

## MID-TERM REVIEW

Project ID:	10541
Project Name:	Sustainable management and restoration of the Dry Forest of the Northern Coast of Peru
Countr(ies):	Peru
Implementing Agency:	FAO

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. OVERVIEW .....3**

**A. Description .....3**

**B. Key Dates .....3**

**II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES .....3**

**A. Main MTR Findings .....3**

**B. Stakeholder Engagement .....12**

**C. Gender Equality .....12**

**D. Knowledge Management .....13**

**III. CORE INDICATORS .....14**

**IV: CO FINANCING .....19**

**V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS .....20**

**VI. ANNEX .....21**

## I. Overview

### A. Description

Project name

Sustainable management and restoration of the Dry Forest of the Northern Coast of Peru

Country

Peru

GEF ID

10541

Implementing Agency

FAO

Executing Entity

Ministry of Environment

Trust Fund

GET

Project Type

FSP

Objective

To restore and sustainably manage the dry forests of the Northern Coast of Peru, facilitating the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services, increasing the resilience of communities and their livelihoods and supporting the achievement of the Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) target.

### B. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval

1/11/2022

Agency Approval

1/18/2022

Implementation Start

12/23/2022

First Disbursement

2/29/2024

Expected MTR

MTR Submission

4/29/2026

Actual MTR

11/14/2025

Expected Completion

12/22/2027

## II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

### A. Main MTR Findings

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- RE1. The project “Sustainable Management and Restoration of the Dry Forest of the Northern Coast of Peru”—hereinafter referred to as the “Project”—is an initiative financed under the seventh replenishment cycle of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), implemented by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in conjunction with the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), and executed by the Ministry of Environment (MINAM), with the Peruvian Trust Fund for National Parks and Protected Areas (PROFONANPE) acting as the operating partner.
- RE2. The project has a total budget of USD 65,500,012, of which USD 7,666,491 corresponds to the GEF grant and USD 57,833,521 to co-financing committed by various associated national institutions and FAO.
- RE3. The project formally started in September 2022; its inception workshop was held in December 2023, and according to its design, completion is envisaged for December 2027, for a total implementation period of 60 months.
- RE4. In accordance with the GEF Project Cycle Management guidelines, projects are required to undergo a Mid-Term Review (MTR) at the midpoint of implementation. The present report was prepared within this framework.
- RE5. The objective of the review was to conduct an independent assessment of the relevance of the project’s design and the interventions implemented at mid-term; its effectiveness in delivering outputs and achieving outcomes and objectives; the efficiency in the use of resources; the integration of cross-cutting perspectives; the likelihood that the results achieved will be sustained beyond the termination of GEF financing (sustainability); and other factors that may be affecting Project performance.
- RE6. The above is intended to ensure accountability to stakeholders, capture lessons learned, and formulate recommendations aimed at improving, adjusting, and/or enhancing the project moving forward.

## MAIN FINDINGS

### Relevance

- RE7. The project is highly relevant. It responds decisively to the needs and interests of the local beneficiary populations, aligns with the strategic priorities of GEF-7, FAO, and IUCN; and is consistent with national priorities regarding the conservation, restoration, and sustainable management of the dry forest ecosystem along the northern coast of Peru.

### Effectiveness

- RE8. Outcome targets and the development of planned deliverables for the medium term are lower than originally envisaged. Nevertheless, substantive progress has been observed in terms of territorial deployment, trust-building with local stakeholders, activation of governance mechanisms, and the initiation of community-based restoration, conservation, and promotion of productive activities. The project has achieved positive implementation momentum, activating processes that have the potential to consolidate structural changes over the medium term.

### Efficiency

- RE9. At mid-term, the project has executed 45% of the budget planned for the reviewed period and 35% of the total budget. The gap observed between the planned and actual expenditures is reflected in the achievement of technical milestones below what was planned for the mid-point of the implementation period.
- RE10. Key stakeholders consider that the institutional arrangements inherent to the implementation modality through Operational Partners (OPIM), the initial difficulties in assembling a suitably qualified team, and the additional complexity arising from having two implementing agencies led to significant delays during the project’s start-up phase and throughout its management.
- RE11. While the MTR acknowledges the efforts undertaken to accelerate implementation and strengthen technical and administrative management—particularly over the past year, during which 93% of the annual budget was executed—it considers that, even with an increased expenditure rate, the remaining implementation period would not be sufficient to fully execute the total budget, consolidate the planned results, and ensure the sustainability of the actions underway.

## **Factors affecting performance**

### ***Design***

RE12. The project was designed in accordance with the procedures and sections required by the GEF. However, the formulated results framework is highly fragmented and limited in its operational usefulness: 9 outcomes with 15 associated indicators, and 31 outputs with 51 linked indicators. A design of this complexity tends to generate programmatic fragmentation, thereby reducing effectiveness, efficiency, and the capacity to implement results-based management.

### ***Implementation and execution***

RE13. Implementation and execution functions have been carried out in accordance with GEF policies. However, the presence of two implementing agencies (FAO and IUCN) and execution under the Operational Partners Implementation Modality (OPIM) have posed significant technical and administrative coordination challenges.

RE14. The coexistence of multiple reporting lines and formats (FAO, IUCN, PROFONANPE, and MINAM), together with demanding and differentiated procurement regulations for goods and services, diverse programmatic priorities, and heterogeneous information requirements, has generated significant challenges in terms of coordination, harmonization, and operational coherence.

### ***Cofinancing***

RE15. As of June 2025, the institutions that committed co-financing have reported contributions equivalent to 52% of the total pledged, amounting to USD 30,017,972 out of USD 57,833,521. While most institutions, in line with GEF co-financing policy and guidelines, have documented their contributions through official sources, others—such as the Ministry of Agrarian Development and Irrigation (MIDAGRI) and private sector companies—have yet to do so, and this situation should be duly regularized.

### ***Communication***

RE16. The project has designed and implemented a communications plan that has contributed to strengthening its positioning in the intervention areas and to consolidating trust-based relationships with regional governments and communities. However, the Mid-Term Review (MTR) finds that this component requires further strengthening, particularly in expanding its reach at the national level, enhancing the visibility of MINAM and the implementing agencies, disseminating results more effectively, and leveraging communications to support knowledge management and institutional advocacy.

### ***Knowledge management***

RE17. The project has initiated the collection and organization of experiences from other initiatives implemented in the territory. Complementing this effort with a systematic documentation of the project's own lessons learned, as well as those of the executing and implementing institutions, would significantly enhance the quality, usefulness, and influence of the knowledge products generated and yet to be developed.

## **Cross-cutting dimensions**

### ***Gender***

RE18. The project has promoted and facilitated women's participation in productive, restoration, and conservation initiatives, generating progress in their organization and leadership.

RE19. The results observed thus far at the community level are positive and constitute a key strength of the project. They have the potential to contribute—and are indeed contributing—to closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources, increasing women's participation, and generating socioeconomic benefits in the territory, three core priorities of the GEF.

### ***Safeguards***

RE20. In accordance with its Moderate Risk classification and GEF guidelines, the project has taken the necessary measures to avoid causing adverse effects on the communities and habitats in which it operates.

### ***Stakeholder Engagement***

RE21. Stakeholders have reported active participation in the project. During implementation, in line with GEF policy and in accordance with the provisions of the formulation, key actors report that they have been invited and have actively participated in the project's

internal governance spaces, the governance bodies that the project is supporting, and the exchange and training opportunities offered.

## Sustainability

RE22. While the project has begun to lay certain foundations for sustainability, the consolidation and continuity of the processes initiated will require sustained institutional continuity, ongoing technical support, and adequate financial conditions to enable communities and institutional stakeholders to maintain, scale up, and replicate the promoted processes and the effects to be achieved over the remaining implementation period.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### **Recommendation 1. To the PMU, PROFONANPE, FAO, IUCN and MINAM on the optimization of processes and the updating and streamlining of planning, monitoring, and accountability instruments**

#### **1a. Review, update, and simplify the results matrix at the product level**

With the aim of ensuring a results matrix structure that facilitates monitoring, reporting, and use in decision-making, and that aligns with the current context in which the project operates, the MTR recommends carrying out an update at the output level and to their associated indicators, focused on simplification and operational feasibility. This adjustment should be undertaken without introducing substantial amendments to the project's programmatic orientation.

#### **1b. Simplify and harmonize the annual planning and accountability instruments as part of building a more agile and user-oriented system.**

As part of a continuous improvement pathway aimed at facilitating decision-making, reducing administrative burdens, and strengthening collaborative relationships among executing and implementing entities, it is recommended to standardize and simplify the annual planning instruments and quarterly accountability reports.

#### **1c. Optimize processes through the aggregation of products**

With the aim of improving administrative efficiency and increasing effectiveness in project implementation, it is recommended to assess the feasibility of grouping certain related technical outputs into integrated packages that can be awarded to a single provider.

#### **1d. Complete and simplify the indicator sheets**

Complete the development of the indicator sheets that still raise questions, prioritizing simplicity and practicality, and incorporating clear definitions along with verifiable criteria for estimating the project's targets.

- **Suggestion 1.** Establish a working group whose sole objective is to promptly address the issues raised.
- **Suggestion 2.** For the adjustment of the results framework, it is recommended to pay special—but exclusive—attention to the outputs and indicators marked in red in Appendix 7.
- **Suggestion 3.** Conduct one or two in-person working sessions (workshop-style).
- **Suggestion 4.** Consider the possibility of hiring an external facilitator to guide the process and systematize the agreements and final instruments produced from the sessions.

### **Recommendation 2. To the PMU, PROFONANPE, FAO, IUCN and MINAM regarding the development of integrated community plans**

As a way to consolidate the integrated approach promoted and implemented by the project, and to increase the likelihood of community ownership and sustainability, it is recommended to transition from conservation agreements toward the development and formalization of medium- and long-term community planning instruments.

- **Suggestion.** Link the community plans to financing mechanisms for the planned activities.

### **Recommendation 3. To the PMU, PROFONANPE, FAO, UICN and MINAM regarding Project sustainability**

Design and implement a sustainability and exit strategy that includes, at a minimum:

- The consolidation, systematization, and promotion of an integrated intervention model.

- The approval and implementation of public policy instruments that have been developed and are yet to be developed.
- Designing financing mechanisms that enable the continuity of restoration and sustainable management actions both inside and outside of NPAs and OMECs.
- The institutionalization of training processes such as diploma programs and the creation of a body of community promoters capable of sustaining and replicating the practices adopted.
- Institutional consolidation and anchoring of territorial governance bodies in the relevant institutions (SERNANP, regional governments, MINAM, MIDAGRI, SERFOR, or others).
- Demonstration that the promoted production models can evolve into profitable businesses.

**Recommendation 4. To the PMU, MINAM, IUCN, FAO Perú and FAO RLC regarding the identification and visibility of the productive, social, and environmental role of participating women**

Promote explicit recognition of women's contributions by fostering the establishment and strengthening of a macro-regional network of women for the conservation and restoration of the dry forest.

- **Suggestion:** Create exchange opportunities to connect and advise the PMU on the work that FAO and/or IUCN carry out with women across Latin America.

**Recommendation 5. To the PMU, PROFONANPE, FAO, IUCN and MINAM on Knowledge Management**

Develop systematizations of intervention experiences in pilot sites. These should document costs and multidimensional effects, have a clear demonstrative emphasis, and be oriented toward promoting learning and replicability and/or scalability on the part of State institutions or other stakeholders.

**Recommendation 6. To the MINAM, FAO RLC, IUCN and other relevant stakeholders, regarding the establishment of experience-sharing spaces**

Establish regular forums for the exchange of regional experiences contributed by FAO and IUCN, as well as national experiences shared by executing partners and other interested stakeholders.

- **Suggestion 1.** It would be advisable to consider topics such as effective management of OMECs, landscape-scale restoration, regenerative livestock systems, community-based environmental planning, among others.
- **Suggestion 2.** Promote exchange spaces among teams of similar projects in the region implemented by FAO and/or IUCN, and by the Ministry of Environment at the national level.

**Recommendation 7. To the PMU, FAO and MINAM on prioritizing and consolidating spaces for multi-stakeholder and multi-level coordination.**

It is recommended to redouble efforts to strengthen—and firmly anchor—the Macro-Regional Platform as a coordinating space among regions, sectors, and territorial stakeholders, while prioritizing support for and consolidation of the governance arrangements associated with the Regional Conservation Systems.

- **Suggestion.** Promote the incorporation of one or two additional strategic milestones into COREFOR to enhance the visibility, relevance, and legitimacy of the Macro-Regional Platform.

**Recommendation 8. To FAO RLC, IUCN and MINAM on a possible temporary extension of the Project**

Technically and financially assess the possibility of extending the Project's duration by 12 to 18 months.

- **Suggestion.** Take into account the time limits that the donor considers reasonable and note that any potential extension would not include additional financial resources.

**Recommendation 9. MINAM on the feasibility of public policy instruments**

It is recommended that MINAM, with the support of the project management unit, establish an inter-institutional technical committee whose main objective is to facilitate the approval of public policy instruments that the project has already developed and will develop in the future.

**Recommendation 10. To FAO Perú and IUCN regarding the strengthening of technical and operational oversight**

Considering the available technical and budgetary margins, and in light of the general technical support role of FAO and UICN as implementing agencies, and as a means of reinforcing the project's technical and operational follow-up, it is recommended that:

- a) The FAO technical team in Lima and UICN in Ecuador strengthen their presence in the intervention territory; and:
- b) Opportunities be fostered for exchanging experiences on project monitoring with other offices in the region.

**Recommendation 11. To the PMU and PROFONANPE regarding the continuity of field technicians.**

To ensure the continuity of field technicians—and, consequently, of the intervention—it is recommended to explore, within the legal framework in place, administrative and budgetary alternatives to modify the current modality of their contractual arrangements.

## Appendix 4. GEF Rating Table

GEF FAO criteria/sub-criteria	Rating <sup>[1]</sup> y <sup>[2]</sup>	Summary comments
<b>A. STRATEGIC RELEVANCE</b>		
A1. <b>Overall strategic relevance</b>	<b>HS</b>	The project is highly relevant. It responds decisively to the needs and interests of the local beneficiary populations, to the priorities of GEF-7, to the strategies of FAO and IUCN, and to the priorities of the Peruvian State in the areas of restoration, conservation, and sustainable management.
A1.1. Alignment with GEF, IUCN and FAO strategic priorities	<b>HS</b>	
A1.2. Relevance to national, regional and global priorities and beneficiary needs	<b>HS</b>	
A1.3. Complementarity with existing interventions	<b>HS</b>	
<b>B. EFFECTIVENESS</b>		
B1. Overall assessment of project results	<b>MS</b> The level of results achieved is broadly in line with expectations and/or there were moderate shortcomings.	The project is experiencing delays. However, progress is being observed toward achieving the project's intended changes and results.

B1.1 Delivery of project outputs	<b>MU</b> The level of results achieved is below expectations and/or there have been significant shortcomings.	The project is experiencing delays. A significant number of deliverables are still pending delivery.
<b>B1.2 Progress towards outcomes and project objectives</b>		
Component 1. Promoting governance with multi-sectoral, multi-level and multi-stakeholder approach for the sustainable development of dry forests in Peru	<b>MS</b> The level of results achieved is broadly in line with expectations and/or there were moderate shortcomings.	Progress has been made in the development of public policy instruments and in the establishment of governance bodies.
Component 2. Strengthening ecological connectivity of dry forests and restoration through effective management and financial sustainability of conservation areas and buffer zones	<b>MS</b> The level of results achieved is broadly in line with expectations and/or there were moderate shortcomings.	Progress has been made in the development of management instruments, and the establishment of conservation and restoration areas has begun, along with the formation of governance bodies.
Component 3. Sustainable production practices for the conservation of the natural heritage of the dry forest on the Northern Coast of Peru	<b>MS</b> The level of results achieved is broadly in line with expectations and/or there were moderate shortcomings.	The project has successfully established itself in the intervention territories, effectively articulating key stakeholders, and has begun implementing restoration and conservation actions in conjunction with support for sustainable productive startups.
Component 4. Knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) based on adaptive management principles and the delivery of measurable and objectively verifiable outcomes.	<b>MS</b> The level of results achieved is broadly in line with expectations and/or there were moderate shortcomings.	The project has implemented a communication strategy and knowledge management plan.  Although there are important areas for improvement, M&E has managed to meet the required accountability standards.
<b>Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes</b>	<b>S</b> There were no/or minor shortcomings	Although the project has experienced delays, it has established a solid presence in the territory, built trust among stakeholders, and is beginning to demonstrate results that contribute to its theory of change.
<b>C. EFFICIENCY</b>		
C1. Efficiency	<b>MS</b>	The project has executed 45% of the budget planned for the mid-term and still has a significant margin of resources available (65% of the total for the five years). While this situation represents a weakness, it is also an opportunity to strengthen investment in pending products and to adjust actions in the second phase of implementation.
<b>D. SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECT OUTCOMES</b>		

D1. Overall likelihood of risks to sustainability	<b>ML</b> There are moderate risks to sustainability.	While the project has laid important foundations for sustainability, the consolidation and long-term continuity of the processes initiated will require sustained institutional commitment, ongoing technical support, and adequate financial conditions to enable communities and institutional stakeholders to maintain, scale up, and replicate the promoted processes and their intended outcomes.
D1.1. Financial risks	<b>ML</b> There are moderate risks to sustainability.	Although funding has not yet been secured, the project has developed specific outputs aimed at designing and operationalizing mechanisms to help ensure long-term financial sustainability.
D1.2. Sociopolitical risks	<b>L</b> There is little or no risk to sustainability.	The project has sought to ensure adequate representation of women and local communities and has implemented the necessary safeguards to actively engage them without adversely affecting their interests.
D1.3. Institutional and governance risks	<b>ML</b> There are moderate risks to sustainability.	The successive changes in public administration in Peru constitute an evident political risk. Each time this has occurred, the project has managed to transfer and rearticulate institutional support, ensuring continued backing for its implementation.
D1.4. Environmental risks	<b>ML</b> There are moderate risks to sustainability.	A pest is affecting the algarrobo tree, the origin and causes of which have not yet been clearly determined. Although addressing this issue falls beyond the scope of the Project, it represents a significant risk to the sustainability of its results.
<b>E. FACTORS AFFECTING PERFORMANCE</b>		
E1. Project design and readiness	<b>MS</b>	A fragmented results framework design, combined with unrealistic targets, is limiting the Project's ability to undertake efficient, effective, and results-based management.
E2. Quality of project implementation	<b>MS</b> There were some shortcomings, and the quality of implementation/execution more or less met expectations	FAO, in its role as implementing agency, has satisfactorily supported the identification, preparation, formulation, and implementation of the project, ensuring technical and administrative quality throughout each phase of the project cycle.
E2.1. Quality of project implementation by FAO (BH, LTO, PTF, among others)	<b>MS</b> There were some shortcomings, and the quality of implementation/execution more or less met expectations	The programmatic and administrative areas of FAO Perú, FAO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, and UICN in Ecuador have maintained regular oversight of the project. However, improving the fluidity of the project's internal and external accountability mechanisms remains a bottleneck that needs to be addressed.
E3. Quality of project execution	<b>MS</b> There were some shortcomings, and the quality of implementation/execution more or less met expectations	MINAM and PROFONANPE, as the executing and operational entities respectively, have successfully carried out the project's day-to-day activities. However, there is room to improve the fluidity of accountability processes and to strengthen the initiative's M&E system.
E3.1. Project execution and management (PMU and	<b>MS</b>	

executing partner performance, administration, staffing, etc.)	There were some shortcomings, and the quality of implementation/execution more or less met expectations	
E4. Financial management and co-financing	<b>S</b> There were no shortcomings, or only minor ones, and the quality of implementation/execution meets expectations	As of June 2025, the institutions that committed co-financing have reported contributions equivalent to 53% of the total pledged—i.e., USD 29,997,558 out of USD 57,833,521.
E5. Project partnerships and stakeholder engagement	<b>S</b> There were no deficiencies, or only minor ones were identified, and the quality of implementation/execution meets expectations.	The various stakeholders have been kept informed. In addition, the project has established consultation and community participation mechanisms to ensure that the voices of local communities and other interest groups are heard and duly considered.
E7. Overall quality of M&E	<b>MU</b> There were significant shortcomings, and the quality of the M&E design or implementation is below expectations	The project has fulfilled its accountability responsibilities through quarterly, semi-annual, and annual reporting. However, its monitoring and evaluation system presents limitations in ensuring fluid internal and external tracking and reporting aligned with the information needs of stakeholders.
E7.1. M&E design	<b>MU</b> There were significant shortcomings, and the quality of the M&E design or implementation is below expectations	
E7.2. M&E plan implementation (including financial and human resources)	<b>MU</b> There were significant shortcomings, and the quality of the M&E design or implementation is below expectations	
<b>E8. Overall assessment of factors affecting performance</b>	<b>MS</b> There were some shortcomings, and the quality of implementation/execution more or less met expectations	Although there are areas for improvement, these factors have not negatively affected the project's performance.
<b>F. CUESTIONES TRANSVERSALES</b>		
F1. Gender and other equity dimensions	<b>S</b> There were no or minor shortcomings	The project has consistently integrated gender perspective into the intervention cycle.
F3. Environmental and social safeguards	<b>S</b> There were no or minor shortcomings	In accordance with its moderate risk classification and GEF guidelines, the project has adopted the necessary measures to prevent adverse impacts on the communities and ecosystems in which it operates.
<b>Overall project rating</b>	<b>MS</b> The project is progressing more or less as expected, and/or the identified shortcomings are generally correctable.	The progress achieved so far indicates that the necessary conditions are beginning to be established to move toward the expected outcomes outlined in the Theory of Change (ToC). These initial advances demonstrate concrete progress in creating conditions conducive to improving the prospects of achieving conservation, restoration, and sustainable management of the dry forests of Peru's northern coast (the proposed medium-term change reflected in the revised ToC). However, it is not yet possible to demonstrate the achievement of results-level targets, given the still incipient nature of the processes and the need for clearer monitoring and verification mechanisms.

## B. Stakeholder Engagement

Finding 13. Stakeholders have been informed and have participated in the Project in accordance with GEF policy requirements.

142. Stakeholders have reported active participation in the Project. During implementation, in line with GEF policy and as established in the Project Document (Prodoc), key actors state that they have been convened and have actively participated in the Project's internal governance spaces, the governance instances supported by the Project, and the exchange and training spaces offered.

143. Key actors, especially natural resource management authorities and beneficiary producers, indicate that they have been consulted and have maintained constant and fluid communication with the Project Management Unit (PMU), that they have been able to freely express their views without interference, coercion, discrimination, or intimidation, and that they have been informed about the actions and participating institutions involved in the initiative.

144. Additionally, in line with the promotion of participation described in the previous findings and in accordance with the Stakeholder Engagement Plan annexed to the Prodoc, a grievance and complaints mechanism has been developed and made available to stakeholders to formally channel any disputes that may arise during the Project's implementation cycle.

## C. Gender Equality

### Gender.

Finding 11. The Project has promoted and facilitated the participation of women in productive, restoration, and conservation initiatives, generating progress in their organization and leadership.

128. In line with GEF guidelines and the FAO Gender Equality Policy 2020–2030, the Project has systematically incorporated a gender perspective throughout its implementation cycle.

129. In accordance with the guidelines of the aforementioned institutional instruments, a gap analysis and an action plan aimed at ensuring women's participation in the Project were conducted during the design phase.

130. During the implementation phase, as highlighted in the testimonies presented alongside the page, the MTR observes strong indications of women's participation and leadership in the intervention territories.

131. Farmer field schools have been the main space where women have found opportunities for learning, organizing, and decision-making.

132. In several communities, in addition to actively participating in these schools, women have also been encouraged to assume leadership roles in monitoring restored areas, managing beehives, and managing productive initiatives, thereby contributing to closing gender gaps in access to and control of natural resources (GEF gender objective (a)).

133. Furthermore, the Project has facilitated women's participation in regional fairs where they can sell their products (for example, Farmers' Day Fair in Piura and the Biodiversity Fair in Pucallpa) and is supporting the design of a proposal for ecotourism enterprises led by women in Playa Blanca, contributing to the generation of socioeconomic benefits or services for women (GEF gender objective (b)).

134. Their involvement in Project activities, in addition to having transformative capacity linked to their economic autonomy and control of natural resources, also contributes to strengthening personal and collective empowerment.

135. Progress is already visible in this regard. For example, the Project supported the formalization of the Mujer Mar y Bosque association in Playa Blanca and has provided, as a cross-cutting strategy across different platforms, tools for their representation and voice in community spaces, contributing to strengthening women's participation and decision-making in the intervention territory (GEF gender objective (c)).

136. To maximize women's participation, the Project has taken practical measures, such as providing childcare services during training sessions and adapting workshop schedules. These actions are highly valued by women, who recognize them as facilitators of their inclusion and as a distinguishing feature compared to other interventions.

137. A particularly noteworthy aspect, due to its high catalytic potential, is the exchange of experiences among women from different regions promoted by the Project. Moving toward consolidating this space represents an opportunity to highlight and make their role visible on a broader scale. The MTR has included a recommendation on this matter.

138. These actions and the results observed so far at the community level are positive and represent a strong point of the Project. They have the potential and are contributing to closing gender gaps in access to and control of natural resources, increasing women's participation, and generating socioeconomic benefits in the territory—three central priorities of the GEF.

139. Finally, it is worth noting that updating and/or adapting the initial gender action plan to reflect what is actually being implemented and achieved would be beneficial for ensuring systematic follow-up of this perspective.

## D. Knowledge Management

Finding 10. The Project has initiated the collection and organization of experiences from other initiatives implemented in the territory. Complementing this effort with the systematization of the Project's own lessons learned and those of the executing and implementing institutions would significantly enhance the quality, usefulness, and influence capacity of this component.

124. Within the framework of the implementation of Component 4, the Project has made progress in systematizing previous experiences that have already been implemented in the dry forest ecosystem. This is positive and a noteworthy contribution, as it allows for the integration of past lessons to improve the relevance and quality of the intervention.

125. Considering that knowledge management is fundamental to the success and prospects for replication and scaling up of the piloted initiatives, this component should be conceived as a strategically designed intervention axis. In this regard, the MTR considers that it is key to strengthen this component with a plan aimed at influencing and ensuring the Project's sustainability.

126. Among the actions that could be considered in a knowledge management plan, the following are suggested:

- Developing closer engagement with the experience accumulated by FAO and IUCN in topics such as OMECs, ecological restoration, regenerative livestock, community environmental planning, or other related fields, as this would broaden technical references and improve the effectiveness and quality of Project implementation.

• Systematizing and bringing to decision-makers and other influential actors the processes that the Project is promoting and the effects it is achieving at the community level, in order to promote their replication and scaling based on evidence.

127. For the latter to be effective, systematization must be conceived as a knowledge product that not only records facts and achievements but also documents costs and timelines, and that demonstrates the multidimensional benefits associated with the promoted practices. The MTR prepared a recommendation related to this point.

### III. Core Indicators

#### Indicator 1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
250250	398013	398011	

#### Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Protected Areas Newly created

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)

#### Indicator 1.2 Terrestrial Protected Areas Under improved Management effectiveness

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
250250	398013	398011	

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
ACP Bosque Natural El Cañoncillo	555555629	Others		1,311.00	1,311.00				
ACP Bosque Urum		Others		706.00	706.00				
ACP Bosques Overall y Palo Blanco	555623636	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		3,522.00	3,522.00				
ACP BS Amotape	555555652	Protected area with		123.00	123.00				

		sustainable use of natural resources							
ACP BS Chililique Alto	555623633	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		200.00	200.00				
ACP BS Colina Juan Velasco Alvarado	555629226	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		2,413.00	2,413.00				
ACP BS San Juan de Guayaquiles	555629234	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		305.00	305.00				
ACP CC Cesar Vallejo Palo Blanco	555623665	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		200.00	200.00				
ACP Chaparrí	555555630	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		34,412.00	34,412.00				
ACP Dotor, Hualtaca, Pueblo Libre	555623663	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		9,099.00	9,099.00				
ACP La Huerta Chaparrí	555555671	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		100.00	100.00				
ACP Mangamanguilla	555623662	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		1,738.00	1,738.00				
ACP Santa Catalina de Moza	555629227	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		1,842.00	1,842.00				
ACP Yacila de Zamba	555623632	Protected area with sustainable		1,000.00	1,000.00				

		use of natural resources							
ACR Angostura Faical	555555656	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		8,795.00	8,795.00				
ACR Huacrupe - La Calera	555555661	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		7,272.00	7,272.00				
ACR Moyan - Palacio	555555662	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		8,458.00	8,458.00				
ACR Salitral Huarmaca	555623629	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		28,812.00	28,812.00				
Bosque de Pómac	303319	Natural Monument or Feature	5,887.00	5,887.00	5,887.00		78.00	84.95	
Cerros de Amotape	259	National Park	151,767.00	151,767.00	151,767.00		74.00	62.28	
El Angolo	30061	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources	65,000.00	65,000.00	65,000.00		76.00	76.67	
Illescas Reserve	555555613	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		37,453.00	37,453.00		30.00	69.79	
Laquipampa	83286	Habitat/Species Management Area	8,329.00	8,330.00	8,329.00		65.00	67.65	
Reserva Nacional de Tumbes	98158	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources	19,267.00	19,268.00	19,267.00		65.00	50.93	

### Indicator 3 Area of land and ecosystems under restoration

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
2278	2278	586.8	

### Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural lands under restoration

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

### Indicator 3.2 Area of forest and forest land under restoration

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
2,278.00	2,278.00	586.80	

### Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and woodland under restoration

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

### Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) under restoration

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

### Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
117383	77491	11960	

#### Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
8,000.00	8,000.00	500.00	

#### Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes under third-party certification incorporating biodiversity considerations

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

#### Type/Name of Third Party Certification

#### Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
2,000.00	2,000.00	700.00	

#### Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value or other forest loss avoided

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

High Conservation Value Forest	107,383.00	67,491.00	10,760.00	
--------------------------------	------------	-----------	-----------	--

#### Indicator 4.5 Terrestrial OECMs supported

Name of the OECMs	WDPA-ID	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
-------------------	---------	----------------------------	--	----------------------------	---------------------------

#### Documents (Document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

Title
-------

#### Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (direct)</b>	4105334	6000795		
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (indirect)</b>				

#### Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (direct)</b>	2,052,667	6,000,795	0	
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (indirect)</b>			0	
<b>Anticipated start year of accounting</b>	2040	2041	2041	
<b>Duration of accounting</b>	20	20	20	

#### Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) Sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (direct)</b>				
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (indirect)</b>				
<b>Anticipated start year of accounting</b>				
<b>Duration of accounting</b>				

#### Indicator 6.3 Energy Saved (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Total Target Benefit	Energy (MJ) (At PIF)	Energy (MJ) (At CEO Endorsement)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at MTR)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at TE)
<b>Target Energy Saved (MJ)</b>				

#### Indicator 6.4 Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Technology	Capacity (MW) (Expected at PIF)	Capacity (MW) (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at MTR)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at TE)
------------	---------------------------------	---	---------------------------------	--------------------------------

## Indicator 11 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
<b>Female</b>	8,548	8,548	183	
<b>Male</b>	8,252	8,252	437	
<b>Total</b>	<b>16,800</b>	<b>16,800</b>	620	<b>0</b>

## IV: Co Financing

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Anticipated at CEO(\$)	Materialized at MTR(\$)
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	467,128.00	103,494.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment (SERNANP)	Grant	Investment mobilized	3,085,602.00	
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment (SERNANP)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	162,924.00	451,796.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MIDAGRI)	Grant	Investment mobilized	6,801,406.00	
Recipient Country Government	Regional Government of Piura	Grant	Investment mobilized	13,972,768.00	12,000,072.00
Recipient Country Government	Regional Government of Lambayeque	Grant	Investment mobilized	8,343,302.00	8,343,302.00
Recipient Country Government	Regional Government of Tumbes	Grant	Investment mobilized	3,870,974.00	354,545.00
Recipient Country Government	Regional Government of La Libertad	Grant	Investment mobilized	18,750,713.00	8,647,452.00
Private Sector	Arena Verde	Grant	Investment mobilized	50,000.00	

Civil Society Organization	Promotion of the Agroindustry of Piura Civil Association "CITEagro Piura"	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	32,041.00	
Private Sector	ENERGÍA EÓLICA S.A.	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	921,053.00	
Private Sector	Agrarian cooperative NORANDINO	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	250,000.00	
Other	University of Piura	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	39,250.00	5,925.00
Civil Society Organization	Yunkawasi	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	125,000.00	
Civil Society Organization	Yunkawasi	Grant	Investment mobilized	375,000.00	
Private Sector	Original Beans	Grant	Investment mobilized	50,000.00	
Private Sector	Original Beans	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	50,000.00	
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	436,360.00	90,972.00
GEF Agency	IUCN	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	50,000.00	20,414.00
<b>Total Co-financing</b>				<b>57,833,521.00</b>	<b>111,386.00</b>

Comments

## V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

### Overall Project/Program Risk Classification

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
	Medium/Moderate	Medium/Moderate	

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

Finding 12. In accordance with its moderate risk categorization and GEF guidelines, the Project has taken the necessary measures to avoid causing harmful effects in the communities and habitats where it operates.

140. The Project maintains its initial risk rating: moderate. In line with this categorization, the initiative has complied with the environmental and social safeguards established by the GEF in its updated policy framework. It has ensured that its implementation does not cause harmful effects on the habitats where it operates, avoids contravening applicable international environmental treaties or agreements, among other potential adverse events.

141. In this regard, an Environmental Risk Management Plan has been developed and updated, and a Field Access Protocol has been validated, establishing concrete measures to prevent impacts on ecosystems and ensure respectful and culturally appropriate interaction with communities.

**VI. ANNEX**

Uploaded Document

Document Category	Prefix	Title
M and E Document	Mid-term Review (MTR)	GEFID10541_Core Indicators at MTR_FAO_Peru
M and E Document	Mid-term Review (MTR)	GEFID10541_MTR_FAO_Peru_Spanish
M and E Document	Mid-term Review (MTR)	GEFID10541_MTR_Executive Summary_FAO_Peru
Project Supporting Document	ESS Supporting Document	Annex I1_ ESS_RiskManagementPlan