



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

### 2022 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

## Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA .....	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE) .....	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	20
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS .....	28
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS) .....	32
6. RISKS .....	34
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION .....	40
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS .....	41
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	42
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING .....	58
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES .....	59
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT .....	60
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE .....	61

## 1. Basic Project Data

### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	Latin America and the Caribbean
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Brazil
<b>Project Title:</b>	Reversing the Desertification Process in Brazil's Susceptible Areas: Sustainable Agroforestry Practices and Biodiversity Conservation (REDESER)
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP/BRA/085/GFF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	5324
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	LD, BD, SFM/REDD+ (multiple focal areas)
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	Federative Republic of Brazil, Ministry of the Environment (MMA), Secretariat of International Relations (SRI), Department of Environmental Economics and International Agreements (DEAAI)
<b>Project Duration (years):</b>	19-Jan-2018 to 30-Jun-2023 (5 YEARS)
<b>Project coordinates:</b>	<a href="https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1qHJeri5cllz1hBsrlJKx-LcoZEX1QKdYHOFYUslHEYk/edit#gid=0">https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1qHJeri5cllz1hBsrlJKx-LcoZEX1QKdYHOFYUslHEYk/edit#gid=0</a>

### Project Dates

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	09-May-2016
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	19- Jan-2018
<b>Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	30-Jun-2022
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if approved) <sup>2</sup></b>	30-Jun-2023

### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	USD 3,930,155
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>3</sup>:</b>	USD 15,766,666
<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)<sup>4</sup>:</b>	USD 557,123
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022<sup>5</sup></b>	USD 193,997

<sup>1</sup> As per FPMIS

<sup>2</sup> If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF CU.

<sup>3</sup> This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

<sup>4</sup> For DEX projects, the GEF Coordination Unit will confirm the final amount with the Finance Division in HQ. For OPIM projects, the disbursement amount should be provided by Execution Partners.

<sup>5</sup> Please refer to the section 12 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

**M&E Milestones**

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:</b>	07/06/2021
<b>Expected Mid-term Review date<sup>6</sup>:</b>	July- August, 2022
<b>Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):</b>	First semester 2023
<b>Expected Terminal Evaluation Date<sup>7</sup>:</b>	To be checked
<b>Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)</b>	<i>[It is mandatory for projects to update the TTs or Core Indicators (CI) before Mid-Term or Terminal Evaluation stage. For projects that have a planned MTR or TE in the next fiscal year, please indicate YES here and provide the updated TTs or CIs as Annex.]</i>

**Overall ratings**

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

**ESS risk classification**

<b>Current ESS Risk classification:</b>	M
---	---

**Status**

<b>Implementation Status (1<sup>st</sup> PIR, 2<sup>nd</sup> PIR, etc. Final PIR):</b>	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR
--	---------------------

**Project Contacts**

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Gustavo Stancioli Campos de Pinho	gustavo.stanciolicamposdepinho@fao.org
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Rafael Zavala	rafael.zavala@fao.org

<sup>6</sup> The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2<sup>nd</sup> PIR, around half-point between EOD and NTE. The MTR report in English should be submitted to the GEF Secretariat within 4 years of the CEO Endorsement date.

<sup>7</sup> The Terminal Evaluation date should be discussed with OED 6 months before the project's NTE date.

<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Pieter Van Lierop (LTO) with support from Jessica Casaza (LTC)	pieter.vanlierop@fao.org jessica.casaza@fao.org
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	Hernan Gonzalez	hernan.gonzalez@fao.org

## 2. Progress towards Achieving Project Objective(s) (Development Objective)

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

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term target <sup>9,10</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>11</sup> since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating
<p><b><u>Project Objective:</u></b></p> <p>To halt and reverse environmental degradation in areas susceptible to desertification (ASD), ensuring the flow of ecosystem services,</p>	<p><b>Outcome 1.1 - Integrated Natural Resources Management (INRM)</b> has been mainstreamed and scaled up at landscape level</p>	<p># of hectares where INRM is adopted and mainstreamed</p>	<p>0 (zero)</p>	<p>271,243 ha.</p>	<p>904,142 ha.</p>	<p>- An updated diagnosis of the target areas (904,142 ha) was performed by APNE, identifying a new reality of land use and the goods practices more suitable and with the greatest potential for positive impact for each target area. Terms of reference are being prepared based on the indications of the study. - The translation of WOCAT site to</p>	<p>MU</p>

<sup>8</sup> This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

<sup>10</sup> Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

<sup>11</sup> Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic Co-benefits as well.

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term target <sup>9,10</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>11</sup> since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating
<p>promoting the integrated management of natural resources, generating environmental benefits and contributing to poverty reduction.</p> <p><b><u>Development Objective:</u></b></p> <p>Increase and improve provision of goods and services from sustainable management and restoration of dryland forest and</p>						Portuguese was performed and should be uploaded in the site by July 2022. With this, it is expected a more friendly platform so restoration experiences of Brazil could be registered by institutions and researches and be exchanged with other countries.	
		# of INRM tools and methodologies introduced	0 (zero)	3 good practices applied in 30% of the target areas	3 goods practices applied in 100% of the target areas and disseminated in capacity development activities	- 18 good practices identified and evaluated in the updated diagnosis for the target areas, and 8 good practices has potential to be applied. - Terms of reference are being prepared based on the indications of the study	
		# of smallholders with increased and diversified	negligible	470 additional people	1,567 people	- A simplified selection process was launched for a LoA in Araripe Region with the objective to implement and	

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term target <sup>9,10</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>11</sup> since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating
agroforestry production landscapes.		production based on INRM				strengthen good practices of INRM focused in food production and sustainable use of Caatinga. A selection was launched because it was an opportunity to identify new institutions to contribute to the project in this theme and in this region. It is foreseen, within 10 months, an expectation of 6 smallholders to have its production increased and diversified based on INRM. - In the LoA with APNE it is expected the implementation of 1000 ha of multi purpose SFM, in properties to be identified.	
		% of small properties that are administered by a woman	negligible	30% of the 470 small landowners are women	30% of the small properties are administer	- A Social specialist in socio-environmental assessments and monitoring of safeguards will support the gender strategy.	

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term target <sup>9,10</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>11</sup> since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating
					ed by a woman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For a LoA in Araripe Region, under selection, 2 smallholders are expected to have women landowners.</li> <li>- APNE will evaluate, under the LoA, the gender participation in the SFM process in Seridó Region</li> </ul>	
	<b>Outcome 2.1</b> - Forest areas under multi-purpose Sustainable Forest management (SFM) have been increased	# of hectares providing sustained flow of services in forest ecosystems in drylands	0 (zero)	309,031 ha.	618,062 ha of forest areas. (85% of forest cover in project area)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1000 ha of SFM will be implemented under the LoA with APNE in Seridó Region by May 2023.</li> <li>- A set of guidelines for SFM implementation and protocols for monitoring will be consolidated by APNE.</li> <li>- In the updated diagnosis delivered by APNE there were identified 5,044 ha of SFM plans in the project target areas (TA), 20,497 ha of SFM plan in a range of 50km around the TA and 38,087 ha in a range of 100 km around the TA. An evaluation will</li> </ul>	MU



Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term target <sup>9,10</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>11</sup> since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating
						be made by APNE on how the project could support the implementation of these plans and the approval of new ones.	
	<b>Outcome 3.1</b> - Seed production capacity improved seedlings to support the restoration of degraded land in the Areas at Risk of Desertification (ARD)	Specific management practices that integrate BD: b) restoration with native species	0 (zero) restoration	10,000 ha under restoration with native species	30,000 ha under restoration with native specie	- In the LoA for Araripe Region, that is under a selection process, an expectation of 10 personnel (5 women) will be capacitated in seeds processing and nursery, by May 2023. Also at least 6 ha will be under restoration process by May 2023	MU
	<b>Outcome 3.2</b> - Sustainably managed forest with connectivity points established	1) Carbon stocked in forest ecosystems and emissions from deforestation and degradation avoided (direct, lifetime):	a) 0 (zero) in the project intervention area (without restoration)	a) 146,400-ton CO <sub>2</sub> eq b) direct impact: additional 174,055-ton CO <sub>2</sub> eq and indirect impact: additional	a) Conservation & enhancement of carbon in forests: +30,000 ha of forest restored,	a) In the LoA for Araripe Region, under selection, at least 6 ha will initiate the restoration process	MU

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term target <sup>9,10</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>11</sup> since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating
		<p>a) Conservation &amp; enhancement of carbon in forests</p> <p>b) Avoided deforestation and forest degradation</p>		618,087-ton CO <sub>2</sub> eq	<p>+439,200-ton CO<sub>2</sub>eq sequestered and additional enhancement of carbon in forest through SFM (target: 618,062 ha, 2,058,146 t CO<sub>2</sub>eq - indirect impact).</p> <p>b) Avoided deforestation and forest degradation (avoided emissions (direct impact): 696,219-ton CO<sub>2</sub>eq</p>	<p>b) The app developed for project REDESER (<a href="https://projectgeffao.users.earthengine.app/view/brazil-redeser">https://projectgeffao.users.earthengine.app/view/brazil-redeser</a>) could provide the monitoring to evaluate the Carbon on Soil (COS) and gain/lost of forest. For example, in the period 2018-2020 the Araripe Region gain 4,315.06 ha of forest and lost 4,411.94 ha, totaling a decrease of 96.88 ha of forest. This area should be converted to evaluate Conservation &amp; enhancement of carbon in forests and Avoided deforestation and forest degradation.</p>	

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term target <sup>9,10</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>11</sup> since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating
					ha in 5,709 ha).  Indirect impact: avoided emissions of 2,472,347-ton CO <sub>2</sub> eq in 60,820 ha	This measurements could be made in the interventions areas of REDESER	
	<b>Outcome 3</b>	2) Restoration/rehabilitation of degraded forests.	0 (zero)	10,000 ha	30.000 ha	In the LoA for Araripe Region, at least 6 ha will be under restoration process	
	<b>Outcome 4.1</b> - Improved capacity of key state and municipal institutions on Sustainable Land Management (SLM), Sustainable	a) Number of teams with improved capacity at the local level.  b) Number of knowledge management networks in ASD	ASD states have very limited exchange on LD and desertification	a) At least 50 people benefited from the capacity development plan.  b) An online database based on LD projects in ASD, with the	a) Increased capacity in LD and desertification issues of at least 270 people from the 14 municipaliti	a) In the LoA for Araripe Region an expectation of 84 stakeholders from municipalities of Araripe Region will have their capacity improved in SLM and FLR  b) A data base, in excel, on SFM plans for	MU

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term target <sup>9,10</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>11</sup> since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating
	Forest Management (SFM) and Forest and Land Restoration (FLR)			help of experts and stakeholders	es in the 9 ASD states  b) A strong knowledge exchange network established in ASD	Northeast Region will be delivered by APNE. Also a virtual seminar will be held to present the results achieved in SFM theme.	
	<b>Outcome 4.2</b> - Policymakers and farmer, private sector and education stakeholders have capacity to implement SFM, FLR, INRM and BD conservation	Availability of good-quality materials at local level.	Poor information materials and delivery.	Enhanced production of material on LD, SFM, FLR, and BD for training courses and other events	Materials for forest officers, nursery staff and seed collectors is produced and distributed in each project site	- In the LoA for Araripe Region 4 instructive videos of INRM practices will be produced, as well as one informative bulletin	MU

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term target <sup>9,10</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>11</sup> since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating
	<b>Outcome 5.1</b> - Functional synergy with complementary initiatives to promote sustainable management and restoration benefits at landscape level	Number of initiatives with collaborations established.	Poor synergy	Interaction with 10 key initiatives	Most interested and relevant stakeholders are currently interacting	13 institutions were identified with key initiatives that could provide interactions possibilities. The institutions are i) Northeast Plants Association (APNE), ii) Embrapa Semi-arid (CPATSA CHPD), iii) Embrapa CENARGEN, iv) National Semi-Arid Institute (INSA), v) Technological Park Foundation of Paraíba (CEPIS), vi) Brazilian Institute of Development and Sustainability (IABS), vii) Araripe Foundation (FA), viii) Chico Mendes Institute of Biodiversity Conservation (ICMBio), stakeholders already foreseen in the PRODOC, and with ix) Water National Agency (ANA), x) World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), xi) Araticum Net, xii) Federal	MS

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term target <sup>9,10</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>11</sup> since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating
						Institute of North of Minas Gerais (IFNMG), and xiii) Agricultural Research Company of Minas Gerais (EPAMIG). The results and advances of this action is presented in section 4. "Summary on Progress and Ratings" - A contract was signed to present alternatives and reflections for improvement of the national communication with UNFCCC and the respective national inventory of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of greenhouse gases	
	<b>Outcome 5.2</b> - The project is implemented with results-based management and incorporation	Delivery of the project products is compliant with the FAO-GEF information requirements.	N/A	Project reports	Full compliance	4 progress reports	S

*Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.*

<b>Project or Development Objective</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Outcome indicators<sup>8</sup></b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Mid-term target<sup>9,10</sup></b>	<b>End-of-project Target</b>	<b>Cumulative progress<sup>11</sup> since project start Level at 30 June 2022</b>	<b>Progress rating</b>
	of findings and lessons learned						

**Action Plan to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings**



Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<b>1.1 - INRM has been mainstreamed and scaled up at landscape level</b>	1) Elaboration of Terms of Reference to implement/improve INRM good practices to be locally applied in each target area and identification of institutions that are willing to develop activities in the field.  2) Hiring/partnerships to implement good practices performed	1) PMU, MMA and APNE  2) PMU	1) September 2022  2) October 2022
<b>2.1 - Forest areas under multi-purpose Sustainable Forest management (SFM) have been increased.</b>	1) Definition of practices and sites for SFM implementation in TAs and identification of institutions that are willing to develop activities in the field .  2) Hiring/partnerships to implement good practices performed  3) Elaborate recommendations of guidelines for implementation and monitoring of SFM.  4) Implementation of multi-purpose Sustainable Forest management	1) PMU, MMA and APNE  2) PMU  3) APNE  4) Partners	1) August 2022  2) November2022  3) December 2022  4) May 2023
<b>3.1 - Seed/seedling production capacity improved to support restoration of degraded lands in ASD.</b>	1) Report on the current situation of seedling production and seed collection in the region and specifically in the project's TAs  2) Present the balance of demand and supply of seeds and seedlings in the TA.  3) Recommendations for action in the specific areas	1) APNE  2) APNE  3) PMU and APNE	1) August 2022  2) August 2022  3) October 2022

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<b>3.2 - Forest connectivity sites have been identified, sustainably managed, and restored.</b>	1) Select locations for the promotion of connectivity corridors and identify partners (rural producers, gov, NGO, Universities, city halls, etc.), based on the updated diagnosis, to implement restoration projects.	1) PMU, MMA and APNE	1) November 2022
<b>4.1 - Improvement in capacity of key state and municipal institutions about SLM, SFM and FLR</b>	1) Identify the themes for capacitation based on the updated diagnosis.  2) Include capacity activities for people from municipalities in the LoA that will be executed and complementarily hire and institution to perform this capacitation.  3) Elaborate material for dissemination.	1) PMU, MMA and APNE  2) PMU, MMA, APNE and partners  3) PMU, MMA, APNE and partners	1) December 2022  2) December 2022  3) May 2023
<b>4.2 - Policymakers and farmer, private sector and education stakeholders have capacity to implement SFM, FLR, INRM and BD conservation.</b>	1) To plan the elaboration of dissemination material, and also foreseen some material in the LoAs that should be produced.  2) Define material content, layout and quantity for distribution  3) Distribute material	1) PMU, MMA and APNE  2) PMU and MMA  3) PMU, MMA and partners	1) October 2022  2) December 2022  3) May 2023

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<b>5.1 - Synergy with complementary initiatives to promote sustainable management and restoration benefits at landscape level.</b>	1) Identify more synergistic initiatives and actors.  2) Interact with these synergistic initiatives	1) PMU and MMA  2) PMU, MMA and partners	1) December 2022  2) May 2023

### 3. Implementation Progress (IP)

*(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as per the Implementation Plan/Annual Workplan)*

Outcomes and Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements <sup>13</sup> (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> in delivering outputs
<b>Outcome 1.1</b>				
<b>Output 1.1.1 - Best practices in INRM identified, evaluated and replicated at property and landscape levels</b>	<p>a) % of areas of project intervention where the best practices have been implemented</p> <p>b) 10 Sites of good practices for up-scaling are identified</p> <p>c) 3 good practices: i) sustainable production of non-wood forest and agriculture products; ii) Forest and Landscape restoration; and iii) sustainable management of natural resources.</p>	<p>a) Best practices assessed and evaluated in 904,142 ha</p> <p>b) 4 Sites of good practices for up-scaling are identified</p> <p>c) 3 good practices: i) sustainable production of non-wood forest and agriculture products; ii) Forest and Landscape restoration; and iii) sustainable management of natural resources.</p>	<p>- An updated diagnosis of the target areas (904,142 ha) was performed by APNE, identifying a new reality of land use and the goods practices more suitable and with the greatest potential for positive impact for each target area.</p> <p>- 18 good practices were identified and evaluated in the diagnosis for the target areas, and 8 good practices has potential to be applied (SFM, honey production, NTFP, biomass residues for energy, agroforest, agroecosystem, Technologic (TRU), restoration by direct seeding)</p> <p>- Terms of reference will be prepared based on the indications of the diagnosis</p> <p>- The practice of sustainable production of non-wood forest and agriculture products will be implemented in 6 rural properties (6 ha) in Araripe Region</p>	<p>The practices will be implemented in rural properties that will be defined in the 4 target areas: Araripe Region, Uauá, Seridó and Xingó.</p>

<sup>12</sup> Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

<sup>13</sup> Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Workplan. Please be concise (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

<sup>14</sup> Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

			<p>through a LoA that is under a simplified selection process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- APNE will implement 1000 ha of SFM in Seridó Region.</li> <li>- A translation WOCAT site to Portuguese was performed. With this, it is expected a friendlier platform so restoration experiences of Brazil could be registered by institutions and researches to be exchange within Brazil and with other countries.</li> </ul>	
<b>Output 1.1.2 - INRM NWFPs incorporated in government programs and projects and in local agribusiness</b>	Increase in products purchased by PAA (National Purchase Program, for its acronym in Portuguese) /PNAE (National Program of School Feeding, for its acronym in Portuguese) (20%)	Capacity improved to access market, including PAA/PNAE, to initiate and increase purchases	A Letter of Agreements will be celebrated for Araripe Region and it is planned a capacitation to improve the rural households knowledge about government programs and markets for selling agroforestry production.	These capacitation will be executed among other activities foreseen in this LoA
<b>Output 1.1.3 - Capacity to identify, evaluate and promote strengthened INRM systems in state departments and agencies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) 1 set of guidelines developed for identification and evaluation of INRM systems</li> <li>b) 100 technical staff prepared to use the guidelines</li> </ul>	No target planned		
<b>Outcome 2.1</b>				
<b>Output 2.1.1 - Innovative small-and large-scale SFM</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) 6 Demonstration areas with selected SFM practices</li> <li>b) 15,000 ha with SFM</li> </ul>	2 demonstration areas selected and with MFS implemented, 1 in Araripe Region and 1 in Seridó Region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) 1 demonstration area was selected in Seridó Region</li> <li>b) 1000 ha will be implemented</li> </ul>	A demonstration area in Araripe should be defined based on the diagnosis and with the support of APNE.

<b>practices identified, evaluated and replicated in selected experimental forest management areas</b>				
<b>Output 2.1.2 - Support for the development of Multiple-Use SFM production chains</b>	2 SFM plans for multiple use with NTFP at Araripe EPA (APA is the acronym in Portuguese for Área de Proteção Ambiental - Environmental Protection Area, EPA) and buffer areas of São Francisco MONAT (Natural Monuments - MONAT as per its acronym in Portuguese).	- Best practices identified and proposed for 2 selected sites (1 for each target area Araripe and Xingó)  - 1 SFM plan for multiple use with NTFP in implementation (1 in each target area)	No progress	APNE will support the implementation, but the sites were not yet defined.
<b>Output 2.1.3 - Guidelines for SFM practices developed and monitoring of protocols at the local level implemented</b>	a) Technical directives  b) 100 forestry officers and agency using the guidelines	a) Set of guidelines with recommendations for elaboration and implementation of SFM, and SFM plans monitoring protocols  b) 20 forestry officers aware of the guidelines for elaborate, implement and monitor SFM plans	a) The guidelines to implement (including licensing) and monitor SFM plans will be consolidated by APNE, based in a government resolution specific for SFM in Northeast region.  b) The seminar foreseen in APNE LoA will present the results of the activities performed, including the guidelines, and should have the participation of at least 20 forestry officers	A training plan is foreseen to be elaborated, as soon as the guidelines be consolidated.
<b>Outcome 3.1</b>				
<b>Output 3.1.1 - Small landowners and public nurseries in</b>	35 nurseries registered	Assessment of existing tree seed nurseries in the target areas	The LoA with APNE will assess the existing tree seed nurseries and the offer/demand for tree seeds for restoration purposes.	The scenario of tree seed nurseries initially foreseen in the PRODOC should be updated by APNE and

<b>legalized ARD with improved native seed and seedling production</b>				based on this information it will be possible to plan and perform the appropriate actions
<b>Output 3.1.2 - Seed collectors and nursery workers trained and registered in the National Seed and Seedling System (SNSM)</b>	<p>a) Level of capacities of personnel working at nurseries (1600 personnel with at least medium-level capacities)</p> <p>b) Capacity development materials prepared and adapted to ASD and the local social context ( Modular training courses for seed collectors and nursery workers developed</p>	<p>Capacity assessment of the personnel of tree nurseries and seed collectors</p> <p>At least 1 training in seeds processing and nursery.</p>	<p>- In the amendment of the LoA with APNE, it will be performed an evaluation of the scenario of nurseries and also of the socioenvironment aspects of the seed collectors , in close cooperation with the safeguard consultant.</p> <p>- In the LoA for Araripe Region an expectation of 10 personnel (5 women) will be capacitated in seeds processing and nursery. The training modules will be delivered as well as an evaluation of the course.</p>	The total number of personnel should be reviewed by APNE based on the updated assessment of existing tree nurseries
<b>Output 3.1.3 Guidelines for Forest and Land Restoration practices in ARD developed and adopted by stakeholders</b>	Guidelines developed and adopted for Brazil using as a basis the FAO global guidelines	No target planned for 2022		
<b>Outcome 3.2</b>				
<b>Output 3.2.1 - Appropriate locations for forest restoration and connectivity are identified and work plans</b>	# of hectares with restored forest connectivity (30,000 ha selected with restoration plans under implementation)	<p>Area selected and restoration plans developed</p> <p>Area with restoration plan under way</p>	- In the LoA for Araripe Region at least 6 ha will be under restoration process	The sites to be restored will be identified based on the updated diagnosis

<p><b>elaborated using adapted cost-effective restoration techniques</b></p>				
<p><b>Output 3.2.2 - Participatory projects for the restoration of degraded land and improvement of productive landscapes and land use practices</b></p>	<p># of local projects prepared for financing (8 projects in 15,000 ha. prepared and financing negotiated with the MMA and national banks)</p>	<p>No target planned for 2022</p>		
<p><b>Outcome 4.1</b></p>				
<p><b>Output 4.1.1 - Reinforced learning networks and actions, facilitating field exchanges in ARD</b></p>	<p>a) # of actions (38 articles elaborated, 12 courses and 24 workshops executed, 270 multiplier agents trained)</p> <p>b) Sustained flow of appropriate information on best practices</p> <p>c) An on-line network/ database developed for exchange of information, knowledge and projects relevant to ASD issues</p>	<p>a) 2 Seminar</p> <p>4 courses</p> <p>Training of at least 35 multipliers agents in SFM, FLR and INRM</p>	<p>- The virtual Workshop “TOWARDS A NATIONAL STRATEGY TO COMBAT LAND DEGRADATION AND SUSTAINABLE SOIL MANAGEMENT IN BRAZIL” was held with the joint organization of FAO, IICA, WOCAT and Minister of Environment of Brazil (MMA). The general objective was to exchange knowledge about different tools, experiences and processes for LDN monitoring and implementation in Uruguay, Ecuador, Colombia</p> <p>- In the LoA for Araripe Region an expectation of 84 stakeholders from municipalities of Araripe Region will have their capacity improved in SLM and FLR, through 4 courses and a field day.</p> <p>- In the LoA for Araripe Region a Seminar will be held in Crato to discuss</p>	



			<p>results of the LoA and the themes SLM, INRM, FLR, with an expectation 150 stakeholders</p> <p>- In the LoA with APNE a virtual seminar will be held to present the results for the definition of SFM guidelines.</p>	
<b>Outcome 4.2</b>				
<b>Output 4.2.1 - Guidelines and briefs on best practices and lessons learned related to SFM, FLR and INRM in ARD prepared</b>	# of information materials (1 folder, 5 videos, 48 radio spots and 1 event)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1 Communication Plan</li> <li>- 4 instructive videos about themes related to the project scope</li> <li>- 1 folder about the project</li> <li>- Media data base with images and videos</li> <li>- 1 bulletin</li> </ul>	- A communication plan draft was developed and the guidelines for the production of material should be established	The material should begin to be delivered in the 4 <sup>th</sup> trimester
<b>Output 4.2.2 - Academic community in ARD engaged against LD and desertification</b>	<p>a) # of publication (5000 booklets, 5 books with new edition)</p> <p>b) # of booklets disseminated (Publication and distribution of booklets and books through partnerships (PRONATEC <sup>15</sup>, RENASEM <sup>16</sup>) / 9 events with family farmers)</p>	No target planned for 2022		
<b>Output 4.2.3 - Awareness raising on sustainable forest restoration in ARD</b>	# of events to improve communication about SFM and FLR in ASD (7 events and 1 radio programs for each target area)	No target planned for 2022		

<sup>15</sup> National Program of Access to Technical Education and Employment

<sup>16</sup> Catholic Charismatic Association of Brazil

<b>Outcome 5.1</b>				
<b>Output 5.1.1 - Effective collaboration with complementary initiatives</b>	<p>a) # of initiatives with established collaboration (30 initiatives)</p> <p>b) # of work plans jointly formulated (12 annual work plans)</p>	a) Identification of updated initiatives and ways to implement synergies	<p>- The project coordination carried out a series of dialogues with many partners, to reestablish the partnership with the some institutions included in the PRODOC and with new ones with potential synergies with the Project. 13 institutions were identified with key initiatives that could provide interactions possibilities. The results of these process is presented in section 4.</p> <p>- A contract was signed to provide specialized technical services to support a study on alternatives and reflections to improve the National Communication to the UNFCCC and the respective National Inventory of Anthropogenic Emissions by Sources and Removals by Sinks of Greenhouse Gases</p>	The synergies with the 2 other projects foreseen in the PRODOC (Sergipe and EMBRAPA) are no longer possible, since they are concluded.
<b>Outcome 5.2 - The project is implemented with results-based management and application of findings and lessons learned</b>				
<b>Output 5.2.1 - Project Monitoring System providing information on progress made towards achieving</b>	M&E System established and fully operational	<p>1 Annual Work Plan</p> <p>2 Progress Project Reports (PPR)</p> <p>1 Project Implementation Report (PIR)</p>	<p>1 Annual Work Plan</p> <p>1 PPR</p>	

<p><b>project outputs and targets</b></p>				
<p><b>Output 5.2.2 - Midterm and final evaluation performed, best practices and lessons learned from the project published and disseminated</b></p>	<p>Project results are tracked on an annual basis and disseminated</p>	<p>1 Project Steering Committee Mid-term evaluation</p>	<p>- The project Steering Committee meeting will be held in second semester - The mid-term evaluation will be performed in second semester</p>	

## 4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

**Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcome of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR.**

During the period covered by this report, a new technical team from the Ministry of Environment was designated to be part of the Project Coordination. They helped in an intense process of negotiation, dialogues and reestablishment of partnerships that was carried out. Many meetings were held to identify possible synergies and potential partnership for implementing the Project. Nevertheless, the director and manager of MMA were changed again in 2022 and the speed of MMA to answer the project demands are still extremely slow and causing serious delays in the execution.

As a result of this process a Letter of Agreement with Northeast Plants Association (APNE) was celebrated. Other LoA should be celebrated with Araripe Foundation and another one is under a selection process, which was an opportunity to identify new stakeholders to implement INRM practices of productive process of food and sustainable use of Bioma Caatinga in Araripe Region. The proposals for these LoAs contemplate activities of the project in Seridó Region (APNE), Araripe Region (winner of the selection process), Bahia (Araripe Foundation). Thus, 3 target areas of the project will have activities initiated. The results expected to be accomplished should meet some targets of outputs 1.1.1, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.2.1, 4.1.1 and 4.2.1.

The main challenges are the great amount of institutions involved and the reestablishment of the partnerships with the identification of new ones that could efficiently contribute with the project, as well as optimize the time spent in this process.

The product 1 of LoA with APNE presented an updated socio-economic diagnosis of the target areas, identifying the INRM practices there are being implemented nowadays in the Caatinga and indicating which practices should be more appropriated for each TA. There were evaluated: i) environmental, economic, social and financial criteria, ii) impacts of each practice, iii) the technology needed, iv) the level of maturity and v) replicability potential (considering the acceptance to adopt and costs viability). With these results an amendment will be celebrated to support de definition of practices to be implemented in each TA and recommendations for seeds and nursery actions to support the restoration activities

Therefore, there is a solid plan for the execution of 5 letters of agreement in the project territories, based on the identification of which INRM and SFM technologies are most appropriate for implementation and on the observance of the local reality. Thus, components 1 and 2 were structured and supported in the execution of these future contracts, which are intended to achieve the expected results for these project fronts. The period of this report, thus, was an intense process of diagnosis, evaluation and relationship with actors for the design of a strategy that will be put into practice in the coming months.

With the updated landscape analysis, based in the diagnosis of the target areas, the selection criteria of the INRM tools/methodologies to be implemented in each Target Area (TA) and the information presented in the project app, the prioritization of activities to be executed will be improved and the project should have its implementation up-scaled.

### **Development Objective (DO) Ratings, Implementation Progress (IP) Ratings and Overall Assessment**

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence and progress reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR. For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

	<b>FY2022 Development Objective rating<sup>17</sup></b>	<b>FY2022 Implementation Progress rating<sup>18</sup></b>	<b>Comments/reasons<sup>19</sup> justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MU</b>	The great effort combined between MMA and FAO to re-establish the partnerships for the implementation of the Project were successful in some cases, with LoAs agreed to be executed achieving indicators of many outcomes. However, it took longer than planned and other partnerships still must be reinforced and/or identified to support many activities execution. The updated landscape analysis and the criteria selection of INRM tool/methodologies for each TA are important achievement that should improve project implementation. Despite this advance the implementation is behind schedule, and the Project implementation end date should impact the execution of many activities and the accomplishment of results.
<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MU</b>	FAO Brazil and MMA had strengthened their partnership which resulted in significant progress in the articulation with key institutions that should improve project implementation. Strategic actions are planned to prioritize activities that could contribute with the achievement of relevant targets foreseen in the project outcomes. However, it is necessary to continuously monitor the actions to answer the deadlines that the project requires and also review the NTE date so the project could achieve its major objectives.

<sup>17</sup> **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.

For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>18</sup> **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>19</sup> Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

<b>GEF Operational Focal Point<sup>20</sup></b>			Comments and ratings from OFP were not received within the set deadline for PIR final submission
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>21</sup></b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MU</b>	<p>During this period, significant progress was made between the MMA and FAO that made it possible to streamline the execution of the project. In addition, 13 institutions with key initiatives that could offer possibilities for interaction and partnership were identified.</p> <p>Progress was made in the approval of Terms of Reference and definition of Letters of Agreement that make it possible to start with the execution of different activities on the ground. One of the Letters of Agreement in execution has made it possible to update a diagnosis of areas of intervention and has identified the best practices.</p> <p>Although delays are observed, there is an encouraging perspective in the operability of the project, with the definition of five letters of agreement that will allow progress with the execution of components 1 and 2 and which will require review of the NTE to achieve the outputs and results proposed and its main objectives.</p>
<b>FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MU</b>	<p><i>Ratings/comments</i></p> <p><i>While the project made significant advances in terms of finding and engaging partners in implementation, the project still showed delays in implementing the Annual Work Plan for the first half of 2022. Nonetheless, the partnership with APNE, the thorough analysis and identification of good practices to upscale, the selection of demonstration areas, and the identification of executing partners on the ground are necessary conditions to improve project delivery. Disbursements are expected to increase significantly by the end of 2022, in line with the approved Annual Work Plan.</i></p> <p><i>The Mid Term Review is expected to be carried out during the first trimester of 2023. Given the delays during start up and those due to the COVID pandemic, an extension of the project closing date is expected.</i></p>

<sup>20</sup> In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

<sup>21</sup> The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

## 5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

*Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)*

Please describe the progress made complying with the approved ESM plan. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Add new ESS risks if any risks have emerged during this FY.

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



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

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid <sup>22</sup> . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
M	M

<i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i>
Not applicable.

<sup>22</sup> **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

## 6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation (including COVID-19 related risks). The last column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in the project, as relevant.

	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>23</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	<p><b>Environmental risks:</b></p> <p>Increased frequency of droughts and drastic reduction in rainfall.</p> <p>Sequence of climate change related events affect the target population.</p>	M	Y	<p>The project will introduce best practices for conservation of soil moisture and water accumulation by installing underground dams and surface water collection systems and disseminating systems favouring the penetration of water under regional conditions soil structure.</p> <p>Other preventive or mitigating actions are planned to support small irrigation projects and diversification of initiatives of family farming for food security, including the distribution and production of traditional seeds with greater resilience to the effects of climate change, and the introduction of agroforestry and silvopastoral systems compatible with semiarid environments.</p> <p>The project will use forms of participatory planning to deal with climate uncertainty, supporting seminars for exchange of experience on appropriate practices for crops in semi-arid conditions.</p>	The updated landscape analysis and the criteria selection of INRM tool/methodologies for each TA will support the project planning to minimize this risk	The activities planning is considering the landscape analysis so the field actions could be better executed

	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>23</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
2	<p>Increased fragmentation of forest in the selected areas.</p> <p>Growing pollution of water resources due to unsustainable land and forest management practices.</p>	M	Y	<p>The project will promote best practices for sustainable land management and the adoption of sustainable forest management. As for the maintenance of productive landscape mosaics, the project will contribute to the capacity-building of the staffs in state environmental agencies for the implementation of the National Rural Registry (CAR) and the Environmental Regularization Program (PRA) in line with the New Brazilian Forest Code, ensuring compliance with the Permanent Preservation Areas (PPA) and Legal Reserve (LR) requirements.</p>	<p>The updated landscape analysis and the criteria selection of INRM tool/methodologies for each TA will support the promotion of the most suitable practices for each case.</p>	<p>The mainly areas to be connected will be identified for each Target Area in a more detailed planning based on the landscape analysis</p>

<sup>23</sup> Risk ratings means a rating of accesses the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>23</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
3	Increasing pressure from agribusiness resulting in growing clearing of forests in vulnerable transition areas	M	Y	The project will expand he actions supported by the international cooperation agreement, promoting capacity-building and institutional strengthening in the state environmental agencies for the implementation of the national rural registry (CAR) and the environmental regularization program (PRA). The project will promote systematic actions with the staffs of the agencies for the understanding and adoption of SFM as an alternative to the full removal of vegetation for alternative land uses.	The updated landscape analysis provided a better understanding of the current situation of each TA. The agribusiness pressure will be evaluated for the implementation of practices based on the updated diagnosis.	Brazilian Government will publish a normative that will standardize the procedures to approve, implement and monitor SFM plans in Northeast region. This should facilitate the implementation of SFM and the state agencies should be able to promote SFM as an alternative to the removal of vegetation for alternative land uses, including agribusiness

	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>23</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
4	<p><b>Institutional/financial risk:</b></p> <p>Participating entities fail to meet financial commitments</p>	M	Y	<p>The project will ensure that co-financing is maintained through project governance bodies such as the National Committee to Combat Desertification, insisting on the need to keep international commitments. The project will maintain an ongoing dialogue with civil society through their organizations in order to ensure the fulfilment of commitments between the project and various partners.</p> <p>Participating institutions have signed co-financing letters for the project. These institutions are also members of the Project Steering Committee; this will help to ensure to a greater extent their commitment to the project. Under the PSC, issues related to co-financing contributions will be coordinated to ensure these commitments in the annual budgetary allocations of institutions and contributions, either in cash or in-kind, will be monitored.</p>	The initial commitments of co-financing is being checked by Minister of Environment and new partnerships should contribute to co-financing and targets of the project	FAO had requested from MMA the confirmation of the co-financing. FAO and MMA are identifying new partnerships that could contribute both in implementing activities and co-financing and target achievements

	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>23</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
5	Institutional instability	S	N	Institutional structure that ensures the technical execution of project actions and the strengthening of partnerships.	A new technical team of MMA was designated in August 2021 to support the project implementation, with good experience in the REDESER thematic. A new director and a new manager were nominated in 2022, but are still not giving fast answer for the project demands, seriously delaying project execution	FAO is in close cooperation with the new team of MMA, but still is not receiving faster answers for project demands
6	COVID-19 Pandemic	L	N	The actions related to the minimization of the Covid-19 pandemic include the adoption of security measures for technicians, managers and beneficiaries of the project, and routine updates on the effects of the pandemic in the Project.	In second semester of 2021 the situation in Brazil still required caution that limited some activities, including field ones. Despite the situation is getting better in 2022, there are still periods of increasing in the number of cases, when isolation measures are needed. Thus , the activities are gradually getting back no normality. The project implementation should benefit from this better scenario of Pandemia	FAO Office in Brazil is following all the measures to avoid contagion among staff and consultants, and reinforcing the use of security measures with partners.

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

FY2021 rating	FY2022 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
<b>M</b>	<b>M</b>	Project Unit focused on re-establish partnerships to executed activities that could face the environmental risks. The updated diagnosis and landscape analysis will significantly contribute to identify the better IRNM methodology/tool and partner to implement the suitable activity in each target area. Nevertheless, some structural issues still should be strengthened, mainly the institutional arrangement and the capacity in the field to promote actions. With FAO arrangements to hire specialist team to strengthen the capacity for execution, and the support of APNE to define the INRM practices and better arrangement to implement them, the project should have relevant advance in its execution, but the project implementation end date is a barrier to commit with activities that requires long period of implementation. Nevertheless, despite the new team of MMA be very collaborative in the project actions, many demands are still taking long periods to be answered, and that is delaying project execution

**7. Follow-up on Mid-term review or supervision mission (only for projects that have conducted an MTR)**

If the project had an MTR or a supervision mission, please report on how the recommendations were implemented during this fiscal year as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
Recommendation 1:	
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation 4:	

Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe	
---	--



## 8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines<sup>24</sup>. Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories. And provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework	-	-	-
Components and cost	-	-	-
Institutional and implementation arrangements	-	-	-
Financial management	-	-	-
Implementation schedule	The Project implementation end date was extended until 30, June 2023	21/12/2021	OCB
Executing Entity	-	-	-
Executing Entity Category	-	-	-
Minor project objective change	-	-	-
Safeguards	-	-	-
Risk analysis	-	-	-
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	-	-	-
Co-financing	-	-	-
Location of project activity	Seventeen municipalities in the north of Minas Gerais State and 4 in Bahia State were inserted in the scope of the project.	June 2021	Approved by Steering Committee
Other	-	-	-

<sup>24</sup> Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

## 9. Stakeholders' Engagement

Please report on progress and results and challenges on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan) included at CEO Endorsement/Approval during this reporting period.

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution (as presented in PRODOC)	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
<b>Government Institutions</b>			
Ministry of Environment (MMA)	MMA is one of the main project co-financiers. Its DCD is responsible for the implementation of Brazil's National Action Plan (NAP) to Combat Desertification. The department is in charge of implementation of Brazilian commitments with UNCCD and is responsible for the design and implementation of public policies to combat desertification and land degradation and conserve biodiversity in ASD. It will play a central role in the implementation of relevant policies and programs.	The new team designated is giving important support to reestablish the partnership and identifying good initiatives for the project	The constant change of managers slowdown the processes of governance, the capacity of decision and thus the speed of answer to project demandas
Chico Mendes Institute of Biodiversity Conservation (ICMBio)	ICMBio, part of MMA, manages the federal protected areas (Conservation Units) and promotes community development in those that allow for sustainable use, in addition to research and knowledge,	MMA led a contact with the Chief of Environmental Protected Area of Araripe to met with FAO to updated some information of the region and inform of project inciativatives in the region aiming at a future colaboration.	It will support the identification of production chains, conflicts and pressures on the Ucs in the Project's areas of intervention. Further contacts should be made to improve the

	<p>environmental education and ecosystem management. It will support development of information materials and training and assist in training farmers on best NTFP and agroforestry production practices, as well as identifying the best alternatives for the recovery of degraded areas providing biological connectivity among forest remnants. It seeks greater integration between protected areas and local communities and society in general.</p>		<p>partnership with this stakeholder</p>
<p>Brazilian Institute of Environment and Renewable Natural Resources (IBAMA)</p>	<p>IBAMA, also part of MMA, will participate in defining technical and regulatory frameworks and coordinate with state environmental agencies to internalize technical standards and develop appropriate guidelines for environmental monitoring, law enforcement and administrative sanctions, particularly with regard to the prevention and control of deforestation and forest fires. The institution will benefit from the best practices and standards of sustainable production to be generated by the project and use them in monitoring and orientation.</p>	<p>IBAMA is coordinating the Work Group of Caatinga and was ahead of the normative elaboration to standardize the rules for licensing, implementation and monitoring of sustainable forest management plans for the entire Northeast (NE) Region</p>	<p>A contact must be made to evaluate how the project could benefit and contribute to this regulation</p>

<p>Brazilian Forest Service (SFB)</p>	<p>The Brazilian Forest Service (SFB), since 2019 as part of MAPA, supports forest management activities in the Caatinga and other biomes and manages the National Fund for Forest Development (FNDF). It is responsible for managing national forests (FLONA) such as Araripe, where it can test the results of the project. The SFB will work with the project to strengthen the collection of seeds, production of seedlings and recovery of degraded areas through seed and seedling planting, supporting the Caatinga Forest Management Network and implementation of the management plan of the Araripe FLONA. In addition, the SFB is a key partner in the design of training and information materials. It is also responsible for the Rural Environmental Registry (CAR) to enforce the Forest Code and for developing and coordinating detailed federal and state norms about its application.</p>	<p>Is an important stakeholder of the project in NE region. A first contact was made with the former Chief of the NE Regional Unit of SFB, which have a good knowledge of REDESER. MMA compromised to send a official letter to check the willingness of SFB to participate in the project.</p>	<p>The Brazilian Forest Service (SFB), belonging to MAPA. Related to the recovery activities of Permanent Preservation Area ( APP), Environmental Rural Register (CAR), Community Forests Program, Forest Management Project, rural landscapes project.</p> <p>An official letter from MMA to BFS was compromised to be sent to verify the willingness of SFB to reestablish the partnership and check the current role of SFB in caatinga biome.</p>
<p>Ministry of Agrarian Development (MDA)</p>	<p>The mission of MDA is to promote sustainable development in agrarian reform settlements and among family farmers in general. It will be the main co-financier of the</p>	<p>This minister was extinct in 2016, and its competencies was transferred to the Special Secretariat for Family Agriculture and Agrarian Development of the Civil</p>	<p>It must be verified if the activities performed by MDA were incorporated in the Family Agriculture Secretary (SAF/MAPA).</p>

	<p>project. MDA policies are fundamental for strengthening and diversifying family farming in areas that are socially and environmentally vulnerable. The project will involve it directly in the introduction of SLM and SFM among family farmers, benefiting from its leadership involving many stakeholders in long-term initiatives. MDA and its agencies strengthen family farming by facilitating access to credit through the National Program to Strengthen Family Agriculture (PRONAF), which includes organic and agro-ecological production, agroforestry and NTFP.</p>	<p>House of the Presidency of the Republic (Sead).</p>	
<p>Ministry of Social Development and the Fight against Hunger (MDS)</p>	<p>The role of MDS, which works closely with MMA and MDA, is to channel public investments for organized for social inclusion, food and nutrition security, social assistance, minimum income and water security for poor families. It can provide additional co-financing for training programs and dissemination of information. The MDS will use the information produced by the project to train its personnel and producers involved in agroforestry, guide investments in target landscapes, provide</p>	<p>The MDS was incorporated into the Ministry of Citizenship, together with the Ministry of Sport and Culture</p>	<p>It must be verified if the activities performed by MDS were incorporated in the Ministry of Citizenship of the Family Agriculture Secretary (SAF/MAPA).</p>

	<p>more effective support for productive activities and improve the Food Acquisition Program (PAA). Together with MDA and BNDES, it will support 24 member organizations of ASA to establish 600 community agro-biodiversity seed banks in the Caatinga.</p>		
<p>Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (MAPA)</p>	<p>The mission of MAPA, which works with large-scale agriculture and livestock, is to promote sustainable development and the competitiveness of agribusiness. Although it is not a project co-financier, one of its most relevant initiatives is the Sector Plan for Mitigation and Adaptation to Climate Change for the Low Carbon Agriculture (ABC Plan), which offers very substantial incentives and resources (on the order of USD 1 billion per year for Brazil as a whole) to farmers who adopt practices that increase the resilience of production systems and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, thus being important for uptake of sustainable technologies that contribute to carbon storage and sequestration and generate co-benefits in terms of biodiversity conservation and land degradation. Another</p>	<p>Many programs and actions of MAPA could have synergies with project . Is under evaluation if a contact should be made specially with the Family Agriculture Secretary.</p>	<p>Is under evaluation if MMA will officially contact MAPA to enable contacts with other secretaries that could contribute to REDESER.</p>

	role is implementation of the National Plan of Agro-ecology and Organic Production (PLANAPO).		
National Food Supply Company (CONAB)	CONAB, part of MAPA, implements two important policies that include NTFPs: minimum prices for biodiversity products (PGPMBio) and food acquisition (PAA). It ensures fair prices for government procurement of NTFPs, setting minimum prices for agricultural and social biodiversity products. It will incorporate project information in its activities.	This stakeholders is not a focus for engagement The local organizations and rural householders in Project Target Areas should be capacitated to access the market, including PAA program.	No challenge identified
Brazilian Agricultural Research Enterprise (EMBRAPA)	EMBRAPA is also part of MAPA. The project will establish a cooperation agreement with EMBRAPA Goats and Sheep in Sobral, Ceará, to disseminate agroforestry in the Caatinga based on best practices of SFM for rearing this kind of livestock common in the region. The center will be involved in providing technical expertise, implementation of project activities, promoting partnerships and coordination with stakeholders (government agencies, cooperatives, producer associations, NGOs) participating in the project to improve	As a result of the identification of new stakeholders, Project coordination engaged Embrapa Semiárid to contribute with some activities in Bahia and Alagoas through a LoA which is under negotiation. Another Embrapa Unit, CENARGEN, is involved in a LoA with Araripe Foundation to implement activities in Uauá Region, which is under negotiation	Other units of Embrapa could join the project, but are under evaluation how they could contribute to project outputs.

	NTFPs, agroforestry, SLM and SFM in ASD.		
Ministry of National Integration (MI)	The MI will be involved because of its mega-projects in the Northeast, especially the São Francisco River transposition project, involving 477 km. of canals to carry water to parts of Ceará, Rio Grande do Norte, Paraíba and Pernambuco, and the Trans-Northeastern Railway. Both projects require environmental compensation that can be synergetic with the project. The MI also supports "Routes of Integration" linking local productive clusters (APLs) of biodiversity products such as honey and cashew.	On January 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2019, the Ministry of National Integration and the Ministry of Cities were merged and transformed into the Ministry of Regional Development (MDR)	Ministry of Regional Development (MDR) supports "Integration Routes" that link local productive arrangements (APLs) of biodiversity products that could contribute to project activities. The contributions of MDR are under evaluation by project coordination
Ministry of Education (MEC)	MEC is responsible for the National School Lunch Program (PNAE). In 2014 the budget for this institutional market program was USD 1.2 billion to benefit 43 million pupils. At least 30% of the funds transferred to municipalities must be used to purchase family farm products, stimulating local and regional economic development and reducing extreme poverty. In addition to conventional products, the program also promotes sustainable	The National School Lunch Program (PNAE) could be one of the destinations of the production from the rural beneficiaries. The municipalities manage the budget of this program. The local organizations and rural householders in Project Target Areas should be capacitated to access the market, including this program.	No challenge identified.



	use of biodiversity such as native fruits, but supply is far from sufficient for this scale.		
Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (MCTI)	The Northeast Regional Center of the National Space Research Institute (INPE) in Natal, Rio Grande do Norte, is doing detailed satellite monitoring in the Caatinga that will provide valuable data for project monitoring and evaluation.	The monitoring made by MCTI was used to elaborate the landscape analysis of the target areas. Their data base will be constantly consulted to update the project data base of landscape analysis	No challenge identified.
National Savings Bank (CEF), Bank of the Northeast (BNB), Bank of Brazil (BB)	These three federal banks provide loans under the National Program to Strengthen Family Farming (PRONAF). Financing supports agroforestry systems, agro-ecology, restoration of Legal Reserves (RL) and Areas of Permanent Preservation (APP), family farming in general and processing and marketing of agricultural products. The project will seek to promote and adjust credit lines for sustainable forest activities and operationalize special financing systems for promoting SFM and dissemination of best production practices among farmers and wild harvesters and their associations.	These stakeholders are not a focus of engagement.	No challenge identified
State Environment Agencies (OEMAs)	Because of decentralization to sub-national governments,	An evaluation is being made to define the better time to contact	MMA must contact the state governments to

	<p>state environment agencies are increasingly responsible for planning and implementation of environmental licensing and regulation. For this project, they will play a key role in implementing state action programs to combat desertification in all the states of ASD (Alagoas, Bahia, Ceará, Paraíba, Pernambuco, Piauí, Rio Grande do Norte, Sergipe, Maranhão, Minas Gerais and Espírito Santo). They will also assist in engaging the private sector. State environment agencies in Paraíba and Alagoas are co-financiers.</p>	<p>the states and municipalities environment agencies, and define their role in project implementation.</p>	<p>verify their role in project implementation</p>
<p>Sustainable RN (Department of Planning and Finance of the Planning Secretariat (SEPLAN) of Rio Grande do Norte)</p>	<p>Through the Department of Planning and Finance of the Planning Secretariat (SEPLAN) of Rio Grande do Norte, one of the co-financiers, the project will establish a partnership with the Rio Grande do Norte Regional and Governance Project (“Sustainable RN”), to be funded by a USD 360 million loan from the World Bank. The partnership focuses on the Seridó Region in conjunction with INSA and MMA through the implementation of a pilot project aimed at integrating soil remediation, landscape management, natural</p>	<p>No contact was made, but this is a big project that could contribute with project targets.</p>	<p>MMA must contact SEPLAN to verify Sustainable RN achievements, the co-financing and the impact in Project targets</p>

	<p>resource management, recovery of natural areas and exchange of experiences of living in harmony (convivência) with drought, thus contributing to increased food security, improved productive infrastructure and access to markets for family farmers.</p>		
<p>National Semi-Arid Institute (INSA)</p>	<p>Collaboration with partners in research and education institutions will provide support for the implementation of technical assistance in the field, training of personnel and improved awareness of local conditions. INSA will play an important role in achieving the knowledge management objectives of the REDESER project using its advanced information and communication technology, in particular through studies, application of new research methods and systematization and dissemination of sustainable use techniques to combat desertification, conserve biodiversity and reduce emissions. INSA will house the implementation unit of the project in Campina Grande, in the state of Paraíba. As one of the main co-financiers, it will host many of the project activities related</p>	<p>A first contact was made and MMA compromised to officially contact INSA to verify their willingness to reengage in the project.</p>	<p>An official letter from MMA to INSA was compromised to be sent to verify the willingness of INSA to reestablish the partnership and check the scope of its reengagement in the project</p>

	to dissemination of best practices and capacity development, facilitating training and the production of extension materials. It will also support in collaboration with FAO and partners the monitoring of project performance and impacts on the ground.		
Center for Sustainable Industrial Production (CEPIS)	CEPIS, one of the co-financiers, is part of the Technology Park Foundation of Paraíba. It is a reference center recognized for its work on industrial energy efficiency and cleaner production. The project will benefit from the joint work with CEPIS by expanding its presence among producers of bricks and tiles throughout the Seridó region that are now heavily dependent on the use of firewood provided by family farmers and ranchers.	Some meetings were made with CEPIS to evaluate the participation in the project, but this must be more discussed. A synergy with ADESE and APNE should be evaluate to optimize the actions in the Seridó Region.	The institution is open to contribute with the project and the challenge is identify the better way for achieve project targets.
University for International Integration of Afro-Brazilian Lusophone Countries (UNILAB)	The project will establish agreements with UNILAB to offer opportunities for trainees and personnel on issues related to living in harmony with semi-aridity. UNILAB will benefit from the project actions to identify, carry out research about and develop best production practices with potential application in drylands in Africa.	The engagement of this stakeholder is under evaluation	The role presented in PRODOC is under evaluation.

<b>Non-Government organizations (NGOs)</b>			
Semi-Arid Network (ASA)	<p>ASA includes over 1,000 civil society organizations that defend the goal of living in harmony with semi-aridity. It implements the program “One Million Cisterns,” which promotes household storage of rain water for human and productive uses. ASA will support the project through: a) dissemination of best production practices in the field; b) capacity development and mobilization of rural communities; c) exchanges with African and Latin American countries.</p>	<p>This institution has a wide capilarity in the semiarid and could give important support to implement the project. A first contact was made by FAO to understand how this organization works, but an official contact was not made. Its reengagement is under evaluation.</p>	<p>An official contact should be made to verify the willingness of ASA to reestablish partnership and define their role in project implementation.</p>
Advice and Management on Nature Studies, Human Development and Agro-ecology (AGENDHA)	<p>The NGO, one of the co-financiers, promotes technological innovation, implements technical assistance and rural extension and participates in policy dialog about ways to live in harmony with semi-aridity. It supports 30 cooperatives and associations mainly led by women involving more than 3,000 people. It will cooperate with expansion of the coverage of food procurement and distribution programs in the northeastern part of the state of Bahia, where the Uauá site is located.</p>	<p>Some contacts were tried by MMA team, with no success</p>	<p>The reengagement is under evaluation</p>

Northeast Plants Association (APNE)	One of the co-financiers, this association promotes sustainable development through the promotion of SFM and greater knowledge about Caatinga flora through the implementation of training courses, field evaluations and studies of ASD environments. The project will work with APNE by establishing agreements to support training on seed collection, forest nursery practices, SFM, degraded areas and biological connectivity.	This institution has been already reengaged in the project with important role, responsible of the landscape analysis updated that will help project planning. A synergy with ADESE and CEPIS should be evaluate to optimize the actions in the Seridó Region.	No challenge identified
Araripe Foundation (FA)	The foundation, one of the co-financiers, plays a key role in raising awareness and dissemination of information about improvement of living conditions in semi-arid conditions. It already implements NTFP production chains in the Crato region of Ceará. The foundation will support project activities to promote better production practices in ASD, staff training and production of information materials.	An important and strategic institution to support implementation of activities in Araripe Region and also in entire semi-arid. This institution is already reengaged with a LoA under negotiation for actions in Uauá Region in collaboration with Embrapa CENARGEN	No challenge identified
Seridó Development Association (ADESE)	The association, which is qualified by the Ministry of Justice as a Civil Society Organization of Public Interest (OSCIP), works in 25 municipalities in Rio Grande do Norte's	An important and strategic institution to support implementation of activities in Seridó Region. A synergy with APNE and CEPIS should be evaluate to optimize the actions in the region.	A contact must be made to evaluate the enrollment of this stakeholder

	<p>Seridó region and is a key player in the “Sustainable RN” project. The organization's goals are the consolidation of local processes of participation, promotion of sustainable socio-economic development and public policy dialog.</p>		
<p>Brazilian Institute of Development and Sustainability (IABS)</p>	<p>One of the co-financiers, also an OSCIP, IABS seeks to promote social welfare, sustainable development and the reduction of international, national, regional and local inequalities. It has an important field center in the Xingó region of Alagoas. The Mandacaru and Drylands Champions prizes are valuable forms of dissemination of innovations. Cooperation with the project will involve management processes and training.</p>	<p>An important and strategic institution to support implementation of activities in Xingó Region. A first contact was made with a collaborative response.</p>	<p>An evaluation is being performed to verify how it could be enroll in the project</p>
<p>Social Action Agency of the Natal Ecclesiastical Province, the Caicó Diocese and the Mossoró Diocese (SEAPAC)</p>	<p>One of the co-financiers, this agency is located in Rio Grande do Norte. Its mission is to support rural and urban population groups that are socially vulnerable, leading the proposition and achievement of rights and public access policies. It invests in the organization and coordination of civil society in dialog with the government and building broad</p>	<p>No contact was made</p>	<p>An evaluation is being made to verify how it could be enroll in the project</p>

	<p>partnerships, implementing educational, social and environmental processes from the perspective of a united, democratic, just and sustainable society. It is a key player in the Seridó project site.</p>		
<p>Alternative Agriculture Center - Northern Minas Gerais (CAA-NM)</p>	<p>The project will establish exchanges with this non-governmental center, which has vast experience in generation and dissemination of knowledge about ways in which local community associations can support land reform, family farming, agro-ecology, agroforestry and NTFPs in the Caatinga and the Cerrado.</p>	<p>This institution has a knowledge in the semiarid that could give support to implement the project. An evaluation should be made to verify how it could be enroll in the project.</p>	<p>A contact must be made to evaluate the enrollment of this stakeholder</p>
<p>Family Farmer Cooperative of Canudos, Uauá and Curaçá (COOPERCUC)</p>	<p>In the Uauá field site, this cooperative will play a key role in providing information and knowledge to help other associations engage in sustainable use of biodiversity. Its more than 200 members, mostly women, process native Caatinga fruits (mainly umbu and passion fruit) for domestic and international markets. The cooperative serves as a model for establishing partnerships with governmental and inter-governmental agencies</p>	<p>An important and strategic institution to support implementation of activities in Uauá Region in Bahia State. An evaluation is being performed to verify how it could be enroll in the project.</p>	<p>A contact must be made to evaluate the enrollment of this stakeholder</p>



	and non-governmental organizations.		
<b><i>Private sector entities</i></b>			
NA			
<b><i>Others<sup>[O]</sup></i></b>			
NA			
<b><i>New stakeholders identified/engaged</i></b>			
NA			

---

[23] They can include, among others, community-based organizations (CBOs), Indigenous Peoples organizations, women’s groups, private sector companies, farmers, universities, research institutions, and all major groups as identified, for example, in Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and many times again since then.

## 10. Gender Mainstreaming

<b>Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) during this reporting period.</b>		
<b>Category</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period</b>
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	Yes	APNE will evaluate the gender participation in the SFM process in Seridó Region. A Social specialist in socio-environmental assessments and monitoring of safeguards will support the gender strategy
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	Each LoA agreed will evaluate the participation of women in the activities planned and promote the gender inclusion with capacities' development in many subjects.
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Yes	This should be an indirect impact of the project.
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	The capacity development of women should improve the participation in decision making in their communities
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	No	
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	The results produced will disaggregated the data by gender for further evaluation.
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	Úrsula Andressa Morais Zacarias Gender Focal Point FAO Brazil
Any other good practices on gender	No	Some practices should be identified through the Project implementation.

## 11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.	The project knowledge management strategy is under elaboration, considering the updated diagnosis. A data base with the courses content, duration, list of participants will be set, including an evaluation of each course provided by the responsible institution, including improvements that can be made for futures trainings.
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	Using as reference the PRODOC of the project, as well as the need of an implementation forecast of the communication, it was proposed a first draft for the communication strategy of REDESER. Also was created a brand through the development of a visual identity. The communication team reviewed the proposal of communication materials at the Terms of Reference under negotiation with partners to disseminate lessons learned during project execution, sharing best practices, and generating new knowledge about sustainable land use and sustainable forest management. An audiovisual data base of the project is planned to be build. The main challenge refers to the general context of project implementation since few field activities are in progress. The expectation is to go forward in the communication strategy as soon as the main activities start.
Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.	NA
Please provide links to related website, social media account	The account of FAO Brazil in tweeter, @FAOBrasil, publish news of many projects including REDESER.
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	The LoA between FAO and APNE was news in FAO Brazil web site: <a href="https://www.fao.org/brasil/noticias/detail-events/pt/c/1476372/">https://www.fao.org/brasil/noticias/detail-events/pt/c/1476372/</a>
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details	Aline Czezacki Kravutschke Communication Officer FAO Brazil

## 12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

**Are Indigenous Peoples and local communities involved in the project (as per the approved Project Document)? If yes, please briefly explain.**

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

Do indigenous peoples and or local communities have an active participation in the project activities? If yes, briefly describe how.

**Not applicable.**

### 13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>25</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Civil Society	AGENDHA - Advice and Management on Nature Studies, Human Development and Agro-ecology	In kind	160,000		N/A	160,000
Civil Society	APNE - Plant Association of the Northeast	In kind	160,000	112,997	N/A	160,000
State Government	CEPIS - Paraíba Technological Park Foundation	In kind	533,333		N/A	533,333
Civil Society	FA - Araripe Foundation	In kind	160,000		N/A	160,000
United Nations Organization	FAO - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	In kind	200,000	81,000	N/A	200,000

<sup>25</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, Beneficiaries, Other.

## 2022 Project Implementation Report

State Government	FUNETEC -Foundation of Technological and Cultural Education	In kind	800,000		N/A	800,000
Civil Society	IABS - Brazilian Institute of Sustainability and Development	In kind	266,666		N/A	266,666
Civil Society	ICRAF - World Agroforestry Center	In kind	100,000		N/A	100,000
Federal Government	INSA - National Institute of the Semi-Arid Region	In kind	1,333,333		N/A	1,333,333
Federal Government	MDA - Ministry of Agricultural Development	In kind	3,360,000		N/A	3,360,000
Federal Government	MMA -Ministry of the Environment	In kind	1,866,667		N/A	1,866,667
State Government	SEAFDS -Agriculture Secretariat of Paraíba	In kind	1,066,667		N/A	1,066,667
Civil Society	SEAPAC -Support Services for Alternative Community Projects	In kind	160,000		N/A	160,000
State Government	SEIHRMACT -Environment Secretariat of Paraíba	In kind	800,000		N/A	800,000
Municipal Government	SEMA – Crato Environment Secretariat	In kind	533,334		N/A	533,334
State Government	SEMARH -Alagoas Environment Secretariat	In kind	533,333		N/A	533,333

State Government	SEPLAN - Rio Grande do Norte Planning Secretariat	In kind	1,066,666	-	N/A	1,066,666
Federal Government	SFB -Brazilian Forest Service	In kind	2,666,667		N/A	2,666,667
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15,766,666</b>	<b>193,997</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>15,766,666</b>

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

## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

<b>Development Objectives Rating.</b> A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>	Project is expected to achieve or exceed <b>all</b> its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”
<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	Project is expected to achieve <b>most</b> of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings
<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>	Project is expected to achieve <b>most</b> of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve <b>some</b> of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits
<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</b>	Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only <b>some</b> of its major global environmental objectives)
<b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b>	Project is expected <b>not</b> to achieve <b>most</b> of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits)
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</b>	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, <b>any</b> of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

<b>Implementation Progress Rating.</b> A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project’s components and activities is in compliance with the project’s approved implementation plan.	
<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>	Implementation of <b>all</b> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice
<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	Implementation of <b>most</b> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action
<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>	Implementation of <b>some</b> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action
<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</b>	Implementation of <b>some</b> components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
<b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b>	Implementation of <b>most</b> components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</b>	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

<b>Risk rating.</b> It should access the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:	
<b>High Risk (H)</b>	There is a probability of greater than <b>75%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
<b>Substantial Risk (S)</b>	There is a probability of between <b>51%</b> and <b>75%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks
<b>Moderate Risk (M)</b>	There is a probability of between <b>26%</b> and <b>50%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.
<b>Low Risk (L)</b>	There is a probability of up to <b>25%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.