



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report **2023 – Revised Template**

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	7
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)	13
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	24
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	29
6. RISKS	31
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION (ONLY FOR PROJECTS THAT HAVE CONDUCTED AN MTR)	42
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	46
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT	48
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	51
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	53
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	55
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	56

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Latin America and the Caribbean
Country (ies):	Uruguay
Project Title:	Climate-smart livestock production and land restoration in the Uruguayan rangelands
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/URU/034/GFF
GEF ID:	9153
GEF Focal Area(s):	Climate Change Mitigation (CCM-2, Program 4) Land Degradation (LD-1, Program 2)
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (MGAP)
Initial project duration (years):	4
Project coordinates: <i>This section should be completed ONLY by: a) Projects with 1st PIR; b) In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.</i>	<i>[Projects in a) and b) categories should indicate YES here and provide the geocoded data in Annex 2]</i>

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	April 17, 2018
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	February 14, 2019
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	February 14, 2023
Revised project implementation End date (if approved) ²	September 30, 2023

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	2,091,781
Total Co-financing amount (USD)³:	14,241,567

¹ As per FPMIS

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

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

Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	1,945,018
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)⁴:	1,711,769
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023⁵	12,943,779

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	May 24, 2023
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	N/A
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	February 2022-July 2022
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	May-October 2023
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	Yes. Annex 1: Tracking tools Annex 2: Core indicators

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

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

⁴ The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

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

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

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

Status

Implementation Status <i>(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):</i>	4 th PIR (Final PIR)
--	---------------------------------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	María Bergós, National Project Coordinator (FAOUY)	Maria.Bergos@fao.org
Budget Holder (BH)	Jorge Meza	Jorge.Meza@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)	Robert Bouvier	Maureen.Bidart@ambiente.gub.uy
Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Carolyn Opio, Livestock Policy Officer (FAOSLM)	Carolyn.Opio@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	Valeria Gonzalez-Riggio, Technical Officer, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit (OCB)	Valeria.GonzalezRiggio@fao.org

Acronyms and abbreviations found throughout this document are detailed in the following table:

ACRONYMS and ABBREVIATIONS	
ANII	<i>Agencia Nacional de Investigación e Innovación</i> National Agency for Research and Innovation
AUCI	<i>Agencia Uruguaya de Cooperación Internacional</i> Uruguayan Agency for International Cooperation
CAF	<i>Cooperativas Agrarias Federadas</i> Federation of Agricultural Cooperatives
CCAC	Climate and Clean Air Coalition
CNFR	<i>Comisión Nacional de Fomento Rural</i> National Commission for Rural Promotion
CSLM	Climate Smart Livestock Management

CURE-UDELAR	<i>Centro Universitario Regional del Este</i> University Centre of the East Region
DINABISE-MA	<i>Dirección Nacional de Biodiversidad y Servicios Ecosistémicos</i> National Directorate for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
DINACC-MA	<i>Dirección Nacional de Cambio Climático</i> National Directorate for Climate Change
DGDR-MGAP	<i>Dirección General de Desarrollo Rural</i> Directorate General for Rural Development
DGRN-MGAP	<i>Dirección General de Recursos Naturales</i> Directorate General for Natural Resources
FAGRO	<i>Facultad de Agronomía</i> Faculty of Agronomy
FUCREA	<i>Federación Uruguaya de Grupos CREA</i> Uruguayan Federation of Regional Centres of Agricultural Experimentation
GIS	Geographic Information System
GLEAM	Global Livestock Environmental Assessment Model
GyC	<i>Proyecto Ganadería y Clima</i> Livestock and Climate Project
INAC	<i>Instituto Nacional de Carnes</i> National Meat Institute
INC	<i>Instituto Nacional de Colonización</i> National Institute of Colonization
INIA	<i>Instituto Nacional de Investigación Agropecuaria</i> National Institute of Agricultural Research
IPA	<i>Instituto Plan Agropecuario</i> Institute of Livestock Technology Transfer
LoA	Letter of Agreement
MA	<i>Ministerio de Ambiente</i> Ministry of Environment
MDR	<i>Mesa de Desarrollo Rural</i> Rural Development Committee
MEF	<i>Ministerio de Economía y Finanzas</i> Ministry of Economy and Finance

MGAP	<i>Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca</i> Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries
MGCN	<i>Mesa de Ganadería de Campo Natural</i> National Livestock Rangeland Board
MPI	Ministry of Primary Industries of New Zealand
MRV	Monitoring, Reporting and Verification
MTR	Mid Term Review
NAMA	Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action
NDC	Nationally Determined Contribution (Paris Agreement)
NGHGI	National Greenhouse Gas Inventory
NZAGRC	New Zealand Agricultural Greenhouse Gas Research Centre
OPYPA	<i>Oficina de Programación y Política Agropecuaria</i> Office of Programming and Agricultural Policy
PSC	Project Steering Committee
PT	Project Team
SNIDER	<i>Sistema Nacional de Innovación y Desarrollo Rural</i> National System of Innovation and Rural Development
UAI-MGAP	<i>Unidad de Asuntos Internacionales</i> International Affairs Unit
UASYCC-OPYPA-MGAP	<i>Unidad Agropecuaria de Sostenibilidad y Cambio Climático</i> Agricultural Sustainability and Climate Change Unit
UD-MGAP	<i>Unidad de Descentralización</i> Unit for Decentralization
UDELAR	<i>Universidad de la República</i> University of the Republic
UGP-MGAP	<i>Unidad de Gestión de Proyectos</i> Unit for Project Management
UPEP-UDELAR	<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)

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
<i>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.</i>	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 Program Directions)	-	8	7 The project continues to collaborate in various initiatives associated with MRV: - The PT continues to provide support to development of the 2nd NDC and the Inter-Ministerial Group for the Livestock Environmental Footprint. - A team of national and international consultants are working on the preparation of the Mitigation Plan (NAMA) and its corresponding MRV. The delivery of the final document is scheduled for July of the current year.	S
		Indicator 5 (CC): Degree of support for low GHG developme	3 (as per the scale in GEF-6 Program ming	-	6	7 During this reporting period, the Strategy Document for Sustainable Livestock foreseen under the project was completed. During its development, to ensure it reflects national priorities and needs, an inclusive and	HS

⁸ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

⁹ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

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

¹¹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory** (HS), **Satisfactory** (S), **Moderately Satisfactory** (MS), **Moderately Unsatisfactory** (MU), **Unsatisfactory** (U), and **Highly Unsatisfactory** (HU). Refer to Annex 1.

		<p>nt in the policy planning and regulatory framework</p>	<p>Direction s)</p>		<p>participatory approach was adopted with the engagement of actors from public agricultural institutions, academia, producer organizations and women and youth representatives. The Minister of MGAP in collaboration with the Minister of the Environment led this process and the output was validated within the <i>Mesa de Ganadería sobre Campo Natural</i>. Following the participatory phase, a working group comprising of representatives from the various departments of the MGAP (OPYPA, DGDR, SNIDER and GyC) was created to explore the possibility of making the strategy an integral part of national policy. The working group was formed at the request of the Minister of MGAP with the objective of facilitating the mainstreaming of the Strategy developed under the project into the national policy. This working group has proposed a roadmap that defines the next steps for implementation of the Strategy Document for Sustainable Livestock within the framework of the National Strategy for the Agricultural Sector. In June, a completion workshop for the field component of the project was held, in which the project results were presented. The event was attended by the Minister of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries and the Minister of Environment. The Minister of Environment called for the GyC project approach to be considered as a national policy. The MGAP Minister held a meeting with the Minister of Economy and Finance in which he expressed interest in scaling up the project. The experience and results of the project are being used to guide the development and design of other initiatives. For example, two projects based on the GyC approach are</p>	
--	--	---	---------------------	--	---	--

						currently under design, for the Green Climate Fund and the European Union. In this regard, the PT has held several consultation meetings to share lessons learned and best practices. -DGDR has also launched an Agroecology project financed by the World Bank that incorporates the co-innovation approach and the lessons learned from the project. This will allow for the continuation of the fieldwork on some of the project farms and the replication in new ones.	
Outcome 1.2: National capacities have been strengthened to support CSLM implementation	Indicator 1.2: No of institutions that commit to supporting the implementation of CSLM	0	-	6	8	Reported in the previous PIR, additional progress includes: SNIDER: A meeting was organized with SNIDER where experiences and lessons from the implementation of the co-innovation and CSLM approach were shared. OPYPA: Several meetings to exchange on the topic of: CSLM approach and results achieved, mitigation of climate change, and the CSLM strategy.	HS
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	32,931 ha on 58 farms monitored * The indicator " <i>índice de cría</i> " (livestock breeding index) was used to calculate area under low GHG management practices as it is an indicator that summarizes the implementation of all the recommended practices. *2 farms are not being considered because the livestock breeding index is not available yet. The closing date is June 30 and some farms have not reported the data yet.	S	

Outcome 2.1: Sustainable CSLM has been implemented in degraded/degradi ng lands	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 and indirectly	458,124 tons CO2eq of GHG reduced or avoided directly and indirectly	HS
Outcome 2.1: Sustainable CSLM has been implemented in degraded/degradi ng 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	Comparing the average of the three years of the project against the average of the three years of the baseline: 54.4% of the farms increased net income by 10% or more. The achievement of the set targets have been greatly affected by the multi-year droughts experienced by Uruguay during the duration of project implementation. Even though the impacts of these climatic events have been reflected in target achievement, at global level, significant impact has still been achieved, with 74% of the project producers achieving an increase in net income.	S
Outcome 2.1: Sustainable CSLM has been implemented in degraded/degradi ng lands	Indicator 4 (CC): Area under low GHG technologie s and practices	0	-	Additional 35,000 ha under low GHG (CSLM) managem ent practices	32,931 ha on 58 farms monitored <i>*2 farms are not being considered because the livestock breeding index is not available yet. The closing date is June 30 and some farms have not reported the data yet.</i>	S

	<p>Outcome 3.1: Project implementation based on RBM and lessons learned/good practices documented and disseminated</p>	<p>M&E system ensuring timely delivery of project benefits and adaptive results-based management</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>Up-to date monitoring on outcomes, outputs and activities</p>	<p>Up-to date monitoring on outcomes, outputs and activities</p>	<p>Project monitoring activities are expected to be functional until the closure of the project in September. During the reporting period, the mid-term review was initiated and concluded. The process of contracting the consultants for the final evaluation was initiated. The international consultant has been identified and selected while the process of hiring the national consultant is underway. The Final Evaluation Team will undertake its evaluation mission next August (2023). The documentation of lessons learned is progressing. This effort will deliver a comprehensive document of lessons learned and good practices from the entire project.</p> <p>- At regional level, the project team are part of an effort to document results and lessons from the three climate smart livestock projects funded by GEF in a two series publication that will provide insights on the implementation of the approach and a guide for countries on how to design and implement CSL projects. This effort is led by the project lead technical officer in collaboration with project teams and countries.</p> <p>The PT has elaborated an Exit Strategy, which defines the project’s plan of action to withdraw support as the project ends and clarify with stakeholders how the project will end and/or transform. The following areas have been identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Exit strategy of the extension team ● Communication to producers on the closure of field activities ● Communication of the closure of the project to stakeholders 	<p>HS</p>
--	--	--	----------	--	--	---	-----------

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy for institutionalization of project products • Knowledge transfer strategy of the project to key actors: FAO, MGAP, MA 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
<u>Outcome 1.1 Policy and planning frameworks have been strengthened to support CSLM implementation and national communication on livestock emissions</u>				
Output 1.1.1 A national climate-smart livestock management (CSML) strategy, designed and validated with key stakeholders	Indicator 1.1.1a: A CSLM strategy document	-> Preparation of the Strategy document -> Validation of the document with MGAP authorities	The inclusive and participatory development process facilitated by the IPA with the participation of stakeholders from the government institutions, public/private institutions, research institutes, producers' organizations, women and youth groups was completed. The document was presented to the MGCN for input, feedback and validation. In July 2022, a working group comprising of representatives from OPYPA, DGDR, SNIDER, and PT was established to draft the Strategy document, taking as an input the document generated in the participatory phase. The document has been completed and will be presented to the MGAP minister for validation, along with a roadmap proposing next steps.	

¹² Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

Output 1.1.1	Indicator 1.1.1b: Number of institutions involved in the preparation and validation process	10 institutions involved in the preparation and validation process	A first workshop was organized on August 2nd with the main institutions participating: MGAP, MA, MEF, MRREE, INIA, IPA, INAC, SUL, FAGRO, MGCN. Following this meeting, additional workshops with a wider participation were organized. In an effort to strengthen the engagement process, the workshops included participation of additional institutions such as the Technological Laboratory of Uruguay-LATU, the Investment, Export and Country Brand Promotion Agency-Uruguay XXI; farmers organizations; and women and youth organizations.	
Output 1.1.2 A Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA), including a national measuring, reporting and validation (MRV) system for the livestock ruminant sector	Indicator 1.1.2a: A validated NAMA document and MRV system	->Hire the consultants ->Complete the workshops with main stakeholders ->Write the document	During the current period, an international consulting team and two national consultants were hired. The International and National teams each have defined but complementary roles and deliverables. The international team planned two missions in Uruguay, the first was executed in November 2022, in which 29 interviews with public and private sector actors were carried out together with the national consultants and the PT. In addition, on November 22, a visit was made to three participating project farms, in which inputs were received on the evaluation of farm results and the co-innovation process.	

¹³ Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Workplan. Please be concise (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

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

			In June, the second mission was accomplished, the purpose was to generate exchanges between the national and international experts and the PT to write the final documents.	
Output 1.1.2	Indicator 1.1.2b: Number of institutions involved in NAMA validation	> In 2022 it is planned to hold workshops with technicians from main institutions involved	<p>1 meeting to define the scope of the NAMA (also known as the Mitigation Plan) and prioritize mitigation measures and the analysis to be carried out.</p> <p>A presentation to assess and exchange information on mitigation measures was organized with main stakeholders (MGAP, INAC, INIA).</p> <p>Following delivery of the draft mitigation Plan, a final validation of the documents by MGAP authorities is planned.</p>	
Output 1.2.1 Capacities developed to effectively support the implementation of CSLM with a gender-sensitive perspective.	Indicator 1.2.1: Number of staff in national institutions with enhanced capacities for mainstreaming CSLM at institutional level	> The project will provide courses, workshops, talks, or other instance to strengthen the capacities of actors that could be interested	-2 meetings with private stakeholders to present the methodology for quantifying emissions and other environmental indicators.	

<p>Output 1.2.2</p> <p>A training program in place, to supporting the rolling out of improved and climate-smart approaches to livestock management</p>	<p>Indicator 1.2.2: Number of extensionists with enhanced knowledge and capacities on CSLM</p>	<p>->Complete an extension training course within the framework of the Postgraduate and Permanent Education Unit (UPEP) of the Faculty of Agronomy</p>	<p>A course "Technological and methodological bases for the ecological intensification of livestock systems on natural grasslands" was prepared and given within the framework of the Postgraduate and Permanent Education Unit. The Course was attended by 15 participants, of which 38% were women.</p> <p>A seminar was held to present the results of the GyC and Innovagro projects followed by an exchange workshop between researchers to gain in-depth knowledge on CSLM practices and current research on the topic. 47 people attended.</p> <p>A dialogue session with technicians from OPYPA was organized to present the results from the pilot farm for the second year of project implementation.</p> <p>The results of the third year of work on the farms were presented during the Component 2 closure workshop, to producers, and representatives of MGAP (OPYPA, DGDR, UGP, SNIDER, UCOD), MA, FAO, INIA, and FAGRO.</p>	
<p><u>Outcome 2.1 Sustainable climate-smart livestock management (CSLM) has been implemented in degraded/degrading lands.</u></p>				
<p>Output 2.1.1</p> <p>Short and medium-term farm level</p>	<p>Indicator 2.1.1: Number of CSLM strategies implemented with a</p>	<p>->Complete the third year of work in the farms</p>	<p>The third year of on-farm implementation was completed. The technical visits to the farms culminated in June with the preparation of a closure report for each producer. The report included data from the</p>	

<p>strategies, implemented on project farms with a gender perspective</p>	<p>co-innovation process on farm level.</p>		<p>previous year, as well as a general evaluation of the project results, integrating the economic-productive, social and environmental variables.</p> <p>Additionally, the environmental team delivered a final report documenting the results for each of the 20 intensive monitoring sites.</p> <p>During this period, communication and awareness activities on the closure of the on-farm implementation were undertaken with each producer.</p> <p>Currently, more than 59% of the producers have decided to contract the technical assistance services of the extension agent with whom they worked during project implementation, and an additional number expressed interest in reaching an agreement with their respective extension technicians.</p>	
<p>Output 2.1.2 A capacity development program focused on the application of the CSLM technologies and practices</p>	<p>Indicator 2.1.2: Number of farmers with enhanced knowledge and capacities on CSLM</p>	<p>->Complete 4 field days (4 in spring 2022)</p>	<p>Four field days were held in the spring of 2022, attended by a total of 144 people:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Northern zone 40 participants, of which 43% women ● Northeast Zone 30 participants, of which 33% women ● Eastern Zone 34 participants, of which 47% women ● Central Zone 40 participants, of which 48% women <p>Due to the closure of on-farm implementation in April, no field days are planned for Autumn this year.</p>	

			Alternatively, emphasis was placed on the organization of a final workshop that included the participation of all project beneficiaries from the 4 project zones. The aim of the workshop was to evaluate the results and impact of the project with project beneficiaries.
Output 2.1.3 On-farm monitoring system, in place (to monitor GHG emissions, adaptation strategies, financing, land degradation and biodiversity)	Indicator 2.1.3: Number of farms that are integrated into the monitoring system.	60 farms	-60 pilot farms monitored with 22 farms managed by women Annual report analyzing the environmental impact measured in the 20 intensive monitoring farms and in the 20 control farms, including analysis of vegetation and manure was prepared and handed to the farmers.
<u>Outcome 3.1 Monitoring, evaluation and knowledge-sharing</u>			
-Output 3.1.1 A set of manuals and media products, for use by extension workers and producers, that capture and describe the	Indicator 3.1.1: Number of information products and number of distributed copies.	->Complete the manual of CSLM practices for producers and rural workers ->Videos documenting the field days	-7 videos and 7 teasers featuring the life stories of 7 project families were filmed and the raw material is being edited. -1 draft manual for livestock farmers prepared -4 field-day reports prepared and disseminated, presenting information on the baseline, redesign plans, actions implemented and results obtained

<p>improved practices, measures and technologies</p>		<p>->Video documenting the environmental dimension</p> <p>->Video documenting CSLM practices</p> <p>->Producers story telling videos</p>	<p>-1 Technical report on the analysis of pregnancy results during the mating season 2021-2022</p> <p>-1 scripted video documenting the case of sustainable livestock farming in Uruguay prepared for RLC</p> <p>-4 videos reporting the spring field days</p> <p>Northern region: Jornada de primavera 2022, zona norte, Colonia Lavalleja. Familia Zorrilla- Silveira</p> <p>Northeastern region: Jornada de primavera 2022, zona noreste, Cerro Largo. Predio de Ana Isabel Ron.</p> <p>Center region: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Op2CR2QSJis</p> <p>Eastern region: Jornada de primavera 2022, zona este, Maldonado. Predio de Paola Fernández.</p>	
<p>Output 3.1.2 Project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and system, in place</p>	<p>Indicator 3.1.2: Number of meetings and workshops.</p>	<p>->Complete lesson learned about:</p> <p>-Extensionist technicians selection</p> <p>-Selection of producers</p>	<p>> 1 comprehensive report documenting lessons learned and best practices from the project prepared, including the following sections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design and planning <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1. Relevance of the topic and alignment with the strategic guidelines of the 2030 Agenda, FAO, GEF and the Uruguayan Context 	

	<p>beneficiaries of the project</p> <p>-Field work</p> <p>->Complete two meetings with PSC</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.2. Logical Framework 2. Execution <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1. Component 1 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1.1. Adaptive planning 2.1.2. Lessons learned in the Strategy construction process 2.1.3. Lessons learned during development of the Mitigation Plan 2.2. Component 2 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.2.1. Learnings from the LoAs 2.2.2. Farm selection processes 2.2.3. Extension team selection process 2.2.4. Training of technical teams and support tools 2.2.5. On-farm implementation 2.2.6. Field days and workshops 3. Monitoring and evaluation <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1. Change management 3.2. The role of the coordination team 3.3. Risk management 3.4. Budget management 3.5. Communication management 4. Selection of project beneficiary producers of the project 5. Selection of the extension team 6. Field work <p>- 40 regular team meetings were held during the reporting period</p> <p>-1 evaluation of project progress in 2022 and planning</p>	
--	---	---	--

			meeting for 2023 were organized	
Output 3.1.3 Knowledge-sharing with other countries and dissemination of verifiable data and tested methodologies	Indicator 3.1.3a: Number of publications	3 articles in international journals	-> To be reported at the end of the project. Three articles published in international scientific journals.	
Output 3.1.3 Knowledge-sharing with other countries and dissemination of verifiable data and tested methodologies	3.1.3b: Number of presentations at conferences	->Complete 5 presentations in conferences	4 presentations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 presentation at the Mercosur Seminar "Sustainable agri-food systems: Mercosur Perspectives" (July 2022) - 1 presentation at COP 27 (November 2022, Egypt) - 1 presentation at the Farming Systems Design Congress (November 2022, Morocco) - 1 presentation at the I4C event on methane, Workshop: Innovations for Climate Change Mitigation through Food System Transformation (May 2023, Bilbao, Spain) - PT has prepared a proposal to showcase the project and its results at the forthcoming FAO Global Conference on Sustainable Livestock Transformation in Rome 	

<p>Output 3.1.3</p> <p>Knowledge-sharing with other countries and dissemination of verifiable data and tested methodologies</p>	<p>Indicator 3.1.3c: Participation in networking events</p>	<p>->Complete participation in 2 networking events</p>	<p>-1 online presentation: "Opportunities for the agricultural sector in Latin America and the Caribbean within the framework of the global methane commitment" (FAO, PLACA, Global Methane Pledge, CCAC, IICA, EU, FVC, among others), in July 2022.</p> <p>-1 case study article for CCAC "Uruguay Reduces Livestock Emissions While Increasing Productivity in a CCAC-Supported Pilot"</p> <p>-Participation in the Network of Coordinators of FAO projects (FAO's Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean).</p>	
<p>Output 3.1.4</p> <p>Project Mid-term Review and Final Evaluation</p>	<p>Indicator 3.1.4: Number of evaluations carried out</p>	<p>->Complete the Mid-term Review</p> <p>->Develop the final evaluation</p>	<p>Mid-Term Review process completed.</p> <p>The terminal evaluation process is currently underway (international consultant already hired and selection of national consultant is in progress).</p>	
<p>Output 3.1.5</p> <p>A communication strategy, implemented</p>	<p>Indicator 3.1.5: Number of appearances in the local media; number of website and social media visitors</p>	<p>->Complete 24 press releases</p> <p>->Complete activities to divulge information of the project</p>	<p>52 press releases were carried in different media (electronic, radio, television)</p> <p>A presentation on the results of the project was made at the North Rural Development Board (MDR) by one of the extension workers and field supervisor.</p> <p>The project was selected by the FAO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (RLC) as a case study</p>	

			<p>in: Digitization opportunities for the project developed in Uruguay: Climate-smart livestock production and land restoration in the Uruguayan rangelands (FSP).</p> <p>Subsequently, a consultancy was carried out by FAO Uruguay with the ORT University on the Evaluation of alternatives for the incorporation of digitization tools and processes in the practices of the project "Climate-Smart Livestock Production and soil restoration in Uruguayan pastures", as an input for its upscaling.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcomes of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR (max 400 words)

Overall implementation progress reaches 98% of the outcomes with a budget execution of 93% (actuals and hard commitments).

During this period, good progress was made in Component 1. The processes undertaken resulted in strengthened institutional capacities and policies. This was the result of the inclusive and participatory processes undertaken during the elaboration of the Strategy Document achieved through 7 thematic workshops and 5 structured interviews resulting in engagement of 151 participants, of which 39% women and 10% youth. In addition, one of the main co-benefits from this process is that project experiences and outcomes have become important inputs in national strategic planning processes. For example, the Minister of Agriculture requested the PT to work jointly with experts from Directorates in the design of the National Strategy for Sustainable Livestock. In this regard, the PT has collaborated with the Office of Programming and Agricultural Policy (OPYPA) and the Directorate General for Rural Development (DGDR), and with the Ministry of Environment (MA), all entities with the responsibility for planning and key to the continued sustainability of the results and actions under this project.

In addition, capacity-building activities of public officials and extensionists have provided tools and capacities needed for the dissemination of project approach and continued engagement with beneficiaries beyond the project implementation period. The continued engagement of main stakeholders following project closure and the institutionalization of project results is addressed in the Exit Strategy.

More than 160 participating farmers and technical advisors met in a two-day workshop to present project results, discuss the whole process and reflect on learned lessons. During the second day, national authorities, including Ministers of Agriculture and Environment, representatives from INIA, FAGRO and producers' organizations attended the meeting and expressed their satisfaction with the results achieved.

One of the major challenges the project encountered was a multi-year drought over three consecutive years, resulting in the whole country facing reduced soil moisture, which affected the quantity of forage available to meet the requirements of the livestock. During this reporting period, due to the severity of the drought, MGAP declared an agricultural emergency. In spite of this context, project results confirmed that the CSL practices are effective and allowed to increase their resilience to extreme climate events. Increases in beef and sheep meat production, both per hectare and per animal; increases in net income and decreases in GHG emissions both per hectare and per kilogram of meat produced, were

achieved on project farms. In comparison, FUCREA farmers, according to its [Livestock Coordinator](#), will have less meat production, more costs and a decrease in pregnancy of approximately 8 to 10 %. In short, "less production, more costs." The manager of the "Carpetas Verdes" monitoring program from IPA foresees similar tendencies in their farms.

An additional challenge the project faced was the lack of resources for communication activities e.g. audiovisual materials. Despite this, the project was able to deliver several through budget reallocation, new funds and joint/coordinated effort with project partners. Specifically with the design of the manual for producers, the contracted expert has decided to discontinue the assignment and considering the NTE, it seems difficult to have it ready before the end of the project. In order to mitigate this risk, the PT is exploring new possibilities.

The project experienced financial difficulties due to the exchange rate and increased costs, but was able to mobilize not only more funds from co-financing partners, but also from new sources like the MPI from New Zealand, through the NZAGRC, which financed an international consultancy for the Mitigation Plan.

In november 2022, the [GEF CEO visited one of the farms](#) in his visit to Uruguay and the LTO performed her mission to the country participating in one of the field days and had the chance to visit two farms and one of the producers' organizations involved in the project.

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

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

	FY2023 Development Objective rating ¹⁵	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating ¹⁶	Comments/reasons ¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	HS	HS	<p><i>The implementation of the project has been successful and this is reflected in the results achieved. The continuity of the good relationship between the project and the national counterparts allowed it to institutionalize the results obtained and incorporate them in public policies. Also, at the private level, the good synergy with producers' organizations resulted in new initiatives being carried out. The results were obtained during one of the worst ever recorded drought in the country. In spite of the extreme climate events, increases in meat production, net income and decreases in GHG emissions were achieved. These results positioned the project as a reference at national level and is considered an example for other initiatives. The PT is sharing lessons learned, accumulated experience and is engaged in knowledge transfer to promote the CSLM approach. The co-innovation approach has facilitated for livestock producers to adopt new practices and methodologies and a majority of the participating farmers will continue working with their technical advisors.</i></p> <p><i>In summary, the sustainability of the project is ensured by the convergence of two new projects which allow the scaling up, the commitment of national authorities and the capacities built by the project.</i></p>

¹⁵ **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁶ **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁷ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

Budget Holder	HS	HS	<i>The Minister of Livestock of Uruguay has expressed his broad satisfaction with the results of the project, in the sense that by providing technical assistance and incentives, it is possible to maintain and increase the levels of profitability of agricultural performance, as soon as carbon emissions are reduced. On the other hand, the Minister has expressed his interest in expanding the project, with the assistance of FAO, to a national programme, which goes well beyond the 60 small farmers who are part of the project.</i>
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸	HS	HS	<i>The results achieved by the Project are considered highly satisfactory despite the adverse climate conditions and the challenges posed by the COVID 19 pandemic. Most of the project outcomes and outputs have been successfully achieved up to date and will be fully achieved by the end of Project implementation. These results confirm that the practices promoted by the Project allow farmers to increase meat production and net income while reducing GHG emissions, sustainably manage natural grasslands and increasing their ability to adapt to climate change. From the Ministry of Environment perspective, these successful results reaffirm the country's climate change commitments included in their NDCs to the Paris Agreement, where these good management practices are prioritized, and reinforce the fact that the approach promoted by the Project constitutes a path towards livestock sustainability and sustainable development. The active participation of national representatives and close relationship with the project team throughout project implementation facilitated to reaching the needed consensus and institutionalize the project results. Now is time to build on the results achieved and the lessons learned and continue working on the new projects that allow the scaling up.</i>

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

Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	HS	HS	<p><i>Both the Development Objective and Implementation progress ratings are highly satisfactory as the project is on track to fully achieve its end-of-project targets by project closure. First, the project has had an impressive impact in improving the visibility of the opportunities to mitigate and adapt to Climate Change, despite the implementation in a complicated climatic context characterized by multi-year droughts. It has proven to be key in making these opportunities more visible among producers, the sector and partners as a way to mobilize additional support for the sector especially considering that one of the recommendations of the MTE was to pay more attention to developing a strategy to secure resources for continuity.</i></p> <p><i>The project has catalyzed strategic partnerships at the national and local levels, consisting of a large number of governmental, academy, cooperation and development agencies, NGOs, private sector and other stakeholders with capacity to provide financial, in kind, technical and organizational support providing a coordination framework that allows long term benefits for consolidation and sustainability of the project model. The project has engaged and shaped national external processes that will foster sustainability of the achieved results.</i></p> <p><i>Concerning the IP progress, the project team is delivering on most of the Outcomes in an efficient way; overall expenditure is according to the annual work plan. This is proof of a committed, effective, and well-organized team of experts who coordinate at a central level on administrative issues, work planning, procurement, and communications, but also deliver high quality technical support and advice at the local level.</i></p> <p><i>Regarding the DO progress, the project has made significant progress towards both main Objectives and the targets are on track. The project's activities are in fact conducive to reduce impacts of the sector, increase resilience to climate change impacts, particularly in regards to beneficiary livelihoods (economic activities) while improving other environmental indicators.</i></p>
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	HS	HS	<p><i>Being a USD 2 million GEF grant, the project results have been impressive. The project is a model on how to improve social, environmental and economic sustainability, invest GEF resources in a catalytic way, bridge the environmental and agricultural agendas, promote policy coherence, and inform the countries' commitments towards UNFCCC and UNCCD. The project results are well placed to be scaled out both in Uruguay and other Latin American countries, with FAO support.</i></p> <p><i>Opportunities for the new Global Biodiversity Framework Fund could be assessed for a follow-up and complementary project in Uruguay.</i></p>

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

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

This section is under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

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

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

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate:

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²⁰ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	Low

<i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i>
No.

²⁰ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit (Esm-unit@fao.org) should be contacted. The project shall prepare or amend an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) or other ESS instruments and management tools based on the new risk classification (please refer to page 13 <https://www.fao.org/3/cb9870en/cb9870en.pdf>)

6. Risks

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	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. 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. 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 climate change and the strengthening of natural resources management, while the GEF Project is focused on the mitigation of climate change, therefore both projects can mutually benefit. DACC-2</p>	<p>The pilot farm selection process was successful in achieving an equal distribution of farms, per zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Center: 25% ○ East: 23% ○ Northeast: 23% ○ North: 28% <p>MGAP declared an agricultural emergency 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.</p> <p>CSL practices already implemented in the pilot farms helped producers to cope with the extreme events.</p>	

²¹ Risk ratings means a rating of the overall risk of factors internal or external, to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

				<p>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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 2. DACC-2 will finance minor investments in infrastructure, such as water management or reforestation in the beneficiaries' farms of the GEF project. 		
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. 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>	<p>The selection process was successful in achieving an equal distribution of farms per zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Center: 25% ○ East: 23% ○ Northeast: 23% ○ North: 28% <p>Uruguay continues with a mandatory vaccination scheme against the foot and mouth disease (FMD). Animal epidemics have not been reported.</p>	
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>	<p>The producer selection process ensures a strong degree of commitment from producers to the project. A promotional video had been developed and disseminated.</p> <p>Eight meetings were organized throughout the four agro-ecological zones, with the support of the producer's organizations.</p>	

					<p>The team of technicians has developed strategies to manage and maintain this commitment.</p> <p>Several communication channels between the producers and the PT (social media, email, cellphone) to keep the farmers motivated have been established.</p> <p>A social technical group was created to monitor and observe social aspects to be aware of difficulties that may arise.</p>	
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>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project presentations ○ Draft methodology proposal (elaborated by the PT) <p>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.</p> <p>The PT has requested MGAP Minister and Vice-Minister for a meeting and as a result the authorities expressed commitment and support to the whole 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>Soil organic carbon samples have been taken, processed and sent to laboratories to be analyzed.</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>	<p>Samples were taken from 20 pilot farms matched with 20 control farms which allows horizontal comparison.</p> <p>The project is working together with other initiatives, for example, Initiative 20x20 that is modeling and measuring soil organic carbon in farms with different grassland management.</p>
<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</p>	<p>Baseline for GHG emissions calculated (herd structure, animal live weight and feed basket has been characterized in 62 pilot farms).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Information gathered in national research suggests that soil organic carbon sequestration is feasible in grasslands with improved management.</p>	

				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 absolute emissions greater than in a “no project” scenario.		
	Low technical capacity of experts and institutions at the national and local levels, slowing down the progress of the project	Low	Y	The evaluation carried out during the project preparation phase showed that this risk is low and that there are qualified national experts. In terms of institutional capacity, the risk will be mitigated through the project's capacity building activities.		
New risks identified						
	Change of government (starting 20/3/1): Dissolution of the MGCN	Low	N	Maintain and redirect communications to the institutions that constituted the MGCN to obtain support. Strengthen agreements to secure MGAP support through FAO and GEF support. Report presenting USAYCC and project activities to new authorities.	Meeting with new ministerial authorities of the MGAP (Minister, Vice-minister, general Director and Director of the International Affairs Unit) was organized. The Representative and the Officer in charge of FAO participated together with the project coordinating team. Meeting with a new focal point of the DGRN and the MGCN. Two coordination meetings with members of the MGCN.	
	Change of government (starting 20/3/1): Difficulties in generating agreements between National Government and Project	Low	N	Strengthen agreements to secure MGAP support through FAO and GEF support. Report presenting UASYCC and project activities to new authorities.		
	Change of government (starting 20/3/1): Difficulties in coordinating between MGAP-Executing Units and Project	Low	N	Strengthen agreements to secure MGAP support through FAO and GEF support. Report presenting UASYCC and project activities to new authorities.	Meeting with the new Director of UD-MGAP to strengthen linkages and promote synergies. 2 members of the staff are designated to cooperate with the project in the territories.	

					4 meetings with the new Director of DGDR-MGAP and members of the staff to explore synergies and ways of cooperation.	
Change of government (starting 20/3/1): Lack of support at the territory level	Low	N	Strengthen links with producer organizations.	<p>The communication strategy of the project foresees permanent communication mechanisms with producer organizations in order to maintain and strengthen ties with the project.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Regular contact of the PT with farmers' organizations is maintained.</p> <p>Activities with producers in the 4 zones are performed to keep the interest and commitment: workshops and virtual presentations.</p>		
Change of government (starting 20/3/1): Lack of collaboration by MGAP technicians in the territory	Low	N	Strengthen links with producer organizations	<p>The communication strategy of the project foresees permanent communication mechanisms with MGAP technicians in order to maintain and strengthen ties with the project</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		
Change of government (starting 20/3/1): Lack of investment at farm level	Medium	N	<p>Exploit new forms of financing</p> <p>Generate new financing requests</p>	The PT is exploring alternative funds.		
Change of government (starting 20/3/1): DACC 2 Funding Withdrawal	Medium	N	<p>Use other ways of financing</p> <p>Generate new financing requests</p>	<p>The PT is exploring alternative funds.</p> <p>PT managed to have access to new funds from DGDR and UGP for specific purposes</p>		

2023 Project Implementation Report

					and a new funding source: NZ Ministry of Primary Industries.	
	COVID-19: possibility for the MGCN to suspend the meetings. Eventually it will generate an overload of the work schedule and therefore the difficulty to interact with the project	Medium	N	Communication will be made in advance to gain access to the agenda. Virtual workshops-INIA conference rooms (smaller workshops, it takes longer)	Meetings were rescheduled in virtual form. PT was invited to participate in the regular MGCN meetings allowing close monitoring of the situation.	
	COVID-19: the suspension of classes by FAGRO. This would delay technicians' training.	High	N	The following alternatives will be used: FAGRO online platform Skype EVA-UDELAR Zoom WebEx	N/A	
	COVID-19: technicians will have difficulty visiting certain producers (producers with co-morbidities, etc.) This generates a delay in data collection for BL (pilot farms) Delay in the selection of the 20 control sites	Medium	N	Telephone communication to collect BL information. On the other hand, the PT and FAGRO developed a protocol to mitigate contagion risks between technicians and producers. INIA could get masks and other supplies for producers.	A protocol was prepared for extension technicians Safety equipment and protective products were provided by INIA. Transport adjustments were made to consider sanitary requirements.	
	COVID-19: producer organizations cannot collaborate in open field days	Medium	N	While the sessions are postponed, documents are disseminated for the work on the premises and collaboration is requested from the producer's organizations.	During the sanitary emergency these activities were currently postponed. Virtual activities were planned instead. Face-to-face activities were re-assumed once the sanitary conditions and regulations allowed them. Additionally, to allow access for people who cannot attend the activities, communication	

					materials reporting the open field days are produced.	
	COVID-19: Risk of lower participation of women due to increased domestic work and care.	Medium	N	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>This topic was included in the gender training for extensionist technicians.</p> <p>Schedule of the activities taken into account domestic work.</p> <p>Childcare provided during activities to allow full participation of women.</p> <p>Social group formed by members of the team with social background was created in order to respond to gender issues.</p> <p>Contacts with the Gender Specialized Commission of the MGAP were established for the eventual resolution of cases of gender-based violence.</p>	
	Exchange rate	M	N	<p>The PT is monitoring the development of the exchange rate 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 re-assignments 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>Exploration of new funding sources resulted in the contribution of the NZ MPI to the NAMA Consultancy.</p> <p>Co-financing partners agreed to supply more funds to cover the costs of the closure workshop of Component 2.</p>	
	Upscaling to 400 thousand ha	L	N	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>SENDA Agroecologica Project: The DGDR launched the initiative funded by the WB based on lessons learned in the GyC Project. In the first call 118 livestock producers covering an area of 34,363 ha were beneficiaries.</p> <p>The Office of Planning and Budget (OPP) has launched a call for the presentation of Territorial Economic Development initiatives, the General Directorate of Development of</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"> -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. -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. -GyC technicians who advise farms outside the 35,000 hectares -The Resilient Family Livestock (CNFR): 17,000 ha -Farms of the Pasture Management Project (IPA): 34,000 ha of farm laboratories and 326,200 ha indirect impact (600 cattle farmers) -DGDR Pilot Project: DGDR Pilot Project. The project seeks to replicate the practices of the GyC project. 4,442 ha. -SUL Project: Sustainability of sheep in mixed livestock systems. The project is based on the co-innovation approach. 8,550 ha -DACC-Más Agua 127,160 ha (374 farmers, 80% family producers) -Survey on Good Practices identified 652,455 ha of natural grasslands under good practices management. 	<p>the Department of Rivera, has presented a proposal called: Climate-Smart Agricultural Production in the Department of Rivera, which is explicitly based on GyC.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	--

	Delay in several environmental deliverables	L	N	Some laboratory analyzes of the environmental dimension have reported delays in processing the samples.	A human resource to collaborate in laboratory analysis tasks was hired to speed the process.	
	Delays in the final version of the Strategy Document. In case of occurrence, the activities will overlap with other activities on project closure. This risk does not depend exclusively on the PT, but on the availability of other collaborators of the work group (OPYPA, DGDR, SNIDER and GyC)	M	N	Follow up on the schedule of activities of the OPYPA-SNIDR-DGDR-GyC working group. If necessary, adaptive planning is carried out	It was not necessary to carry out adaptive planning since the document was finalized and sent for approval in a timely manner.	
	Problems in validation of the strategy Document with MGAP authorities. Risk of disagreement on the part of certain decision-making actors, this could delay validation.	M	N	Possibility of making some intermediate presentation to the authorities to gradually validate the product. For example, when the lines of action are defined	It was not necessary to generate risk mitigation activities since there is partial approval from the minister.	
	Validation of the Strategy document by the MGCN. It is a document that synthesizes the contributions received during the collaborative construction process, however, in parallel,	L	N	A communication is planned and made to the MGCN about the document that was sent to it for validation, clarifying that it refers only to the participatory phase.	MGCN has reviewed the document and made comments and suggestions	

<p>the Strategy Document is developed, which includes the inputs presented to the MGCN. The existence of two documents can be confusing and cause misunderstandings.</p>					
<p>Risks associated with the closing workshop of Component 2. The lack of budget and the consequent need to seek financing alternatives delayed the contracting of the workshop site and suppliers.</p>	M	N	<p>Periodic communications were maintained with suppliers and with the Paso Severino store. Multiple funding alternatives for the workshop were sought (FAO, MGAP, MA, CDP). It was decided to divide the financing requests by item, in order to make it easier to obtain financing.</p>	<p>Funds for the workshop were obtained and the 2-day workshop was performed at the beginning of June.</p>	

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

FY2022 rating	FY2023 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Low	Low	

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>
<p>Recommendation 1: A1. It is recommended to harmonize and coordinate with national and environmental public policies.</p>	<p>Coordination of CSL Strategy and MGAP Strategic Plan (SENDA):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Experts and Director of OPYPA-MGAP participate in the activities of the CSL Strategy. ● The Minister of MGAP recognized the opportunity to incorporate the CSL Strategy as a sector strategy within SENDA, and that this can be taken as an example for other sectors. The CSL Strategy is presented as SENDA Ganadera under the framework of SENDA MGAP. ● A working group made up of the PT, OPYPA, SNIDER and DGDR experts is formed to coordinate activities and draft the final document. <p>Coordination of NAMA and MRV with MGAP and MA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● OPYPA and DINACC-MA experts participate in the work instances for the formulation of the NAMA and its corresponding MRV, including the prioritization of measures and practices to analyze. <p>Coordination with Inter-ministerial working group on environmental footprint of livestock:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Member of the PT participates in the entire process and presents outcomes to the authorities together with experts from MGAP, MA, INIA, INAC and INALE. <p>Coordination with NDC2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Project director is a regular member of the SNRCC working group for the design of the NDC2. ● PT collaborates in the definition of indicators. <p>Coordination with DGDR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Pilot project launched in one of the participating organizations, El Fogon CAL, where 2 groups of farmers visit and follow the activities of two farms with technical support of the GyC team.
<p>Recommendation 2: B.1. Guarantee the best possible achievement of all outcomes and outputs of the project.</p>	<p>Collection and improvement of calculations of core indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Survey designed to collect data in indirect intervention areas to get a more accurate estimation. · An estimated calculation system for emissions avoided in the indirect area was designed. This tool was submitted to and approved by the CDP and the LTO.

	Preliminary calculations allow us to conclude that the goal of reducing emissions in the indirect area will be reached.
Recommendation 3: C.1. Work Plan to guarantee the fulfillment all outcomes and outputs.	Planned activities and the assigned budget ensure compliance with the objectives, outputs and outcomes, as stipulated in the ProDoc, and in the successive POAs and annual Budgets approved by the CDP. From the start of implementation, the project has sought coordination and searched for synergies with other stakeholders.
Recommendation 4: D.1. Definition of a strategy to get resources for continuity.	<p>The MGAP and MA authorities, given the good results that have been obtained in terms of productivity, net income and environment, and regarding the possibilities of scaling, have advanced in the negotiations for future projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SENDA Agroecologica Project: The initiative launched by DGDR is financed by the WB and is based on lessons learned in the GyC Project. In the first call 118 livestock producers covering an area of 34,364 ha were beneficiaries. ● EU Project on sustainable livestock: the concept note of the project has been approved and the final proposal is being designed. The implementation is expected to start in the second half of 2023. ● GCF project together with the Adaptation Fund: the MGAP and the MA are working to prepare the Concept Note. This project constitutes a continuation and scaling in terms of the technological proposal for sustainable livestock. ● Within the framework of the consultancy for the development of the NAMA, possible sources and mechanisms of financing were explored.
Recommendation 5: E.1. Need to work as a team for a unique project and communicate the outcomes in an appropriate way.	<p>In June 2023 field work finished and productive and environmental results of the 3 year implementation in the livestock farms were analyzed and presented in a 2-day workshop attended by more than 160 farmers, technical advisors, researchers and authorities. The event had great dissemination through official web pages, national and international press and social media. Additionally, a presentation of results took place between researchers from the Faculty of Agronomy and experts from the MGAP to discuss them.</p>
Recommendation 6: To make the most of the gender strategy and involvement of youth	During the development of the CSL Strategy, special attention was paid to the implementation of the gender perspective. In this sense, the participation of women and youth representatives was sought throughout the process. The MGAP gender referent was consulted to review the strategy with a gender perspective.

<p>Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize</p>	<p>The project has developed an exit strategy whose main objective is to move towards the sustainability of the project results. To this end, the strategy has two specific objectives:</p> <p>(i) Manage the project closure processes. This includes planning the specific communication for each of the actors involved about the completion of the project and the exit of teams. A careful communication at this stage helps to avoid misunderstandings and the synergies generated can allow the stakeholders to continue with the project approach.</p> <p>(ii) Institutionalize the products of the project, consists of the appropriation of the products and results of the project by the key actors, define information transfer strategies such as databases, deliverables, reports, etc. The fulfillment of this objective ensures the continuity of the lines of work of the project.</p> <p>Currently, there are some results that allow us to guarantee sustainability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In June, the field component closing workshop was held, attended by participating producers and all the project teams. In this instance, they reflected on the results obtained and on the closure of the project. ● 59% of the producers have decided to privately contract the extension technician who was accompanying them, which ensures the continuity of the work. ● Within the framework of the construction of the Strategy for Sustainable Livestock, a team made up of diverse technical expertise from MGAP and the PT was formed; it will continue to function after project closure, in order to further develop the document and generate action plans. This activity is part of the MGAP National Strategy for Agricultural Development (SENDA) and serves as an example to develop plans for other areas of the agricultural sector. ● The project has generated databases of three years of information, including baseline information on economic-productive, social and environmental variables. These databases will be transferred to the MGAP. ● The project has generated a bank of images and audiovisuals that will be transferred to the UCOD-MGAP. ● The project is generating a document of lessons learned and good practices on the entire process, which will be disseminated among interested parties. ● The deliverables generated within the framework of the LoA with suppliers are uploaded on the MGAP website and available for public consultation. ● The UASYCC-MGAP is working on the drafting of two new projects, one with the Green Climate Fund and Euroclima, which seek to continue the line of work of the project.
--	--

- The MGAP minister has expressed in the closing workshop for Component 2, that the project must become a national policy and therefore its sustainability must be ensured.
- IPA has expressed to the Director of OPYPA its interest in incorporating GyC producers into an extension project, whose objective is to continue providing technical assistance to the producers in group modality.
- The Planning and Budget Office (OPP) has launched a call for the presentation of Territorial Economic Development initiatives, the General Directorate of Development of the Department of Rivera, has presented a proposal called: Climate-Smart Agricultural Production in the Department of Rivera, which is explicitly based on GyC.
- The environmental team presented two projects whose concept notes were approved, to continue their research based on the project data:
 - *Spatial and temporal estimation of forage quality in the Río de la Plata grasslands with remote sensors and its application in grazing management against climate change.* Presented to the INNOVAGRO fund of ANII
 - *Methane and nitrous oxide emissions in cattle farms. Sensitivity of the equations used for their estimations, and impact of spatiotemporal variations in the quality of forage estimated by remote sensing.* Presented to the María Viñas fund of ANII
 - *Characterization of the quality of the supply and diet of cattle in herds with different grazing management conditions.* Presented to Basic Sciences Development Programme (PEDECIBA)

8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines²². Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories and provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework			
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management	A budget revision was carried out for re-allocation	Endorsed 2023-03-24	FAO-GEF
Implementation schedule			
Executing Entity			
Executing Entity Category			
Minor project objective change			
Safeguards			
Risk analysis			
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%			
Co-financing			
Location of project activity			
Other minor project amendment (define)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Output 1.1.2 The validation of the document will be performed by MGAP rather than with institutions - Output 3.1.3a The articles in peer-reviewed journals will not be available before the end of the project. The justification for this change is that it is necessary to have 		

²² Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

	<p>the databases completed in order to generate the corresponding analysis and the subsequent writing of the articles.</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	Type of partnership	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government institutions			
MGAP	Executing partner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A working group comprised of the PT, OPYPA, SNIDER and DGDR experts is formed to coordinate activities, draft the final document and oversee the implementation of the CSLM Strategy. - The PT has obtained co-financing from the MGAP to cover part of the costs of the closing workshop of Component 2 not foreseen in the initial agreement. 	
MA	Co-executing partner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The PT has obtained co-financing from the MGAP to cover part of the costs of the closing workshop for Component 2 not foreseen in the initial agreement. 	
NGOs²³			
Private sector entities			
INIA	Co-financing partner	INIA collaborated with extra funds and in-kind	

²³ Non-government organizations

		contributions to prepare audio-visual materials.	
CNFR	Co-financing partner	<p>A group including the PT and the GFR project team with the support of an honorary sociologist gathered to analyze lessons learned between the two projects.</p> <p>The second phase of the “<i>Small scale resilient livestock production</i>” project requested the PT to provide support in the quantification of livestock emissions estimations in all its 46 farms.</p>	
El Fogón CAL	Participating producers’ organization	Within the framework of the pilot project carried out jointly between the El Fogón Producers' Cooperative and the DGDR, two groups of producers were formed based on the CSLM approach led by a trained extensionist with the support of the GyC team.	
IPA	Public private extension institution	IPA expressed the intention of incorporating generated knowledge and experience, including project pilot farms and extension workers in a new extension program.	
Others²⁴			
New stakeholders identified			
ORT	Private University	Within the framework of a consultancy for FAO, the ORT has selected the GyC to carry out an evaluation of the	

²⁴ They can include, among others, community-based organizations (CBOs), Indigenous Peoples organizations, women’s groups, private sector companies, farmers, universities, research institutions, and all major groups as identified, for example, in Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and many times again since then

		digital maturity of the project. As a result, a document was generated that includes a set of proposals for the incorporation of digital solutions.	
NZ Ministry of Primary Industries	Co-financier	The PT has maintained communication with international experts and contacts from New Zealand, and has obtained additional funding from the MPI for the hiring of international consultants, who are part of the International team engaged in the development of the Mitigation Plan.	

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	
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women’s empowerment?	Yes	
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	
b) improving women’s participation and decision making	Yes	
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	-Management of the farms disaggregated by gender. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 61 farms: 22 directed by women -Participation in field days disaggregated by gender. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Northern zone 40 participants, of which 43% women ● Northeast Zone 30 participants, of which 33% women ● Eastern Zone 34 participants, of which 47% women

2023 Project Implementation Report

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Central Zone 40 participants, of which 48% women <p>-Tasks in which each member of the farm participates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Will be reported in the deliverable (35) <p>-Number of average hours dedicated to work on the property (of each member).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Will be reported in the deliverable (35)
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	
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>The project has a knowledge management strategy that aims at the preparation of a comprehensive document that includes the collection of lessons learned, good practices, theoretical-practical reflections, and the proposal of a set of management tools, which can be adapted for future Projects. Once the document is presented, it is expected to be able to generate instances of exchange with institutions and other projects. The table of contents of the document can be found in the box "Implementation Progress (IP); Output 3.1.2.</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 (8) press (AFP; Barron's; FAO; swissinfo; America retail; Yahoo) and national press (52 releases). 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. A noteworthy event was the press conference during the final workshop with producers. The conference has the participation of the Minister of Livestock, Agriculture 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, an INIA researcher and two FAGRO professors. The conference was attended by more than 200 people and it was broadcasted in institutional channel of MGAP. The week following the conference, 25 press releases were published in different print media and on all the radio stations in the country.</p> <p>The FAGRO production team held a seminar on the GyC approach and the results after three years of implementation:</p>

2023 Project Implementation Report

	<p>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oJYLwtVIDUQ&t=9694s</p> <p>After the presentations, the innovation manager of INIA and the president of the Uruguayan Association of Rangelands Ranchers (AUGAP) contributed their vision on the results of the project.</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>In a context of 3 years of drought, where forage production and water availability were scarce, livestock producers achieved good economic, productive, and environmental results.</p> <p>El Observador (national media with large circulation) published the following story:</p> <p>Producción climáticamente inteligente: así progresó un productor, pese a la sequía (elobservador.com.uy)</p>
<p>Please provide links to related website, social media account</p>	<p>Already reported</p>
<p>Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.</p>	<p>Already reported</p>
<p>Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point’s name and contact details</p>	<p>cecilia.marquez@fao.org valentin.balderrin@fao.org</p>

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

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

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

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁵	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ²⁶	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023	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	10,233,141	10,721,613
National Government	MGAP	In-Kind	2,660,000	0		880,000
Other (Public/Private)	INIA	In-Kind	796,000	787,154	518,906	796,000
Multi-lateral Agency	FAO	Grant	360,002	3,000		20,000
Multi-lateral Agency	FAO	In-Kind	100,000	100,000	72,500	100,000
National Government	MA	In-Kind	178,250	178,145	15,300	178,250

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

²⁶Grant, Loan, Equity Investment, Guarantee, In-Kind, Public Investment, Other (please refer to the *Guidelines on co-financing* for definitions https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_FI_GN_01_Cofinancing_Guidelines_2018.pdf)

Other (Public University)	FAGRO	In-Kind	670,000	507,933	270,970	670,000
Multi-lateral Agency	CCAC	Grant	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Private sector	CNFR	In-Kind	49,315	58,762	48,609	58,785
Other (Public/Private)	IPA	In-Kind	378,000	487,172	45,037	378,000
TOTAL			14,241,567	12,943,779	11,304,463	13,902,648

(*) Actual amount
materialized at MTR
31 January 2022

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

It is important to highlight that, apart from anticipated co-financing at the design stage, some new funding sources were identified during the implementation stage. The project had increased costs due to diverse issues, among others, extension of project duration, COVID-19 and rate of exchange. The PT was able to obtain more funds from the existing partners and also from new sources which are detailed in the following table:

Institute/organization	Actual amount (USD)	Target
DGDR-MGAP	200,000	Extension team
DGDR-MGAP	10,000	Specific territorial intervention_Pilot El Fogon CAL
UGP-MGAP	8,043	Catering final workshop
Ministry for Primary Industries-NZ	76,934	International consultants for NAMA
Total	294,977	

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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

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

Annex 2.

GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap](#) or [GeoNames](#) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#)

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location & Activity Description

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