



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

### 2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



## 1. Basic Project Data

### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	Latin America and the Caribbean
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Brazil
<b>Project Title:</b>	Strengthening National Policy and Knowledge Frameworks in Support of Sustainable Management of Brazil's Forest Resources
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP/BRA/079/GFF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	3767
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Biodiversity - Climate Change BD-SP 4; CC-SP6
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	Brazilian Forest Service (BFS) of Ministry of Environment (MMA)
<b>Project Size (FSP/MSP):</b>	FSP
<b>Project Duration:</b>	5 years

### Milestone Dates:

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	03 November 2010
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	01 August 2011
<b>Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	31 July 2016
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) <sup>2</sup></b>	30 June 2019
<b>Actual Implementation End Date<sup>3</sup>:</b>	n/a

### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	USD 8,850,000
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>4</sup>:</b>	USD 56,670,000
<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):</b>	USD 8,794,021

<sup>1</sup> as per FPMIS

<sup>2</sup> In case of a project extension.

<sup>3</sup> Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

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

<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019<sup>5</sup></b>	USD 29,910,000
--	----------------

### Review and Evaluation

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:</b>	07 December 2018
<b>Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):</b>	December 2014
<b>Mid-term review/evaluation actual:</b>	30 June 2015
<b>Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	No
<b>Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	No
<b>Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:</b>	April-June 2019
<b>Tracking tools/ Core indicators required<sup>6</sup></b>	Yes

### Ratings

<b>Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):</b>	S	
<b>Overall implementation progress rating:</b>	MS	
<b>Overall risk rating:</b>	L	

### Status

<b>Implementation Status (1<sup>st</sup> PIR, 2<sup>nd</sup> PIR, etc. Final PIR):</b>	7 <sup>th</sup> and final PIR
--	-------------------------------

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

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

## Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Gustavo Pinho, Project Manager, FAO-Brazilian Forest Service	<a href="mailto:gustavo.pinho@florestal.gov.br">gustavo.pinho@florestal.gov.br</a>
	Claudia Maria Mello Rosa, Project Coordinator, Brazilian Forest Service	<a href="mailto:claudia.rosa@florestal.gov.br">claudia.rosa@florestal.gov.br</a>
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Anne Branthomme, Forestry Officer, Forest Policy and Resource Division (FOA)	<a href="mailto:Anne.Branthomme@fao.org">Anne.Branthomme@fao.org</a>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Rafael Zavala, FAO Representative in Brazil	<a href="mailto:rafael.zavala@fao.org">rafael.zavala@fao.org</a>
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Climate and Environment Division, CBC</b>	Valeria Gonzalez Riggio, Natural Resources Officer, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit (CBC)	<a href="mailto:valeria.gonzalezriggio@fao.org">valeria.gonzalezriggio@fao.org</a>

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Outcome 1:</b>  <b>Component 1:</b> <b>National framework for forest resource and land monitoring and assessment (including biodiversity and carbon in forests), analysis and strategic decision making is established and operating.</b>						
	1.1 All relevant agencies (national and sub-national) gather and share information in compatible format about forest resources	The information about forest resources is dispersed among relevant national and subnational agencies and not compatible	Institutional arrangements for gathering, sharing and using compatible information about forest resources in 15 States and with major relevant partner agencies	All 26 states and Federal District, and all relevant agencies are engaged in NFM&AS implementation, and have institutional arrangements for gathering, sharing and using compatible information about forest resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 23 states and Federal district and the relevant institutions are engaged in NFM&amp;AS</li> <li>• <b>18 Technical Cooperation Agreements (TCAs)</b> signed with Federal States in CE, PR, RJ, AM, BA, RO, RS, SE, PA (2), PE, PB, AL, TO, MS, AC, RR, SP and <b>3 Terms for Decentralized Execution (TED)</b></li> <li>• Operational Manual available and used</li> <li>• <b>6 meetings</b> of CGFLOP (National Advisory Commission)</li> <li>• <b>10 meetings</b> of the National forest Inventory (NFI) National Technical Committee. The Technical Commission is composed of a total of 10 members from 6 relevant national institutions (SFB, Embrapa, UFPR, INPE, UFPA and FAO) was created in November 2011</li> </ul>	<b>S</b>

<sup>7</sup> This should describe the quantitative and qualitative indicators as indicated in the current logframe of the project and in the tracking tools. Please use one cell for each indicator in order to have one rating for each indicator.

<sup>8</sup> Many projects did not identify mid-term targets at the design stage therefore this column should only be filled if relevant.

<sup>9</sup> Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)**, **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>7 Committees</b> created (botanical identification, soils, data processing, allometric equation, planted forests, forest inventory symposiums, mangrove collection), 11 meetings held (2 botanical identification, 1 soils, 1 data processing, 1 allometric equation, 2 planted forests, 2 symposium, 1 mangrove)</li> <li>• Merely <b>4 State Advisory Committees</b> (SC, CE, PR and PE) and 8 meetings</li> <li>• Methodologies and protocols for national forest monitoring agreed amongst relevant stakeholders</li> <li>• Internet Site (Extranet) being used by the partner institutions</li> </ul>	
	1.2 Forestry development is targeted more effectively towards forest areas of high value	There is lack of official and accurate information about forest areas of high value to drive strategic decisions about forestry development	Robust and unbiased analysis of data and information about forest areas of high values being generated in 10 states, and responding to information needs for strategic decision making	Forestry planning considering the official updated and accurate information about forest areas of high value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updated information in <b>12 states (RS, SC, PR, RJ, ES, SE, AL, PE, PB, RN, CE, RO)</b> as well as DF available. Info tables with detailed data available on the website for these 12 States and DF. The states in bold had all NFI activities (field data collection training, botanical identification, quality control, data processed and analysed, and the final report) funded by the project.</li> <li>• Updated information available for one Indigenous land (TI Mangueirinha/PR) and one municipality (Caçador/SC). BFS will make primary data available after corrections and validation.</li> </ul>	<b>S</b>

	1.3 Information produced by the NFM&AS is used in strategic decisions about zoning (ZEE), land-use planning and forest conversion	The existing information for ZEE, land-use planning and forest are based mostly on satellite images	Information produced from field data and satellite images interpretation from the NFM&AS being used to support the elaboration of ZEE, land-use planning and forest management in 2 states	Reliable information from the NFM&AS, based on field data integrated with satellite images is used in strategic decision about zoning (ZEE), land-use planning and forest management in 10 states and at the national level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of the NFM&amp;AS information for strategic decision in four states (Santa Catarina, Paraná, Ceará and Rio de Janeiro).</li> <li>• NFI methodology used by Instituto Chico Mendes de Conservação da Biodiversidade (ICMBio -Monitora) and BFS – Gerência de Monitoramento e Auditoria Florestal (GEMAF).</li> <li>• Data from NFI integrated in Reflora and SIBBR.</li> <li>• A series of specific direct and indirect applications of NFI methodologies and results.</li> </ul>	<b>MS</b>
	1.4 A nationally agreed standard for monitoring and estimating carbon stocks in forests is applied by states and municipalities	There is no nationally agreed standard for monitoring and estimating carbon stocks in forest	Field data and RS methodology defined to estimate and monitor carbon stocks in forest and being applied in 10 states	26 States, District Federal and 2 municipalities using the NFM&AS methodologies for estimating and monitoring carbon stocks in forests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field data collection protocols for monitoring and estimating carbon has been agreed amongst stakeholders and applied in 23 states, Federal District and 2 municipalities. <b>23</b> States (RS, SC, PR, RJ, ES, BA, SE, AL, PE, PB, RN, CE, MA, PI, PA, AM, AC, RO, RR, TO, MT, MS, GO) plus DF, one indigenous land (Indigenous Land (Mangueirinha TI, PR) and one municipality (Caçador/SC) actively involved, at different levels in carbon monitoring through the NFM&amp;AS</li> </ul>	<b>S</b>
<b>Outcome 2: Component 2:BFS and partners have the capacity to collect and analyze information about forest resources and</b>	2.1 Training in forest resource assessment and monitoring meets the needs of stakeholders	The stakeholders are not trained in the forest resource assessment and monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholders are satisfactorily trained in forest resources assessment and monitoring in 10 states, BFS and partner</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholders are satisfactorily trained in forest resources assessment and monitoring in 26 states and Federal District,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 training program on field data collection prepared</li> <li>• 1 training course on botanical identification in Amazon biome realized</li> <li>• In total <b>644</b> persons trained in NFM&amp;AS methodology, including: 516 on field inventory, 36 on</li> </ul>	<b>HS</b>

influence development policies more effectively			institutions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 200 technicians trained in field data collection and quality control</li> <li>• Capacity development of 10 partner institutions in 5 technical meetings</li> </ul>	BFS and partner institutions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 565 technicians in field data collection and quality control</li> <li>• Capacity development of 20 partner institution in 10 technical meetings</li> </ul>	quality control, 10 NFI instructors, 11 State technicians, 76 decision makers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 21 staff trained on data collection in planted forests.</li> <li>• 10 staff trained on data collection for allometry</li> <li>• 19 herbariums strengthened (UFSM, FURB, MBM Curitiba, JBRJ, UFES, CEPLAC/BA, UFS, MAC/IMA, IPA/PE, UFPB, UFRN, UFC, CPATU, INPA, UFAC, UNIR, UNEMAT, UnB, CENARGEN)</li> <li>• 25 botanists from 12 institutions institution, one BFS staff and two IBAMA staff.</li> <li>• NFM&amp;AS national coordinator participated in an international training workshop on allometric equations</li> <li>• 10 professionals from EMBRAPA and BFS trained in geospatial methods and tools in Brazil and in FAO-Rome</li> <li>• One meeting for elaboration of a research program. Allometry research carried out in Caatinga, Cerrado and Atlantic Rain forest10 professors and technicians from 12 institutions, 6 of which are Universities, trained on Quality Control</li> <li>• <b>108</b> Decision makers of 14 states (RS, PR, CE, RJ, SE, BA, RN, RO, ES, PA, MT, AL, PB, PE) trained</li> <li>• NFM&amp;AS national coordinator participating in an international workshop on allometric equations</li> <li>• 10 professionals from EMBRAPA</li> </ul>	
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

					and BFS trained in geospatial methods and tools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 meeting for elaboration of a research program</li> </ul>	
	2.2 Methodologies are continuously upgraded to place Brazil at the forefront of tropical forest resource assessment	There is no nationally agreed methodology for forest resource assessment. Stakeholders do not fully agree on methodology to evenly influence the forest policy	Tropical forest resource assessment methodology developed and continuously upgraded	Brazilian NFM&AS methodology is a state-of-the-art reference for tropical forest resource assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sampling design and methodology for field data collection elaborated through a consultative process with key national and international experts, and tested in all Brazilian biomes</li> <li>• Field Manuals including updated graphics developed or revised and being used in field data collections</li> <li>• Soil sampling protocols elaborated and inserted in the Field Data Collection Manual</li> <li>• Standard data collection protocol customized for mangrove environments</li> <li>• Methodology for planted forests tested and consolidated.</li> <li>• Manual for data processing produced.</li> <li>• Manual for quality assurance /quality control produced</li> <li>• Landscape analysis methodology developed manual for landscape analysis and a manual for quality control of landscape analysis developed.</li> <li>• Methodology for integration of field and landscape data at national and regional level defined</li> <li>• Allometric equations for Caatinga and Mata Atlântica biome finalized and ongoing in Cerrado through LoA with UFG</li> </ul>	<b>S</b>



	2.3 Stakeholders trained by the project use their skills to influence development policies	Stakeholders are not trained in forest resource assessment and monitoring	Stakeholders already trained start influencing the policies	Many stakeholders trained and influencing the forest policies' development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Though there is limited evidence at Federal level, there are significant breakthrough in some states (PR, RJ, SC, CE): Paraná is elaborating the forest policy based on the results of NFI assessment; in Rio de Janeiro 5 conservation units were created based in the results of the field collection; in Santa Catarina the investment for the second cycle was agreed by the State thanks to the positive results of the first cycle. Ceará is using NFI information to subsidize decisions of forest management, forest suppression and reposition.</li> <li>• The impact analysis study has not been scheduled yet.</li> <li>• The NFM&amp;AS is operational with repeated cycle in one state (SC).</li> <li>• NFI results fully used for the Global forest resources assessment 2020 (FRA 2020).</li> </ul>	MS
--	--	---	---	--	---	----

<p><b>Outcome 3:</b></p> <p><b>Component 3:</b> Information about forest resources and land use and cover is improved and widely used by clients at the national and local levels and for reporting to international fora</p>	<p>3.1 Stakeholders assess the information provided by the project as high quality, comprehensive and relevant</p>	<p>The existing information is dispersed, and needs to be evaluated and consolidated</p>	<p>Information about forest resources and land use and land cover is improved in 10 States and assessed of as high quality, comprehensive and relevant by stakeholders</p>	<p>The information about forest resources and land use produced by the project is improved in <u>all states</u> and at the national level, and assessed as of high quality, comprehensive and relevant by stakeholders</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15 reports with NFI results for RS, SC, PR, RJ, ES, SE, AL, PE, PB, RN, CE, RO, DF, IL Mangueirinha and Caçador Municipality.</li> <li>• Info tables with detailed data available on the website for <b>12 States</b> (RS, SC, PR, RJ, ES, SE, AL, PE, PB, RN, CE, RO), plus DF, TI Mangueirinha/PR and municipality of Caçador/SC</li> <li>• Field data collected and reports in preparation in 11 States (BA, PI, MA, PA, AM, RR, AC, MT, MS, GO, TO). NFI still pending in 3 States (SP, AP, MG)</li> <li>• NFM&amp;AS integrated into the national forest information system (SNIF)</li> <li>• Landscape analysis carried out in 395 Landscape sampling Units (UAPs) in (Mata Atlântica, Pampa and Caatinga) out of 5 000 planned UAPs.</li> <li>• Pilot assessment of planted forests in the State of PR carried out.</li> <li>• Vegetation maps developed in States with NFI. Map quality still to be assessed.</li> <li>• Planted forest map developed in Paraná State.</li> <li>• Online information system to store and process NFI data developed and operational. Most system users (herbariums, enterprises) have difficulties to operate the system.</li> <li>• 24 828 soil samples analyzed</li> <li>• Most of botanical samples have</li> </ul>	<p><b>MS</b></p>
---	--	--	--	--	---	------------------

					<p>been identified adequately and duly registered in online data bases</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information from NFM&amp;AS used by a multi-stakeholder working group to develop Guidelines for a new forest policy in Santa Catarina State and proposing detailed actions and to create 5 conservations areas in RJ.</li> <li>• NFI is a major information source for FRA 2020.</li> <li>• Results partially available for end users. Data access policy still under construction. Data sources are protected.</li> </ul>	
	3.2 Stakeholders (public and private sectors) use the information in the development of policies, projects and plans	The information about the forest sector is dispersed and need to be consolidated in order to be properly used in the development of policies, projects and plans	Information generated by the project is ready to be used in 10 states	Information from NFM&AS from the projects is used by stakeholders in the development of policies, projects and plans in 10 states, and ready to be used in the other states	Information from NFM&AS used by a multi-stakeholder working group to develop Guidelines for a new forest policy in Santa Catarina State and proposing detailed actions and to create 5 conservations areas in RJ	<b>MS</b>

	3.3 Reports to international fora using the information produced by the project	Information used in reports to international fora is incomplete, not harmonized and consistent nationally or outdated	Information produced by the NFM&AS is compatible with international reporting requirements	NFM&AS information produced by the project used in reports to international fora	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The information produced by the NFM&amp;AS is compatible with international reporting requirements. FRA 2020 prepared with NFI data.</li> <li>Negotiations started with South American countries in Amazônia Biome in and with Mesoamerica and Caribbean to harmonize the results of National Inventories.</li> </ul>	<b>S</b>
<b>Outcome 4:</b>  <b>Component 4:</b> <b>Biodiversity conservation, SFM and climate change adaptation/mitigation measures are mainstreamed into policies, plans and practices in relevant sectors at the national and sub-national levels</b>	4.1 Number of policies and plans in productive sectors that are changed to enhance biodiversity conservation and support SFM	Low number of policies and plans in productive sectors enhancing biodiversity conservation and support SFM	Some policies and plans in productive sectors have been changed to enhance biodiversity conservation and support SFM	Some policies and plans in productive sectors have been changed to enhance biodiversity conservation and support SFM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Awareness raising on NFM&amp;AS results and activities related to biodiversity conservation and support SFM to policy makers and planners done through national and international meetings (First, Second, national symposium, Third and Fourth international symposium on forest inventory held in 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2016 and participation in 3 international events)</li> <li>Guidelines for a new forest policy in Santa Catarina State proposing an action and publishing of NFM&amp;AS information on the Internet (website in operation and continuously updated)</li> <li>Guidelines for a new forest policy in Santa Catarina State proposing an action plan for forest conservation and support SFM developed based on NFM&amp;AS data and through a multi-stakeholder process</li> <li>Decisions about forest management, forest suppression and reposition in Ceará, based on</li> </ul>	<b>MS</b>

					<p>NFI results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed forest resources data in 1 Indigenous Land ready to use for local environmental conservation and sustainable economic development</li> <li>• The use of NFI for influencing or supporting public policy making is still to be demonstrated as the results were just released.</li> <li>• Detailed forest resources data in 1 Indigenous Land ready to use for local environmental conservation and sustainable economic development</li> <li>• Preliminary NMF&amp;AS results used in RJ to create five conservation units.</li> </ul>	
	4.2 Number of new policies and plans to adapt to and mitigate climate change in land-use activities	Low number of policies and plans to adapt to and mitigate climate change in land-use activities	Some policies and plans to adapt to and mitigate climate change in land-use activities	Some policies and plans to adapt to and mitigate climate change in land-use activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Awareness raising on NFM&amp;AS results and activities suitable for feeding policies and plans to adapt to and mitigate climate change in land-use activities to policy makers and planners (see above)</li> <li>• Socio-economic results from the NFM&amp;AS were used to promote the development of the program "Plantadores de Rios" for the conservation of water spring.</li> <li>• As the results were just released, the use of NFI for influencing or supporting public policy making cannot yet be demonstrated.</li> </ul>	<b>MS</b>

**Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating <sup>10</sup>**

---

<sup>10</sup> To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Action(s) to be taken</b>	<b>By whom?</b>	<b>By when?</b>
<i>1.3 Information produced by the NFM&amp;AS is used in strategic decisions about zoning (ZEE), land-use planning and forest conversion (MS)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results and good practices in use of NFM&amp;AS shall be disseminated at Federal level and channeled to the Federal States through the National Federation of State Environmental Agencies (OEMAS).</li> <li>• A strategy for the dissemination of the NFM&amp;AS data and their use in policy making processes should be elaborated and implemented</li> </ul>	<i>BFS, NFI National Commission and partners</i>	<i>Forthcoming 2-3 years</i>
<i>2.3 Stakeholders trained by the project use their skills to influence development policies (MS)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A strategy for the dissemination of the NFM&amp;AS data and their use in policy making processes should be elaborated and implemented</li> <li>• An impact analysis study and tracking tools should be developed to assess the level of use of NFM&amp;AS data into public policies</li> </ul>	<i>BFS and MAPA</i>	<i>Forthcoming 2-3 years</i>
<i>3.1 Stakeholders assess the information provided by the project as high quality, comprehensive and relevant (MS)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Efforts should be deployed to speed up data analysis as well as results reporting and dissemination</li> <li>• Finalize data collection in the three remaining states.</li> <li>• Analysis and monitoring of impact and use of the information generated need implemented</li> <li>• Increase staff working on data processing and analysis or /and improve data analysis tools to automatize more the data processing and analysis process</li> </ul>	<i>BFS, NFI national commission</i>	<i>Forthcoming 2-3 years</i>
<i>3.2 Stakeholders (public and private sectors) use the information in the development of policies, projects and plans (MS)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The data of NFM&amp;AS to be further disseminated, enabling stakeholders (public and private sectors) to use the information in the development of policies, projects and plans. A monitoring system to track NFM&amp;AS data /information use needs also to be established</li> <li>• Speed up the communication of the results and</li> </ul>	<i>BFS, NFI National Commission</i>	<i>Forthcoming 2-3 years</i>

	<i>elaborate a communication strategy tailored to main potential users so to enhance data access and use</i>		
4.1 Number of policies and plans in productive sectors that are changed to enhance biodiversity conservation and support SFM (MS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Efforts should be deployed to speed up data analysis as well as results reporting and dissemination</i></li> <li>• <i>An impact analysis study and tracking tools should be developed to assess the level of use of NFM&amp;AS data into public policies</i></li> </ul>	<i>BFS, PMU, NFI National Commission and partners</i>	<i>Forthcoming 2-3 years</i>
4.2 Number of new policies and plans to adapt to and mitigate climate change in land-use activities (MS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Efforts should be deployed to speed up data analysis as well as results reporting and dissemination</i></li> <li>• <i>An impact analysis study and tracking tools should be developed to assess the level of use of NFM&amp;AS data into public policies</i></li> </ul>	<i>BFS, NFI National Commission</i>	<i>Forthcoming 2-3 years</i>



Outputs	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR		
Component 1: National framework for forest resource monitoring, assessment and strategic decision making									
Output 1.1 Institutional Partnerships established to assure forest monitoring	June 2019			85%	- Project and partners working together - 8 Agreements established - 13 draft TCAs prepared and under negotiation	- Project and partners working together - 13 Agreements established - 9 draft TCAs prepared and under negotiation	- Project and partners working together - 16 Agreements established - 8 draft TCAs prepared and under negotiation - 3 Decentralized Execution Terms signed.	87%	
Output 1.2 Programme Consultative Framework established and technical support and advise to BFS provided	June 2019			40% - The Technical Commission is active, as well as Thematic Committee. The other commissions depend on a major articulation by BFS and proactive attitude from state and municipal	The Technical Commission is active (8 meetings held), as well as the 6 Thematic Committees (10 meetings held). • 1 meeting (3 <sup>rd</sup> ) of the National Consultative Committee • Mangrove thematic committee (7 <sup>th</sup> ) created, 10 meetings • PE State commission created (4 meetings until June) • Support of experts in 2	• 2 meetings ( 4 <sup>th</sup> and 5 <sup>th</sup> ) of the National Consultative Committee	85% • 6 meetings of the Public Forests Management Commission (CGFLOP) acting as the National Consultative Commission; • Technical Commission created and guiding the actions of NFI had 9 meetings; • 7 Committees created (botanical identification, soils, data processing, allometric equation, planted forests, symposium, mangrove collection) totaling 12	The other commissions depend on a major articulation by BFS and proactive attitude from state and municipal partners. Regional commissions were not created, but in the Technical Cooperation Agreements between BFS and the states there is a compromise of the states to create the State Consultative Committee and to take	

<sup>11</sup> As per latest workplan (latest project revision)

Outputs	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR	7 <sup>th</sup> PIR	
				partners		meetings		meetings; Commissions established in CE, SC and PE and undertaking actions for the NFI, 8 meetings	measures to reach the formation of the Regional Committee
<b>Output 1.3</b> State or municipal adhesions negotiated and established	June 2019			<b>75%</b> - The adhesions in the states and municipalities covered by GEF funding have been accomplished satisfactorily. However, the adhesions at national level depend also on other projects (co-financing through Amazon funds and FIP). Amazon Fund project has just begun, but FIP Project still needs to solve some issues to start its implementation.	The adhesions in the states and municipalities covered by GEF funding have been accomplished satisfactorily.	23 States and District Federal aware of NFM&AS, 29 meetings • Institutions in 20 States assisted 21 States inserted in NFM&AS 19 TCAs and covenants signed, 7 in negotiation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 States aware of NFM&amp;AS,</li> <li>• 6 meetings</li> <li>• Institutions in</li> <li>• 25 States and FD inserted in NFM&amp;AS</li> <li>• 1 TCAs signed, 10 in negotiation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 85%</li> <li>• 26 States (RS, SC, PR, SP, RJ, ES, MG, BA, SE, AL, PE, PB, RN, CE, PI, MA, AM, PA, AP, RO, AC, RR, TO, MT, MS, GO) and DF aware of NFI;</li> <li>• Institutions of 20 States (RS, SC, PR, RJ, ES, BA, SE, AL, PE, PB, RN, CE, AM, PA, RO, AC, MT, MS, TO, GO) and DF assisted</li> <li>• 26 States (RS, SC, PR, SP, RJ, ES, MG, BA, SE, AL, PE, PB, RN, CE, PI, MA, AM, PA, AP, RO, AC, RR, TO, MT, MS, GO) and DF inserted in NFI</li> <li>• 18 TCAs elaborated, and two amendments, and 9+ TCAs under negotiation. 1 covenant with CE, 1 covenant with SC and 1 contract with DF</li> <li>• States and municipalities</li> </ul>	However, the adhesions at national level depend also on other projects (co-financed through Amazon fund and FIP). Amazon Fund project is ongoing since late 2015, but FIP Project started only in early 2016.

Outputs	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR	7 <sup>th</sup> PIR	
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>participating in the NFI</li> <li>In the celebration of the TCAs, guidelines are defined for the participation of states and municipalities</li> <li>40 Contracts implemented satisfactorily in 22 States: RS(3 contracts), PR(3), RJ(3), ES, BA(3), SE, AL, PE, PB, RN, CE, PI, MA(3), PA, AM, RR, RO, AC, TO(2), GO(3), MT(3), MS(2), plus Caçador municipality and Indigenous Land of Mangueirinha</li> </ul>	
<b>Component 2: Capacity building for the management of the NFM&amp;AS</b>									
<b>Output 2.1</b> Technical support and NFM&AS management established and operating	Apr. 2017			50% - The methodology and manuals development for the landscape analysis are behind schedule, but preliminary results were delivered. Data processing manual is being	Specific methodology for field data collection in mangrove developed. ToRs for contracting allometric measurements in Cerrado and Mata Atlântica launched. Data processing	Field manual for planted forest finalized ToRs for landscape analysis launched Workshop held on automatic generation of landscape indexes NFM&AS extranet	Partnership agreements for botanical identification of Cerrado species 2 thematic reports for SC and SE  Manual for landscape analysis and Quality Control (QC) finalized and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>100%</li> <li>Secretariat operating and managing the project</li> <li>Creation of the Executive Management of the National Forest Inventory (GEIFN) within the structure of the BFS</li> <li>PMU of NFI established</li> <li>Equipment of Forest Inventory procured</li> <li>Field Manuals are used for data collection</li> <li>Manuals for Field data</li> </ul>	Planted forest activities are behind schedule, the methodology was elaborated, but the procurement process was delayed

Outputs	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR		
				improved as the data processing advances. Planted forest activities are behind schedule, but the methodology is being consolidated. The support of botanical collections is in track	manual is being improved as the data processing advances. The support of botanical collections is on track.	operational	being used. Planted forest methodology consolidated  Methodology of planted forest consolidated.	collection, soil collection, botanical collection and socio-environment protocols updated and used for data collection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field Manual with updated illustrations</li> <li>• Methodology for planted forest defined.</li> <li>• Information collected in accordance with the defined methodology</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> version of the manual for data processing elaborated</li> <li>• Results of Paraná landscape analyses available</li> <li>• FAO training Workshop, in Colombo-PR, with 10 participants (BFS and Embrapa) on the development of landscape analysis tools held</li> <li>• JRC training workshop, in Ispra and technical discussions with FAO in Rome, including 5 participants from BFS and Embrapa, on the development of landscape analysis tools held</li> </ul>	

Outputs	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR	7 <sup>th</sup> PIR	
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manual on landscape analysis elaborated and applied</li> <li>• Manual for landscape analysis quality control developed.</li> <li>• Manual on quality control of landscape analysis being used</li> <li>• 19 herbaria strengthened in: RS, SC, PR, RJ, ES, BA, SE, AL, PE, PB, RN, CE, PA, AM, AC, RO, MT and DF (2) including the acquisition of laboratory materials, equipment and consultants</li> <li>• Partnerships established for botanical identification of species from RS, SC, PR, RJ, SP, MG, ES, BA, SE, AL, PB, PE, RN, CE, PI, MA, RO, PA, AM, RR, AC, MT, MS, TO, GO, DF (26)</li> <li>• Innovator mechanism and tools to improve trees developed and technicians capacity to apply this methodology</li> </ul>	

Outputs	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR	7 <sup>th</sup> PIR	
								built <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Glossary developed and applied as a reference for harmonization of terminology and definitions on forest resources (land cover, land use classification and quality of forest systems)</li> <li>• Internet Site (Extranet) developed and being used by the partner institutions</li> <li>• National forest monitoring system applied in 23 states as well in DF in indigenous lands and in one municipality</li> <li>• 15 thematic reports with NFI findings at elaborated (RS, SC, PR, RJ, ES, SE,AL, PE, PB, RN, CE, RO, DF, Caçador and IL Mangueirinha)</li> </ul>	

Outputs	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR		
<b>Output 2.2</b> Capacity building for data collection, processing and analysis assured	June. 2017			45% - Progress in capacity building for data collections at national level (GEF funding plus co-financing) has advanced with the inception of Amazon Fund Project. Nevertheless, it still depends on FIP project to gain scale, where some delay have been recorded	Progress in capacity building for data collections at national level (GEF funding plus co-financing) has advanced with the inception of Amazon Fund Project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 training courses on field data collection, 1 on mangroves</li> <li>• 2 bidding processes launched for allometric equations in Mata Atlântica and Cerrado, both failed</li> <li>• 4 websites of biome networks on line and operational</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 training courses on field data collection (2 for Cerrado and 2 for Amazônia) 79 technicians trained</li> <li>• Letter of Agreement for allometric equation in Cerrado signed and partly executed (tree mass not included because the environmental authorities did not approve the request to cut sample trees in the selected PA)</li> </ul>	<b>100%</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training Program implemented satisfactorily Teams implementing data collection in accordance to methodology</li> <li>• 10 teachers from 6 Universities of UESB, UFERSA, UFS, UFCG, UFRN e UFRPE, trained to perform quality control activities (2012)</li> <li>• 25 botanists, from twelve institutions, one technician from BFS and two from IBAMA trained in NFI methodology for field data collection. (2013)</li> <li>• 516 technicians trained in: 479 of PR (first, second and third phase), RS (first, second and third phase), CE, RJ, SE, RN, BA (first, second and third phase), RO, MT (first and second phase), PA (first phase), Caçador County, mangrove in RJ, AL, PB, PE, MA, TO, PI, RR, GO, MS, AM, AC and 37 in DF</li> </ul>	

Outputs	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR	7 <sup>th</sup> PIR	
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12 technicians trained to be instructors in NFI training courses</li> <li>• 15 technicians from BFS and 4 consultants of FIP/Project trained to carry out quality control</li> <li>• 11 technicians (5 of ICMBio and 6 of IFT) trained on NFI Methodology to carry out field data collection in National Forests of Bom Futuro/RO and Jatuarana/AM</li> <li>• 6 technicians of Saltus company trained to insert the field data in the NFI data management System</li> <li>• 10 technicians trained to carry out field data collection in planted forest</li> <li>• In total 644 technicians trained in NFI methodology (field data collection)</li> <li>• Institutions and collaborators collecting reliable data and quality</li> <li>• 26 meetings for strengthening and capacity building of</li> </ul>	



Outputs	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR	7 <sup>th</sup> PIR	
								partner institutions and collaborators of NFI held (RS, SC, PR, SP, MG, RJ, ES, BA, SE, AL, PE, PB, RN, CE, PI, MA, AP, PA, AM, RO, AC, RR, MT, MS, TO, GO) and DF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 108 Decision makers/stakeholders from 14 States participated in NFI training (RS, PR, CE, RJ, SE, BA, RN, RO, ES, PA, MT, AL, PB, PE)</li> <li>• 15 institutions with technicians able to carry out NFI quality control (RS, SC, PR, RJ, ES, BA, SE, AL, PE, PB, RN, CE, PA, RO, MT)</li> <li>• The research program was set mostly for allometric equation and including the support to post graduation of universities to develop research in themes related to NFI</li> <li>• New allometric equations developed in SC, for Mata Atlântica and Caatinga biomes</li> </ul>	

Outputs	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR	7 <sup>th</sup> PIR	
								(in collaboration with APNE) and field data collected for development of allometric equations for Cerrado biome in partnership with Fundação de Apoio à Pesquisa (FUNAPE), Fundação de Apoio para a Pesquisa, Ensino e Extensão (FINATEC), UnB and UFG • Participation of research projects in technical workshop for NFI methodological development (2013) • 8 meetings of Permanent Plots(PP) networks held: 4 for Caatinga PP network, 4 for Redeflor and 1 for Cerrado and Pantanal PP networks and reports produced • 4 websites with information of each Permanent Plots network developed and maintained (Rede CERPAN, RedeMAP)	
<b>Component 3: Baseline and monitoring and information system establishment</b>									

Outputs	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR	7 <sup>th</sup> PIR	
<b>Output 3.1</b> Data collection under execution	Dec. 2017			45% - Data collections in states receiving GEF support is in track. Amazon Fund project begun its field data collection activities, while FIP Project has not yet begun.	Data collection in states receiving GEF support is in track.	Field data collection is nearly completed in GEF funded states of Caatinga and Mata Atlântica, work in Amazon and Cerrado states is proceeding more slowly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field data collection funded by GEF reached its proposal to initiate the field data collection and subsidize the upcoming collections in Cerrado and Amazônia Biomes. In Cerrado and Amazônia is being implemented (FIP and Amazon Fund, respectively)</li> <li>Landscape analysis being implemented for Pampa, Mata Atlântica and Caatinga.</li> <li>Quality control missions carried out for Cerrado</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>46 %</li> <li>Secondary and auxiliary information being used for preparation of data collection planning, including operational field maps</li> <li>Maps for NFI planning elaborated and National forest information system (SNIF) consolidated</li> <li>29 Data collection plans for 26 states (RS, SC, PR, SP, MG, RJ, ES, BA, SE, AL, PE, PB, RN, CE, PI, MA, PA, AP, RR, AM, AC, RO, MT, MS, GO, TO, MG), DF as well as for mangroves of RJ, Caçador Municipality and Indigenous land of Manguelirinha prepared</li> <li>34 Terms of Reference (ToRs) to hire enterprises to carry out field data collection in PR (3) , RS (3), BA (3), RN, ES, RJ (2), CE, SE, RO, PA(2), AM (2), MT, AC, RR, PI, MS, GO, TO, MA, PB, PE, AL, Caçador County, TI</li> </ul>	Amazon Fund project begun its field data collection activities in second half of 2015 only, while FIP Project has begun in late 2016. The implementation of the landscape analysis in samples of three biomes (Pampa, Mata Atlântica and Caatinga) is in progress and will be completed during the second semester, 2018

Outputs	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR	7 <sup>th</sup> PIR	
								Mangueirinha, and Mangroves of RJ developed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 ToRs to implement field data collection in planted forests in Paraná</li> <li>• 1 ToRs to hire enterprise to interpret images for landscape analysis</li> <li>• 2 ToRs elaborated for quality control of field data collection in PR e RS</li> <li>• Field data collected in accordance with planning in 23 states (RS, SC, PR, RJ, ES, BA, SE, AL, PE, PB, RN, CE, PI, MA, PA, RO, AM, AC, RR, MT, MS, GO, TO) and DF: data collected in 10,105 cluster plots, representing <b>417 million ha</b></li> <li>• 50 contracts and one agreement for field data collection signed in 24 states, including 2 contracts at local level (one municipality and one indigenous land): DF, SC (agreement), RS (3), PR (3), RJ (2), ES, BA (3), SE, AL, PB, PE, RN, CE, PA, RO, MT(3), Caçador County, TI Mangueirinha,</li> </ul>	

Outputs	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR	7 <sup>th</sup> PIR	
								mangroves in RJ, RR, MA (2), TO (2), PI , AC, AM, MS(2), GO(3) • 15 Reports with final results and findings • 8 field equipment kits purchased for field teams • Field data collection in planted forests in Paraná carried out • Maps of planted forests in Paraná developed • Methodology for data collection in planted forest elaborated and consolidated • Satellite images acquired • Licenses of software ArcGIS, ENVI and E-cognition updated • Landscape analysis carried out in PR and DF • 395 Landscape Units located in Mata Atlântica, Pampa and Caatinga analyzed. ( the FIP Project and Amazon Fund Project will hire enterprises for the landscape analyses, respectively in Cerrado and Amazônia) • Coordination and implementation of NFI quality control as planned:	

Outputs	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR	7 <sup>th</sup> PIR	
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 24 QC reports of PR1, RS1, CE, SE, RN, BA1, ES, AL, PA, Caçador, RJ2, BA2, PE, PI, TO1, TO2, MA1, MA2, GO1, GO2, GO3, MT2, MS2, IL Manguinhos elaborated; 15 Initial quality evaluation report of RJ, CE, SE, RN, BA, RO, ES, MT, RS2, RS3, PR2, AL prepared</li> <li>• Data collected with quality in 23 states: RS, SC, PR, RJ, ES, BA, SE, AL, PB, PE, RN, CE, PI, MA, PA, AM, AC, RR, RO, MT, TO, GO, MS, plus DF, Caçador and IL Manguinhos</li> <li>• 4 reports of certification of products of Landscape analysis contract</li> <li>• Landscape analysis executed with quality and available</li> </ul>	
<b>Output 3.2</b> Vegetation mapping carried out and available	June 2019			Vegetation mapping work is being conducted in parallel with field collections. The implementation of co-financing projects will	Vegetation mapping work is being conducted in parallel with field collections. The implementation of co-financing	GEO consultant supporting the definition of spatial strata	The methodology to diagnose the landscape units is being implemented	85% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vegetation map of Probio evaluated with field data by providing geodatabase to the enterprises that executed field data collection</li> <li>• Maps from DF, SC, SE, CE, PR, RS, RN, RJ, ES,</li> </ul>	The integration of field and landscape data collected for national and regional objectives is still waiting for the results of the landscape study methodology to be ready

Outputs	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR	7 <sup>th</sup> PIR	
				improve this mapping.	projects will improve this mapping.			AL, PE, PB, RO, IL Manguerinha and Caçador elaborated <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NFI using the information of vegetation mapping available in the country</li> <li>• Methodology and procedures for integrating field data and landscape for national and regional application under development.</li> <li>• The results from the landscape analysis will give the necessary inputs for this activity</li> </ul>	

Outputs	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR		
<b>Output 3.3</b> Data processing and analysis carried out and information available	Dec. 2017			35% - Soil analysis is behind schedule, whereas botanical identification is progressing well. Data processing was defined by BFS and is being executed for the states, which have the field data collection completed.	Botanical identification is progressing well. Data processing was defined by BFS and is being executed for the states, which have the field data collection completed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biophysical and socio-environmental data of 3 states (PB, AL, ES) uploaded (15 states in total in the database)</li> <li>• 1,502 new socio-environmental interviews</li> <li>• Soil fertility analysis in 2 new states (PB, AL)</li> <li>• Botanical identification advances as field data collection is carried out</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biophysical and socio-environment data of Cerrado states uploaded in the NFI System</li> <li>• Organization of data bank and definition of the terms for the migration for the NFI system</li> <li>• 5,046 new socio-environment interviews and analysis completed in PR, RS, SC, RJ, ES, AL, RN.</li> <li>• Soil being analysed under GEF funded surveys (2,942 soil samples) and for Cerrado (3,530)</li> <li>• Botanical identification for PE, PB, AL, and Cerrado, with approximately</li> </ul>	<b>65%</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NFI information system developed</li> <li>• Recommendations of the integration of the NFI information system and SNIF elaborated</li> <li>• Linkage of NFI Information system to SNIF under development</li> <li>• Data migrated from present NFI DB to NFI Information System</li> <li>• Biophysical and socio-environmental data of <b>23</b> states: RS, SC, PR, RJ, ES, BA, SE, AL, PE, PB, RN, CE, PI, MA, PA, AM, RO, RR, AC, MT, MS, TO, GO, plus DF, Caçador and IL Manguueirinha, processed and stored in the NFI information system</li> <li>• <b>27,590</b> socio-environmental interviews carried out, <b>105,758</b> botanical samples collected and <b>26,869</b> soil samples collected</li> <li>• NFI data processed and analyzed</li> <li>• Restructuration of NFI databases of NFI for PR, RS, RO, BA and MT</li> </ul>	The organization, processing and analysis of data is a priority for NFI so it can finalize the states' field collection funded by the project. With this, it is expected to leave guidelines and procedures for the entire NFI.



Outputs	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR	7 <sup>th</sup> PIR	
							8,000 samples identified.	states <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Socio-environmental Survey analysis of PE, PB and RO</li> <li>• Online data entry system developed</li> <li>• Mobile data collection application under development with delay</li> <li>• Protocols for soil survey and analysis of soil samples of SC and DF developed</li> <li>• Protocols and procedures established, tested and integrated in Field Data Collection Manual and applied by all field teams</li> <li>• 1 ToRs to contract laboratory for soils analysis developed</li> <li>• <b>At total 24828 soil samples were analyzed</b></li> <li>• Soil samples of SC analyzed by soil laboratory , with 447 of fertility and 400 of density, summing 847 soil analysis;</li> <li>• Contract for analysis of 10,000 soil samples concluded. Analysis for RS, SC, PR, RJ, ES, BA, SE, AL, PB, RN, CE, DF, PR, IL</li> </ul>	

Outputs	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR	7 <sup>th</sup> PIR	
								<p>Mangueirinha and Caçador executed, <b>4747</b> analysis for fertility and <b>4100</b> for density, summing <b>8847</b>;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NFI soil analysis for Biome Cerrado under FIP Project being implemented, with analyses of <b>4080</b> samples of fertility and <b>4059</b> of density, summing <b>8139</b> of the states of MA, PI, TO and BA;</li> <li>• Collaboration with Embrapa CPATU for the soil analyses for Amazon Biome, with the analysis of <b>3575</b> samples of fertility and <b>3420</b> of density, summing <b>6995</b>;</li> <li>• Complementary collection of soil samples in DF carried out</li> <li>• Data being processed in accordance with defined procedures and protocols.</li> <li>• Statistical analysis to be carried out in the NFI defined</li> <li>• The consolidated primary data available in the NFI website through Tableau panels for RS, SC, PR,</li> </ul>	

Outputs	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR	7 <sup>th</sup> PIR	
								RJ, ES, SE, AL, PE, PB, RN, CE, RO, DF, as well as Indigenous Land of Mangueirinha and Caçador <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All NFI consolidated data will be made available in second semester of 2019 in the NFI website for free, so everyone can access the data and made their own analyses</li> <li>• Policy makers and stakeholders accessing NFI results through NFI website</li> <li>• Results of IFN-SC being used by the State Government in guidelines for forest policy</li> <li>• Results of RS, SC, PR, RJ, ES, SE, AL, PE, PB, RN, CE, RO, DF, as well as Indigenous Land of Mangueirinha and Caçador accessible through the NFI website</li> <li>• The results of other states will be available as soon as they are validated</li> <li>• Tree Species of 23 states (RS, SC, PR, RJ, ES, BA, SE, AL, PE, PB, RN, CE, PI, MA, PA, RR, AM,</li> </ul>	

Outputs	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR	7 <sup>th</sup> PIR	
								AC, RO, TO, MT, MS, GO) and DF, as well as Caçador municipality and IL Manguairinha botanically identified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At total <b>92</b> consultants were hired to support the botanical identification in 19 herbaria throughout the project</li> <li>• Under FIP Project, in the period covered by this report two technicians gave support for the identification of samples of Cerrado. At total 12 consultants were hired</li> <li>• Equipment and material to support the botanical identification acquired and installed to strengthen herbarium</li> <li>• <b>91,021</b> botanical samples collected and <b>72,816</b> samples exsiccates identified (identification includes family, gender and species levels)</li> <li>• Reports on the analysis of the states of forest resources in RS, SC, PR, RJ, ES, SE, AL, PE, PB, RN, CE, RO, DF, Caçador and IL Manguairinha developed</li> </ul>	

Outputs	Expected completion date <sup>11</sup>	Achievements at each PIR						Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR		
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The results of other states will be available as soon as they are finalized and validated</li> </ul>	
<b>Component 4: Policies to enhance the contribution of SFM to national development and global environmental benefits</b>									
<b>Output 4:</b>  Reliable, accurate and updated information for Policies to contribute to SFM and enhanced carbon stock and biodiversity conservation improved	Dec. 2017			15% - Delay in the start up of the national network within the National Effectiveness Technical Committee	Website operational, NFM&AS information available on the Internet, Results of the actions developed in the states available in the NFM&AS website. Report on NFM&AS-SC and NFM&AS-DF. - 2.000 folders, 10 banners, 1.000 pens, 500 pads of paper produced and disseminated in the 3 Forest Inventory symposiums.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fourth Forest Inventory National Symposium held.</li> <li>Two mobile stands of NFM&amp;AS to give support in dissemination of NFM&amp;AS results</li> <li>According to Google Analytics, from January to May 2017, the many pages of the subjects under NFM&amp;AS theme had 1,968 accesses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dissemination of NFI in 68<sup>th</sup> Botanic National Congress, in a Workshop in CATIE, VII Latin America Forest Congress and other events.</li> <li>Meetings to discuss technical results for NFI in Rio Grande do Norte and Indigenous Land of Mangueirinha</li> <li>According to Google Analytics, from January to June 2018, the many pages of the subjects under NFM&amp;AS theme had 29,922 accesses</li> </ul>	55% Once the first NFI results will be published and available, their use will be monitored.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The need to set up a National Effectiveness Technical Committee is being questioned. It will depend on the impact study to be worked out after a number of state and thematic reports will be published (delivery pace is very slow).</li> <li>Not all studies on impact analysis on public policies will be performed under the GEF project as foreseen in ProDoc. Nevertheless, the results provided by the project will subsidise the referred studies in another time.</li> </ul>

## Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

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

Max 200 words:

The institutional component has achieved its main goal by creating an institutional framework for the monitoring of forest resources through the NFM&AS. Thus, there are a few exceptions and weaknesses, such as the delay in the implementation of the effectiveness committee. The second project component focusing on strengthening scientific and technical capacity at national and local level has also been successful. The project has substantially enhanced skills on data collection, processing and analysis as well as in developing standard methods and tools applicable at the national level and also adaptable to fit subnational and local data needs, as piloted in the Indigenous lands of Mangueirinha and Caçador Municipality. The largest effort ever undertaken in Brazil to collect field data on forest and trees, including on their biophysical and socio-economic dimensions, has been largely successful with 385 million ha of Brazilian territory covered (73%). While GEF funding was used to cover in particular data collection in Mata Atlântica and Caatinga biomes, the biomes to be surveyed with co-financing (Amazon and Cerrado biomes) have stayed behind due to administrative and legal constraints. Reports were produced for 13 states. Overall delays in data analysis, finalizing the reports and publishing the results is the main reason behind the rather limited evidence of decision making based on NFI information, which is the main environmental and sustainable development objective of the project. Despite of this, data starts to be embedded in a few state-level policies aiming at forest resources conservation and their sustainable use.

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

Max 200 words:

The difficulties to use the co-funding resources via the BNDES project in Amazonia (Amazon funds) and the FIP one in Cerrado biomes caused serious delays in data collection in those biomes. Since the overall objective of the project is nation-wide, the weak performance of the co- financing delivery in those biomes has negatively influenced the overall success of the project.

In addition, due to lack of systematic organization and management of field data at the beginning, the homogeneity of the whole dataset was compromised, making it necessary to meticulously control their quality and restructure the full database prior to data processing and analysis.

Another issue has been the outstanding discontinuity in management of the national executing partner BFS at the change of federal government, already announced in late November 2018 after the result of the electoral process. The institution was born in 2006 under the Ministry of Environment, but in January 2019, it has been transferred to the Ministry of Agriculture. However, it seems that the department of forest information has been preserved in personnel and duties, which should allow for continuation, strengthening and valorization of the NFI activities and results.

## 2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

### Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating <sup>12</sup>	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating <sup>13</sup>	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	The evaluation of the project must be done carefully, between what was proposed to execute in this PRODOC and what is the execution of the entire NFI. It is not responsible for the implementation of the entire NFI, thus some indicators and results proposed must have a different evaluation. The project worked as a booster of initiatives and contributed notably to test and improve procedures and NFI methodology. In the states where the project budget was used to cover all the activities involved (field collection, training, quality control, botanical identification, soil analysis and compilation and dissemination of final results), to be known, RS, PR, RJ, ES, AL, PE, PB and RN, plus IL Mangueirinha and Caçador Municipality, the project fulfilled its purpose. Considering that it represents 30% of all states, and the project resources represents 23% of all budget in BFS governance to execute NFI, it can be assumed that the project achieved the outputs foreseen and for this reason can be considered successful.

<sup>12</sup> **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet.

Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>13</sup> **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	The efforts to recover the delay in data elaboration and publication of results have been noteworthy and effective to disseminate the large corpus of information in the multifaceted dimensions of biodiversity, carbon stocks and socio-economic perceptions. However, there has been time enough to record the impact of such information on qualified decision-making at federal and local levels.
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>14</sup></b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	Despite of delays in its implementation the project is concluding with major achievements and unprecedented quality data on forest and trees covering most of the country (73%). Those data and findings have started to be integrated in state-level policy making processes as well as in international reporting and constitute a solid basis for developing sound evidence-based policies, support researches on forest and tree resources status, and land uses. The project was formulated including expected delivery of huge co-financing and the delay in mobilizing and implementing the counterpart projects made it impossible to deliver fully on all expected outcomes. GEF contribution has been very catalytic in mobilizing additional resources and in developing capacities, methods and tools, getting buy-in from all States and involving partners. Efforts still need to be deployed to finalize all reports and data analysis and ensure their wide dissemination, easy access as well as correct use of the data, targeting different audiences, in particular to policy makers at national state and local level. Finalizing data collection as well as producing national and biome level analysis and reports on finding should also be a priority. In addition, the wealth of information produced should be made available to stakeholders including research and universities, to support in-depth analysis on different thematic areas and their valorisation.
<b>CBC-GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>MS</b>	Agree with the LTO. Good project achievements in longer-than-expected implementation period.

---

<sup>14</sup> The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.



### 3. Risks

**Environmental and Social Safeguards** (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid <sup>15</sup> . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
L	Still valid

Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.

#### Risk ratings

RISK TABLE					
The following table summarizes risks identified in the <b>Project Document</b> and reflects also <b>any new risks</b> identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, <b>as relevant</b> .					
	Risk	Risk rating <sup>16</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>17</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force

<sup>15</sup> **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

<sup>16</sup> GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

<sup>17</sup> If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>16</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>17</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	<u>Lack of Close Inter-institutional Project Coordination</u> - Close and collaborative cooperation between BFS state/municipal administrations and research institutions will be essential for the project to achieve its stated objectives (over the 5 year life of project) and goal (over the medium to long-term)	L			
2	<u>Lack of management capacity at the national execution agency</u> A suitable team of skilled personnel at BFS is necessary to execute the work plan with efficiency and good quality standards	M	Since most personnel working for the NFM&AS has been hired under the GEF-FAO project, after its closure the risk of weakening of qualified HR must be addressed immediately through all available mechanisms (secondment, relocation from other departments within the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (MAPA), fellowships etc.)	To be seen	
3	<u>Difficulty to complete project activities by NTE.</u> Whereas the data publication of all field surveys compiled in a report may override the time foreseen (December, 2018), hence avoiding the eventual goal of enhanced decision making at several states and at possibly the national level	H	Consolidate political support within the new institutional ministry in charge of the NFM&AS (MAPA); negotiate additional resources or extended timeframe in flanking co-financing projects	An advanced negotiation with CIF, PIF and IDB is focussing on the use of the 9,4000,000 USD of the unopenable balance to design and operate a new project where FAO will be the executing agency	
EXTERNAL RISKS – PROJECT CONTEXT					

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>16</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>17</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
4	Biodiversity: Access restriction into state protected areas and Indian lands	L			
5	<u>Social and institutional- Sustained political and public commitment</u> The high co-financing and the complex inter-institutional framework postulated as enabling environment of the full achievement of project objectives and goals imply high political willingness and awareness within the federal government in general and at the Ministries directly affecting forest information (Environment, S&T, Planning) in particular	M	The new leadership of BFS is taking steps to escalate the highest levels of the Ministry of Agriculture aiming at demonstrating the importance of NFI and NFM&AS in the overall framework of governmental priorities.	<b>Starting now</b>	
6	<u>Social and institutional- Scientific/technical partners (EMBRAPA, IBGE, Universities) unable or unwilling to collaborate to produce project outputs</u> S&T cooperation with domestic public R&T entities with expertise in the forest information domain is crucial for the success of project work program	L			
7	<u>Social and institutional- Information quality:</u> stakeholders do not participate actively in the Technical Commission (TC), many sample points cannot be accessed or the quality of the collected data is low	L			

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>16</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>17</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
8	<u>Social and institutional</u> - Stakeholders do not participate actively in the consultative committees	M	Put efforts in client tailored communication campaigns aimed at showing the importance strengthening institutional and social participation in NFM&AS and NFI	In progress	

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
L	L	The legal obligation of the National Forest Inventory (NFI) is a very strong argument in favour of continuing efforts, and the signals from the new overarching Ministry (MAPA) in its favour is encouraging. However, financial restrictions and budget contingency, as well as the loss of skilled human resources after the GEF project ends could negatively affect the maintenance and further development of the capacities and NFI programme.

## 4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months<sup>18</sup>

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	NO	
Project Outputs	NO	However, some activities were changed as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mapping of planted forest methodology developed to complement the field data collection. Added as additional specific data is required in this type of forest (added activity 3.1.8)</li> </ul>

### Adjustments to Project Time Frame

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

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	Original NTE: 30 June 2016. Revised NTE: 30 June 2019  Justification: The delay in operationalizing the co-financing projects has led the project Management Unit to request the Steering Committee and the FAO GEF Unit several extensions of the project in order to ensure delivery at the end of the GEF project of a substantial part of the work in all biomes including Amazon and Cerrado biomes.

<sup>18</sup> Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

## 5. Gender Mainstreaming

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

**Was a gender analysis undertaken or an equivalent socio-economic assessment?** While no gender action plan was developed, gender aspects have been considered in many different project activities.

**Please briefly indicate the gender differences.**

The execution of the field surveys and in particular its socio-environmental survey component is highly gender-sensitive. Efforts have been deployed to capture both the perception of rural women and men about forest. Socio-environmental surveys are indeed integral part of the field data collection, and attention was paid so at least 50% of respondents be women, as specified in the survey guidelines. Statistical estimates generated from the interviews have been disaggregated by gender in order to capture and take in due consideration the different gender perceptions and knowledge in relation to forests.

The main labor-intensive task, that is the field data collection, has been executed through service contracts. The informal recommendation when selecting the companies was to include women in the field teams, especially for leading the socio-environmental surveys.

## 6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

During the project formulation, the decision was taken to skip from the national field sampling grid all indigenous lands, due to the legal complexity implied in obtaining permissions from the indigenous communities and from the state indigenous foundation FUNAI. However, thanks to the cooperation with another GEF project (GEF nr. 2934) a first pilot survey in an indigenous land (Terra Indigena Mangueirinha) has been successfully accomplished. The field inventory, gathering biophysical data and information, as well as collecting the perception of indigenous people on forest through the socio-environmental survey component has been undertaken in full compliance of legal procedures. For the generation of the results, a consultant expert in working with indigenous peoples has been hired to negotiate with the community the format and language of the findings report, in full respect of 'prior informed consent about disclosure of tribally sensitive information and images.

## **7. Stakeholders Engagement**

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

If your project had a stakeholder engagement plan, specify whether any new stakeholders have been identified/engaged: no stakeholder engagement plan was elaborated at CEO endorsement

If a stakeholder engagement plan was not requested for your project at CEO endorsement stage, please

- list all stakeholders engaged in the project;
- briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.

List of stakeholders	Category	Engagement mechanism	Date engaged	Purpose
EMBRAPA-Florestas	Agricultural R&D	Technical Cooperation Agreement Information and participation in decision making	2011	Technical support
Rio de Janeiro Botanical Garden Institute - IJBRJ	Public Research Institution	Technical Cooperation Agreement Information and participation in decision making	2011	Botanical identification and herbarium of reference

<b>Blumenau Regional University - FURB</b>	Public Research Institution	Technical Cooperation Agreement Information and participation in decision making	2011	Technical support
<b>Secretariat of Environment and Water Resources of Paraná - SEMA</b>	Public Institution	Technical Cooperation Agreement Information	2012	Technical support for NFI in Paraná
<b>State Secretariat of Environment of Rio de Janeiro - SEA</b>	Public Institution	Technical Cooperation Agreement Information	2012	Technical support for NFI in Rio de Janeiro
<b>State Superintendence of Environment of Ceará - SEMACE</b>	Public Institution	Technical Cooperation Agreement Information	2012	Technical support for NFI in Ceará
<b>Embrapa Eastern Amazon - CPATU</b>	Agricultural R&D	Technical Cooperation Agreement Information	2016	Botanical identification, soil analysis and technical support
<b>Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics - IBGE</b>	Public Research Institution	Partnership Information	2011	Technical support
<b>National Institute of Amazonia Research - INPA</b>	Public Research Institution	Technical Cooperation Agreement Information	2015	Botanical identification and technical support
<b>Goiás Federal University</b>	Public Research Institution	Technical Cooperation Agreement Information	2017	Allometric equation and technical support
<b>University of Brasília</b>	Public Research	Technical Cooperation Agreement Information	2018	Botanical identification, allometric equation and technical support
<b>Embrapa Cenargen</b>	Agricultural R&D	Technical Cooperation Agreement Information	2018	Botanical identification and technical support

## 8. Knowledge Management Activities



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

- Please tell us the story of your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihood and how it is contributing to achieve the expected global environmental benefits

The project has not elaborated a knowledge management strategy and plan at the time of CEO endorsement, but the scope and expected outcome of components 3 and 4 objectives closely relate to, respectively, knowledge generation and dissemination.

Knowledge management was covered through:

- i) data on forest collected at the national level in all biomes, representing 385 million ha (73% of the country)
  - ii) the elaboration, publication and dissemination of thematic and geographic reports (15 of them issued until NTE);
  - iii) creation of an online geoportal with all field data and as well as botanical identification results accessible to everybody  
(<http://reflora.jbrj.gov.br/reflora/herbarioVirtual/ConsultaPublicoHVUC/ConsultaPublicoHVUC.do>); iv) support knowledge exchange through X NFI symposiums, covering scientific, technological and organizational related matters were debated among national and international specialists, academia and other forestry practitioners.
- Please provide the links to publications, video materials, etc:
  - Publications: <http://www.florestal.gov.br/inventario-florestal-nacional/491-resultados-ifn>
  - Videos: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vz92TLC4ReM&t=177s> / <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5KH0lawBpcU&t=7s>

## 9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>19</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing <sup>20</sup>	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National Government	<b>Federal Government</b>	Grant	USD 50,810,000	USD 4,050,000	USD 4,050,000	USD 4,860,000
National Government	<b>Federal Government</b>	In kind	USD 5,560,000	USD 9,050,000	USD 9,050,000	USD 7,430,000
Local Government	<b>Ceará Federal State</b>	Grant		USD 1,130,000	USD 1,130,000	USD 1,130,000
Local Government	<b>Sergipe Federal State</b>	Grant		USD 420,000	USD 420,000	USD 420,000
Local Government	<b>Paraná Federal State</b>	Grant		USD 280,000	USD 280,000	USD 910,000
Local Government	<b>Rio Grande do Sul Federal State</b>	Grant		USD 300,000	USD 300,000	USD 300,000
Local Government	<b>Rio de Janeiro Federal State</b>	Grant		USD 1,510,000	USD 1,510,000	USD 1,510,000
Local Government	<b>Santa Catarina Federal State</b>	Grant		USD 1,620,000	USD 1,620,000	USD 1,620,000

<sup>19</sup> Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Other.

<sup>20</sup> Type of Co-financing may include: Grant, Soft Loan, Hard Loan, Guarantee, In-Kind, Other.

Local Government	Pernambuco State	Grant				USD 480,000
Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies)	Amazon Fund	Grant		USD 6,940,000	USD 6,940,000	USD 29,400,000
Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies)	Forest Investment Fund	Grant		USD 4,310,000	USD 4,310,000	USD 6,750,000
Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies)	FAO	Grant	USD 300,000	USD 300,000	USD 300,000	USD 300,000
<b>TOTAL</b>			USD 56,670,000	USD 29,910,000	USD 29,910,000	USD 55,110,000

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

53% of expected co-financing from the Brazilian Government have materialized. On the other side, contributions from local partners, mostly States of the Federation not been foreseen at inception have been mobilized.

The major co-financing amount as grants was supposed to come from the Amazon Fund (to cover Amazon biome) and FIP (to cover Cerrado biome). Both expected contributions have been delivered, at project closure, with a much lower level to what was planned, due to expenditures limit imposed by the Federal Government in 2017, which included budget from international technical cooperation projects.

The original co-financing of FIP and Amazon Fund has been converted from the equivalent figures in national currency Real, so they are subject to exchange fluctuations. The FIP project, which had an original budget of USD 16.55 million, had a cut of USD 9.80 million

## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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