



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2021 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Latin America and the Caribbean				
Country (ies):	Mexico				
Project Title:	Securing the Future of Global Agriculture in the face of climate change by conserving the Genetic Diversity of the Traditional Agroecosystems of Mexico				
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/MEX/305/GFF				
GEF ID:	9380				
GEF Focal Area(s):	Biodiversity				
Project Executing Partners:	National Commission for the Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO)				
Project Duration:	60 months				
Project coordinates: (Ctrl+Click here)	GCP_MEX_305_GFF - Google Drive https://drive.google.com/file/d/1AehWqkyMEpRKXCgK74mmXFhwcEPM2R9N/view?usp=sharing				
	ID	State	Locality	LONG	LAT
	1	Mexico City	Santa Ana Tlacotenco	-98.99611	19.17389
	2	Mexico City	San Pedro Actopan	-99.04917	19.20056
	3	Mexico City	San Juan Tepenahuac	-98.993549	19.187439
	4	Mexico City	San Francisco Tlaltenco	-98.994994	19.286291
	5	Mexico City	San Miguel Xicalco	-99.163229	19.233139
	6	Mexico City	San Miguel Topilejo	-99.14167	19.20056
	7	Mexico City	San Gregorio Atlapulco	-99.053964	19.248067
	8	Mexico City	San Luis Tlaxialtemalco	-99.032631	19.261706
	9	Mexico City	Santiago Tulyehualco	-99.017336	19.252151
	10	Mexico City	San Mateo Xalpa	-99.119646	19.229786
	11	Mexico City	San Nicolás Totolapan	-99.23333333	19.3007105
	12	Chihuahua	Norogachi	-107.131944	27.273056
	13	Chihuahua	Gumisachi	-107.5116667	27.7222222
	14	Chihuahua	Sehuerachi	-107.2745806	27.1943667
	15	Chihuahua	Rejogochi	-107.4782361	27.4230528
	16	Chihuahua	Ramucheachi	-107.1574194	27.0296667
	17	Chiapas	Jutuba	-92.322222	16.821389
	18	Chiapas	El Retiro	-92.362222	16.796389
	19	Chiapas	Guadalupe	-92.348889	16.77
	20	Chiapas	Kistolja	-92.359444	16.791944
	21	Chiapas	Corazon del Valle	-93.98416666	16.4197222
	22	Chiapas	Las Palmas	-93.636944	16.056389
	23	Chiapas	El Triunfo	-93.677222	16.280278

2021 Project Implementation Report

24	Chiapas	Villahermosa	-93.504722	16.260556
25	Chiapas	California	-93.612778	16.261389
26	Chiapas	Josefa O de Dominguez	-93.647778	16.344722
27	Chiapas	San Fernando	-92.435	17.0080556
28	Chiapas	El Roblar Chishtontic	-92.50055556	17.0652778
29	Chiapas	San Carlos Corralito	-92.42333333	17.0827778
30	Chiapas	Rio Tanat'el	-92.342222	16.939722
31	Chiapas	El Triunfo	-92.385	16.968611
32	Chiapas	El Porvenir	-92.41556	17.00194
33	Chiapas	Pusilhó	-92.71083333	16.9375
34	Chiapas	Miguel Hidalgo (Zacalapa)	-93.21083	17.13194
35	Chiapas	Benito Juárez	-93.2475	17.1388889
36	Chiapas	Agustin de Iturbide	-93.251389	17.174167
37	Chiapas	Veinte Casas	-93.533611	16.990556
38	Chiapas	San Joaquín El Rosario	-93.511111	16.909722
39	Chiapas	Efraín A. Gutiérrez	-93.29694444	16.8819444
40	Chiapas	El Divisadero	-93.38388888	16.8997222
41	Chiapas	Libertad Campesina	-93.03305556	16.8788889
42	Michoacán	San Francisco Uricho	-101.715833	19.571667
43	Michoacán	San Francisco Pichátaro	-101.806944	19.570833
44	Michoacán	San Andrés Ziróndaro	-101.6322222	19.6697222
45	Michoacán	Nurio	-102.1305556	19.65
46	Michoacán	Tzurumutaro	-101.5883333	19.5466667
47	Michoacán	Arantepacua	-101.9683333	19.5955556
48	Oaxaca	Valle Nacional	-96.3	17.776389
49	Oaxaca	Santa Rosa de Lima	-97.623333	16.071111
50	Oaxaca	San Marcos Zacatepec	-97.354167	16.143333
51	Oaxaca	Santiago Yaitepec	-97.269167	16.225556
52	Oaxaca	Santiago Asunción	-98.029722	17.518056
53	Oaxaca	Pinotepa de Don Luis	-97.977	16.428
54	Oaxaca	San Andres Huaxpaltepec	-97.91585042	16.3431176
55	Oaxaca	El Mandimbo	-96.21	15.891111
56	Oaxaca	San Pedro Jicayán	-98.03929694	16.4717917
57	Oaxaca	Santa Catarina Mechoacan	-97.83789298	16.3419449
58	Oaxaca	El Zanjón	-97.595	16.088333
59	Oaxaca	San Pedro Comintancillo	-95.159722	16.490278
60	Oaxaca	San Juan Diuxi	-97.373	17.281
61	Oaxaca	San Pedro Topiltepec	-97.344	17.436
62	Oaxaca	El Almacén	-97.098333	17.583611
63	Oaxaca	Jazmín Morelos	-97.156389	17.660556
64	Oaxaca	San Antonio Nduayaco	-97.146389	17.686667
65	Oaxaca	Buenavista	-97.341	17.313
66	Oaxaca	El Carmen	-97.354	17.293
67	Oaxaca	El Progreso	-97.318	17.324
68	Oaxaca	El Socorro	-97.34	17.273
69	Oaxaca	Guadalupe Hidalgo	-97.401	17.193
70	Oaxaca	La Providencia	-97.328	17.294
71	Oaxaca	Montenegro	-97.351111	17.263333

2021 Project Implementation Report

72	Oaxaca	San Antonio	-97.331	17.313
73	Oaxaca	San Isidro	-97.304	17.288
74	Oaxaca	San José Tres Lagunas	-97.305278	17.241111
75	Oaxaca	Zaragoza	-97.316	17.261
76	Oaxaca	Santa Maria Jaltepec	-96.53959888	17.3657123
77	Oaxaca	Flores	-96.110833	17.103611
78	Oaxaca	Guadalupe Victoria	-96.034167	17.07
79	Oaxaca	Metate	-96.054444	17.123056
80	Oaxaca	Nejapa	-96.155278	17.096389
81	Oaxaca	Red	-96.033889	17.087222
82	Oaxaca	Santa Cruz	-96.043611	17.086667
83	Oaxaca	Santa Maria Tlahuitoltepec	-96.0604773	17.0988679
84	Oaxaca	Tejas	-96.015833	17.098611
85	Oaxaca	Santa María Yavesía	-96.429444	17.234167
86	Oaxaca	Totontepec Villa deMorelos	-96.027	17.257
87	Oaxaca	San Andrés Cabecera Nueva	-97.680556	16.888333
88	Oaxaca	San Cristóbal Honduras	-97.041111	16.325278
89	Oaxaca	Santa Martha Chichihualtepec	-96.773333	16.648056
90	Oaxaca	Oaxaca de Juarez	-96.72	17.067778
91	Oaxaca	San Agustín Amatengo	-96.85691596	16.5393783
92	Oaxaca	Ejido Unión Zapata	-96.415278	16.919444
93	Oaxaca	Santa Catarina Minas	-96.615	16.778
94	Oaxaca	Santa María Peñoles	-96.99478542	17.0912145
95	Oaxaca	Santo Domingo Tomaltepec	-96.623	17.061
96	Oaxaca	Reyes Mantecón	-96.727778	16.905278
97	Oaxaca	Teotitlán del valle	-96.52	17.029167
98	Oaxaca	San Lorenzo Cacaotepec	-96.8	17.128333
99	Oaxaca	San Pablo Huitzo	-96.8825	17.276389
100	Oaxaca	San Agustín Etlá	-96.764167	17.189444
101	Oaxaca	Zimatlán de Álvarez	-96.785	16.866111
102	Oaxaca	Magdalena Apasco	-96.820833	17.240833
103	Oaxaca	San Sebastián Etlá	-96.782222	17.165278
104	Oaxaca	San Pablo Villa de Mitla	-96.361667	16.920833
105	Oaxaca	San Jerónimo Tlacoahuaya	-96.583333	17.006944
106	Yucatán	Chacsinkín	-89.016111	20.1725
107	Yucatán	Xbox	-89.005	20.203889
108	Yucatán	Kambul	-88.886389	19.984722
109	Yucatán	Xoy	-88.970833	20.122778
110	Yucatán	Dzutoh	-89.0625	20.261667
111	Yucatán	Sabacché	-89.0275	20.315278
112	Yucatán	Sisbic	-89.068611	20.286944
113	Yucatán	Tahdziu	-88.943056	20.202222
114	Yucatán	Timul	-88.9375	20.310278
115	Yucatán	Yaxunah	-88.675556	20.540833
116	Yucatán	Kancabdzonot	-88.710556	20.509167
117	Yucatán	Huechen Balam	-88.680556	20.393889
118	Yucatán	Balantum	-88.43667	20.79389
119	Yucatán	Xocén	-88.163611	20.598889

	120	Yucatán	Sihó	-90.16277778	20.4861111
	121	Yucatán	Halachó	-90.08194444	20.4763889
	122	Yucatán	Santa María Acú	-90.16333333	20.5466667
	123	Yucatán	Tixcaltuyub	-88.91699996	20.4927778
	124	Yucatán	Tiholop	-88.68888889	20.3313889
	125	Yucatán	San Mateo	-90.21299222	20.5908136
	126	Yucatán	Kancabchen	-90.13814361	20.5259272
	127	Yucatán	Cepeda	-90.10961222	20.5061489

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	March 14th, 2018
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	July 15th, 2018
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	July 14th, 2023
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	N/A
Actual Implementation End Date³:	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	5,329,452
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	36,185,188
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2021 (USD m):	3.774.854
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2021⁵	27,158,806

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee Meeting:	March 2nd, 2021
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	June-August 2021
Actual Mid-term review date:	June-August, 2021

¹ As per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

³ Actual date at which project implementation ends - only for projects that have ended.

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

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

⁶ The MTR should take place about halfpoint between EOD and NTE – this is the expected date

Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022) ⁷ :	Yes
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date:	August 2023
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022):	No
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required ⁸	Yes

Ratings

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

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Vicente Arriaga Martínez/ Project Manager	varriaga@conabio.gob.mx
Lead Technical Officer	Pilar Santacoloma, FAO Agri-Food Systems Officer, ESN	Pilar.Santacoloma@fao.org
Budget Holder	Lina Pohl Alfaro, FAO Representative in Mexico	Lina.PohlAlfaro@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Valeria González-Riggio, Technical Officer, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, OCB.	Valeria.GonzalezRiggio@fao.org

⁷ Please note that the FAO GEF Coordination Unit should be contacted six months prior to the expected MTR date

⁸ Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

2. Progress Towards Achieving Project Objectives and Outcome (DO)

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

Project objective and Outcomes (as indicated at CEO Endorsement)	Description of indicator(s) ⁹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ¹¹
Objective(s): To develop policies and mechanisms that support agro-biodiversity conservation, sustainable use and resilience						
Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive knowledge about globally-important agrobiodiversity, its values, the traditional practices, the scientific and technological research and development activities, associated knowledge base and capacities that maintain the diversity in Mexico, has been generated, communicated and made available for its use.	<p>- Direct project coverage: Number of hectares of globally important landraces (traditional varieties)</p> <p>-N° of existing data bases for agroBD species converted / transformed according to a Comprehensive Agrobiodiversity Information System (SIAgroBD)</p> <p>-N° of analysis and synthesis based on the SIAgroBD and on results of research projects to guide decision making</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>	<p>350,000 ha</p> <p>12 databases currently being processed</p>	<p>700,000 ha</p> <p>12 converted databases</p>	<p>A preliminary analysis of existing data from 11 projects indicates that the estimated area of impact is 424,000 hectares</p> <p>17 databases are in the process of conversion and 31 databases converted</p>	HS

⁹ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

¹⁰ 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.

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

	-Level of awareness of the economic and cultural values of agroBD among key stakeholders, measured through an AgroBD Value Awareness Index to be developed at the beginning of the project	None Baseline to be determined during first 6 project months (e.g., 30 from 100 points)	1 TBD depending on baseline (e.g., 60 from 100 points)	3 TBD depending on baseline (e.g., 80 from 100 points)	6 Following the calculation derived from the preliminary data of surveys, the value of the subjective index of self-sufficiency is 0.71 (71/100) and the index of income is 0.36 (36/100).	
Outcome 2.1: Local capacities have been strengthened in order to support long-term plans and actions for the conservation and sustainable use of agroBD, developing strategies to revalue traditional knowledge, and support ongoing adaptation to climate change	1. Area in hectares where knowledge, practices and/or management derived from capacity-building projects for agroBD conservation are applied 2. Number of producers having received different benefits for conserving and sustainably using agroBD (market incentives, subsidies for conserving agroBD and related traditional practices)	604 hectares 2,268	1,090 hectares 2,900	2,180 hectares 4,100	1,042 hectares with baseline 5,609 producers considering the baseline	S

	<p>3. Number of globally significant species (cultivated and wild) maintained in the agroecosystems described in the specific implementation areas</p>	<p>168 species/described agroecosystems</p>	<p>168 species/described agroecosystems</p>	<p>168 species/described agroecosystems</p>	<p>251 species/described agroecosystems Based on the most recent calculations with data from the National System of Biodiversity Information (SNIB-CONABIO)</p>	
--	--	---	---	---	---	--

<p>Outcome 3.1: The protection and promotion of traditional knowledge, practices and production systems have been mainstreamed into public plans and policies, building effective partnerships with communities and disseminating values associated with agroBD and local cultures.</p>	<p>-The 2019-2024 National Development Plan incorporates agroBD in one or more objectives, strategies or lines of action</p> <p>-Number of sectoral programmes incorporating agroBD in one or more objectives, strategies or lines of action</p> <p>-Number of budget programmes whose operating rules incorporate regulations, rules, criteria or incentives aimed at the conservation and sustainable use of agroBD</p>	<p>The 2013-2018 NDP did not include agroBD in objectives and lines of action</p> <p>2019-2024 sectoral programmes have not been included AgroBD</p> <p>2 budget programmes</p>	<p>The NDP incorporates agroBD in one or more objectives, strategies, lines of action or cross-cutting strategies</p> <p>(1) Environmental, (2) Farming development, (3) Social development and (4) Special Indigenous People’s sectoral programmes incorporate agroBD</p> <p>6 budget programmes</p>	<p>The NDP incorporates agroBD in one or more objectives, strategies, lines of action or cross-cutting strategies</p> <p>(1) Environmental, (2) Farming development, (3) Social development and (4) Special Indigenous People’s sectoral programmes incorporate agroBD</p> <p>9 budget programmes</p>	<p>The NDP included in generic terms the issue of sustainable production and biodiversity (including AgroBD)</p> <p>Agrobiodiversity mainstreaming was achieved in programs of the following sectors: Environment, Forestry, Welfare, Agriculture and Health</p> <p>Producing for Welfare (Agriculture and Rural Development Ministry (SADER), Sowing Life (Welfare Ministry BIENESTAR) and Rural Supply (Social Development Supply Chain DICONSA-SADER)</p>	<p>S</p> <p>Project launch coincided with the change in the federal administration and as time progressed budgets that had been identified to align agrobiodiversity conservation and sustainable use were drastically reduced. For this reason it is difficult to still consider that mainstreaming will be possible in 9 programs as originally expected.</p>
--	---	---	---	---	--	--

<p>Outcome 4.1: The consumption of agroBD products has been enhanced through different types of promotion and marketing, linking agroBD with local and regional markets and taking a value chain approach, where applicable</p>	<p>-Strategy for agroBD product promotion and marketing campaigns designed and implemented</p> <p>-Accessibility of agroBD products to local and regional markets, measured through a compound index of 4 indicators of marketing facilities identified under project output 4.1.2 for strengthening market linkages (sum of values of 4 output indicators)</p>	<p>None</p> <p>2</p>	<p>Strategy designed</p> <p>More than 19</p>	<p>Strategy implemented</p> <p>52</p>	<p>The design phase has concluded and the strategy is in the implementation phase</p> <p>30</p> <p>Accessibility to agrobiodiversity products of family productive units (UPF) linked to the project</p>	<p>S</p>
--	---	----------------------	--	---------------------------------------	--	-----------------

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1			
Outcome 2			
Outcome 3			
Outcome 4			

3. Progress in Generating Project Outputs (Implementation Progress, IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as planned in the Annual Work Plan)

Outputs ¹²	Expected completion date ¹³	Achievements at each PIR ¹⁴		Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments Describe any variance ¹⁵ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR		
Output 1.1.1 New knowledge generated through participatory research	Q4Y5	13 national-level projects underway and 2 projects in the implementation zones on information gathering. In 5 of the 6 implementation zones, focus groups have been carried out with participating communities. More than 7 publications have been made.	In this reporting period, an additional 5 studies from a second call for proposals have been added. A total of 18 national level projects are currently underway and 2 projects in the implementation zones on information gathering. 2 publications were released during this reporting period.	70%	During 2020 and to date in 2021 the information projects in general have shown a delay of 6 months in expected progress, because of the pandemic. The situation has been similar in the case of interviews on economic valuation, although these have slowly been carried out in some localities and preliminary results exist.
Output 1.1.2 A Comprehensive Agro biodiversity Information System (SI AgroBD) has been developed through a protocol designed,	Q4Y5	Protocol adopted by diverse stakeholders and the information system in testing phase with real data.	The protocol and information system have been implemented and adopted by different stakeholders.	80%	Participating stakeholders that have approved and used the protocols include areas of the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM) such as the Institute of Geography, the Institute of Biology, the Institute of Research in Ecosystems and Sustainability;

¹² Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

¹³ As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹⁴ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁵ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

approved, and adopted by key stakeholders to facilitate their public access		At least 10 stakeholders have adopted and are using the AgroBD information system (SIAgroBD)			the Autonomous Universities of Querétaro and Guadalajara; the National Institute of Forestry, Agriculture and Livestock Research (INIFAP), the National Polytechnical Institute and two NGOs Conservation and Natural Heritage for Social Well-being, and Geoconservación, as well as CONABIO itself.
<p>Output 1.1.3</p> <p>Strategy of participatory economic valuation and communication/ dissemination of agroBD values between the different stakeholders, aimed at small producers and their families (in coordination with output 2.1.1), policymakers (see output 3.1.1) and consumers (see output 4.1.1), designed and implemented</p>	Q4Y5	<p>The protocol for participatory rural valuation has been established and applied in 5 of the 6 implementation areas</p> <p>The surveys and the methodology to calculate a rural valuation index have been established</p> <p>77 communication materials for the dissemination of Agrobiodiversity values have been produced, as accounted for in the baseline and those produced with counterpart funds.</p> <p>Communication strategy in design</p>	<p>The protocol for participatory rural valuation has been established and applied in 5 of the 6 implementation areas</p> <p>The surveys and the methodology to calculate a rural valuation index have been established</p> <p>Surveys have started in at least 3 of the implementation areas</p> <p>22 communication materials for the dissemination of Agrobiodiversity values have been produced</p> <p>The communication strategy has been developed and is under implementation</p>	70%	<p>The Project has directly financed the production of 47 communication materials. An additional 20 products have been generated through co-financing derived from the partnerships between the project, CONABIO as executing agency and other partners. The goal of 30 materials was surpassed. These are some examples:</p> <p>https://vimeo.com/showcase/8304561</p> <p>https://bioteca.biodiversidad.gob.mx/janium/Documentos/15371.pdf</p> <p>https://bioteca.biodiversidad.gob.mx/janium-bin/janium_zui.pl?jzd=/janium/Documents/ETAPA06/AP/15251/d.jzd&fn=15251</p> <p>https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?vanity=CONABIO&set=a.10158661369429120</p> <p>https://www.biodiversidad.gob.mx/nos-nutrimos-de-naturaleza</p>

					The communication strategy places emphasis on the importance of agricultural biodiversity as a source of tasty, healthy and sustainable foodstuffs of Mexican origin, produced through biodiversity-friendly practices in traditional agro-ecosystems. It is important to note that these foodstuffs would not be possible without the efforts of smallholder farmer families to maintain the evolutionary process under domestication that makes conservation possible and generates the diversity of plants that feeds us. https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/10qDMdyAgxkLXkMLs1IQZEInbDe4k3UQy
Output 2.1.1 Capacity building programs to increase local knowledge and skills for managing regional agroBD through participatory research and information sharing among farmers, developed and implemented.	Q4Y5	69 events to exchange experiences have been carried out, producing 63 materials for knowledge dissemination. This progress includes activities such as the focus groups and ethnobotanical research workshops that were reassigned. Communication materials in this case consider both baseline and co-financing scenarios.	37 events to exchange experiences have been carried out in this reporting period, reaching a cumulative total of 87 events carried out considering the baseline. 22 materials for knowledge dissemination were prepared in this reporting period for a total of 69 considering the baseline and 89 including those supported through co-financing.	100%	The indicators of this output nominally suffered a setback in comparison to the previous report. With respect to the exchange experiences, these were calculated without considering either the focus groups or the ethnobotanical research events that were reassigned under the information component. Regarding the materials, 47 were produced with project funds, 20 through co-financing and 22 from the baseline scenario. Progress in both indicators is greater than the stated final goal in the Project.

<p>Output 2.1.2 Seed conservation projects (community and family seed banks, networks of seed custodians, seed exchange initiatives, and others) for improving self-management and control of local and regional agroBD by farmers, implemented.</p>	Q4Y5	<p>There are 10 activities for seed conservation that involve 31 different localities and 219 farmers, of which 37% are women and only 2.3% are youth. This progress includes baseline assumptions.</p>	<p>In this reporting period 10 projects of seed conservation are included, involving 10 communities and 160 farmers, of which 56% are women and 31% youth. At the same time 83 activities were carried out on seed conservation that involve an additional 43 localities and the participation of 934 farmers of which 37% are women and 17.5% youth.</p>	50%	<p>With respect to the 10 seed conservation projects, 8 are community seed banks and 2 are seed exchange networks. The activities refer inter alia to workshops on selection and conservation of seeds, seed exchange events. All of the projects considered in the first PIR should be categorized as activities. These activities complement projects and provide impact in a wider number of stakeholders. This is a first step that allows for the identification of possible sites to establish a Seed Conservation Project. Progress in this reporting period is quite satisfactory and the end result is considered as attainable.</p>
<p>Output 2.1.3 Milpa and other agroforestry systems improved, diversified, more productive and better adapted to climate change</p>	Q4Y5	<p>109 projects to improve the milpa and other agroforestry systems are under implementation in 67 localities with the participation of 2,360 smallholder farmers of which 47% are women and only 8% are youth. Progress includes baseline</p>	<p>179 projects to improve the milpa traditional system and seeds were carried out in 87 localities with the participation of 1,783 farmers of which 36.5% are women and 21% are youth.</p>	70%	<p>These projects are activities prone to boost the transition to agroecology with the use of native seeds, organic practices and zero use of agrochemicals. Likewise, the report includes projects for the participatory improvement of seeds. The end result is considered as attainable.</p>
<p>Output 3.1.1 A communication and awareness strategy aimed at decision-makers on the value and importance of the conservation and sustainable use of agroBD, formulated and implemented</p>	Q1Y5	<p>Communication strategy for decision makers elaborated and under implementation, with a tool to measure the level of awareness.</p>	<p>The communication strategy is operational and is applied at every available opportunity. The preliminary results of the awareness tool with a response of 57 participants produces a result of 88/100, surpassing the goal of 85/100.</p>	75%	<p>The communication strategy has been applied to different meetings and fora with government officials, legislators and advisors to mainstream the issue with key stakeholders in the agriculture, health, environment and economy sectors. The awareness tool was applied during this reporting period to a group of 300 public servants, with only 57 responses received.</p>

<p>Output 3.1.2 Inter-institutional strategy for integrating the conservation and use of agrobiodiversity, agreed and implemented.</p>	Q4Y5	25 policy instruments identified of which 19 have been subject to negotiation and 7 have been modified. 7	3 additional instruments have been added to the list of impact, for a total of 22 corresponding to the Charter of the Agriculture Ministry and 2 Official Standards, one corresponding to tortillas and the other to nutritional health.	85%	Of the policies identified, one was the National Development Plan; 3 correspond to the sectoral programs and a special program; 8 are budgetary programs and 12 are legislative reforms. The policies and strategies that were negotiated include 5 Plans and Programs, 8 budgetary programs and 7 legislative reforms. With respect to the modified instruments, these include the NDP, 4 budgetary programs and 2 legislative reforms and 2 Official Mexican Standards.
<p>Output 4.1.1 Dissemination and education campaigns directed to consumers on the specific nutritional, health, wellbeing and other values of agroBD products (values identified in participatory economic valuation under component 1, output 1.1.3)</p>	Q3Y5	<p>2 workshops on the differentiating attributes have been carried out, one with the PCU and the other with the regional coordination offices. 4 communication materials have been produced.</p> <p>2 meetings have been celebrated to produce agreements for the purchase of organic maize in “The Cooperative Marku Anchekoren” with 2 communities in Michoacan State.</p>	<p>-6 market studies completed, one for each region</p> <p>- During implementation, the following has been addressed: The validation of biodiversity friendly practices in traditional agroecosystems (ABAT, Spanish acronym); two collective sessions with regional stakeholders and one individual support meeting in each region.</p> <p>1 communication material has been produced.</p>	50%	<p>Based on the 6 market studies carried out and the strategy of differentiation and valuation, a program of technical assistance is being carried out. This is carried out with family production units, commercial agents, technical outreach and project coordinators in Michoacán, Chiapas, Chihuahua, Yucatan, CDMX and Oaxaca.</p> <p>This activity is carried out measured with the indicators of component 4.</p> <p>The credibility scales of the strategy will be the biodiversity friendly practices (ABAT, Spanish acronym) applied in the family production units selected in each of the 6 regions of impact of the project, the evaluation phase of which has finished and whose implementation is considered in the backstopping program previously mentioned.</p>

					ABAT criteria takes into account that production should take place in traditional agroecosystems that allow surpluses of small farmer family units to be commercialized either locally, regionally or nationally, with strategies such as short value chains, customer segment pivots, collective brands among others. This is why the development of differentiated attributes, the differentiation strategy and valuation of agrobiodiversity in traditional agroecosystems will permeate the outputs of component 4 and respective indicators and will be the guiding principle of this component.
Output 4.1.2 Strengthened market linkages between small-scale farmers (family farmers and indigenous communities) and local and regional markets, to support conservation through sustainable production of food and goods based on agrobiodiversity.	Q4Y5	19 agrobiodiversity fairs have been supported in 5 of the 6 states of project implementation. 3 gastronomy fairs have been supported in 3 of the 6 states of project implementation. There are two community companies that the Project has promoted: the Tsiri Network in the State of Michoacan and Ecosta Yutu Cui on the Oaxacan Coast.	The following actions received support in this reporting period: 4 practical get-togethers between traditional women chefs were carried out in Michoacan to safeguard recipes using <i>quelites</i> or edible wild greens, and 1 traditional women chef participated in the class “Strengthen your health with the flavors of traditional Mexican cuisine” in Teotitlán del Valle, in Oaxaca.	57.7%	Output 4.1.2 has 5 indicators in which progress is noted in 3. The remaining 2 indicators are covered by the support program for the implementation of the valuation and differentiation strategy and in market studies.

			<p>8 expositions on agrobiodiversity products and native seed exchange fairs were carried out in 8 towns in Yucatan in the Yaxcabá and Halachó municipalities.</p> <p>A pilot project to supply a school in Quiroga, Michoacan with tortillas made with native corn is underway.</p>		
<p>Output 4.1.3 Innovative market incentives that promote the conservation of agroecosystems and generate a transformational change in business-as-usual rural production</p>	Q4Y5	<p>The collective Brand Milpaiz has been supported</p> <p>Technical assistance was provided for two processes of participatory guarantee systems.</p>	<p>No progress was made with the collective brand given the pandemic. For the same reason there was very little progress made with the Participatory Guarantee Systems for the <i>maguey pulquero</i> and diversified maize plot <i>milpa</i> system with native cotton species, as the communities in which activities were planned had lockdowns with restricted access during several months.</p>	25%	<p>The agreement with the NGO Promaiz Nativo to use the brand "PROMAIZ" was not signed given the pandemic, in spite of being approved by FAO. The Biodiversity Friendly certification mark was identified as a possibility to work in coordination with the Ministry of Agriculture and the National Forestry Commission</p> <p>This output has 4 indicators and work has been done on 2. Also, technical assistance was provided for two processes of creating Participatory Guarantee Systems in Oaxaca: 1) Slow food bastion <i>Maguey pulquero</i> in the Oaxacan Mixteca region and 2. "Tierra Viva " farmer cooperative using the diversified maize plot milpa system with native cotton species in the Oaxacan Coast region.</p>

4. Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on Project Implementation

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

- 18 information gathering projects at national level are under implementation; the information gathered up to now represents a direct project coverage of 424,000 ha.
- The AgroBD information system (SIAgroBD, acronym in Spanish) has been developed and is being adopted and has been implemented.
- The focus groups are functional, and the surveys have started where the COVID-19 pandemic permitted it.
- The communication strategy has been designed and is under implementation. Additionally, in this reporting period 22 communication materials have been prepared, for a total of 47 supported by project funds, plus 20 supported by co-financing funds and an additional 22 corresponding to the baseline.
- The project is operating with institutional and social approval in the 6 states and to date has reached 3,341 direct beneficiaries, of which 36.5% are women, with a partial count of the number of hectares covered which will be finalized in the next PIR.
- 10 projects for seed conservation have been established, with 8 of them for community seed Banks and 2 focused on strategies to recuperate and exchange native seeds. These in turn have detonated 95 actions between workshops, selection and conservation of seeds.
- 179 projects for milpa and seed improvement were carried out in 87 localities with the participation of 1,783 smallholder farmers of which 36.5% were women and 21% youth.
- A tool was applied to measure the level of awareness of agrobiodiversity in decision makers, with a score of 88/100 that is higher than the end-of-project goal, although a higher number of responses would be ideal.
- Strategic alliances were established with the Ministry of Agriculture through the field operators of the Production for Welfare Program and its Technical Support Strategy that reaches more than 2 million smallholder farmers of maize, beans, amaranth, cacao and traditional milpa farmers. The project is providing training and specialized information on agrobiodiversity for these personnel.
- Additionally, the Project has engaged areas of the Health Ministry to promote consumption of agrobiodiversity products, as well as regionalized diets with these products, in order to promote a healthy and culturally appropriate diet.
- 6 regional market studies were prepared, and an agrobiodiversity product differentiation strategy is in place with local entrepreneurs in the 6 regions of the project, including technical backstopping.
- 48 consultation processes for Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) were carried out in the same number of communities, with 46 positive responses and only 2 that decided not to participate in the project.

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?

The principal challenge without doubt has been coping with the COVID-19 health contingency without reaching irreversible reductions in project implementation. While all work in the field was suspended during the first three months of the pandemic (April to June 2020), video conference platforms were used to remain active and prepare for a return to the field. This time was also used to evaluate the project and carry out planning for new ways of project intervention. Fortunately, field work was able to reinstate in July 2020 with a strict security protocol in those communities in which it was possible. This allowed for approximately 60% of the expected activities and financial resources programmed for 2020 to be implemented and disbursed. Perhaps the most drastic impact of the pandemic was in output **4.1.3. Innovative market incentives**, in which the Collective Brand Project was cancelled for 2020 and 2021, with no progress made in the associated indicators. Aside from this it was a good year of operations thanks to the strategy developed to return to the field operating through local partners and project sponsors, as well as the adoption of the security protocol. In fact, two of the outputs of the Strengthening of Local Capacities component that had been delayed, achieved considerable progress in 2020, exceeding the mid-term goal. All of this confirms that the greatest asset of the project is its field personnel and the way in which local partners have been engaged. Additionally, through our work during project implementation we have come to realize that the indicator “Level of awareness of the economic and cultural values of agroBD among key stakeholders, measured through an AgroBD Value Awareness Index” part of Outcome 1.1 is difficult to change through time because it obeys to the socioeconomic context of each region. Nevertheless, we have also come to realize that this parameter has helped us learn and understand the weight agrobiodiversity has in the UPF of the areas in which the project is working.

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.

	FY2021 Development Objective rating ¹⁶	FY2021 Implementatio n Progress rating ¹⁷	Comments/reasons ¹⁸ justifying the ratings for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	<p>The result of the development of project objectives is satisfactory, as it has progressed properly and on time towards fulfilment, in the majority of outcomes and outputs there has been considerable progress which mostly coincides with the implementation schedule. The Mid-Term Review is expected to provide clarity regarding the progress made towards the objectives as views of an external observer are always useful.</p> <p>Implementation progress is also considered to be satisfactory because there has been progress in all of the Components and Outputs, even in the Valuation and market linkages component the main elements have been generated in the form of the regional market studies and a well-defined strategy to differentiate agrobiodiversity products, and work has begun in all the project regions with entrepreneurial partners that are providing backstopping to place their products in the market in a differentiated way.</p> <p>Additionally, the Project team has acquired experience and have satisfactorily engaged local partners which has boosted implementation, as have the alliances reached with government agencies in agriculture, environment and health. The alliance with the Vice-ministry for Food Self-sufficiency in the Agriculture ministry is of note for the access it has provided to the target population: hundreds of thousands of small and medium farmers. Likewise, the project has been able to take advantage of the pandemic situation to raise the level of the issue of agrobiodiversity through its communication and outreach strategy, resulting in a very advantageous year in positioning agrobiodiversity and raising awareness in key stakeholders. Proof of this is the fact that officials in the health sector have shown interest in agrobiodiversity as a possibility to recommend improvements in the diet of the general population and consumption of healthy, delicious and sustainable foodstuffs. In conclusion, there is a positive balance in spite of the pandemic and subsequent delays in project implementation.</p>

¹⁶ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁷ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁸ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

Budget Holder	S	S	<p>The mobility restrictions that have motivated the health contingency due to COVID-19 that have made it difficult to supervise the development of field activities, has been supplemented with periodic and timely reports from the technical units deployed in each of the territories, as well as the reports from the Project Coordination and the reports presented to the Steering Committee.</p> <p>With the opening for staff mobility, which is taking place gradually, in addition to the conjunctural coincidence of the Mid-Term Review on these dates, which is estimated to have the opportunity to review in the territories themselves, they will contribute new elements to redefine the program of activities in the assistance and accompaniment of the FAO Mexico office to the field activities, the results and their evaluation both in the thematic areas that are being reported and in the communities in which the project is being implemented.</p> <p>The budgetary rationality and austerity policies in the Mexican government agencies will be impacting the amounts and forms for the co-financing directed to the project, including the reclassification of personnel costs that was financed by CONABIO and will now be absorbed by the project.</p>
GEF Operational Focal Point	S	S	<p>Most of the outputs have been partially delivered according to the initial timeline and the main drawback has been the COVID-19 pandemic. On the other hand, difficulties to accomplish outcome 4.1.3. Innovative market incentives can serve as a lesson for future projects that also consider market-related measures.</p>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	S	S	<p>The accomplishment of development objectives is satisfactory as expressed by the rating of the majority of the outputs' indicators. Except by some of the indicators particularly under the Component 4, all other output indicators have a cumulative implementation status superior to the expected results at this project's mid-term. Furthermore, the holistic approach to agrobiodiversity by integrating health, sustainability and improved small-scale producers' livelihood paves the way for achieving the development objectives.</p>

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

			<p>The implementation progress is also satisfactory despite the operational challenges faced due to the administrative changes in the government and the COVID-19 restrictions. The alliance with national, regional and local institutions have proved to be an important strategy to permit continuity of the evidence-based, communication, policy-oriented, capacity development and other field activities. The main asset in this result is the academic and/or institutional experience of the partners as well as their strong links to the target communities. The outcomes of this collaboration offers also the opportunity to scale out and integrate project results into a broader institutional context. In conclusion, the balance of the project implementation is positive so far whereas it is expected the mid-term review (MTR) will provide important insights for the second-term of the project.</p>
<p>FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Most of the project outcomes and outputs are on track or have surpassed the targets set at the design phase. The Project Coordination Unit has been able to cope with the challenges posed by a new administration in Mexico and the COVID-19 pandemic. The Operational Partner (CONABIO) has a strong technical expertise and this has translated into the ability to meet the project targets and create synergies with different Mexican institutions. Once said so, the OP is encouraged to involve more the GEF implementing agency (FAO), particularly with regards to Component 4 – which falls out of the specific CONABIO’s mandate. FAO has the technical expertise to support and help the OP to speed up the achievement of outputs under Component 4. In addition, the OP is encouraged to include the upcoming MTR recommendations in a revised work plan for the next fiscal year. This is typically a useful exercise for stocktaking at project mid-term.</p>

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

This section of the PIR describes the progress made towards complying with the approved ESM plan, when appropriate. 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 add recommendations to improve the implementation of the ESM plan, when needed.

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

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

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid²⁰. If not, what is the new classification and explain.
M	Yes, the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid, although mitigation mechanisms have been applied promptly and possible risks have been kept under control

<i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i>
There have been no grievance from the beneficiaries in the life of the Project

6. Risks

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
<i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and also reflects any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. Please make sure that the table also includes the Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant.</i>

²⁰ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

	Risk	Risk rating ²¹	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ²²	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	<p>Environmental: Genetic erosion and loss of agrobiodiversity has likely already reduced the capacity to face extreme circumstances caused by climate change.</p>	L	<p>The project will contribute to protect genetic resources that may address climate change challenges in Mexico through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The generation and promotion of knowledge. • Valuation of the millenary processes (including the relationship between humans and plants) behind the diversification of these resources. • Capacity building for those who manage the resources directly and also for other decision makers that can have a positive impact on the conservation of agrobiodiversity. • Attention to local and regional markets <p>Public policies related to reinforcing the conservation and sustainable use of the resources.</p>	<p>The project has taken different actions that influence the mitigation of this risk. With respect to knowledge generation and dissemination, projects on information gathering are underway on agrobiodiversity species of interest for the project. Likewise, communication activities and outputs have allowed for dissemination of the importance of agrobiodiversity and the processes together with the traditional smallholder farmers that use them to maintain it. This dissemination has taken place both at the community level as well as at the level of society in general through focus groups, graphic material such as posters, pamphlets and books, videos, talks, speakers, radio and tv programs among others. Specific activities for capacity development and exchange of experiences have taken place in the regions and will continue to be strengthened in the future.</p>	<p>The project is designed precisely to address this risk. At the current point of implementation, we consider that we are in time to positively influence by avoiding erosion of genetic diversity as well as of loss of agrobiodiversity. In fact, the main result of this Project will be that the process of evolution through domestication of cultivated plants is maintained.</p> <p>For this reason, we consider that this risk should be eliminated from the matrix as it is multi-causal and the project is precisely designed to mitigate it, making it redundant as a risk.</p>

²¹ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High

²² If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation.

For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

2	<p>Environmental / climate: Accelerated loss of elements of agrobiodiversity due to drastic climate change.</p>	L	<p>The project will identify and promote the conservation and sustainable use of materials that have already adapted to extreme abiotic and biotic conditions, and which most certainly include genetic combinations that have contributed to their resilience. The Project also covers the setting up of projects aimed at local seed conservation (output 2.1.2)</p> <p>Project areas of intervention are distributed in geographic regions with very different characteristics, which decreases the likelihood of extreme events occurring in all chosen locations</p>	<p>Seed exchanges have been supported in different localities through seed fairs that allow the farmers to obtain new material to sow.</p> <p>The projects aimed at participatory improvement and the generation of seed banks will continue to support the conservation of local agrobiodiversity.</p>	<p>We are about to enter in a program of re-establishment of seeds of native varieties that have been lost in some of the localities in Yucatan State in coordination with our governmental partners and with associated academic institutions.</p> <p>Support has been provided to establish new local seed banks and some existing banks have been strengthened.</p>
3	<p>Social: Target communities may lack disposition to participate in the project in the terms that it is formulated</p>	L	<p>To counter resistance or skepticism, the project will continue to work hand in hand with well-respected local organizations and researchers with strong links to the target communities. They participated in the different regional workshops and their initial concerns were addressed. Throughout the implementation of the project the participative nature of the four components will keep them engaged so as to incorporate their grievances and feedback.</p>	<p>This risk had not been validated, to the contrary, the selected communities and additional ones have joined the project. Nevertheless, in Chiapas during the period of this report, 2 communities of a total of 20 decided not to participate following the process of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), based on their expectation to receive a subsidy for participating in the project. In contrast, there were another 3 communities that requested inclusion in the project. In all regions a total of 48 FPIC were carried out and only 2 resulted negatively.</p>	<p>In general, the communities have been interested in participating and this has been facilitated by reaching out through local partners and having project promoters that are from the region and when relevant, that speak the local language.</p>

4	<p>Social: Lack of younger people living in the communities and participating in the project, that can be a replacement generation and safeguard continuity</p>	M	<p>The participation of young people is fundamental to achieve a generational replacement not only of farmers, but of all those who hold the knowledge on agrobiodiversity and who live within the communities in which the project will be implemented, or in other regions. The project has included key actors of several academic institutions to assure the involvement and participation of young recent graduates that manifest interest in the project's goals. It has also established the need of youth involvement in most of its components, especially in capacity building, valuation and markets. A communication campaign will also be launched with youth leadership. All of these actions target youth in general, including the inclusion of digital tools.</p>	<p>Progress has been made in this area through support from the federal government program called Youth Building the Future (<i>Jóvenes Construyendo el Futuro</i>) that has allowed the incorporation and involvement of youth, although the challenge remains large and now these stipends will need to be made more long-term. This remains as one of the greatest challenges facing the project.</p> <p>On the other hand, through the Production for Welfare Program carried out by the Vice-ministry for Food Self-sufficiency of SADER that is a project partner, 4,800 youth agricultural extensionists have been hired and that are receiving training on various issues including agrobiodiversity and agroecology.</p>	<p>The main problem is that not many young people remain in the communities. Nevertheless, in some cases youth have been involved by helping them apply for scholarships and at times they themselves have organized collectives to participate in the project as is the case of the Guardians of the Milpa and Biodiversity in the State of Chiapas.</p> <p>Likewise, we are now starting a project to involve young agroecology students from a rural university in the indigenous municipality of Chacsinkin, Yucatan. This will allow for young students to have impact in their families and communities.</p>
5	<p>Political/social: Insecurity in some rural areas as a result of organized crime.</p>	L	<p>Agree with local partners on transit protocols in implementation zones in order to minimize risk. When the area is definitely very unsafe, work will no longer be carried out in that area and, in recompense, efforts will be increased in another project area offering greater safety.</p>	<p>In all cases, the project works with local partners that know the security measures required.</p>	<p>When project staff have travelled, this has taken place in absolute safety.</p> <p>In the case of some gathering projects, requests have been made to modify the areas of work given security issues. These have all been approved, emphasizing that the safety of project personnel is paramount.</p>

6	<p>Political/institutional: The government agencies lack disposition towards participation in the project and sharing information.</p>	L	<p>The role that will be performed by all of the participating agencies in the project has been established during full project preparation and agreed upon through the Project Document. This role has been assigned according to the legal attributes and capacities of each agency.</p>	<p>All partners have responded to the call to participate in the Project Steering Committee, in spite of the change of the federal administration and that some of the official programs have changed.</p>	<p>Nevertheless, with some of the partners it has been impossible to establish concrete actions in spite of their willingness although this absence has been compensated by the participation of other, unanticipated partners that have turned out to be important for project implementation. The search for possible alliances and agreements continues.</p>
7	<p>Institutional: Researchers lack disposition to share information and form exchange networks.</p>	L	<p>Initial contact has been established to the most important researchers on national agrobiodiversity. Through meetings, workshops and general sharing of ideas, an intention of collaboration has been asserted. CONABIO has previous experience of involving researchers in information-gathering projects (see global maize project http://www.biodiversidad.gob.mx/genes/proyectoMaices.html)</p>	<p>Researchers in different academic institutions responded to the call for proposals to carry out information gathering projects, whose databases will be hosted in the SIAgroBD, in fact many researchers will also share prior information that they have in their archives.</p> <p>An agreement was reached with the National Institute for Medical Sciences and Nutrition “Salvador Zubirán” (INCMNSZ) to link its data base on the composition of Mexican foodstuffs with the SIAgroBD.</p>	<p>There has been good response from researchers that work on this issue in diverse academic institutions. We consider this risk to have been resolved.</p>
8	<p>Social: The project entails working with local agrobiodiversity and or associated traditional knowledge that is in possession of local communities and</p>	M	<p>In accordance with FAO directives, a thorough Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) process has begun in some project communities and it will be conducted from the start-up of project implementation in all of them</p>	<p>The process for data gathering for the survey of the FPIC has begun in the 4 of 6 implementation zones where there exist local coordination units or implementation groups. It is important to highlight that the activities realized to date are backed by agreements with all</p>	<p>In all the implementation zones the activities prone to the obtention of FPIC were suspended in light of the social distancing measures imposed by the Federal Government given the COVID-19 health emergency. Nevertheless, field work was renewed once a security protocol was established.</p>

	indigenous peoples to conserve it and systematize the information and knowledge (for its use).			participants, whilst Consent is reached at the community level.	Currently, in 4 of the 6 project implementation areas there is significant progress. 48 FPIC have been processed.
9	Social-Institutional: The project entails creating alliances with other projects and stakeholders that might use genetic resources and/or associated traditional knowledge that is in possession of local communities and indigenous peoples.	M	Reach agreements with the projects on the rules of the game and communicate the scope of the project to third parties.	As a safeguard the collection projects include among relevant commitments that the responsible party must submit and secure the necessary permits required either by law or current regulations for collection, trapping or manipulation of organisms or for field work in protected areas. Likewise, when applicable the responsible party must obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent of the communities where project work is carried out. Additionally, it is specified that these projects will not support the utilization of genetic resources as described by the Nagoya Protocol. Lastly, it is specified that the conditions of the repository of the material will be subject to agreement between CNRG and CONABIO with the participation and agreement of the responsible party of each project and in accordance with applicable national law/norms.	The academic institutions with whom we interact have their own codes of ethics that they must abide by and which consist of directives of this nature.

10	<p>Social: Existing gender inequalities in terms of men's and women's participation in decision making and/or their differential access to productive resources, services and markets</p>	M	<p>To mitigate this risk, the project is designed to ensure that the various components focus on actions and processes aimed at the participation and empowerment of women.</p> <p>Since its conception the project has been based on the assumption that the role of women in aspects of agrobiodiversity is fundamental and overriding because women contribute in some way when deciding on the crops and landraces to be grown due to their experience and preferences in food preparation. Women also participate by maintaining a group of species and varieties with culinary, medicinal and other properties in more domestic cultivation settings that are under their control, such as home gardens or backyards. In other words, women play an important role in conserving agrobiodiversity. However, we realize that the role of women has changed in the new social contexts (migration, dietary changes and so on) and this project therefore aims to find out exactly how the role of women has changed and document this change with the aim of influencing their empowerment.</p>	<p>In the work developed to date, activities have been included that contemplate the role of women and that promote women's participation.</p> <p>During the project launch workshops, a part of the exercises was directed towards information and opinion gathering on the role of women and proposals for their empowerment.</p> <p>The participation of women in the different project activities is recorded in the monitoring instrument.</p>	<p>Distinct events linked to the use of agrobiodiversity such as gatherings of traditional women cooks in different regions have focused on the role of women.</p> <p>In the participatory workshops on agrobiodiversity knowledge in the communities focus groups of men and women are carried out separately to understand their perspective on the issue.</p> <p>There are other types of activities carried out in the Project such as the knowledge exchange events, gastronomic fairs, in which the participation of women is not measured, in spite of its importance and that it could reveal more about the role that women play in the aspects of food and agrobiodiversity.</p> <p>It would be important to differentiate this participation by gender.</p>
11	<p>Environmental: Some of the implementation zones are located in</p>	L	<p>Initial mitigation measure proposal.</p> <p>Since the project design phase, the presence of officials from the National</p>	<p>It has not been difficult to work in Protected Areas as CONANP - responsible for the management of the PA- has been an ally of the</p>	<p>In three of the implementation zones that are in Protected Areas (Oaxaca, Yagul National Monument; Chihuahua Barrancas</p>

	Protected Areas.		<p>Commission for Protected Areas (CONANP) in the implementing zones has been promoted. These officials have participated in the initial and validation workshops as well as 3 of the 4 regional workshops (Chihuahua, Oaxaca and Chiapas). The reason behind their participation is to present the project's objective to them and build links between them and other GEF projects.</p> <p>Overall, the mitigation actions proposed to reduce this risk involve the integration of project activities with other activities already under implementation in CONANP and its partners. This way the corresponding environmental safeguards will be met.</p>	<p>project and has actively participated in its operation providing guidance on the actions carried out in PA according to their respective management plans.</p> <p>Likewise, efforts were made to integrate other GEF projects both in execution or completed thus links were established with Sustainable Mixteca, Sustainable Tarahumara and the carbon sequestration project in Chiapas with AMBIO and Conservation International.</p>	<p>de Chihuahua Flora and Fauna Protection Area; Chiapas La Sepultura Biosphere Reserve) CONANP participates actively.</p> <p>In these three cases CONANP forms part of the Regional Operational Committees and in Oaxaca it serves as chairman; in Chiapas it is responsible for the actions carried out in the towns within the Sepultura Biosphere Reserve and provides close supervision to the actions carried out in the El Ocote Biosphere Reserve.</p>
12	<p>Health (New): The health emergency provoked by the propagation of COVID-19 can cause severe delays in the completion of project activities</p>	M	<p>Until the health emergency passes, work will continue through the local partners as they are located in the implementation regions and are aware of the stipulations and precautions that must be followed in each one of them. Extreme care will be exercised and only essential activities that cannot be postponed will be implemented.</p>	<p>The mitigation measure has been implemented and some local partners are planning to resume some activities as of July 2021.</p>	<p>From March 2020 to date, activities have been carried out as far as the pandemic stoplight phase (Mexico uses a stoplight system for restriction of activities) has allowed it.</p> <p>Whenever it was possible, some activities were carried out remotely or virtually as was the case of the training workshops for carrying out surveys that were executed from Mexico City with the implementation groups in Michoacan and Chihuahua, as well as with regional groups in Chiapas, Yucatan and Oaxaca.</p>

					Several of the collecting projects requested an extension for project activities in exchange for reducing the risk of contagion for the researchers and communities. For field work, safety protocols were established in each of the regions, in addition to delegating activities to local partners and project sponsors located in the relevant communities.
13	Institutional (new): CONABIO is in transition to become a Decentralized Public Entity which may generate institutional instability that eventually may affect the progress of the project.	M	Strengthen the participation of local partners in the operation of the project so that they can support the carrying out of actions in their localities. In the case of an eventual reduction in support from CONABIO personnel, this could help mitigate its potential impact. Likewise, the strengthening of the in-field structure of Project Coordination Unit should be a priority to withstand the changes and continue with the progress of the project.	This structure of work with local partners has been the strategy promoted by the project and is the reason for the Regional Operational Committees (COR, acronym in Spanish) or the Implementation Groups (GI, acronym in Spanish). To date they have demonstrated their functionality.	While CONABIO has had financial difficulties and problems with institutional stability, the strengthening of the staff responsible for the project, especially those in the field, has allowed for adequate operation with local partners. This has prevented the Project from suffering from delays or other problems associated with the transition of CONABIO to a semi-autonomous agency status. At the central offices, CONABIO is seeking financing from diverse ministries to maintain adequate staffing in support of the project.

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

FY2020 rating	FY2021 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
M	M	Most of the risks are considered as low (L) however, some of the more delicate risks such as those related to the FPIC, the institutional stability of the executing partner, and the health contingency are classified as medium (M), therefore the overall rating should be considered as M until the risks are resolved or mitigated.

**7. Adjustments to Project Strategy –
Only for projects that had the Mid-term review (or supervision mission)**

If the project had a MTR review or a supervision mission, please report on how the MTR recommendations were implemented as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented
Recommendation 1:	
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation 4:	

Adjustments to the project strategy.

Please note that changes to outputs, baselines, indicators or targets cannot be made without official approval from PSC and PTF members, including the FLO. These changes will follow the recommendations of the MTR or the supervision mission.

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outputs		
Project Indicators/Targets		

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

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

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
<p>Project extension</p>	<p>Original NTE: Revised NTE:</p> <p>Justification:</p>

8. Stakeholders Engagement

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

If your project had a stakeholder engagement plan, specify whether any new stakeholders have been identified/engaged:

The main stakeholders of the project are traditional farmers of Mexico as they make it possible for Mexico to still host a wide diversity of species and varieties of globally important cultivated plants. These farmers are found in most of the country and we are working particularly with those found in the localities for project implementation, and indirectly with traditional farmers that benefit from government programs or initiatives of project partners, through coordinated actions between the project and its partners.

In addition to the 13 original partners that are the secondary stakeholders of the project, more than 100 stakeholders have been incorporated since inception in all areas of implementation and they have helped to increase the impact and scope of the project by adding new areas and initiatives as well as by giving new dimensions through different approaches and converging interests with project goals. This is to say that the project has been significantly enriched through the addition of new stakeholders. Also, the participation of these new stakeholders has made up for the lack of participation of some of the original 13 partners.

If a stakeholder engagement plan was not requested for your project at CEO endorsement stage, please
 - **list all stakeholders engaged in the project**

Initially there were 13 partners that agreed to participate in the project, some as co-financing partners and members of the project Steering Committee. These are mentioned below:

The Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT). It is a federal government agency under which CONABIO is centralized and therefore has had an important role in the project. It provided financial support for projects that allowed an increase in the wealth of knowledge on native species of importance as food. It participated in the three sessions of the project's Steering Committee and we are collaborating with them in specific normative issues around agrobiodiversity conservation and sustainable use.

The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development SADER (previously SAGARPA). With this federal government agency, we have had greater proximity and there is close coordination at the level of the Vice Ministry for Food and Competitiveness that incorporated the issue of agrobiodiversity in its technical assistance program for the beneficiaries of the Production for Welfare Program that has more than 2 million beneficiaries between small and medium agricultural farmers that are the target of this program. Cooperation with this institution has been growing and we have dissemination activities for Project beneficiaries on issues such as agroecology, agrobiodiversity and the milpa system.

The National Institute for Medical Sciences and Nutrition "Salvador Zubirán (INCMNSZ). With this institute that forms part of the health sector of the federal government we have developed close collaboration with the goal of receiving their guidance with respect to the nutritional value of the food products derived from Mexican Agrobiodiversity, in fact we agreed on the sharing of their database on nutritional contents of Mexican foodstuffs, which is being incorporated into the project's Information System on Agrobiodiversity (SIAgroBD), as well as evaluating other areas of possible partnership. We carry out periodic meetings to address issues such as the Regional Baskets of Good Food and other emerging issues.

The National Institute of Social Economy (INAES). This institute is a semi-autonomous agency of the Ministry of Welfare (previously Social Development) and supported the project at the beginning by launching a call for proposals exclusively related to Agrobiodiversity in the states where the project operates, and in which several of our partners were benefitted with the help of their ventures. We have a good relationship with this agency although we now collaborate more on aspects of information exchange.

The National Institute for Forestry Agriculture and Livestock Research (INIFAP). There are different partnerships with this institute, ranging from data gathering, participation in exchange workshops, to specific guidance for field work principally in the states of Chiapas, Oaxaca and Chihuahua. INIFAP is an exceptional ally and we have agreed to continue with specific projects such as the one on community seed banks and participatory improvement of cultivars.

Ministry of Welfare (previously SEDESOL). Representatives of this ministry have participated in the two meetings of the Project Steering Committee; however, the representation has suffered changes of officials several times which has prevented the possibility of finding concrete areas of partnership, in addition to the fact that its programs have been substantially modified under the new administration. Currently the focal point is the General Director for the Sowing Life (*Sembrando Vida*) program, however we are still looking for the way to have joint coordination and actions.

National Institute for Indigenous Peoples INPI (previously CDI). Recently contact was established with the Director for Indigenous Shelters who is interested in promoting healthier and more culturally appropriate diets based on the Regional Baskets of Good Food, although we have not yet agreed on concrete activities of this possible collaboration.

State-level Ministry of Sustainable Development SDS (previously SEDUMA). This agency of the State of Yucatan participates very actively in the project and is in fact the executive agency of the project in Yucatan and has achieved synergies benefitting the project with other agencies in the state such as SEDER, INDEMAYA, SIIES and SEDECULTA. Currently the state is promoting the Milpa Maya Program in which the project is located and with which actions are leveraged; likewise, they are the promoters of the proposal for decreeing the Peninsular Milpa System as a Globally Important Agricultural Heritage System GIAHS.

Ministry of the Environment of Mexico City (SEDEMA). SEDEMA substituted the Authority for the Heritage Zone which was a co-financing partner of the project. A solid relation exists with this government office although the COVID-19 pandemic has not allowed for concrete agreements to be established. Currently the coordination activities have been renewed and planning is underway for activities that would promote agroecology amongst smallholder farmers.

Ministry of the Environment of the State of Coahuila (SEMACE). With SEMACE there had been plans to adopt a sister project for the case of the wild black walnut tree. Nevertheless, to date it has not been possible to carry out concrete activities, as SEMACE has not yet presented a proposal. Possibly they have lost interest.

Institute for the Sustainable Development of Mesoamerica (IDESMAC). IDESMAC is a civil society organization and project partner. It operates in Chiapas, specifically in the Altos or Highlands area and its participation in the project is very dynamic as it is responsible for implementation in 7 indigenous localities and its activities are part of the Annual Work Plan of the project in Chiapas. Likewise, IDESMAC forms part of the project Steering Committee.

United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). FAO is the GEF Implementing Agency for the project. CONABIO, the Executing Partner, maintains close coordination to jointly monitor administrative and technical aspects of the project.

The National Commission for Biodiversity Knowledge and Use (CONABIO). CONABIO is the executing partner that together with FAO as Implementing Agency is responsible for project implementation.

Other relevant stakeholders that are original partners but not co-financing partners that have participated actively since the preparatory phase include:

National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM). This university through its different schools and faculties has been of great support to the project, as the Center for Research in Environmental Geography is the implementing partner for the project in Michoacan; the Institute of Biology has the same responsibility in Chihuahua; the Institute of Geography is in charge of supervision of component 2 on Strengthening Local Capacities, and additionally a research specialist in Food Analysis of the Faculty of Chemistry carried out her sabbatical year in support of the project and although the annual period has concluded, the collaboration subsists very actively. Likewise, some gathering projects are carried out by this University.

The National Commission for Protected Areas (CONANP). The theoretical basis on which the project was designed originates in part in a project carried out by CONABIO and CONANP call Complementary Actions of the Conservation Program for Native Maize. Additionally, CONANP participates in various areas of implementation that coincide with the project, as in the case of Chiapas where CONANP is in charge of the project in the La Sepultura Biosphere Reserve; in Oaxaca there is coordination for the promotion and carrying out of events such as the Agrobiodiversity Fair or other actions related to the diversified maize plot or milpa in the Yagul National Monument park. CONANP is chairman of the Regional Operational Committee in Oaxaca; in Chihuahua CONANP has also participated in project workshops and activities.

The National Council of Science and Technology (CONACYT). The participation of the Council is relevant for the project given the type of research and activities that it carries out. For this reason, CONACYT was invited to participate in the most recent session of the project Steering Committee and an invitation was made to formalize its participation in the Committee, which was accepted by the General Director.

In the implementation zones there also exists important participation by public institutions, whether by local offices of federal agencies or state and municipal governments. There are also academic institutions such as universities, technology institutes and research centers. There is a relation with 48 public institutions that participate in the project in its 6 implementation zones. To save space in this document a full list of participants is available in the following link:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Pk13eG4ooeUfyT6kiFAIJY1IS9vG91BX/view?usp=sharing>
Sheet/Local level public institutions

More recent partners have joined the Project since the COVID-19 pandemic, mostly from the health sector that see agrobiodiversity as an option to promote healthy and nutritious diets. The Director General of Planning and Development of the Health Ministry, the National Center for Preventative Programs and Disease Control, and the Mexican Institute of Social Security's Welfare program have agreed on a joint work program with the project in order to move forward in the promotion of healthier diet through the use and of agrobiodiversity.

- **please indicate if the project works with Civil Society Organizations and/or NGOs**

The project has significant contact with Civil Society Organizations both at the central and in each of the 6 implementation zones. In total there are 39 CSO partner and a full list and detailed explanation is available in the following link: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Pk13eG4ooeUfyT6kiFAIJY1IS9vG91BX/view?usp=sharing> Sheet/ Civil Society or NGO

-briefly describe stakeholders’ engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.

In the list of stakeholders, the role of each of them is described as well as its contribution. As far as the results, it is not possible at this stage of the project to identify results.

- **Please also indicate if the private sector has been involved in your project and provide the nature of the private sector actors, their role in the project and the way they were involved**

Yes, there is relation with the private sector at the level of the implementation regions, in the link provided there is a list of 42 private sector actors and the way they have been involved. It is important to mention that many of these initiatives have come about from social initiatives that have converted to or are in process of becoming more entrepreneurial without losing their community and social essence.

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Pk13eG4ooeUfyT6kiFAIJY1IS9vG91BX/view?usp=sharing> Sheet/ Private Sector

9. Gender Mainstreaming

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

Was a gender analysis undertaken or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages? Please briefly indicate the gender differences here.

In the Project it is clear that the activities carried out by women are essential to the conservation of the diversity of plants used in our diet, by cultivating, collecting, preparing food and creating enterprises to sell products derived from the native cultivars of Mexico.

For this reason, during the Project launch workshops carried out in the six states where the Project is implemented, questions were asked of the participants to identify: what role women play in the conservation of agrobiodiversity; how to incentivize recognition of that role played by women so that through the valuation of their contributions, other actions are triggered that can close the gender gap between women and men.

Derived from this question, comments were emitted regarding the gender roles assigned to women that participate in agriculture. To cite an example, it was mentioned that field work is generally developed by the family, but tasks that requires greater physical effort are still carried out for the most part by men, except when the women are heads of family they have to be responsible for these tasks given the absence of the male role model whether it is because it is a case of a man that emigrated to try and improve his living conditions and that of his family, or because the man no longer forms part of the household.

Meanwhile women continue to be assigned roles of being in charge of the preparation of food that the family consumes at the same time that men continue to have the power to make decisions on what is done on their land, to cite an example with one caveat: it is the woman that usually decides what to cultivate (species and varieties) when the harvest is destined for auto-consumption or even for the preparation of products for sale.

To delve into the knowledge and documentation of these gender differences that impact in the development of any project, we disaggregated the percentage of participation of women and men in the project's Monitoring and Evaluation System in particular in component 2 related to the strengthening of local capacities and we established a goal of reaching parity in participation. Likewise, in the implementation of the focus groups for agrobiodiversity knowledge at the community level, segregated groups of men and women are formed in order to register this knowledge separately and to ensure that the presence of men does not inhibit participation by the women.

Additionally, it is important to highlight that to date it has been demonstrated that the actions to link markets and entrepreneurship of businesses linked to agrobiodiversity, are mostly carried out by women, both in processing as well as in commercialization.

Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data? How is the project tracking gender results and impacts?

Specifically, there are two indicators in Component 2. Strengthening capacities that measure the participation of women in aspects related to projects for seed conservation as well as in projects to improve the diversified maize plot or milpa and other agroforestry systems, in both cases the goal establishes equality in the participation of men and women, which means that project implementation as a whole contributes to meeting this objective.

Does the project staff have gender expertise?

Yes, the integration of the Communication Strategy is the responsibility of Luisa Daniela Esteva de la Barrera who has received training on gender issues and has worked in civil society organizations as well as government institutions that have gender perspective as a guiding issue.

Likewise, Liza Covantes Torres, Coordinator of the Mexican Agrobiodiversity Project in Mexico City whose background in Human Rights contributes to stress these issue, in particular women's rights; Elsa Torres Zapata, Regional Coordinator in Yucatan is an anthropologist with a robust background in gender and indigenous rights; Irene Sanchez Gómez, Operational Specialist in Chiapas is an agronomist and anthropologist expert on gender and indigenous rights; Mahelet Lozada Aranda is a specialist in outreach and valuation in CONABIO together with Alicia Mastretta Yanes, Professor of the National Council on Science and Technology (CONACyT) assigned to CONABIO who have demonstrated their commitment to this issue and their interest in further developing their capacities. Liber Saltijeral Giles, who works as the special field assistant to the project in Mexico City and forms part of a FAO project which prioritizes gender issues; and Tania Gómez Fuentes Galindo who is the Operational Special Assistant of the project in Mexico City has received training on gender and has delivered talks on gender in previous jobs. Similarly, in general 60% of the project personnel both those hired by the project and those that CONABIO assigns to the project is female.

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

- closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources.
- improving women's participation and decision making; and or
- generating socio-economic benefits or services for women

It is considered that this project can contribute to gender equality in different aspects, one linked to generating benefits or socio-economic services for women and the other to improve participation of women and decision-making. To start, the plan includes the organization of exchanges of experience, strengthening of their capacities, and later the generation of links to the market based on the products they create, through project components 2 and 4.

We have promoted the assistance of women smallholder farmers to the exchange of experiences workshops that have been carried out in the project implementation regions.

We have also promoted the participation of women in income-generating activities such as the elaboration of products based on edible plants that exist in the country. With this support, we contribute to their economic empowerment.

In the capacity development workshops we have given recognition to the contributions of women in conserving agricultural biodiversity, and we have invited men to reflect on the results that are achieved when tasks and responsibilities are shared both in day-to-day work as well as in decision-making, as we are convinced that closing the gender gap is a task that requires commitment from everyone.

Regarding the Communication Strategy, communication materials have been designed that emphasize that without the contribution of women, it would not be possible to maintain the edible plants used in Mexican families' homes and that their contributions should be remunerated based on the principal of equality. These publications have been disseminated through CONABIO's social media platforms in the context of International Women's Day and Rural Women's Day.

In the second half of 2021 a series of spots are planned in which women from different regions share their personal histories of agrobiodiversity conservation in order to inspire other women.

10. Knowledge Management Activities

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

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.

The knowledge management strategy permeates all project components as each of them contemplate activities of the strategy that are relevant to meeting the objective of conserving agrobiodiversity. (See document 02-02-18 CEO Endorsement Request Revised).

Specifically, the Project has a component wholly dedicated to knowledge including its generation at different levels, the development of an information system that will make information available to all relevant stakeholders, as well as a cross-cutting communication strategy to make the information available to the public, described in detail below.

At the beginning of the project, one of the very relevant planning activities carried out in CONABIO by the General Coordination of Agrobiodiversity and Biological Resources which harbors the Project Coordination Unit and most of the personnel that support project implementation, was the elaboration of the Theory of Change or ToC (see: <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1TjtPv4o8u8X33bDvaXUWSkxJQjUrlyn?usp=sharing>) of the project. The ToC defined a series of clearly interrelated initial and intermediate outcomes that feed into an outcome which is the “evolutionary process under domestication of native plants used for food in Mexico is maintained.” This activity allowed us to align the project to CONABIO’s institutional vision of Mexican Agrobiodiversity and at the same time allowed all the participants to develop a common, well-characterized bearing and clear understanding of where the project was headed. With this we ensured that knowledge was a cross-cutting priority in the entire project, from gathering, systematization, communication, capacity building, the public policies to influence and the reasons why the project attempts to impact local and regional markets.

In addition to linking with similar projects in different regions, this project has been linking and building upon prior projects carried out by different stakeholders in the implementation regions, as well as projects carried out by the Execution Partner CONABIO, thereby taking into account lessons learned for project development. One example is the development of the document “Conservation of agrobiodiversity in Mexico: Proposals and experiences from the field” which was product of many meetings with experts and regional stakeholders in the framework of cooperation between CONANP and CONABIO, which is also a guiding document for the development of the project in its different areas of implementation. Another example is the “Global Project of Native Maize” (consult at <https://www.biodiversidad.gob.mx/genes/proyectoMaices>) and its multiple results have served as a guide along the way in this GEF project in which biological, social and economic valuation variables have been considered.

The project has made efforts to produce detailed manuals for the use of information gathering tools in the implementation areas (focus groups and surveys) that together with training on their use, has the goal of producing the most standardized and systematized data as possible, and that these tools can be used by the diverse teams of project staff in the implementation regions.

- **Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.**

Owing to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Communication Strategy was restructured to place emphasis on the importance of agrobiodiversity as a source of tasty, healthy and sustainable foodstuffs with Mexican roots, produced through biodiversity friendly practices in traditional agroecosystems. These foodstuffs would not be possible without the efforts of smallholder farmer families, who are responsible for the process of plant evolution through domestication, ensuring the safeguarding and generation of diversity of the plants we eat.

The focus on health and sustainability gives us the opportunity to generate interest across different sectors, as increased focus is being placed on this aspect as a key element not only to protect human life but also to protect the soil, as among other benefits, it provides a wide diversity of cultivated or collected foodstuffs for smallholder farmer families. <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1OqDMdyAgxkLXkMLs1iQZEInbDe4k3UQy>

The communication publications produced this last year make reference to the nutritional contributions of the plants that make up Mexico's agrobiodiversity and, in some cases, specific benefits are highlighted such as: income-generation that help to reactivate local economies, and the preservation of traditional knowledge that exists regarding productive systems and the multiple environmental benefits that they produce.

The Communication Strategy is composed of two central themes and six action lines:

Central theme 1. Linkages. Action lines: 1.1 Strengthen coordination ties with local project partners to produce communication materials in light of local context and needs; 1.2 Join forces with institutions and organizations that contribute to the conservation of agricultural biodiversity or that promote healthy diets, in order to contribute to meeting common objectives in communication issues; 1.3 Stimulate the participation of opinion leaders in promoting agrobiodiversity conservation and the consumption of healthy foodstuffs; and 1.4 Strengthen alliances with mass-media.

Central theme 2. Dissemination. Action lines: 2.1 Permanently disclose project activities; and 2. Carry out communication campaigns targeting smallholder farmer families, decision-makers and consumers, to promote the valuation and consumption of the wide variety of foodstuffs produced through biodiversity friendly practices in traditional agroecosystems.

In the past year a social media campaign called "Delicious, healthy and sustainable" was carried out that consisted of 12 digital postcards that were shared through CONABIO's social media accounts. It was conceived as an "emerging action" to take advantage of the juncture which is why it was developed as part of the overall planning process of the communication strategy. It has had positive results, generating around 9,000 responses from followers of CONABIO's social media networks. <https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?vanity=CONABIO&set=a.10158661369429120>

A poster of squash diversity "Calabazas" was also published which forms part of the series of posters that CONABIO has produced to disseminate the diversity of plants that exist in Mexico. In this case it was the result of joint action between the Mexican Agrobiodiversity Project UNAM and CONABIO. https://bioteca.biodiversidad.gob.mx/janium-bin/janium_zui.pl?jzd=/janium/Documentos/ETAPA06/AP/15251/d.jzd&fn=15251

As part of the Strategy, there has been collaborative efforts with local partners to produce diverse communication materials, such as 6 videos that form part of a series on the Milpas of Mexico that were shared with the federal-level Ministry of Agricultural and Rural Development to be included in their training platform. They were also shared through CONABIO's social media networks, generating positive comments from their Facebook followers. <https://vimeo.com/showcase/8304561>

There has also been an important outreach to communication media that have disseminated issues addressed by the Project. This year in particular there was great interest in the launching of the guide "Surviving COVID-19 in Mexico: the forgotten cure" and the inauguration of community seed banks. Diverse local, national and even

international media requested interviews and/or published the bulletins issued by CONABIO. <https://bioteca.biodiversidad.gob.mx/janium/Documentos/15371.pdf>

The launching of two communication campaigns is contemplated for next year, one on agrobiodiversity values and the other on biodiversity-friendly practices in traditional agroecosystems.

- **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. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.**

A story is shared that underlines the importance of safeguarding native seeds to cope with the damage caused by hurricanes and tropical storms in the Yucatan Peninsula, as these natural hazards have destroyed the harvests of smallholder farmer families in a number of occasions, putting their food sovereignty at risk.

In 2020 smallholder farmers in the Yaxcabá and Halachó municipalities of Yucatan suffered a catastrophic loss of their crops right in the middle of the COVID-19 pandemic. Against this background the United Nations Development Program turned to the grassroots organization Guardians of Seeds to purchase the seeds they had stored. Through the support of the diverse institutions that Guardians has engaged as allies, such as the National Commission for the Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO), seeds were distributed to meet the needs of the 2020 planting cycle. CONABIO participated through this CONABIO/FAO/GEF Project. With the help of community sponsors, 272 kg of 15 varieties of native maize (including Xnuknal, Pixcristo, Nalxoy, Xmejenal, Cubana, Palomera, Naltel and Tsibacal) were distributed to 127 smallholder farmers (28 women and 99 men) that participate in the Project in the Centro (Center) and Poniente (West) regions of the milpa traditional agricultural system zone of Yucatan. This also had the goal of recuperating some traditional varieties that were no longer planted in these regions. Smallholder farmers such as Gabriel Campos Canto and María Fátima Yama Cauch from Kankabdzonot and Vicente Canul Un and Isidra Un Uc from Tiholop are just a few of the farmers that received these seeds. As part of the partnership agreements, each beneficiary signed a letter of intent upon receipt of the seeds, detailing the commitment to plant and take care of the seeds through the adoption of at least one agro-ecological technique. The commitment also includes giving back a minor portion of the seeds at the end of the agricultural cycle to expand the number of beneficiaries of these varieties. This CONABIO/FAO/GEF Project has provided follow-up to this donation by first integrating fact sheets and later by providing training on the elaboration of biofertilizers, pest control and plant disease. Upcoming activities include backstopping for the end of the productive cycle and provision of expert advice, because after the 2020 hurricane season the communities of Tiholop and Kankabdzonot highlighted the importance of having an area to safeguard their seeds, and therefore both communities wish to create seed banks to cope with new hazards. Through this type of support, this Project joins forces with other partners to contribute to the diversity of edible plants that exist in our country. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1EH8I2ZsPzNB7qwF5dzNrcjQyOiobncc/view?usp=sharing>

There is another testimony that describes how the project intervention allowed for NGOs to open their facilities for youth from rural communities in Oaxaca to train them on issues related to the conservation of agricultural diversity.

Oaxacan youth building a future based on agrobiodiversity conservation. Considering that the participation of rural youth is of utmost importance for the conservation of Mexico's agricultural biodiversity, the National Commission for Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO, acronym in Spanish) became accredited as a training institution in the Ministry of Labor and Social Security for its Youth Building the Future Program. Through this arrangement, a total of 86 youths from Oaxaca (40 males and 46 females) were supported with a stipend to strengthen their knowledge and technical aptitudes in order to build mechanisms to improve their family and community living conditions. This was supported by personnel from CONABIO/FAO/GEF Project through the design of a training program in coordination with the following five regional non-governmental organizations that acted as coaches and carried out training and technical backstopping: Ecosta Yutucui SSS, CIINDER Kukoj A.C., Geoconservación A.C., Ñadee YaaVi SSC y CONBIODES A.C.. Some of the activities developed by the youth groups

include: backstopping and follow-up in agricultural plots, evaluation of production systems, capacity development workshops, processing of raw materials, and exchange of know-how and experiences between interns. These activities were carried out in the Sierra Norte (Northern Range), Chinantla, Valles Centrales (Central Valleys), Mixteca, Sierra Sur (Southern Range) and Costa (Coastal) regions of Oaxaca. It is considered to be the center of origin of maize and has an immense cultural heritage made up in large part by indigenous cultures, which has allowed the conservation and transmission of ancestral knowledge on its regional productive systems and advantages.

Nevertheless, rural-urban migration -particularly by youth- has prompted a disruption in the generational change in agriculture, and for this reason it is imperative to support actions that promote interest in this sector for the production of delicious, healthy and sustainable foodstuffs that create benefits for both the smallholder farmer families as well as for consumers. The work carried out by these young men and women of the Youth Building the Future Program generated important lessons learned for the interns and was a notable source of support for the Mexican Agrobiodiversity Project. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XLp5J9LJzqXtYciCxlzjpc1UUZv-5vOJ/view?usp=sharing>

Please provide links to publications, leaflets, video materials, related website, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.

Because there are many communication products that the project is disseminating, the following link provides a log of these and links when available. It is a total of 47 communication materials financed totally or partially with resources from the CONABIO/FAO/GEF project, which count towards reaching the goal of the project. The following link also includes 22 communication materials prepared in the baseline scenario and 20 materials that were supported through co-financing. The log includes a list of additional materials such and press communiques, interviews, notices etc. that have been produced in the framework of the project.

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/13mtpG5zYZ5QdUHLjckLb3luejQ4ocM5L/edit#gid=1012266406>

Does the project have a communication and/or knowledge management focal point? If yes, please provide their names and email addresses

Luisa Daniela Esteva de la Barrera, Specialist, Communication Strategy of the FAO-GEF Mexico Agrobiodiversity Project: lesteva@conabio.gob.mx

11. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

The project component for Local Capacity Development is focused on working with traditional smallholder farmer communities, many of which are indigenous. In Yucatan the 20 focal communities are Mayan, in Chiapas 13 of the 24 communities are principally Tseltal and Tzotzil indigenous communities, in Michoacan while the 4 focal communities are indigenous, Spanish is spoken in all of them; in Chihuahua the work regions are mostly Rarámuri indigenous communities and in Oaxaca approximately 30 communities are mostly indigenous from various ethnic groups: Chinantecos, Zapotecos, Mixtecos, Chatinos and Mixes, and finally in Mexico City the proposed sites are all Spanish speaking with little indigenous presence.

In those sites where the native language is prevalent and it is the best way to communicate with the local inhabitants, the project has translation support through our local partners or through promoters hired by the project that are bilingual technical staff with social acceptance and broad knowledge of local customs.

The indigenous communities have been linked principally through the workshops with Focus Groups which try to identify the agrobiodiversity heritage of the community, likewise these communities have participated in exchanges of knowledge such as the Meeting of Smallholder Farmers, the Agrobiodiversity Fairs and workshops that promote better management of the diversified maize plot (milpa) through agroecology, and seed conservation projects such as seed banks or networks for seed exchange.

If applies, please describe the process and current status of on-going/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities

Part of the social commitments of the project consists of the request for Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) in all of the communities where the project has activities. Once agreement was reached with the FAO consultant on the Mitigation of Social and Environmental rRisks following the procedures detailed in FAO's Manual on *Free Prior and Informed Consent: An indigenous peoples' right and a good practice for local communities*, from July 2020 onwards and once the health safety protocol was established, in the communities in Chiapas, Oaxaca, Yucatan and Michoacan the FPIC process began.

The status of this process is different in each of the six project regions, however, there has been significant progress. In this reporting period, 47 of the 48 FPIC have been carried out. The FPIC processes are broken down as follows: Michoacán 3, Yucatán 10, Oaxaca 15 and Chiapas 20. It is important to note that in Chiapas of the 20 FPIC carried out, 18 were positive and 2 decided not to participate.

In Chihuahua it has been more difficult to define the meaning of community, as the population is very scattered and just having them meet is a significant challenge. Nevertheless, from the very beginning of the project, a formal consultation with the Raramuri Governors in their convening was applied and a positive verbal commitment was obtained by the Chihuahua implementation project leaders. Carrying out a FPIC by family unit or groups of participating families is under consideration as an option.

Finally, in Mexico City the Project Coordinator has begun to analyze the possible cases in which -given their nature- a FPIC should be negotiated, as the rural areas of Mexico City are very different from the rural zones in the rest of the country. In this region the local communities are mostly ejidatarios or small landowners and are not indigenous. For this reason, carrying out FPIC in Mexico City is not currently under consideration, unless at some point an indigenous community is engaged.

- **Do indigenous peoples have an active participation in the project activities? How?**

In project implementation zones in Chiapas, Oaxaca, Yucatan, Chihuahua and Michoacan there are large indigenous populations that are the principal beneficiaries of project actions for the conservation of seeds, such as seed banks, networks for seed exchange, agrobiodiversity fairs as well as projects aimed at improvement of the milpa and other agroforestry systems that include agroecological activities and the collective improvement of yields; likewise for the projects of valuation of agrobiodiversity and market linkages. The indigenous population is the main steward of agrobiodiversity knowledge, as they and their ancestors have generated and safeguarded this knowledge.

Likewise, as of the initial date of this report, a group of indigenous Maya women smallholder farmers from Yucatan called “Guardians of the Seeds” have taken the lead and are teaching the course on improvement of the milpa with an agroecological focus, in addition to organizing the seed fair exchanges in diverse communities of the Yucatan Peninsula.

12. Innovative Approaches

Please provide a brief description of an innovative²³ approach in the project / programme, describe the type (e.g. technological, financial, institutional, policy, business model) and explain why it stands out as an innovation.

Listed below are two innovative approaches of the project, the first on the technological focus and management of data and information, and the second on the institutional approach and impact on public policy.

SIAgroBD

SIAgroBD’s objective is to produce and systematize data in order to generate knowledge that enables the conservation of traditional agricultural practices and native crops. For this, ten research teams from different universities are collecting new data for SIAgroBD on native crops and their wild relatives. Additionally, we are integrating pre-existing datasets on nutritional information, qualitative and quantitative agronomic data, qualitative assessments of local use of agrobiodiversity, among others. The above mentioned data is highly heterogeneous and covers both the ecological and human dimensions of agroecosystems. Integrating this data to fulfill SIAgroBD’s objective represents technical and conceptual challenges, which are common to other organizations working with agrobiodiversity data, but that have not been resolved. To tackle these challenges, we are implementing a workflow that facilitates FAIRness (Findability, Accessibility, Interoperability, and Reusability) across the data lifecycle, from collection to publication. This includes the adoption of field data collection tools (Kobotoolbox), vocabulary standards, reproducible methods for data cleaning, open data training for participants, and the development of a custom data integration platform (Zendro).

Expected results

We expect that the innovations we propose and the lessons learned on integrating socio-ecological data in a policy-oriented project would be valuable for a wider audience of researchers and practitioners.

Institutional cooperation with the Technical Backstopping Strategy (SADER)

From the institutional and public policy point of view, the Project collaborates with the main governmental program aimed at supporting agricultural production in small and medium farmers, including indigenous farmers. This program is implemented by the Vice Ministry of Food Self-sufficiency in the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development and is called Production for Welfare (*Producción para el Bienestar PpB*) and is aimed at supporting agricultural production through direct subsidies for more than 2 million producers of maize, beans, amaranth, cacao and milpa systems. This Program has a Strategy of Technical Backstopping (EAT, Spanish acronym) that is

²³ Innovation is defined as *doing something new or different in a specific context that adds value*

mainly focused on the transition to agroecology. In this Strategy the Project has managed to become a technical branch. The EAT has a solid group of technical personnel in productive and issues that have received information and communication materials on the importance of agrobiodiversity in a country like Mexico. In this way the technical personnel promote agrobiodiversity and disseminate related information. Through the Project, CONABIO has provided these personnel with a large amount of information and has specifically made a “The Milpas module” that has 6 video spots that address different aspects of the milpa system. Outreach materials are also used to train thousands of youth receiving support from the “Youth Building the Future” program that are linked to smallholder farmers that are beneficiaries of the PpB program, promoting that youth learn new practices or knowledge that they can pass to the farmers with which they are linked.
<https://vimeo.com/showcase/8304561>

Results:

Through this Program this CONABIO/FAO/GEF Project has attained an impact that was unimaginable when the Project was designed, translated as follows:

- 1) Through the alliance with EAT, the Project impact in hundreds of thousand small and medium farmers that are the principal targeted population of the Project
- 2) The scope of dissemination of agrobiodiversity reaches thousands of young people linked to smallholder farmers and that provide training on a number of issues including agrobiodiversity.
- 3) These actions contribute significantly to the revaluation of agrobiodiversity by the smallholder farmers themselves, by the young extensionists and by the technical personnel operating the Producing for Welfare Program.

13. Possible impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the project

Please indicate any implication of the Covid-19 pandemic on the activities and progress of the project. Highlight the adaptative measures taken to continue with the project implementation.

- Are the outcomes/outputs still achievable within the project period.

The COVID-19 pandemic definitely caused delays in Project activities that impacts in results and outcomes in different ways. All of the activities having to do with the field or contact with people suffered delays and in some cases were canceled, meaning that other activities will need to be found to substitute them and to comply with outcomes and results. The most affected outputs were in Information and Knowledge, as nearly all 11 projects to collect information requested extensions given the impossibility of field work, and the component of Valuation and Markets and particularly the activities for the Collective Brand could not be carried out given that the Project expected to reach a collaborative agreement with the NGO PROMAIZ NATIVO that promotes the collective brand Milpaiz. Nevertheless, given the average age of the members of that organization (over 60), the expected collaborative activities were severely affected from March 2020 to date. We hope that in the near future, when the conditions of the pandemic allow it, that this effort can be renewed. Failing this, alternatives have been identified that could be implemented if necessary.

Extensions in Projects and activities

From March 2020 to date the activities have been carried out as far as possible given the pandemic stoplight restrictions. When it was possible, activities were carried out virtually/remotely, as was the case of the training workshops to carry out surveys that were given from Mexico City with implementation groups in Michoacan and Chihuahua, and with regional groups in Chiapas, Yucatan and Oaxaca.

During 2020 and 2021 to date, information collecting projects in general showed delays of about 6 months in the expected progress given the pandemic. The situation has been similar with respect to surveys, although these have been able to slowly start in some areas.

- **Will the timing of the project MTR or TE be affected/delayed?**

The Mid-Term Review is affected and has delays, but the adjustments to the project that arise from the MTR can be approved in a session of the Project Steering Committee by 31 December 2021. In this way, in the second part of the Project, it will be possible to count on the adjustments that have been found necessary in the MTR..

- **What is the impact of COVID-19 on project beneficiaries, personnel, etc.?**

Fortunately, most Project activities that have to do with beneficiaries were carried out, although with delays. The most complicated issue was the cancelation of the agrobiodiversity fairs that are fora in which our beneficiaries capitalize their participation. With respect to project personnel, although there were regions in which field work diminished, there were still office work and other activities that kept them busy. No personnel was dismissed during the pandemic.

- **Are there good practices and lessons learned to be shared?**

2 strategies were established that together allowed the project to continue operating.

Given its nature the Project component on Capacity Development requires direct contact with beneficiaries that are the smallholder farmers that cultivate and protect agrobiodiversity. The pandemic began when the smallholder farmers needed our support because it was right before planting time. The countryside did not stop in spite of the pandemic. The project suspended field work for only 3 months (April to June 2020). During this period a protocol was designed to be able to continue field work, which consisted in implementation of activities through local partners and project advocates located in the communities that did not require travel, as well as the application of health measures such as social distancing, the use of masks and personal hygiene, a reduction in the number of people participating in meetings or activities, preferred use of spaces with better air circulation and activities in open spaces. This allowed for Project activities to continue, and in spite of the delays more than 60% of planned activities were carried out and 65% of the expected budget outlays was spent.

To take advantage of the tough lesson that the pandemic left us and its relation between lethality and comorbidities, a request was made to AFSA to translate and modify to the Mexican context the guide called "Surviving COVID-19: the forgotten remedy" (<https://bioteca.biodiversidad.gob.mx/janium/Documentos/15371.pdf>) to help demonstrate the relationship that exists between a good diet based on agrobiodiverse products cultivated under agroecological practices, good health, and the capacity to cope with problems such as these. The pandemic situation seems to have provoked greater interest in the production and consumption of local produce.

Development of a strategy for the use of Platforms

With respect to communication, the circumstances of the pandemic were taken advantage of to create allusive messages on the health benefits of consuming foodstuffs product of Mexican agrobiodiversity. We used virtual platforms to get the message across on this and other issues related to diversity and the importance of the efforts of smallholder farmer families. Dissemination was carried out in diverse seminars, fora and media that have seen an increase in their audiences. Therefore, the result in communication efforts was favorable to the Project since we had a greater reach in digital media and we could reach very diverse audiences.

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 2021	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National Government	CONABIO	In kind	4,812,629	2,041,377		4,812,629
National Government	SADER (SAGARPA)	In kind	4,166,667	451,715		4,166,667
		Cash		9,204,627		
National Government	INPI (CDI)	In kind	1,111,111	0		1,111,111
		Cash	833,333	0		833,333
National Government	SEMARNAT	In kind	1,688,200	124,213		1,688,200
National Government	SEDESOL (Sembrando Vida)	Cash	1,500,000	0		1,500,000
National Government	SEDESOL (INAES)	Cash	1,500,000	1,039,637		1,500,000
National Government	Salvador Zubirán National Institute of Medical Sciences and Nutrition (INCMNSZ)	In kind	6,004,444	6,884,211		6,004,444
National Government	National Institute of Forestry, Agricultural and Livestock Research (INIFAP)	In kind	565,754	0		565,754
Local Government	SDS (SEDUMA) State Government	In kind	1,363,638	2,973,773		1,363,638
		Cash	4,636,362	1,375,228		4,636,362
Local Government	SEDEMA (AZP) CDMX Government	In Kind	427,500	464,211		427,500
		Cash	5,272,500	1,817,406		5,272,500

Local Government	SEMAC, Coahuila State	In kind	228,050	0		228,050
Civil Society Organization	Institute for the Sustainable Development of Mesoamerica (IDESMAC)	In kind	1,875,000	581,121		1,875,000
Multi-lateral Agency(ies)	FAO	In kind	200,000	140,958		200,000
Local Government	Secretaria de Medio Ambiente e Historia Natural (SEMAHN) en el estado de Chiapas	In kind	0	60,329		0
TOTAL			36,185,188	27,158,806		36,185,188

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

As mentioned in different moments, the change in federal administration resulted in many changes and adjustments in governmental programs and budgets. Most programs that had been identified as co-financing for the project either disappeared or suffered drastic reductions in budget. Under this scenario, other programs with like-minded objectives with the project were identified, and even other partners that could make up for the co-financing that would be impossible to mobilize from the originally planned sources.

Fortunately, many of the partners have been very generous in their participation and have contributed above and beyond their original commitments as is the case with INCMNSZ and SADER, while others have provided support commensurate with project progress. Likewise, the project has many local-level partners that are providing in-kind support. Currently, only one previously unidentified contribution has been registered but the possibility exists of adding up all of the small contributions of our local partners if it were necessary to meet the commitment.

Currently, the overall co-financing support from partners has been very significant at a ratio of 8 to 1 relative to the GEF grant to date. That is to say, it is higher than what was originally expected and therefore we expect that co-financing goals will be met, either through what was identified in the ProDoc or conversely by finding compensatory commitments.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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