15,000 hectares identified to replicate the experience in the Agro-biodiversity Management Plans</p> <p>The partner ministries are committed to implementing the project</p>	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–
<p><b>Output 2.1.1</b></p> <p>Gender-sensitive assessment of local agro-biodiversity conservation methodologies and practices and classification of cultivated eco- types/varieties, wild and native seeds and associated traditional knowledge in five macro-regions.</p>	<p>a) N° of reports systematising the evaluation of traditional knowledge reports on in situ conservation practices and technologies in the 5 macro-regions</p> <p>b) N° of varieties/ecotypes grown and classified, wild species and native seeds, including methodologies and practices with gender-sensitive data</p> <p>c) National Catalogue of Genetic Agro-biodiversity (in the 5 macro-regions) with the varieties/ecotypes grown and classified, wild species and native seeds, including methodologies and practices and traditional knowledge, with</p>	–		–

Outcomes and Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements <sup>13</sup> (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> in delivering outputs
	gender-sensitive data that include the communities' information registers, spatial and seasonal availability (maps), local descriptions			
<b>Output 2.1.2</b> Communities practice the development and implementation of management plans and participatory monitoring systems for in situ conservation and sustainable use of under-utilized crop/plant ecotypes and their wild relatives (with at least 60% participation of women)	N° of communities receiving technical assistance (directly and indirectly, through experience sharing) on integrated and sustainable management and practising in situ conservation through the implementation of Integrated Management Plans for the sustainable use of agro biodiversity (selected wild and cultivated species), taking into account conservation, seed production and reproduction, with at least 60% participation of women	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–
<b>Output 2.1.3</b> Best practices for the cultivation and management of ecotypes of selected crops/plants documented (based on community implementation in the five macro-regions under Output 2.1.2) including: multiplication, conservation, improvement, and exchange of local seeds; pest and disease control, and strategies to intensify sustainable production	N° of new good documented practices regarding the Management Plans implemented including: multiplication, conservation, improvement and exchange of local seeds; pest and disease control, and strategies to intensify sustainable production  Toolbox of good practices to be disseminated	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–
<b>Output 2.1.4</b> Strategy and action plan funded for MMAyA and MDRyT Expand in situ conservation and the sustainable use model developed by the project (in at least 125 additional communities)	N° of possible communities in the municipalities covered by the project identified to boost the integrated sustainable management of agro-biodiversity.  N° of lessons learnt from component 2 gathered and analysed (agreements with farmers' associations, institutional agreements, draft and validate management plans, strengthen capacities, and exchange experiences)	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–

Outcomes and Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements <sup>13</sup> (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> in delivering outputs
	Agro-biodiversity programme developed with a strategy that promotes in situ conservation to be funded by MMAyA and MDRyT			
<b>Output 2.1.5</b> Permanent Monitoring Centre focused on selected species of cultivated and wild varieties, ensuring continuous monitoring of established genetic and climate trends	Agro-biodiversity monitoring system, linked to the information system, focused on cultivated and wild varieties of selected species, ensuring continuous monitoring of established genetic and climate trends	–		–
<b>Outcome 2.2a</b> Income would be generated for men and women (approximately USD 500/year/family representing an annual increase in income of 25%) in the participating communities for the production, processing, and marketing of agro-biodiversity products with nutritional labelling of crop ecotypes / selected plants	The income of the farming families (headed by men or women) has risen by boosting production and marketing capacities including agro-biodiversity and nutritional labelling (Evaluated through ex ante and ex post socioeconomic surveys and ex ante and ex post surveys divided by gender on farmers' income generation)	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–
<b>Outcome 2.2b</b> Areas for agro-biodiversity production and nutritional labelling are standardized (monitored through the application of the GEF BD2 monitoring tool)  Partner ministries committed to facilitate the extension of the areas at the end of the project	Nº of hectares subject to agro-biodiversity and nutritional labelling production standards (monitored using the GEF's BD-2 tracking tool)  The ministries concerned commit to providing an additional 2,500 ha through the National Agro-biodiversity Programme	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–
<b>Output 2.2.1</b> Certification of agro-biodiversity- friendly products and origin labelling and nutrition mechanism developed and used by farmers (at least 50 per cent of whom are women) for ecotypes of selected crops based on SENASAG product standards and agreed	Nº of communities with certification of agro-biodiversity- friendly products and origin labelling and nutrition mechanism developed and used by farmers (at least 50 per cent of whom are women) for ecotypes of selected crops based on SENASAG product standards and agreed criteria for agro-biodiversity production practices.	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–

Outcomes and Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements <sup>13</sup> (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> in delivering outputs
criteria for agro-biodiversity production practices.	Sustainable agro-biodiversity production systems with agreed to criteria and indicators for each macro region.  Guidelines or protocol for nutritional labelling  N° of lab reports on nutritional value of certified products.			
<b>Output 2.2.2</b> Opportunities to market local agro-biodiversity food products analysed and, links to strengthened markets for agro-biodiversity- friendly food products through a "Participatory Marketing Approach" (50% participation of women)	N° of agro-biodiversity food products with added value and nutritional labelling have boosted their market links, measured by an increase in sales benefitting men and women alike.  Ex-ante and ex post HIS study to monitor the increase in incomes of X families.  N° of business and sales plans developed for agro-biodiversity products.	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–
<b>Outcome 3.1</b> Conserving and Sustainable Measures for the agro-biodiversity are incorporated into agriculture, nutrition, health, education and food security policies, programmes and regulatory frameworks	The score of the policy frameworks that incorporates the conservation of agro-biodiversity in the GEF monitoring tool increases to 10 (from 12 possible points)	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–
<b>Output 3.1.1</b> Multisectoral national platform established within CONAN to promote and monitor the integration of agro-biodiversity into policies and programmes in the sectors of agriculture, nutrition, education, health and food security	Multisectoral national platform established within CONAN to promote and monitor the integration of agro-biodiversity into policies and programmes in the sectors of agriculture, nutrition, education, health and food security	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–
<b>Output 3.1.2</b>	N° of new/adapted policies will be adopted to support the conservation and sustainable	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–



Outcomes and Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements <sup>13</sup> (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> in delivering outputs
New/adapted policies will be adopted and implemented to support the conservation and sustainable use of agro-biodiversity, considering its importance for nutrition, food security and health.	use of agro-biodiversity, considering its importance for nutrition, food security and health  Nº of policies approved by the municipal authorities.			
<b>Output 3.1.3</b> The conservation and sustainable use of agro-biodiversity transversalized in at least 6 programmes and projects implemented by ministries members of the Multisectoral Platform at local and national levels	Nº of programmes and projects validated by the ministries and municipalities that incorporate the conservation and sustainable use of agro-biodiversity to improve food and nutritional security  Nº of lists that identify programmes, projects and actors in the project intervention area.  Nº of conventions and agreements signed with the GADs and GAMs on the conservation, use and exploitation of agro-biodiversity in programmes and projects	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–
<b>Outcome 4.1</b> Increasing awareness of the conservation, sustainable use and nutritional benefits of agro-biodiversity (measured through surveys, disaggregated by gender)	30% (50% women) working in the institutions, consumers and farmers, who were targeted by the awareness-raising campaigns and training courses are aware of the nutritional benefits of local agro-biodiversity, as measured by two studies divided by gender in one sample group	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–
<b>Output 4.1.1</b> Gender-sensitive promotional material on agro-biodiversity conservation, traditional knowledge, innovations and practices, agro-biodiversity and nutrition product standards and labels, incentives for production, benefits of dietary diversity and consumption, including case studies and comparative analysis in five macro-regions of Bolivia, elaborated and disseminated	Nº of promotional publications on agro-biodiversity species/ecotypes  Nº of marketing packages to disseminate, promote and raise farmers, consumers, processors and policy makers' awareness including gender-sensitive material  Nº of case studies on the links between agro-biodiversity conservation, varied diets, nutritional benefits and climate change	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–

Outcomes and Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements <sup>13</sup> (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> in delivering outputs
<p><b>Output 4.1.2</b> Gender- sensitive national information campaigns implemented to promote the value of agro- biodiversity as a resource for food security, through official and popular media</p>	<p>Nº of people reached by gender- sensitive national information campaigns to promote the value of agro-biodiversity as a food security resource, through official and popular media National media plan (radio and television) to influence public opinion. Nº of round tables, forums, media plan with messages targeting authorities Project information portal dedicated to communication. Nº of events in local schools Nº of local events to share experiences</p>	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–
<p><b>Output 4.1.3</b> Farmers, processors, local government technical personnel (average 50% women) trained in the conservation, use and nutritional benefits of agro biodiversity through training events in the nine departments of Bolivia.</p>	<p>% of government personnel trained by the project who put what they have learnt into practice  Network of agro-biodiversity facilitators set up  Nº of relevant local organizations involved with the project participating in/attending the training sessions on agro-biodiversity  Percentage of farmers trained by the project who put what they have learnt into practice</p>	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–
<p><b>Output 4.1.4.</b> Capacities of key policy makers and national government technical personnel (at least 40 per cent women) on the use of agro- biodiversity in nutrition and food security strengthened through: (a) Training modules on the use of agro-biodiversity for nutrition and health programmes, developed and implemented.</p>	<p>At least 30% of the national government technical personnel (at least 40% women) trained by the project put what they have learnt into practice  At least 10 relevant national public/private institutions local organizations involved with the project participating in/attending the training sessions on agro-biodiversity and nutrition.</p>	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–

Outcomes and Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements <sup>13</sup> (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> in delivering outputs
b) Guidelines on how to improve the use of local agro-biodiversity products in traditional food systems, developed and disseminated	30 dieticians (INLASA, labs and universities) trained and promoting the value of nutritional agro-biodiversity			
<b>Outcome 5.1.</b> Project execution based on results-oriented management and application of project findings and lessons learned in future operations	Project outcomes achieved and demonstrating sustainability	–	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–
<b>Output 5.1.1.</b> Project monitoring system in operation and providing systematic information on progress towards achieving the results and outcomes	8 semester progress reports	-Administrative processes such as cancellation of consultant fees, letters of agreement and operational advances for the closure of field activities as of June have been closed. - The project's documentary information has been reviewed, consolidated, and transferred to different stakeholders.	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–
<b>Output 5.1.2.</b> <b>Mid-term and final evaluation carried out</b>	2 evaluation reports	The final evaluation of the project has been socialized with the focal points of the Ministry of Development Planning (MPD) and the Ministry of Environment and Water (MMAyA)	Field activities completed (June 2022)	–

Outcomes and Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements <sup>13</sup> (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> in delivering outputs
<p><b>Output 5.1.3.</b>  <b>"Best practices" and "lessons learned"</b>  <b>from the project, disseminated through the</b>  <b>project's Information System and</b>  <b>published</b></p>	<p>Disseminated through the Information System:  a) Methodological Report on the methodology used to abide by international FAO/INFOODS standards, collecting and analysing food samples  b) Reports on the two agro-biodiversity nutrition indicators for diversifying diets  c) Gender-sensitive Methodological Report on the characteristics of native species, practices used for in situ conservation Management Plans and the SIG  d) Commercializing and labelling agro-biodiversity  e) 35 new good practices widely disseminated (see Outcome 2.1.3).</p>	<p>–</p>	<p>Field activities completed (June 2022)</p>	<p>–</p>

#### 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)**

For the last NTE extension of the project, the existing budget structure of USD. 2,600,000 was maintained, without any modification to the structure of results and outputs. Likewise, there were no modifications to the results obtained until June 2022. The purpose of this extension was to: 1. Close administrative processes such as the cancellation of consultant fees, letters of agreement and operational advances for the closure of field activities by June 2022; 2. The review, consolidation and transfer of documentary information generated by the project to different stakeholders; 3. The socialization of the final evaluation of the project to government stakeholders, as well as the preparation and approval of the projects reports.

### ***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.

	<b>FY2023 Development Objective rating<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>FY2023 Implementation Progress rating<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>Comments/reasons<sup>17</sup> justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<i>The fourth extension of the project to December 2022 was aimed at closing administrative processes such as pending payments of feed and operating advances made in June 2022. In addition, the final evaluation of the project was satisfactorily shared with the government agencies belonging to the project's steering committee (MMAyA and MPD). Also, the review, consolidation and transfer of documentary information generated by the project to different stakeholders and partners.</i>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<i>The last NTE extension of the project was maintained within the same last budget year 2022, the existing budget structure of 2,600,000 USD. Distributed in the 5 project components and project management was not modified. On the other hand, the field activities ended in June 2022 and the administrative closing processes were carried out during this period.</i>
<b>GEF Operational Focal Point<sup>18</sup></b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<i>MMAyA – After the review of the report and the recommendations of the final evaluation of the project, it is intended to organize the “Project Steering Committee”, with the presence of different national focal points (MPD and MMAyA), together with other stakeholders. With the purpose of following up the project activities (or others related to “Climate Finance2). According to periodic meeting, to transfer information and to carry out an adequate follow-up of the planning of activities and results.</i>
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<i>The project met its revised goals and is considered satisfactory. Most field activities were completed by the last PIR.</i>

<sup>15</sup> **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.

<sup>16</sup> **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.

<sup>17</sup> Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

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

<sup>19</sup> The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

<b>GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<i>The project was completed in a satisfactory manner as validated by the final evaluation. The project closed in December 2022 in order to close outstanding administrative processes.</i>
--	----------	----------	---

## 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
<b>ESS 1: Natural Resource Management</b>				
<b>ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats</b>				
<b>ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</b>				
<b>ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</b>				
<b>ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management</b>				
<b>ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement</b>				
<b>ESS 7: Decent Work</b>				
<b>ESS 8: Gender Equality</b>				
<b>ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage</b>				
<b>New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY</b>				



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 <sup>20</sup> . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
L	The environmental and social risk according to PRODOC and the report presented is LOW because the good practices and the socialization of management instruments were implemented until June 2022, these practices ensure that the collection, harvesting and processing are carried out in a sustainable manner, with standardized processes and self-evaluation processes to maintain production standards.

<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>
N/A

<sup>20</sup> **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit ([Esm-unit@fao.org](mailto: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 <sup>21</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Climate change may threaten nutritionally rich local crops due to lack of adaptation to changing environmental conditions	Low	Y	Management instruments were implemented for the production and conservation of agrobiodiversity, considering the needs of producing families in the communities in a participatory and inclusive manner.	Implemented during field activities until June 2022	By June 2022, the project has developed and implemented management tools for the production and conservation of agrobiodiversity species in accordance with and considering the needs of the producing families in the communities.
2	Project technicians may be unable to gain the trust and commitment of communities involved	Low	Y	The fundamental importance of collaboration between the relevant technical agencies will be strongly emphasized in planning meetings and by FAO Bolivia.	Implemented during field activities until June 2022	Until June 2022, the Project established cooperative ties with the beneficiaries for the implementation of good practices in the conservation and use of agrobiodiversity.

---

<sup>21</sup> 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 <sup>21</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
3	Agrobiodiversity products have difficulties in entering the market and competing with other food products.	Moderate	Y	The associations were able to market their products in local markets and showcase the nutritional benefits of agrobiodiversity.	Implemented during field activities until June 2022	As of June 2022, the associations have been able to market their products through the active participation in local fairs where they could demonstrate the benefits of agrobiodiversity species.
4	Lack of political will for effective integration of agrobiodiversity and conservation and sustainable use.	High	Y	Ongoing coordination with national and subnational officials for the integration, promotion, and use of agrobiodiversity. However, the national elections had an impact on the change of public officials, but technical assistance continued to promote healthy eating and the use of agrobiodiversity.	Implemented during field activities until June 2022	The political situation is a factor that limits the coordination of the project with the public sector. Consequently, there is the possibility of a change of authorities and technical staff. However, the Project has so far managed to maintain good relations at the national (ministerial) and subnational (municipalities) levels.
5	The change of head staff in the Project coordination partner, the Ministry of environmental and Water, could delay the implementation of activities	High	Y	The Project works with local organizations that understand the socioeconomic and cultural aspects of local communities in each macro-region, encouraging the participation of women, organizations representing indigenous communities and civil society.	Implemented during field activities until June 2022	Until June 2022, the Project has established cooperation links with producing associations, social organizations and producing families for the implementation of good practices for the conservation and use of agrobiodiversity species.
6	Limited involvement of the Ministry of Agriculture would result in lost opportunities for synergies	Moderate	Y	Coordination with government entities (SENASAG/MDRyT) for the certification of agrobiodiversity species for the different production links.	Implemented during field activities until June 2022	As of June 2022, it has become evident that the project's partner institutions were operational arms that collaborated in the certification of agrobiodiversity products.

**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	N/A	The best practices and the socialization of the management tools were implemented in the field until June 2022; during the period of this report the actions were oriented to closed he administrative processes of the project.

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

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

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
<b>Recommendation 1:</b>	During the RMT conducted in 2020, there were 9 recommendations; these were implemented during field activities until June 2022. For this Reporting period, only Project closure activities were carried out.

<b>Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize</b>	During the closing of activities in June 2022, the Project has generated exit strategies focused on the transfer of technical tools and information to strengthen the management of resources to key stakeholders. The strategy contemplated the realization of events to present results, training events and exchange of experiences where tools were transferred to 118 (40 women) belonging to producing associations and municipal technical staff.
---	--

## 8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines<sup>22</sup>. Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories and provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework	–	–	–
Components and cost	–	–	–
Institutional and implementation arrangements	–	–	–
Financial management	–	–	–
Implementation schedule	–	–	–
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)	–	–	–

<sup>22</sup> 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
<b>Government institutions</b>			
General Directorate of Biodiversity and Protected Areas Ministry of the Environment and Water (MMAyA)	Technical focal point for the project	The final report of the project has been socialized, building in a participatory manner the responses to the recommendations of the evaluation, taking these recommendations as a starting point to improve inter-institutional coordination between the government and the executing agency for an adequate implementation of the project.	Elaboration of guidelines for permanent coordination between the governmental focal point and the project implementer.
<b>NGOs<sup>23</sup></b>			
<b>Private sector entities</b>			
<b>Others<sup>24</sup></b>			
<b>New stakeholders identified</b>			
Ministry of Development Planning	Focal point for the project	The MPD has a high interest in following up on development Projects and even more if they are considered as "Climate Finance" because they are investment resources destined to implement a series of activities that can contribute to slow down climate change and to achieve the sustainable development goals.	Elaboration of guidelines to determine the follow-up of climate finance projects and of the "Project Steering Committee".

<sup>23</sup> Non-government organizations

<sup>24</sup> 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

<b>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.</b>		
<b>Category</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period.</b>
<i>Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.</i>	<b>YES</b>	<i>Until June 2022, the project carried out the gender diagnosis call mom which resulted in five gender and generational plans applied to each macro region with prioritized goals and actions.</i>
<i>Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?</i>	<b>YES</b>	<i>Until the completion of field activities, the project generated training opportunities the number of women's participation has increased from 43% (RMT) to 49.16% in conservation and species management.</i>
<i>Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):</i>		
<i>a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources</i>	<b>YES</b>	<i>As of June 2022, the project has managed to increase the participation of women to 49% in the products "Product 2.1.2, Product 2.2.1 and Product 2.2.2"</i>
<i>b) improving women's participation and decision making</i>	<b>YES</b>	<i>Until the completion of the field activities, the strategies established in the gender plans succeeded in increasing the participation of women in the project's actions, especially those related to the generation of opportunities to diversify income.</i>
<i>c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women</i>	<b>YES</b>	<i>As of June 2022, 52% of women in producing associations had participated in the processing and marketing chain.</i>
<i>M&amp;E system with gender-disaggregated data?</i>	<b>YES</b>	<i>Until the completion of field activities, the information described in the indicators reflects the number of people accompanied by the percentage of women.</i>
<i>Staff with gender expertise</i>	<b>YES</b>	<i>Ongoing support is provided by FAO's gender focal point, with whom relevant consultations are held on gender and generational issues to raise awareness of the fundamental role of women especially indigenous women.</i>
<i>Any other good practices on gender</i>	–	–



## 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.	As of June 2022, the project had a knowledge management strategy through two channels; the first is the direct socialization to the impact population of all the processes carried out in conservation, policies and others related to agrobiodiversity, making a permanent return of the progress and results; the second is linked to the media through social networks and especially radio (strategy assumed by from COVID 19) that have allowed permanently and according to the context of each macro-region to manage the knowledge, progress and results generated in the project.
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges <b>this year</b> .	During the period of this report, no communication activities were carried out to promote the project's image. However, as support to other profile projects the Facebook page was used to make visible actions related to the conservation and management of the species
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>The Guaraní territory shelters a great variety of agrobiodiverse species that are the basis for food. As of June 2022, the OECOM Guaraní Amandiya Monteagudo Community Economic Organization is registered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The name and image of the brand AMANDIYA means "Owner of the rain", emphasizes, and enhances woman as custodians and guardians of agrobiodiversity. The name comes from the Guaraní words AMA which means rain and AMA which means God.</li> <li>- It has a participation of 120 member producers (44% are women) in 10 communities. With a production area of native species of 309.61 ha, for wild species of 1,178 ha., for an organic production of 178 tons.</li> </ul>
Please provide links to related website, social media account	<p>The following information platforms are available:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <a href="https://twitter.com/Agrobiodiversi2">https://twitter.com/Agrobiodiversi2</a> has 8,600 Tweets in <u>46 publications</u> for this Reporting period (338 publications in total)</li> <li>- <a href="https://www.facebook.com/AgrobiodiversidadBol">https://www.facebook.com/AgrobiodiversidadBol</a> has <u>30 publications</u> for the period of this report (70 publications in total)</li> <li>- Web address: <a href="#">Sistema de Información de Agrobiodiversidad - MMAyA - SIARH</a> where the project information can be found on the Ministry's website.</li> </ul>
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	<p>The following information platforms are available:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <a href="https://twitter.com/Agrobiodiversi2">https://twitter.com/Agrobiodiversi2</a> has 8,600 Tweets in <u>46 publications</u> for the period of this report (338 publications in total)</li> </ul>

## 2023 Project Implementation Report

	- <a href="https://www.facebook.com/AgrobiodiversidadBol">https://www.facebook.com/AgrobiodiversidadBol</a> has <u>30 publications</u> for the period of this report (70 publications in total)
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details	The focal point of the commissioned project is: Name: Raúl Perez Email: Raul.PerezAlbrecht@fao.org

## 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.**

They Guaraní territory shelters a great variety of agrobiodiverse species that are the basis for food. In the case of the municipality of Monteagudo, native species such as corn (avati), sweet potato (yeti), joco (anday) and others have been identified. Also, fruits from the Chaco dry forest such as algarrobo (iguiope), guayabilla (guayaba rai), mistol (yuaí), nogal (sara), and others.

The main achievements are cited in 4 stages:

- a) Identification of ecotypes based on field collections (22 native maize, 18 of curcubitas and 5 of wild fruits) with standardized instruments for the collection of information.
- b) Implementation of good practices such as: positive selection and conservation of native seed; crop management; harvesting, shelling and storage of corn grains.
- c) Constitution and consolidation of its organic, productive, and evaluative structure to establish the SPG Asamblea del Pueblo Guaraní as a local Ecological Certification Body, with the Registry issued by the sectorial authority (SENASAG 04-15-0047) and use of the National Ecological Seal for harvested, produced, and processed products.
- d) With the support of the Guaraní Indigenous Nation, the OECOM Guaraní Amandiya Monteagudo Community Economic Organization was born, an organization dedicated to carry out economic activities within the territory. With the principles of associativism, promotion of agroecology, sustainable use of agrobiodiversity, promotion of healthy eating, with cross-gender and generational approaches. It also aims to preserve, promote, and disseminate the Guaraní Nation's own practices to strengthen the cultural identity.
- e) Finally, OECOM was awarded a public bid for the provision of inputs for complementary school meals for the municipality of Monteagudo, in the amount of 16,156.8 bolivianos.

### 13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>25</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing <sup>26</sup>	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
NATIONAL GOVERNMENT	General Directorate of Biodiversity and Protected Areas – EMAGUA	Grant, Soft loan, Hard loan, Collateral, Cash, other.	250,000 USD	302,697 USD	302,697 USD	–
NATIONAL GOVERNMENT	Ministry of environment and Water (MMAyA)	Biocultira project – In kind	8,528,030 USD	787,572 USD	787,572 USD	–
NATIONAL GOVERNMENT	Autonomous regional government of the Chaco	In kind	3,517,991 USD	2,759,300 USD	2,759,300 USD	–
FAO	Multilateral Agencies	In kind	1,379,000 USD	3,780,989 USD	3,780,989 USD	–
CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS	National committee for the competitiveness and productivity of the Quinoa production chain (CONACOPROQ)	In kind	440,000 USD	0 USD	0 USD	–
NATIONAL GOVERNMENT	CT- CONAN / Health			22,699 USD	22,699 USD	–

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

<sup>26</sup>Grant, Loan, Equity Investment, Guarantee, In-Kind, Public Investment, Other (please refer to the *Guidelines on co-financing* for definitions)

[https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF\\_FI\\_GN\\_01\\_Cofinancing\\_Guidelines\\_2018.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_FI_GN_01_Cofinancing_Guidelines_2018.pdf)

NATIONAL GOVERNMENT	INIAF / UC-CENAPE / IBMETRO / AMNI EL PALMAR / MDRyT- IPDSA			278,494 USD	278,494 USD	-
LOCAL GOVERNMENT	Sub national – Governments – Macro-regions			457,738 USD	457,738 USD	-
Public universities and institutes	Universities / Academia			339,318 USD	339,318 USD	-
Non Governmental Organizations	ONG / Foundations			102,451 USD	102,451 USD	-
Civil society organizations	Producing Associations / Civil society			135,167 USD	135,167 USD	-
		<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>14,115,021 USD</b>	<b>8,966,425 USD</b>	<b>-</b>

Field activities ended in June 2022, during this reporting period there has been no evidence of contributions or contributions regarding funding by the institutions.

## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

<b>Development Objectives Rating.</b> A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>	Project is expected to achieve or exceed <b>all</b> its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”
<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	Project is expected to achieve <b>most</b> of its <b>major</b> global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings
<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>	Project is expected to achieve <b>most</b> of its major <b>relevant</b> 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
<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</b>	Project is expected to achieve its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to <b>achieve only some</b> of its major global environmental objectives
<b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b>	Project is expected <b>not</b> to achieve <b>most</b> of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</b>	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, <b>any</b> of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits

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

<b>Risk rating</b> 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:	
<b>High Risk (H)</b>	There is a probability of greater than <b>75%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
<b>Substantial Risk (S)</b>	There is a probability of between <b>51%</b> and <b>75%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks
<b>Moderate Risk (M)</b>	There is a probability of between <b>26%</b> and <b>50%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk
<b>Low Risk (L)</b>	There is a probability of up to <b>25%</b> 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
<a href="#">Ver excel anexo 2023-FAO GEF GEOCODING WORKSHEET</a>				

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



2023 FAO-GEF  
Geocoding Workshee

**Annex 3.****BD GEF TRACKING TOOL**

2023 TRACKING  
TOOL.xlsx