FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Latin America and the Caribbean
Country (ies):	Ecuador
Project Title:	Promotion of Climate-Smart Livestock Management Integrating Reversion of Land Degradation and Reduction of Desertification Risks in Vulnerable Provinces
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/ECU/085/GFF - GCP/ECU/092/SCF
GEF ID:	4775
GEF Focal Area(s):	Climate Change Mitigation (CCM), Climate Change Adaption (CCA), Land Degradation (LD)
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Environment of Ecuador (MAE) Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG)
Project Duration:	Four years

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	July 1, 2015
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	May 2, 2016
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE[1]:	June 2, 2020
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) [2]	N/A
Actual Implementation End Date[3]:	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	3,856,060
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO	USD 22,156,555

[1] as per FPMIS

[2] In case of a project extension.

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

Endorsement Request/ProDoc[4]:	
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	GCP/ECU/085/GFF – Cash received USD 1,883,601 GCP/ECU/092/SCF – Cash received USD 1,233,826 Total: USD 3,117,427
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019[5]	USD 10,897,412

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	10/01/2019
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	July - August 2019
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	N/A
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	**Yes**
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	**Yes**
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	March, 2020
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required[6]	**Yes** or **No**

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

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

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

Ratings

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

Status

Implementation Status ***(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):***	3rd PIR

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Juan Merino, National Project Coordinator	Juan.MerinoSuing@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Hivy Ortiz Chour, Forestry Officer, FAO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean	Hivy.OrtizChour@fao.org
HQ Technical Officer	Carolyn Opio, Livestock Policy Officer	Carolyn.opio@fao.org
Budget Holder	John Preissing, FAO Ecuador Representative	John.Preissing@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Climate and Environment Division (CBC)	Valeria Gonzalez Riggio, Technical Officer, FAO GEF Coordination Unit	Valeria.gonzalezriggio@fao.org

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)[7]	Baseline level	Mid-term target[8]	End-of-project target	Level at June 30, 2019	Progress rating [9]
Component 1: Strengthening of institutional capacities and coordination to incorporate the CSL approach in territorial management and in the development of livestock-related policies and tools.						
Outcome 1.1: The CSL approach has been mainstreamed in climate change mitigation and adaptation policies in the livestock sector and land-use planning	**Indicator CCA-1.1.1:** CSL approach mainstreamed in 5 Land-Use and Development Plans (LUDPs), 1 CSL National Strategy and 5 Local Zoning Plans.	The Climate Smart Livestock (CSL) approach is not applied in livestock policies. **Indicator CCA-1.1.1:** Adaptation actions implemented in national/sub-regional development frameworks: 0 CSL strategies.		**Indicator CCA-1.1.1:** CSL approach mainstreamed in 5 Land-Use and Development Plans (LUDPs), 1 CSL National Strategy and 5 Local Zoning Plans.	▪ The draft for the National Climate Smart Livestock Management Strategy (ENMGCI) has been developed. This document has been reviewed and validated by the ministries (of the Environment – MAE and Agriculture and Livestock – MAG). To date, it represents 85% progress, and it is divided into eight sections: (1) Presentation; (2) Introduction and Structure; (3) Background; (4) Justification of the need for the strategy; (5) ENGCI: Vision, Objectives, Indicators and Goals, Planification; (6) Mechanisms of Implementation; (7) Bibliography; (8) Annexes. Once it is finalized, during the next months, it will be uploaded to the GCI webpage and shared with the general public. ▪ The Land Use and Development Plans (LUDPs) participative analysis (11 workshops and 212 participants), seven proposals were constructed to update this territorial planning tool, including: CSL approach, livestock zoning results (seven zoning plans), GHG emissions and climate risk. The total progress of the LUDPs update documents is 90 %.	S
	Indicator LD-3.i: Enhanced enabling environment for cross-sectoral integrated landscape management: 7 Integrated land management plans	**Indicator LD-3.i:** Enhanced enabling environment for cross-sectoral integrated landscape management: 0 Integrated land management plans		**Indicator LD-3.i:** Enhanced enabling environment for cross-sectoral integrated landscape management: 7 Integrated land management plans	▪ For the development of the LUDPs update proposals, seven livestock zoning plans have been developed and validated in the field. They were presented for feedback during technical meetings with MAE, MAG and Provincial Governments in the following provinces: Guayas, Manabí, Imbabura, Loja, Napo and Morona Santiago. ▪ It is important to highlight that the livestock zoning methodology has been replicated nationwide, hoping to deliver this product (recommended use of grasses map) to	S

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

[8] 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.

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

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)[7]	Baseline level	Mid-term target[8]	End-of-project target	Level at June 30, 2019	Progress rating [9]
					MAG by the end of July 2019. https://www.ganaderiaclimaticamenteinteligente.com/archivos/Mapa%20de%20uso%20recomendado%20para%20pastos.pdf	
Outcome 1.2: Institutional capacities for the implementation of CSL management strategies strengthened.	**Indicator CCA-2.2.1:** Five (5) national institutions (regional branches); 2 national institutions (central government); 7 provincial agencies.	National and provincial institutions have no knowledge on CSL. **Indicator CCA-2.2.1:** No. and type of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to minimize exposure to climate variability: 0 for the livestock sector.		**Indicator CCA-2.2.1:** Five (5) national institutions (regional branches); 2 national institutions (central government); 7 provincial agencies.	In the Capacity Strengthening Implementation Strategy (approved by MAG and MAE), two levels have been worked on actively: cattle producers and technical teams of the Ministries, Local Governments, Universities and NGOs. ▪ The training provided for the cattle producers is done through 37 Field Schools (ECA), four matrixes of skill strengthening though learning objectives defined within four guides to encourage the implementation of accurate livestock practices in milk and meat (588 training events). To date, the project has permanently trained 678 male cattle producers and 327 female cattle producers. ▪ The Under-secretariat of Livestock Production in MAG, requested FAO´s support to replicate the CSL project methodology natiowide. As a result, technical training has been provided for technicians of the Sustainable Livestock Program (66 participants) for the development of rural participative diagnostics and prioritizing main issues within the national livestock sector. Furthermore, seven workshops have been held to elaborate training curricula, which reponds to the local realities and needs. ▪ Within the training process, technicians from MAG, MAE, GAD, Universities, NGOs, directly linked to the CSL Project throughout the seven provinces, have participated in the 13 training events along with 144 male technicians and 98 female technicians.	S
Component 2: Strategies of Technology Transfer, Deployment and Implementation for Climate-Smart Livestock Management						
Outcome 2.1: CSL approach adopted in degraded livestock areas.	30,000 hectares of degraded lands for livestock production have adopted the CSL management.	0 hectares under CSL practices		30,000 hectares in livestock degraded lands have adopted the CSL management.	▪ To date, with the implementation of the provincial intervention plans by the provincial technical teams, in coordination with local institutions, (MAG, MAE, Local Governments, Universities, NGO), 29,936 hectares are under the ¨Climate Smart Livestock¨ approach, linked permanently with 1,005 cattle owners (of which 33% are women).	S

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)[7]	Baseline level	Mid-term target[8]	End-of-project target	Level at June 30, 2019	Progress rating [9]
	Indicator CCA-3.1.1: % of targeted groups adopting adaptation technologies by technology type: i) pasture management: 50% (men and women); ii) animal and herd management: 50% (men and women); iii) water management: 50% (men and women); iv) supplementary feeding: 50%; v) grazing management: 50 %.	**Indicator CCA-3.1.1:** % of targeted groups adopting adaptation technologies by technology type: i) pasture management: 10% (men and women); ii) animal and herd management: 5% (men and women); iii) water management: 10% (men and women); iv) supplementary feeding: 0%; v) grazing management: 0%.		**Indicator CCA-3.1.1:** % of targeted groups adopting adaptation technologies by technology type: i) pasture management: 50% (men and women); ii) animal and herd management: 50% (men and women); iii) water management: 50% (men and women); iv) supplementary feeding: 50%; v) grazing management: 50 %.	In addition to capacity building processes, the project's technical team has made an estimate of adoption rates* of good livestock practices, the detail of which is presented below: ▪ Adoption with co-financing: pasture management (26.8%); animal management (25.14%); water management (20.45%); supplementary feeding (16.78%); organizational strengthening (12.69%); milking hygiene and milk quality (22.73%); soil management (13.85%); %); record management (7.38%); farm planning (5.12%); excreta management (10.23%); implementation of silvopastoral systems (12.25%). Adoption without co-financing: pasture management (4.03%); animal management (12.85%); water management (4.09%); supplementary feeding (4.09%); organizational strengthening (3.5%); milking hygiene and milk quality (7.37%); management of water (3.4%); record management (1.85%); farm planning (10.25%); excreta management (2.43%); implementation of silvopastoral systems (6%). *The adoption rate considers the percentage of producers who have implemented the practice versus the total number of producers in the association. The estimate is determined separately for producers receiving supplies (adoption with supplies from the project) and those who do not receive supplies (adoption without supplies).	S
	Indicator LD-1.ii: Vulnerability rate of livelihoods as perceived by local inhabitants: 3 (medium)	**Indicator LD-1.ii:** Vulnerability rate of livelihoods as perceived by local inhabitants: 2 (high)		**Indicator LD-1.ii:** 3 (medium)	This indicator will be reported in the fourth year (2020), however, the CSL Project has the following results so far: ▪ Current and future climate risk analysis of the livestock sector (based on the guidelines of the Quito Report – AR5 - of the IPCC) in the seven provinces of intervention. The average in all provinces is 3 (moderate), on a scale of 1 (good) to 5 (bad).	S
	Indicator CCM-5: i) 2 (development of guidelines for sustainable livestock management); ii) emissions avoided: 78 052 ton CO_{2eq} avoided in direct GHG emissions; 247 050 ton CO_{2eq} direct	**Indicator CCM-5:** i) good practices developed and adopted: 1 (without action); ii) GHG emissions avoided: 0. GHG emissions per product unit are		**Indicator CCM-5:** i) 2 (development of guidelines for sustainable livestock management); ii) emissions avoided: 78,052 ton CO_{2eq} avoided in direct GHG emissions;	▪ The GHG emissions of cattle farming for Ecuador were determined. The emissions baseline for 2016 is: 15,977,840 tons of CO_2eq (preliminary information), the value corresponds to the scenario developed for the NAMA preparation (national level). ▪ Carbon sequestration for pasture management will be calculated with references from literature. Through five	MS

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)[7]	Baseline level	Mid-term target[8]	End-of-project target	Level at June 30, 2019	Progress rating [9]
	carbon sequestration.	approximately 4 CO2eq and 32 CO2eq per liter of milk and kilo of meat.		247 050 ton CO_{2eq} direct carbon sequestration.	meetings with the technical board/working group (MAG, INIAP, MAE, CSL), the results of the emissions scenario were reviewed and validated. ▪ For 2018, monitoring activities indicate a total *10716.50 ton CO2eq avoided in direct GHG emissions due to project implementation. ▪ According to the Project Document (p.57), project targets need to be refined. Due to the information collected in pilot farms (after implementation of good livestock practices), the project estimates a target of 41296.23 ton CO2eq avoided in direct emissions. The value is currently under revision (Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Agriculture). The refined target estimates for avoided direct emissions was also presented in the mid-term review process.	
Outcome 2.2: Access to financing instruments for investments in CSL practices in degraded areas has been improved	**Indicator LD-1.iv**: + USD175 000 investment through 1 pilot financing mechanism and 1 existing incentive scheme strengthened.	**Indicator LD-1.iv:** Increased investments in integrated landscape management: 1) small grant scheme.		**Indicator LD-1.iv**: + USD175 000 investment through 1 pilot financing mechanism and 1 existing incentive scheme strengthened.	▪ The National Strategy of Financial Mechanisms and Incentives has been developed by the technical team of the CSL project and validated by the Management and Management Committees. The following has been considered: climate microfinance, generation of green financial products, promotion of comprehensive businesses, articulation with Local Governments, training and financial technical assistance and identification of certification systems. ▪ Climate microfinance has been strengthened through the creation and training of seven community-based Communal Funds in the provinces of Imbabura (2), Napo (1), Morona Santiago (1), Loja (2) and Manabí (1). ▪ For the generation of green financial products, an agreement was signed between FAO-EC and BanEcuador (main public bank) for the development of a green credit line to enable the financing of climate-smart livestock practices. It is estimated that in August 2019 the first deliveries of credits to farmers linked to the project will be made and the green credit line will be scaled up by the end of 2019 and early 2020. ▪ The promotion of a whole business entity was consolidated with the incorporation of two Agricultural Service Centers in the provinces of: Santa Elena and Guayas. ▪ In terms of training and financial technical assistance, 689	S

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)[7]	Baseline level	Mid-term target[8]	End-of-project target	Level at June 30, 2019	Progress rating [9]
					producers have been trained, 393 have been technically assisted and 473 access financial mechanisms.	
Component 3: Monitoring of GHG emissions and adaptation capacity in the livestock sector						
Outcome 3.1: Livestock sector GHG emissions in selected areas have been reduced and monitored	**Indicator CCM-5:** Carbon monitoring system: 3 (compiling and analysis of information on carbon stocks). Emission factors in the livestock sector for national inventory: 1 proposal	**Indicator CCM-5:** Carbon monitoring system: 2 (forest mapping). Emission factors in the livestock sector for national inventory: 0		**Indicator CCM-5:** Carbon monitoring system: 3 (compiling and analysis of information on carbon stocks). Emission factors in the livestock sector for national inventory: 1 proposal	▪ To date, there are two tools for monitoring GHG emissions, one at the national level and one at the farm level. The tools were generated with the analysis, adaptation and development of an "R" script, for the calculation of direct emissions of GHGs at the national level. The tool is in validation process (98% progress). ▪ Update tools using the following links: http://supaysoft.sytes.net:84/jobs/supaywork/fao2018/app-riesgo-climatico.php http://supaysoft.sytes.net:84/jobs/supaywork/fao2018/app-emisiones-directas-test.php Password: prueba1234 ▪ Preliminary results (database and image correction) of the quantification of carbon stocks in trees on livestock farms are estimated on the pilot farms in five provinces: Guayas, Santa Elena, Manabí, Napo and Morona Santiago (study progress 70%). ▪ A total of 100 livestock farms were sampled, preliminary estimates indicate that carbon stocks on trees within pasture areas correspond to 97.45 ton. The preliminary value corresponds only to sampled areas, extrapolation of the values at farm level is going to be developed in the next months.	S

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)[7]	Baseline level	Mid-term target[8]	End-of-project target	Level at June 30, 2019	Progress rating [9]
Outcome 3.2: Adaptation capacity of the livestock sector has been monitored.	The JICA monitoring tool for monitoring adaptive capacity in the livestock sector has been tested and evaluated.	The JICA Project developed an adaptation capacity M&E tool in Ecuador. The tool hasn't been tested.		The JICA monitoring instrument, and other instruments, methodologies for monitoring adaptive capacity in the livestock sector have been tested and evaluated. The adaptive capacity monitoring tool for the project is adjusted, evaluated and in operation.	▪ Based on the current and future climate risk analysis of the livestock sector, 11 indicators were approved at farm level, out of 46 used in the study at the national level. ▪ This input allowed to generate an adaptive capacity monitoring tool by developing an R script. It is currently being developed as a web application (70% progress) to quantify farm-level climate risk: http://supaysoft.sytes.net:84/jobs/supaywork/fao2018/app-riesgo-climatico.php (temporary link).	S
Component 4: Project Management, Monitoring and Evaluation and Knowledge Management						
Outcome 4.1: Project implemented. Lessons learned, and best practices have been documented and disseminated.	The project has been executed with a results-based management approach. Project sustainability has been ensured.	-----		The project has been executed with a results-based management approach. Project sustainability has been ensured.	▪ The project has been implemented with a participatory approach, which allowed to identify problems and solutions with the producers, which were subsequently reflected in Provincial Intervention Plans, whose implementation in the field is carried out through five pillars: (1) Field Schools with Farmers, with 100% practical skills in local conditions and techniques; (2) Co-financing, for the implementation of good CSL practices with local counterparts (cattle owners, MAG, MAE, Local Governments, among others); (3) Technical assistance, by the CSL Project team and local partner institutions (MAG, MAE, AGROCALIDAD, Local Governments, Universities, NGOs); (4) Strategies for approach sustainability (local management and interagency articulation MAE and MAG), to achieve the empowerment of the approach; and, (5) Monitoring and evaluation, through the application of web tools for productivity, GHG emissions and adaptive capacity. ▪ The processes of dissemination of the activities implemented by the CSL Project are carried out through provincial communication groups led by MAE, MAG and FAO; and, through a "Platform for the Management of Climate intelligent Livestock Knowledge", which is currently in the process of being updated with the incorporation of a Geoportal, two monitoring tools (GHG emissions and adaptive capability), and a multimedia section of CSL practices (videos and infographics).	S

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating [10]

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

[10] To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs[11]	Expected completion date [12]	Achievements at each PIR[13]					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance[14] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
Component 1: Strengthening of institutional capacities and coordination to incorporate the CSL approach in territorial management and in the development of livestock-related policies and tools								
Outcome 1.1: The CSL approach has been mainstreamed in climate change mitigation and adaptation policies in the livestock sector and land-use planning								
Output 1.1.1 National Climate Smart Livestock Strategy prepared and adopted	Q4, Y2	▪ Situational analysis of livestock policy and its relation to climate change. ▪ A first draft of the CSL National Strategy was developed and presented to MAE and MAG, as a technical instrument that can be used to implement public policies in the livestock sector. The document is divided in the following sections (i) Background information, (ii) Vision, (iii) Strategic objectives, (iv) Strategies and, (v) General indicators.	▪ The CSL National Strategy draft (50% progress) was validated by MAE and MAG. The document is divided in the following sections (i) Presentation, (ii) Introduction, (iii) Background information, (iv) Justification, (v) CSL Strategy: vision, objectives, indicators and targets, planning, (vi) Implementation, (vii) Bibliography (viii) Annexes. Both, MAE and MAG, have provided feedback to the CSL National Strategy in technical meetings.	▪ A draft of the (85% progress) National Climate-Smart Livestock Management Strategy (MGCI) validated by the ministries (MAE and MAG) is available. The document is divided into the following sections: (1) Presentation; (2) Introduction and structure; (3) Background; (4) Justification of the need for the strategy; (5) ENGCI: vision, objectives, indicators and targets, planning; (6) Implementation mechanisms; (7) Bibliography; (8) Annexes. The document has received feedback in working meetings with			92.30%	The progress of this product has been delayed by changes in government and staff (authorities and technicians) of partner institutions. Despite this, there is an interinstitutional team with which the construction of the Strategy is validated/re-fed.

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

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

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

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

				MAE and MAG.				
Output 1.1.2 One Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA) for the livestock sector	Q4, Y3	▪ The national framework conditions for the development of the NAMA were assessed and validated by the Management Committee: 1 report regarding the political and governance framework (including mitigation and development strategies) and, 1 report assessing the gaps remaining in existing policies. ▪ The baseline scenario for the NAMA is under development. Currently, there is 1 report that evaluates different GHG quantifying tools. As a result, GLEAM was chosen as the tool that is going to be used to carry out the scenarios. The report and its results were approved by the Management Committee.	▪ Development, feedback and validation of the national framework conditions for the development of the NAMA. ▪ Primary data collection of livestock management information (419 surveys; 95% confidence level) thanks to a coordinated work with INIAP, MAE and MAG. For 2016, the direct GHG emissions account for 10, 583, 000 t CO2 eq (preliminary data calculated with GLEAM). ▪ Conformation of a technical working group (MAE, MAG, INIAP, CSL Project) to analyze and consolidate the parameters (herd, feed and manure management) required for the GHG emission calculation process (baseline and mitigation scenarios).	▪ The GHG emission scenario of cattle farming in Ecuador (with the ECUADOR-adapted GLEAM model) has been determined, reviewed and analyzed. The emission baseline for 2016 corresponds to: 16,547,000 tons of CO2eq (preliminary data and under review). ▪ Review and validation of the results of the emissions scenario through five meetings with the technical roundtable/working group (MAE, MAG, INIAP, CSL), for the construction of the baseline and mitigation scenario for the period 2010-2025. ▪ Validation of calculation methodology and variables for the potential mitigation scenario of the livestock sector at the national level. A potential mitigation scenario is currently available in a first version for discussion (MAE, MAG, INIAP, CSL). ▪ The design of the MRV will be carried out with the recruitment of technical staff who will support the CSL Project Mitigation Specialist.			70.09%	The goal of this product is the development of the NAMA. Based on GHG results, the development of the NAMA proposal includes the potential for mitigation, social, environmental and economic impact assessment, among others. For this reason, this result will be analyzed by the project team and the technical advisory team. The results are planned for December/2019.

Output 1.1.3 PDOT's of provincial, local governments with CSL approach and livestock zoning plans	Q4, Y3	▪ 7 Project presentation meetings with authorities and technical representatives from the local governments were carried out in the following provinces: Guayas, Santa Elena, Manabí, Imbabura, Loja, Napo and Morona Santiago. ▪ 5 LDUPs participatory analysis workshops were carried out to incorporate the climate change and CSL approach in the following provinces: Guayas, Manabí, Imbabura, Loja and Morona Santiago. ▪ 4 climate characterization workshops at province level were carried out to incorporate the climate change and CSL approach in Guayas, Manabí, Imbabura and Loja. ▪ 1 analysis document of the national regulatory framework: CONGOPE; Third Communication; COP22; BUR; etc. ▪ 1 analysis of the contents and variables for the elaboration of zoning plans.	▪ 11 LDUPs participatory analysis workshops were carried out to incorporate the climate change and CSL approach in the following provinces: Guayas, Santa Elena, Manabí, Imbabura, Loja, Napo and Morona Santiago (212 participants). ▪ 7 Land-Use and Development Plans Update Proposals along with 8 technical meetings have been developed to socialize the documents (livestock zoning, climate risk and provincial policies) and gathering feedback from the local institutions. (80% progress). ▪ 7 livestock zoning plans have been developed. These plans have been socialized and received feedback from MAE, MAG, and local governments in 6 provinces: Guayas, Manabí, Imbabura, Loja, Napo and Morona Santiago.	▪ With the participatory analysis of LDUPs and climate characterization (14 workshops and 212 participants in the seven intervention provinces), seven proposals for updating LDUPs were developed and 8 working meetings were held for dissemination and feedback (zoning, climate risk and provincial policies) – 90% progress. ▪ As part of the CSL-focused LDUPs update documents, seven livestock zoning plans (socialized and reviewed in technical meetings with MAE, MAG, Prefecture and CSL actors) were developed in 6 provinces: Guayas, Manabí, Imbabura, Loja, Napo and Morona Santiago. ▪ Three workshops were developed to present and validate the Methodology of National Livestock Zoning with 30 technicians from the Undersecretariat for Livestock Production, CGSIN, INIAP, IEE, MAE. In addition, individual meetings were held with each institution for review and validation. It should be noted that the livestock zoning methodology (recommended use for pastures) has been replicated nationally, hoping to deliver the product to the MAG by the end of July 2019.			89.42%	The political and technical will, by the provincial governments, to incorporate the CSL approach and Climate change in their PDOTs is a challenge once developed and validated. To date, there have been many changes in authorities at the sectional level governments. This will require dissemination meetings of the CSL Project and delivering the LDUPs documents.
Outcome 1.2: Institutional capacities for the implementation of CSL management strategies strengthened.								

Output 1.2.1 Key representatives of MAE, MAG, provincial councils and municipalities with strengthened capacities for the implementation of CSL management measures in different livestock production systems	Q4, Y3	▪ A national training workshop on the use of the GLEAM tool was carried out. The workshop was directed to technical staff of MAE and MAG at national and province levels. A total of 27 people was trained. Some workshops on the following provinces were carried out: ▪ Baseline information was collected through 14 rural participatory appraisal workshops in Manabí (100 people), Imbabura (30 people), Loja (75 people), Napo (125 people) and Morona Santiago (100 people).	▪ Local information regarding current issues and training needs was collected through 29 rural participatory appraisal workshops in Manabí (62 people), Guayas (73 people), Santa Elena (121 people) Imbabura (167 people), Loja (120 people), Napo (55 people), Morona Santiago (88 people). ▪ A National Capacity Building Strategy was developed and approved by the Management and Steering Committees (including appraisal results as well as intervention and capacity building plans at province level). ▪ The Field School approach is being used to strengthen the capacities of producers. To implement such approach, 4 matrices and learning goals were developed as a basis to prepare 4 guides (50% progress) that will ease the understanding and dissemination of the CSL approach in beef and dairy production systems. ▪ A training workshop on the use of the GLEAM model (ArcGis environment) directed to technical personnel of MAE, MAG and the CSL Project was developed (13 participants). ▪ A training workshop regarding the CSL approach and Open Data kit (ODK) tool management was carried out for technical personnel of the local government in the Guayas province (15 participants).	▪ To train producers, the Field Schools (ECA) methodology is used. For this purpose, four skills matrices and learning objectives were developed for the construction of four guides that facilitate the learning of climate-smart livestock in meat and milk systems (85% progress). ▪ For the July/2018-June/2019 period, 37 ECAs have been implemented, with a total of 6,252 trained beneficiaries (63% men and 37% women). ▪ Capacity building processes have been implemented at a national level, aimed for extensionist technicians from MAG (Undersecretary for Livestock Production) for the development of diagnostics (66 participants – two national workshops). In addition, the project has held a second day at a national level, executing seven workshops to develop training resumes, in response to the issues identified in DPPs. ▪ At the provincial level, 13 training events were held with the participation of 144 male technicians and 98 female technicians permanently linked to the CSL project in the seven provinces. On the other hand, in the province of Loja there is a School of Sustainable Land Management, which constantly trains provincial technicians			70.07%	-----

			▪ A training workshop on the CSL approach and the use of participatory tools was carried out with technical personnel from MAE and MAG in the Imbabura province (37 participants). ▪ Until now, 126 Field Schools have been implemented, with a total number of 2,526 (65% men and 35% women) beneficiaries. ▪ A rural participatory appraisal and design of implementation plans workshop was developed for technicians from the Undersecretary of Livestock (50 participants). ▪ Participation in 7 events organized by the public and private sectors, with a total of 450 attendees among students, technicians and producers.	from MAE, MAG, Local Governments, University, and NGOs. In the province of Santa Elena, in connection with the State University Peninsula de Santa Elena (UPSE), joint processes have been developed for training technical personnel in the province.				
Component 2: Strategies of Technology Transfer, Deployment and Implementation for Climate-Smart Livestock Management								
Outcome 2.1: CSL approach adopted in degraded livestock areas.								
Output 2.1.1 CSL practices disseminated in degraded livestock lands, with a participatory approach	Q4, Y4	▪ A synthesis report containing 11 components and the description of 96 good livestock practices was developed. The report is the result of a validation and prioritization process carried out in six provinces with the technical support of MAG, INIAP and the University of the Armed Forces (ESPE for its Spanish acronym). ▪ The methodology for the selection of pilot farms	▪ Currently; 13,153 hectares have been influenced with the CSL approach. ▪ A technical report containing 12 components and the description of 83 good livestock practices. The report is the result of a validation and prioritization process developed in six provinces with technical support by MAG, the National Institute for Agricultural Research (INIAP) and ESPE University (6 workshops and 64 technicians). ▪ The methodology for	▪ To date, 29,936 hectares are used with the CSL approach, permanently linking 1,005 producers (33% are women). ▪ Complementary to the ECAs, 165 pilot farms (30% women and 70% men) were selected and distributed in the seven provinces, for the development of training with farmers, as well as the impact monitoring the implementation of CSL practices (three axes: productivity, mitigation and adaptation). ▪ To date, the GHG			61.76%	-----

		was developed. The first selection process was carried out in the province of Loja. This experience will serve to adjust the criteria and indicators, as well as the selection process for the other provinces which will be carried out from July 2017. ▪ A methodology for the evaluation of implementation costs, cost-benefit and maintenance of good livestock practices was developed. The methodology will be used as part of the studies that are being coordinated with ESPE.	selection of pilot farms (places for learning and research) was applied: 171 farms (30% women and 70% men) were selected. ▪ A methodology for evaluation of implementation costs and maintenance of good livestock practices, as well as its cost-benefit analysis was developed. The methodology was applied in two Master theses for valuation of manure management systems and animal nutrition management. The theses collected data from Manabí, Imbabura and Napo. ▪ Until now 1,237 producers have adopted good livestock practices: grassland management (486), animal management (102), water management (64), supplementary feeding (97). Besides that, based on the rural participatory appraisal at local level, there are some other thematic areas where the project is working: organizational strengthening (160), hygiene in the milking process and quality of milk (122), soil management (60), register management (44), farm planning (11), manure management (66), implementation of silvopastoral systems (25). ▪ Determining gender relationships in livestock production systems (28 focal groups, with 239 producers).	emissions baseline has been available on the 165 pilot farms and a 70% progress in the calculation of mitigation potential for the implementation of CSL practices. ▪ In addition, there is a 60% progress in the definition of the climate risk baseline in the 165 pilot farms and a 40% progress in the calculation of the potential for adaptive capacity improvement by implementing CSL practices. ▪ Currently there are 678 male cattle owners and 327 female cattle owners who are implementing CSL practices: pasture management; animal management; water management; supplementary feeding; pastoral management; good milking practices; planning tools; infrastructure; genetic improvement; organizational strengthening; land management; record management; estate planning; excreta management; implement silvopastoral systems. ▪ Review and analysis of eleven Research Action Participatory studies in the seven provinces focused on the production of silage with maize, nutritional value and adaptability of different varieties of				

				pastures, implementation of protein banks, pasture harvesting and pasture fertilization with biol.				
Output 2.1.2 Small-scale and medium-scale livestock producers' networks created and strengthened	Q4, Y4	-----	According to the Project Document, the indicator is "7 livestock producers' networks created and trained in climate change, CSL and associative capacity strengthened". However, after a technical analysis with the Project team, the GEF Portfolio Coordination in FAO-EC and the LTO, it was agreed to start with this activity on the 2nd year of project implementation. The activity was re-schedule after considering that the rural participatory appraisal workshops that were carried out as part of the Output 1.2.1, would help to understand the dynamic in the producers' associations. 3 training workshops for organizational strengthening of producers' associations will be held in Santa Elena (2 workshops: 68 participants) and Imbabura (1 workshop: 38 participants)	The activities of this product are linked to the product (2.2.1): ▪ The Napo Provincial Livestock Network has been created and is in the process of capacity building and training. ▪ The Provincial Livestock Bureau of Loja has been established and is in the process of capacity building and training. ▪ Three networks of cattle owners linked to the Communal Funds and Agricultural Services Centers are in the process of formation (see product below).			61.32%	-----
Outcome 2.2: Access to financing instruments for investments in CSL practices in degraded areas has been improved								
Output 2.2.1 Financing mechanisms and incentive schemes to support CSL	Q4, Y4	The technical assistance plan and its implementation will be developed from August 2017. Up to date, the following activities have been developed: ▪ Operative Strategy for the Financial and Incentives Mechanisms: 1 report regarding the design of	▪ An assessment report of the Good Livestock Practices Certification Scheme from the National Agency of Agricultural Health Control (AGROCALIDAD) and its implementation feasibility was developed. The assessment report provided information regarding potential synergies between AGROCALIDAD	▪ An analysis of the Microfinance Strategy for Sustainable Land Management and Climate Change Adaptation has been developed. ▪ It was developed and validated through the Technical and Management Committee, the National Strategy of			76.18%	-----

		the financial mechanism (microfinance) and available incentives for the implementation of good livestock practices. ▪ A first draft of the Financial Mechanisms Proposal. For these activities, the following task were developed: ▪ Analysis of the incentives provision for the livestock sector: 1 national compendium of the currently available incentives, 1 report summarizing case studies and experiences from MAE, MAG and ONGs on natural resources management; 1 SWOT analysis of the available incentives. ▪ The political will was evaluated through meetings with the Decentralized Autonomous Governments in order to articulate incentives with a CSL approach. Besides, the following activity was carried out: ▪ The Microfinance for Sustainable Land Management and Climate Change Adaptation Strategy was analyzed and validated. The activity includes an analysis report, consultation process with 5 experts, review and	certification scheme and CSL practices (sustainable production). ▪ The political will was evaluated through meetings with the Decentralized Autonomous Governments to articulate incentives with a CSL approach. ▪ The operativity proposal of the Microfinance for Sustainable Land Management and Climate Change Adaptation Strategy was reviewed with MAE and MAG. ▪ The Incentives specialist was hired (May 2018).	Financial Mechanisms and Incentives of the CSL Project. ▪ Two Learning Guides for Financial Education have been developed, and two for Popular Finance for Climate Change have also been developed. In addition, a methodological guide for financial technical assistance has been generated. ▪ A feasibility analysis is available for the strengthening of Agroquality Certification. ▪ Provincial characterization (in the seven intervention provinces) has been carried out for intervention in financial mechanisms and incentives. ▪ Popular finances are strengthened through the creation and strengthening of seven Communal Funds (CC) and two Agricultural Services Centers (CSAs). ▪ In conjunction with BanEcuador, a green credit line is being created for the financing of climate-smart livestock practices. This linkage was formalized by an agreement signed between the two institutions. ▪ To date, there are 50 training events in financial mechanisms and				

		validation process with MAE and MAG and, 1 proposal for its operability.		incentive schemes, training 464 producers and 225 producers. ▪ In total, 281 male producers and 112 female producers have received direct technical assistance at farm level to access financial and incentive mechanisms. ▪ In total, 351 male producers and 122 female producers have accessed financing mechanisms and incentives.				
Component 3: Monitoring of GHG emissions and adaptation capacity in the livestock sector								
Outcome 3.1: Livestock sector GHG emissions in selected areas have been reduced and monitored								
Output 3.1.1 Measurement of GHG emissions reduction	Q4, Y4	▪ Two training workshops on the topics of capacity building, climate change vulnerability, mitigation (including the use of GLEAM), and good livestock practices were carried out with the National and Province Project Team (15 people). ▪ The methodology for the selection of pilot farms was developed and applied in the Loja province. This experience will serve to adjust the criteria and indicators as well as the selection process for the rest of the provinces, which will start on July 2017.	▪ The GLEAM modules required to calculate direct GHG emissions have been adapted to national circumstances and migrated from python to R (open source). The tool is still under development and validation (70% progress). ▪ Based upon the GLEAM adaptation, a monitoring tool at farm level is under development. The tool is going to be used for monitoring the GHG emissions in the 171 pilot farms. ▪ The field phase required to estimate the carbon stock in the arboreal component of livestock systems has already started (20% progress). The study is carried out through a collaboration between the University of Aberdeen, University of Cuenca and the CSL Project. ▪ The primary data collection of livestock management information, and the	▪ Analysis, adaptation and the development of a tool based on a ¨R¨ script, for the estimation of direct GHG emissions nationwide. The tool is under validation process (98 % progress). ▪ Design of a tool to quantify and monitor the GHG emissions of livestock practice throughout the 165 pilot farms of the project. ▪ Review, systematization and analysis of farm data collection to quantify the calculation of the carbon stock of the tree component in livestock systems in the intervention zones of the CSL Project in the Coast and Amazon (108 pilot farms in Guayas, Manabí , Santa Elena, Napo and Morona Santiago). The study is carried out in			45.42%	-----

			preliminary calculations carried out with GLEAM are going to be used to prepare a proposal for Emission Factors.	collaboration with: University of Aberdeen, University of Cuenca, CSL Project. ▪ The information generated for baseline construction has been reviewed and subsequently shared with the team responsible for the realization of the National Greenhouse Gas Inventory (INGEI). The data was used for the calculation of tier II emission factors.				
Outcome 3.2: Adaptation capacity of the livestock sector has been monitored.								
Output 3.2.1 Tool for monitoring adaptive capacity in the livestock sector	Q4, Y4	▪ There has been some progress regarding the vulnerability analysis of the livestock sector: 1 document providing an analysis and repository of climate change studies in the livestock sector, 1 review report of vulnerability methodologies and monitoring systems/ assessment of climate change adaptation projects in Ecuador and in the Region. ▪ Besides, the vulnerability analysis at local level was developed with the participation of male and female producers. A total of 17 workshops were developed: Loja (2), Manabí (2), Napo (6) Imbabura (1), Morona Santiago (3), Guayas (3). The analysis was done by applying the CRiSTAL tool. The workshops were	▪ From February to August 2017, the participatory analysis of local vulnerability was carried out through the development of 29 workshops (797 people): Loja (4 workshops – 120 people), Manabí (3 workshops – 80 people), Napo (6 workshops – 145 people) Imbabura (5 workshops – 162 people), Morona Santiago (5 workshops – 123 people), Guayas (3 workshops – 55 people) y Santa Elena (3 workshops – 112 people). The analysis was done by applying the CRiSTAL tool, with a total of 797 local participants (producers, Academia, MAE, MAG, and local governments). ▪ A consultant team to carry out the "Climate Risk and Vulnerability Assessment of the Livestock Sector in Ecuador" was hired. The assessment results for the Current Climate Risk have been presented and received	▪ There is an analysis of the current and future climate risk of the livestock sector, based in the seven intervention provinces of the CSL Project. The study was presented and received feedback in a workshop with national climate change experts. ▪ Based on the national study, 11 farm-level indicators (out of 46 used in the study) have been approved for the development and validation of the monitoring tool to measure adaptive capacity, vulnerability and climate risk at the farm level (70% progress). ▪ The format, structure, content and style of the results of the climate risk study for the diagramming and publication of: (1) Full study document (480			76.69%	-----

		carried out at local level with producers from the livestock associations. The analyses are an input for the "Vulnerability Assessment of the Livestock Sector" study.	feedback from national experts in a technical workshop. Currently, the project is working on: (i) Future Climate Risk Assessment (70% progress), (ii) Development and validation of a vulnerability and climate risk monitoring tool at farm level (70% progress). ▪ The assessment results for the Current Climate Risk have been presented and received feedback from national experts in a technical workshop. The results indicate that the average current climate risk in all the provinces is 3 (moderate level) as measured in a 5-point scale (1 – low; 5 – high).	pages); (2) 80-page summary document; (3) Policy Brief (13 pages). ▪ Adaptation and productivity measures are implemented in livestock farms (165 pilot farms) related to: forage conservation, implementation of reservoirs and irrigation systems, planning tools (farm, sanitary, reproductive, livestock infrastructure), forest conservation and restoration.				
Component 4: Project Management, Monitoring and Evaluation and Knowledge Management								
Outcome 4.1: Project implemented. Lessons learned and best practices have been documented and disseminated.								
Output 4.1.1 Project management, monitoring and evaluation system	Q4, Y4	Currently, there are: ▪ 2 half-year reports: 1 PPR and 1 PIR. Besides, the following products and activities: ▪ 1 project start-up report. ▪ Baseline of 7 provinces and per producers' association (45). ▪ 1 annual operational planning matrix. ▪ 7 province planning matrices. ▪ 1 monitoring and follow-up matrix for the activities carried out by the project national team. ▪ 7 monitoring and follow-	▪ 2 half-year reports: 1 PPR and 1 PIR. Besides, the following products and activities: ▪ 1 annual operational planning matrix. ▪ 7 province planning matrices. ▪ 1 national and 7 province dashboards. ▪ 1 monitoring and follow-up matrix for the activities carried out by the project national team. ▪ 7 monitoring and follow-up matrices for the activities carried out by the project province team. ▪ 10 monthly meetings with	▪ 7 technical progress reports: 4 PPR and 3 PIR. Furthermore, it includes: ▪ 1 2019 annual operational planning matrix. ▪ 7 provincial annual operational planning matrices 2019. ▪ 8 dashboards: 1 national y 7 provincial to report the technical progress. ▪ 1 monitoring matrix of activities developed by the national team. ▪ 7 monitoring matrixes of activities developed by the teams throughout the provinces. ▪ 12 monthly meetings with the project team for			49.14%	-----

		up matrices for the activities carried out by the project province team. ▪ 6 monthly meetings with the project team for monitoring and follow-up. ▪ 8 monthly meetings for monitoring of the annual operational planning with FAO Ecuador	the project team for monitoring and follow-up. ▪ 10 monthly meetings for monitoring of the annual operational planning with FAO Ecuador. ▪ 7 province offices and 7 vehicles properly operating and in constant maintenance.	monitoring. ▪ 12 monthly meetings for monitoring annual operational planning with FAO Ecuador. ▪ 7 provincial offices and 7 operational and maintenance vehicles.				
Output 4.1.2 Project knowledge management system	Q4, Y4	▪ The compendium of 11 components and 96 good livestock practices was socialized with MAE, MAG, INIAP and ESPE. After the comments and suggestions from the partners are incorporated, a dissemination process with small and medium producers, as well as with the private sector will be carried out. ▪ A "CSL Management Platform" will be ready on July 2017. Besides, there is: ▪ Project image: roll up, brochure, communication plan draft and, progress report.	▪ Climate smart livestock knowledge management platform launching: http://ganaderiaclimaticamenteinteligente.com/index.php ▪ CSL Project Communication Plan designed. ▪ Fort the last quarter of 2018, the Project will publish the results of the "Climate Risk and Vulnerability Assessment of the Livestock Sector in Ecuador" study.	▪ The Climate-Smart Livestock Knowledge Management Platform is under way. The main changes are: (1) Incorporation of a Geoportal to visualize the geographical components of the developed products. Data on GHG emissions at the national level are included; climate risk data from the seven provinces; areas of grass production and their limitations in Ecuador; and information on pilot farms (165); (2) Farm-level direct emission calculation tool; (3) Farm-level climate irrigation calculation tool; (4) Recommendations of CSL practices and their implementation through a multimedia section (videos and infographics). The platform will be published by August 2019. ▪ Hiring a Communication Specialist for review and implementation of the Project Communication			51.63%	-----

				Plan. ▪ During the next quarter, it has been scheduled to				
				publish the results of the climate risk study in the livestock sector.				

Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):
Max 200 words:

Technical progress reaches 65.28% on a budget execution of 67.16%, and 3,700 producers and technicians involved in:

- Component 1: Development of the National CSL Management Strategy (85% progress); 7 proposals to update LDUPs (90% progress); Preparation of the recommended zoning for the production of pastures in Ecuador (95 % progress); Training 1,005 farmers (67% men and 33% women) in 37 ECA; Calibration of parameters for estimating mitigation potential nationwide (75% progress).
- Component 2: 29,936 hectares applying CSL practices, involving 1,005 producers; 1,669 hectares preserved and restored; 240 farms adopted silvopastoral systems; Creation of 7 Communal Funds and 2 Agricultural Service Centers; FAO and BanEcuador developed and placed resources for a green credit line to finance CSL practices.
- Component 3: Development of 2 tools for farm-level monitoring of GHG emissions and adaptive capacity; Calculation of carbon stocks in trees on livestock farms (73 % progress).
- Component 4: M&E system working and update of the CSL project KNOWLEDGE management platform.

The project focuses on monitoring and disseminating the CSL approach and good practices nationwide. The implementation of good practices has been consolidated on the project´s pilot farms and is expanding to replica farms (co-financing).

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?
Max 200 words:

The main challenge that the project has faced is the change of mindset in the producers for the implementation of good practices, starting from the needs prioritized by the farmers in their production systems and presenting technical solutions of easy application. This has led to the commitment and empowerment of producers in the Field Schools, understanding that the solution is the efficient management of their farms (productive and environmental) and not the dependence of state solutions through supplies of inputs / materials/equipment. The key to working with farmers is technical assistance, training, monitoring, and co-financing of CSL practice implementation.

Another challenge for the project is the authorities change because this means making great efforts to empower new personal and prove the “climate-smart livestock” approach is a good way to improve productivity, reduce GHG emissions and increase the capacity of adaptation to climate change.

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating[15]	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating[16]	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	*During the reporting period, the commitment of the national and provincial technical team has been key, which has allowed to obtain the results that are allowing to position the CSLC Project not only at the national level, but also regionally.* *The FIVE-pillar CSL Project implementation strategy (capacity building, co-financing, technical assistance, approach sustainability, and monitoring and evaluation) has made it easier for farmers to adopt and replicate knowledge acquired in the Field Schools and whose reinforcement is carried out through Technical Assistance.* *That is why, in close ties with the Undersecretary for Livestock Production of the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG), work is being done to replicate the approach and its methodology at the national level, through the training of technicians of the Sustainable Livestock (execution arm of extensionist and medical assistance of the MAG).* *Finally, one of the important milestones during the reporting period has been the formalization of the interinstitutional link between FAO and BanEcuador that seeks the development of a green credit line (with differentiated interest) for the implementation of CSL practices, under the technical sustenance of the tools generated by the project (quantification of emissions and climate risk at the farm level, as well as recommended use zoning for pastures at the national level).*

[15] **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

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

Budget Holder	S	S	*During this third year of implementation, continuity has been key in the successful relationship between the project and national counterparts (Ministry of the Environment and Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock) and local counterparts. These actions together have led to positive results in territory, allowing not only producers to adopt the approach, but also for local institutions to include it within their territorial planning.* *The management and articulation that has been achieved with national institutions such as BanEcuador, to generate easier processes for farmers, which allows them access to financial mechanisms for the financing of CSL practices, should be highlighted; on the other hand, there is the linkage from the FAO-EC Country Office with the private sector (Milk company El Ordeño) to the implementation of the CSL approach and as a base experience to generate technical elements that support the sustainability of the approach with the company linkage; and, finally, the link with companies such as Telefónica, for the development of mobile applications of emissions and adaptive capacity, which will facilitate the management of resources within their farms.*

Lead Technical Officer[17]	HS	HS	*The implementation of the project by the technical team is on track and of exceptional quality. It is recommended that the team work on consolidating the results and lessons and intensification on their dissemination.* This Project is a clear example of combining rural development, adaptation to climate change, adopting of appropriate production systems, and innovation methods for appropriate reporting (local and national level) on carbon emissions. The project has a relevant social impact on making more efficient the use of natural resources, restoration of land, natural regeneration of forests areas, biodiversity conservation, social empowerment, economic benefits. The project will have a national impact with the potential of reaching 280,000 producers in the country that will have access to credits for a climate smart livestock production through the BanEcuador. This is a major challenge for national authorities to guarantee the appropriate technical assistance as requested to guarantee results that will be associated to the financial mechanism. The project assumed the technical assistance and the capacity building to delegates from the participating ministries, so as the provisional authorities. It is also relevant to mention the close collaboration between this project and the Conservation and Good Living Napo project (GCP/ECU/082/GFF GEF ID: 4774)
CBC-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	HS	The project's implementation is being successful. The project is already sharing lessons learned and tools with other GEF-financed climate-smart livestock projects in the LAC region (i.e. Uruguay, Dominican Republic) under FAO's auspices. It has highly innovative features, as the use of mobile apps at farm level to measure GHG emissions and climate risks/impacts. The project is also pioneer in private sector engagement through agreement with Telefonica (apps), Milk producers, and the national financial sector (BanEcuador).

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

3. Risks

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

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	**Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid[18].** If not, what is the new classification and explain.
L	Yes

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

Risk ratings

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

	Risk	**Risk rating[19]**	**Mitigation Action**	**Progress on mitigation actions[20]**	**Notes from the Project Task Force**

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

[19] GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

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

	Risk	Risk rating[19]	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions[20]	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	**Technical risk:** Scarcity of technical personnel to meet entire areas and activities that need to be covered by the project	L		**Solved:** The Project has 9 national specialists and 14 technicians in territory (2 per province). In addition to meeting field goals, the project has been articulated with the extensionist technicians of the National Sustainable Livestock Program of the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG).	
2	**Technical Risk:** Lack of transportation complicates the ability for trainers to train the producers on the field.	L		**Solved:** The Project has 7 vehicles (one for each province), which allow teams to implement ECA and monitor producers.	
3	**Technical risk:** Lack of a technician exclusively dedicated to CSL monitoring on field.	L		**Solved:** The Project has a technical monitoring unit composed of: producers (records information); technical extensionists (compiles data and analyzes); mitigation specialist (supports and technically assists monitoring and analysis).In addition, in February 2018, the project hired a programming specialist so that GHG emission calculation processes can be automated at a farm level (executed by provincial teams).	

	Risk	Risk rating[19]	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions[20]	Notes from the Project Task Force
4	**Technical risk:** Unable to gather data for the design of national emission factors.	L		**Solved:** There is a national mitigation specialist, dedicated exclusively to GHG emissions issues. In addition, the Project specialist and team have been trained by high-level FAO Roma professionals, linked to the quantification of emissions with the GLEAM tool. And, this tool has been adapted and validated for the needs of Ecuador, to quantify emissions at the national and farm level.	
5	**Technical risk:** Malfunctioning of the MAG Platform	L		The project contracted the development of a platform for GCI knowledge management, which is managed directly by the project (currently in the process of being updated).	It is considered necessary to manage the future transition from the project platform to MAG, to ensure sustainability.
6	**Technical and social risk:** Difficulties in accessing the Global Mechanism and incentives by producers.	L		With the hiring of an Incentives Specialist, a Financial Mechanisms and Incentives Strategy is being implemented, which one of its pillars has been the creation and strengthening of popular finances through communal funds and agricultural service centers.	
7	**Technical and social risk:** Producers do not apply good livestock practices correctly.	L		With the implementation of Field Schools, technical assistance and confinement aimed at producers, the risk of poor application of good practices is reduced, and this anchored to the follow-up process carried out by our technicians.	

	Risk	Risk rating[19]	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions[20]	Notes from the Project Task Force
8	**Political risk:** Change of authorities and lack of support to Project activities.	M		Regular project monitoring and promotion meetings with ministries at both national and provincial levels (MAE and MAG) have managed support and engagement from authorities and focal points.	Generate greater project empowerment by producers, as well as private sector participation can help maintain political support.
9	**Political risk:** Local governments lack of collaboration.	M		Through regular meetings to follow up and promote the project with provincial government authorities by provincial technical teams, support and commitment from local authorities has been managed.	This report shows greater participation of the productive sector and local authorities.
10	**Technical and Institutional risk:** Technicians lack knowledge on sustainable livestock.	S		With close ties with the MAG Undersecretary for Livestock Production, work was heavily done on training technicians of the National Sustainable Livestock Programme for the replication of the CSL Project methodology, based on the development of participatory rural diagnoses for the generation of training resumes.	Training processes for technicians have been carried out.
11	**Economic risk:** Lack of operability of the MAG BANECUADOR credit line for climate-smart livestock.	S		Through the formalization between FAO and BanEcuador, work is underway to develop a green credit line for the financing of CSL practices with a differentiated interest rate.	It is recommended to strengthen technical and political management with the MAG, other ministries and the private sector.

	Risk	Risk rating[19]	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions[20]	Notes from the Project Task Force
12	**Climate risk:** Typical or extreme natural phenomena (volcanic eruptions, El Niño, etc.) that can cause profound adverse effects in project implementation areas.	S		-	
13	**Co-financing risk:** Low co-financing from executing project counterparts.	S		With the hiring of a Communication Specialist, the Communication Strategy is being implemented, informing executing partners of the progress of the project through: progress reporting; newsletter; social media; knowledge management platform.	The progress indicated to date shows the support of the counterparties.

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
M	M	To the date, only risks 8 and 9 generated delays in the implementation of the GCI Project (mainly during the period June to December 2018). With the necessary correctives, the implementation of the project has been equalized and the appropriate support of the partner institutions is supported.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months[21]

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

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

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

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	Original NTE: Revised NTE: Justification:

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

5. Gender Mainstreaming

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

For the analysis of the gender relations of the livestock systems of the intervention areas and the incorporation of the focus into the activities of the CSL Project, a specialist was linked during the second half of 2017, starting their activities with the information gathering process to know the state of gender relations in the production systems of the seven provinces in which the project is involved. The project needed to have a thorough understanding of reality in the field and the steps to take regarding good practices training according to the needs of men and women. It was imperative to conduct this process in order to create and promote local public policies that included a focus on gender; adaptation and mitigation measures considering gender relations; and incentives focused in men and women.

28 focus groups were formed involving 239 people, including 118 women and 121 men. The specialist visited 15 livestock farms to understand the productive and environmental dynamics of livestock, all this according to a technical itinerary. The research deepen on the access, use, control of resources and the benefits men and women acquired from them, the roles each had and a thorough detail on how they spent their time.

The main findings on the state of gender relations in each province were presented to the Undersecretary for Climate Change of the Foreign Ministry, who congratulated the project and ratified its decision on the need to hire a gender consultant from the beginning of the project.

In addition, based on provincial implementation plans, in November and December, a document was prepared with recommendations for gender mainstreaming in provincial POAs for 2018, which is maintained in the 2019 planning. It emphasized the special attention that the project should give to women heads of households, those who lead livestock practices in the absence of their husbands, and women who work together with their husbands (milking, selling milk and making cheese).

At the same time, the gender specialist supported the incorporation of the focus on the following products: learning tools, IAP protocols, 7 provincial PDOTs, National Climate-Smart Livestock Strategy, Good Document Practices and Incentive Strategy.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

The CSL project intervenes in the province of Imbabura, a territory located in the north of Ecuador recognized by the presence of several indigenous peoples and Kichwas nationalities; including the Natabuelas, Karankis and Otavalos. These are people characterized by their customs, language and culture, closely linked to agriculture and land (Pachamama), where livestock plays a fundamental role as a livelihood and development of the territory.

In this context, the CSL project has established working ties with several indigenous associations in the area, of which San Francisco del Abra stands out belonging to the Karankis people and San José de Tangalí of the Otavalos people. Ethnic groups that have oriented their economic development in agricultural activities achieving levels of community organization, which allow support by the National Government for equipment with milk collection centers, cooling tanks, laboratories for milk analysis and machinery for the conservation of forage. A set of initiatives which the CSL project has joined, inserting the concepts of equity, sustainability and sustainability into a context of climate change and productivity; making significant progress that has led to the appropriation of the "Climate Smart Livestock" approach through practices such as livestock management and rearing, pasture management, irrigation and applying good livestock and milking practices.

7. Stakeholders Engagement

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

List of stakeholders	Category	Engagement mechanism
National Institute of Agricultural Research (INIAP for its Spanish acronym)	Academic & research institutions	Provision of technical information: good livestock practices. It is part of the technical table for the analysis of the variables of productivity, food, herd management and excreta of livestock, for the calculation of total GHG emissions.
University of the Armed Forces (ESPE for its Spanish acronym)	Academic & research institutions	Studies are carried out for cost assessment and cost/benefit analysis of good livestock practices.

Aberdeen University (Scotland)	Academic & research institutions	A study is carried out to quantify the carbon stock in the tree component on Coastal and Amazonian pilot farms (doctoral thesis).
Autonomous Decentralized Governments at provincial, municipal and parish level (GADs for its Spanish acronym)	Public institution	Links with local governments as a sustainability strategy for maintaining good livestock practices identified by the project. Articulation and channeling of incentives to producers (existing resources of local governments). Management and implementation of CSL actions with counterparties (in kind and economic) for the implementation of CSL practices.
Other National Universities (Loja, Manabí, Guayas, Santa Elena)	Academic & research institutions	Studies are carried out to analyze good livestock practices. Linkage by volunteers (through MAE and MAG) in the field phase of carbon stock quantification in the tree component of livestock systems in the Coast and the Amazon.
Other GEF initiatives (Landscapes and wildlife; Conservation and sustainable use in Napo; Amazonian Comprehensive Program)	Development Projects	Articulation of joint actions with initiatives in areas of shared intervention. Exchange of experiences (several working meetings). Dissemination of knowledge and information.
Consortium of Provincial Governments in Ecuador (CONGOPE for its Spanish acronym)	Public institution	Articulation to incorporate the Approach of Climate Smart Livestock into provincial agendas (PDOT). Feedback of technical documents for the incorporation of the climate change approach into PDOT (results of the climate risk study).
Amazonian Productive Transformation Agenda (ATPA for its Spanish acronym) – MAG	Public institution	Support and guidance with field technicians in the provinces of the Ecuadorian Amazon to identify CSL practices.
General Coordination of the National Information System and Programme (SIGTIERRAS) - Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock **Institutor Ecuadorian Space - (IEE)**	Public institution	Provision of information on the country's livestock sector (land use with pastures, classification of production systems, segmentation of the country in terms of production systems, livestock zoning, etc.), which was used to determine the baseline of GHG emissions from meat and milk farming in Ecuador (2016) and the mitigation scenario.
MAE and MAG	Public institution	Advice and guidance in the implementation of CSL practices, and training of producers in the ECAs.
Producers' Associations in the 7 provinces: Loja, Imbabura, Manabí, Guayas, Sta. Elena, Napo and Morona Santiago	Small producers	Capacity building through the design of intervention plans according to the needs of producers in each province. Co-financing by producers for the implementation of good livestock practices. To scale the practices promoted by the project, producers have obtained additional financial resources.
Private sector business El Ordeño	Private business	By linking FAO-EC, it can generate experiences by implementing the CSL approach, which enables technical supplies to be obtained to determine the sustainability of the approach to the linkage of the business sector.
Telefónica	Private business	The link with FAO, will facilitate the development of web applications for emissions monitoring and adaptive capacity at a farm level.

8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

The project began in August 2016 with workshops with farmers, technicians and local authorities. It was the opportunity to change the traditional working schemes in Ecuador, which is why the first meetings with the farmers was key to mention that co-financing represents one of the main intervention strategies. The producers should invest their own resources for the implementation of activities. Farmers who decided to bet on this initiative and work under co-financing, started the activities with the local diagnostics to jointly identify problems and solutions to improve livestock activity from the perspective of the CSL approach (improving productivity, reducing emissions and improving climate change adaptive capacity).

After six months of hard work with local actors, the project's intervention strategy was strengthened, and seven provincial implementation and capacity building plans were generated, responding to the problems of each of the areas of intervention. One of the biggest challenges was to change the conception of livestock to local producers and actors under the guidelines of the CSL approach, however, with appropriate training through Field Schools, technical assistance, monitoring and evaluation, management and inter-agency articulation, and mainly co-financing, has achieved favorable results that have currently positioned the CSL Project at the national and international levels.

The main change is evident in the field, where one can observe at first glance the change not only of livestock systems, but also of the producers who bet on this project, and who currently share the knowledge acquired with other local actors. It is interesting to observe how the farmers after improving their production systems, decide on their own to take other steps for the environment, for example: conserve natural remnants, free up areas for forest restoration, incorporate trees through silvopastoral systems, which are beneficial for capturing and fixing carbon and offsetting GHG emissions, and improving adaptive capacity. Currently, after having an intervention in consolidated territory, the project's actions will focus on analyzing, systematizing and publishing the main findings. Within the 2019 planning, some findings will be published from July to December.

To date, there are:

CSL Video: https://youtu.be/ufIB_j0Nkuk

Publications and technical reports: https://www.ganaderiaclimaticamenteinteligente.com/documentacion.php

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing[22]	**Name of Co-financer**	**Type of Co-financing**	**Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval**	**Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-**	**Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure** (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	**Expected total disbursement by the end of the project**
National Government	Ministry of Environment	Cash	11,566,891	3,473,203	-----	11,566,891
National Government	Ministry of Environment	In-kind	191,300	198,409	-----	191,300
National Government	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock	Cash	6,107,069	6,801	-----	6,107,069
National Government	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock	In-kind	3,159,895	6,149,849	-----	3,159,895
International Organization	FAO	In-kind	320,000	97,401	-----	320,000
Private sector	Beneficiaries	In-kind	811,400	294,673	-----	811,400
Private sector	Beneficiaries	Cash	-----	173,835	-----	-----
Local Government	Autonomous Decentralized Governments	In-kind	-----	215,905	-----	-----

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

Local Government	Autonomous Decentralized Governments	Cash	-----	7,260	-----	-----
Local Government	County level	In-kind	-----	123,177	-----	-----
Local Government	County level	Cash	-----	17,600	-----	-----
Local Government	Parrish level	In-kind	-----	50,968	-----	-----
Local Government	Parrish level	Cash	-----	300	-----	-----
Local Government	INIAP	In-kind	-----	74,154	-----	-----
Other	Universities ESPOCH, UNL	In-kind	-----	12,676	-----	-----
Other	Universities ESPOCH, UNL	Cash	-----	1,200	-----	-----
		TOTAL	22,156,555	10,897,412	-----	22,156,555

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

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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