

## Mid-term project review Executive Summary

Securing the Future of Global Agriculture in the face of  
climate change by conserving the Genetic Diversity of the  
Traditional Agroecosystems of Mexico

**GCP /MEX/305/GFF**

**Code FMAM: 9380**

**FAO Partnership and Liaison Office in Mexico  
November 2021**

## Acknowledgments

The evaluation team would like to thank all the people who contributed to the completion of this Mid-Term Review (MTR). The evaluation team was led by Doris Cordero, independent international consultant, lead evaluator and evaluation team leader; and two national consultants: Martha Marisol Torres Álvarez, specialist in governance, climate change and farmer networks; and José Rodolfo de la Garza González, specialist in agriculture, sustainable management of natural resources and public policy analysis. Eduardo Benitez served as evaluation manager of the FAO Office in Mexico. Ina Salas, of the FAO-GEF Coordination Office, provided support and advice.

The MTR was conducted with the support of FAO Mexico staff and the Project Coordination Unit (PCU), whose vision, knowledge, recommendations, and comments made this evaluation possible. Thanks are due to Lina Pohl, FAO Representative in Mexico; Genevieve Braun, GEF-FAO Coordination Unit; José Sarukhán, CONABIO National Coordinator; Vicente Arriaga, GEF Project Director; and Brenda Pequeño, GEF Focal Point; the staff of the FAO Mexico Office and the staff of the Project Coordination Unit (PCU).

The MTR had the input of many stakeholders, including government officials, non-governmental organizations, local communities, research centers and international donors, private sector representatives and project beneficiaries. Their contributions were critical to the work of the MTR team, for which we are deeply grateful.

### **MTR team**

- *Doris Cordero - International consultant and lead evaluator*
- *Martha Marisol Torres Álvarez - National consultant*
- *José Rodolfo de la Garza González - National consultant*

### **MTR manager**

- *Eduardo Benitez Paulin*

### **FAO-FMAM UC Staff**

- *Ina Salas*

## Acronyms and abbreviations

Acronym	Description
AgroBD	Agrobiodiversity
AWP	Annual Working Plan
AOP	Annual Operating Plan
DLO	Donor Liaison Officer (FAO)
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FAPU	Family Agricultural production Unit
FLO	Funding Liaison Officer
FPMIS	Field Programme Management Information System
FPIC	Free, Prior and Informed Consent
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GISAMAC	Intersecretarial Group on Health, Food, Environment and Competitiveness
Ha	Hectare (10 000 square metres; 0.01 square kilometre)
IA	Implementing Agency
IB	Institute of Biology
INPI	National Institute of Indigenous People
LTO	Lead Technical Officer
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MTR	Mid-term review
OED	FAO Independent Office of Evaluation
OP	Operational Partner
OPA	Operational Partnership Agreement
OPIM	Operational Partnership Implementation Modality
PCU	Project Coordination Unit
PIR	Project Implementation Report
PPR	Project Progress Report
PRODOC	Project document
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RFBI	Regional Food Baskets Initiative
ROC	Regional Operating Committee
SADER	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
SEBIEN	Ministry of Welfare
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference

## Executive summary

1. The project "Securing the Future of Global Agriculture in the face of climate change by conserving the Genetic Diversity of the Traditional Agroecosystems of Mexico" - GCP/MEX/305/GFF was approved by the Global Environment Facility - GEF in December 2017 for a duration of five years. The project started operations in August 2018 and has a completion date of July 2023. The GEF grant is USD 5,329,542 and the expected co-financing, from public and private institutions linked to agrobiodiversity issues, is USD 36,185,188.
2. FAO is the GEF Implementing Agency responsible for technical support and project supervision. The project implementation is carried out through the FAO Operational Partner Implementation Modality (OPIM), or indirect project implementation. This involves the transfer of FAO funds to operational partners for the implementation of the program or project components based on commonly defined and shared program/project objectives. FAO maintains overall responsibility for the project towards the donor when the government has the responsibility to ensure proper management of funds, technical quality, and the achievement of results. The Mexican government designated the National Commission for the Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO, Spanish acronym) as responsible for the implementation of activities. The FAO Office in Mexico acts on behalf of the GEF implementing agency.
3. As part of the commitments with the donor, a Mid-Term Review (MTR) was carried out two years and ten months after the start-up date.
4. The MTR is an independent assessment of progress in achieving the expected results and output targets versus expenditures incurred, potential replicable good practices, and major problems experienced during the project implementation. It focuses on project implementation progress and performance, including project management, implementation arrangements, administrative processes, procurement and field actions.
5. The objective of the MTR, as detailed in the Terms of Reference, (ToR) is to "*Evaluate project performance in terms of expenditures incurred, effectiveness (results achieved according to the project agreement and mid-term targets) and efficiency, based on targets and progress reported to the GEF, and verification of the achievement of objectives, outcomes and outputs, which provide recommendations to strengthen the next phase of project implementation*".
6. The methods used for information collection included:
  - (i) semi-structured individual interviews, online or by telephone, with members of the PCU, partners, beneficiaries, members of the regional implementation teams and Regional Operating Committees (ROC) and other key stakeholders;
  - (ii) review of project reports and documentation, as well as regulations and other public policy documents;
  - iii) meetings with PCU members;

- iv) field visits to the State of Chiapas and Mexico City and remote interviews with beneficiaries and partners in the States of Yucatan, Michoacan and Chihuahua; and
- v) participation of the evaluation team as observers in project meetings and workshops.

During consultations and information gathering, special attention was given to indigenous people, women and young beneficiaries of the project.

7. 87 key stakeholders (48 % women) belonging to the various entities and groups linked to the project were interviewed. Most of the interviews were conducted using digital tools such as Teams, Zoom and WhatsApp platforms or via telephone, depending on the connectivity of the stakeholders. Conducting individual interviews as the primary way to gather information helped to ensure that all opinions, experiences, perceptions and recommendations were heard in an equitable manner. Appendix 3 contains the list of stakeholders to be interviewed.
8. The project is integrated by four components that together seek to develop policies and mechanisms that support the conservation and sustainable use of agrobiodiversity, as well as its resilience, by promoting knowledge about traditional agroecosystems and cultural methods that maintain agrobiodiversity in Mexico.
  - Component 1. Information and knowledge management.
  - Component 2. Strengthening of local capacities for the conservation and sustainable use of agrobiodiversity in the field.
  - Component 3. Improvement of public policies.
  - Component 4. Valuation of agrobiodiversity by consumers and market linkage.

## MTR findings

9. **Finding 1.** The Mexican Agrobiodiversity project is aligned with the FAO Strategic Framework 2022-2031 that seeks to support the Agenda 2030 through the transformation towards more efficient, inclusive, resilient and sustainable agri-food systems; and with the strategic priorities of the FAO Country Program Framework in Mexico and the GEF-6 replenishment cycle. At the national level, the Environment and Natural Resources Sector Programme 2020-2024, is coherent and relevant to the project, specifically in its proposal to maintain functional ecosystems as a basis for the well-being of the population. At the regional and local level, it responds to the priorities of small farmers by providing them with training to conserve and manage the agroBD and improve production in their milpas and fields.
10. **Finding 2.** The current Mexican policy framework gives relevance to traditional agriculture, agroecology and the principle of food sufficiency for farming families, elements related to the project's approach. The Environment and Natural Resources Sector Programme 2020-2024 is coherent and relevant to the project, specifically in

its proposal to maintain functional ecosystems as a basis for the wellbeing of the population.

11. **Finding 3.** The project responds to the development needs of small farmers by transferring and strengthening capacities to conserve and manage the agroBD found in traditional, agroecological or productive reconversion agricultural systems that are part of the Family Agricultural production Unit (FAPUs). The causal logic of the project also contemplates actions that will lead to transformational processes related to the creation and strengthening of capacities linked to marketing and market access, as an alternative to improve the income of small producers, which is a pending issue on which only incipient actions have been developed.
12. **Finding 4.** The project complements and coordinates actions with the Production for Well-Being Program of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (SADER) and in some cases locally with the Sembrando Vida Program (SVP) of the Ministry for Welfare (SEBIEN, Spanish Acronym).
13. **Finding 5.** At the state level, the project has developed alliances with academia and non-governmental organizations by linking with ongoing initiatives in the six states (Chiapas, Chihuahua, Mexico City, Michoacan, Oaxaca y Yucatan). This has facilitated work at the level of local communities and indigenous people. The regional implementation teams formed in each state have different structures and partners according to each context. In Chihuahua, Chiapas, Mexico City, Oaxaca and Yucatan, the project has created ROCs as a space for consultation and articulation of beneficiary participation with other levels of intervention.
14. **Finding 6.** Component 1 has generated, communicated, and made available new knowledge related to agroBD; component 2 has strengthened local capacities for agroBD management and conservation at the household level; and component 3 has supported the integration of agroBD-related elements into public policies. Component 4 presents a significant delay in relation to outcome 4.1, which seeks to improve the marketing and consumption of agroBD products, with a focus on short value chains that are sensitive to economic, nutritional, and cultural valuation elements. The quality of the products is variable, with some of them being of very good technical quality.
15. **Finding 7.** Component 1. Information and knowledge management. The project has 18 teams of external professionals that carry out participatory research projects at the national level. The data collected by these teams, in addition to other data from CONABIO's existing databases, feed the Agrobiodiversity Information System (SiAgroBD) created by the project. The information generated, especially that related to the valuation of agroBD, was used as input to develop the Communication Strategy, in addition to feeding the production of educational and dissemination materials for the general public, and scientific publications. It is outstanding the synergy between the implementation model of this component and CONABIO's structure, which is rooted in the institutional structure and experience.

16. **Finding 8.** Component 2. Strengthening of local capacities. The project has worked to strengthen the capacities of 5,609 small farmers (including the baseline), which has contributed to the revaluation of traditional crops in terms of food security and conservation of genetic resources, and the rescue of native edible plant species and varieties. The project has had a direct impact on 1,042 hectares (including the baseline) that supports 251 cultivated and wild species of global importance.
17. **Finding 9.** Component 3. Improvement of public policies. During its first two years, the project actively participated in public policy discussion forums at federal level, such as the Intersecretarial Group on Health, Food, Environment and Competitiveness (GISAMAC) and the Center for the Study of Sustainable Rural Development and Food Sovereignty of the Chamber of Deputies. In analyzing the achievements of this component, it is important to keep in mind that the scope of the indicators of result 3.1 are beyond the control of the project, since they depend on the decisions made in political and legislative bodies.
18. **Finding 10.** Component 4. Valuation of the agroBD and market linkages. The actions of this component have been executed with the support of the company Tekio under the coordination of the PCU. Tekio developed six regional market studies, which were used as input for the formulation of the strategy for the valuation and differentiation of agroBD in traditional agroecosystems, and the regional accompaniment program for differentiation and valuation processes. The accompaniment program is being implemented and seeks to transfer capacities to at least two initiatives per state, to improve their links with the market, including addressing legal, administrative, fiscal and communication aspects. The component presents delays in relation to the planning proposed in the PRODOC and requires a strong linkage with component 2, so that producers can improve their productive capacities, which would allow them to access the benefits of linking to markets through component 4.
19. **Finding 11.** The project's contribution to maintaining the evolutionary process of native edible plants is related to promoting the generation of knowledge and valuation of the agroBD, together with the conservation of their wild relatives, which in turn allows the maintenance of their domestication mechanisms. If the project succeeds in generating knowledge and scientific information, adding value to the agroBD (agroecosystem diversity, species diversity considering wild relatives and genetic diversity within species) and contributing improvements to family agriculture as the main livelihood of small farmer families, it will be making a contribution to the maintenance of the evolutionary process of native plants for food.
20. **Finding 12.** CONABIO's credibility and technical soundness in biodiversity issues, as well as its management and convening capacity, have added value to the project. Synergies and context-specific implementation arrangements have been developed for each component and for the actions executed in the states, which has led to efficient implementation of the project at the lowest possible cost. Components 1, 2 and 3 have been implemented within the proposed timeframe; component 4 is significantly behind schedule and urgent progress is needed to strengthen the

project's results. Project management has adapted to changing conditions, especially in the context of the pandemic, to improve implementation efficiency.

21. **Finding 13.** CONABIO's installed capacity and expertise in biodiversity, knowledge management and communication, in addition to having a high-level technical team, have been key positive aspects for the proper functioning of the project under the implementation modality through an Operational Partner Agreement (OPA).
22. **Finding 14.** The generation, communication and dissemination of information on agroBD are actions that will continue to be developed by CONABIO after the end of the project. The practices aimed at conservation and management of agroBD in the FAPUs will be maintained over time as they generate an increase in production, either for self-consumption or for sale. From the institutional point of view, the existence of CONABIO ensures the monitoring of project results, especially at a national level. In terms of public policy, the integration of elements related to biodiversity, agroBD and food security in public policy instruments is evidence of the government's interest in keeping the issue on the public agenda, which is an important step towards keeping the topic on the agenda.
23. **Finding 15.** At the state level, sustainability is expected to be different in each state. Chiapas, Oaxaca and Yucatan show a higher level of progress in achieving results. In these states, the project's actions are aligned with the objectives and interests of the implementation groups, which has generated a framework of collaboration and complementarity with the project, supporting activities that the partners were already conducting, especially with the small farmer work.
24. **Finding 16.** The project design, including its objectives and components, is clear and coherent, facilitating the implementation of activities and the achievement of expected results. The objectives and results framework do not integrate a gender perspective.
25. **Finding 17.** FAO, as the GEF implementing agency, has played a key role in supporting the project formulation process undertaken by CONABIO. FAO's Funding Liaison Officer (FLO) played a key role in the formulation stage and later in the approval and initiation of the project, as well as in supporting its implementation. Despite the above, during the development of the project, monitoring has been limited to the preparation of reports and technical support was provided by the Lead Technical Officer (LTO) and the FLO, reducing the role of the FAO Mexico Office to administrative issues.
26. **Finding 18.** The project is executed with high quality standards, using the technical, scientific, operational and administrative experience of CONABIO and its partners as input. The main challenge in relation to the management and administration of the project is the complexity of its administrative management, including procedures and processes required by FAO and/or the donor.



27. **Finding 19.** The Project Steering Committee (PSC) was formed at the beginning of the project and includes representatives of the 13 institutions providing co-financing. There was no evidence that it has an advisory role in strategic decision making. In the states of Chiapas, Chihuahua, Oaxaca, Yucatan and Mexico City, ROCs operate as spaces for consultation, advice and articulation among actors and stakeholders in each state. The LTO, the FLO and FAO Mexico provide support in the revision of the Annual Working Plan (AWP) or Operating Plan (AOP), PPRs and PIRs.
28. **Finding 20.** The project has executed 45 % of the total budget allocated by the donor. Components 3 and 4 have the lowest execution levels with 41 % and 36 % respectively. Approximately 75 % of the programmed co financing has been received at project closing.
29. **Finding 21.** The formulation of the project was led by CONABIO and FAO, with the participation of SEMARNAT, SADER, SEBIEN and INPI, the state governments of Yucatan and Mexico City, UNAM and civil society actors. The implementation of the project involves the participation of about 97 key actors and stakeholders (of which 4 first level, 25 second level, and 68 third level) with particular roles and functions in the implementation of activities, mainly at the state level. The participation of multiple actors and the linkage of the project to ongoing actions is one of its main strengths, which implies challenges such as inter-institutional coordination and the harmonization of concepts and approaches for the implementation of activities in the field.
30. **Finding 22.** The Communication Strategy developed by the project has as its main axis the message that the food provided by the agroBD would not be possible without the role of the farming families that conserve the diversity of edible plants that feed us, as well as the benefits that agroBD provides to people and the environment.
31. **Finding 23.** The design and operation of the Project's M&E system is efficient and contributes to the implementation of the activities planned in the project results framework and in the AWP, in addition to supporting timely decision making.
32. **Finding 24.** The gender perspective was not integrated in the project design, nor in the planning and execution of activities. Neither has a gender study or analysis been done to identify gender-related roles in the various agroBD management and conservation activities carried out inside and outside the FAPUs. In general terms, the project does not disrupt local agreements regarding the division of labour and gender roles, especially in relation to the activities of components 2 and 4, emphasizing the participation of women in various capacity building activities.
33. **Finding 25.** In general terms, the project respects the cosmovision of the indigenous people, including authority arrangements, uses and customs, rituals, roles and language (support from translators and bilingual promoters). Between 2020 and 2021, 48 Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) exercises were developed, embodied in 33 minutes signed by the parties, to facilitate the participation of

stakeholders belonging to indigenous peoples in project activities. In the case of Mexico City, where the producers are indigenous peoples, according to national regulations FPIC is not required (although it is required for the GEF and FAO) and in the case of Chihuahua, FPIC was not signed but derived from a verbal agreement for the execution of project activities. There was no evidence of a FPIC monitoring process by project staff.

34. **Finding 26.** During the project design process, a series of environmental, social, political and institutional risks related to the execution of the project were identified, most of which were qualified as having a low and moderately low probability of occurrence. In 2019 the Environmental and Social Risk Mitigation Plan was updated, adding new risks to those initially identified. Both PIRs detail the progress in the project's risk management.

## **Conclusions**

35. **Conclusion 1. Relevance.** The project responds to the development needs of Mexico's small farmers and the country's development strategy. It is also relevant to the strategic and operational priorities of the GEF and FAO. It is also in line with the current Mexican policy framework that gives importance to traditional agriculture, agroecology and the principle of food self-sufficiency for farming families.
36. **Conclusion 2. Relevance.** The linkage of the Project with pre-established actions in the six states where it is implemented has allowed it to benefit, more or less, from synergies and complementarities with second level organizations, academia, non-governmental organizations and civil society, facilitating execution, especially at the state level, and the relationship with local communities and indigenous beneficiary people.
37. **Conclusion 3. Effectiveness.** The project has achieved the results indicators of components 1, 2 and 3, generating, communicating and making available new knowledge on agroBD; strengthening local capacities for the management and conservation of agroBD in the FAPUs; and supporting the integration of elements related to agroBD in public policies and in the current legislative framework. The quality of the products is variable, highlighting some with very good technical quality.
38. **Conclusion 4. Effectiveness.** Component 4 is significantly behind schedule in terms of the scope of the outputs and the proposed outcome. The design of the activities and outputs of this component was based on a series of assumptions that were detached from reality, mainly related to the capacity of small farmers to generate surpluses for sale, which has led to a significant delay in the implementation of this component. In addition, the health crisis associated with COVID-19 has caused delays in the activities programmed for this component.
39. **Conclusion 5. Effectiveness.** The project has managed to reconcile the conservation of agroBD with the production needs of small farmers for self-consumption and

production for sale, depending on the particular interests of the participating actors, differentiating between FAPUs exclusively for self-consumption, marketing of surpluses and others where production is for marketing purposes.

40. **Conclusion 6. Efficiency.** Project execution at the state level is based on a series of implementation arrangements specific to the social, cultural, environmental and economic context of each state, involving multiple actors and stakeholders that facilitate the implementation of project actions and contribute to improving efficiency and reducing costs, as well as avoiding duplication with other initiatives.
41. **Conclusion 7. Efficiency.** The installed capacities and recognition of CONABIO as a leader in biodiversity issues, together with its knowledge management and communication skills, and its convocation capacity, have added value to the project, facilitating its execution under the implementation modality through an OPA. However, the project is embedded in CONABIO's institutional structure, which makes it difficult to separate the effects and actions carried out and which must be clear in order to comply with the "incrementality" required for GEF funds.
42. **Conclusion 8. Sustainability.** The generation, communication and dissemination of information on agroBD are actions that will continue to be carried out by CONABIO, at the end of the project, as part of its institutional mission. The practices aimed at preserving and managing agroBD in the FAPUs will be maintained by small farmers to the extent that they generate food, economic or cultural benefits.
43. **Conclusion 9. Sustainability.** In the states of Chiapas, Oaxaca and Yucatan, that show a higher level of progress in the achievement of results, the project's actions are aligned with the objectives and interests of the implementation groups. These groups maintain collaboration and complementarity networks within the project, which support activities that the partners were already performing and that it is presumed they will continue to conduct once the project is completed. In Chihuahua and Michoacan, where the project is executed through subcontracting, the level of progress and ownership of project actions by local stakeholders was much lower than in the other states.
44. **Conclusion 10. Factors affecting progress.** The project design, including its objectives and components, were clear and coherent. However, the indicators for Outcome 2.1 do not fully reflect the intended scope. The objectives and results framework do not explicitly integrate a gender perspective.
45. **Conclusion 11. Factors affecting progress.** FAO, being the GEF implementing agency, played a key role in accompanying the project formulation process (CONABIO's responsibility), approval and initiation. During implementation, FAO Mexico provides guidance and support on operational, administrative and financial issues. The LTO provides technical support to the project. The Funding Liaison Officer (FLO) provides monitoring and guidance on budget issues, accompanying the review processes of the AWP, PPR and PIR.

46. **Conclusion 12. Factors affecting progress.** Project management and administration has been efficient and effective, fulfilling the responsibilities delegated through the OPA. The PSC was formed at the start of the project and includes representatives of the 13 institutions that committed to provide co-financing under the PRODOC, but there is no evidence that it has an advisory role in strategic project decision-making.
47. **Conclusion 13. Factors affecting progress.** The participation of multiple actors and the linkage of the project to ongoing actions is one of its main strengths, which entails challenges such as inter-institutional coordination, and the homogenization of concepts and approaches. The ROCs created by the project in the states of Chiapas, Chihuahua, Oaxaca, Yucatan and Mexico City are beginning to consolidate as a space for consultation, advice and articulation among actors and stakeholders in each state; however, they need to strengthen the representation of the project's final beneficiaries.
48. **Conclusion 14. Factors affecting progress.** The implementation of the project's Communication Strategy has made it possible to communicate the main experiences, lessons learned and results of the project to its partners, stakeholders and the general public, emphasizing, among other messages, that the food provided by agroBD would not be possible without the role of family farmers who conserve the diversity of edible plants.
49. **Conclusion 15. Cross-cutting dimensions.** The different tools developed to follow up on actions to mitigate environmental, social, political and institutional risks related to project implementation present inconsistencies among themselves, such as the absence of a gender perspective in project activities, despite the fact that this is proposed in the risk mitigation plan.
50. **Conclusion 16. Cross-cutting dimensions.** The project respects the cosmovision of indigenous people, including authority arrangements, uses and customs, rituals, roles and language, and therefore developed 48 FPICs exercises to facilitate the participation of stakeholders belonging to indigenous people as project beneficiaries, as well as a complaints mechanism. However, given the high level of involvement of local communities, it is important to consider a process of accompanying FPIC exercises that includes monitoring, analysis and review of the commitments made by FAO Mexico with the support of project staff.

## **MTR Recommendations**

### ***51. For FAO in its role as GEF implementing agency:***

**Recommendation 1.** To have a technical specialist, as part of the FAO Mexico team supporting the project, to provide advice and technical support to the PCU, paying special attention to issues that fall under Component 4, Valuation of agroBD and market linkages, where there is a comparative advantage for agrobiodiversity projects and involvement of small producers, under the supervision of both FAO Mexico and the LTO.

**Recommendation 2.** To accept the proposed change in indicators developed by the PCU and discussed in the meetings held within the MTR, given that the proposed changes help to clarify the results framework and better delimit the scope of the proposed outputs and outcomes.

**Recommendation 3.** To review the implementation of the Social and Environmental Risk Mitigation Plan, including how gender and FPIC issues have been integrated into project activities, in order to generate and implement concrete recommendations for compliance with this instrument in partnership with the PCU and to comply with donor requirements and be in line with FAO principles.

**Recommendation 4.** To activate the FAO Project Task Force to provide specialized advice to the project, especially on market issues that fall under component 4, the suggested changes to components 2 and 3, and the integration of the resilient food systems approach into the project.

**Recommendation 5.** To support the PCU in the review of the work plans of components 2, 3 and 4 in accordance with the findings and conclusions of the MTR in order to propose changes that take into account the design and commitments in the PRODOC in the implementation of actions in the field (see Recommendation 7).

**Recommendation 6.** To analyse, together with the PCU the component 4 objective and its results framework, as well as the progress (delays) in its implementation, in order to define whether it is necessary to integrate changes that reflect the existing positions on the issue of market access and its importance in contributing to generate monetary income to FAPUs, as established in the results framework of the PRODOC and the validated Theory of Change (ToC).

## ***52. For CONABIO in its role as executing agency of the GEF:***

**Recommendation 7.** To review jointly with FAO the work plans for components 2, 3 and 4 in order to propose changes that take up the design and commitments in the PRODOC in the implementation of actions in the field, mainly for components 2, 3 and 4. For component 2, it is recommended that greater emphasis be given to increasing production in those FAPUs, as well as making visible the role of the project in the adaptation of small farmers to climate change. In the case of component 3, it is suggested that a more active role be taken in public policy discussion and advocacy forums at the national and state levels to influence public policies with the lessons learned from the project; and for component 4, it is recommended that the scope of ongoing actions be reviewed, understood as the number of small farmers who are benefiting from the actions of this component focused on creating and strengthening capacities for access to markets.

**Recommendation 8.** Under component 2, it is recommended to work specifically with the group of small-scale agricultural producers interested in maintaining traditional,

agroecological or productive reconversion production that require the technification (materials and agricultural machinery) of such practices, i.e., the strengthening of productive capacities that will enable them to reduce their labour force and achieve volumes that will allow them to access markets.

To the extent that the project supports: (a) the increase in production of producers interested in accessing markets; (b) the strengthening of capacities considering knowledge, use and valuation of agroBD, and (c) that the process of evolution under domestication is maintained, there will be greater possibilities of success in the implementation of component 4.

**Recommendation 9.** To continue supporting the formulation (in progress) of the National Healthy, Fair, Sustainable and Affordable Food Strategy, in order to promote good nutrition through the Regional Baskets of Good Food initiative, piloted by the project in 4 municipalities of Veracruz, to be later implemented in some of the states where the project was developed.

**Recommendation 10.** To improve the articulation of direct beneficiaries (small agricultural producers, traditional farmers, family units, local communities and indigenous peoples) with project technicians and organizations that have a role in the execution of activities, especially in the states of Chihuahua, Michoacan and Mexico City. It is recommended that the ROCs include or increase the representation of direct project beneficiaries within their structure, as well as clear and transparent mechanisms for accountability and decision-making.

**Recommendation 11.** To develop and implement a project closure strategy, in partnership with FAO, that involves the transfer of responsibilities to state actors who will remain in the territory at the end of the project, together with capacity building of local actors on governance issues, strengthening of collectives and self-management capacities for decision-making.

**Recommendation 12.** Propose and implement specific actions to promote the interest and participation of young people from local communities and indigenous beneficiary people in project activities, especially those related to components 2 and 4, so that they visualize the management and conservation of agroBD as an alternative livelihood.