

Project Evaluation Series

**Mid-term evaluation of the project
“Sustainable management of
agrobiodiversity and vulnerable ecosystems
recuperation in Peruvian Andean Regions
through the approach of Globally Important
Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS)”**

**Project code: GCP/PER/045/GFF
GEF ID: 9092**

Executive summary

Contents

Acknowledgements	iv
Executive summary.....	1
Main findings	2
Conclusions	6
Recommendations	9
Mid-term evaluation summary of ratings	13

Acknowledgements

The Office of Evaluation (OED) would like to thank all the people involved in completing this mid-term evaluation. The evaluation team was led by Doris Cordero, independent international consultant, main evaluator and team leader; Liza Meza, specialist in sustainable economic activities and rural development; and Wilser Hilario Benites, specialist in socio-environmental and territorial management, as national evaluators. The exercise was led by Ina Salas, Evaluation Manager of the FAO Office of Evaluation.

The evaluation process was possible thanks to the huge support provided by the GIAHS team, led by César Sotomayor, its Technical Coordinator; and FAO, whose vision, knowledge, advice and comments made this evaluation possible. Special thanks to Mariana Escobar Arango, FAO Representative in Peru, and the FAO staff in Peru; Anton Willems, Profonampe Executive Director; José Álvarez, Director-General of the Directorate Office of Biological Diversity of the Ministry of Environment as Director of the project; and Jessica Amanzo, Director of the Directorate Office of Genetic Resources and Biosafety of the Ministry of Environment as Director in charge of the project; and the personnel of the FAO Regional Office and OED, who supported the development of this evaluation. The collaboration and valuable contributions of Geneviève Braun from the GEF-FAO Coordination Unit are also appreciated.

The evaluation received inputs from many stakeholders, including government officials, groups of agricultural producers and non-associated producers, academia, state banks, and the private sector. Their contributions were critical for the work of the evaluation team, who deeply appreciate their collaboration.

Executive summary

1. The project “Sustainable Management of Agrobiodiversity and Vulnerable Ecosystems Recuperation in Peruvian Andean Regions through the Approach of Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS)”, GCP/PER/045/GFF (GEF ID 9092), known as GIAHS project, was approved on 2 January 2018 by the Secretariat of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) for a four-year period, and was declared operational on 27 September 2018. The mid-term evaluation (MTE) was implemented as part of the commitments made to the donor, between December 2020 and March 2021.
2. The project is executed under the Operational Partners Implementation Modality (OPIM) involving the national execution of projects with the transfer of funds from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) to operational partners for execution based on commonly defined and shared objectives. FAO, as the implementing agency, holds overall responsibility before the donor and the Government of Peru. At the request of the Government, the project is executed by Profonampe as the Project’s Operational Partner. The Ministry of Environment (MINAM) is the GEF Operational Focal Point and acts as the project headquarters in Lima.
3. The project general objective is **the *in situ* conservation and sustainable use of globally important agrobiodiversity through the preservation of traditional agricultural systems, the integrated management of forests, water and land resources, and the maintenance of ecosystem services.**
4. The overall benefits of the project according to the GEF CEO endorsement include:
 - i. Biodiversity: i) The genetic diversity of 40 globally important agrobiodiversity species and varieties will be improved in 15 970 ha of farming systems; ii) 642 136 ha of landscapes in five target locations will be subjected to planning, management and restoration to promote active *in situ* conservation of globally important agrobiodiversity in production systems and optimize the flows of ecosystem services on which the status of agrobiodiversity conservation depends.
 - ii. Land degradation: 7 760 families in 58 communities, including at least 35 percent of female-headed households and 12 percent of households headed by farmers under 30, apply integrated management practices that support the conservation of agrobiodiversity.
 - iii. Sustainable forest management: 83 000 ha of forest ecosystems (including on-farm plot / off-farm trees and high watersheds) will be subject to restoration.

Main findings

Relevance: moderately unsatisfactory

5. The project covers a relevant topic for the country, which is also aligned with the GEF and FAO strategies and objectives at global level, and the FAO Country Programming Framework (CPF) in Peru. The project is also linked to two strategic axes of the National Development Strategic Plan known as the Bicentennial Plan. However, the modifications made in the results framework, the incorporation of a new target group (primary and secondary school students), and an incipient work to improve the livelihoods of recipient families during its implementation, hindered the appropriate adoption of the Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems approach for rural development. GEF objectives on land degradation and sustainable forest management, as set in the design phase, show very little progress three years after the project approval.
6. The project meets the needs and priorities of beneficiary communities at the regional and local level, contributing to the development of districts and regions. The issues of food security, maintenance of traditional livelihoods and landscape restoration have become more important for the project's beneficiaries (indigenous peoples) due to the crisis caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. Community life plans have been considered a tool to promote *in situ* conservation and sustainable management of agrobiodiversity. The project, however, has mainly focused on agrobiodiversity management issues, disregarding other pillars of the GIAHS approach that could have a greater impact on the dynamic conservation and quality of life of local communities, such as the rescue of knowledge, ancient farming traditions and practices; income generation; sustainable production; and the reduction of climate change vulnerability of recipient communities.

Effectiveness: unsatisfactory

7. The project is contributing to *in situ* conservation and sustainable management of agrobiodiversity by developing local capacities. However, the greater attention paid to a new target group (students) has impacted the capacity building processes focused on local producers, project main target group. In relation to landscape management and restoration to ensure the flow of ecosystem services, minimal progress has been made towards achieving the goal (0.11 percent), compared to the proposed mid-term goal of 30 000 hectares (Component 1).
8. With regard to markets, the project is partially contributing to improving the marketing of agrobiodiversity products to support their sustainable use and rural livelihoods. The AGROBIO initiative, which receives feedback from the *Apachicuy* learnings, offers an alternative to rural beneficiary families from Apurimac and Puno to trade their products, but it is not sustainable in its current form (Component 2).
9. In relation to the enabling environment, various isolated actions have been developed that lack a common thread towards building the desired enabling environment. Some main actions include the creation of the Acora Municipal Environmental Commission and the design and approval of its management tools; the development of the Concerted Local Development Plan (PDLC) of the District of Lares; and the development of a communication strategy (Component 3).
10. The project responds to a demand-driven management, rather than to a results-based management. This is evidenced by the changes made to the results framework, the constant changes and rescheduling of activities, the lack of a monitoring and evaluation system to support decision-making processes, and the attention paid to students, neglecting the project's target

group. Likewise, there is a lack of monitoring of global indicators and how the different project actions contribute to their achievement (Component 4).

11. There is a significant delay to achieve outcomes within set deadlines. Only 1 out of the 38 mid-term goals of the results framework has been achieved, and the available information does not allow measuring the progress towards the other goals. The attainment of outcomes has also been limited by the lack of strategic planning – reflected in the constant rescheduling of plans, activities and changes in the results framework – changes in the 2020 budget, including financial operations among components, and the lack of coherence, synergy and complementarity among project's activities and components, together with the little progress made in other elements of the GIAHS approach. The general progress of the implementation, as well as the progress towards achieving the project development objective and the overall project objectives, are incipient regarding the implementation period and the expenditure made.

Efficiency: unsatisfactory

12. The project has not made a cost-efficient use of resources, and very little progress has been made towards achieving outcomes, both at the level of activities and at the level of budget execution, affecting the achievement and sustainability of expected outcomes. The level of budget execution is at 19.4 percent of the total amount approved for the project. In 2019, 47 percent of the budget planned for that year was executed, and in 2020, 34 percent of the funds approved for each year.
13. Coordination mechanisms established in the Project Document (PRODOC) and the Operational Partners Agreement for the project operation, outlined in the 2019 Strategic Plan, are not working properly, affecting coordination between the implementing agency and the implementing partner.
14. The Operational Partners Agreement established between FAO and Profonanpe establishes that the latter has direct responsibility for the project execution through the development of planned activities. However, during the project development process, its role has been reduced to financial management and the submission of reports to FAO as operational partner.
15. During 2019 and 2020, FAO Peru underwent constant changes in its technical and administrative staff, including its Representation, which limited the project supervision and follow-up, both in technical and administrative matters. Changes were also made at the level of the Lead Technical Officer assigned to the project, and the Project Task Force (PTF) was not active.

Factors affecting progress: unsatisfactory

16. At the design level, the targets established in the results framework were ambitious and complex, considering the national context. The Operational Partners Implementation Modality is not being used as established in the Operational Partners Agreement. Profonanpe plays the role of project financial manager, but it is legally responsible for the project implementation before the donor.
17. Profonanpe, as executing agency, has not fulfilled its technical role (as noted in the section on efficiency), which includes monitoring the co-financing. According to the external verification made for Profonanpe in 2020, management costs for 2019 and 2020 corresponded to the amounts approved in the Annual Operational Plan and not to the activities and amounts executed, accounting for 11.2 percent and not 5 percent as agreed in the PRODOC.
18. The implementing agency has played a limited role in supervision, guidance, and technical, administrative and operational support (assigned by FAO Peru, the Regional Office for Latin

America and the Caribbean (RLC), and other FAO units), with delays in approvals, responses, or follow-up, which have sometimes delayed project implementation.

19. In the first quarter of 2019, salaries of the Project Management Unit team were increased and the budget, approved by components, was modified with significant cuts in some items, which could have a direct impact on the indicators expected at the level of outputs and outcomes.
20. Knowledge management. The project lacks a sound knowledge management strategy to facilitate the systematization and dissemination of experiences, good practices and lessons learned. Communication actions promote isolated activities, but they are not aimed at raising awareness on the importance of the different areas of the GIAHS approach to value the project outcomes and disseminate key messages and good practices for the peasant communities that are main recipients of the project.
21. Associations and commitments of stakeholders. there is room in the project to expand the network of partners and allies, mainly with the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MIDAGRI) and the National Institute of Agricultural Innovation (INIA) that address project-related issues, such as market development for family farming, income generation for small-scale producers, and the creation and management of agrobiodiversity areas, among others. Some civil society and academia stakeholders that were considered in the PRODOC have not been incorporated.

Sustainability: moderately unlikely

22. The project lacks a sustainability strategy. Activities of knowledge management on agrobiodiversity in educational institutions, seed recovery, and the incorporation of agrobiodiversity in life plans (in process) are aimed at generating sustainable outcomes, but they are not complemented by a capacity building component and permanent follow-up for local stakeholders to take ownership of them, nor are they interconnected or integrated into a sustainability strategy.
23. AGROBIO is being consolidated as a market alternative for producers from Apurímac and Puno, allowing them to sell their products in Lima and Cusco, and potentially contributing to the sustainability of the project's actions. This initiative is, however, not sustainable in its current form due to the lack of actions to ensure the transfer of capacities to producers and their inclusion in commercial chains on a continuous basis as an incentive for conservation, without depending on intermediaries. At the moment, the packaging and commercial presentation of products does not take advantage of the characteristics of territories or biodiversity. Also, the commercial brand has been temporarily granted to a consultant and the payment for sales is made to project consultants.

Cross-cutting factors:

- i. **Gender and other equality dimensions: unsatisfactory**
 - ii. **Human rights issues: satisfactory**
 - iii. **Environmental and social safeguards: moderately satisfactory**
24. Even though the project works with men and women, a formal gender strategy has not been developed to ensure outcomes related to income generation, access to resources, and decision-making towards equity, a mandatory condition for this intervention. The available means of verification do not allow assessing whether men and women are impacted differently by the project.

25. There is an incipient effort to promote socially and environmentally responsible actions within the framework of binding social and environmental safeguards. The free, prior and informed consent carried out at the beginning of the project implementation phase with 19 peasant communities of ancestral origin (indigenous peoples) out of a total of 75 beneficiaries,¹ has allowed the execution of joint activities in 19 communities, ensuring the commitment of local stakeholders and an enabling environment for the project development. Communities that were consulted live in remote areas of the Peruvian Andes, which shows the importance of the process carried out.
26. The project has developed an intercultural approach, aligned with the GIAHS criteria. This can be evidenced in the participation of ancestral communities, such as Quechua and Aymara, as protagonists of the project, and in the implementation of activities in their native language, incorporating local experts (*yachachis* and *yachitires*) whose role is fundamental in the symbiosis process between the communities and the project.

¹ As reported in the baseline study, carried out in 2000, the project works with a total of 75 beneficiary communities.

Conclusions

Conclusion 1. Relevance. The project addresses a relevant issue for the country, which is also aligned with the GEF-FAO global strategies and objectives, the FAO Country Programming Framework in Peru, and the National Development Strategic Plan. The approach was, however, changed during implementation (in relation to its original version contained in the PRODOC and in Annex 2 of the Operational Partners Agreement), which is reflected in the constant modifications made in the results framework that do not consider the improvement of livelihoods and income generation for beneficiary families, core elements of the GIAHS approach, nor the GEF objectives as set in the design phase. Likewise, there is plenty of room for improvement in terms of synergies and complementarities with institutions as the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation and the National Institute of Agricultural Innovation, as well as other initiatives on related and complementary topics for rural development and the improvement of people's livelihoods in rural Andean areas.

Conclusion 2. Effectiveness. The project outcomes are incipient considering the time elapsed and the expenditure made. The interventions of the four components are mainly supported by studies and external consultancies, without a common thread or an integrating element among consultancies and studies, the processes implemented by the project with its partners, and the final work with and for communities. Although attention is paid to *in situ* conservation and sustainable management of agrobiodiversity, little progress was made in terms of landscape restoration, commercialization of products, and markets, which are other pillars of the project, hindering the development of the GIAHS approach. Similarly, there is little clarity on how the project is moving towards building the enabling environment required for the sustainable use of agrobiodiversity to ensure that initiatives are developed at regulatory and political level.

Conclusion 3. Effectiveness. The project's contribution to the GEF global targets is minimal. According to the information available, there was a progress of only 0.04 percent in achieving the target related to sustainable forest management. It was not possible to determine the level of progress for the other targets due to the lack of means of verification, and measurement and monitoring mechanisms, leading us to infer that the project will not achieve the commitments in the remaining period unless strong adjustments are made (engaging all agencies and institutions involved), especially considering the current pandemic context.

Conclusion 4. Effectiveness. A process of results-based management was not demonstrated, where all project stakeholders directly or indirectly contribute to the implementation of strategies and activities to achieve desired outcomes and changes. On the contrary, the project operates with a demand-driven approach, carrying out activities that do not necessarily contribute to the objective. In general, there are significant delays to meet the deadlines of outcomes of all project components, which cannot be measured with the information available. Also, there are no evident changes to guarantee the achievement of outcomes at the end of the project, or a system to hold the donor accountable for the progress made to achieve targets.

Conclusion 5. Effectiveness. The complexity of the process to obtain certification through the Participatory Guarantee System (PGS) by the Supreme Decree No. 002-2020-MINAGRI has created a hindrance for the entire project that must be solved soon to comply with some requirements, indicators and outputs for the recognition of products from organic or ecological production.

Conclusion 6. Efficiency. The delay in the implementation of planned activities and budget execution by December 2020, accounting for 19.4 percent of the total project budget (according to the person responsible for the budget), compromises the achievement and sustainability of project outcomes. This has been worsened with the COVID-19 context and mobility restrictions. There is, however, room to

improve the work with and for communities, with greater involvement of producers and local and regional governments.

Conclusion 7. Efficiency. In addition to delays in the activities, the coordination and decision-making mechanisms are not working properly. These include the communication among FAO, Profonanpe and the Ministry of Environment in the project and the operation of the Project Steering Committee (PSC), where representatives of two Regional Governments also participate. Likewise, Profonanpe is not fulfilling its role as operational partner, responsible for the technical and administrative implementation of the project, as established in the agreement signed with FAO, involving an increased reputational risk for FAO as implementing agency with the GEF. On the other hand, there are gaps in the technical follow-up provided by FAO, the Project Technical Committee and the involvement of partners that may play a fundamental role in the project, such as the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation.

Conclusion 8. Sustainability. The project has not developed a sustainability strategy or actions to promote the systematization of learning and good practices for replication and scaling-up. AGROBIO is an initiative that could offer a market alternative for producers from Apurímac and Puno, but it does not have the characteristics to be sustainable in the way it currently operates. Ensuring the sustainability of AGROBIO involves capacity building of producers in various subjects, including management, logistics, accounting and basic finances, to enable them to manage and take ownership of this commercial initiative following the completion of the project.

Conclusion 9. Factors affecting the progress. The reported co-financing corresponds to 5 percent of the pledged amount, which indicates the need to expand the collaborative work with partners and allies, including the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation and the National Institute of Agricultural Innovation, as well as other existing initiatives with common objectives. The project lacks a monitoring and evaluation system for the follow-up of the implementation of activities and their relationship with the project outcomes. There is no real time monitoring of the budget or the impact on plots, communal lands and landscapes; nor is there a planning to inform investments, strategic alliances and other interventions in the project area that contribute to the progress and articulation towards the project objectives.

Conclusion 10. Factors affecting the progress. Changes made in the results framework, reflected in the 2019 Strategic Plan (approved in the PSC session of May 2019), include modifications at the level of outcomes, outputs and indicators (in relation to its original version contained in the PRODOC and Annex 2 of the Operational Partners Agreement), and the addition of two new outputs and 17 indicators. These fundamental changes are aimed at providing greater importance to agrobiodiversity in general, disregarding important pillars of the GIAHS approach related to income generation of small-scale producers and the recognition of intellectual property and territory's assets. Moreover, there are the constant changes and rescheduling of activities, which reflects the lack of strategic planning, together with a weak coordination among project components, causing a negative impact on the project implementation.

Conclusion 11. Factors affecting the progress. The lack of permanent technical and administrative follow-up of the project by FAO, as well as the lack of clarity on the roles assumed by Profonanpe and the Ministry of Environment, have negatively affected the progress of the project, which is reflected in the little progress made towards the attainment of goals and the low budget execution.

Conclusion 12. Cross-cutting factors. The project strives to implement actions within a framework of binding social and environmental safeguards. The free, prior and informed consent process carried out shows that decisions and rights of local stakeholders are respected, including family-based subsistence farmers, a highly vulnerable segment in the Andean rural economy. However, the integration of these stakeholders in all project actions should continue. The intercultural approach is reflected in the

involvement of ancestral communities, such as Quechua and Aymara, as protagonists, with project technicians creating synergies between the communities and the project.

Recommendations

To Profonanpe, as project executing agency (operational partner), Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation as executing partners and FAO as GEF implementing agency.

Recommendation 1. Carry out a total reengineering of the project where the main objective and targets are validated, and activities and planned outputs are revised considering farmer communities, as the main target group of the project. This will improve project management and ensure the attainment of outcomes and fulfilment of commitments made to the donor and society (accountability).

27. The following actions are suggested:

- i. Carry out a budget analysis and evaluate changes made to the budget to evaluate its potential impact on the targets of each component and ensure that investments, commitments and actions to be developed for targeted communities and producers will not be affected.
- ii. Rethink or clarify the roles of agencies (FAO, Profonanpe, Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation) in technical aspects, project's direction, supervision and management. All this taking into consideration commitments made to the donor, the Operational Partners Agreement signed between FAO and Profonanpe, the current contexts and its risks, and existing activities implemented in beneficiary communities, respecting the project's main objective and existing commitments.
- iii. Assign a more active role to Project Steering Committee members in decision-making processes, ensuring that all members, including Regional Government representatives, receive updated information on the technical and financial progress of the project. PSC meetings can be used as an opportunity to ensure project accountability towards partners and communities involved.
- iv. Analyse the project's theory of change as an essential element to validate the key elements of the project's technical approach, which proposes dynamic conservation as an approach that can contribute to rural development, considering: i) contribution to livelihoods and food security; ii) income generation and productive agriculture, capitalizing on markets (with initiatives by the stakeholders themselves); and iii) rural development preserving elements that make the site unique.
- v. Place greater emphasis on capacity building activities on marketing to help beneficiary local communities ensure a permanent linkage with the market to improve their income and quality of life, together with actions for landscape management and biodiversity conservation.
- vi. Target and prioritize actions towards the main target group (local peasant communities) to actively involve them in the project development; also ensuring that activities, outputs and expected outcomes, and their contribution to the main target of the project are aligned and coherent.
- vii. When developing the management response, that will be part of the mid-term evaluation report, it is recommended to analyse and prioritize the recommendations in this report and carry out a revision and reprogramming of the 2021 Annual Operating Plan. This to attain the targets committed to the donor, without neglecting existing actions with beneficiary communities, and considering that the COVID-19 context and the political environment may affect project development. The possibility of requesting a one-year no-cost extension for the project is also suggested, provided that it ensures the achievement of targets and the clarification of processes and responsibilities.

To Profonanpe (including the project team), Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation as implementing partners and FAO as GEF implementing agency

Recommendation 2. Maximize the benefits of the rural development approach (GIAHS) and integrate it into a joint working agenda that addresses issues, such as the management of existing agrobiodiversity areas by local stakeholders, to contribute to the improvement of their quality of life through the generation of income and the creation and formalization of new agrobiodiversity areas; a feasibility analysis to implement the new version of the Participatory Guarantee System; and actions for the restoration of forest ecosystems.

28. The following actions are suggested to achieve it:

- i. Develop actions that directly involve producers of prioritized areas and ensure the generation of income and livelihoods in the communities.
- ii. Consider increasing the decentralization process towards localities where actions will be implemented with the communities to work more closely (and avoid displacement in a pandemic context) in processes of land restoration, production development, and access to markets. In this regard, farmer field schools could become the axis to ensure the transfer of capacities for improving production.
- iii. Greater collaboration and synergies with FAO technical areas (Food Systems and Nutrition, and GIAHS), the National Institute of Agricultural Innovation, the National Agrarian Health Service of Peru (SENASA), and the National Forest and Wildlife Service (SERFOR), bodies associated to the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation.
- iv. Promote synergies and complementarities with institutions such as the National Institute for the Defense of Competition and Intellectual Property (INDECOPI), the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Tourism (MINCETUR), the Ministry of Culture, Regional Governments; non-governmental organizations (NGOs) such as ANDES and ECOAN; private entities such as the National Association of Ecological Products (ANPE, for its Spanish acronym), the Peruvian Agroecological Consortium, Slow Food Peru, and groups of chefs and restaurants; as well as international cooperation projects on issues to increase the value of biodiversity. This is particularly important in the context of COVID-19 where synergies are key and where many institutions are seeking alliances to generate actions that promote social, environmental and economic development in rural territories.

Recommendation 3. Ensure that processes and outputs meet a minimum technical standard and contribute to project outcomes.

- i. This requires improving the technical and quality control of outputs (including consultancies) and project interventions and reports, preferably by means of peer reviews among the different project stakeholders, with the support of the Project Task Force and FAO as a technical specialist, including headquarters teams managing similar projects in other regions, to use validated approaches and verify the content and quality of outputs. It is also suggested to establish a results-oriented monitoring system for the articulation of actions, resources and outputs, and the follow-up of financial resources, timetables and established deadlines.

Recommendation 4. Improve communication, generation of knowledge and transfer of capacities among partners and stakeholders by promoting opportunities for the exchange of experiences (face-to-face, virtual, or mixed) among local stakeholders from different districts and regions, project team members and participating agencies and institutions, in order to discuss learnings and difficulties in the implementation, development and consolidation of a network of pilot sites.

- i. In addition, implement a knowledge management strategy, linked to the communication strategy, for informing project actions and documenting and sharing results, experiences and lessons learned generated by its main partners (FAO, Profonanpe, Ministry of Environment, and Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation), and other regional and governmental bodies.

To FAO in its role as GEF implementing agency.

Recommendation 5. Improve the accountability process by requesting the Office of the Inspector-General (OIG) to carry out an investigation of the project to analyse the impact of budget modifications in the components on project outcomes, the increase of salaries of the Project Management Unit staff, personnel expenses (including consultants) and payroll against investments in field actions, and the management of responsibilities around the Operational Partners Agreement.

- i. The review may also generate recommendations to guide the project operation according to the commitments made to the donor during its second mid-term and reduce reputational and operational risks for FAO, something especially important considering the coming political transition. It is also important to analyse procedures and expense receipts for having an updated accounting system shared by all project partners.

Recommendation 6. Improve the project implementation and impact by clarifying roles and responsibilities and improving the project administrative processes with the development of a new Project Operations Manual based on the roles approved in the operational agreement, the commitments made to the donor, and property rights of knowledge products. It should also become a guide to facilitate contract and procurement approval processes.

- i. If necessary, the financial and technical aspects of the follow-up, monitoring, and progress reporting activities can be shared between the executing and the implementing agency.

Recommendation 7. Contribute to the achievement of project outcomes by monitoring the project reengineering process to improve the quality of daily support and technical assistance provided to the project, as well as supervision activities including the follow-up of no objections, review and feedback on technical outputs, consulting reports, and technical and financial reports.

- i. It is also recommended to reactivate the project's interdisciplinary working group (Project Task Force) within FAO to ensure effective technical, operational, and administrative management throughout the project cycle.

Recommendation 8. Improve partnerships and involvement of stakeholders in the project by supporting the project team in creating links with the initiatives NGO Terra Nuova and IFOAM developed by FAO Peru, to identify new opportunities for promoting agrobiodiversity in local markets.

- i. This may be possible by facilitating spaces for the implementation of agreements and partnerships with other UN agencies, integrating technical activities (for instance, in health and infrastructure) that allow positive synergies for beneficiary rural communities.

TO Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation as National Authorities and partners in the project implementation:

Recommendation 9. Contribute to the achievement of project outcomes by negotiating with SENASA and the National PGS Council a work agreement for the implementation or modification of Supreme Decree No. 002-2020-MINAGRI to prevent it from becoming an obstacle for local small-scale producers.

- i. If not possible, it is suggested to modify the indicators of Outputs 2.1.3 and 3.1.3 related to the Participatory Guarantee System to work with more feasible certificates, as the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation Family Farming Certificate.

To FAO teams at headquarters or decentralized offices.

Recommendation 10. Identify lessons learned to improve the monitoring and technical support to projects in the countries.

- i. Regional Office. Provide technical follow-up to projects of national offices to ensure the attainment of outcomes agreed with the countries, especially in offices without an appointed representative or with political challenges.
- ii. FAO GEF Coordination Unit. Monitor the outcomes and FAO's role as the implementing agency to fulfil the commitments to the donor.
- iii. Operational Partners Implementation Modality Office. Accompany and follow-up the commitments of Operational Partners Agreements to ensure full compliance and observance of agreements.
- iv. Field programme. Ensure the implementation of a follow-up and monitoring system for the projects executed by partners. This monitoring should include the follow-up of technical outcomes and financial commitments, and facilitate access by all those involved in the project, including the Regional Office or headquarters staff.

Mid-term evaluation summary of ratings

GEF criteria/sub-criteria	Rating	BRIEF COMMENTS
A. STRATEGIC RELEVANCE		
A1. Overall strategic relevance	Moderately unsatisfactory	While the project addresses a truly relevant issue for the country, the change of approach and the lack of complementarity have reduced its potential to remain relevant.
A1.1. Alignment with GEF and FAO Strategic Priorities	Satisfactory	
A1.2. Relevance for national, regional and global priorities, and the needs of beneficiaries	Moderately unsatisfactory	
A1.3. Complementarity with other ongoing interventions	Moderately unsatisfactory	
B. EFFECTIVENESS		
B1. General evaluation of project outcomes	Unsatisfactory	Project interventions are focused on <i>in situ</i> conservation, with specific progress made on the issues of sustainable management of agrobiodiversity, landscape management and restoration, commercialization and markets, and management to achieve an enabling environment for the sustainable use of agrobiodiversity. No evidence was found to demonstrate a results-based management, but rather a demand-driven management.
B1.1 Delivery of project outputs	Unsatisfactory	
B1.2 Progress towards project outcomes and objectives	Unsatisfactory	
Outcome 1.1 Agrobiodiversity is conserved <i>in situ</i> and managed in a sustainable and adaptable way.	Moderately satisfactory	
Outcome 1.2 Andean landscapes are managed and restored in a sustainable way to ensure the flow of ecosystem services necessary to maintain agrobiodiversity and the sustainability of agrobiodiversity-based production systems.	Moderately unsatisfactory	
Outcome 2.1 Enhanced marketing of agrobiodiversity-based products to support the sustainable use of agrobiodiversity and rural livelihoods.	Moderately unsatisfactory	
Outcome 3.1 Strengthened enabling environment for the sustainable use of agrobiodiversity.	Highly unlikely	
Outcome 4.1 The project implementation applies results-based management, and lessons learned / good practices are documented and disseminated.	Unsatisfactory	
Overall assessment of progress towards the project outcomes and objectives.	Unsatisfactory	
C. EFFICIENCY		
C1. Efficiency	Unsatisfactory	The project implementation, both at the level of activities and budget, presents a considerable delay that affects the fulfilment and sustainability of expected outcomes. Likewise, the coordination and decision-making mechanisms are not working properly.
D. SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECT OUTCOMES		
D1. Overall likelihood of risks to sustainability	Moderately unsatisfactory	A sustainability strategy has not been developed for the project, nor actions to promote the systematization of learning and good practices that allow its replication and scaling-up.
D1.1. Financial risks	Moderately unsatisfactory	
D1.2. Sociopolitical risks	Moderately unsatisfactory	

GEF criteria/sub-criteria	Rating	BRIEF COMMENTS
D1.3. Institutional and governance risks	Moderately unsatisfactory	
D1.4. Environmental risks	Moderately likely	
D2. Acceleration and replication	Unsatisfactory	
E. FACTORS AFFECTING THE PERFORMANCE		
E1. Project design and development	Moderately unsatisfactory	The project execution modality (OPIM) is not being used as established in the Operational Partners Agreement. The reported co-financing corresponds to 5 percent of the pledged amount. Administrative support given by FAO Peru has sometimes caused delays in the activities. The project has room to expand its network of partners and allies. Substantial modifications have been made to the results framework and there is no monitoring and evaluation system for measuring the performance and supporting decision-making processes.
E2. Quality of project implementation	Unsatisfactory	
E2.1 Quality of project implementation by FAO	Unsatisfactory	
E2.1 Project supervision (PSC, project working group, etc.).	Unsatisfactory	
E3. Quality of project execution	Unsatisfactory	
E3.1 Project execution and management	Unsatisfactory	
E4. Financial management and co-financing	Unsatisfactory	
E5. Project partnerships and stakeholder involvement	Moderately unsatisfactory	
E6. Communication, knowledge management and knowledge products	Unsatisfactory	
E7. Overall quality of monitoring and evaluation (M&E)	Unsatisfactory	
E7.1 M&E design	Unsatisfactory	
E7.2 M&E implementation plan (including human and financial resources)	Unsatisfactory	
E8. Overall assessment of factors affecting performance	Unsatisfactory	
F. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES		
F1. Gender and other dimensions of equality	Unsatisfactory	The project strives to implement actions within a framework of binding social and environmental safeguards. The free, prior and informed consent process proves that decisions and rights of local stakeholders are respected, including family-based subsistence farmers, a highly vulnerable segment in the Andean rural economy. The project does not have a gender strategy or specific actions to address this issue.
F2. Human rights issues	Satisfactory	
F3. Environmental and social safeguards	Moderately satisfactory	
Overall rating of the project	Unsatisfactory	

Office of Evaluation
evaluation@fao.org
www.fao.org/evaluation

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Rome, Italy



Some rights reserved. This work is available
under a CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO licence.