FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2021 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Latin America and the Caribbean
Country (ies):	Uruguay
Project Title:	Climate-smart livestock production and land restoration in the Uruguayan rangelands
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/URU/034/GFF
GEF ID:	9153
GEF Focal Area(s):	Climate Change Mitigation (CCM-2, Program 4) Land Degradation (LD-1, Program 2)
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (MGAP)
Project Duration:	48 months
Project coordinates: **(Ctrl+Click here)**	*This section should be completed by:* *-Projects with 1st PIR* *-Projects could re-submit the coordinates if they have changed, or if the PMU now has more updated coordinates*

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	2018/4/17
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	2019/2/14
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE[1]:	2023/2/14
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) [2]	2023/5/14

[1] As per FPMIS

[2] In case of a project extension.

Actual Implementation End Date[3]:	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	2,091,781
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc[4]:	14,241,567
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2021 (USD m):	858,305
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2021[5]	10,880,546

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee Meeting:	2021/5/25
Expected Mid-term Review date[6]:	July-September 2021
Actual Mid-term review date:	N/A
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022)[7]:	Yes
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date:	March-May 2023
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022):	No

[3] Actual date at which project implementation ends - only for projects that have ended.

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

[5] 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.

[6] The MTR should take place about halfpoint between EOD and NTE – this is the expected date

[7] Please note that the FAO GEF Coordination Unit should be contacted six months prior to the expected MTR date

Tracking tools/ Core indicators required[8]	Yes

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	**S**
Overall implementation progress rating:	**S**
Overall risk rating:	**L**

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	María Bergós, National Project Coordinator (FAOUY)	Maria.Bergos@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Carolyn Opio, Livestock Policy Officer (FAOSLM)	Carolyn.Opio@fao.org
Budget Holder	Ruben Flores Agreda, Senior Policy Officer (FAORLC)	Ruben.FloresAgreda@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Valeria Gonzalez-Riggio, Technical Officer, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit (OCB)	Valeria.GonzalezRIggio@fao.org

Acronyms and abbreviations found throughout this document are detailed here:

[8] 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

ACRONYMS and ABBREVIATIONS	
AUCI	*Agencia Uruguaya de Cooperación Internacional* Uruguayan Agency for International Cooperation
CAF	*Cooperativas Agrarias Federadas* Federation of Agricultural Cooperatives
CCAC	Climate and Clean Air Coalition
CNFR	*Comisión Nacional de Fomento Rural* National Commission for Rural Promotion
CSLM	Climate Smart Livestock Management
CURE-UDELAR	*Centro Universitario Regional del Este* University Centre of the East Region
DNCC-MA	*Dirección Nacional de Cambio Climático* National Directorate for Climate Change
DGDR-MGAP	*Dirección General de Desarrollo Rural* Directorate General for Rural Development
DGRN-MGAP	*Dirección General de Recursos Naturales* Directorate General for Natural Resources
DILAVE-MGAP	*Dirección de Laboratorios Veterinarios* Directorate of Veterinary Laboratories
DINAMA-MA	*Dirección Nacional de Medio Ambiente* National Directorate of Environment
FAGRO	*Facultad de Agronomía* Faculty of Agronomy
FUCREA	*Federación Uruguaya de Grupos CREA* Uruguayan Federation of Regional Centres of Agricultural Experimentation
GIS	Geographic Information System
GLEAM	Global Livestock Environmental Assessment Model
INAC	*Instituto Nacional de Carnes* National Meat Institute
INALE	*Instituto Nacional de la Leche* National Milk Institute

INC	*Instituto Nacional de Colonización* National Institute of Colonization
INIA	*Instituto Nacional de Investigación Agropecuaria* National Institute of Agricultural Research
IPA	*Instituto Plan Agropecuario* Institute of Livestock Technology Transfer
LoA	Letter of Agreement
MA	*Ministerio de Ambiente* Ministry of Environment
MDR	*Mesa de Desarrollo Rural* Rural Development Committee
MGAP	*Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca* Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries
MGCN	*Mesa de Ganadería de Campo Natural* National Livestock Rangeland Board
MRV	Monitoring, Reporting and Verification
MTR	Mid Term Review
NAMA	Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action
NDC	Nationally Determined Contribution (Paris Agreement)
NGHGI	National Greenhouse Gas Inventory
OPYPA	*Oficina de Programación y Política Agropecuaria* Office of Programming and Agricultural Policy
PSC	Project Steering Committee
PT	Project Team
RBM	Results-based management
SNAP	*Sistema Nacional de Áreas Protegidas* National System of Protected Areas
UAI-MGAP	*Unidad de Asuntos Internacionales* International Affairs Unit
UASYCC-OPYPA-MGAP	*Unidad Agropecuaria de Sostenibilidad y Cambio Climático* Agricultural Sustainability and Climate Change Unit
UD-MGAP	*Unidad de Descentralización* Unit for Decentralization

UDELAR	*Universidad de la República* University of the Republic
UGP-MGAP	*Unidad de Gestión de Proyectos* Unit for Project Management
UPEP-UDELAR	*Unidad de Posgrado y Educación Permanente* Postgraduate and Continuing Education Unit from UDELAR

2. Progress Towards Achieving Project Objectives and Outcome (DO)

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

Project objective and Outcomes (as indicated at CEO Endorsement)	**Description of indicator(s)[9]**	**Baseline level**	**Mid-term target[10]**	**End-of-project target**	**Level at 30 June 2021**	**Progress rating [11]**
Objective(s):						
Outcome 1.1: **Policy and planning frameworks have been strengthened to support CSLM implementation and national communication on livestock emissions**	Indicator 3 (CC): One MRV system for emission reduction in place and reporting verified data	4 (as per the scale in GEF-6 Programming Directions)		**8**	The project has collaborated with the NDC monitoring team in the process of continuous improvement of NDC indicators and methodologies related to rangelands and livestock. That collaboration resulted in improved indicators and the certainty that methodologies converge to further improvements. Last year a survey (Anuario OPYPA 2020 p. 563) was carried out in coordination with the project to characterize and monitor herd and grasslands management practices.	**S**

[9] 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.

[10] 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.

[11] 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).

					At the national level, initiatives have been generated to strengthen the development and implementation of the CSLM. For example: creation of a working group on environmental footprint of livestock where the Director of the project participated in the launching of the working group composed of MGAP, MA, INIA, INAC and INALE technicians. Project collaborates and exchanges information and data with Initiative 20x20. Members of the PSC integrate the reporting system for international environmental reports.	
Outcome 1.1: **Policy and planning frameworks have been strengthened to support CSLM implementation and national communication on livestock emissions**	Indicator 5 (CC): Degree of support for low GHG development in the policy planning and regulatory framework	3 (as per the scale in GEF-6 Programming Directions)		**6**	During the current reporting period, the activities have focused on presenting the project to newly appointed government representatives taking into account the different departments, units and strategic partners to guarantee a clear communication and common understanding to achieve the commitment of the stakeholders. The following activities were undertaken: o 9 project presentations for MGAP departments (UD, UGP, DGDR, DGRN) o 4 project presentations for: IPA, AUCI, MGCN and “Ganadería Familiar Resiliente” project (Euroclima+, CNFR).	**S**

					The following progress was made on the development of the CSL strategy: o A call for Expressions of Interest was issued through the In-Tend platform (UNMG) to invite consultancy firms to assist the project in developing the national CSL Strategy. o To broaden the reach of the call, and increase number of applicants, the FAOUY communications team collaborated in the dissemination. o 3 applications were received and reviewed by the Evaluation Committee composed of 1 representative from MGAP, 1 representative from MA, 2 representatives from FAO and 1 representative from the PT. o The selection process has been finalized. Instituto Plan Agropecuario (IPA) has been selected and a first meeting between the project team and IPA was organized. Members of the PT now assist at the monthly meeting of MGCN where policies and technological recommendations related to grasslands and livestock are coordinated. The PT has met regularly with the new minister and vice-minister to make them aware of the project and to keep them updated of the progress and opportunities to coordinate with policy design and implementation. Directors of the new government have been successfully introduced to the project by the PT and integrated to the PSC showing commitment and motivation towards the project.	

Outcome 1.2: **National capacities have been strengthened to support CSLM implementation**	Indicator 1.2: No of institutions that commit to supporting the implementation of CSLM	0		6	● Producers' organizations were visited in order to strengthen linkages and guarantee support to CSLM. ● A technical working group on environmental footprint of livestock production systems was formed, in which the Project Director participated. The team is made up of technicians from INIA, INALE, INAC, MGAP and MA. The objective is to create a comprehensive approach that incorporates the environmental dimension in the country's livestock production systems. ● A coordination space has been established with the coordinator of the INIA-FAGRO team and the national project coordinator on a monthly basis to exchange information, follow-up on the progress of the activities and identify problems and solutions in the implementation of CSL practices. ● An exchange meeting was organized with all the research projects working on issues related to natural grasslands. The meeting was organized by the MGCN with the aim of exploring synergies and finding joint actions to strengthen CSLM approaches. ● An exchange meeting was held between projects financed within the framework of the Innovagro Fund of the National Research and Innovation Agency (ANII) linked to the project to update the current status and favour exchange among researchers. ● A training session on the topic of Animal Health was delivered by a researcher from INIA and technicians from the Division of Veterinary Laboratories (DILAVE-MGAP). The training targeted the project extension team and the Resilient Family Livestock project (Euroclima +, CNFR) extensionists.	**S**

					● 4 athenaeums held for the extension team on characterization and diagnosis of farms.	
Outcome 2.1: **Sustainable CSLM has been implemented in degraded/degrading lands**	Indicator LD 1.1: Land area under effective rangeland management practices and/or supporting climate-smart agriculture	0 ha (*)	15,000 ha	35,000 ha under CSLM	● The diagnostic stage of the pilot farms has been completed. The results have been shared with the producer families and the main critical points for intervention within the system have been jointly identified. ● 4 workshops in the project zones were organized to evaluate the progress of the project, present the results of the diagnostic, considerations on the prevailing climatic situation and alternative mitigation measures. 186 people participated, of which 41% were women. ● 61 plans presenting the redesign of the pilot farms have been finalized. ● 4 athenaeums held for the extension team on characterization and diagnosis of farms.	**S**

<table>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2.1:

Sustainable CSLM has been implemented in degraded/degrading lands</td>
<td>Indicator 1 (CC): Tons of CO2 eq of GHG reduced or avoided directly and indirectly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>379,000 t CO2eq of GHG reduced or avoided directly and indirectly</td>
<td>62 farms have been characterized and main constraints have been identified by extensionists and farmers. The information is documented in 62 diagnosis reports and has been analyzed by the technical support team.

61 farms (one of the farmers could not continue with the project due to personal issues) with a re-design plan agreed between extensionists and farmers and where implementation of GCI practices with a co-innovation approach has started.

61 farms with estimated GHG emissions, and other environmental, social, economic and productive variables quantified.

Pilot farms mapped using GIS tools. Information mapped include land use and sites for the sampling of environmental variables.

Samples of vegetation, manure and soil from 20 pilot farms (implementing co-innovation) and 20 neighboring farms (with no co-innovation) have been sampled and sent to laboratories for analysis.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2.1:

Sustainable CSLM has been implemented in degraded/degrading lands</td>
<td>Pilot farms with increased farm-level incomes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>At least 80% of pilot farms achieve a minimum of 10% increases of farm-level incomes</td>
<td>61 pilot farms with a gender perspective (22 women at the helm) implementing CSLM.
Based on the typology elaborated in the Synthesis Report of the redesign plans, the average net family income (USD / ha) in the baseline (BL) and projected in the re-design according to the typology of farms elaborated in the diagnosis is as follows:
<table>
<tr><td>Group</td><td>Average BL</td><td>Average redesign</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
<td>HS</td>
</tr>
</table>

1	88.9	108.8
2	-50.3	92.4
3	53.1	106
4	65.7	95
5	27.4	81.8

Outcome 2.1: **Sustainable CSLM has been implemented in degraded/degrading lands**	Indicator 4 (CC): Area under low GHG technologies and practices	0		Additional 35,000 ha under low GHG (CSLM) management practices	62 farms covering 36,000 ha have been characterized and main constraints have been identified by extensionists and farmers. The information is documented in 62 diagnosis reports and has been analyzed by the technical support team. 61 farms (one of the farmers could not continue with the project due to personal issues) with a re-design plan agreed between extensionists and farmers and implementation of GCI practices with a co-innovation approach has started. 61 farms with estimated GHG emissions, and other environmental, social, economic and productive variables quantified. Impact of the re-design plans in terms of livestock emissions is currently being calculated. Soil sequestration potential of the practices has been modeled within the framework of Initiative 20 x 20. Initiative 20x20 is a country-led effort seeking to change the dynamics of land degradation in Latin America and the Caribbean by beginning to protect and restore 50 million hectares of forests, farms, pasture, and other landscapes by 2030. This initiative is quantitatively estimating restoration opportunities in Eastern grasslands which is a very useful study and complementary to the project. MGAP leads both projects and PT members coordinate with this other project by participating in their regular technical meetings. Pilot farms mapped using GIS tools. Information mapped include land use and sites for the sampling of environmental variables.	

					Samples of vegetation, manure and soil from 20 pilot farms (implementing co-innovation) and 20 neighboring farms (with no co-innovation) have been sampled and sent to laboratories for analysis.	
Outcome 3.1: **Project implementation based on RBM and lessons learned/good practices documented and disseminated**	M&E system ensuring timely delivery of project benefits and adaptive results-based management	0	Up-to date monitoring on outcomes, outputs and activities	Up-to date monitoring on outcomes, outputs and activities	The monitoring system continues functioning. In the reporting period the following issues stand out: ○ A consolidation of the lessons learned in the implementation of first FAO-INIA LoA was undertaken. ○ As a result of the lessons learned during first LoA, a planning of the second LoA was designed, in a participatory way with the main actors involved. ○ The fifth, sixth and seventh meetings of the PSC were organized. ○ The monitoring, systematization and preparation of a report of the evaluations of the families participating in the 4 annual zonal workshops is carried out. ○ A report documenting the results of an evaluation of the project in the 4 project zones. ○ The PT continues to hold its operational, strategic and adaptive planning meetings.	**S**

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings

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

3. Progress in Generating Project Outputs (Implementation Progress, IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as planned in the Annual Work Plan)

Outputs[12]	Expected completion date [13]	Achievements at each PIR[14]					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments Describe any variance[15] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
Output 1.1.1 A national climate-smart livestock management (CSML) strategy, designed and validated with key stakeholders	Q3 Y3	• 1 meeting was organized with MGAP Implementation Units to present the work-plan and build consensus on component 1.	• 1 meeting with the new MGAP authorities (Minister, Vice-Minister, Director General and Director of UAI), 2 representatives from FAO (Represen				38%	

[12] 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.

[13] As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

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

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

		• Meeting resulted in consensus on the scope of the strategy and explicit commitment from the units to participate in the CSLM strategy design process. • A draft proposal for the development of CSLM strategy has been developed. This proposal outlines the steps in the design of a CSLM strategy	tative ad interim and Officer in Charge) and the PT to present the project and start coordination of actions for the launching of the National CSLM Strategy. • 9 meetings with MGAP authorities in order to publicize the project and commit support in the implementation of the strategy:					

		and takes into account the need for broad participation among key actors in the public, private and academic sectors. The defined steps include: ● Validation of the methodology. ● Review of bibliography and background information. ● Definition of the scope, work plan and monitoring of the participat	● 1 meeting with the Minister and the Vice-minister in order to reaffirm MGAP's commitments in its leadership role in the process of construction of the Strategy. ● 1 meeting with the new Director of Decentralization (currently director of the DGDR) and his advisor. Faced with the change in the designated authority, an additional					

		ory design process. ● Development of a monitoring system for the participatory process. ● The project participated in two meetings of the MGCN monthly meetings. During these meetings, the Project Team (PT) (i) presented the project, and (ii) presented a draft methodology	meeting was held with the new director. ● 1 meeting with the newly appointed focal point of the DGRN and the MGCN ● 1 with the MGAP gender focal point. ● 2 meetings with MGCN. ● 1 meeting with the new DGDR´s director. ● 2 meetings with DGDR to explore new synergies. ● 1 meeting with the new					

		proposal, prepared by the PT, for the participatory design of a low GHG development strategy for the livestock production sector. The MGCN validated the proposal and declared its intention to contribute towards developing the draft methodology proposal as well as actively participate in the developm	Director of UGP. ● 2 meetings with Resilient Family Livestock project in order to: i) coordinate activities; and ii) exchange on knowledge management and lessons learned. ● 1 meeting with focal point of AUCI. ● Within the framework of ExpoPrado, the main exhibition of livestock production in the country, 2					

		ent of the strategy. ● A review of related studies and background information, including studies on the intersection of CSLM and the gender perspective, is in progress. This review will be used to incorporate lessons learned from other countries and sectors in the national strategy.	work sessions were organized: ○ A working group made up of 13 technical experts from 8 institutions (INIA, FAGRO, MGAP, DNCC-MA, CNFR, CAF, IPA, FUCREA) was formed. ○ The second session was intended for					

		● A first call to MGAP units to collaborate and establish a work group to lead the process has been issued.	the main authorities related to the topic (Minister and Vice-minister of MGAP, Minister of Environment, Directors of DGRN, DGDR, OPYPA (MGAP), Director of Climate Change (MA), President of INIA, President of INAC,					

			Representative of FAGRO - UDELAR, of IPA, of CNFR and CAF, Officer in charge of FAO in Uruguay). ○ The objective was to introduce the proposal to prepare a CSL strategy within the framework of the Project					

			and receive initial input and comments from stakeholders. ● The following progress was made on the development of the CSL strategy: ○ A call for Expressions of Interest was issued through the In-Tend platform (UNMG) to invite consu					

			ltancy firms to assist the projec t in devel oping the natio nal CSL Strate gy. ○ To broad en the reach of the call, and increa se numb er of applic ants, the FAOU Y comm unicat ions team collab					

			orated in the dissemination. ○ 3 applications were received and reviewed by the Evaluation Committee composed of 1 representative from MGAP, 1 representative from MA, 2 representat					

			ives from FAO and 1 representative from the PT. ○ The selection process has been finalized. Instituto Plan Agropecuario (IPA) has been selected and a first meeting between the projec					

			t team and IPA was organized.					
Output 1.1.2 A Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA), including a national measuring, reporting and validation (MRV) system for the livestock ruminant sector	Q4 Y4	● Two meetings were held with MVOTMA DCC unit authorities and technicians to initiate discussions on the NAMA and agree on working	● Participation in the GLEAM Workshop: in addition to the participation of two members of the PT, a member of the INIA-FAGRO environmental team was invited to participate in order to strengthen national capacities. ● 2 meetings with a carbon				11%	The delays experienced in product 1.1.1 require a rescheduling of the activities of output 1.1.2 ● **September 2021**: ○ The call and hiring of the International NAMA Specialist and the National Technical expert to support the preparation of the NAMA is scheduled to start on

		modalities. Collaboration has started and guidelines for the design of the NAMA are being developed in collaboration with MVOTMA technicians. ● A review of bibliography related to livest	trading consultant to explore potential sources of financing. ● 1 exchange workshop with the UASYCC on carbon financing. ● 1 meeting with the Vice-minister on climate funding. ● Regular exchange of information with NDC monitoring team on indicators and methodologies.					September 2021. ● **Novembe**r 2021: ○ Meetings between the International Specialist and representatives of MGAP, MA, and the Support Technician are planned. ○ Workshops led by the International Specialist are planned, with the participation of specialized technicians. ● **December 2021**:

		ock NAMAs is in progress. This review will be used to incorporate lessons learned from other countries in the design of the NAMA.						○ A draft of the document will be drawn up ○ Work will begin on the analysis of financing opportunities and mechanisms for accessing financing for the NAMA at the national and international level. This analysis includes: (I) Assessment of the relevance of NAMA options for investment portfolios of

								potential sources of climate finance (public and private); (ii) Assessment of national capacities to engage with climate finance and institutional options for intersectoral collaboration in NAMA development and; (iii) Estimation of financial needs and evaluation of existing sources of financing.

Output 1.2.1 Capacities developed to effectively support the implementation of CSLM with a gender sensitive perspective	Q4 Y4	N/A	● Preparatory meetings were held in which the following agreements were established: ○ 1 Meeting with DGDR on biological control of ticks. ○ Director of UD appointed 2 focal points to collaborate with the proje				0%	The work related to this product is scheduled to begin this year, with the activity "Institutional workshops to align institutional concepts with the CSLM strategy and the NAMA". In **September 2021** the following is planned: ○ Selection of the 6 institutions ○ Information meetings with the heads of the 6 institutions and appointment of the officials who will participate (with

			ct in the dissemination of activities and information related to the project to promote CSLM practices at the territorial level.					○ 20% participation of women). ○ The workshops will be held in 2021.
Output 1.2.2 A training program in place, to supporting the rolling out of improved and climate-smart	Q3 Y4	N/A	● 1 training course on *Biological and technological bases for the analysis and redesign*				47%	

approaches to livestock management			*of livestock systems on natural grasslands* for 35 extensionists was conducted by the UPEP of FAGRO-UDELAR (13 women and 22 men). • The course was run for 50 hours, and 16 teachers participated (INIA researchers, University professors and members of the PT). • 1 training manual for extension					

			technicians was developed.					
Output 2.1.1 Short and medium-term farm level strategies, implemented on project farms with a gender perspective	Q4 Y4	• 1 meeting with NPTTD, INIA-FAGRO to agree on the selection criteria for the pilot farms. • 1 meeting with NPTTD and Regional Coordinators to present the	• The phase of characterization and diagnosis of the farms was completed (a total of 1015 visits to the farms carried out). • A report presenting the results of the diagnoses of the pilot farms, including the 62 individual diagnoses has been developed. • The results of				82%	

		project and agree on modalities for coordination between the project and other projects and institutions at territorial level. ● 1 meeting with Department Directors of UD-MGAP to present the projec	the diagnosis were presented on two occasions, in virtual mode: ○ 1 presentation for producers and producer organizations ○ 1 presentation for MGAP authorities and other interested institutions. ● The redesign stage has been					

		t was organized. During this meeting, coordination procedures were established and focal points at regional level were identified to facilitate operational coordination and communication. ● 3 meeti	completed (61 redesign plans and a synthesis report of the redesign proposals has been developed). ● 6 meetings to prepare the first annual planning and evaluation workshop to be carried out with all the project team and technical teams were organized. ● First annual planning and evaluation					

		ngs were organized to build awareness on the project and to establish joint consensus on the implementation of the project. The meetings were organized with (1) CAF (2) CNFR (3) INC. The outco	workshop involving extensionists, field supervisors, researchers and academic staff and project team carried out (31 participants including 7 members of the PT; 13 members of the INIA-FAGRO team; 9 extensionists and 2 field support technicians) on July 29 and 30, in order to exchange information,					

		me of the meetings includes proposals on criteria for the selection of local farmer organizations, and commitment to facilitate farmers and local farmer organizations participation and	promote knowledge sharing and communication and agree on joint actions in the territory. ● 1 report on the systematization and evaluation of the workshop of all the project teams was developed. ● 9 meetings between the coordinator of the INIA-FAGRO team and the national project coordinator to					

		suppo rt. ● 8 meeti ngs with the board of direct ors of local farme rs' organi zation s in the four AEZ. The purpo se of these meeti ngs was to prese nt the projec t and levera ge their suppo	exchange informatio n, follow-up on the progress of the activities and identify problems and solutions in the implemen tation of the LoA and CSL practices have been undertake n. ● 2 exchange meetings were organized with all the research projects working on issues related to natural grasslands within the MGCN					

		rt as key stakeholders in the territory. The local farmers' organizations committed to promote the project among farmers and provide logistics and infrastructure for project	and Innovagro with the aim of exploring synergies, finding joint actions to strengthen CSLM approaches and favour exchange among researchers. ● 1 training session on the topic of Animal Health was delivered by a researcher from INIA and technicians from DILAVE-MGAP. The training targeted the					

		activities. ● 1 strategy for gender mainstreaming has been designed and presented to different members of the project and the MGAP, and to extension technicians. ● 8 meeti	project extension team and the Resilient Family Livestock project (Euroclima+, CNFR) extensionists. ● 4 athenaeums held for the extension team, 2 on characterization and diagnosis of farms and 2 on the redesign of production systems. ● 5 meetings to prepare 4 workshops in the project zones with the INIA-					

		ngs with farmers (192 participants) in the four AEZ. The objective was to present the project and invite farmers to participate. ● The process to select pilot farms with a gender perspective has	FAGRO teams were held. ● First annual planning and evaluation workshops in the 4 regions carried out and attended by the producers, their families, the technical teams and the project team. 186 participants (41% women). There was also participation of some local technicians and departmental directors					

		been completed. 131 farmers applied to participate as pilot farms. Initial filters such as location in the project zone and other mandatory requirements were applied which resulted in a shortlisting	from MGAP. ● The 4 workshops in the project zones had multiple objectives: ○ build a common vision of the project, as well as shared knowledge between the actors involved. ○ present a summary of the diagnosis of					

		of 94 farms. The resulting 94 farms were visited. During these visits, interviews were held with the farmers in order to establish their motivations in detail and ensure the degree of commitmen	each zone. ○ dialogue about the problems that the current climate situation represents. ○ share experiences, practices, problems, etc. ● In this period, 13 meetings were held between the PT and members of the INIA-FAGRO team.					

		t to the project. 64 farms covering 36,798 ha were selected (women headed 22). ● 9 extensionists have been selected through a competitive selection process. They have started	● A report documenting the outcomes of the workshop and results of the stakeholder evaluation has been prepared. ● The following deliverables were generated in the reporting period: ○ Handbook to train extensionist technicians (deliverable no. 7)					

		working on the implementation of the on-farm activities. ● An initial training for extensionists was organized. This initial phase of training consisted in on-line lectures, practical exercises,	○ Certificates delivered to extensionist (deliverable no. 8) technicians (deliverable no. 8) ○ Reports and evaluations of the workshops (deliverables no. 13 and 14) ○ Reports of the workshops with the objectives,					

		bibliography study, exchange and consultation sessions on: (i) Livestock and grassland management. Production system characterization and analysis. Low-cost practices, how to	contents covered and the evaluations of the participants (deliverable no. 15) ○ Field-day handouts (deliverable no. 16) ○ Evaluations of the participating public (deliverable no. 18) ○ Short videos docu					

		prioritize and case studies; (ii) Co-innovation process, phases and approach with a gender perspective. Farm management team characterization. Discussion sessions to address practical challe	menting field days (deliverable no. 17) ○ Farm redesign plans (deliverable no. 11) ○ Databases containing (i) all the variables collected by remote sensing at mid-term of the project. With the					

		nges on establishing a working relationship with the farmers, mutual trust and commitment and how to manage complex gender situations; (iii) Ecosystem components, functi	description of all the meta data of the database (deliverable no. 21); (ii) sampling and analysis of manure (deliverable no. 22); (iii) soil sampling and analysis (deliverable no. 23); (iv)					

		ons and servic es. Mana ging ecosy stems for food produ ction and other ecosy stem servic es simult aneou sly; (iv) Livest ock and GHG emissi ons. Sourc es and sinks. Benefi ts of the practi ces and	○ vegetation sampling and analysis (deliverable no. 24). ○ Mid-term report analyzing the impacts on land mitigation and restoration indicators with respect to the baseline (deliverable no. 25).					

		mitigation approach. Project environmental monitoring scheme: (v) Information management tools to support co-innovation; (vi) Soft skills: Time management, interview and infor	○ Database containing all socioeconomic and gender variables collected at mid-term of the project. With the description of all the meta data of the database (deliverable no. 26). ○ Baseline					

		mal communication and creative thinking. • 1 protocol was developed for extension technicians on care and hygiene requirements during farm visits. The protocol was devel	with information on each of the farms and their production system, integrating all dimensions (deliverable no. 28).					

		oped to addre ss the sanita ry probl em cause by COVI D-19 and was valida ted by the World Healt h Organ izatio n (WHO - Urugu ay). • 142 farm visits have been under taken by exten						

		sionists to perform the characterization and diagnosis of the pilot farms. These visits will produce the following information: (i) A reconstruction of the economic and productive data for the last 3 years;						

		(ii) Production strategies and objectives of the producers are identified; (iii) Review information on the herd structure and condition, land use planning, grassland management practi						

		ces and forage availability. This will enable the participatory re-design of the production system and the development of plans that incorporate CSLM practices. • Eight documents have been produ						

		ced and will be made available on the project web site currently under construction. The deliverables include: • Report with a description of the 4 project regions, validated farm selection criteri						

		a and results of the informative talks with farmers. ● Format and content of the interview carried out to the preselected farmers. ● Training syllabus for extensionist, including transferred concepts						

		and techniques. ● Work plan for the CSLM implementation on farms. ● Report on the pilot farm selection process documenting the methodology and results (including the list of the 64 farms						

		of the project covering 36,798 ha) and the relevant initial information on selected farms. • Report of the selection process documenting the methodology and the results (including						

		the list of 20 control sites and the relevant initial information in each of them). ● List of selected extensionist technicians. ● Monitoring plan and protocols for all the variables to be						

		meas ured on farms.						
Output 2.1.2 A capacity development program focused on the application of the CSLM technologies and practices	Q4Y4	N/A	• Within the framework of ExpoPrado 2020, a talk on the opportunities to promote livestock farming on natural grasslands was organized by the project. The talk was given by 2 professors of FAGRO-UDELAR (members of the INIA-FAGRO technical team). • 8 meetings				0%	

			with local farmers' organizations (SFR Basalto Ruta 31, SFR Cerro Largo, El Fogón CAL, URFlores, CALAI, SFA Velázquez, SFR Ruta 109, CALIMA) to strengthen linkages and guarantee support to CSLM approach. • 1 meeting with the CNFR board of directors to keep a link on the project and further explore synergies					

			to support the CSLM approach. ● 2 presentations of the results of the diagnosis of pilot farms were made. One of them aimed at producers and grassroots organizations and another aimed at institutional authorities.					
Output 2.1.3 On-farm monitoring system, in place (to monitor GHG	Q3 Y4	● Protocols for on-farm monitoring, sampling and analysis	● Implementation in the pilot farms began in March 2020, at the time				58%	

emissions, adaptation strategies, financing, land degradation and biodiversity)		have been developed. The protocols cover the following dimensions: (i) Productive and economic variables; (ii) Social and gender variables; and (iii) Environmental variables. ● A geo-referenced system of pilot farms is being developed. This system will store all information related to each pilot farm. ● The baseline	of the presentation of this report, the diagnostic phase and the redesign stage of the co-innovation process have been completed. ● A GIS based system in a Shape file was established that includes subdivisions, infrastructure, history of land use, environmental sampling points and neighboring control farms.					

		measurements are being carried out with significant progress.	● Databases established, functioning and shared in the cloud, for monitoring the economic-productive, environmental and social dimensions. ● Modification of the protocols for sampling and analysis of environmental variables. ● The 20 control farms were selected by analyzing the layers in the GIS					

			of the 62 farms which provides information such as location, area, geomorphological region, history of land use, division of paddocks, primary productivity satellite monitoring and CONEAT (indicates production capacity in terms of kg of beef, lamb and wool produced per ha) soil groups of each farm. Focal pixels are selected from					

			representative paddocks, presented to the farmers and extensionists to validate them. A search for pixels matching environmental conditions and primary productivity time series is conducted within neighboring farms to finally select the control farms. ● The baseline measurements are completed for all variables.					

			● Information survey forms are developed ● Development of a satellite image processing application for monitoring forage production and training of extensionists on forage satellite monitoring. ● Water quality measurements surveyed in cutwaters and ravines.					
-Output 3.1.1 A set of manuals and	Q4 Y4	● An online training platfo	The following communication material was developed:				58%	

media products, for use by extension workers and producers, that capture and describe the improved practices, measures and technologies		rm including 11 lectures and 17 technical materials and guides for training extension technicians has been developed. • 11 copies have been distributed to extension technicians and field	○ 1 video describing the diagnostic stage in the co-innovation approach ○ 1 video illustrating the development of the zonal workshops ○ 6 short videos to disseminate activities ○ 1 prese					

		supervisors. • A work plan, storyboard and technical script for the development of audio-visual material has been developed incorporating gender perspective. The material will cover the	ntation of the project at the ExpoPrado event: ○ Opportunities to promote livestock on natural grasslands. ○ 2 presentations of diagnostic results to authorities and producer organizations and					

		following thematic area: (a) Diagnostic process of pilot farms; (b) The co-innovation process; (c) The environmental impact; (d) Farm stories capturing the whole process of change. Projec	territorial technical teams ○ 1 dossier of the project ○ 1 livestock body condition chart inserted in a notebook specially designed for the project and a weather resistant poste					

		t partners as part of their co-financing commitments will produce some of these audio visuals. The material will be useful for replication and scaling up of project results. The material will	r for field use ○ 1 co-innovation brochure					

		be made available on the project website.						
Output 3.1.2 Project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and system, in place	Q4 Y4	• An M&E system has been developed. Tools that assess schedule, progress on activities and deliverables and gender mainstreaming were	• A process for collecting lessons learned from LoA with FAO-INIA was carried out which included: ○ 13 meetings with qualified informants ○ Systematization of information and				59%	

		developed and are used in the weekly project team meetings to monitor progress of project (Outcomes, outputs and activities). The weekly PT planning meetings uses the information	preparation of a report ○ Meeting to present the Lessons Learned report ○ 5 planning preparation meetings (with FAO, and MGAP) ○ 5 planning meetings for the second LoA ● 1 meeting with the Resilient					

		generated from the M&E system to provide feedback on project implementation and progress. ● 4 project steering committee meetings have been organized. ● 1 annual PT meeti	Family Livestock Project to exchange knowledge management and lessons learned ● 1 presentation of a Good Practice report, requested by FAO ● 24 weekly planning meetings of the PT ● 3 meetings with the Project Steering Committee ● 5 strategic meetings of the PT: to analyze project budget and the needs of					

		ng for adaptive planning has been carried out. ● Continuous monitoring of project progress to ensure the alignment of the implementation with the initial plan in the project document, and for	new funding sources, to further discuss the call for consultancy on GCI strategy, to review the scope statement of the LoA, to update the stakeholders' matrix and their roles and to review the calendar of some postponed activities to re-schedule them. ● 1 annual workshop of the PT to evaluate 2020 and to plan					

		management of changes and risks. A grievance mechanism has been put in place (http://www.mgap.gub.uy/institucional/contacto/formulario-de-contacto) ● Multiple communication channels	2021 activities. ● 1 annual workshop for all project teams (INIA-FAGRO team, PT, extensionists and field supervisors) in order to level the information and promote communication.					

		have been established with stakeholders (Phone, WhatsApp Business, E-mail, Contact persons list).						
Output 3.1.3 Knowledge-sharing with other countries and dissemination of verifiable data and tested methodologies	Q4 Y4	N/A	• Participation in the GLEAM workshop • Participation in the FAO Gender Training, in which the gender				33%	

(a): Number of publications			approach implemented by the project was presented. ● A meeting with the Global Research Alliance (GRA) in order to present the project and seek support. ● 2 meetings with Marfrig Global Foods in order to identify synergies.					
Output 3.1.4 Project Mid-term Review	Q4 Y4	N/A	● The mid-term review will be carried out this				25%	

and Final Evaluation			year between the months of July to September. ● 1 meeting with FAO-GEF Unit to review evaluation procedures and requirements. ● Proposal of ToR for MTR consultancy developed and shared with FAO-GEF Unit in Rome.					
Output 3.1.5 A communication strategy, implemented	Q4 Y4	● 1 Communication strategy incorporating	● 1 presentation of the project at the Florida Rural Development Board.				82%	

		gender perspective is under development with significant progress and simultaneous implementation, including: ● Institutional arrangements with 7 partner organizations for communication	● Close coordination is maintained with UCOD, with the communication department of FAO, and with the Communication department of INIA and IPA. ● A member of the INIA-FAGRO team was awarded the Golden Paspalum prize, recognition promoted by the MGCN. The event and prize was widely					

		coordination and enhancement. ● 18 appearances in press (including written press, radio and TV). ● 1 promotional video clip presenting the project and inviting farmers to participate.	disseminated among public media by PT. ● The project has been covered in the following media: ○ 3 radio interviews ○ 5 Articles in the newspaper El Observador ○ 6 news on the MGAP website ○ 4 News on the FAO					

		● The project website is currently under construction. The website will be located in the MGAP portal. ● 4 communication channels are available including (phone, instant	website ○ 4 News on the FAGRO website ○ 1 Article in the Green Magazine ○ 1 Article in the Acontecer Magazine ○ 1 Article in Todo el Campo Magazine ○ 1 Article in					

		messaging, e-mail, institutional social networks). • 2 dissemination articles in national magazines and yearbooks presenting the project, including structure, institutional arrangements,	the newspaper El Telégrafo ○ 1 Article in Radio avisos Magazine ○ 1 Article in La Prensa Magazine ○ 1 Article in the weekly Search ○ 1 Interview on Radio del Sol					

		objectives, expected outcomes and activities.	○ 1 Note in Informative Telenoche ○ 1 Article in the ISOTÉ Newspaper ○ 1 Article in the portal Agencia FPP ○ 1 Article on the portal France 24 ○ Note in the television program Agro 4					

			○ 1 Note in Portal 180 ○ 1 Note in the Radio Show En Perspectiva					

4. Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on Project Implementation

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

Overall execution of the project has been slightly slowed by the change of authorities after the Presidential elections 2020 and the sanitary emergency and the restrictions due to the outbreak of COVID-19. However, there are no significant delays that may affect the attainment of the project targets. Implementation progress reaches 41 % of the outcomes with a budget execution of 41 %.
Main achievements per Component include:

- **Component 1 (progress 22%):**
  - Consolidation of the commitment of the new ministerial authorities and other strategic partners with the project objectives.
  - Selection process for the development of a national CSL strategy finalized.
  - Training course on CSLM practices for extensionists completed.
- **Component 2 (progress 49%):**
  - Training of the extension team and the field supervisors finalized.
  - Progress on 2 phases of co-innovation approach: Characterization and diagnosis of the farms completed; and farm plans designed, discussed and agreed upon between the extensionists and the producers.
  - First annual planning and evaluation workshops in the 4 regions carried out and attended by the producers, their families, the technical teams and the project team.
  - First annual planning and evaluation workshop involving extensionists, field supervisors, researchers and academic staff and project team carried out.
  - Determination of the baseline for production, economic, social and environmental variables (except for soil carbon).
  - Sites for the sampling of environmental variables selected including 20 control farms and 20 pilot farms.
  - Vegetation, soil and manure samples taken and analyzed.
  - A set of technical deliverables documenting the initial piloting process and results completed and publicly accessible.
- **Component 3 (progress 51%):** First LoA FAO-INIA finalized, and lessons learned documented from this process; with these inputs a planning process for a second LoA has been initiated.
  Project visibility: the project has featured regularly in the local and national media (radio, TV and written press) and at international level.
  Monitoring of the project is on track allowing a permanent evaluation of the implementation, collection of lessons-learned, and the realization of adjustments, if needed.

At present, the project is recognized and valued in the agricultural sector and has strengthened linkages with several initiatives and other ongoing projects.

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

Main challenges confronted:

- Building trust between extensionists and producers to ensure the establishment of an environment that allows exchange of expectations and ideas in a horizontal way encouraging a permanent dialogue to understand the main constraints of the system and the commitment to work together to overcome them.
- The execution of the project implies coordination between several institutes, organizations and teams and this represents a challenge in terms of communication, common language and understanding and joint planning.
- As it was pointed out in the previous PIR, the change of government and hence the appointment of new authorities in different areas, implied that the project team had to dedicate additional time to rebuild new linkages, trust and sensitize newly appointed authorities on the project.
- The change of authorities in some of the project's partner institutions implied a strategic redefinition of the budget. Therefore, meetings were held with the partners in order to renegotiate and update the commitments.
- The length of the sanitary emergency also meant an extra challenge in terms of adapting and re-planning activities, and maintenance of a fluid communication with the numerous stakeholders of the project.
- The sanitary emergency drastically affected the work and the communication between farmers' organizations and farmers. That made it difficult to work together with the project, affecting, among other things, the dissemination of information related to the project.
- The planning of the second LoA represented an important challenge since it implies managing the participation of multiple stakeholders and generating consensus in relation to the scope of the work to be developed, deadlines, resources, etc.
- The Director of the project retired and a new Director was appointed by the Minister requiring an adaptation of the PT to the change to guarantee the continuation of the project.
- Extreme climate conditions, some areas of the project experienced a severe drought during last spring and summer affecting grass growth.

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.

	FY2021 Development Objective rating[16]	FY2021 Implementation Progress rating[17]	Comments/reasons[18] justifying the ratings for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	**S**	**S**	During the current reporting period the project faced several challenges, mainly the establishment of new national and local authorities; restrictions on the national budget that affected the co-funding of the project, the restrictions imposed by the outbreak of COVID-19 and extreme climate events in some areas. Despite all these constraints, the progress made on the implementation of activities is satisfactory thus leading to the achievement of the outputs and the outcomes proposed in the original ProDoc. The PT could maintain monitoring and a permanent appraisal of the situation that allowed to re-adjust or re-design activities in search of the achievement of the objectives. It is my understanding that the work done in this period has enabled the consolidation of the project in the livestock sector. The project is now recognized and valued as an important and technically sound contribution to the development and implementation of CSL practices, mitigation of GHG emissions and land restoration. Factors that have contributed to this achievement are: close and continuous communication and coordination with authorities, institutions and strategic partners; consolidation of a technical team of 25 researchers, professors and extensionists with a solid academic and field background working for the field Component and a skilled and highly motivated and committed PT. The overall progress of the project reaches 41 % with a budget execution of 41 %, which is regarded as satisfactory by this time of the project life. The progress made in Component 2 is higher than Component 1 according to the original plan as C2 provides inputs and valuable data for C1. It is expected that all the assets attained in this period will allow the achievement of the established objectives and the contribution to public policies and programmes.
Budget Holder	**HS**	**S**	The project had to face delays due to Government change (national poll) and COVID19 Pandemic. However, the project team was successful to communicate to the new authorities the project aim and workplan, and now have the authorities "on board". Besides this, the project is on track to achieve its end of project targets, and is delivering high quality results, due to the team's ability to adapt to the new situation.
GEF Operational Focal Point	**HS**	**S**	Satisfactory progress has been made in project activities for the three components. Despite the challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic, the objectives set for the evaluation period were achieved. The project is aligned with the National Climate Change Policy and linked to mitigation objectives and adaptation measures included in Uruguay's First Nationally Determined Contribution to the Paris Agreement. The project includes the development of a Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action for livestock (NAMA) with its corresponding Measurement, Reporting, and Verification (MRV) system. In this component, the National

[16] **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

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

[18] Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

			Directorate of Climate Change of the Ministry of the Environment will play a relevant role. In addition, significant synergies with biodiversity and neutral land degradation are implicit.
Lead Technical Officer[19]	**HS**	**S**	The project is rated satisfactory. Despite the delays caused by the COVID 19 Pandemic, the project is on track to achieve its end of project targets. The team has succeeded in not only delivering but also delivering high quality results. This has been a result of the team's ability to adapt easily to the changing situation. An additional aspect worth highlighting is that the project is well anchored in the national and territorial institutional setting and continues to be a high priority of the government, a key indication of ownership and important element for sustainability.
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	**S**	**S**	The project is on track to achieve its outcome and output targets. The Project Team has been able to adapt to the *new normality* caused by the COVID-19 pandemic restrictions. In addition, the Project Team has rapidly built ties with the new authorities, allowing the project implementation phase to keep the pace. It is suggested that the PT share the excellent communication products (subtitled /translated in English) with the FAO GEF Coordination team in Rome for further dissemination at global level. The co-innovation approach has a potential for South-South cooperation both inside the LAC region and with other developing countries. FAO is ready to support these triangular cooperation opportunities.

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

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

This section of the PIR describes the progress made towards complying with the approved ESM plan, when appropriate. 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 add recommendations to improve the implementation of the ESM plan, when needed.

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
ESS 7: Decent Work				
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan **at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate if the initial Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid; if not, what is the new classification and explain**.

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	**Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid[20].** If not, what is the new classification and explain.
L	

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.

6. Risks

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
*The following table summarizes risks identified in the **Project Document** and reflects also **any new risks** identified in the course of project implementation. Please make sure that the table also includes the Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans. The Notes column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, **as relevant**.*

[20] **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.

	Risk	Risk rating	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Extreme events related to climate change and climate variability	M	Selecting sites across the country, in different agro-ecological zones, ensures that a high proportion of farmers can apply and test practices and technologies when an area is affected by extreme events such as drought. The co-innovation approach enables the CSLM strategy to be adapted to climatic conditions and extreme events. CSL practices should buffer the effects. Investments to cope with extreme events as drought conditions can be covered by the DACC-2 project. Twenty control farms will be selected to ensure environmental monitoring will capture the innovation impact despite climate events. Project management will closely monitor the situation and take corrective action if necessary.	● The pilot farm selection process was successful in achieving an equal distribution of farms, per zone. ○ Center: 25% ○ East: 23% ○ Northeast: 23% ○ North: 28% ● MGAP declared an agricultural emergency on 2020/12/9 due to drought in some agro-ecological zones. In this situation, the PT informed the producers about the support provided by the MGAP to the affected farms. In addition, the producers were advised and monitored in terms of CSL practices that help adapt and avoid the impact of drought. ● CSL practices already implemented in the pilot farms helped to cope with the extreme events.	

2	Epidemic in animals in the project area	L	Selecting sites across the country, in different agro-ecological zones, ensures that at least a good proportion of producers can introduce and test practices and technologies, even when an area is affected by an epidemic.
			The only epidemic that could affect the project is FMD. However, the probability of an outbreak occurring is low, given that Uruguay has adequate prevention for this disease (e.g., vaccination, border control). Project management will closely monitor the situation and take corrective action if necessary.
				• The selection process was successful in achieving an equal distribution of farms per zone.
				  ○ Center: 25%
				  ○ East: 23%
				  ○ Northeast: 23%
				  ○ North: 28%
				• Uruguay continues with a mandatory vaccination scheme against the foot and mouth disease (FMD). Animal epidemics have not been reported.	

3	Lack of interest and motivation of producers to participate	Medium/Low	The selection process will ensure that participating producers are genuinely interested and motivated. In addition, the selection process is articulated by local producer associations that will support the implementation of field activities.	The producer selection process ensures a strong degree of commitment from producers to the project. A promotional video had been developed and disseminated. Eight meetings were organized throughout the four agroecological zones, with the support of the producer's organizations. The team of technicians has developed strategies to manage and maintain this commitment. Several communication channels between the producers and the PT (social media, email, cellphone) to keep the farmers motivated have been established. A social technical group was created to monitor and observe social aspects to be aware of difficulties that may arise.	

4	Lack of stakeholder interest in participating in the strategy formulation and validation process for the CSLM and in capacity development activities.	Medium/Low	Most of the potential stakeholders were involved in the preparation phase. Now, support the project approach. The project will be advised by the Livestock Board on the Natural Field (MGCN) in which all the key actors from the public, private, academic, and civil society sectors participate. This will ensure a smooth flow of information and a feedback mechanism with all stakeholders.	● The PT has held several meetings and an open communication channel with the MGCN and other key stakeholders to manage and maintain this commitment. Some of them include: ○ Project presentations ○ Draft methodology proposal (elaborated by the PT) ● A consultant institution with sound knowledge of the livestock sector and their stakeholders have been hired to facilitate the formulation of the strategy and ensure an iterative and participatory process. ● The PT has requested MGAP Minister and Vice-Minister for a meeting and as a result the authorities expressed commitment and support to the whole the process with their convening capacity and leadership.	

5	The carbon sequestered in the soil is uncertain.	Low	Estimates of carbon sequestration in natural grasslands are based on the best information available. In addition, a conservative approach was taken to estimate the carbon balance in the soil. The establishment-level monitoring system will monitor trends in soil and vegetation carbon. In those establishments in which the levels deviate from the goals, the CSLM strategies will be adjusted. However, the degree of certainty is high because the project will eliminate overgrazing, which is the main cause of soil degradation and carbon loss.	• Soil organic carbon samples have been taken, processed and sent to laboratories to be analyzed. • Samples were taken from 20 pilot farms matched with 20 control farms which allows horizontal comparison. • The project is working together with other initiatives, for example, Initiative 20x20 that is modelling and measuring soil organic carbon in farms with different grassland management.	

	Rebound effect: The project is likely to contribute to increasing production volume, due to the profitability of CSLM practices. This brings with it the risk of a potential increase in total GHG emissions, rather than the expected decrease.	Low	The total emissions of the livestock sector can be sent as the production volume multiplied by the average emission per unit of product (Emissions intensity - Ie). In the project area (35,000 ha) a production growth of 53% is estimated due to productivity gains (from 3,100 to 4,800 tons of live weight), while emissions intensity is reduced by 38% emissions gross from livestock, and 71% of evaluations carbon sequestration. This results in a net mitigation effect on livestock production. Therefore, there will be no increase in absolute emissions in the project area. At the national level, it is possible to assume that, because GGCI practices are more profitable than current practices, the project will help accelerate the growth of the national meat sector, resulting in more animals in production. This could generate a rebound effect whereby the reduction in emission intensity is offset by total growth in production. However, this scenario must be compared against a baseline in which the meat sector is likely to grow anyway, driven by national and international demand. Global meat consumption is projected to nearly double between 2005 and 2050. Without the project, growth in the sector would occur at emission intensity levels similar to today. It is, therefore, unlikely that any	• Baseline for GHG emissions calculated (herd structure, animal live weight and feed basket has been characterized in 62 pilot farms). • Sampling protocols for grassland vegetation, manure and soil carbon analysis were designed and sampling sites on the pilot farms including on the 20 control farms were selected. • Information gathered in national research suggests that soil organic carbon sequestration is feasible in grasslands with improved management.	

			possible effect will rebound from increases in absolute emissions greater than in a “no project” scenario.		

	Low technical capacity of experts and institutions at the national and local levels, slowing down the progress of the project	Low	The evaluation carried out during the project preparation phase showed that this risk is low and that there are qualified national experts. In terms of institutional capacity, the risk will be mitigated through the project's capacity building activities.		
	New risks identified				

	Change of government (starting 2020/3/1): Dissolution of the MGCN	Low	Maintain and redirect communications to the institutions that constituted the MGCN to obtain support. Strengthen agreements to secure MGAP support through FAO and GEF support. Report presenting USAYCC and project activities to new authorities.	● Meeting with new ministerial authorities of the MGAP (Minister, Vice-minister, general Director and Director of the International Affairs Unit) was organized. The Representative and the Officer in charge of the FAO Representation in Uruguay participated together with the project coordination team. ● Meeting with a new focal point of the DGRN and the MGCN. ● Two coordination meetings with members of the MGCN. ● During the ExpoPrado, the main exhibition of livestock production in the country, a technical working group was organized to exchange ideas and define components of GCI's national strategy. Technicians from INIA, Faculty of Agronomy, IPA participate in it., CAF, CNFR, FUCREA, MGAP (OPYPA y DGRN), MA (DNCC). ● The results of the working group were presented to the authorities. Participants: Minister, Under Secretary, Director de DGRN, Director de DGDR, Director of OPYPA-MGAP; Minister and Director of DNCC-MA; delegate of dean of FAGRO; President of INAC; delegate of CAF.	
	Change of government (starting 2020/3/1): Difficulties in generating agreements between National Government and Project	Low	Strengthen agreements to secure MGAP support through FAO and GEF support. Report presenting UASYCC and project activities to new authorities.		

	Change of government (starting 2020/3/1): Difficulties in coordinating between MGAP-Executing Units and Project	Low	Strengthen agreements to secure MGAP support through FAO and GEF support. Report presenting UASYCC and project activities to new authorities.	● Meeting with the new Director of UD-MGAP to strengthen linkages and promote synergies. 2 members of the staff are designated to cooperate with the project in the territories. ● 4 meetings with the new Director of DGDR-MGAP and members of the staff to explore synergies and ways of cooperation.	
	Change of government (starting 2020/3/1): Lack of support at the territory level	Low	Strengthen links with producer organizations.	● The communication strategy of the project foresees permanent communication mechanisms with producer organizations in order to maintain and strengthen ties with the project. ● The PT visited eight farmers' organizations to exchange ideas; share needs, update on the situation, and receive feedback about progress and impact of the project. ● Regular contact of the PT with farmers' organizations is maintained. ● Activities with producers in the 4 zones are performed to keep the interest and commitment: workshops or virtual presentations.	

	Change of government (starting 2020/3/1): Lack of collaboration by MGAP technicians in the territory	Low	Strengthen links with producer organizations	The communication strategy of the project foresees permanent communication mechanisms with MGAP technicians in order to maintain and strengthen ties with the project Meeting with the new Director of the UD-MGAP and the new Director of DGDR-MGAP who work with technical staff in the areas where the project is being implemented.	
	Change of government (starting 2020/3/1): Lack of investment at farm level	Medium	Exploit new forms of financing Generate new financing requests	The PT is exploring alternative funds. .	
	Change of government (starting 2020/3/1): New authorities carried out a budget reduction across government programmes resulting in a reduction of the funding for DACC 2 .	Medium	Use other ways of financing Generate new financing requests	The PT is exploring alternative funds. A possibility of agreement with DGDR may allow access to new funds.	
	COVID-19: possibility for the MGCN to suspend the meetings. Eventually it will generate an overload of the work schedule and therefore the difficulty to interact with the project	Medium	Communication will be made in advance to gain access to the agenda. Virtual workshops-INIA conference rooms (smaller workshops, it takes longer)	Meetings were rescheduled in virtual form. PT was invited to participate in the regular MGCN meetings allowing close monitoring of the situation.	

	COVID-19: the suspension of lessons by FAGRO. This would delay technician training.	High	The following alternatives will be used: FAGRO online platform Skype EVA-UDELAR Zoom WebEx	. N/A	
	COVID-19: technicians will have difficulty visiting certain producers (producers with co-morbidities, etc.) This generates a delay in data collection for BL (pilot farms) Delay in the selection of the 20 control sites	Medium	Telephone communication to collect BL information. On the other hand, the PT and FAGRO developed a protocol to mitigate contagion risks between technicians and producers. INIA could get masks and other supplies for producers.	● A protocol was prepared for extension technicians ● Safety equipment and protective products were provided by INIA. ● Transport adjustments were made to consider sanitary requirements.	
	COVID-19: producer organizations cannot collaborate in open field days	Medium	While the sessions are postponed, documents are disseminated for the work on the premises and collaboration is requested from the producer's organizations.	These activities are currently postponed. Virtual activities are planned instead.	
	COVID-19: CNFR cannot start executing the Euroclima project, and this affects the spill in the 400,000 ha	Low	Sharing our tools and strategies with Euroclima project.	N/A	

	COVID-19: Risk of lower participation of women due to increased domestic work and care.	Medium	Raise awareness of the field extension technicians about this situation so that they maintain special attention on the absence of the women in the participatory technical instances, as part of the initial diagnosis.	• This topic was included in the gender training for extensionist technicians. • Contacts with the Gender Specialized Commission of the MGAP were established for the eventual resolution of cases of gender-based violence.	

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

FY2020 rating	FY2021 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
L	L	

7. Adjustments to Project Strategy – Only for projects that had the Mid-term review (or supervision mission)

If the project had a MTR review or a supervision mission, please report on how the MTR recommendations were implemented as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented
Recommendation 1:	
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation 4:	

Adjustments to the project strategy.
Pleases note that changes to outputs, baselines, indicators or targets cannot be made without official approval from PSC and PTF members, including the FLO. These changes will follow the recommendations of the MTR or the supervision mission.

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

Project Indicators/Targets		

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, mid-term review, final evaluation 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	Original NTE: 14-Feb-2023 Revised NTE: 4-May-2023 Justification: The current situation with COVID-19 (Extension under extraordinary circumstance)

8. 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)

If your project had a stakeholder engagement plan, specify whether any new stakeholders have been identified/engaged:

The project continues to work with all the stakeholders identified and listed in the previous PIR. In the following table, new stakeholders and specific progress made with some of them are listed.

Stakeholders	Category	Actual role and engagement mechanism
DGDR-MGAP	Public sector	Although the DGDR, was one of the stakeholders since the beginning of the project, the change of Director allowed a clear strengthening and the identification of new synergies with the project. Several meetings have taken place and new areas to work jointly are being identified: ● Training of technical staff on CSLM at national level. ● Training of farmers in biological control of Asian blue tick (*Rhipicephalus (Boophilus) microplus).* ● Collaboration in the promotion of CSLM. ● Collaboration in the replication of CSLM practices in 400,000 ha. ● Facilitation to access local governments to explore opportunities for joint work regarding CSLM practices.
DGRN-MGAP	Public sector	As a result of the change of authorities, a new focal point for the project was appointed, allowing: ● Closer collaboration and facilitation of exchange of information with other projects working with rangelands. ● Invitation to collaborate with the recently launched Observatorio de campo natural (Observatory of rangelands) with data generated in the project. ● Cooperation to disseminate regular messages about rangelands and good management practices, including joint Twitter campaign under the hashtag #ViernesDeCampoNatural
UD-MGAP	Public sector	Although the UD was one of the stakeholders since the beginning of the project, the change of Director allowed more collaboration and the identification of new possibilities for joint work. ● The new Director assigned 2 members of his staff to cooperate with the project. ● Updated information has been shared with the project.
INIA	Public-private institution	● Improved relationship with staff in charge of communication allowing support in dissemination of

		activities of the project and preparation of communication materials. ● Project cooperates in the spread of INIA technical survey among project farmers.
IPA	Public-private institution	● Exchange with new IPA project (FPTA INIA-IPA Gestión del pasto). ● Agreement on the participation of project farmers and extensionists in courses given by IPA to promote permanent training. ● Sponsor of IPA activities related to cattle and good practices by the project. ● Collaboration in the development of audiovisual materials.
MGCN	Advisory Board	● Project was invited to participate as a member in the regular monthly meetings. ● A specific space for projects regarding cattle and rangelands was launched in the regular meetings promoting exchange of experiences. ● Project was invited to share data in the Rangelands Observatory.
FUCREA	Private sector	● Participation in the working group gathered at the Expo Prado to analyze the national CSLM strategy.
CNFR-Project GFR	Private sector	CNFR is implementing the CSLM project Ganadería Familiar Resiliente (GFR) with 52 farms and 6 farmers organizations in 2 regions. ● Exchange of experiences in systematization and social results. Possibility of further joint research of the 2 projects in this area. ● Capacity building: extensionists of project GFR trained in the course implemented by the UPEP-UDELAR. ● PT advised the GFR project on possibilities of environmental appraisal of the farms. ● Joint participation of PT and members of CNFR staff in meetings with first degree organizations members of CNFR.
New stakeholders		
CURE-UDELAR	Academic institution	● Researchers of this University Centre are participating in the environment evaluation of Component 2 (water quality).
Students from UDELAR	Academic institution	● Undergraduate students: field trips to project farms, interviews with members of PT as part of their course syllabus. ● Postgraduate students: MSc and PhD thesis done using project farms and data.
Vaquería del Este	Private sector	Group of cattle producers located in the East of Uruguay with a long record in improving beef production and beef quality over rangeland and product differentiation. The aim of the association is to support production and commercialization of beef cattle among their partners to improve the economic results of their businesses with an overall concern about care

		of natural resources. The association represents 25 enterprises which work in 31 cattle farms comprising 80,000 ha. ● 1 meeting realized to explore ways of cooperation to assess environmental performance of the group.

The PT placed emphasis on maintaining the linkages and a regular communication with the 11 farmers' organizations involved in the project during the sanitary emergency. 8 of them were visited on site when the sanitary protocols allowed and the 11 were contacted again by phone when the restrictions imposed were tightened.

If a stakeholder engagement plan was not requested for your project at CEO endorsement stage, please

- list all stakeholders engaged in the project
- please indicate if the project works with Civil Society Organizations and/or NGOs
- briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.

Please also indicate if the private sector has been involved in your project and provide the nature of the private sector actors, their role in the project and the way they were involved

9. Gender Mainstreaming

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

Was a gender analysis undertaken or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages? Please briefly indicate the gender differences here.
Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data? How is the project tracking gender results and impacts?

The project developed a gender mainstreaming strategy in the initial stages of project implementation. This strategy takes into consideration national and international commitments and normative frameworks on gender equality. The strategy includes an analysis of the gender situation in rural areas and in the livestock sector, based on a review of recent studies on this topic. The strategy describes the identified gender gaps, how the project will address the gaps, and proposes indicators to track gender results and impacts. Based on the strategy developed and taking into consideration the gaps identified, during the period of this report, the project has carried out the following actions:

- 35 extensionists were trained on gender perspective in co-innovation processes in the framework of the course for extensionists accredited by the Postgraduate and Permanent Education unit of the Faculty of Agronomy.

- Participation in the FAO regional training “Gender mainstreaming in large-scale projects” to present the project, exchange of experiences, good practices and lessons learned about the incorporation of the gender perspective in the project. The project coordinator and the gender specialist shared the experience, the main challenges, lessons learned and made recommendations.

- 1 WhatsApp group composed of rural women who participate in the project was created in order to promote women´s exchange, share information or calls for women, as well as women´s empowerment courses.

- 1 FAO video for the International Women's Day was created with the participation of a rural women who participate in the project, this video was made for the UN campaign "rural women, women with rights".

- 1 video to honor women farmers who participate in the project was broadcast within the framework of the International Day of Rural Women.

In consultation with the women farmers, their difficulties in participating in the regional workshops were analyzed. Based on this, solutions and alternatives were proposed to overcome these difficulties and promote greater women`s participation. As an example:

Women were consulted on the most convenient days and times to hold the workshop according to their activities.

Children's corners were created so the whole family could participate and the children had a recreation space while the parents participated in the workshop activities.

In some cases, women were encouraged to attend the workshop with a known person with the intention of promoting their participation.

- In the ToR for consultancy for the design and development of a climate-smart livestock strategy, the incorporation of a gender perspective will be throughout the work process, as well as in its products.

- The project team maintains contact with the gender specialist of the Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries in order to articulate the actions of the project with the gender guidelines of the Ministry: 3 meetings were held to exchange information about the National Gender Plan in Agricultural Policies, to align guidelines with the gender group in SNRCC and to inform and share data about the gender approach and equity activities in the project.

- In both oral and written communications, special attention was paid to show men and women`s stories, experiences, and opinions equitably. Inclusive language was used in all communications.

The M&E system has gender-disaggregated data for tracking gender results and impacts. In that way, indicators for tracking of gender results and impacts were defined and the gender approach and its indicators were incorporated into the data collection protocols.

During the period of this report, the following actions have been carried out:

- Pilot farms characterization and diagnosis was carried out. In this process, in addition to economic-productive and environmental data, social and gender data from 59 farms were collected according to established protocols. At this stage, the baseline was determined that made it possible to report the impacts at the end of the project. Some of social and gender dimension conclusions were:

- 29% of the pilot farms are led by women, and 64% have relevance of women's participation in decision-making and productive activities. The level of women's participation in the management of the pilot farms is one of the characteristics that distinguishes the project from the general situation of national livestock, since it was a specific criterion for the selection of pilot farms.

- Farms with leadership or significant women´s participation in decision-making and in productive activities show better productive and economic results than farms led by men and without women`s participation, but these differences were not statistically significant.

- 1 article published by a national newspaper "El Observador" which highlights these conclusions.

- 4 annual evaluation regional workshops in which 186 people participated, with a 41% participation of women. Of the total women, 53% are under 50 years of age.

- 4 systematization reports of the regional workshops with data and analysis of the evaluations of the participants disaggregated by sex.

- 3 meetings to strengthen the social team and to adjust the protocols and plans for measuring the social variables.

Does the project staff have gender expertise?

The project hired a gender specialist in the initial stages of project implementation for 10 months. After the end of the contract, the project team maintains contact with the gender specialist, who has voluntarily participated in some activities:

- Training course for 35 extensionists, in charge of module on incorporating the gender perspective in co-innovation processes.

- FAO regional training on “Gender mainstreaming in large-scale projects”.

In addition, the technical team has been trained on gender aspects and all project staff have been instructed on the gender mainstreaming strategy.

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

- **closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources.**
- **improving women’s participation and decision making; and or**
- **generating socio-economic benefits or services for women**

The project is expected to contribute to gender equality, generating benefits for women by promoting their participation in instances of technical advice and in all the activities that the project has planned, placing them in leadership and leading roles to increase their autonomy and improve their participation in decision-making.

10. Knowledge Management Activities

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

- **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 mentioned in the previous PIR, the project has a knowledge management strategy, which is based on good practices from Project Management Institute (PMI) project management. Starting from the basis of recognizing two types of knowledge, the explicit and the tacit, we seek to use appropriate tools to capture, evaluate and share this knowledge.
For example, interviews with producers in audiovisual format, in order to capture both speech and body gestures, social and environmental environment, etc.
The main sources of knowledge include:

- Learned lessons
- Experiences of producers
- Scientific material
- Experiences and opinions of stakeholders involved

Last year, once the sanitary situation permitted, workshops were held with producers following strict protocols developed by the project. This allowed farmers to get to know each other and the team, the exchange of experiences, the presentation of diagnosis results and training to face up to the adverse weather conditions forecasted.

Each year, the PT visits the producers' organizations in order to interact with and obtain feedback on the project, exchange ideas and to find new ways of collaborating.

Every year, the PT holds meetings with the counterpart partners in order to monitoring their collaborations and discuss possible changes according to the actual situation.

Collection of lessons learned from the LoA between FAO-INIA was performed. The process started in 2020 and included:

- 13 meetings with qualified informants from FAO, INIA, FAGRO, and MGAP.
- Systematization and analysis of the information.
- 1 meeting to present the conclusions of the process to the main stakeholders.
- A proposal to start the planning of the second LoA ensuring commitment of the main stakeholders.

The planning of the second LoA is carried out based on a collaborative process, with main stakeholders. That includes three phases:

- Strategic planning (to define the main goals, products and deliverables)
- Detailed planning (to define deadlines, resources, and budgets)
- Review and definition of the schedule and final budget

This activity was recorded as a good practice to be shared on the FAO web site.

- **Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.**

A communications strategy has been developed. This strategy contains a description of the project dissemination strategy and the tools identified to effectively support the communication of the project progress and results to a wide community of citizens, decision-makers, the livestock sector, and academia.

Dissemination: A variety of communication tools are being used to distribute knowledge and increase awareness about the project and CSLM practices. These include publishing of written media stories and sharing on social platforms, websites, etc., e.g., publication of articles in international press (*AFP*, *ISOTÉ*, *SWI*, *France 24*) and national press (*El Observador*, *Portal 180*, *El País*). As previously reported, the project has also established monthly communications with project partners to update on project progress and developed weekly customized messages for participating producers featuring news and key messages. These channels also act as a feedback mechanism for the project.

Since 2021, communication began to include the international community through press releases.

Communication Successes and Challenges:

Despite the challenges caused by the COVID 19 Pandemic, the project has successfully re-adjusted its communication by adopting and strengthening the use of virtual communication tools.

Highlights include:

- Virtual presentation of the technical proposal of the project by 2 University professors carried out during the main livestock exhibition in the country, Expo Prado. Although few people were allowed inside the room due to sanitary restrictions, it was broadcasted in streaming.
- Virtual press conference for general public, authorities and press to share the results of the characterization and diagnosis of the 62 pilot farms. In addition, a virtual presentation was given for producers' organizations and technical staff.
- Video describing the diagnosis phase of the co-innovation approach.
- Maintenance of the weekly communication of the PT with the farmers with news or key messages. This communication mechanism has also allowed the PT to receive feedback from producers.
- Successful maintenance of internal communication within PT, the technical team that implements Component 2 and the extensionists who work directly with farmers. Besides the virtual meetings, there is an exchange of information using WhatsApp and mail groups between the teams at least twice a week.
- 4 virtual athenaeums were executed. The athenaeums are conducted by researchers and specialists with the aim of capacity building and offer support to field extensionists. A specific topic is selected and best solutions and alternatives are discussed allowing a thorough understanding of it.

- The former Project Director retired and a new Director took up the position. To communicate this news during the pandemic in a friendly manner, the former Director recorded a farewell message and the incoming Director recorded a self-presentation video. This message was sent to the farmers who answered with welcoming messages and greetings, they even invited both to an "asado" (barbecue).

Face-to-face meetings:

- When sanitary restrictions allowed face-to-face activities, a two-day workshop with the whole project team (PT, extensionists and field supervisors, INIA researchers and University staff) was executed with the aim of strengthening bonds among the different actors who work for the project, to update and level information among all the actors and discuss ways of improving the implementation of the project. (link)
- To support field extensionists and improve technical capacities, 3 field training days were implemented. These activities allow intensive exchange and training under actual field conditions and were very well evaluated by extensionists not only for the knowledge acquired considered basic for their work but also as contributing to their self-esteem.
- 4 regional workshops with farmers and technicians with a total of 186 participants (41% women and 53% under 50 years) implemented. The aim was to share and discuss the results of characterization and diagnosis of the farms in the different zones, to promote knowledge among project participants, discuss the actual situation and climate events forecasted and a general appraisal of the implementation of the project. These activities were well evaluated as enriching experiences by farmers as well as technicians.
- 8 visits of the PT to farmers' organizations to exchange ideas, share needs and update of the situation and receive feedback about progress and impact of the project. When the sanitary restrictions did not allow face-to-face visits, the PT phoned the 11 organizations to maintain the relationship.
- During the main national livestock exhibition, the Expo Prado, the National CSL Strategy was launched with authorities and special guests and it was broadcasted for the press. This activity had the aim of compromising the different institutions to participate and commit in the process of designing the Strategy under the leadership of MGAP. Before the conference, a working group of specialists, researchers and representatives of farmers' organizations gathered to discuss and analyze key aspects of the Strategy.
- The project targets decision makers and technical staff of public and private institutions, so there is permanent contact with the different stakeholders ensuring they are regularly updated (once a month via email or WhatsApp) about the achievements of the project (MGAP, MA, farmers´ organizations, INIA, FAGRO, PSC, IPA).

Knowledge sharing with other countries:

- Presentation of the gender approach of the project at the FAO Gender Training, "Gender mainstreaming in large-scale projects".
- Participation on the program "Diálogos" of the Noticiero Científico y Cultural Iberoamericano.
- Presentation of the co-innovation approach on the II Jornada de Capacitación FAO - FCA - OIRSA - ANAGAN.

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. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.

During this period, life histories from female and male farmers have been collected. Seven families were filmed showing diversity of situations. In these interviews, they were asked about their expectations as project participants, their relationship with the extensionist and their goals about the project.
These interviews will be complemented with more filming at the end of the project to show their life histories, their active participation in the project and to compare initial expectations with final results.

One of the families was interviewed by AFP press agency where they spoke about their participation in the project, their expectations and how the project contributed to improve their farm and another female producer was also interviewed for the national written press.

One of the families was interviewed by El Observador, a national newspaper, where they talked about their life and their participation in the project. This interviewed was made to a female producer, who is a single mother and she life with her son on the farm.

During workshops with farmers, a video was recorded where they shared their experience in the project and in the workshops.

Please provide links to publications, leaflets, video materials, related website, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.

- Web page of the project located in the MGAP website
- Dossier describing to project for a general public
- Leaflet describing co-innovation process with the aim of disseminating this methodology for a general public.
- Documents published with results of the co-innovation process (technical deliverables).
- News published on the website of MGAP
- Articles published on Press

El observador	https://www.elobservador.com.uy/nota/vacas-gordas-y-emisiones-flacas-2020814211227
Radio del sol	¿Qué sabemos del cambio climático y ganaderia en Uruguay?
Telenoche	Políticos reaccionaron a dichos de Bill Gates
France 24	https://www.france24.com/es/minuto-a-minuto/20210324-uruguay-el-pa%C3%ADs-de-las-cuatro-vacas-por-persona-busca-una-ganader%C3%ADa-m%C3%A1s-verde
SWI	https://www.swissinfo.ch/spa/uruguay--el-pa%C3%ADs-de-las-cuatro-vacas-por-persona--busca-una-ganader%C3%ADa-m%C3%A1s-verde/46476072#:~:text=En%20Uruguay%2C%20un%20pa%C3%ADs%20pr%C3%A1cticamente,explica%20el%2062%25%20del%20total
El observador	https://www.elobservador.com.uy/nota/el-proyecto-ganaderia-y-clima-busca-reducir-las-emisiones-de-gases-de-efecto-invernadero-202132417143
ISOTÉ	https://istoe.com.br/uruguai-o-pais-das-quatro-vacas-por-pessoa-busca-uma-pecuaria-mais-verde/
Agencia AFP	https://www.clarin.com/agencias/afp-uruguay-pais-vacas-persona-busca-ganaderia-verde_0_cugXp1Z1e.html
Radio Sarandí del Yí	
Informativo del canal 3	https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1S90Uc4Zzm32rd1EpGA5mz8OQBxEndFwT
Radio CX33	
Radio Durazno	
Sur FM	
a+V	InforAgro TV
Canal 8 Trinidad	InforAgro TV
Charrúa TV	https://tv.vera.com.uy/canal/6038

El observador	https://www.elobservador.com.uy/nota/mayor-tendencia-a-la-innovacion-si-hay-mujeres-en-los-sistemas-ganaderos--20214255058/amp?__twitter_impression=true
Agro4	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sGNxYa4GmUo
FAO	http://www.fao.org/uruguay/fao-en-uruguay/es/
FAO	http://www.fao.org/uruguay/fao-en-uruguay/es/
Busqueda	https://www.busqueda.com.uy/sites/default/files/styles/content_full/public/field/image/_mg_7840.jpg?itok=UI1B9Cyy
MGAP web	https://www.mgap.gub.uy/sites/default/files/multimedia/folleto_informativo_proyecto_ganaderia_y_clima.pdf
El Observador	https://www.elobservador.com.uy/nota/-una-estrategia-interesante-para-uruguay-es-la-implementacion-de-la-ganaderia-climaticamente-inteligente
MGAP web	www.cotryba.gub.uy/unidad-organizativa/direccion-general-de-secretaria/actividad/05-11-2019/presentacion-del-proyecto
Radio Florida	https://unfao-my.sharepoint.com/personal/maria_bergos_fao_org/_layouts/15/onedrive.aspx?id=%2Fpersonal%2Fmaria%5Fbergos%5Ffao%5Forg%2FDocuments%2FAllegati%2F20191130%2DB02%2DDESIEMBRA%2Emp3&parent=%2Fpersonal%2Fmaria%5Fbergos%5Ffao%5Forg%2FDocuments%2FAllegati&originalPath=aHR0cHM6Ly91bmZhby1teS5zaGFyZXBvaW50LmNvbS86dTovZy9wZXJzb25hbC9tYXJpYV9iZXJnb3NfZmFvX29yZy9FWDRGMmxZMEl5Uk1yZGs1SDNQRlhsb0JDb1FlUzhWbkR2THJsWE9UaVBRX3BRP3J0aW1lPXZObGpiUUktMkVn https://unfao-my.sharepoint.com/personal/maria_bergos_fao_org/_layouts/15/onedrive.aspx?id=%2Fpersonal%2Fmaria%5Fbergos%5Ffao%5Forg%2FDocuments%2FAllegati%2F20191130%2DB03%2DDESIEMBRA%2Emp3&parent=%2Fpersonal%2Fmaria%5Fbergos%5Ffao%5Forg%2FDocuments%2FAllegati&originalPath=aHR0cHM6Ly91bmZhby1teS5zaGFyZXBvaW50LmNvbS86dTovZy9wZXJzb25hbC9tYXJpYV9iZXJnb3NfZmFvX29yZy9FVFhkSjZLNEZrcEh0OFRlY1NrU3dCa0JhVm1ZU3h4cC0yN09FWm5aMG9UaGlBP3J0aW1lPXYxZ3M2UUktMkVn

Does the project have a communication and/or knowledge management focal point? If yes, please provide their names and email addresses

- The project has a communication and knowledge management focal point.
- **Communication focal point**: Cecilia Márquez, Cecilia.Marquez@fao.org
- **Knowledge management focal point:** Valentín Balderrín, Valentin.Balderrin@fao.org
- **Mail:** ganaderiayclima@mgap.gub.uy
- **WhatsApp business**: 092898213

11. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.
If applies, please describe the process and current status of on-going/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities Do indigenous peoples have an active participation in the project activities? How? N/A

12. Innovative Approaches

Please provide a brief description of an innovative[21] approach in the project / programme, describe the type (e.g. technological, financial, institutional, policy, business model) and explain why it stands out as an innovation.
The project incorporates a systemic approach to the promotion of improvements emphasizing social, economic, and environmental co-benefits and synergy opportunities. This has enabled the reflection of stakeholders (farmers, extensionists, leaders, government staff) about the challenges the sector faces. It has also resulted in horizontal exchange between stakeholders generating new ideas and innovations in various aspects. For example, farmers' interest in manure sampling and analysis, and their dialogue with researchers and field technicians, has prompted the development of manure sampling kits that are used by the farmers and sent to laboratories to monitor diet quality and calibrate indirect and quick ways of analysis. The communication strategy of the project has been designed and it is implemented with an intensive and constant exchange with all stakeholders engaged in the implementation. Several communication channels between farmers and the project team (social media, email, cellphone) to keep the farmers motivated and updated on the ongoing activities. The communication via these channels has focused on maintaining a sense of ownership and belonging, which has greatly improved working relationships with diverse actors. The technological approach adopted in the extension work prioritizes knowledge and process management before inputs or consumables solutions. This vision ensures the farmers learn to better manage their resources, plan and improve efficiency and avoid getting into a dead end by adopting costly and input-dependent management pathways. As an example, it is much more beneficial for a farmer to get to know grass physiology and to manage it, than start using fertilizer or sowed species to improve grassland productivity. The latter without the first one will make little production impact while increasing costs and perhaps resulting in irreversible damage to the ecosystem.

[21] Innovation is defined as *doing something new or different in a specific context that adds value*

13. Possible impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the project

Please indicate any implication of the Covid-19 pandemic on the activities and progress of the project. Highlight the adaptative measures taken to continue with the project implementation.

The project has been affected by the pandemic in various ways.

- Extensionists had to cancel visits to farms for some periods during 2020 and, in particular cases in 2021, special care was taken when dealing with the elderly or farmers with co-morbidities.
- The training for extensionists had to be reduced, divided in two and most of it, transformed into a virtual training. With the obvious consequences of implementing a very practical and field-based training in a virtual manner.
- Evaluation and farmers workshops had to be postponed.
- Field days had to be postponed and redesigned to be held virtually.
- Environmental sampling trips were affected by restrictions in the use of shared vehicles and travel time.
- Environmental laboratories were closed or with reduced personnel during significant periods, delaying sample processing and analysis.
-

Adaptive measures taken:

- A protocol was prepared for field work. Protective clothes were provided to field extensionists.
- Coordination with local sanitary authorities to evaluate the risk of carrying out workshops and adaptation to local requirements during their execution.
- Supply of face masks and alcohol as well as temperature control and special measures regarding food and beverage during workshops.
- Extra cars had to be hired to comply with sanitary requirements to transport field environmental teams during sampling periods.
- Re-design of field days to a virtual presentation with audiovisual materials.
- Regular monitoring of the situation has facilitated decision-making to redirect actions properly.
- Monitoring and planning were adapted and updated.

In this scenario, outcomes and outputs achievement are not at risk but quantitative targets could be affected. The timing of MTR is not expected to be affected but a delay of the final closing of the project is foreseen in order to complete the project activities and monitor some indicators.
The COVID-19 emergency is putting extra pressure on the national economy, society and the project team and is limiting group and open activities and exchange between stakeholders. Farmers' daily life, quality of life, health, production and income are not being heavily affected in general but there is widespread tension and uncertainty. Risk mitigation plans are being incorporated in the planning of every future activity while alternative ways of implementation are being designed to attenuate limitations and delays.

14. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing[22]	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2021	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National Government	MGAP	Grant	8,950,000	10,051,406		8,950,000
National Government	MGAP	In-Kind	2,660,000			2,660,000
Other (Public/Private)	INIA	In-Kind	796,000	394,889		796,000
Multi-lateral Agency	FAO	Grant	360,002	0		360,002
Multi-lateral Agency	FAO	In-Kind	100,000	54,000		100,000
National Government	MA	In-Kind	178,250	11,925		178,250
Other (Public University)	FAGRO	In-Kind	670,000	194,339		670,000
Multi-lateral Agency	CCAC	Grant	100,000	100,000		100,000
Private sector	CNFR	In-Kind	49,315	44,752		49,315
Other (Public/Private)	IPA	In-Kind	378,000	29,235		378,000

[22] 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.

		TOTAL	**14,241,567**	**10,880,546**		**14,241,567**

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

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.