



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

### 2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



## 1. Basic Project Data

### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	LAC
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Mexico
<b>Project Title:</b>	Sustainable Land Management Promotion (PROTIERRAS)
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP/MEX/303/GFF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	5785
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Land Degradation (LD)
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT) through the Center of Education and Training for Sustainable Development (CECADESU, EDUCA at the present time) and the General Direction of the Primary Sector and Renewable Natural Resources (DGSPNR)
<b>Project Duration:</b>	3 years

### Milestone Dates:

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	October 29 <sup>th</sup> , 2015
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	November 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2016
<b>Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	October 31 <sup>st</sup> , 2019
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) <sup>2</sup></b>	N/A
<b>Actual Implementation End Date<sup>3</sup>:</b>	N/A

### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	USD 1,735,160
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>4</sup>:</b>	USD 8,746,566
<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):</b>	USD 1,609,993

<sup>1</sup> as per FPMIS

<sup>2</sup> In case of a project extension.

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

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

<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019<sup>5</sup></b>	USD 4,988,265
--	---------------

### Review and Evaluation

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:</b>	April 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2019
<b>Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):</b>	N/A
<b>Mid-term review/evaluation actual:</b>	July – November 2018
<b>Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> or No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> or No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:</b>	July – October 2019
<b>Tracking tools/ Core indicators required<sup>6</sup></b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> or No <input type="checkbox"/>

### Ratings

<b>Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):</b>	HS	
<b>Overall implementation progress rating:</b>	S	
<b>Overall risk rating:</b>	M	

### Status

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

---

<sup>5</sup> Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

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

## Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Araceli Vargas Mena y Amezcua, Project Manager, Protierras	<a href="mailto:Araceli.VargasMena@fao.org">Araceli.VargasMena@fao.org</a>
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Ronald Vargas, Land and Water Officer, Climate, Biodiversity, Land and Water Department, CBL	<a href="mailto:Ronald.Vargas@fao.org">Ronald.Vargas@fao.org</a>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Crispim Moreira, FAO Mexico Representative	<a href="mailto:Crispim.Moreira@fao.org">Crispim.Moreira@fao.org</a>
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Climate and Environment Division, CBC</b>	Valeria González Riggio, Natural Resources Officer, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit.	<a href="mailto:Valeria.GonzalezRiggio@fao.org">Valeria.GonzalezRiggio@fao.org</a>

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Objective(s): Reduce land degradation through the implementation of a land management model focused on Sustainable Land Management and the strengthening of local institutions to facilitate the concurrence of multi-sectoral policies and investment in public goods in 3 priority micro regions.</b>						
<b>Outcome 1.1: Local actors committed to and trained in SLM practices</b>	No. of participants that jointly take part in decision making for land management	0	1 Municipality, 3 Agrarian Units and 15 Civil Society and Producer Organizations in each micro-region (MR)	1 Municipality, 3 Agrarian Centers, 15 Civil Society and Producer Organizations in each MR	The project has been implemented in 6 municipalities, 17 agricultural hubs, and 37 producing representatives. They are distributed as follows: • Valle del Mezquital in Hidalgo, 20 persons (2 women and 18 men) representing 3 municipalities, 8 agricultural hubs, and 17 production representatives. • Mixteca in Oaxaca, 10 persons (5 women and 5 men), representing 1 municipality, 1 agricultural hub, and 4 production representatives. • Pánuco in Zacatecas, 15 persons (15 men), representing 3 municipalities, 8 agricultural hubs, and 16 production representatives.	S
<b>Outcome 1.2: SLM approach mainstreamed into local territorial management</b>	Area under territorial planning with an SLM approach	0	86,818 ha	86,818 ha	94,730 ha	HS

<sup>7</sup> This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

<sup>8</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>9</sup> Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)**, **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Outcome 1.3: Investment for SLM increased in the MRs</b>	Increased investment in integrated landscape management	USD 703,406 (investment in 2012-2014 in the MRs)	USD 3,600,000	USD 8,524,995	USD 4,555,148	MS
<b>Outcome 2.1: SLM implemented in degraded watersheds</b>	Spatial coverage of INRM practices in the wider landscape	796 ha	2,150 hectares covered through project-supported activities	3,800 hectares covered through project-supported activities	8,367.13 ha through 114 Demonstration units with SLM practices established in 576 ha and 88 projects implemented on Replication units in 7,791 ha	HS
<b>Outcome 2.2: Technical capacities for SLM strengthened, contributing to improve the communities' livelihoods</b>	Increased agricultural productivity	1.44 ton/ha	Not measurable	+20%	A 20% in productivity has been registered in at least one crop after one agricultural cycle in each MR (irrigated corn in Hidalgo, rainfed wheat and corn in Oaxaca and rainfed bean in Zacatecas). A methodology to assess the productivity during this year's agricultural cycle is under implementation.	S
	Rate of vulnerability of livelihoods, as perceived by the communities	High perceived vulnerability	High perceived vulnerability	Medium perceived vulnerability	A preliminary analysis of livelihood vulnerability as performed on the communities of the 3 MRs shows a reduction from high to medium. An in-depth analysis of the data will allow for a more precise report.	S
<b>Outcome 3.1: Systematized information on project results and other relevant experiences disseminated at the micro regional, regional, state, and national levels</b>	PROTIERRAS model systematized and consolidated	0	0	The PROTIERRAS model is systematized and consolidated	The PROTIERRAS model is under development with a 60% progress involving the general concepts, objectives, theory of change and critical route. The methodologies to record successful stories, upscaling of experiences and good practices are under implementation in the field.	S
<b>Outcome 3.2: Project implemented on a results based</b>	Project results achieved,	0	50% of results achieved	100% of results achieved	85% of results reached	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
management approach	demonstrating sustainability					

**Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating<sup>10</sup>**

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<b>Outcome 1.3:</b> Investment for SLM increased in the MRs	<p>In December 2019, a new federal government took office, with a very different political perspective from the previous one. As a result, the senior officers of every ministry were changed with the main priority being the reduction of public expenditure. The new administration performed a serious budget cut, eliminated government programs and redefined the priorities to be supported during the coming years by the project's partner institutions. This notably affected the capacity of the partners to meet their co-financing commitments on time.</p> <p>The first action taken by the team to overcome this situation was to inform the new representatives of the federal institutions about the Project's objectives and main achievements, and to determine whether the SLM practices and/or technologies will be financed by the partners under their new programs. To this end, a Project Steering Committee session was held in April 2019. As a result, it was acknowledged that CONAFOR will support some proposals within the 3 MRs, however, SADER and SEMARNAT were still uncertain about this situation. The Project Team has developed investment proposals for the potential financing of the last year of implementation.</p> <p>Another strategy that is currently being explored, until October 2019, is to acquire investment/ funds through other sources of co-financing, such as Development Aid Agencies, Private Sector and Local Governments (States and Municipalities). During the Project's life span, other sources have contributed with more than USD 500,000 in SLM practices and technologies.</p>	<p>Budget Holder (FAO Representative in Mexico)</p> <p>National Project Coordinator</p> <p>Project Steering Committee</p>	October 2019

<sup>10</sup> To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

## 2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs <sup>11</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>12</sup>	Achievements at each PIR <sup>13</sup>		Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR		
<b>Output 1.1.1:</b> Three (3) Territorial Management Committees established	Q3 Y1	3 working Land Management Committees	3 working Land Management Committees	100%	
<b>Output 1.1.2:</b> Local stakeholders trained in territorial management and SLM (local institutions, extension workers, local producer organizations) (300)	Q2 Y3	178 local stakeholders trained in Land Management for SLM	341 local stakeholders trained in Land Management for SLM	113%	
	Q2 Y3	3 training and education sessions	10 training and education sessions	125%	
<b>Output 1.2.1:</b> Land Management Plans formulated with the participation of local stakeholders (3)	Q2 Y2	3 Approved integrated land management plans (PGT)	3 Approved integrated land management plans (PGT)	100%	
<b>Output 1.2.2:</b> Territorial regulations formulated by land users to foster SLM (3)	Q3 Y3	Existing regulatory instruments diagnosis of each micro-region as a basis for the elaboration of Land Regulations.	Territorial regulations formulated by land users in 2 of 3 MRs.	65%	The territorial regulations for the remaining MR (Mixteca, Oaxaca) will be delivered by July 2019.

<sup>11</sup> Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

<sup>12</sup> As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

<sup>13</sup> Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

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

<b>Output 1.3.1:</b> Integrated financing strategies for SLM developed in a participatory manner including public and private financing sources	Q3 Y3	Integrated financing strategies for SLM developed for the 3 MRs.	Integrated financing strategies for SLM developed for the 3 MRs.	100%	
<b>Output 2.1.1:</b> Demonstration units with SLM practices established (500 ha), involving youngsters and women	Q3 Y2	29 Demonstration units with SLM practices established in 149 ha	114 Demonstration units with SLM practices established in 575 ha	115%	
	Q3 Y2	39 technical assistance sessions	130 technical assistance sessions	120%	
<b>Output 2.1.2:</b> Project profiles formulated and implemented on Replication Units over 3,300 has	Q1 Y3	30 projects implemented on Replication units in 1,712 ha	88 projects implemented on Replication units in 7,791 ha	264%	
	Q1 Y3	100 technical assistance sessions	303 technical assistance sessions	202%	
<b>Output 2.2.1:</b> Capacity-building plans for SLM, with special emphasis on the involvement and reintegration of youth and women with their land	Q3 Y3	Capacity building plans designed for the 3 MRs	Capacity building plans designed for the 3 MRs	100%	
	Q3 Y3	178 producers trained in SLM processes.	1,017 producers trained in SLM processes.	175%	
<b>Output 2.2.2:</b> Establishment of an experience exchange mechanism with an emphasis on the youth and women in the 3 micro regions	Q3 Y3	1 strategy designed for the exchange of strategies	1 strategy designed for the exchange of strategies	100%	
	Q3 Y3	7 exchanges conducted	24 exchanges conducted	120%	
<b>Output 3.1.1:</b> PROTIERRAS communication strategy designed and implemented, with a special emphasis on youth and women	Q4 Y3	1 communication strategy 13 communication materials designed and distributed	1 communication strategy 48 communication materials designed and distributed	160%	
<b>Output 3.1.2:</b> Mechanism for knowledge exchange with international initiatives such as LADA-WOCAT	Q2 Y3	1 international experience identified	3 international experiences identified	75%	
	Q2 Y3	1 local stakeholder participates in 1 knowledge exchange	39 local stakeholders participate in 3 knowledge exchanges with international experts	90%	
<b>Output 3.1.3:</b>	Q3 Y3	Preliminary proposal of the scheme and critical route for	Design and development of the main elements of the	60%	The Protierras intervention model is being developed



PROTIERRAS intervention model systematized and published, including lessons learned		the development of the ProTierras intervention model.	structure for the ProTierras intervention model. It includes vision statement, challenges, and programmatic framework.		considering the main results from field sites, good practices and success stories.
<b>Output 3.2.1:</b> Establishment of a monitoring and evaluation system	Q3 Y3	1 PPR report	85% of results reached, as reported in 4 PPR and 1 PIR	85%	
<b>Output 3.2.2:</b> Mid-term review and final evaluation	Q3 Y3	Terms of Reference for the Mid-term review.	1 Mid-term review completed with a Satisfactory grade. Terms of Reference for the Final Evaluation and undergoing recruitment process for the evaluation team.	65%	The final evaluation will be carried on from July until September 2019.

## Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

**Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):**

Max 200 words:

The Project is perceived by local actors as an opportunity to link academic researchers, experts, governmental officers and producers to implement SLM systems under a territorial approach in order to reduce soil and other natural resources degradation. Its main results are:

- Strengthening of the local governance for an effective prioritization of the productive and restorative activities under a participatory construction of agreements and indigenous customs and traditions respect approaches.
- Vertical and horizontal articulation between localities, municipalities, states, the federation and the private sector in order to achieve multi-sectoral investments convergent in integral territorial projects.
- Technical assistance to promote effective land management by local users and the implementation of SLM practices within their agricultural systems and integral projects with a watershed management approach.
- Promotion of women participation in training and organization activities for sustainable agricultural production.
- Promotion of productive reconversion to improve soil conditions, such as structure and nutrient fixation.
- Community awareness in the relevance of the ecosystem services, their sustainable use and conservation.
- Preliminary evidences on the reduction of the soil degradation because of SLM practices, as well as a yield increase of some crops.
- Water harvesting and supply in the upper basin to recharge aquifers and its use in productive systems.

**What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?**

Max 200 words:

- Due to the changes in the government, the appointment of new officers at the federal institutions was delayed.
- The new administration underwent a budget cut, restructured the ministries and eliminated/redefined government programs. This is affecting the capacity of the partners to fulfil, in time and quantity, their co-financing compromises, affecting as well the physical investments (complimentary infrastructure) to assist in project productivity in the MRs.

## Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating <sup>15</sup>	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating <sup>16</sup>	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
--	--	--	--

---

<sup>15</sup> **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet.

Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>16</sup> **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

Project Manager / Coordinator	HS	HS	<p>It is considered that the Project had a highly satisfactory development and progress during the reporting period. This is due to the evidence of strengthened capacities of the communities to implement SLM practices, better organization skills and local governance. An increase in the diversity of crops produced was also noted, and preliminary records have indicated the beginning of a degradation reduction process at the Project sites.</p> <p>During this last year of implementation, many of the Project's indicators were achieved and exceeded as a result of a continuous interest of the communities to implement the SLM approach. With the technical assistance given by the Protierras team, local stakeholders are the main decision-makers over their land's use, mainly at the Land Management Committees established during the first year of implementation. This has proven that an integral approach (productive and environmental) of Land Management supported with capacities development and SLM instruments developed by the Project will benefit the local actors, their farming production, and improve the subsequent ecosystem services, such as water supply. Farmer Field Schools have been an extremely adequate approach to enhance skills for critical analysis and improved decision making by local people.</p> <p>Sustainability evidence of the Project's model in the MRs is the fact that the producers are reporting to be incorporating the SLM practices in their regular production techniques/ programs, and to promote them among their neighbors. They are more aware of the negative impacts of farming practices that degrade their lands and aim to take care of them by incorporating new approaches and technologies that favor sustainable production. During the reporting period, the systematizing efforts have increased in order to consolidate the Protierras approach as a model for SLM with all the stakeholders' involvement.</p> <p>A mid-term review was conducted from August to November 2018, and a set of 8 recommendations were suggested in order to improve the Project's implementation and to promote its sustainability. A strategy has been developed and put into practice by the Project's team in order to attend the advice in the most suitable way. As of now, the team has attended to 6 of 8 recommendations. Some of the recommendations depend on the governmental participation. Given the change in federal administration, there was a delay in the appointment of new officers, affecting the high level lobbying by FAO Representative.</p>
-------------------------------	----	----	--

			<p>In general, the project is in line with its work plan, due to an extensive effort made to surpass the consequences caused by the delays. This was done with the technical field assistance from FAO's technical team, Technical Agencies and researchers from research institutes and social institution's officials.</p>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>HS</b>	<b>HS</b>	<p>During the third year of implementation, the lack of co-financing from the partners has been more evident, and therefore the project consultants have had to double their time and efforts to obtain funds to complete the project commitments in the micro-regions. Nevertheless, the project advances in a satisfactory manner, complying with the indicators in the logical framework, and no important changes in the results and products have occurred.</p> <p>At this stage, the Project focuses on finishing the tasks planned for the third year and, more than anything, in positioning the PROTIERRAS as a reliable methodology for reducing land degradation. The Project also focuses on the identification of interested partners in implementing an intervention model not only in the micro-regions where the project was successful during the last three years, but also in other states.</p>
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>17</sup></b>	<b>HS</b>	<b>HS</b>	<p>The implementation of the PROTIERRAS activities was done in line with the work plan despite the challenges posed by the change in government. This change has impacted the timely delivery of the project results, as the national financial contributions were limited due to the institutional reorganization. However, the PROTIERRAS team continued their activities in a versatile approach and tried to be more effective on the ground keeping the momentum and thus commitment of the beneficiaries and users.</p>

---

<sup>17</sup> The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

			<p>It should be highlighted that PROTIERRAS is very successful, particularly in the ground, as constitutes a solid inclusive platform for allowing the various regional/municipal institutions focused on rural development, natural resources management and agriculture to work together with a common goal. Farmers and land users are at the center of PROTIERRAS, thus the project is appreciated by the beneficiaries and by the local authorities and institutions, as they perceive that PROTIERRAS constitutes a neutral platform for inter-institutional work to address the issue of land degradation. Various authorities and institutions at regional and local level expressed their interest in continuing to support PROTIERRAS, as a way to scale up these successful interventions.</p>
<b>CBC-GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<p>The project is on track. More efforts could be made to ensure the effective disbursement of co-financing and buy-in of new government partners, in order to facilitate the durability of project outcomes after project closure.</p>

### 3. Risks

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

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid <sup>18</sup> . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	The initial risk classification of the project remains valid

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

#### Risk ratings

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

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Difficulties in the institutional coordination between SEMARNAT, SAGARPA, CONAFOR and other participating state institutions as a result of land	M	A Liaison Committee (LC) has been maintained for high-level inter-agency coordination and a Project Steering Committee (PSC) was established for operative decision, both include officers	After the government change, a new session of Liaison Committee was carried out with the new officers. The LC, as well, is in charge to appoint the new members of the	The actions specified in the ProDoc had to be reinforced to reduce the risk of lack of support at local level.

<sup>18</sup> **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

<sup>19</sup> GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

<sup>20</sup> If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
	competition, changes in political orientation, or rotation of functionaries		from the national institutions involved in the Project.	Project Steering Committee, which is the operative decisions board. A session of the PSC will take place in August.  It is important to continue the negotiations with the new authorities in order to have continuity and consistency for the ongoing activities.	
2	Difficulties in securing co-financing.	S	<p>All the projects partners expressed their willingness to support the Project through formal co-financing commitment letters for the GEF during the previous administration, but the new Government administration was not aware of this situation. As a result, there are not planned funds to support the project's implementation.</p> <p>The first action taken to overcome the administration change, was to socialize the Project's objectives and achievements with the new representatives of the federal institutions, and to identify if the SLM practices and/or technologies will be financed by the partners under their new programs.</p>	<p>During the SC session held in April 2019, it was acknowledged that CONAFOR will support some proposals within the 3 MRs, but SADER and SEMARNAT are uncertain about it. The Project Team has prepared the proposals to be financed during PY3 (last year of implementation), aiming to have access to the committed co-financing resources.</p> <p>Another strategy currently undergoing and to be followed up until October 2019, is to obtain investment by other sources of co-financing, like Development Aid Agencies, Private Sector and Local Governments (States and Municipalities). During the Project's life span, other sources have contributed with more than USD 500,000 in SLM practices and technologies.</p>	During the Project's life span, other sources have contributed with more than USD 500,000 in SLM practices and technologies.



	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
3	Lack of interest or skepticism on the part of residents and producers in the micro regions.	L	The conformation of Land Management Committees (LMC), as the main governance instances for land planning, ensures the participation of local actors in the decision-making process under a SLM approach. Capacity development, technical support, a communication strategy and instruments developed by the Project for an integral land management have supported this process.	Local stakeholders have revealed a deep compromise with the SLM approach as they have witnessed an improvement in their land quality and in their production. The producers or users of the three micro-regions are fully convinced of the usefulness of the project.	
4	Difficulties arising from the regularization, formalization or agricultural registration of the plots of land that can impede the establishment of demonstration plots or access to federal programs that support SLM.	L	The project will establish a coordination mechanism with the responsible institutions of the Agricultural Register for the selection of demonstration and replication plots as well as for the identification of possible solutions to the problems that could arise during implementation.	Inter-institutional committees were established as coordination mechanisms at the local level to discuss and solve problems, and they include representatives from the main municipalities.	No land ownership issues have arisen so far.
5	Conflicts of individual and collective (agrarian centers) interests between beneficiaries, residents, and producers due to the differentiated access to project benefits and financing, for example between demonstration and replication plots.	L	Key project decisions made in the field, particularly with regard to the selection of areas, demonstration plots, beneficiaries, and other actions will be made by consensus with the communities and producers.	The LMC are the main governance able to mitigate this risk as they function as multi-participant groups for the decision-making process at the local level.	There is no evidence of such situation.
6	Power groups exert political pressure on the project, in an effort to influence the orientation or focus of the beneficiaries.	M	The project's governance structure will establish an oversight system that will protect the project from possible external influence or from a small group of power within the MRs.	The LMC are the main governance instances to mitigate this risk as they function as multi-participant groups for the decision-making process at the local level.	There is no evidence that any power group is exerting pressure on any LMC at the MRs.

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
7	Contingencies originated in possibly deteriorated conditions of public order and safety due to the presence of organized crime being.	L	In the case of unexpected deteriorations in security, the project will coordinate with the institutions responsible for security policy to evaluate possible solutions according to the specific risk conditions in the target areas. Security courses are taken by the Project Task Force.	The Project Task Force took the courses recommended by the UNDSS.	There is no evidence of such situation.
8	Possibility of extreme weather events throughout the time frame of the project, involving significant changes in the project's baseline natural conditions.	L	SLM models will be selected according to known patterns of climate change.	SLM models were selected considering the semi-arid conditions of the MRs.	There is no evidence of such situation.
9	Women do not participate in the decision-making process of the communities' agricultural practices.	S	Gender vision must be strengthened and follow up to trainings must be provided. There is also the possibility to focus on gender equality for certain projects, to ensure the participation of women and youth.	Workshops on leadership and gender perspective with rural women within the three MR have been held. Women of the MRs showed great interest and participated actively in SLM practices focused on strengthening the families' access to food, such as school gardens and backyard orchards.	

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
M	M	The Project is facing institutional and co-financing risks that may affect the achievement and sustainability of Project outcomes.

## 4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months<sup>21</sup>

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

### Adjustments to Project Time Frame

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

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	N/A

---

<sup>21</sup> Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

## 5. Gender Mainstreaming

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

The main gender assessment of the Protierras has focused on strengthening women's participation in the decision-making processes of the land use in the MRs.

To achieve this, the Project has promoted their involvement in the LMCs, in the capacity development processes and in SLM practices. This has led to satisfactory results in Oaxaca's and Hidalgo's MRs. However, in Zacatecas it has been difficult to boost their participation in the SLM practices in the agricultural fields, and in the decision-making processes.

In Zacatecas, it has been evident that only activities focused in assuring food access to their families will capture the women's attention and attendance. School gardens and backyard orchards have been the main topics in which the capacity development has focused since 2018; meanwhile in Oaxaca and Hidalgo these practices are complimentary. Also in Zacatecas, the Protierras provided technical assistance on the formulation, presentation and implementation of a productive project of cattle raising derived from a governmental program from SAGARPA ("*El Campo en Nuestras Manos*"). In Hidalgo MR, a group of women has been working in the women's plot of the Hermosillo ejido, receiving technical assistance from the project and producing vegetables for self-consumption and for local commerce.

In 2017, the Project Task Force attended a gender sensitization workshop, and during 2018, the FAOMX's gender specialist facilitated leadership workshops for women at the 3 MRs. The specialist was also able to identify any present gender gaps.

The M&E system has gender disaggregated data from every workshop, LMC session, as well as projects and investments committees.

## 6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

**Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.**

There are indigenous people present in two MRs: in Valle del Mezquital, Hidalgo, there is a wide population of Nāhñús (otomí), and in Mixteca, Oaxaca the main indigenous population are Mixtecs.

During the 1<sup>st</sup> year of implementation, the process for the Free Prior Informed consent (FPIC) was informally carried out and during the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of implementation it was ratified and formalized, even when it was not initially considered during the design of the project.

The FPIC formal endorsement was signed in May 2018 in both MRs as a result of a wide range of activities that included some traditional practices and respected their world view of the natural resources.

## 7. Stakeholders Engagement

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

**1. INIFAP.** The INIFAP was formally included in the Project implementation as part of the capacity development strategy in 2 MRs (Oaxaca and Hidalgo) and in an informal manner in Zacatecas. Their participation has been fundamental in the training of promoters and producers, thanks to the participation of researchers with wide experience in agricultural and forest practices, as well as in the Farmer Field School approach and the establishment of Demonstrative Intervention and Replication Sites.

**2. CIMMYT.** The CIMMYT has been involved in the Project implementation in an informal way as a technical advisor and as facilitator of exchanges of experiences on methodologies and new agricultural technologies for corn and wheat conservation. In particular, CIMMYT's support was part of their actions related to Program Masagro.

**3. GIZ in Hidalgo.** The Cooperation German Agency (GIZ) was involved in the project as an informative and training agent on Hidalgo's MR during 2018. Their participation has been through the implementation of workshops on entrepreneurial methodologies and business competencies (CEFES) for the development of community projects and business plans.

**4. GIZ in Oaxaca.** The Cooperation German Agency (GIZ) has also worked in the Mixteca MR as a concurrent investor in the territory with their project "Mainstreaming biodiversity into the Mexican agricultural sector" also known as IKI-IBA. In a cooperation scheme with Protierras, they work to trace the biodiversity changes into some of the demonstrative intervention sites and have trained some producers to do it. They also have invested in some complimentary infrastructure to promote the SLM and the biodiversity streaming into rural activities.

**5. State and municipal authorities.** The representatives of the institutions in the states and municipalities involved of Hidalgo, Oaxaca and Zacatecas have supported the Project with different degrees of participation. This is the result of the constant change of appointed officers and the lack of information from the design of the project provided by the federal regime throughout the state and municipal levels. In the case of Hidalgo and Oaxaca, the municipal authorities have been more involved, even contributing as co-financers with investments in the field.

**6. WWF – Carlos Slim Foundation Alliance.** In Oaxaca, this Alliance has worked since 2015 by supporting the actions promoted by the Local Technical Agency (Mixteca Sustentable) in order to achieve better conditions for natural resources conservation. With the incorporation of the Protierras within the same geographical scope, a cooperation in terms of co-financing and complimentary projects has been achieved, with many beneficial results for the communities of Santiago Tilantongo municipality.

**7. Private Sector.** In Hidalgo, some small businesses have contributed as co-financers of complimentary works of productive projects implemented in 2018. This kind of action reflects the increasing compromise of all types of local actors to promote SLM practices and technologies that will benefit the entire community.

## 8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

The project Sustainable Land Management promotion (PROTIERRAS), has as its main objective to reduce land degradation through the implementation of an integral land management model focused on the Sustainable Land Management (SLM) approach. It also focuses on the development of capacities of producers and the strengthening of the local governance of local institutions to promote the confluence of investments in 3 micro-regions located in Hidalgo, Oaxaca and Zacatecas in Mexico. ProTierras seeks to reduce land degradation and vulnerability of the population regarding the impacts climate change through the mobilization, organization and empowerment of local stakeholders in the management of territories and natural resources, and promote participatory decision-making processes on the use of resources.

In localities with indigenous populations, the project has carried out the Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), in order to safeguard their way of life and to encourage participation in the decision-making process.

The farmer promoters training is a process that enhanced the emergence of change agents that voluntarily participate in order to gain knowledge and to implement technologies to stop and reverse the land degradation in their territories. Through the Farmer Field Schools (FFS) approach, the project trains agricultural and livestock producers to be agents of change (promoters) within their communities. The FFS method has been implemented through collaboration with research institutes (INIFAP, CIMMYT) that facilitate the learning process about the SLM approach. It is not only the most innovative available technology, but also is respectful of their customs and traditions. The capacities strengthening in both men and women focused on, changes their agricultural habits, increasing their crops diversity and yield, improving their income and overall wellness, recovering the traditional knowledge that has proven to be good for the ecosystem's conservation (natural and agricultural), as well as coming up with future solutions for soil conservation. The identified lead farmers became promoters and acquired commitment to replicate their knowledge on SLM practices in their lands and to share and replicate it with other producers as a way to upscale the implementation of these successful practices.

The Project highlights the women's participation, promotes their empowerment, strengthening their participation in the planning and decision-making in the communities

Juana Pedro José is a farmer promoter in her locality. Thanks to the Farmer Field School sessions on the sustainable land management, she has learnt to care for her parcel's soil and to generate greater production. *"The trainings and the knowledge that we have as farmers have helped us to enhance our land production and to thank everything that our land has given us for our own good and our community"*

### **Related Videos:**

- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y9BpKxAyuW8>
- <https://youtu.be/XO-Z1zDu0Cg>

### **Related Website:**

- <http://www.fao.org/in-action/protierras/es/>

**Related News Stories:**

- <http://www.fao.org/mexico/noticias/detail-events/es/c/1148729/>
- <http://www.fao.org/mexico/noticias/detail-events/es/c/1140798/>
- <http://www.fao.org/mexico/noticias/detail-events/es/c/1129819/>
- <http://www.fao.org/mexico/noticias/detail-events/es/c/1171365/>

**Photos (listed below):** <https://bit.ly/2X3vxaK>

1. Home gardens Farmer Field School (FFS) © FAO/Carolina Martínez Ceja (ProTierras Hidalgo.jpg)
2. Land preparation FFS © Proyecto Mixteca Sustentable A.C./Enrique Montes Hernández (ProTierras Oaxaca 1.jpg)
3. Land preparation FFS © Proyecto Mixteca Sustentable A.C./Enrique Montes Hernández (ProTierras Oaxaca 2.jpg)
4. Milpa intercalated with fruit trees technological system (MIAF) FSS ©Proyecto Mixteca Sustentable A.C./Enrique Montes Hernández (ProTierras Oaxaca 3.jpg)
5. Soil evaluation FSS©CECADE A.C. (ProTierras Zacatecas 1.jpg)
6. Farmer promoters © CECADE A.C. (ProTierras Zacatecas 2.jpg)
7. Sunflower cultivation FSS© CECADE A.C. (ProTierras Zacatecas 3.jpg)
8. Pest management FSS© CECADE A.C. (ProTierras Zacatecas 4.jpg)

## 9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>22</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National Government	SEMARNAT - DGSPNR	Grant and in-kind	USD 668,074	-	-	-
National Government	SEMARNAT - CECADESU	Grant and in-kind	USD 250,000	USD 95,643	USD 61,367	USD 95,643
National Government	CONAFOR	Grant and in-kind	USD 1,728,492	USD 1,445,504	USD 1,170,314	USD 1,447,754
National Government	SAGARPA	Grant	USD 6,000,000	USD 2,617,715	USD 2,227,539	USD 2,617,715
U.N. Agency	FAO	In-kind	USD 100,000	USD 68,901	-	USD 68,901
National Government	CONABIO	In-kind	-	USD 11,333	-	USD 11,333
National Government	INPI	Grant	-	USD 16,666	-	USD 16,666
National Government	INIFAP	In-kind	-	USD 6,506	-	USD 6,506
National Government	SEMARNAT – Zacatecas Office	Grant and in-kind	-	USD 30,344	USD 24,603	USD 30,344
Local Govt (State)	Government of Oaxaca	Grant	-	USD 13,643	-	USD 13,643
Local Govt (State)	Government of Zacatecas (SECAMPO)	Grant	-	USD 449,633	USD 439,324	USD 449,633
Local Govt (County)	Santiago Tilantongo County (Oaxaca)	In-kind	-	USD 22,000	-	USD 22,000
Development Aid Agency	GIZ	In-kind	-	USD 111,933	-	USD 111,933

<sup>22</sup> Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.



Civil Society Organization	Alianza WWF Fundación Carlos Slim	Grant	-	USD 44,600	USD 16,311	USD 44,600
Foundation	CIMMYT	Grant	-	USD 15,333	-	USD 15,333
Private Sector	BIOSUVA	In-kind	-	USD 33	-	USD 33
Private Sector	Biofábrica Siglo XXI	In-kind	-	USD 66	-	USD 66
Private Sector	Squid Pheromones	In-kind	-	USD 66	-	USD 66
Private Sector	Fertilex	In-kind	-	USD 133	-	USD 133
Private Sector	DAHNER – CONSTRUCCIONES	In-kind	-	USD 260	-	USD 260
Other	Beneficiaries	Grant	-	USD 47,028	-	USD 47,028
<b>TOTAL</b>			USD 8,746,566	USD 4,997,348	USD 3,887,634	USD 4,999,598

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

Due to major budget cuts to the SEMARNAT ministry, they acknowledge their incapacity to fulfill their co-financing compromise with the GEF through an official notice to FAOMX.

In the latest Steering Committee session, CONAFOR committed to support some proposals within the 3 MRs, but SADER and SEMARNAT are uncertain about it.

In order to fulfill some of the co-financing target, the Project has gotten investments by other financing sources, like Development Aid Agencies, the Private Sector and Local Governments (States and Municipalities). During the Project's life span, other sources have contributed with more than 500K USD in SLM practices and technologies.

## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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