



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)	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	9
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	10
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	14
6. RISKS	17
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	23
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	25
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	26
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	35
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	36
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	40
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	42

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Latin America and the Caribbean
Country (ies):	Chile
Project Title:	Mainstreaming the Conservation, Sustainable Use and Valuation of Critically Endangered Species and Ecosystems into Development-frontier Production Landscapes of the Arica y Parinacota, and Biobío Regions
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/CHI/033/GEF
GEF ID:	5429
GEF Focal Area(s):	Biodiversity
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of the Environment -MMA, Ministry of Agriculture – MINAGRI (National Forestry Corporation-CONAF, Livestock and Agricultural Service –SAG)
Initial project duration (years):	36 months / 3 years
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:	10 January 2017
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	25 September 2017
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	25 September 2020
Revised project implementation End date (if approved) ²	30 November 2022

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 2,411,416
Total Co-financing amount (USD)³:	USD 6,610,611
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	USD 2,409,443

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 actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD) ⁴ :	USD 2,409,324
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023 ⁵	USD 5,433,268

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	September 13 th , 2022
Expected Mid-term Review date ⁶ :	March, 2021
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	June, 2021
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date ⁷ :	December, 2022
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	Moderate
----------------------------------	----------

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
---------	-----------------------------------	--------

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.

Project Coordinator (PC)	Fabiola Lara, Regional Project Coordinator Juan Anjari, National Project Coordinator	fabiola.larasalinas@fao.org juan.anjari@fao.org
Budget Holder (BH)	Eve Crowley, FAO Chile Representative	Eve.crowley@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)	Miguel Stutzin, Ministry of the Environment	MStutzin@mma.gob.cl
Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Pieter van Lierop, Forest Officer FAO, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean	Pieter.VanLierop@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	Lorenzo Campos Aguirre, RLC GEF Project Task Manager, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean	Lorenzo.camposaguirre@fao.org

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 by 30 June 2022	Progress rating ¹¹
Mainstreaming conservation criteria of the four critically endangered species (Darwin's fox, Chilean huemul, Keule and Chilean woodstar) into the management of main 'development border' territories in Arica y	<p>Outcome 1: Strengthened local actors' capacity to implement good forestry and agroforestry practices, mainstreaming habitat conservation for four endangered species</p> <p>(Chilean woodstar, Chilean huemul, Darwin's fox and Keule)</p>	<p>Number of people aware of the importance of the conservation of the four endangered species</p> <p>Number of people trained to implement good forestry and agroforestry practices that consider the conservation</p>	<p>One-off initiatives of environmental education and conservation which provide information on the species from an environmental perspective.</p> <p>There is no inter-sectoral coordination.</p> <p>There are no programmes to connect the conservation of the four endangered species with the</p>	<p>1,000 school students, 500 people from municipalities selected.</p> <p>700 civil servants, 100 farmers from municipalities selected.</p>	<p>2,250 school students, 750 people from municipalities selected.</p> <p>1 500 civil servants, 350 farmers from municipalities selected.</p>	<p>2,250 students at schools, 3 929 people from selected Municipalities (92% achievement in students indicator and 518 % achievement in civil society indicator).</p> <p>1,567 civil servants; 731 farmers from selected Municipalities. (102 % achievement in public servants indicator and 209 % achievement in farmers indicator).</p>	S

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).

Parinacota and Biobio regions.		of the four endangered species	agroforestry and forestry sector management.																				
	<p>Outcome 2: The populations of the four endangered species are stabilised by reducing the pressure on their habitats, land-use planning and biodiversity conservation management.</p>	<p>Zones of influence of protected areas under good practice implementation</p> <p># Specimens of endangered species</p>	<p>0 ha</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="751 505 934 966"> <tr> <td>Darwin's fox</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chilean Huemul</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Keule</td> <td>5000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chilean woodstar</td> <td>400</td> </tr> </table>	Darwin's fox	50	Chilean Huemul	80	Keule	5000	Chilean woodstar	400		<p>501 200 ha area under management plans (indirect); 10 percent of the total area under direct Intervention (50,120 ha).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1165 613 1348 1075"> <tr> <td>Darwin's fox</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chilean huemul</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Keule</td> <td>5000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chilean woodstar</td> <td>400</td> </tr> </table>	Darwin's fox	50	Chilean huemul	80	Keule	5000	Chilean woodstar	400	<p>Good agroforestry and tourism practices under direct implementation: 53,873 hectares.</p> <p>Through participatory design of environmental interpretation circuits, species monitoring, creation of new protected areas (nature sanctuary), reduction of ranching in buffer zones, management of nurseries for ex situ conservation, integrated soil management, reforestation, substitution of Agrochemicals. Distribution by species: Keule, Chilean Coast Range: 1,278 ha; Darwin's Fox, Cordillera de Nahuelbuta: 2,978 ha; Chilean huemul, Cordillera de los Andes, Central Chile: 49,370 ha; Chilean woodstar, productive valleys and Micro-reserves network: 2 ha.</p> <p>Under protected area management plans and other administrative and management/planification instruments, in zones of influence of protected areas (indirect): 2,618,375 hectares. Comprised by the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Management Plan of Biosphere Reserve Nevados de Chillan -Laguna Laja + Chilean Heumul RECOGE plan: 565,807 hectares; - Darwin's fox RECOGE plan + High Value Conservation Areas (private): 1,513,585 ha; -Keule RECOGE plan: 372,863 ha; -Chilean Woodstar RECOGE plan + area under Pladetur Camarones and PLADECO Arica that 	S
Darwin's fox	50																						
Chilean Huemul	80																						
Keule	5000																						
Chilean woodstar	400																						
Darwin's fox	50																						
Chilean huemul	80																						
Keule	5000																						
Chilean woodstar	400																						

						are current and potential area of specie’s distribution: 166,120 ha). ** Differences on indirect area reported historically are due to adjustments in the coverage of the plans throughout its development (zorro, keule). In case of picaflor, new number considers only the area of current and potential distribution of the species under RECOGE, PLADECO y PLADETUR.	
	Outcome 3: Public policies and regional regulatory frameworks mainstream conservation criteria for the four endangered species based on the territorial management experiences of Component 2	# of regional public policies that refer to biodiversity conservation criteria	Outdated conservation plans that provide additional information on the status of the species. New regulations for the classification of wild species.		4 RECOGE plans. 7 municipal ordinance proposals.	4 RECOGE plans: Chilean woodstar and huemul enacted under Presidential Decree; Keule under public consultation; Zorro (under revision by the MMA RECOGE Plan Comitee). 7 municipal environmental ordinance proposals. Additional achievements: -Integration of biodiversity criteria in the Municipal Development Plan of Arica (PLADECO 2021-2030). -A Tourism Development Plan (PLADETUR) for Camarones, as the basis for the construction of the Camarones Commune’s PLADECO. - Policy for Biodiversity Conservation, Biobío, that increase potential of sustainability of project’s results in the region. -Mainstreaming conservation criteria in the Zone of Tourist Interest (ZOIT) Pinto, Ñuble Region.	HS
	Outcome 4: Results-based management approach of the implemented Project	Project outcomes achieved and demonstrate d	Project Results Framework with indicators, baseline and targets for project outcomes and	30-40 percent progress project outcomes	Project outcomes are achieved and demonstrate sustainability	The result of the M&E tool as of November 2022, showed the following level of achievement of the activities of the POA 2021/2022 and LMF: Component 1: 97%; Component 2: 96%; Component 3: 100% Component 4: 100%-	S

		sustainability	outputs validated with key actors.			The project has been affected by the social outburst (2019), the pandemic by COVID-19 (2020), the escalation of the territorial conflict in the Southern Macrozone Sur, and the national constitutional process that ended in September 2022. Under this scenario, together with the level of ambition of some products and unfulfilled assumptions (such as the creation of the Biodiversity National Service), project implementation and some products had to be adjusted (as systematically reported in the PIRs).	
--	--	----------------	------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
The project ended in November 2022			

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

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

During the last months, the project team prepared the Final Report and the financial closure of the project.

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</u>				
<u>Output 1.1.1</u>				
<u>Output 1.1.2</u>				
<u>Outcome 2.1</u>				
<u>Output 2.1.1</u>				
<u>Output 2.1.2</u>				
<u>Output 2.1.3</u>				
<u>Outcome 3.1</u>				
<u>Output 3.1.1</u>				
<u>Output 3.1.2</u>				

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

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.

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)

As established in the Terminal Evaluation: The main objective of the project was achieved at a satisfactory level; the conservation criteria of the four threatened species were incorporated into the management of the "development frontier" territories in the target regions of the project, through the implementation of good forestry, agricultural and livestock practices, the development of local capacities, awareness-raising and the incorporation of biodiversity into local policies and regulatory frameworks.

The project has represented an important effort to improve social awareness of the importance of biodiversity conservation and also to promote greater inter-institutional coordination for the mainstreaming of environmental commitments in sectoral agendas. The project has closed its execution with a positive balance of verifiable compliance in its value-adding components (Components 1, 2 and 3), with a positive evolution of its performance after the corrective measures identified in the Mid Term Review.

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 rating¹⁵	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	<i>The outcome indicators achievement of component; the output indicators achievement; and the progress and achievement level of AOP tasks. The positive change is given in the implementation of results-based management, implementation of the M&E Tool, sustainability and financing strategies and with this, the AOP targeting under a project-exit strategy focused on actions that will facilitate the achievement of outputs and outcomes contributing to the achievement of outcome and output indicators, together with national and regional governance management centred on sustainability, scalability and replication, and knowledge management.</i>
Budget Holder	S	S	During project closure significant progress was made in terms of the implementation of outputs and outcomes, virtually reaching 100 percent of progress by the end of the project. Although, there are specific indicators that could not be achieved due to exogenous factors, such as mobility restrictions imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic and the social and political outburst of 2019, the project has exceeded other key indicators and has demonstrated significant impact in the territories and the local communities. This is backed by an independent economic

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

			valuation of the good practices implemented by the project. On the other hand, the project has contributed in terms of instruments and the policy framework to promote the conservation of endangered species. However, due to the delay in the approval of the Biodiversity and Protected Areas Service Law, sustainability of Project's approach and products has been weakened and relies on different continuity initiatives and agreements with executing entities and strategic partners.
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸	S	S	<i>The project was successful in terms of implementation. It resulted in the development and implementation of relevant policies and instrument with the involvement of the local communities and relevant regional stakeholders promoting and strengthening the conservation of the species and biodiversity in the territories. The project also incorporated the social and economic value of biodiversity and its conservation with 'good practice' initiatives in areas of tourism, agriculture and forestry and developed an effective communication strategy. Nonetheless, its implementation was affected by the COVID pandemic and other external factors which required adaptations and solutions, all professionally managed and implemented by the project team and the implementation agency.</i>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	S	S	<i>The project was implemented in a challenging context over the last three years: social riots, COVID-19 pandemic, constitutional process, increased tension in the Southern Macrozone due to the State/Mapuche conflict. The measures adopted during the last year and a half of the project, in line with the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation, and the adjustments to the intervention strategy adapted to the national and macroregional context, allowed satisfactory progress. Of note in the period for the Environmental Education Programme is the Didactic Unit with regional sustainability, the regional biodiversity policy in Biobío, the FPIC process as the basis for decision-making on actions in the area of</i>

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

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

			<p><i>influence of Darwin's fox, the formulation and presentation of budget programmes and investment projects in the areas that mainstream biodiversity in the agroforestry, tourism and educational sectors, the recovery and conservation plans for the four species, the ordinances at the municipal level, and the results-based management of the project. Qualitative and quantitative evidence of the socio-environmental and economic value of mainstreaming biodiversity in agroforestry and tourism practices was systematized based on the project's experiences as an input for policy design.</i></p>
<p>GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)</p>	S	S	<p><i>During the last months of implementation, the project oriented efforts to ensure adequate closure of activities and possibilities for sustainability of results. Most of the main outcomes were satisfactorily achieved, although as reported in previous PIR, the project had to overcome and adjust to several challenges due to external factors that hindered the achievement of certain outcomes. This was also mentioned in the Terminal Evaluation of the project, which qualified the project in general as Satisfactory.</i></p>

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				
There are indigenous communities in the areas surrounding the project intervention zones. The project activities	The members of indigenous communities will	- For actions related to the conservation	The project ended in November 2022	1. Regional Coordinator Southern

<p>will have no negative impact in indigenous lands. On the contrary, the good forest and agriculture sustainable practices that are being conducted could be implemented in indigenous communities land, considering their ancestral knowledge.</p>	<p>participate in the process of free, prior and informed consent that will take place before starting the operations of the project in the first year in the communes of the Arica y Parinacota and Biobío Region.</p>	<p>landscape in Nahuelbuta territory with the presence of indigenous communities (Southern Macrozone), the team implemented the FPIC process. However, based on the first steps of the FPIC, it was determined that project activities could not move forward due to territorial conflicts in the areas.</p>		<p>Macrozone. 2. Territorial Extension Specialist. 3. National Project Coordinator 4. In coordination with the LTO and Native Peoples' team.</p>
<p>New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY</p>				

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

<p>Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)</p>	<p>Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid²⁰. If not, what is the new classification and explain.</p>
<p>Moderate Risk</p>	<p>Moderate Risk</p>

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>)

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.

No grievance during the Project implementation

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	Economic risk: Difficult access to market for products under recognition systems of biodiversity	High	Y	Some products are traded at a reasonable price in reliable markets. Labelled products or services to be introduced by this project will require a market analysis to assess its economic viability.	With the support of INDAP and its market access instruments (Farmers Markets, Economic Association Program), producers were supported to better access markets. This support continues through sustainability agreements with INDAP.	

²¹ Risk ratings means the overall risk factors whether internal or external to the project which may affect project implementation or the possibility to achieve project objectives. The project risks should be rated according to the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

2	<p>Climate risk: Climate change acceleration further worsens the chances of species survival</p>	Medium	Y	<p>The project promotes measures to increase the effective habitat and stop illegal logging, what increases the chances of the species to cope with unmanageable changes (at this scale) such as the displacement of suitable habitat due to climate change.</p>	<p>More frequent and severe forest fires due to climate change have been the main threat for species survival. However, project activities and associations with institutions and other initiatives – such GCF RBP Project - allowed preventive actions.</p>	
3	<p>Organizational risk: Organizational weaknesses of partners and public-private partnerships prevent the effective project implementation</p>	Low	Y	<p>Current risk mitigation systems (e. g., support the capacity building of partners and partnerships, appropriate co-financing rates, intensive monitoring) will be strengthened to maintain or improve the success rates. The project will also reduce this risk through the implementation of good practices that have been successful in previous experiences of FAO.</p>	<p>Recruitment of a national coordinator whose work has included the implementation of monitoring and follow-up tools; improvement of results-based management and strengthening the team management focused on governance and sustainability of institutional and financial outputs, as well as institutional and financial knowledge management.</p>	

4	<p>Political risk: Lack of political will to support and favour sustainable production landscapes. Change of authorities, elections in May 2021: mayors, governors, regional councillors</p>	Medium	Y	<p>Experiences show that landscape sustainability is closely related to the degree of biological diversity, beyond goods and services directly provided by said biodiversity. The project will promote resilience and care when recording and promoting ecosystem services of associated landscapes production by recognizing the value of biodiversity such as increased soil stability and fertility, endured crops resistance to diseases and pests, increased water cycle regulation capacity, microclimate benefits and others.</p>	<p>The project has undergone changes in local, regional and national governments, national institutional directors, heads of divisions and departments, and some focal points. In keeping with the same, the strategy has adopted a national and regional approach, at high political and technical levels, based on the project's achievements and contribution to local, regional and national policies, inviting and facilitating participation in the achievement of outputs. A sustainability and financing strategy was implemented, as well as a strategy for effective and relevant communication and knowledge management as tools to support capacity strengthening.</p>	
---	---	--------	---	--	--	--

5	<p>Social risk: Low interest of the indigenous people that live outside the project intervention zones who could reject the project activities.</p>	High	Y	<p>Members of indigenous communities will participate in the Free, Prior, Informed Consent process that will take place before the project inception in the first year, in the Biobío Region communes. According to the FAO Policy on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples and the Environmental and Social Management Guidelines, the process of Free, Prior, Informed Consent must take place and generate the corresponding complaint mechanisms.</p>	<p>Stakeholder consultation is permanently considered in project decision-making, planning and actions implementation.</p> <p>For actions related to the conservation landscape in Nahuelbuta territory with the presence of indigenous communities (Southern Macrozone), the team applied the FPIC process during the second half of 2021. This tool enabled to collect primary and secondary information that was critical to decide to discontinue the work, because of the absence of the necessary conditions for a participatory and inclusive process, in accordance with the FAO Policy on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples and Convention 169.</p>	
---	--	------	---	---	--	--

6	Territorial risks: Red Zones Mapuche Conflict/ State of Chile	Medium	N	Establish field work protocols, considering potential risks and preventive and mitigation measures.	As mentioned above, actions in Nahuelbuta territory with the presence of indigenous communities included FPIC application. However, based on the first steps of the FPIC, it was determined that project activities could not move forward due to territorial conflicts in the areas.
7	Health risk: Global situation, COVID 19 pandemic.	Medium	N	Implementation and enforcement of health measures of the National Health Authority in accordance with the Step-by-Step Plan and UN and FAO health measures.	Compliance with the Step-by-Step Plan; restrictions on face-to-face events and field trips; compliance with self-care measures; compliance with vaccination plan and mobility pass; implementation of measures according to the step-by-step plan per region and commune according to active cases reflected in travel plans; strengthening of virtual and telephone communication and applications such as WhatsApp; application of isolation measures in case of Covid-positive cases, complying with the health report and monitoring the evolution.

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
High	Moderate	<p>Thanks to timely and effective prevention and mitigation measures , especially related to the change of authorities and increase in territorial conflict in the Southern Macrozone, in addition to the improvement of the health context imposed by the COVID 19 pandemic, the overall risk of the project has been reclassified as Moderate.</p> <p>Risks have been permanently monitored as part of the implementation of the annual operational plan and managing any potential impacts with prevention and mitigation measures.</p> <p>Strategies and actions have been implemented based on the situational analysis; use of the monitoring</p>

		<p>and evaluation tool and feedback from the project team with local and regional vision together with the Lead Technical Consultant, delegated by the Lead Technical Officer, and Task Manager of FAO Chile; as well as the vision of the institutional counterparts and support from the National Project Management and the Seremis of the Environment.</p> <p>Strategies have been designed and implemented in support of results-based management, in the form of an operational plan, accompanied by a sustainability, financing, communication and a knowledge management strategy.</p>
--	--	--

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

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

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
Recommendation 1: Adaptation to the new context and prioritisation.	The project ended on September 2022
Recommendation 2: Ensuring the maximum possible achievement of all outputs and outcomes.	
Recommendation 3:C.1. Extension period	
Recommendation 4: Greater engagement of partners in the project and better positioning vis-à-vis the entire community.	
Recommendation 5: Definition of the governance level and resources for project continuity.	
Recommendation 6: Gender, minority groups, indigenous peoples and local community policy.	

<p>Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize</p>	<p>An exit strategy that considers elements of results-based management, institutionalisation, replication and scalability of initiatives, financing, communication and knowledge management has been formulated in 2021, with input from the team and main counterparts, and is being implemented at macro-regional and regional levels. It considered the targeting of actions, the search for agreements and public/private funding for institutionalisation and</p>
--	---

	<p>sustainability of the main achievements of the project. This strategy also considered the exchange of knowledge and the transfer of capacities based on the main achievements and lessons learned from the project to the counterparts, at the macro-regional and national levels.</p> <p>In parallel, and related to this strategy, a monitoring and evaluation tool was designed and is periodically implemented to ensure results-based management and continuous improvement</p>
--	---

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	N/A		
Components and cost	N/A		
Institutional and implementation arrangements	N/A		
Financial management	N/A		
Implementation schedule	N/A		
Executing Entity	N/A		
Executing Entity Category	N/A		
Minor project objective change	N/A		
Safeguards	N/A		
Risk analysis	N/A		
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	N/A		
Co-financing	N/A		
Location of project activity	N/A		
Other minor project amendment (define)	N/A		

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

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

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

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government Institutions			
Ministry of the Environment - MMA	Responsible for the general execution of the project.	Participation in Final Evaluation as informants and reviewers. Participation in closure seminar and final steering committee.	
National Forestry Corporation (CONAF) Ministry of Agriculture	Project co-executing institution participates in the steering committees and collaborates in activities related to the production, maintenance and monitoring of plant species.	Participation in Final Evaluation as informants. Participation in closure seminar and final steering committee.	
Livestock and Agricultural Service (SAG) Ministry of Agriculture	Permanent member of the Project Committee. Participates in the steering committee and the regional technical committees and is	The institution has fulfilled the co-financing commitments through its participation in the committees.	

	also part of the governance of RECOGE plans. Co-executing project partner		
National Tourism Service (Sernatur)	Strategic actor in the awareness programme and dissemination of information on endangered species. Participate in the Regional Technical Committees.	Participation in closure regional seminars and final Regional Technical Committees.	
National Institute of Agricultural Development (INDAP) Ministry of Agriculture	Strategic project partner, not identified in the elaboration of the PRODOC, but with whom work has been done at the regional and national levels, building partnerships focused on strengthening professional capacities, and reaching agreements to implement good practice pilots in territories of beneficiaries. It is part of the National Steering Committee and participates in the sub-committees of species and RECOGE plans.	Participation in Final Evaluation as informants. Participation in closure seminar and final steering committee.	

Regional Government of Biobío (GORE)	Strategic partner for the implementation of the project's biodiversity policy in Biobío region.	Participation in closure regional seminar and final Regional Technical Committee.	
Regional Government of Ñuble (GORE)	Strategic partner to conserve biodiversity at regional level.	Participation in closure regional seminar and final Regional Technical Committee.	
Ministry of National Assets	Its role is to facilitate bailment of fiscal land that may be included in some category of conservation areas. Depending on the area, the loan would be delivered to the national system of Protected Areas, municipality or private sector.		
Regional Governments (GORE) of Arica y Parinacota and Biobío	Coordinate with the MMA actions for institutional strengthening, so they can have a key role in the prioritization of regional regulations and investment projects for the conservation of endangered species, through relevant allocation.	Participation in closure regional seminar and final Regional Technical Committee.	
Municipalities of Arica y Parinacota	Opportunity to strengthen their role and technical capacity of the environmental	Participation in closure regional seminar.	

	teams, to ensure good practices sustainability.		
Municipality of Cobquecura, Ñuble region	There is direct work with the local environmental officer. All the activities related to the Keule in the commune are informed and worked jointly.	Participation in closure regional seminar.	
Municipality of Tomé, Biobío region	There is direct work, with the local environmental manager and the municipal tree nursery manager. There is direct participation in the pilot that the project implements in rural mountain zone. Its role has been to introduce Keule protection and conservation into environmental community policies.	Participation in closure regional seminar.	
Municipality of Cañete, Biobío region	Its role has been to support the project and to facilitate joint opportunities for the promotion of rural tourism based on biodiversity conservation in general.	Participation in closure regional seminar.	
Municipality of Purén, Araucanía region	The Municipality participates directly through the productive development unit;	Participation in closure regional seminar.	

	there is a direct participation in the pilot that the project implements in rural mountain zone.		
Municipality of San Fabián, Ñuble Region	Work with the municipality's Prodesal. Its role was to establish a pilot farm at the community level, as a demonstrative unit for Chilean huemul conservation.	Participation in closure regional seminar.	
Municipality of Coihueco, Ñuble Region	The Municipality participates directly through the productive development unit.	Participation in closure regional seminar.	
Municipality of Pinto, Ñuble Region	The Municipality participates directly through the productive development unit	Participation in closure regional seminar.	
Municipality of Los Alamos, Biobío Region	Participation in the project at various levels. Environmental education plan and sending citizen signatures to the Seremi of the Environment requesting the creation of the Quebrada de Caramávida Nature Sanctuary, currently owned by Forestal Arauco.	Participation in closure regional seminar.	

<p>Municipality of Angol, Araucanía region</p>	<p>The Municipality is part of the 'Nahuelbuta Landscape of Conservation' proposal, there is a direct participation in the pilot that the project implements in rural mountain zone.</p>	<p>Participation in closure regional seminar.</p>	
<p><i>Non-Governmental organizations (NGOs)</i></p>			
<p>AvesChile</p>	<p>They will participate in the Regional Participation Committees. They will also make available their monitoring methodologies to unify the procedure and will support project outputs through letters of agreement.</p>	<p>Participation in closure regional seminar.</p>	
<p>NGO Aumen</p>	<p>They participate in Regional Committees and in the work developed to obtain the methodology for Chilean huemul monitoring. Implementation of good practices for Chilean huemul through a letter of agreement in San Fabián-Coihueco.</p>	<p>Participation in closure regional seminar.</p>	
<p>Fundación Nahuelbuta</p>	<p>They participate in the Regional Committees and in</p>	<p>Participation in closure regional seminar.</p>	

	the Darwin's Fox RECOGE Plan		
Agrupación Los Huemules, Las Trancas Pinto	Community group for the defence of Chilean huemules and the environment in general. It has good political partnerships in the territory and supports the logistic activities of the Project.	Participation in closure regional seminar.	
<i>Private sector entities</i>			
ANPROS Arica y Parinacota	ANPROS is an organisation that represents the seed industry in the Region of Arica y Parinacota and includes Corteva (former Pioneer) among its companies.	Participation in closure regional seminar.	
Pioneer (Du Pont Group)	Support the implementation of good practices pilots and outreach programmes.	No further participation.	
Forestal Arauco	It participates in the regional technical committee in Biobio and in working groups with the Regional Environmental Secretariat in order to reach agreements for the protection of the Quebrada de Caramavida.	No further participation.	

	Field activities have been conducted in forest lands with the presence of Keule, to learn about the work for the species conservation.		
Forestal CMPC	Key actor to promote rural development in sectors threatened by degradation in Cordillera de Nahuelbuta. The company aims to develop a model for environmental improvement in rural areas as part of its corporate responsibility.	No further participation.	
Private property owners	Key actors in the implementation of the project. They make their land available for the implementation of good conservation practices.	No further participation.	
<i>Others[1]</i>			
Universidad de Tarapacá	It operates in the territory of interest to the Project.	Participation in closure regional seminar.	
Universidad Católica del Maule	Strategic partner in scientific studies on Keule.	Participation in closure regional seminar.	
<i>New stakeholders identified/engaged</i>			
Municipality of Hualqui	Its role in the project has been to participate in a public-private partnership for the restoration of land	Participation in closure regional seminar.	

	with Keule.		
--	-------------	--	--

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) <u>during this reporting period.</u>		
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.	No	Although no gender analysis was done, the socio-environmental and economic valuation study started in the first half of 2022 includes guidelines that will allow the evaluation of the impacts of good practices in the pilots assessed, as well as the proposal of the recognition system for the GAP-T implementation.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	- Promotion of equal participation in workshops and trainings. - Consideration of gender aspects when planning activities.
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	No	
b) improving women's participation and decision making	No	
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	No	
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	All data are disaggregated by gender.
Staff with gender expertise	No	
Any other good practices on gender	No	

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval, <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
<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 developed a knowledge management strategy as part of the communication strategy, that was strengthened and implemented during the project cycle.</p> <p>The project produced good agricultural and tourism practices manuals representative of the territories where the experiences were carried out.</p> <p>The project built a database in share point where the documents are hosted. They are also hosted on the project's website (https://gefespeciesamenazadas.mma.gob.cl) .</p> <p>A repository of documents and good practice were made at: https://gefespeciesamenazadas.mma.gob.cl/#material</p> <p>Other good practices and lessons learned considered are: the environmental education programme and development of the Didactic Unit that applies the project-based learning methodology; territorial management and governance for biodiversity conservation (a milestone to highlight is the formulation of the Biobío biodiversity policy); and identification of social, economic, cultural, environmental and biodiversity benefits with gender and indigenous perspectives based on a study of the pilot sites.</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, the project developed a communication strategy focused on the project exit stage and dissemination of the AOP 2021-2022 milestones, re-launching the website and expanding contacts as target audience, and knowledge management focused on publications produced by the project and knowledge sharing. Success: A Communication Strategy related to milestones resulting from the activities per product defined in the AOP, strengthening the participation and visualisation of strategic regional and local stakeholders, contributing to institutional management in the</p>

	<p>territory, strengthening environmental and biodiversity policy and work and reaching out to the public. Challenge: To ensure that the communication and knowledge management strategy obtains a better thematic visualisation in national institutional decision-makers together with knowledge management and sustainability of outputs and outcomes, in order to demonstrate the contribution of the project in a comprehensive manner from the local-regional to the national level.</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 the documents listed above, which are in the final stage of development, stories, verbal quotes from beneficiaries and photographs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Study of identification of social, economic, cultural, environmental and biodiversity benefits as a result of good practice implementation. - Proposal of a recognition system for good practice implementation. - Document of project experience systematisation.
<p>The experience of a beneficiary from the Northern Macrozone, an indigenous woman, demonstrates the co-benefits of good practices implementation.</p> <p>Ms Fresia Beyzaga, an Aymara woman, is a farmer and INDAP user from Caleta Vítor, in the Arica Commune, who has 3.9 hectares of vegetable and fruit tree production. INDAP Regional selected her as a subject of interest for the implementation of GAP, so the initiative began the work for the implementation of a good agricultural practices pilot in a passion fruit crop with ecological soil management and the use of floral strips, with combined benefits of improving soil fertility through beneficial microorganisms and reducing the incidence of pests and diseases through arthropod controllers, resulting in a friendly alternative to the environment and people's health.</p> <p>This pilot is one of the most successful examples in the Northern Macrozone, as it allowed to eliminate the use of agrochemicals, reducing the costs of inputs and labour, producing passion fruit of a comparatively superior quality than in conventional farming, getting better sales price.</p> <p>Another benefit additional to the environmental benefits is the cultural ecosystem services related to the farmer's mental health, as the flower strips eventually became a garden that she</p>	

<p>visits every afternoon and enjoys spending time in a space surrounded by nature, improving her health and spiritual connection.</p>	
<p>Please provide links to related website, social media account.</p>	<p>Sitio web del Proyecto GEF Especies Amenazadas https://gefespeciesamenazadas.mma.gob.cl</p>
<p>Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.</p>	<p>Publications to date: Stories: Gabriela's journey: https://gefespeciesamenazadas.mma.gob.cl/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Cuento-el-viaje-de-Gabriela-compressed.pdf Darwin's fox: https://gefespeciesamenazadas.mma.gob.cl/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Cuento-zorro_2020-compressed.pdf Keule: https://gefespeciesamenazadas.mma.gob.cl/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Cuento-queule_2020-compressed.pdf Decalogue of the Chilean huemul: https://gefespeciesamenazadas.mma.gob.cl/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/decalogo-huemul.jpg Book: Trun el Gonfoterio: https://gefespeciesamenazadas.mma.gob.cl/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/TRUN_GEF_fao_compressed-1.pdf Short story: Knowledge of the Keule and the Darwin's fox: https://gefespeciesamenazadas.mma.gob.cl/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Libro-Zorro-de-Darwin-Queule-web.pdf Final Keule project report: https://gefespeciesamenazadas.mma.gob.cl/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/Informe-Final-Proyecto-Queule-Licitacion-31-08-201.pdf Chilean woodstar RECOGE plan: https://gefespeciesamenazadas.mma.gob.cl/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/2115828-RECOGE-picaflor-de-Arica-compressed.pdf</p> <p>Pilot sites in the Northern and Southern Macrozones: description and videos.</p> <p>Chilean woodstar monitoring paper.</p>

	<p>Videos: Rescuing the Chilean huemul in central Chile. Protecting Biodiversity in the Biobío Region. Environmental Education Programme of Chilean woodstar.</p> <p>Monthly news for more information can be found at the website https://gefespeciesamenazadas.mma.gob.cl/.</p>
<p>Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details</p>	<p>Victoria Valencia, journalist Victoria.Valencia@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.

The project integrated the ethnic-differential approach and complied with the Free Prior and Informed Consultation (FPIC) procedure according to the required guidelines.

An extensive process of gathering information and background information was conducted during 2021 as input for decision-making on the direction of the planned work in the Nahuelbuta territory, with the presence of indigenous peoples. A diagnosis of the territory, informal and bilateral meetings with different stakeholders have been conducted throughout the development of the project, as part of the FPIC process. The following is a brief explanation of the justification for the decision taken with respect to the project goal of creating the Cordillera de Nahuelbuta Biosphere Reserve.

A proposal for the Cordillera de Nahuelbuta Biosphere Reserve, an area with an important presence of Mapuche communities, was developed during the first half of the project. This process was interrupted after a period of broad dissemination in the territory and a joint analysis among the main partners and political actors related to the proposal, within the framework of the Regional Technical Council of the Southern Macro-zone of the project. Later, to meet this Territorial Management goal, the Project team proposed the development of a Conservation Landscape, and the organisation of the team was adapted to have a dedicated professional. This instrument has objectives and processes similar to those of the Biosphere Reserve, but with a more decentralised organisation coordinated by the municipalities. This change of strategy was put forward to and approved by the project's national Steering Committee.

Despite the strategies for adaptation to the complexities of the territory, such as changing the tool for a management proposal for local governments and also proposing a plan for adaptation to the COVID-19 pandemic and security conditions for the team due to territorial conflicts, the proposal for territorial management and governance system has not found the political and social conditions for its adoption. Political and social conflicts are currently expressed in the form of direct violence by various private actors and police and military control. Access to and ownership of land, devoted to the extensive forestry industry and in the hands of a few landowners, is being questioned. This situation has been harnessed by other local motivations (such as timber theft) with an escalation of violence, with state intervention through militarisation of the area and the declaration of a state of exception, a legal instrument of the country, on several occasions.

In view of this situation, the project team decided to stop the process of dissemination of the Conservation Landscape and to cancel the Free Prior and Informed Consent process required by this tool. After gathering background information through bilateral consultations with territorial actors and secondary information, it has been concluded that moving forward with Territorial Planning and Management is a complex proposal which requires agreement on the land

ownership and management. When part of key actors in the discussion, such as some sectors of indigenous peoples and their rights over ancestral territories, are in permanent conflict with another actor that exercises legal ownership, the development of a formal governance body is a risky process. The escalation of violence in these project areas is such, that in June 2022 all missions to the Cordillera de Nahuelbuta that involve travelling on secondary roads not patrolled by police or military personnel have been cancelled, in order to protect consultants and partners.

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	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	MMA	CASH	\$358,070	\$72,952	\$72,952	\$358,070
		IN KIND	\$1,282,851	\$158,852	\$158,852	\$1,282,851
National Government	CONAF	IN KIND	\$1,623,447	\$4,423,600	\$ 4,423,600	\$4,423,600
National Government	SAG	CASH	\$30,000	\$ 7,359	\$ 7,359	\$30,000
		IN KIND	\$170,319	\$7,103	\$ 7,103	\$170,319
ONG	AUMEN	CASH	\$61,400	\$4,533	\$ 4,533	\$61,400
		IN KIND	\$160,000	\$2,200	\$2,200	\$160,000
ONG	KEULE	CASH	\$3,000	\$0	\$ 0	\$ 0
		IN KIND	\$25,000	\$0	\$ 0	\$ 0
ONG	Etica Los Bosques	CASH	\$24,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$24,000
		IN KIND	\$277,000	\$4,315	\$4,315	\$277,000
ONG	Aves Chile	CASH	\$1,047,636	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$1,047,636
		IN KIND	\$403,636	\$200,000	\$ 200,000	\$403,636

PRIVADO	Forestal Arauco	IN KIND	\$397,242	\$99,800	\$ 99,800	\$397,242
Empresa Privada	Pioneer	IN KIND	\$416,010	\$5,200	\$ 5,200	\$416,010
	Anpros	CASH		\$11,354	\$11,354	\$11,354
	Syngenta					
GEF Agency	FAO	CASH	\$31,000	\$31,000	\$ 31,000	\$ 31,000
		IN KIND	\$300,000	\$400,000	\$ 400,000	\$300,000
		TOTAL	\$6,610,611	\$5,433,268	\$5,433,268	9,382,764

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

Co-financing was lower than expected because the COVID-19 crisis affected the availability of resources from Project partners.

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.

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:	
High Risk (H)	There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
Substantial Risk (S)	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
Moderate Risk (M)	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
Low Risk (L)	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

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.