



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	LAC
Country (ies):	Brazil
Project Title:	Reversing Desertification Process in Susceptible Areas of Brazil: Sustainable Agroforestry Practices and Biodiversity Conservation (REDESER)
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/BRA/085/GFF
GEF ID:	5324
GEF Focal Area(s):	Biodiversity, Land Degradation, SFM
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Environment, departments of agriculture of four states
Project Duration:	4 years

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	9 May 2016
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	19 Jan 2018
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	9 May 2020
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	
Actual Implementation End Date³:	28 Feb 2022

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	3,930,155 USD
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	15,766,666 USD
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	57,357 USD
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	N/A

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

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

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

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	<p>A Steering Committee meeting had been solicited by FAO since June 2018, to discuss and define guidance for the correct start-up procedure. The SC did not eventually take place. The Minutes are attached to this PIR as annex 1 (Spanish).</p> <p>Steering Committee was convened in June 2018 to initiate the project. FAO was informed about the interest of making substantial review to the project document. A technical meeting was organized with the participation of the Ministry of Environment, the project director and technical staff. FAO informed the participants the logic behind GEF projects, the importance to follow the guidelines provided by the BD focal area of GEF and its contribution to the global environmental benefits. MMA was informed about the procedures that need to follow if changes on the intervention area, project objectives and products were proposed. Minutes of this meeting attached.</p>
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	NA
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	NA
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	NA
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	Yes

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

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

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	MU	Major delay on the project initiation was faced due to the request of the former leadership of the Ministry of Environment (MMA) was considering making substantial changes to the project document without the appropriate consultation with counterparts. Changes on the intervention area moving from the caatinga to cerrado ecosystem arguing that is part of the semi arid zone. Intervention strategy was also proposed with a main action to donate wood saving stoves to local communities. During this same period, Brazilian election semester was taking place, which meant that political interests came into play. FAO considered that it was not appropriate to continue the project initialization process until as the political risk was increasing. After the election, new authorities requested a major change in the MMA internal structure that is still under adjustment but at this reporting period, FAO received the notice of an ongoing designation of a new project director. In July 2019 high level authorities of the MMA, officially designated project director and FAO, convoked a meeting for the revision of the project document, and identified immediate actions to be taken by each party. The project was also presented to new authorities from the semi arid region and from the central offices, to make a revision of base-line information, learn about new actions that exist in the semi-arid region, identify potential new actors, and define and implementation strategy to face the existing delay. It was agreed that the revision of the ToRs for the project coordination, and the VA is urgently needed for the preparation of the inception workshop in semi arid zone, expecting to take place in October 2019.
Overall implementation progress rating:	U	Project is facing a significant delay, as it was described above
Overall risk rating:	Medium	With the nomination of the new director, and the new institutional arrangements and political priorities of the MMA, the project director, and current fluent communication with FAO personnel, project risk is considered medium. Project director has an interest in the construction of new partnerships and re co-financing commitments., since the original ones may not be able to reconfirm their commitments of those actors identified during the project elaboration. Some of them may not be available due to several changes on government administration.

Status

Implementation Status (1 st PIR, 2 nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	1 st PIR
---	---------------------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	To be hired	
Lead Technical Officer	Hivy Ortiz, Forest Officer, RLC	Hivy.ortizchour@fao.org
Budget Holder	Rafael Zavala, FAO Representative, FAO Brazil	Rafael.zavala@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Climate and Environment Division	Valeria Gonzalez Riggio, Technical Officer, CBC	Valeria.GonzalezRiggio@fao.org

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Objective(s): To halt and reverse environmental degradation in areas susceptible to desertification (ASD), ensuring the flow of ecosystem services, promoting the integrated management of natural resources, generating environmental benefits and contributing to poverty reduction.						
Outcome 1.1 INRM has been mainstreamed and scaled up at landscape level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •# of hectares where INRM is adopted and mainstreamed •Spatial coverage of INRM practices in wider landscape (in hectares) •areas where the project directly contributes to BD conservation or sustainable use of its components 	0	542,485 ha.	904,142 ha.	0	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •# of INRM tools and methodologies introduced •# of smallholders 	0	3 good practices applied in 60% of the target areas	3 good practices: i) sustainable production of non-wood forest and agriculture products; ii) Forest and Landscape restoration; and iii)	0	

⁷ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

⁸ 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.

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

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	with increased and diversified production based on INRM •% of households that are female-led	0	940 people) 30% of households are female-led	sustainable management of natural resources 1,567 people 50% of households are female-led	0 0	
Outcome 2.1: Forest areas under multi-purpose Sustainable Forest management (SFM) have been increased	LD-2 iii) # of hectares providing sustained flow of services in forest ecosystems in drylands: *SFM/REDD+-1.2: a) <i>Area covered by forest management plans</i> b) <i>with conservation and enhancement of carbon in forest through SFM</i> BD-2 iii): Specific management practices that integrate BD: a) SFM plans	0 a) 2 management plans exist covering a total of 1,712 ha 0 0	309,031 ha. Additional 4,000 ha with SFM plans	618,062 hectares of forest areas (85% of forest cover in project area) +15,000 ha. under SFM plans) b) 618, 062 ha corresponding to 2,058,146 t CO2eq (indirect impact)	0 0 0	NA

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	LD-2 ii): Total spatial coverage of SFM practices and technologies					
Outcome 3.1: Seed/seedling production capacity improved to support restoration of degraded lands in ASD	BD-2 iii): Specific management practices that integrate BD: b) restoration with native species	0	10,000 ha under restoration with native species	30,000 ha under restoration with native species	0	NA
Outcome 3.2 Forest connectivity sites have been identified, sustainably managed and restored	SFM/REDD+-1. Carbon stored in forest ecosystems and emissions avoided from deforestation and forest degradation from this project (Direct lifetime): a) Conservation & enhancement of carbon in forests b) Avoided deforestation and forest degradation	0	792,142 ton CO ₂ eq, and indirect impact: additional 618,087 ton CO ₂ eq	a) Conservation & enhancement of carbon in forests: +30,000 has of forest restored, +439,200 ton CO ₂ eq sequestered and additional enhancement of carbon in forest through SFM (target: 618,062 ha, 2,058,146 t CO ₂ eq - indirect impact) b) Avoided deforestation and forest degradation (avoided emissions (direct impact): 696,219 ton	0	NA

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
				CO ₂ eq ha in 5,709 ha) Indirect impact: avoided emissions of 2,472,347 ton CO ₂ eq in 60,820 ha		
Outcome 4.1: Improvement in capacity of key state and municipal institutions about SLM, SFM and FLR	# of staff with improved capacities at local level # of knowledge management networks in ASD	ASD states have very limited exchange on LD and desertification	An on-line data base designed on LD projects in ASD, experts and stakeholders	Increased capacity and knowledge of at least 270 personnel from the 14 municipalities and the 9 ASD states on LD and desertification issues and responses A strong network established in ASD for knowledge exchange	0	NA
Outcome 4.2: Policy-makers 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 Enhanced material for nurseries	Materials for forest officers, nursery staff and seed collectors is produced and distributed in each project site	0	NA

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Outcome 5.1: Synergy with complementary initiatives to promote sustainable management and restoration benefits at landscape level	# of initiatives with established collaboration	Poor synergy	Interaction with 10 key initiatives	Majority of relevant stake-holders interacting	0	NA
Outcome 5.2: Project implemented with results-based management and application of findings/lessons learned	Project delivery complies with FAO-GEF reporting requirements	NA	Project reports	Full compliance	0	NA

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹⁰

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
ALL OUTCOMES	To recruit the National Coordinator to organize the inception workshop: prepare an annual workplan and budget, convoke participants to the revision and update the baseline information according to the annual workplan, convoke to partners for the Inception Workshop then convoking the first Project Steering Committee for workplan approval	Project director designated by the Ministry of Environment, s FAO shall support and assist in the start-up process	Inception workshop October 2019

¹⁰ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1.1: INRM best practices identified, evaluated and replicated at farm and landscape levels	02/2022						0%	
Output 1.1.2 NTPP from INRM incorporated in government programs and projects and local agro-	02/2022						0%	

¹¹ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

¹² As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹³ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

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

industries								
Output 1.1.3 Capacity for identification, evaluation and promotion of INRM systems strengthened at state-level departments and agencies	02/2022						0%	
Output 2.1.1 Innovative small- and large-scale SFM practices identified, evaluated and replicated in selected forest management and experimental areas	02/2022						0%	
Output 2.1.2 Support for the development of multiple-use SFM supply chains	02/2022						0%	

<u>Output 2.1.3</u> Guidelines developed for SFM practices and monitoring protocols at local level	02/2022						0%	
<u>Output 3.1.1</u> Smallholders and public nurseries in ASD legalized with improved native seed and seedling production	02/2022						0%	
<u>Output 3.1.2</u> Seed collectors and nursery personnel trained and registered in National System of Seeds and Seedlings	02/2022						0%	
<u>Output 3.1.3</u> Practical guidelines for FLR in ASD developed and adopted by	02/2022						0%	

stakeholders								
<u>Output 3.2.1</u> Appropriate sites identified and restoration plans under implementation for restoration and establishment of forest connectivity using cost-effective and adapted restoration techniques (assisted natural regeneration, enrichment and planting etc.)	02/2022						0%	
<u>Output 3.2.2</u> Participatory projects for restoration of degraded lands and improvement of production landscapes and land use practices	02/2022						0%	

<u>Output 4.1.1</u> Strengthened learning and action networks facilitating field exchanges in ASD	02/2022						0%	
<u>Output 4.2.1</u> Guidelines and briefs developed on best practices and lessons learned on SFM, FLR and INRM in ASD	02/2022						0%	
<u>Output 4.2.2</u> ASD academic community engaged against LD and desertification	02/2022						0%	
<u>Output 4.2.3</u> Increased awareness about sustainable forest management and Forest and Landscape Restoration in ASD	02/2022						0%	

<u>Output 5.1.1</u> Effective collaboration with complementary initiatives	02/2022						0%	
<u>Output 5.2.1</u> Project monitoring and evaluation system operational providing information on progress in meeting project outcome and output targets	02/2022						0%	
<u>Output 5.2.2</u> Mid-term and final evaluation conducted, project best practices and lessons learned published and disseminated	02/2022						0%	

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

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

The project REDESER has suffered a long elaboration process. The ProDoc was approved by FAO on May 19, 2016, whereas the national approval by the Ministry of Environment and the Brazilian Agency of Cooperation of the Ministry of Foreign Relation (ABC/MRE) has taken place as late as in late November, 2017¹⁵.

MMA Minister proposed, after approval of the project, to introduce new areas in the federal State of Maranhão. Nonetheless these are not geographically and climatically located in the semi-arid region.

Moreover, the former NPD wanted to use GEF funding to finance his personal concept of combatting desertification, mainly associated with the deliver of firewood saving stoves as the mechanism to reduce deforestation without considering appropriate forest management practices, and to set aside the approaches and methodologies described in the approved ProDoc. FAO provided the technical advice, and highlighted the appropriate procedures requested by the technical units, GEF unit in HQ and the GEF Secretariat, highlighting the commitments related to global environmental benefits, indicators, and results presented in the PRODOC and agreed with the donors. Since FAO resisted to such attempts, the project did not actually start. The national coordinator selected in March 2018 has resisted only two months and has quit on May 2018.

As per news received informally on June 27 2019 by the would-be NPD (in fact not officially designated yet), the desertification theme and the technical staff responsible for it is being moved to another sector of the Ministry, hence the recent meetings and deals made with them for the start-up of the project are going. The project is to be updated in its baseline anyway.

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

On January 2019 the new government was appointed, with a complete restructuration of the Ministry of Environment that ended on May 2019. In early June 2019 the would-be new NPD got in touch with FAO to resume the negotiations for the start-up of the project.

The major challenges are to achieve an overall alignment with the new management of the Ministry of Environment with new priorities that will require new negotiation processes. The advantage is that technical staff have permanent positions that have the institutional memory from the design of the project until this moment. There will be a challenge to persuade a commitment with the Multilateral Environmental Agreements (CBD, UNCCD, UNFCCC). It is important to mention that the new MMA department which has assumed some responsibility in front of UNCCD and the project has urban environment as highest priority.

Additionally, contact must be resumed urgently with the founding governmental and social partners in four States of the Northeast semiarid to reconfirm co-funding and interest to collaborate with the project.

¹⁵ Either FAO and the Brazilian Agency for Cooperation (ABC) did not accept to sign the due Project Agreement using the same text agreed in 2011 for two similar GEF projects. The negotiation for the new text of the project agreement took ten additional months, and was agreed on late March, 2017. Then, the ABC took other 4 months to check the correspondence between the English and the Portuguese versions of ProDoc and Project Agreement. The documents were finally ready to sign at the end of July, 2017.

	FY2019 Development Objective rating¹⁶	FY2019 Implementat ion Progress rating¹⁷	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	NA	NA	No coordinator/manager in office
Budget Holder	HU	HU	The project is going to be restarted, while preserving its original objectives, outcomes and most outputs, however the definition of activities at the AWP/B shall take into consideration the new keywords of the new leadership of MMA, that is combining conservation wit socio-economic development and bio-economy. The BH has nothing to object to this new deal because it was already embedded in the ProDoc, although not explicitly.
Lead Technical Officer¹⁸	U	U	Project was facing a high risk in terms of political intervention, inappropriate technical decisions, and not appropriate use of the funds. As project LTO it was recommended to put on hold the project until more clarity on the government structure and interest was in place. After the election period (January 2019) two project directors were nominated and it was changed to different departments and secretariats at the MMA. After the designation of the International Affairs Secretariat of the MMA, particularly the office of Climate Change and Desertification, a coherent procedure is now in place. Once the project coordinator is hired and workplan approved by the SC, project will request a strong effort on implementation.
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MU	U	Due to political instability in Brazil and internal coordination, technical and political problems, the project has not started yet. Recommendations made by the LTO should be considered to start the project implementation in October (Inception workshop) smoothly.

¹⁶ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet.

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

¹⁷ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁸ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

3. Risks

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

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ¹⁹ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
High	Due to the change of government and new policies the project will request a high negotiation ability at national level and at regional level. During the inception workshop and the conformation of the Project Steering Committee national authorities are to be fully briefed on GEF projects (global environmental benefits, national commitments, roles, responsibilities, coordination) to guarantee an appropriate implementation. FAO financial procedures, regulations, M&E will be clarified. This same procedure should be implemented at regional level.

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

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant .

	Risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
--	------	---------------------------	-------------------	--	-----------------------------------

¹⁹ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

²⁰ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²¹ If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

	Risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Climate change	H	Interaction with the National Forest Inventory project may assist the updating on the level of risk related to forest biodiversity and climate change	NA	
2	Biodiversity	M		NA	
3	Support from public and governments	M	To be verified at project inception	NA	
4	Pressures from agribusiness	H	To be discussed at inception workshop	NA	
5	Socio-economic conditions	M	To be discussed at inception workshop	NA	

	Risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²¹	Notes from the Project Task Force
6	Changes in governmental priorities	H		It has been planned to have 2 working days for the inception workshop and a full day with the decision makers at national level to brief new authorities on the GEF rational, procedures, norms and regulation to get to agreements on the implementation. A strong FAO task team will attend this meeting to guarantee transparency. Results of the meeting will be presented to national authorities to obtain clearance.	

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
M	H	The new Federal Government has not shown yet high interest in the issues of biodiversity, climate change and forest management in general and in the specific semi-arid environment, although sectors in the Ministry of Environment are committed with those issues, and the states in the northeast must cope with them and are possibly an even stronger partners as at the time of project elaboration.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²²

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes		
Project Outputs		

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

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

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	<p>Original NTE: May 9, 2020 Revised NTE: December 2022</p> <p>Justification: The delay between GEF CEO approval and national approval has been of 1.5 years, so FAO EOD has been adjusted at January 1, 2018.</p>

²² Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

5. Gender Mainstreaming

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

Was a gender analysis undertaken or an equivalent socio-economic assessment? Please briefly indicate the gender differences.

Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data? How is the project tracking gender impacts and results?

Does the project staff have gender expertise?

The socio-economic assessment has not been included in the PPG, as well as the M&E. Nevertheless, gender and generation aspects have been included in the project document. Further analysis might be required at project inception.

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

- closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;
- improving women's participation and decision making; and or
- generating socio-economic benefits or services for women.

All outcomes shall enshrine elements advocating, promoting and implementing gender equality.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

If applies, 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

The project does not involve indigenous people or Afro-descendant *quilombola* communities directly, but the SLM, SFM and NTFP best practices can be adopted by the various groups that live elsewhere in the Caatinga and its transitions to other biomes.

7. Stakeholders Engagement

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

If your project had a stakeholder engagement plan, specify whether any new stakeholders have been identified/engaged:

No stakeholders' engagement plan has been developed at PPG stage, however, as far as financial partners are concerned, each co-financing institution has declared in its support letter in which project component will pour its contribution. Considering the long gap between partnership negotiation and the eventual startup in July-August 2019, the stakeholder engagement plan shall be a relevant task of the forthcoming inception workshop.

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

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

Co-financing:*

1. AGENDHA – socio-environmental NGO
2. APNE - Northeast Plants Association
3. CEPIS - Technological Park Foundation of Paraíba
4. FA - Araripe Foundation
5. FAO – Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
6. FUNETEC - Technological and Cultural Education Foundation
7. IABS - Brazilian Institute of Development and Sustainability
8. ICRAF – World Agroforestry Centre
9. INSA - National Semi-Arid Institute
10. MDA - Ministry of Agrarian Development
11. MMA - Ministry of Environment
12. SEAFDS - Paraíba state agriculture secretariat
13. SEAPAC - Rio Grande do Norte social organization
14. SEIHRMACT – Paraíba state environment secretariat
15. SEMA - Crato municipal environment secretariat
16. SEMARH – Alagoas state environment secretariat
17. SEPLAN - Rio Grande do Norte State Planning Secretariat
18. SFB - Brazilian Forest Service

Relevant no-co-financing partners: Ministry of Social Development, ASA.

8. Knowledge Management Activities

Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or

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

No story to tell, since the project has not started yet.

9. Co-Financing

Sources of Co-financing ²³	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
		TOTAL				

²³ 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.

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

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