MID-TERM REVIEW

Project ID:	10184
Project Name:	LDN Target-Setting and Restoration of Degraded Landscapes in Western Andes and Coastal areas
Countr(ies):	Ecuador
Implementing Agency:	FAO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Overview

A. Description

Project name LDN Target-Setting and Restoration of Degraded Landscapes in Western Andes and Coastal areas	
Country Ecuador	
GEF ID 10184	Implementing Agency FAO
Executing Entity CONDESAN (Operating Partner)	
Trust Fund GET	Project Type FSP
Objective Prevent, reduce and reverse land degradation processes (SDG 2, 13, 15) to promote the sustainable development of rural communities, ensuring the provision of key ecosystem services and food sovereignty, within the framework of national efforts to achieve the LDN in Ecuador (2.4.1; 13.2.1; 15.3.1).	

B. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval 6/3/2021	Agency Approval 2/2/2021
Implementation Start 9/21/2021	First Disbursement 12/31/2021
Expected MTR 8/11/2024	MTR Submission 10/31/2025
Actual MTR 4/30/2025	Expected Completion 12/31/2026

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

A. Main MTR Findings

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RE1. The project "LDN Target-Setting and Restoration of Degraded Landscapes in Western Andes and Coastal areas" complements national efforts to drive transformative change toward Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN). It is implemented by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and executed under the Operational Partners Implementation Modality (OPIM) by the Consortium for the Sustainable Development of the Andean Ecoregion (CONDESAN).

RE2. CONDESAN is a regional non-governmental organization that works integrally, informedly, and cooperatively to conserve, restore, and responsibly use the resources of the Andean mountains, in favor of sustainable development for its people.

RE3. The total project budget is USD 32,744,997, of which USD 4,416,210 are provided as GEF grant and USD 28,328,787 as co-financing.

RE4. The LDN project began implementation on September 21, 2021, with the signing of the OPIM agreement between FAO and CONDESAN and the first disbursement. The project is scheduled to close in August 2026.

RE5. The mid-term review (MTR) aims to analyze the results achieved against planned objectives and identify potential recommendations and adjustments to strengthen the ongoing intervention and guide execution through project completion.

Findings

Relevance

RE6. Finding 1. The project's objectives, outcomes, and intervention strategy are aligned with global priorities and guidelines aimed at promoting Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) and advancing sustainable production systems.

RE7. Finding 2. The project responds to the strategic guidelines of the Ecuadorian State related to soil conservation and restoration, the strengthening of sustainable production, the fight against desertification and land degradation, and climate change adaptation and mitigation. The actions carried out in the intervention sites address the needs of local stakeholders, including Indigenous peoples, peasant organizations, women's organizations, and local communities.

Coherence

RE8. Finding 3. CONDESAN has successfully established linkages with other projects, programs, and processes led by FAO, MAATE, and MAG, enhancing synergies and complementarities, and contributing to the achievement of the project's outcomes (internal coherence).

RE9. Finding 4. All project actions are connected to ongoing processes led by partner entities, including the provincial GADs of Imbabura, Bolívar, and Santa Elena, civil society organizations, and other cooperation actors. This has enabled the strengthening of synergies, the development of complementary actions, greater effectiveness, and improved prospects for sustainability (external coherence).

Effectiveness

RE10. Finding 5. Progress in achieving the expected results is enabling the project to fulfill its objective of preventing, reducing, and reversing land degradation processes, while promoting the sustainable development of rural communities and contributing to the provision of ecosystem services and food sovereignty. As of March 31, 2025, an estimated 87% progress has been made toward mid-term targets.

RE11. Finding 6. The project has achieved approximately 91% progress in Component 1 relative to mid-term targets. Significant advances have been made in establishing an LDN monitoring system, building local capacities for applying the LDN approach in planning and implementing Sustainable Land Management (SLM) practices, and integrating these into intersectoral coordination mechanisms and public policies.

RE12. Finding 7. The project has met the mid-term target for Component 2, benefiting approximately 1,628 individuals (50% women) through the implementation of Sustainable Land Management practices. As part of field monitoring and follow-up actions, the project evaluates the implementation of practices on each plot, within a continuous feedback process.

RE13. Finding 8. The project has fully achieved (100%) and exceeded the mid-term target for Component 3, benefiting approximately 831 individuals with incentives for Sustainable Land Management in value chains, and 1,490 individuals with strengthened capacities in the LDN approach.

RE14. Finding 9. In the three landscapes where the project operates—particularly in the pilot sites—skills and knowledge of farmers and producers engaged in family farming have improved regarding the use of Sustainable Land Management practices linked to value chains. Notably, sustainable livestock practices have been implemented in the Sierra Centro landscape.

Efficiency

RE15. Finding 10. The project has faced technical, administrative, and operational challenges that have affected its efficiency. Staff turnover within partner institutions has limited continuity and ownership among technical teams, resulting in gaps in coordination, knowledge transfer, and activity implementation.

RE16. Finding 11. The project's response to contextual changes—such as the lack of commitment from organizations in the provinces of Tungurahua and Chimborazo (within the Sierra Centro landscape)—demonstrates its adaptive management capacity and the efficient coordination led by CONDESAN and the project team.

RE17. Finding 12. As of December 31, 2024, budget execution is reported at a low level of 35%. Half of the project's investment budget is allocated to the purchase of consumable goods, which lacks coherence with the ongoing implementation approach.

RE18. Finding 13. Out of the programmed co-financing, 69% of has been received, contributed by FAO, MAG, CONDESAN, and GIZ. There is no clarity regarding the delivery of the committed co-financing from MAATE.

Sustainability

RE19. Finding 14. The integration of the LDN approach and the tools and instruments developed by the project into national, provincial, and local plans, regulations, and public policy instruments will contribute to the sustainability of the results achieved.

RE20. Finding 15. The sustainability of the project's results will depend, first and foremost, on the effective completion of ongoing activities, in order to create the necessary conditions for follow-up. It will also be essential to ensure technical capacities, institutional commitment, and ownership by co-executing partners, as well as by the institutions and organizations involved. Risks that could affect sustainability include changes in authorities, shifts in public policy approaches, and limitations in resource availability.

Factors Affecting Progress

Implementation and Execution

RE21. Finding 16. The technical strength, credibility, and management capacity of CONDESAN as the executing agency—combined with governance arrangements developed through the participation of multiple stakeholders—have facilitated the implementation of project actions at both national and landscape levels.

RE22. Finding 17. FAO, as the implementing agency, has fulfilled its roles and responsibilities in project oversight and administration. However, the complexity of its administrative procedures has posed a challenge for project execution.

RE23. Finding 18. The OPIM modality has generated both opportunities and challenges. It has enabled CONDESAN to strengthen its capacity for direct execution, facilitating fieldwork and decentralized technical implementation. Nonetheless, a significant institutional learning curve is evident regarding the administrative and financial procedures required by FAO.

Stakeholder Engagement

RE24. Finding 19. The governance arrangements and dynamics developed by the project at national, provincial, and local levels have ensured the participation, ownership, and commitment of institutional actors and partner organizations.

Communication and Knowledge Management

RE25. Finding 20. The implementation of the Communication Strategy has shown significant progress since mid-2024. However, the absence of clear guidelines for knowledge management and results systematization limits the project's ability to make its actions, outcomes, and impacts visible.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

RE26. Finding 21. To date, the project has a Monitoring and Evaluation System in place, including a procedure for the systematic collection of information, fed by members of the executing team. The data contained in this system will support decision-making to adapt and improve project planning and implementation.

Gender and Social Inclusion

RE27. Finding 22. The integration of a gender approach has been progressive. Although it was not robustly incorporated in the project design, significant progress has been made during implementation in the territories—particularly in the provinces of Imbabura and Santa Elena, where work is being carried out with women's groups.

RE28. Finding 23. Collective construction processes have been developed with Indigenous peoples and local communities to define the actions and practices to be implemented in the landscapes and pilot sites. To date, six Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) agreements have been signed, with one additional agreement currently in process.

RE29. Finding 24. Social and environmental safeguards have been fully considered in both the design and implementation of the project. As part of the implementation strategy, measures to mitigate social and environmental risks were incorporated. The project's environmental and social risk classification remains at a moderate level.

Recommendations

For FAO, CONDESAN, MAATE and MAG

Recommendation 1. Structurally integrate the project’s instruments and approaches—including the National Observatory on Land Degradation (ONLD)—into national, provincial, and local development plans and policies. This should be complemented by resource mobilization strategies and institutional strengthening efforts across multiple scales. (Sustainability).

Recommendation 2. Assess the possibility of requesting a no-cost extension of the project for a period of six to twelve months. This extension would allow for the consolidation of ongoing technical and territorial processes, the systematization and packaging of key results and good practices, and the strengthening of conditions for institutional ownership and the integration of the LDN approach into public policies.

To manage this extension, the first recommended step is to review and adjust the current budget structure to ensure continuity and consolidation of ongoing technical and territorial processes. This adjustment should prioritize resource allocation to strategic activities such as technical assistance, capacity building, and the operation of the ONLD. Additionally, it is essential to analyze actual expenditures against the original results-based budget to demonstrate that available resources are sufficient to complete the activities without deviating from the project's objectives. Budget planning must be accompanied by a detailed and realistic activity plan. (Effectiveness / Efficiency / Sustainability)

For MAATE and MAG

Recommendation 3. Strengthen synergies among the Climate Change, Land Degradation, and Biodiversity Conventions by promoting a more balanced articulation of these commitments. The Sustainable Land Management (SLM) approach represents a strategic opportunity to highlight the integrated contributions of implemented practices in adaptation, mitigation, biodiversity conservation, and ecosystem degradation reduction—thus overcoming a fragmented vision in the management of these issues. (Relevance / Coherence)

For la FAO and CONDESAN

Recommendation 4. Review the administrative procedures established in the Operational Manual, identifying those that stakeholders consider eligible for simplification, with the aim of implementing improvements that streamline the project's technical and administrative management. In parallel, strengthen management capacities within FAO and CONDESAN teams to reduce delays in the submission and review technical and financial reports. (Efficiency)

For FAO

Recommendation 5. Provide intensive technical and administrative support, accompanied by an induction program, to reduce the learning curve related to FAO's administrative procedures and the mechanisms for timely reporting and submission of technical and financial reports. This support should be offered during the initial months of implementation of new projects, particularly those under the OPIM modality. (Efficiency)

For CONDESAN

Recommendation 6. Strengthen knowledge management actions framed within the Communication Strategy and the Capacity Building Strategy to enable the systematization of good practices, technological innovations, results, impacts, and lessons learned at local, provincial, and national levels. Additionally, continue developing communication products to disseminate the project's achievements and progress to both internal and external audiences. *(Factors Affecting Progress / Communication and Knowledge Management)*

Recommendation 7. Consolidate the established Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) System, ensuring its integration into the project's planning and decision-making processes. Also, strengthen the capacities of professionals responsible for the technical and financial reporting mechanisms required by FAO. *(Factors Affecting Progress / M&E*)

Recommendation 8. Bundling the products and services contracted to organizations and consulting firms in the territories could improve cost-efficiency and accelerate budget execution. *(Effectiveness / Efficiency*)

Recommendation 9. Strengthen budgetary and programmatic planning processes to expedite activity and budget execution, and ensure a continuous cash flow that guarantees the proper functioning of the project. *(Effectiveness / Efficiency*)

Recommendation 10. With the support of specialists in gender, interculturality, and LDN, review the scope of Outcome 1.1 related to indicators, protocols, and institutional arrangements of the LDN monitoring system that are sensitive to gender and interculturality. This review should define clear criteria for effectively integrating gender and intercultural variables into the system, recognizing that access to productive resources, capacities, and power differs among women, men, and ethnic groups.

GEF Criteria Rating Summary

GEF Criteria / Dimensions	Rating [1][1]	Comments
A. RESULTS		
A1. Overall Strategic Relevance	AS	The project aligns with global and national policies related to LDN, as well as with local priorities and needs.
A2. Coherence	AS	All project activities are linked to ongoing initiatives, generating synergies and complementarities.
A3. Effectiveness	MS	83% of mid-term targets have been achieved.
A4. Efficience	MI	Technical, administrative, and operational challenges have affected efficiency. Budget execution stands at 35%.
B. SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECT RESULTS		
D1. Overall Risk Probability for Sustainability	MP	Moderate financial, sociopolitical, institutional, and governance risks may affect sustainability.
D1.1. Financial Risks	MP	
D1.2. Sociopolitical Risks	MP	
D1.3. Institutional and Governance Risks	MP	
D1.4. Environmental Risks	P	No significant environmental risks to sustainability.
D2. Scaling and Replication Potential	P	Risks to scaling and replication are minimal.
C. IMPLEMENTATION	MS	Some implementation gaps, such as limited initial support to the executing partner. Results moderately meet expectations.
D. EXECUTION	MS	Execution challenges include lack of clarity on co-financing and knowledge management. Results moderately meet expectations.
D.1 Monitoring & Evaluation System	MS	The M&E system was finalized in April 2025. It is solid and well-structured, meeting expectations.
D.2 M&E Implementation (human and financial resources	MS	The M&E system was delayed due to the responsible professional not being exclusively dedicated to the project.
Overall Project Rating	**MS**	

[1] Ver el sistema de calificación al final del documento.

B. Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder Engagement

Finding 19. The governance arrangements and dynamics developed by the project at national, provincial, and local levels have ensured the participation, ownership, and commitment of institutional actors and partner organizations.

All project interventions in the territories are linked to initiatives led by local actors, including provincial GADs and civil society organizations composed of Indigenous peoples and local communities. This has enabled effective activity implementation, supported by the ownership and commitment of stakeholders involved in the project.

During field visits, active participation of MAG officials was observed at all three sites. In Bolívar province, MAATE officials participated in the field visit conducted as part of this evaluation, although they were not familiar with the project. No MAATE participation was recorded during the other visits.

Co-executing partners provide technical follow-up and participate in project decision-making through the Management Committee and the Steering Committee, respectively. Additionally, MAATE, in its role as GEF focal point, requests monthly technical implementation reports from the project as a means to ensure that funds are used appropriately and remain aligned with public policy.

C. Gender Equality

Gender and Social Inclusion

Finding 22. The integration of the gender approach has been progressive. Although it was not robustly incorporated into the project design, significant advances have been made during implementation in the territories, particularly in the provinces of Imbabura and Santa Elena, where work is being carried out with women's groups.

The integration of the gender approach in the project has been gradual. While the results framework includes gender-disaggregated indicators, the initial design did not explicitly incorporate actions that consider gender differences in formulation, implementation, and monitoring. Nevertheless, this approach has been progressively integrated through activities in Cotacachi canton (Imbabura province) and Santa Elena province, where women have taken an active role in implementing SLM practices, product commercialization, and training processes.

The project works in coordination with women's organizations, which has helped promote their participation and make their contributions visible. However, there is still room to structurally integrate and strengthen the gender approach within project implementation, while respecting cultural differences across the intervention landscapes. It is recommended to explore how gender variables could be incorporated into LDN indicators, as required under Outcome 1.1, using some of the project's own actions and experiences as reference.

Of the actors trained, 36.58% are women. The project aims to increase this figure to 40% to meet the proposed targets.

Finding 23. Collective construction processes have been developed with Indigenous peoples and local communities to define the actions and practices to be implemented in the landscapes and pilot sites. To date, six Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) agreements have been signed, with one additional agreement currently in process.

In all cases, prior to the implementation of activities, FPIC mechanisms are activated to ensure respect for the collective rights of Indigenous peoples and the formalization of agreements for the execution of activities within the framework of the project. Table 5 summarizes the territories, stakeholders, and main activities to be carried out under each FPIC agreement signed by the project.

D. Knowledge Management

Communication and Knowledge Management

Finding 20. The implementation of the Communication Strategy has shown significant progress since mid-2024. However, the absence of clear guidelines for knowledge management and the systematization of results limits the project's ability to showcase its actions, outcomes, and impacts.

The project has a Communication Strategy that guides the production, validation, and dissemination of content—such as information briefs, campaigns, and products—aligned with project objectives and adapted to different audiences, ensuring message coherence. Nonetheless, there remains a need to strengthen an integrated narrative that articulates synergies and complementarities across components, landscapes, and the national level.

Important steps have been taken toward more participatory communication, progressively incorporating the voices of key territorial actors—farmers, Indigenous peoples, and rural women—through life stories that highlight their role in sustainable production and in landscape conservation and restoration. This approach seeks to foster local ownership, including by provincial governments (GADs), of the project's content and campaigns, in order to strengthen a sense of belonging and ensure the sustainability of communication efforts. However, this is still a process in consolidation, requiring reinforcement of the technical team and the development of a knowledge management strategy that ensures sustained and articulated impacts across all intervention scales.

One persistent challenge is the absence of dedicated dissemination channels and the reliance on institutional review processes—often slow—by FAO, ministries, and other partners. This situation may delay the timely circulation of strategic information. Therefore, active commitment from all co-executing partners in communication, systematization, and knowledge management tasks is essential.

Although the project's interventions are technically sound and effectively implemented, the lack of mechanisms to highlight their articulation, impacts, and contributions to public policy may limit their visibility and influence. The absence of guidelines and plans for knowledge management is a critical limitation, especially considering the diversity of interventions deployed at national, provincial, and local levels, which risk becoming fragmented if not properly systematized and communicated.

A reallocation of budget lines would allow for the assignment of specific resources to strengthen the communication and knowledge management components. This measure would facilitate the incorporation of additional technical support, enhancing the project's visibility, systematization, and strategic projection.

III. Core Indicators

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)
4000	4000	13433	

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)
4,000.00	2,000.00	2,325.00	

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)
Natural grass		2,000.00	11,108.00	

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)
33000	24750	6640	

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)

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)
8,000.00	4,750.00	1,040.00	

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	25,000.00	20,000.00	5,600.00	

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
Updated_20210325_Annex_P_Supplementary_Material Annex_P_Setting_targets_for_GEF_core_indicators

Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO_2e (direct)	12170020	9596730		
Expected metric tons of CO_2e (indirect)				

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)
Expected metric tons of CO_2e (direct)	12170020	9,596,730	0	
Expected metric tons of CO_2e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting	2020	2021		
Duration of accounting	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)
Expected metric tons of CO_2e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO_2e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting				
Duration of accounting				

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)
Target Energy Saved (MJ)				

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)
Female	2,400	2,338	830	
Male	3,600	3,112	798	
Total	**6,000**	**5,450**	1628	**0**

IV: Co Financing

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Anticipated at CEO($)	Materialized at MTR($)
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	Investment mobilized	50,000.00	
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	Investment mobilized	3,125,000.00	1,596,800.00
Civil Society Organization	CONDESAN	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	67,852.00	44,500.00
Civil Society Organization	CONDESAN	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	204,148.00	119,479.00
Recipient Country Government	REM Program	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,000,000.00	
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG)	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	46,111.00	
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	18,612,692.00	17,477,513.00

Recipient Country Government	Ministry of the Environment and Water (MAAE)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	4,545,914.00	
Donor Agency	GIZ	In-kind	Investment mobilized	300,000.00	300,000.00
Recipient Country Government	GADP Manabi	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	77,070.00	
Recipient Country Government	GADP Chimborazo	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	100,000.00	
Recipient Country Government	GADP Imbabura	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	200,000.00	
Total Co-financing				**28,328,787.00**	**300,000.00**

Comments

MTR Finding 13. By the end of the project, 69% of the programmed co-financing had been received, provided by FAO, MAG, CONDESAN, and GIZ. There is no clarity regarding the delivery of the co-financing committed by MAATE. Of the co-financing received, 99% was in-kind, while the remaining 1%—in cash—was provided by CONDESAN as the implementing partner. The documentation reviewed and stakeholder consultations regarding the co-financing committed by MAATE do not specify how or when this contribution will be delivered to the project. This information does not align with what is reported in the PIRs. The project requested the provincial GADs of Bolívar and Santa Elena—who were not originally included in the project design document—to formalize their co-financing commitments. As of the reporting date, no information has been received regarding co-financing from the provincial GAD of Imbabura. However, according to statements made to the evaluation team, efforts are underway to consolidate this information for submission to the project.

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 24. Social and environmental safeguards have been comprehensively considered in both the design and implementation of the project. As part of the implementation strategy, measures were incorporated to mitigate social and environmental risks.

The project’s environmental and social risk classification remains at a moderate level. In line with this rating, the project has implemented the necessary mitigation measures to comply with the safeguards established by the GEF. These measures include consultation and participation of local stakeholders to ensure that the needs and proposals of Indigenous peoples, local communities, and other interest groups are fully integrated into the planning and implementation of project activities

Working with community-based organizations, conducting collaborative processes with local actors, and signing FPIC agreements with Indigenous peoples have helped prevent negative social impacts. On the environmental side, the vulnerability and limiting factors of farms and productive units targeted by the project were assessed prior to the design and implementation of sustainable land management practices, in order to prevent and minimize adverse impacts.

VI. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

Document Category	Title
M and E Document	GEFID10184_Core Indicators_MTR_FAO_Ecuador
M and E Document	GEFID10184_MTR - Executive Summary_FAO_English
M and E Document	GEFID10184_MTR_FAO_Ecuador_Spanish