



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

### 2022 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

### Table of contents

1. Basic Project Data	2
2. Progress towards Achieving Project Objective(s) (Development Objective)	7
3. Implementation Progress (IP)	16
4. Summary on Progress and Ratings	29
5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)	34
6. Risks	36
7. Follow-up on Mid-term review or supervision mission (only for projects that have conducted an MTR)	59
8. Minor project amendments	60
9. Stakeholders' Engagement	62
10. Gender Mainstreaming	65
11. Knowledge Management Activities	67
12. Co-Financing Table	72

## 1. Basic Project Data

### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	Latin America and the Caribbean																																			
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Uruguay																																			
<b>Project Title:</b>	Climate-smart livestock production and land restoration in the Uruguayan rangelands																																			
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP/URU/034/GFF																																			
<b>GEF ID:</b>	9153																																			
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Climate Change Mitigation (CCM-2, Program 4) Land Degradation (LD-1, Program 2)																																			
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (MGAP)																																			
<b>Project Duration (years):</b>	4																																			
<b>Project coordinates:</b>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>S.F.R. Colonia José Artigas</td> <td>-30.601233</td> <td>-57.040717</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gauviyú de Arapey</td> <td>-31.03436</td> <td>-56.63419</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Carumbé</td> <td>-31.52306</td> <td>-56.60372</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Melo</td> <td>-32.37028</td> <td>-54.1675</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sarandí del Yí</td> <td>-33.35</td> <td>-55.63333</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Trinidad</td> <td>-33.5165</td> <td>-56.89957</td> </tr> <tr> <td>S.F.R. Sauce y Molles de Timote "A. Gallinal Heber"</td> <td>-33.54775</td> <td>-55.89088</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Aiguá</td> <td>-34.20498</td> <td>-54.75665</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rocha</td> <td>-34.48333</td> <td>-54.33333</td> </tr> <tr> <td>San Carlos</td> <td>-34.797</td> <td>-54.92698</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Velázquez</td> <td>-34.03631</td> <td>-54.28054</td> </tr> </table>			S.F.R. Colonia José Artigas	-30.601233	-57.040717	Gauviyú de Arapey	-31.03436	-56.63419	Carumbé	-31.52306	-56.60372	Melo	-32.37028	-54.1675	Sarandí del Yí	-33.35	-55.63333	Trinidad	-33.5165	-56.89957	S.F.R. Sauce y Molles de Timote "A. Gallinal Heber"	-33.54775	-55.89088	Aiguá	-34.20498	-54.75665	Rocha	-34.48333	-54.33333	San Carlos	-34.797	-54.92698	Velázquez	-34.03631	-54.28054
S.F.R. Colonia José Artigas	-30.601233	-57.040717																																		
Gauviyú de Arapey	-31.03436	-56.63419																																		
Carumbé	-31.52306	-56.60372																																		
Melo	-32.37028	-54.1675																																		
Sarandí del Yí	-33.35	-55.63333																																		
Trinidad	-33.5165	-56.89957																																		
S.F.R. Sauce y Molles de Timote "A. Gallinal Heber"	-33.54775	-55.89088																																		
Aiguá	-34.20498	-54.75665																																		
Rocha	-34.48333	-54.33333																																		
San Carlos	-34.797	-54.92698																																		
Velázquez	-34.03631	-54.28054																																		

### Project Dates

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	2018/4/17
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	2019/2/14

<b>Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	2023/2/14
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if approved) <sup>2</sup></b>	2023/9/30

### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	2,091,781
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>3</sup>:</b>	14,241,567
<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)<sup>4</sup>:</b>	1,725,806
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022<sup>5</sup></b>	12,190,172

### M&E Milestones

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:</b>	2022/6/22
<b>Expected Mid-term Review date<sup>6</sup>:</b>	
<b>Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):</b>	February 2022-July 2022
<b>Expected Terminal Evaluation Date<sup>7</sup>:</b>	July 2023
<b>Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)</b>	Annex 1: Tracking tools Annex 2: Migration of indicators from GEF-6 to GEF-7 (Core indicators)

<sup>1</sup> As per FPMIS

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

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

<sup>4</sup> For DEX projects, the GEF Coordination Unit will confirm the final amount with the Finance Division in HQ. For OPIM projects, the disbursement amount should be provided by Execution Partners.

<sup>5</sup> Please refer to the section 12 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

<sup>6</sup> The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2<sup>nd</sup> PIR, around half-point between EOD and NTE. The MTR report in English should be submitted to the GEF Secretariat within 4 years of the CEO Endorsement date.

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

**Overall ratings**

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

**ESS risk classification**

<b>Current ESS Risk classification:</b>	Low
---	-----

**Status**

<b>Implementation Status</b> <i>(1<sup>st</sup> PIR, 2<sup>nd</sup> PIR, etc. Final PIR):</i>	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR
--	---------------------

**Project Contacts**

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	María Bergós, National Project Coordinator (FAOUY)	<a href="mailto:Maria.Bergos@fao.org">Maria.Bergos@fao.org</a>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Sebastián Viroga, Officer-in-Charge (FAOUY)	<a href="mailto:sebastian.viroga@fao.org.uy">sebastian.viroga@fao.org.uy</a>
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Carolyn Opio, Livestock Policy Officer (FAOSLM)	<a href="mailto:Carolyn.Opio@fao.org">Carolyn.Opio@fao.org</a>
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	Valeria Gonzalez-Riggio, Technical Officer, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit (OCB)	<a href="mailto:Valeria.GonzalezRiggio@fao.org">Valeria.GonzalezRiggio@fao.org</a>
	Lorenzo Campos (a.i.), GEF Task Manager RLC	<a href="mailto:Lorenzo.camposaguirre@fao.org">Lorenzo.camposaguirre@fao.org</a>

Acronyms and abbreviations found throughout this document are detailed here:

<b>ACRONYMS and ABBREVIATIONS</b>
-----------------------------------

<b>AUCI</b>	<i>Agencia Uruguaya de Cooperación Internacional</i> Uruguayan Agency for International Cooperation
<b>CAF</b>	<i>Cooperativas Agrarias Federadas</i> Federation of Agricultural Cooperatives
<b>CCAC</b>	Climate and Clean Air Coalition
<b>CNFR</b>	<i>Comisión Nacional de Fomento Rural</i> National Commission for Rural Promotion
<b>CSLM</b>	Climate Smart Livestock Management
<b>CURE-UDELAR</b>	<i>Centro Universitario Regional del Este</i> University Centre of the East Region
<b>DINACC-MA</b>	<i>Dirección Nacional de Cambio Climático</i> National Directorate for Climate Change
<b>DGDR-MGAP</b>	<i>Dirección General de Desarrollo Rural</i> Directorate General for Rural Development
<b>DGRN-MGAP</b>	<i>Dirección General de Recursos Naturales</i> Directorate General for Natural Resources
<b>DINABISE-MA</b>	<i>Dirección Nacional de Biodiversidad y Servicios Ecosistémicos</i> National Directorate for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
<b>FAGRO</b>	<i>Facultad de Agronomía</i> Faculty of Agronomy
<b>FUCREA</b>	<i>Federación Uruguaya de Grupos CREA</i> Uruguayan Federation of Regional Centres of Agricultural Experimentation
<b>GIS</b>	Geographic Information System
<b>GLEAM</b>	Global Livestock Environmental Assessment Model
<b>INAC</b>	<i>Instituto Nacional de Carnes</i> National Meat Institute
<b>INC</b>	<i>Instituto Nacional de Colonización</i> National Institute of Colonization
<b>INIA</b>	<i>Instituto Nacional de Investigación Agropecuaria</i> National Institute of Agricultural Research
<b>IPA</b>	<i>Instituto Plan Agropecuario</i> Institute of Livestock Technology Transfer
<b>LoA</b>	Letter of Agreement

<b>MA</b>	<i>Ministerio de Ambiente</i> Ministry of Environment
<b>MDR</b>	<i>Mesa de Desarrollo Rural</i> Rural Development Committee
<b>MGAP</b>	<i>Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca</i> Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries
<b>MGCN</b>	<i>Mesa de Ganadería de Campo Natural</i> National Livestock Rangeland Board
<b>MRV</b>	Monitoring, Reporting and Verification
<b>MTR</b>	Mid Term Review
<b>NAMA</b>	Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action
<b>NDC</b>	Nationally Determined Contribution (Paris Agreement)
<b>NGHGI</b>	National Greenhouse Gas Inventory
<b>OPYPA</b>	<i>Oficina de Programación y Política Agropecuaria</i> Office of Programming and Agricultural Policy
<b>PSC</b>	Project Steering Committee
<b>PT</b>	Project Team
<b>RBM</b>	Results-based management
<b>SNAP</b>	<i>Sistema Nacional de Áreas Protegidas</i> National System of Protected Areas
<b>SNIDER</b>	<i>Sistema Nacional de Innovación y Desarrollo Rural</i> National System of Innovation and Rural Development
<b>UAI-MGAP</b>	<i>Unidad de Asuntos Internacionales</i> International Affairs Unit
<b>UASYCC-OPYPA-MGAP</b>	<i>Unidad Agropecuaria de Sostenibilidad y Cambio Climático</i> Agricultural Sustainability and Climate Change Unit
<b>UD-MGAP</b>	<i>Unidad de Descentralización</i> Unit for Decentralization
<b>UDELAR</b>	<i>Universidad de la República</i> University of the Republic
<b>UGP-MGAP</b>	<i>Unidad de Gestión de Proyectos</i> Unit for Project Management
<b>UPEP-UDELAR</b>	<i>Unidad de Posgrado y Educación Permanente</i> Postgraduate and Continuing Education Unit from UDELAR

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

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

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.							
Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators[1]	Baseline	Mid-term Target[2]	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress[3] since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating[4]
<b>To mitigate climate change and to restore degraded lands through the promotion of climate-smart practices in the livestock sector, with focus in family farming.</b>	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	6  MRV system established in 61 farms covering approximately 35,000 ha. The system reports environmental, economic, productive and social indicators, with annual evaluation. Intensive environmental monitoring system based on a methodology of paired fields (20 sites under low emission practices and 20 control sites) established and reporting.  At present, the project collaborates on several initiatives associated with the MRV:  -The country has developed an online monitoring system for tracking progress towards its <a href="#">1st NDC goals</a> .  - Indicator of emissions intensity from meat, is monitored through the NGHGI. The project keeps a permanent link with the INGEI and provides to the constant improvement	S



					<p>processes of the parameters and emission factors.</p> <p><a href="#">-Survey on Good Practices</a> in rangeland management, the survey gathered information on implementation of management practices in rangelands and livestock.</p> <p>-The outcomes of the project serve as an input to national processes such as the design of the Long Term Climate Strategy and the 2nd NDC.</p> <p>-The PT continues to attend the meetings of the Interministerial group of livestock environmental footprint.</p> <p>-The project has participated in the process of designing a sustainable sovereign bond, directly related to the NDC goals.</p> <p>-Two meetings with experts from Costa Rica were organized to facilitate exchange of experiences and lessons learned.</p> <p>-Meetings with focal point from the MA and the LTO were held to explore funding opportunities for the NAMA.</p> <p>-A meeting with an international consultant with the aim of exploring the actual state of NAMAs as a funding instrument was organized.</p>	
	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 Programmin g Directions)	-	6	4	5
					<p>During the current reporting period, activities to achieve greater engagement and commitment from the main stakeholders have been carried out, in particular with the Minister and the Vice-Minister. Activities have focused on building awareness on the project, as well as on encouraging continuous</p>	

					<p>engagement through regular updates on progress and aligning activities of the project with the design and implementation of national policies and with the MGAP strategic plan.</p> <p>The project team keeps the authorities of the Ministry of Environment updated through its representatives in the Project Steering Committee, and works in collaboration with its technical units to coordinate and implement project activities.</p> <p>Through MGAP, awareness activities on the project have been undertaken with the Ministry of Economy and Finance. As a result of this engagement, project outputs have been used in the design of a sovereign bond with environmental goals.</p> <p>The inter-ministerial working group on environmental footprint of livestock has presented its first report: Environmental Footprint of livestock production, reporting indicators for soil, water, air and biodiversity.</p> <p>The Directorate General for Rural Development is developing a pilot project based on findings and lessons learned in the project.</p> <p>The National Meat Institute has hired an international consultant to develop a strategy to mitigate GHG emissions from livestock.</p> <p>The following progress have been made in the <a href="#">National CSLM Strategy</a>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A call for expression of interest was issued through the In-Tend (UNMG) platform to consultancy firms to facilitate the design and development of the National CSLM Strategy.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection process was concluded. The Plan Agropecuario Institute (IPA) was selected.</li> <li>• IPA has delivered the first deliverables, including a Work Plan that establishes the methodology to achieve the final output.</li> <li>• The Work Plan for the design of the CSLM Strategy was presented to the MGCN on June 29.</li> </ul> <p>The project and its preliminary results on GHG mitigation potential has been presented to the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in their visit to Uruguay.</p> <p>The PT continues to attend the regular monthly meetings of the MGCN where policies and recommended technologies related to livestock and rangelands are discussed.</p>	
<p><b>Outcome 1.2:</b></p> <p>National capacities have been strengthened to support CSLM implementation</p>	<p><b>Indicator 1.2:</b> No of institutions that commit to supporting the implementation of CSLM</p>	0	-	6	6	<p>HS</p> <p>-CNFR has completed the <a href="#">Resilient Family Livestock project</a>, whose proposal is based on the Livestock and Climate project. The project has also collaborated on the estimation of GHG emissions.</p> <p>-An agreement was reached with DGDR-MGAP to develop a <a href="#">pilot project</a> with the aim of replicating the Livestock and Climate proposal, involving one of the farmers organizations that participates in the project and 2 of the project pilot farms.</p> <p>-DGDR is also launching an Agroecology project funded by the World Bank taking into account the co-innovation approach and lessons learned from the project. This will allow a</p>

					<p>continuation of the field work in some of the project farms and replication on new ones.</p> <p>-Fagro is developing a program entitled Innovagro, which focuses on ecological. Fagro is building capacities in the subject through its postgraduate programme.</p> <p>-IPA is executing the <a href="#">Pasture Management project</a>, which seeks to highlight the main knowledge and practices to promote an adaptive and sustainable management of the rangelands in livestock production.</p> <p>-MEF is designing a green bond, related to environmental indicators of livestock and mitigation of GHG emissions linked to the second NDC 2. The project provided guidance on possible indicators and ways of monitoring.</p> <p>-CAF maintains an agenda that includes various activities to promote sustainable development.</p>	
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	29,066 ha	S
Outcome 2.1: Sustainable CSLM has been implemented in	Indicator 1 (CC): Tons of CO2 eq of GHG reduced or avoided directly and indirectly	0	-	379,000 t CO2eq of GHG reduced or avoided directly	61,626*	S

degraded/degrading lands				and indirectly		
Outcome 2.1: Sustainable CSLM has been implemented in degraded/degrading lands	Pilot farms with increased farm-level incomes	0	-	At least 80% of pilot farms achieve a minimum of 10% increases of farm-level incomes	-56% of the farms increased the net income in the 2020-2021 financial year compared to the baseline.  -There was an average increase of 20% in the net income of the 61 farms.	S
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	29,066	S
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 to work. In the reporting period the following issues stand out:  -The project has provided valuable lessons during the following processes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selection of beneficiary farms</li> <li>• Selection of the extension team</li> <li>• Field work</li> </ul>	S

						<p>-The Mid-Term Review of the Project is being carried out, in which comments and recommendations are received. The PT is working on incorporating these recommendations. A PSC meeting to discuss and approve the adjustment was organized.</p> <p>-The PT continues to hold its operational, strategic and adaptive planning meetings.</p> <p>-9 meetings were held with the PSC</p>	

---

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

**[2]** *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.*

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

**[4]** *Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU).*

---

---

**Action Plan to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings**

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

### 3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

<b>Outcomes and Outputs[1]</b>	<b>Indicators</b> <i>(as per the Logical Framework)</i>	<b>Annual Target</b> <i>(as per the annual Work Plan) *8</i>	<b>Main achievements[2] (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)</b>	<b>Describe any variance[3] in delivering outputs</b>
<b><u>Outcome 1.1 Policy and planning frameworks have been strengthened to support CSLM implementation and national communication on livestock emissions</u></b>				
<b>Output 1.1.1</b> <b>A national climate-smart livestock management (CSML) strategy, designed and validated with key stakeholders</b>	Indicator 1.1.1a: A CSLM strategy document	->Complete the workshops with stakeholders  ->Write the document and validate it with main stakeholderS	Preparatory actions  ->Regular meetings between PT and IPA team are held to monitor the progress of activities and joint planning.  ->In order to strengthen the foundations of the participatory process of construction of the Strategy, the IPA developed 4 deliverables that consist of a background review of similar Strategies, methodologies for the construction of Strategies, the identification of key actors, and a definitive Work Plan. The deliverables were approved by the LTO.	



			<p>-&gt;Four meetings were organized between the PT and OPYPA, in order to identify synergies between the GCI Strategy and the MGAP Strategic Plan.</p> <p>Communication:</p> <p>-&gt;A communication team made up of IPA and the PT was formed.</p> <p>-&gt;Considering that the MGAP leads the Strategy construction process, the IPA-PT communication team held a meeting with the MGAP communication manager, in order to validate a strategy for launching the process.</p> <p>-&gt;On 22/06/10 the project is presented and the launch of the Strategy construction process is mentioned, at the "<a href="#">Expo Sustainable Uruguay 2022</a>".</p> <p>-&gt;The awareness phase of the Start of the process, including various communication materials has started.</p> <p>Start of the process:</p> <p>-&gt;A series of interviews are held with qualified informants in order to obtain inputs for the Initial Institutional Workshop. 6 interviews were conducted.</p> <p>-&gt;1 presentation of the work plan to MGCN</p>	
<p><b>Output 1.1.1</b></p>	<p>Indicator 1.1.1b: Number of institutions involved in the preparation and validation process</p>	<p>10 institutions involved in the preparation and validation process</p>	<p>On August 2nd will be carried out the first workshop including the main institutions involved: MGAP; MA; MEF; MRREE; INIA; IPA; INAC; SUL; FAGRO; MGCN.</p>	

<sup>8</sup> The Annual Operating Plan approved by the PSC runs from 01/01 to 12/31.

			<p>After that more workshops will be carried out including other institutions, farmers organization, and women and youth organizations in order to strength the collaborative process</p>	
<p><b>Output 1.1.2</b></p> <p><b>A Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA), including a national measuring, reporting and validation (MRV) system for the livestock ruminant sector</b></p>	<p>Indicator 1.1.2a: A validated NAMA document and MRV system</p>	<p>-&gt;Hire the consultants</p> <p>-&gt;Complete the workshops with main stakeholders</p> <p>-&gt;Write the document</p>	<p>Adaptive Planning Activities:</p> <p>-&gt;An adaptive planning is carried out, in order to align the deadlines of the consultancies to the development of the GCI Strategy.</p> <p>-&gt;Multiple meetings are held in order to define the professional profiles necessary to develop the product, and determine the possible hiring mechanisms, taking into account the two main limitations, time and budget.</p> <p>-&gt;A meeting with an MA representative to adjust criteria and fine-tune the status of financing opportunities for NAMAs at a global level.</p> <p>-2 meetings with the Technical Officer (LTO), one to consult on the validity of the financing tools for NAMAs and the possibility of exploring other tools, and another after the meeting with the international expert, to analyze alternatives and make decisions.</p> <p>-1 Meeting with a DINACC representative to define activities and strategies, and exchange the information handled in the meeting with LTO.</p> <p>-2 Exchanges with Costa Rica in which lessons learned from its experience in livestock NAMA are collected.</p> <p>-1 Meeting with FAO to analyze possible contracting mechanisms to carry out the planned consultancies.</p> <p>-&gt;The TDRs for the national consultants are defined and the call is open.</p>	

			<p>-&gt;The profile for international consultants continues to be defined, as well as the hiring mechanisms.</p> <p>-&gt;1 <a href="#">workshop</a> with researchers and institutional representatives to identify possible measures for the NAMA and Uruguay's second NDC</p>	
<b>Output 1.1.2</b>	<p>Indicator 1.1.2b: Number of institutions involved in ANAM validation</p>	<p>&gt; In 2022 it is planned to hold workshops with technicians from main institutions involved</p>	<p>The process of hiring the consultants is ongoing, the workshops are planned for the second half of the year</p>	
<p><b>Output 1.2.1</b></p> <p><b>Capacities developed to effectively support the implementation of CSLM with a gender-sensitive perspective.</b></p>	<p>Indicator 1.2.1: Number of staff in national institutions with enhanced capacities for mainstreaming CSLM at institutional level</p>	<p>&gt; The project will provide courses, workshops, talks, or other instance to strength the capacities of actors that could be interested</p>	<p>-Three meetings were held with MEF and IDB officials, in order to convey the project's strategy in terms of mitigation and internalize it in the design of sustainable sovereign bonds with NDC-based indicators.</p> <p>-12 training meetings with FAGRO. GHG emissions calculation capacities are transferred at the farm level with the IPCC methodology.</p> <p>-7 meetings with officials from the DGDR to transmit GCI concepts, co-innovation as a work methodology, monitoring and indicators.</p> <p>-2 meetings with OPYPA officials to convey the project's strategy in terms of mitigation and internalize it in the design of sustainable sovereign bonds with NDC-based indicators.</p> <p>-2 meetings with OPYPA officials and consultants to convey the project's strategy in terms of mitigation and internalize it in the design of the country's Long-Term Climate Strategy, including the possible scaling of the proposal.</p> <p>-A Brazilian researcher completed an internship in the project, joining the environmental monitoring team.</p>	

			<p>-1 presentation on implementation progress to Departmental Directors of MGAP.</p> <p>-1 presentation on the co-innovation approach and the methodology used in the project to the National System of Innovation and Rural Development - SNIDER</p>	
<p><b>Output 1.2.2</b></p> <p><b>A training program in place, to supporting the rolling out of improved and climate-smart approaches to livestock management</b></p>	<p>Indicator 1.2.2: Number of extensionists with enhanced knowledge and capacities on CSLM</p>	<p>-&gt;Complete an extension training course within the framework of the Postgraduate and Permanent Education Unit (UPEP) of the Faculty of Agronomy</p>	<p><a href="#">On 22/06/10, the results of the first year of work were presented at a press conference. The conference featured presentations by the Minister of MGAP, the MA Minister and the Officer in Charge of FAOUY as well as the participation of the Project Director and a technical representative of the MA.</a></p> <p>The event was broadcasted on TV and press releases were issued. Extension technicians are a target audience for these materials.</p> <p>The second training course for extensionists is being defined, in charge of the UPEP of FAGRO, UDELAR.</p>	
<p><b><u>Outcome 2.1</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Sustainable climate-smart livestock management (CSLM) has been implemented in degraded/degrading lands.</u></b></p>				

**Output 2.1.1**

**Short and medium-term farm level strategies, implemented on project farms with a gender perspective**

Indicator 2.1.1: Number of CSLM strategies implemented with a co-innovation process on farm level.

->Complete the second year of work in the farms

The first year of the implementation of the redesign proposal was closed, highlighting the following results:

->On average the total gross product had an increase of less than 2%

->A reduction of almost 7% in total costs was observed.

->Net Family Income increased by 20%.

->Beef production increased by 10%.

-Sheep meat production increased by almost 15%.

->Without considering emissions from fertilizers, around 60% of farms managed to reduce their GHG emissions.

->On average, the project resulted in a reduction of GHG emissions per ha by 4.9%.

->GHG emissions per kg of meat produced were reduced by 16%.

->On August 18 and 19, the annual technical team workshop was held, with a total of:

-26 participants in total

-The objectives of the workshop were:

a) Contribute to developing trust and building awareness among team members.

b) Share information on the activities carried out in the year and future activities.

c) Analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the project, evaluate what has been done in the year from different perspectives and establish lines of work.

			<p>d) <i>Analysis of the soft component of the co-innovation process.</i></p> <p><i>-Four zonal workshops were held in which 149 members of the producing families (41% women), a team of extensionists, a technical support team, and the PT participated. This also included participation of some zonal technicians and departmental directors from MGAP.</i></p> <p><i>The objectives of the workshops were:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>-Present the progress of the project in each area, explaining the causes of the results.</i></li> <li><i>-Evaluate the work of the project in the farms of each area, reviewing the expectations and results of the workshops of the previous year.</i></li> <li><i>-Motivate the actors about the next stages of the project.</i></li> <li><i>-Generate awareness about the seriousness of the climatic situation for the next seasons, and actions that can be taken.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>-&gt;1 field day to discuss specific situations related to economic and productivity variables,</i></p> <p><i>-&gt;2 meetings were held to discuss about climatic problems and possible measures to be taken</i></p>	
<p><b>Output 2.1.2</b></p> <p><b>A capacity development program focused on the application of the CSLM technologies and practices</b></p>	<p>Indicator 2.1.2: Number of farmers with enhanced knowledge and capacities on CSLM</p>	<p>-&gt;Complete 8 workdays in field (4 in autumn, and 4 in spring)</p>	<p><i>-The Autumn 2021 open field days were held. Due to the restrictions imposed by the COVID19 pandemic, the autumn 2021 field days were held virtually</i></p> <p><i>-The sessions were broadcast live on YouTube. The videos were hosted on YouTube, on the MGAP channel.</i></p> <p><i>-4 virtual sessions were held, one for each area:</i></p>	

			<p><a href="#">-North Zone: 21//07/14</a></p> <p><a href="#">-Central Zone: 21/07/15</a></p> <p><a href="#">-East Zone: 21/ 07/21</a></p> <p><a href="#">-Northeast Zone: 21/07/22</a></p> <p>The <a href="#">Spring 2021 open field days</a> were held attended by a total of 115 (33% women)</p> <p>-&gt; 11/25/2021 - <a href="#">Tomás Gomensoro, Artigas</a></p> <p>-&gt; 12/02/2021 – <a href="#">Sarandí del Yi, Durazno</a></p> <p>-&gt;12/09/2021 – <a href="#">Sarandí del Rio Negro, Tacuarembó</a></p> <p>-&gt;12/16/2021 – <a href="#">Godoy, Lavalleja</a></p> <p>The <a href="#">Autumn 2022 open field days</a> were held, attended by a total of 299 people (39% women), including extensionists, institutional officials, producers, etc.</p> <p>-&gt;05/05/2022 - <a href="#">Molles del Timote, Florida</a></p> <p>-&gt;05/19/2022 - <a href="#">Bañado Medina, Cerro Largo</a></p> <p>-&gt;05/12/2022 - <a href="#">Cerro Pelado, Lavalleja</a></p> <p>-&gt;05/28/2022 - <a href="#">Basalto Ruta 31, Salto</a></p> <p>-&gt;<a href="#">1 field day between one of the beneficiaries of the project which is a group and a INC group</a>, to improve group work, information exchange and group decision making.</p>	
<p><b>Output 2.1.3</b></p> <p><b>On-farm monitoring system, in place (to</b></p>	<p>Indicator 2.1.3: Number of farms that are</p>	<p>-Complete 37 deliverables of the second LoA</p>	<p>-61 pilot farms monitored</p> <p>-22 Directed by women</p>	

<p><b>monitor GHG emissions, adaptation strategies, financing, land degradation and biodiversity)</b></p>	<p>integrated into the monitoring system.</p>	<p>*All the work carried out within Component 2 is possible through a LoA between FAO-INIA. The service provider supplies the necessary technical resources and the expertise to implement the CSLM practices and its monitoring . Two LoAs were signed between FAO-INIA, the first ended in April 2021 and the second is underway and is expected to complete the product .</p> <p>Within the framework of the 2nd LoA, 37 deliverables are established to be elaborated throughout the execution.</p>	<p><a href="#"><u>The following deliverables are obtained within the framework of the 2nd LoA:</u></a></p> <p>Deliverable (29) Annual evaluation report 2021 including all indicators for each farm</p> <p>Deliverable (34, part 1) Annual reflection and planning workshops report of the project technical team</p> <p>Deliverable (37, part 1) Database containing all the variables collected by remote sensing and those calculated from these</p> <p>Deliverable (38, part 1) Databases containing all the information regarding the sampling and analysis of manure, vegetation and estimates of emissions from enteric fermentation</p> <p>Deliverable (40, part 1) Database containing all productive and economic variables.</p> <p>Deliverable (30) Intensive environmental monitoring of the 20 farms plus the 20 witness farms.</p> <p>Deliverable (32, part 1) Analysis report of the co-innovation process. It consists of a report that collects lessons learned and obstacles in the process.</p> <p>Deliverable (33, part 1) Report on the annual reflection and evaluation workshops with participating families and the project's technical team.</p> <p>Deliverable (39, part 1) Database containing all the information regarding soil sampling and analysis and carbon sequestration. Includes the description of all the database metadata</p> <p>Land use was surveyed in all farms, focusing on forest lands.</p>	
<p><b><u>Outcome 3.1 Monitoring,</u></b></p>				



<b><u>evaluation and knowledge-sharing</u></b>				
<p><b>-Output 3.1.1</b></p> <p><b>A set of manuals and media products, for use by extension workers and producers, that capture and describe the improved practices, measures and technologies</b></p>	<p>Indicator 3.1.1: Number of information products and number of distributed copies.</p>	<p>-&gt;Complete the manual of CSLM practices for producers and rural workers</p> <p>-&gt;Videos documenting the field workdays</p> <p>-&gt;Video documenting the environmental dimension</p> <p>-&gt;Video documenting CSLM practices</p> <p>-&gt;Producers story telling videos</p>	<p>-12 field days reports were prepared, containing information on the farms as a baseline, redesign plans, actions implemented and results obtained:</p> <p><a href="#">Autumn 2021</a></p> <p><a href="#">Spring 2021</a></p> <p><a href="#">Autumn 2022</a></p> <p><a href="#">-Presentation of the results from the co-innovation process at the Expo Prado 2021.</a></p> <p>-Presentation of the results of the first year of work on the farms, with the participation of the MGAP and MA ministers and Officer in charge from FAO UY at the Expo Uruguay Sostenible.</p>	
<p><b>Output 3.1.2</b></p> <p><b>Project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and system, in place</b></p>	<p>Indicator 3.1.2: Number of meetings and workshops.</p>	<p>-&gt;Complete lesson learned about:</p> <p>-Extensionist technicians selection</p> <p>-Selection of producers beneficiaries of the project</p> <p>-Field work</p>	<p>-&gt;The collection of lessons learned on the following processes is being carried out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Selection of beneficiary producers of the project</li> <li>● Selection of the extension team</li> <li>● Field work</li> </ul> <p>-Up to the reporting date, 15 interviews were conducted with extension technicians and members of the PT.</p> <p>-&gt;21 meetings within the framework of the RMT.</p> <p>-&gt;3 FAO meetings for exchanges with the region (2 exchanges with Costa Rica and a regional RLC workshop for lessons learned in LoAs)</p>	

		->Complete two meetings with PSC	->8 operational FAO meetings / trainings  ->2 meetings with the PSC	
<b>Output 3.1.3</b>  <i>Knowledge- sharing with other countries and dissemination of verifiable data and tested methodologies</i>	Indicator 3.1.3a: Number of publications	-> To be reported at the end of the project. Three articles will be sent to international journals.	->A meeting was held with the LTO and the research team from INIA-Fagro to define articles to be published.  ->Participation in the Compendium of Innovations in the livestock sector: <a href="#">Compendium of experiences in Latin America and the Caribbean</a>	
<b>Output 3.1.3</b>  <i>Knowledge- sharing with other countries and dissemination of verifiable data and tested methodologies</i>	3.1.3b: Number of presentations at conferences	->Complete 5 presentations in conferences	<a href="#">1 presentation by the coordinator of the production team at Expo Prado.</a>  -Panama: "II Technical Seminar: Climate-Smart Livestock Examples Applied in Latin America" "GCI in Uruguay: Participatory Approaches Adapted to the Local Reality"  - Livestock Development Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (CODEGALAC): <a href="#">"Lessons learned and challenges of Livestock and Climate: a transformative, inclusive and sustainable project"</a>  - Project results presentation inside Climate and Clean Air Coalition (CCAC)- <a href="#">webinar on Government Action to Reduce Methane from Livestock</a>  -1 Presentation: <a href="#">"Rural communication in co-innovation projects: Analysis of the communication processes of the Livestock and Climate project, in the framework of a global pandemic"</a> at the VIII Meeting of the Latin American Federation of Faculties of Social Communication (FELAFACS), Congress " Crossroads and new communication scenarios"  -1 presentation to FAO: Letters of Agreement-Lessons learned	

<p><b>Output 3.1.3</b></p> <p><b>Knowledge- sharing with other countries and dissemination of verifiable data and tested methodologies</b></p>	<p>Indicator 3.1.3c: Participation in networking events</p>	<p>-&gt;Complete participation in 2 networking events</p>	<p>-&gt;2 meetings with Experts from Costa Rica to discuss lessons learned regarding the implementation of the livestock NAMA.</p> <p>-&gt;Participation in the event: Del Diálogo a la Acción Climática: Oportunidades para el sector agrícola de América Latina y el Caribe en el marco del Compromiso Global de Metano.</p>	
<p><b>Output 3.1.4</b></p> <p><b>Project Mid-term Review and Final Evaluation</b></p>	<p>Indicator 3.1.4: Number of evaluations carried out</p>	<p>-&gt;Complete the Mid-term Review</p>	<p>The scope of the RMT covers the period between 01 February of 2018 to 31 March of 2022</p> <p>On the date of this report the final version of the report is in process.</p>	
<p><b>Output 3.1.5</b></p> <p><b>A communication strategy, implemented</b></p>	<p>Indicator 3.1.5: Number of appearances in the local media; number of website and social media visitors</p>	<p>-&gt;Complete 24 press releases</p> <p>-&gt;Complete activities to divulge information of the project</p>	<p>A communication strategy is being implemented.</p> <p>1 press conference to present the results of the first year of co-innovation work. <a href="#">The conference featured presentations by the Minister of MGAP, the MA Minister and the Officer in Charge of FAO/UY, as well as the participation of the Project Director and a technical representative of the MA.</a></p> <p>The project has been covered in the following media:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-10 radio notes and interviews</li> <li>-2 TV notes</li> <li>-29 press releases</li> </ul>	

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

**[2]** Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Workplan. Please be concise (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

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

---

## 4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcome of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR.

The project faced another change of authorities in the Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries, a new Minister was appointed in June 2021. Other changes in the MGAP authorities included the Director of DGRN and new Department Directors. In this regard, the PT carried out a round of presentations and updates on the project.

The sanitary emergency and restrictions due to the outbreak of COVID-19 continued until April, 2022, when the end of the sanitary emergency was enacted allowing the execution of face-to-face activities.

Another challenge faced was the declaration of agricultural emergency due to drought in some agro-ecological zones. For a second year in a row, the farmers had to cope with lack of rains and water scarcity affecting the growth of grasslands and cattle performance. In spite of this, the results obtained confirmed that the actions deployed were effective and allowed to mitigate and adapt to changing climate conditions.

Overall implementation progress reaches 50% of the outcomes with a budget execution of 82% (actuals and hard commitments).

Main achievements per Component include:

Component 1 (progress 33%):

- Several international and national initiatives regarding low GHG emissions and environmental impacts of livestock have been launched that are aligned with the project and strengthen the commitment of the authorities:
  - Uruguay was one of the signatures of the Global Methane Pledge launched at the COP 26 in Glasgow.
  - Working group on the environmental footprint of livestock production continued to work and presented results at the Stockholm+50 Conference.
- National CSLM Strategy launched at the Expo Uruguay Sostenible. Activities of public awareness and interviews with qualified informants are being held.
- Interinstitutional workshop was carried out to identify feasible national actions to be included in the NAMA and Uruguay's second NDC. Results from component 2 were presented. National NAMA specialists' vacancies are published and open.
- DGDR started a pilot project based on the co innovation and the technical approach and the lessons learned in the project to scale up the proposal. The DGDR is also beginning an Agroecology project taking into account the achievements of the project.

**Component 2 (progress 51%):**

- Signature of the 2nd LoA FAO-INIA to complete the development and deployment of CSLM technologies and practices at field level.
- DGDR co-financed the LoA to allow the extension of the work of the technical team.
- Monthly technical visits continued uninterrupted in the 61 farms.
- First year of implementation of redesign proposals analyzed and reported good results in terms of production, economic returns and environmental aspects. The co-innovation process has proven to be an effective way to promote social learning and the sustainability of the changes in the long term.
- Field open days were held in Winter 2021, Spring 2021 and Autumn 2022 with an excellent participation of farmers, students, technicians and authorities.
- Annual planning and evaluation workshops in the 4 regions are carried out and attended by the producers, their families, the technical teams and the project team.
- Annual planning and evaluation workshop involving extensionists, field supervisors, researchers and academic staff and project team carried out.
- Commitment of farmers and the technical teams and their high motivation is an invaluable asset to the project.
- GHG emissions were estimated for the first year of implementation in the farms, and work is already on course to estimate the second year. Data confirmed a reduction in overall livestock emissions and in the intensity of emissions.
- Baseline data has been completed and reported for all the environmental variables.

**Component 3 (progress 66%):**

- MTR process is in process and findings and recommendations are being analyzed by the PSC.
- Monitoring of the project is on track allowing a permanent evaluation of the execution, risk evaluation and the implementation of adjustments, if needed.
- Lessons learned related to selection processes of extensionists and of farmers are being collected.
- Project visibility: information about the project, project activities and results obtained are widely disseminated in local and national media.

-

**Development Objective (DO) Ratings, Implementation Progress (IP) Ratings and Overall Assessment**

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence and progress reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR. For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

	<b>FY2022 Development Objective rating<sup>9</sup></b>	<b>FY2022 Implementation Progress rating<sup>10</sup></b>	<b>Comments/reasons<sup>11</sup> justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<i>The project is rated satisfactory. The results obtained in Component 2 confirming good performance in spite of adverse climatic conditions allowed the project to be seen as a reference and an example to be followed. In particular, mitigation results were highly appreciated by Ministry authorities, both from the productive and also from the environmental sector as well. The project is expected to contribute with new scientific data regarding carbon sequestration in grasslands. The project is on track to achieve its development objectives in spite of some delays mainly due to the change of authorities and the sanitary emergency. The project team has had the ability to adjust to this changing situation.</i>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<i>The achievement obtains up to now, are very auspicious in relation to the expected results of the project and they are very well valued by the Minister of Environment and Minister of Livestock Agriculture and Fisheries. They have high expectations of being able to scale up these results including more farmers in the future.</i>

<sup>9</sup> **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>10</sup> **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>11</sup> Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

<p><b>GEF Operational Focal Point<sup>12</sup></b></p>	<p><b>S</b></p>	<p><b>S</b></p>	<p><i>First of all, it should be noted that this project is aligned with the National Climate Change Policy and is directly linked to mitigation objectives and adaptation measures included in the First Nationally Determined Contribution of Uruguay to the Paris Agreement and in Uruguay's Long-term Climate Strategy. The results achieved to date will be a fundamental input for the process of preparing the Second Nationally Determined Contribution, which is being carried out during the year 2022. For this reason, Livestock and Climate is a very important project for the Ministry of Environment and we have participated very actively from the National Directorate of Climate Change and the National Directorate of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services since its inception. The results of the first year of on-farm monitoring are very auspicious and encouraging and seem to confirm that the set of good practices promoted by the project would have the expected effect in reducing emissions per unit of product. The information that is being generated from the project has a very important value for the elaboration of policies and for decision-making in environmental and climate change matters.</i></p> <p><i>These results were presented during the first edition of the Uruguay Sustainable Expo (June 2022), organized by the Ministry of the Environment. The Minister of the Environment, the Minister of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries and the FAO Officer in charge in Uruguay were present at that instance, which reinforces the relevance of this project for both institutions.</i></p> <p><i>In June 2022, a joint workshop on mitigation and livestock was held, organized between the Livestock and Climate Project and the National System for Response to Climate Change (SNRCC), with the aim of generating inputs for the preparation of the Second Uruguay's Nationally Determined Contribution to the Paris Agreement. Representatives of the project, of the ministries that make up the SNRCC, of the academia and research institutes participated in this activity. As a result, ideas of possible measures to be considered in the process of preparing the Second NDC were identified.</i></p> <p><i>The participatory preparation of the Climate-Smart Livestock Strategy, the Livestock Mitigation Plan and its corresponding MRV system, which will be carried out in the coming weeks, are very significant milestones among the Project's activities and will also be relevant inputs to guide the development of production and environmental policies in our country.</i></p>
--	-----------------	-----------------	---



			<i>Finally, the Project has achieved satisfactory progress in all the activities of the three components. The objectives set for the evaluation period were met and the mid-term evaluation process has been satisfactorily completed.</i>
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>13</sup></b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<i>The project is on track and is expected to achieve project outcomes and outputs as set out in the approved Project Document. Substantial progress has been made during this reporting period. The project has garnered a lot of interest and support from different stakeholder groups at both national and international level and this is laying a foundation for sustainability of project results and impacts.</i>
<b>FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<i>The project has faced difficulties during implementation, mainly related to changing authorities and restrictions imposed by the Covid19 pandemic but has established mitigation actions to overcome those challenges and continues to be relevant for the country. The results obtained from the second year of implementation in the farms are promising, especially considering the drought that affects the country, and could be used for national strategies in climate change mitigation and adaptation. As it reaches half of its implementing period, it will be important for the project to start identifying an exit strategy to ensure long-term sustainability of the results achieved.</i>

<sup>12</sup> In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

<sup>13</sup> 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)*

Please describe the progress made complying with the approved ESM plan. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Add new ESS risks if any risks have emerged during this FY.

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

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

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification change Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid <sup>14</sup> . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	Low

***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.***

---

<sup>14</sup> **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

## 6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation (including COVID-19 related risks). The last column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in the project, as relevant.

	Type of risk	Risk rating	Identified in the Project Document	Mitigation Actions		Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit

1	Extreme events related to climate change and climate variability	M	Y	<p>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.</p> <p>The co-innovation approach enables the CSLM strategy to be adapted to climatic conditions and extreme events. CSL practices should buffer the effects.</p> <p>Investments to cope with extreme events as drought conditions can be covered by the DACC-2 project.</p> <p>Twenty control farms will be selected to ensure environmental monitoring will capture the innovation impact despite climate events.</p> <p>Project management will closely monitor the situation and take corrective action if necessary.</p> <p>*The DACC-2 is a project of the MGAP focused on the adaptation to the climate change and the strengthen of natural resources management, while the GEF Project is focused on the mitigation of the climate change, therefore both projects can mutually benefit. DACC-2 was expected to provide the main basis for scaling up and replication, as well as co-financing for the field activities of the GEF project.</p> <p>The cooperation with DACC-2 in a field level is based in two aspects:</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The pilot farm selection process was successful in achieving an equal distribution of farms, per zone.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Center: 25%</li> <li>○ East: 23%</li> <li>○ Northeast: 23%</li> <li>○ North: 28%</li> </ul> </li> <li>· MGAP <a href="#">declared</a> an <a href="#">agricultural emergency</a> 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.</li> <li>· CSL practices already implemented in the</li> </ul>	
---	--	---	---	--	--	---	--

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The DACC-2 farms will be benefited by the capacity building activities, tools and methodologies developed by the GEF project. In consequence the area of the DACC-2 farms can be considered as indirect coverage</li><li>2. DACC-2 will finance minor investments in infrastructure, such as water management or reforestation in the beneficiaries' farms of the GEF project.</li></ol>			<p>pilot farms helped to cope with the extreme events.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

2	Epidemic in animals in the project area	L	Y	<p>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.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>Project management will closely monitor the situation and take corrective action if necessary.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The selection process was successful in achieving an equal distribution of farms per zone.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Center: 25%</li> <li>○ East: 23%</li> <li>○ Northeast: 23%</li> <li>○ North: 28%</li> </ul> </li> <li>· Uruguay continues with a mandatory vaccination scheme against the foot and mouth disease (FMD). Animal epidemics have not been reported.</li> </ul>	
---	---	---	---	--	--	--	--

3	Lack of interest and motivation of producers to participate	Medium/Low	Y	<p>The selection process will ensure that participating producers are genuinely interested and motivated.</p> <p>In addition, the selection process is articulated by local producer associations that will support the implementation of field activities.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The producer selection process ensures a strong degree of commitment from producers to the project. <a href="#">A promotional video had</a> been developed and disseminated.</li> <li>· Eight meetings were organized throughout the four agro-ecological zones, with the support of the producer's organizations.</li> <li>· The team of technicians has developed strategies to manage and maintain this commitment.</li> <li>· Several communication channels between the producers and the PT (social media, email, cellphone) to keep the farmers motivated have been established.</li> <li>· A social technical group was created to monitor and observe social aspects to be aware of difficulties that may arise.</li> </ul>	
---	---	------------	---	---	--	---	--



4	Lack of stakeholder interest in participating in the strategy formulation and validation process for the CSLM and in capacity development activities.	Medium/Low	Y	<p>Most of the potential stakeholders were involved in the preparation phase. Now, support the project approach.</p> <p>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.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· 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:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Project presentations</li> <li>○ Draft methodology proposal (elaborated by the PT)</li> </ul> </li> <li>· A consultant institution with sound knowledge of the livestock sector and their stakeholders has been hired to facilitate the formulation of the strategy and ensure an iterative and participatory process.</li> <li>· The PT has requested MGAP Minister and Vice-Minister for a meeting and as a result the</li> </ul>	
---	---	------------	---	---	--	---	--

						<p>authorities expressed commitment and support to the whole process with their convening capacity and leadership.</p> <p>The consultant institution has designed an awareness campaign on the importance of the Strategy using social media, radio and TV.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

5	The carbon sequestered in the soil is uncertain.	Low	Y	<p>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.</p> <p>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 GGCI 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.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Soil organic carbon samples have been taken, processed and sent to laboratories to be analyzed.</li> <li>· Samples were taken from 20 pilot farms matched with 20 control farms which allows horizontal comparison.</li> <li>· 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.</li> </ul>	
---	--	-----	---	--	--	--	--

<p>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.</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The total emissions of the livestock sector can be set as the production volume multiplied by the average emission per unit of product (Emissions intensity -EI).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 possible effect will rebound from increases in</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Baseline for GHG emissions calculated (herd structure, animal live weight and feed basket has been characterized in 62 pilot farms).</li> <li>· 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.</li> <li>· Information gathered in national research suggests that soil organic carbon sequestration is feasible in grasslands with improved management.</li> </ul>	
---	------------	----------	---	--	--	--

				absolute emissions greater than in a "no project" scenario.			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>Low technical capacity of experts and institutions at the national and local levels, slowing down the progress of the project</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>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.</p>			
	<p><b>New risks identified</b></p>						

<p><b>Change of government (starting 20/3/1):</b> Dissolution of the MGCN</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Maintain and redirect communications to the institutions that constituted the MGCN to obtain support.</p> <p>Strengthen agreements to secure MGAP support through FAO and GEF support.</p> <p>Report presenting USAYCC and project activities to new authorities.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· 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 FAO participated together with the project coordinating team.</li> <li>· Meeting with a new focal point of the DGRN and the MGCN.</li> <li>· Two coordination meetings with members of the MGCN.</li> <li>· 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,</li> </ul>	
---	------------	----------	--	--	--	--

						<p>FUCREA, MGAP (OPYPA y DGRN), MA (DINACC).</p> <p>The results of the work group were presented to the authorities. Participate: Minister, Vice-Minister, Director de DGRN, Director de DGDR, Director of OPYPA-MGAP; Minister and Director of DINACC-MA; delegate of dean of FAGRO; President of INAC; delegate of CAF.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--



	<p><b>Change of government (starting 20/3/1):</b> Difficulties in generating agreements between National Government and Project</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Strengthen agreements to secure MGAP support through FAO and GEF support.</p> <p>Report presenting UASYCC and project activities to new authorities.</p>			
	<p><b>Change of government (starting 20/3/1):</b> Difficulties in coordinating between MGAP-Executing Units and Project</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Strengthen agreements to secure MGAP support through FAO and GEF support.</p> <p>Report presenting UASYCC and project activities to new authorities.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· 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.</li>   <li>· 4 meetings with the new Director of DGDR-MGAP and members of the staff to explore synergies and ways of cooperation.</li> </ul>	

<p><b>Change of government (starting 20/3/1):</b> Lack of support at the territory level</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Strengthen links with producer organizations.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The communication strategy of the project foresees permanent communication mechanisms with producer organizations in order to maintain and strengthen ties with the project.</li> <li>· 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.</li> <li>· Regular contact of the PT with farmers' organizations is maintained.</li> <li>· Activities with producers in the 4 zones are performed to keep the interest and</li> </ul>	
--	------------	----------	--	--	--	--

						commitment: workshops or virtual presentations.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<p><b>Change of government (starting 20/3/1):</b> Lack of collaboration by MGAP technicians in the territory</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Strengthen links with producer organizations</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The communication strategy of the project foresees permanent communication mechanisms with MGAP technicians in order to maintain and strengthen ties with the project</li> <li>· 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.</li> <li>· 2 meetings to present project implementation and progress: 1 to the 19 Department Directors (UD) and 1 to the field technical team of the DGDR.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Change of government (starting 20/3/1):</b> Lack of investment at farm level</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Exploit new forms of financing</p> <p>Generate new financing requests</p>		<p>The PT is exploring alternative funds.</p>	

<p><b>Change of government (starting 20/3/1):</b> DACC 2 Funding Withdrawal</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Use other ways of financing</p> <p>Generate new financing requests</p>		<p>The PT is exploring alternative funds.</p>	
<p><b>COVID-19:</b> possibility for the MGCN to suspend the meetings.</p> <p>Eventually it will generate an overload of the work schedule and therefore the difficulty to interact with the project</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Communication will be made in advance to gain access to the agenda.</p> <p>Virtual workshops-INIA conference rooms</p> <p>(smaller workshops, it takes longer)</p>		<p>Meetings were rescheduled in virtual form. PT was invited to participate in the regular MGCN meetings allowing close monitoring of the situation.</p>	
<p><b>COVID-19:</b> the suspension of classes by FAGRO. This would delay technician training.</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The following alternatives will be used:</p> <p>FAGRO</p> <p>online platform</p> <p>Skype</p> <p>EVA-UDELAR</p> <p>Zoom</p> <p>WebEx</p>		<p>N/A</p>	

	<p><b>COVID-19:</b> technicians will have difficulty visiting certain producers (producers with co-morbidities, etc.) This generates a delay in data collection for BL (pilot farms)</p> <p>Delay in the selection of the 20 control sites</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Telephone communication to collect BL information.</p> <p>On the other hand, the PT and FAGRO developed a protocol to mitigate contagion risks between technicians and producers.</p> <p>INIA could get masks and other supplies for producers.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· <a href="#">A protocol was prepared for extension technicians</a></li> <li>· Safety equipment and protective products were provided by INIA.</li> <li>· Transport adjustments were made to consider sanitary requirements.</li> </ul>	
	<p><b>COVID-19:</b> producer organizations cannot collaborate in open field days</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>While the sessions are postponed, documents are disseminated for the work on the premises and collaboration is requested from the producer's organizations.</p>		<p>During the sanitary emergency these activities were currently postponed. Virtual activities were planned instead.</p> <p>Face-to-face activities were reassumed once the sanitary conditions and regulations allowed them.</p> <p>Additionally, to allow access for people who cannot attend the activities, communication materials reporting the open field days are produced.</p>	

	<p><b>COVID-19:</b> Risk of lower participation of women due to increased domestic work and care.</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>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.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· This topic was included in the gender training for extensionist technicians.</li>   <li>· Contacts with the Gender Specialized Commission of the MGAP were established for the eventual resolution of cases of gender-based violence.</li> </ul>	
	<p><b>Exchange rate</b></p>	<p>M</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The PT is monitoring the development of the exchange range and analyzing the possible impact in the project budget. Additionally communications are being held with the co- financiers partners analyzing possible alternatives.</p> <p>Since the resignations made in the budget revision B, approved by FAO-GEF, the funds assigned for contingency are now under 3% of the general project budget. Considering that, it is not possible to respond to eventual variations of the exchange rate or other contingency.</p>			

<p>Escalation to 400 thousand ha</p>	<p>L</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Cooperation with the DACC project at territorial level provides a unique window of opportunity for the GEF project in two respects: 1. Due to the coordinated implementation arrangement, farms of the DACC project will benefit from the capacity building activities, tools and methodologies developed by the GEF project. Consequently, the area of the farms can be considered indirect coverage.</p> <p>The DACC2 project was reformulated with changes in the area coverage thus having an impact in the initial area of intervention affecting the scale up of the project.</p> <p>Considering that, PT have defined several actions and initiatives that must be measured to ensure the achievement of this indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Technicians trained in UPEP: a survey is being carried out to reveal the area the extensionists are advising and where their knowledge is spreading and building farmers capacities on CSLM practices.</li> <li>-Technicians trained in field days: a survey is carried out to reveal the area the extensionists are advising and where their knowledge is spilling over.</li> <li>-GyC technicians who advise farms outside the 35,000 hectares</li> <li>-The Resilient Family Livestock (CNFR): 17,000 ha</li> </ul>			
--------------------------------------	----------	----------	---	--	--	--



			<p>-Farms of the Pasture Management Project (IPA): 34,000 ha of farm laboratories and 326,200 ha indirect impact (600 cattle farmers)</p> <p>-DGDR Pilot Project: DGDR Pilot Project. The project seeks to replicate the practices of the GyC project. 4,870 ha.</p> <p>-SUL Project: Sustainability of sheep in mixed livestock systems. The project is based on the co-innovation approach. 8,550 ha</p> <p>-DACC-Más Agua 127,160 ha (374 farmers, 80% family producers)</p> <p>-Survey on Good Practices identified 652,455 ha of natural grasslands under good practices management.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

<p><b>Delay in several environmental deliverables</b></p>	<p>L</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Some laboratory analyzes of the environmental dimension have reported delays in processing the samples.</p>		<p>The possibility of adding a human resource to collaborate in laboratory analysis tasks is currently being explored.</p>	
---	----------	----------	--	--	--	--

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

<p><b>FY2021 rating</b></p>	<p><b>FY2022 rating</b></p>	<p><b>Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period</b></p>
<p>L</p>	<p>L</p>	

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

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

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
<b>Recommendation 1: A.1. Adjustment and coordination with national and environmental public policies</b>	<i>*MTR is currently underway, measures will be defined once the final report is received.</i>
<b>Recommendation 2: B.1. To guarantee the best possible achievement of all outputs, outcomes and that of the project.</b>	
<b>Recommendation 3: Work Plan to guarantee the fulfillment of all outputs and outcomes.</b>	
<b>Recommendation 4: Definition of a strategy of inputs for its continuation.</b>	
<b>Recommendation 5: Need to work as a team for a unique project and communicate the outcomes in an appropriate way.</b>	
<b>Recommendation 6: To make the most of the strategy and involvement of young people.</b>	
<b>Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe</b>	

## 8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines<sup>15</sup>. Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories. And, provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework			
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management	A budget revision was carried out	Since 2021 until the end of the project	FAO-GEF
Implementation schedule			
Executing Entity			
Executing Entity Category			
Minor project objective change	Regarding indicator 1.2.1, as established by the ProDoc, 6 institutions should be selected to train their officials in GCI. The PT in coordination with the MGAP counterpart defines the institutions to build capacities with, based on the demand.	Since 2021 until the end of the project	
Safeguards			
Risk analysis			

<sup>15</sup> Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

<p><b>Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%</b></p>			
<p><b>Co-financing</b></p>			
<p><b>Location of project activity</b></p>			
<p><b>Other</b></p>	<p>1.2.1 and 2.1.2 The new capacities are not determined by a knowledge test, but by another kind of test (satisfaction test for example)</p> <p>2.1.3 The final Goal should not be 4 years but 3 since the field work began in 2020</p> <p>3.1.1 Final goal -26 videos                      -1 co-innovation brochure                      -1 manual of good practices                      -1 dossier</p> <p>Mid-term goals were determined for the indicators</p> <p>3.1.3c. Number of participation in networking events was determined (2)</p> <p>3.1.5 Final goal: 36 press releases</p>		

## 9. Stakeholders' Engagement

Please report on progress and results and challenges on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan) included at CEO Endorsement/Approval during this reporting period.

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
<b>Government Institutions</b>			
DGDR-MGAP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-financier</li> <li>• Support at territory level</li> </ul>	<p>Although the DGDR was one of the stakeholders since the beginning of the project, new activities are being performed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DGDR is developing a pilot project with the aim of replicating the Livestock and Climate proposal, involving one of the farmers organizations that participates in the project and 2 of the project farms.</li> <li>• DGDR is launching an Agroecology project funded by the World Bank taking into account the co-innovation approach and lessons learned from the project and that will allow a continuation of the field work in some of the project farms and in new ones.</li> </ul>	
<b>Non-Government organizations (NGOs)</b>			
<b>Private sector entities</b>			

<b><sup>16</sup>Others[1]</b>			
<b><i>New stakeholders identified/engaged</i></b>			
Local government: Intendencia de Lavalleja/Intendencia de Tacuarembó	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation in field days.</li> <li>• Interest in replication of the co-innovation approach and dissemination of environmental results.</li> </ul>		
University students (undergraduate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field trips to project farms (113 students from diverse Colleges)</li> </ul>		
MSc students (4 people)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of data generated in the project farms for the thesis.</li> <li>• Participation in capacity building activities of the extension team.</li> </ul>		
Innovagro project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyzes data from 4 project farms.</li> </ul>		
Cerro Pelado farmers group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interest in methodology to estimate GHG emissions from livestock</li> </ul>		
Ariel Asuaga farmers group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interest in methodology to estimate GHG emissions from livestock</li> </ul>		
Ingleby Farms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interest in the environmental impact of livestock</li> </ul>		

<sup>16</sup>[1] They can include, among others, community-based organizations (CBOs), Indigenous Peoples organizations, women's groups, private sector companies, farmers, universities, research institutions, and all major groups as identified, for example, in Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and many times again since then.





## 10. Gender Mainstreaming

**Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) during this reporting period.**

Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	Yes	<p>The participation of women in project activities is measured, such as: work days, workshops.</p> <p>The participation of women in decision-making on the farms is measured.</p>
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women’s empowerment?	Yes	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>In some cases, women were encouraged to attend the workshop with a familiar person with the intention of promoting their participation or they were called personally to encourage their participation.</p> <p>A breastfeeding room was available during the annual planning and evaluation workshop.</p> <p>Dissemination of women only invitations to activities or projects through a WhatsApp group created for the women beneficiaries of the project.</p>

Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Yes	It seeks to ensure the participation of women in activities such as field days and workshops with producers (see actions mentioned above).
b) improving women’s participation and decision making	Yes	Through the visits made by the extension agents, the aim is to generate the participation of women by integrating them into the dialogue about the actions to be carried out in the farms.
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	Women-led farms are expected to improve net income through CSLM practices implemented in the co-innovation process.
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	-Management of the farms disaggregated by gender. -Participation in activities of the project disaggregated by gender. -Tasks in which each member of the farm participates. -Number of average hours dedicated to work on the property (of each member).
Staff with gender expertise	Yes (11 months contract)	The products generated were reported in the second PIR.
Any other good practices on gender		-

## 11. Knowledge Management Activities

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

<p>Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.</p>	<p>Yes. During the reporting period the documentation of lessons learned is being carried out on the following processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Selection of beneficiary farms. That process includes from territory arrival strategy developed by the PT, communications aspects, selection criterias, coordination with local actors as producers organizations, etc.</li> <li>-Selection of the Extensionist team. That process covers design aspects of the call, its publication, coordination with the main stakeholders (FAO, MGAP, INIA, Fagro), as well as, results of the process.</li> <li>-Field work. The process seeks to deepen the analysis of the field work stage (since 03/20 up to date), including visits to the farms, work methodologies, communications, team building, etc.</li> </ul> <p>An analysis of the satisfaction surveys of the workshops with producers 2021 was carried out. Based on this a report was developed, which constitute an input for the deliverable "Report of the annual planning and evaluation workshops"</p>
<p>Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Dissemination: A variety of communication tools are being used to distribute knowledge and spread 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 (<i>EFE, SWI, Jujy es producción, Suena a campo-Tucuman</i>) and national press. As previously reported, the project continues to communicate monthly with project partners and producers to update project progress and has developed weekly personalized messages for participating producers with news and key messages. These channels also act as project feedback mechanisms.</p> <p>Since 2021, communication began to include the international community through press releases.</p> <p>A noteworthy event included the participation of the project at a press conference during the Expo Sustainable Uruguay. The conference has the participation of the Minister of Livestock, Agriculture</p>

	<p>and Fisheries, the Ministry of Environment and the FAOUY Officer-in-Charge. A presentation of the project results was made by the Director of the project and the focal point of the MA. The conference was attended by more than 100 people and it was broadcasted in institutional channels of MGAP and MA.</p>
<p>Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people’s livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.</p>	<p>María Teresa De Los Santos is 74 years old, together with her husband Abayubá Rivas, of the same age, lead the San Ceferino farm which covers a surface of 495 ha. The farm is located in the Department of Salto, north of Uruguay and they are one of the beneficiaries of the “Ganaderia y Clima” Project. They have 2 sons and one daughter who are related to the farm production, as well as their grandson, Santiago. The family inherited the land 50 years ago, at that moment, Maria Teresa left her work as a school teacher to live on the farm.</p> <p>The family has undergone three main crises, two of economic kind and one of a serious illness. During these hard times, one of their sons, Nelson, has been the pillar to maintain the farm working and producing. Abayuba and Maria Teresa are very active in their community, Maria Teresa is the President of the local farmer’s organization and Abayuba is the Secretary. At the onset of the Project, together with Luisina, the Extensionist, the family identified their goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To re-define the livestock system in order to work less time and with less physical effort</li> <li>• To improve the economic results to achieve a better quality of life</li> </ul> <p>The farm is based on natural grasslands (campo natural), a valuable natural resource, and currently they raise 204 bovines and 685 ovines.</p> <p>At the beginning of the project, a characterization and diagnosis of the farm was carried out where they identified a low net income as the main problem. This low income was the result of a low meat production due to scarce forage intake for the herd.</p> <p>During the co-innovation process, strategies are defined to improve the income without increasing the work burden and to improve meat production without increasing the costs. This meant to implement the following activities: shorten the mating season, define an early weaning, lower the ovine/bovine ratio and allocate forage resources according to species, category and season.</p>

	<p>The rise of forage production was key to improve the whole efficiency of the system and was achieved in spite of the adverse climatic conditions.</p> <p>Comparing the baseline with the current situation, an increase in meat production from 57 kg/ha to 86 kg/ha was achieved, the net income raised from 56 USD/ha to 132 USD/ha. <a href="#">These improvements allowed the family not only to spend on farm infrastructure, but also to repair the family house and to travel with their grandsons, things that had been impossible to carry out for Maria Teresa and Abayuba before.</a></p> <p>From the environmental side, there was a reduction in the intensity of the GHG emissions from 20 kg CO<sub>2</sub>eq/kg meat to 14 kg CO<sub>2</sub>eq/Kg meat.</p>
Please provide links to related website, social media account	<p>website: <a href="https://www.gub.uy/ministerio-ganaderia-agricultura-pesca/ganaderia-y-clima">https://www.gub.uy/ministerio-ganaderia-agricultura-pesca/ganaderia-y-clima</a></p> <p>Twitter: <a href="https://twitter.com/GanaderiaClima">https://twitter.com/GanaderiaClima</a></p>
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	<p>Radio note: <a href="#">“Una estrategia de ganadería baja en carbono que puede traducirse en una política pública”</a></p> <p>Press conference: <a href="#">“Uruguay hacia una ganadería sostenible”</a></p> <p>Press releases: <a href="#">“Ganadería y Clima confirma mejoras productivas y ambientales alcanzadas en el 2021”</a></p> <p><a href="#">“Luisina la agrónoma que se define como una mujer rural en construcción”</a></p>
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point’s Name and contact details	<p><a href="mailto:cecilia.marquez@fao.org">cecilia.marquez@fao.org</a></p> <p><a href="mailto:valentin.balderrin@fao.org">valentin.balderrin@fao.org</a></p>

## Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

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

If applicable, 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 and or local communities have an active participation in the project activities? If yes, briefly describe how.

N/A

## 12. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>17</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	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	10,721,613	10,233,142	10,721,613
National Government	MGAP	In-Kind	2,660,000	0	0	880,000
Other (Public/Private)	INIA	In-Kind	796,000	576,636	518,906	796,000
Multi-lateral Agency	FAO	Grant	360,002	0	0	20,000
Multi-lateral Agency	FAO	In-Kind	100,000	79,000	72,500	100,000
National Government	MA	In-Kind	178,250	20,925	15,300	178,250

<sup>17</sup> Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.



Other (Public University)	FAGRO	In-Kind	670,000	343,293	270,970	670,000
Multi-lateral Agency	CCAC	Grant	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Private sector	CNFR	In-Kind	49,315	52,218	48,609	58,785
Other (Public/Private)	IPA	In-Kind	378,000	296,487	45,037	378,000
		TOTAL	14,241,567	12,190,172	11,304,464	13,902,648

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

**Link to [FAO note](#) to justify changes in co financing**

## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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

<p><b>Risk rating.</b> It should assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:</p>	
<p><b>High Risk (H)</b></p>	<p>There is a probability of greater than <b>75%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.</p>
<p><b>Substantial Risk (S)</b></p>	<p>There is a probability of between <b>51%</b> and <b>75%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks</p>
<p><b>Moderate Risk (M)</b></p>	<p>There is a probability of between <b>26%</b> and <b>50%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.</p>
<p><b>Low Risk (L)</b></p>	<p>There is a probability of up to <b>25%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.</p>