

GEF - PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR)

Document Generated by: GEF Coordination Office CO

At: 2024-09-04 08:26:07

Table of contents

| | |
|---|----|
| 1 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION | 3 |
| 1.1 Project Details | 3 |
| 1.2 Project Description | 4 |
| 1.3 Project Contacts..... | 5 |
| 2 Overview of Project Status..... | 6 |
| 2.1 UNEP PoW & UN..... | 6 |
| 2.2. GEF Core and Sub Indicators | 7 |
| 2.3. Implementation Status and Risks | 7 |
| 2.4 Co Finance | 9 |
| 2.5. Stakeholder | 10 |
| 2.6. Gender | 12 |
| 2.7. ESSM | 12 |
| 2.8. KM/Learning..... | 13 |
| 2.9. Stories | 14 |
| 3 Performance..... | 15 |
| 3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes | 15 |
| 3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs (Implementation Progress) | 27 |
| 4 Risks..... | 32 |
| 4.1 Table A. Project management Risk | 32 |
| 4.2 Table B. Risk-log..... | 32 |
| 4.3 Table C. Outstanding Moderate, Significant, and High risks..... | 41 |
| 5 Amendment - GeoSpatial..... | 56 |
| 5.1 Table A: Listing of all Minor Amendment (TM)..... | 56 |
| 5.2 Table B: History of project revisions and/or extensions (TM) | 57 |

UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2024
Reporting from 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024

1 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

1.1 Project Details

| | |
|---|--|
| GEF ID: 9413 | Umoja WBS: GFL-11207-14AC0003-SB-010140 |
| SMA IPMR ID: 37266 | Grant ID: S1-32GFL-000621 |
| Project Short Title: GEF AP | |
| Project Title: Realizing the Biodiversity Conservation Potential of Private Lands | |
| Duration months planned: | 60 |
| Duration months age: | 81 |
| Project Type: | Full Sized Project (FSP) |
| Parent Programme if child project: | |
| Project Scope: | National |
| Region: | Latin America and Caribbean |
| Countries: | Brazil |
| GEF Focal Area(s): | Biodiversity, Land Degradation |
| GEF financing amount: | \$ 8,953,425.00 |
| Co-financing amount: | \$ 33,892,917.00 |
| Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval: | 2018-01-31 |
| UNEP Project Approval Date: | 2018-05-09 |
| Start of Implementation (PCA entering into force): | 2018-05-10 |
| Date of Inception Workshop, if available: | 2018-08-07 |
| Date of First Disbursement: | 2018-08-06 |
| Total disbursement as of 30 June 2024: | \$ 4,505,331.00 |
| Total expenditure as of 30 June: | \$ 5,441,451.00 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| Midterm undertaken?: | Yes |
| Actual Mid-Term Date, if taken: | 2023-05-01 |
| Expected Mid-Term Date, if not taken: | 2023-05-01 |
| Completion Date Planned - Original PCA: | 2023-05-09 |
| Completion Date Revised - Current PCA: | 2026-06-30 |
| Expected Terminal Evaluation Date: | 2026-12-31 |
| Expected Financial Closure Date: | 2027-06-30 |

1.2 Project Description

In 2010, the Convention on Biological Diversity established 20 Aichi Biodiversity Targets, whose achievement depended on actions that were beyond the establishment of protected areas administered by the government of Brazil, multi-party bodies (i.e., government-private sector partnerships), or indigenous peoples and local communities, who have rights of occupation and use of their traditional territories. Brazil, as one of the most biodiverse countries of the world, has two pillars for biodiversity conservation: the first one is based upon the large extension of the country's protected areas system (i.e., 30% of the territory encompassing circa 2,5 million square kilometers); the second one is comprised of the indigenous territories, occupying 13,9% of the Brazilian territory, that is, 1,7 million square kilometers. However, it is still lacking in Brazil a comprehensive set of instruments to support biodiversity conservation initiatives within private areas. Private properties in Brazil hold approximately 53% of the remnant native vegetation cover. The country thus has the potential of leading initiatives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in private areas, which can act as another effective area-based conservation measure, potentially supporting the achievement of some Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Currently, the main threats to biodiversity conservation in private areas in Brazil are unsustainable farming, unsustainable use of the native vegetation, wildlife poaching, and introduction of alien invasive species. Although several initiatives have been developed to overcome these threats, there are key factors that still contribute to these threats and need to be tackled to ensure effective conservation in private areas. The demanding actions are: 1) to disseminate knowledge on the conservation value of private areas; 2) to improve the low institutional capacity and inadequate governance; and 3) to curtail harmful subsidies. Given this context, the long-term goal of this project is, within private areas, to enhance biodiversity conservation and the provision of ecosystem's services; increase connectivity and native vegetation cover; reduce environmental degradation; improve endangered species conservation; and mitigate climate change. The short and medium-term objective of this project is to scale up sustainable landscape management initiatives and to contribute for biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services provision within private areas in Brazil. This project encompasses three interrelated components. First, to implement pilot areas in the biogeographical regions of the Atlantic Forest and the Cerrado, where on the ground activities will be developed for reducing the degree of fragmentation in production landscapes, increasing habitat availability for endangered species, and promoting incentives schemes for conservation. Second, establishing a sectorial agreement with the Forestry Sector (i.e., tree plantation companies) to enhance biodiversity conservation and recovery of the native vegetation within their properties. Third, improving public capabilities to plan and implement conservation policies in private areas, by mainstreaming conservation value in public policies and tools. The project duration was planned for 60 months, and the United Nations Environment Programme

is the Implementing Agency; the Brazilian Ministry of Environment (MMA) is the main governmental partner and the CSO International Institute for Sustainability has been selected as the Executing Agency. The project is aligned with the Results Framework for GEF Trust Fund (6th Replenishment) on Biodiversity - BD (Objective 4, Program 9, Outcomes 9.1 and 9.2); Land Degradation - LD (Objective 2, Program 3, Outcomes 2.1 and 2.2; Objective 3, Program 4, Outcomes 3.1 and 3.2); and Sustainable Forest Management - SFM (Objective 1, Program 2, Outcomes 1 and 2; Objective 2, Program 5, Outcome 3).

1.3 Project Contacts

| | |
|---|--|
| Division(s) Implementing the project | Ecosystems Division |
| Name of co-implementing Agency | |
| Executing Agency (ies) | International Institute for Sustainability (IIS) |
| names of Other Project Partners | Brazilian Ministry of the Environment (MMA) |
| UNEP Portfolio Manager(s) | Johan Robinson |
| UNEP Task Manager(s) | Anna Fanzeres/Robert Erath |
| UNEP Budget/Finance Officer | Paul Vrontamitis |
| UNEP Support Assistants | Gloritzel Frangakis Cano |
| Manager/Representative | Rafael Loyola |
| Project Manager | Mariana Gogola |
| Finance Manager | Samantha Brito |
| Communications Lead, if relevant | |

2 Overview of Project Status

2.1 UNEP PoW & UN

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| UNEP Current Subprogramme(s): | Thematic: Nature action subprogramme |
| UNEP previous Subprogramme(s): | Subprogram 3: Healthy and Productive Ecosystems |
| PoW Indicator(s): | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nature: (iii) Number of countries and national, regional and subnational authorities and entities that incorporate, with UNEP support, biodiversity and ecosystem-based approaches into development and sectoral plans, policies and processes for the sustainable management and/or restoration of terrestrial, freshwater and marine areas • Nature: (iv) Increase in territory of land- and seascapes that is under improved ecosystem conservation and restoration |
| UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages | UNSDCF Outcome 3: “Institutions, communities, and people actively apply and implement low carbon development, sustainable natural resources management, and disaster resilience approaches that are all gender sensitive”. |
| Link to relevant SDG Goals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere • Goal 2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture • Goal 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls • Goal 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts • Goal 15: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss |
| Link to relevant SDG Targets: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.1 By 2030, eradicate extreme poverty for all people everywhere, currently measured as people living on less than \$1.25 a day • 2.1 By 2030, end hunger and ensure access by all people, in particular the poor and people in vulnerable situations, including infants, to safe, nutritious and sufficient food all year round • 5.1 End all forms of discrimination against all women and girls everywhere • 13.1 Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries • 15.1 By 2020, ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreements |

2.2. GEF Core and Sub Indicators

GEF core or sub indicators targeted by the project as defined at CEO Endorsement/Approval, as well as results

| Indicators | Targets - Expected Value | | | Materialized to date |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|
| | Mid-term | End-of-project | Total Target | |
| 1.2- Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness | N/A | 859,700 hectares | 859,700 hectares | These goals are in the process of revision due to the adjustment of the project activities post MTR. |
| 3.1- Area of degraded agricultural lands under restoration | N/A | 7,275 hectares | 7,275 hectares | These goals are in the process of revision due to the adjustment of the project activities post MTR. |
| 4- Area of landscapes under improved practices (excluding protected areas) | N/A | 859,700 hectares | 859,700 hectares | These goals are in the process of revision due to the adjustment of the project activities post MTR. |
| 6.1- Greenhouse gas emission mitigated in the AFOLU sector | N/A | 46,000,000 tCO2Eq | 46,000,000 tCO2Eq | These goals are in the process of revision due to the adjustment of the project activities post MTR. |
| 11- People benefitting from GEF-financed investments | N/A | 45,081 | 45,081 | These goals are in the process of revision due to the adjustment of the project activities post MTR. |

Implementation Status 2023: 5th PIR

2.3. Implementation Status and Risks

| | PIR# | Rating towards outcomes (section 3.1) | Rating towards outputs (section 3.2) | Risk rating (section 4.2) |
|---------|---------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| FY 2024 | 5th PIR | U | MU | M |
| FY 2023 | 4th PIR | U | MU | M |
| FY 2022 | 3rd PIR | MS | MS | S |
| FY 2021 | 2nd PIR | MS | MS | M |
| FY 2020 | 1st PIR | S | S | M |

| | | | | |
|---------|--|--|--|--|
| FY 2019 | | | | |
| FY 2018 | | | | |
| FY 2017 | | | | |
| FY 2016 | | | | |
| FY 2015 | | | | |

Summary of status

Half year after the launching of the project implementation phase, a change in the federal administration in Brazil, led to a stallment of environmentally related initiatives. Topped by the Covid 19 Pandemic that brought the country to a two-year halt of public activities, in the first semester of 2023 it was conducted the Mid Term Review (MTR) with the intent of identifying the necessary adjustments in the project strategy. The MTR established the parameter for a new phase of project execution, with the period from June 2023 to June 2024 utilized by the incoming federal administration (including the restructuring of the Ministry of Environment) to review the achievements and propose restructuring measures, all in accordance with the recommendations of the MTR, delivered in May 2023. Notable changes included the separation of roles and responsibilities between IIS and MMA, as a key process for restructuring the project governance, including the adoption of a new execution format. IIS became solely responsible for the financial and administrative management of the project, while MMA will oversee the technical coordination of activities. The herein reporting period (July 2023 to June 2024), covers the actions taken to realign the technical execution with partners and departments of the Secretariat of Biodiversity (within MMA), review project actions, and reorganize the activities accordingly to the new execution timeline (amended to end in 2026). The project reorganization planning process described below:

Between October 2023 and March 2024, IIS allocated a reduced team for the management of the project, involving those directly related with the day-to-day activities and, the technical personnel necessary to support MMA during the transition phase for the structuring the Ministry technical support unit. Four consultants have been hired to support the MMA in coordinating the project: a Technical Coordinator (Mayne Assunção), a Monitoring & Evaluation Coordinator (Marcia Coura), a Communication Coordinator (Karoline Diniz) and a Technical Assistant (Icaro Souza).

The governance of the project was reviewed and extended with the inclusion of new actors and the redefinition of some roles. A Strategic Technical Council has been established to maintain dialogue among the various executing partners and strategic stakeholders. The redefinition and re-negotiation of roles and responsibilities were key points in the project's restructuring process, addressing the recommendations from the Mid-Term Review.

The Project Operational Manual (MOP*) is under revision to accommodate all new implementation arrangements and necessary operational adjustments. The Technical Cooperation Agreement (ACT*) between MMA and IIS was revised, considering the project adjustments and new assignments.

The Communication Coordinator conducted a diagnosis of the project's previous initiatives in this area. Based on this finding it was designed a Communication Plan for the new phase of the project (post MTR) The proposed strategy aims to promote the actions and results of GEF Private Areas project, increase its visibility, engage strategic actors at various levels, and involve direct beneficiaries and the external public sensitive to the project's themes.

Several meetings, involving MMA Coordination at the Secretariat of Biodiversity (SBio), IIS and relevant project stakeholders took place since July 2023. Based upon the recommendations of the MTR, all relevant actors were consulted to suggest possible activities aligned with interests. To culminate the planning for the new phase, two workshops at the two pilot areas – Cerrado and Atlantic Forest biomes were organized, respectively, in January and February, to debate with local actors the restructuring and relaunching of the project interventions at both sites (APA Pouso Alto and APA São João) with the CSOs Funatura and Golden Tamarin Association (AMLD) assuming a leading role in this new phase of the project.

The consolidation of the Project review, guided by the MTR, ensures the consecution of the approved objectives and results. For such, the consolidation of the new POA is resultant of an internal articulation of the MMA departments of the Secretariat of Biodiversity with: other MMA areas such as the Executive Secretariat (Secex), the Secretariat of Bioeconomy (SBC), the Secretariat for Traditional Peoples and Sustainable Rural Development (SNPCT), the Brazilian Forest Service and ICMBio; also with partners from the private sector such as the Brazilian Tree Industry (Ibá); and with supra-national governmental agencies - the State of Goiás Secretariat for the Environment and Sustainable Development (Semad/GO), the State of Goiás Secretary for Environment and Sustainability (SEAS), and the State of Rio de Janeiro Environmental Institute (Inea/RJ); and at last, but not least, civil society organizations – Funatura and AMLD.

2.4 Co Finance

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Planned Co-finance: | \$ 33,892,917 |
| Actual to date: | 21,222,628 |
| Progress | <p>Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges:</p> <p>Until June 30th, 2023, a total of USD 21.222.628,62 was spent by the institutions that offered co-finance for the project, equivalent to 63% of the planned total co-finance pledge.</p> <p>It is important to mention that the extension of the Project's deadline occurred on November 7th, 2023. From this moment until presently, the Project team focused on the review of the Project with no execution of Components actions. During the current reporting period (July 2023 to June 2024) it has not yet been accounted the co-finance executed by the partners.</p> |

2.5. Stakeholder

| | |
|--|---|
| Date of project steering committee meeting | 2024-03-14 |
| Stakeholder engagement (will be uploaded to GEF Portal) | <p>In the period (July 2023 to June 2024) there were meetings between SBio/MMA, UNEP and IIS (which makes up the Project Steering Committee) to align on the review of the project and its governance. Although they were not specifically documented as CDP meetings, they can be considered as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting of July 7th, 2023 and August 29th, 2023, agenda: attributions of the project's governance bodies, preliminary proposal of the IIS team, priority products and Funatura contract; • Meeting on March 13th, 2024, considered as a Supervisory Mission due to the presence of Task Manager Robert Erath, agenda: Contextualization of the current moment of the project, Update of the new governance proposal, New execution strategy Alignment on the cash advance, Next steps; • Meeting on April 17th, 2024, on reviewing the Project budget in the Anubis system, updating the Inventory, Half Yearly/2023 and the work plan; • Meeting on April 30th, 2024 for guidance and final alignment of the review of the Project budget in the Anubis system, including justifications for changes and indicating where the movement went from, and request for cash advance; • Meeting on May 23th, 2024 on updating the progress of the Project (budget review, Q1 accountability, Half Yearly, planning of the POA, meetings with IBÁ, ACTs with IIS and local partners). <p>The main stakeholder engagement measures were the workshops held in the pilot areas to align the results obtained so far, mobilize and articulate actors and local representations from various segments involved in the project, with the purpose of facilitating the exchange of ideas and contributing to the participatory planning of the second phase of the project, as the resumption after the revision of the Project is being identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cerrado Biome – APA Pouso Alto: between 25th and 26th January, 2024, 64 people, including representatives of the municipal (São João da Aliança, Colinas, Alto Paraíso, Cavalcante, Teresina de Goiás), state (Semad) and federal (MMA, ICMBio, SFB) governments, NGOs, researchers, owners of Private Natural Heritage Reserves (RPPN), traditional peoples and other potential partners, were gathered in the auditorium of UnB Cerrado, in Alto Paraíso de Goiás, in Chapada dos Veadeiros, during the Workshop of the GEF Private Areas Project – Phase II. After introducing the progress of the project, the participants were organized into three thematic working groups: ecotourism, sustainable agroextractivism, and biodiversity monitoring. • Atlantic Forest Biome – APA of the São João River basin: between 21th and 22th February, 2024, 62 people met at the Golden |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Lion Tamarin Ecological Park, in Silva Jardim (RJ), to discuss Phase II of the GEF Private Areas project. Representatives of the municipal governments (Silva Jardim, Rio Bonito, Casimiro de Abreu, Rio das Ostras), state (Inea, Seas) and federal (MMA, ICMBio, SFB), members of civil society, rural landowners with RPPNs, academics, NGOs and representatives of family farming, including rural settlements. After an introduction on the progress of the project, participants were organized into four thematic working groups: ecotourism, restoration, agroecology, and sustainable livestock and biodiversity monitoring. In addition, technical meetings were held with other MMA secretariats that are important in conducting central themes of the Project, such as Secex with environmental education, SBC on bioeconomy, and SNPCT on sustainable agroextractivism, with ICMBio on regulation of RPPNs and development of the Veadeiros-Paraná Mosaic covering the APA Pouso Alto, with SBio departments and with a representative of the Brazilian Tree Industry (IBÁ*).</p> <p>* Acronym in Portuguese</p> |
|--|---|

2.6. Gender

| | |
|---|---|
| Does the project have a gender action plan? | No |
| Gender mainstreaming (will be uploaded to GEF Portal): | <p>Given the large number of stakeholders involved in the project, it is important to promote gender equality throughout its actions and results. Therefore, an appropriate gender analysis was conducted in project preparation and activities execution to determine the different roles, needs, and knowledge between women and men. This gender analysis was a critical first step in defining the result chain and developing the project with a gender-responsive approach to actions and results. The project has guidelines in the planning of actions to promote the participation of women and youngsters, especially in sustainable agroextractivism actions, where they play a fundamental role, and in environmental education. actions that are transversal in the project. The design and planning of the new phase of the project (post MTR) considers the initial gender analysis and for the gender equity-related outcomes to be effective it is being conduct a re-evaluation of the activities and a Gender Action Plan (GAP) will be elaborated.</p> <p>During the reporting period, two regional workshops were held to consult stakeholders on the continuity of the project as well as review actions on the planned themes. In the APA Pouso Alto, 64 people were present, 54.68% men and 45.32% women. In the APA São João, 62 people participated, 45.16% men and 54.84% women.</p> |

2.7. ESSM

| | |
|--|--|
| Moderate/High risk projects (in terms of Environmental and social safeguards) | <p>Was the project classified as moderate/high risk CEO Endorsement/Approval Stage? Yes</p> <p>If yes, what specific safeguard risks were identified in the SRIF/ESERN?</p> <p>Although the project is classified as Moderate or Higher Risk, the project's Environmental, Social and Economic Review Note (ESERN) described the standards triggered for the project, the associated risks were classified as Low (please refer to attached document) SS1 Biodiversity, natural habitat and Sustainable Management of Living Resources (L); SS2 Resource Efficiency, Pollution Prevention and Management of Chemicals and Wastes (L); SS5 Indigenous Peoples (L); SS6 Labor and working conditions (L); SS7 Cultural Heritage (L); SS8 Gender equity (L); and SS9 Economic Sustainability (L).</p> |
| New social and/or environmental risks | <p>Have any new social and/or environmental risks been identified during the reporting period? No</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | If yes, describe the new risks or changes? |
| Complaints and grievances related to social and/or environmental impacts | <p>Has the project received complaints related to social and/or environmental impacts (actual or potential) during the reporting period?</p> <p>No</p> <p>If yes, please describe the complaint(s) or grievance(s) in detail, including the status, significance, who was involved and what actions were taken?</p> |
| Environmental and social safeguards management | <p>Nevertheless, after approval of the project extension, in November 2023, the actions carried out then for the project's technical review and governance restructuring encompassed regional workshops with the participation of key stakeholders and no complaints were registered during the period.</p> |

2.8. KM/Learning

| | |
|--|---|
| Knowledge activities and products | <p>Some of the project's knowledge production activities have been implemented and described in previous reports.</p> <p>For the current reporting period, considering that there was no technical execution of the project, the products listed below were prepared within the scope of the governance restructuring and revision of the proposed activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication Plan for phase II • New Project Operational Manual (ongoing) • 2 reports on the conclusions of the Workshops with local stakeholders at the two pilot areas • New Cooperation Agreement between IIS and MMA (ongoing revision by MMA Coordination) • Proposal for a new project governance structure (to be approved by the PSC) • Project Workplan for the new phase (post-MTR)(under final consolidation) |
| Main learning during the period | <p>The main lessons learned from the project, identified in the MTR are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perform due diligence to assess not only the financial capacity but also the capacity and institutional mechanisms of the project executing agency. • Establish clear and simple institutional arrangements with well-defined roles and responsibilities, supported by a strong project steering committee to resolve performance issues, especially when there is no consensus between the parties. • Senior managers should share the context and logic of eventual top-down decisions with the technical staff during the |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>elaboration of a workplan to gain their input, buy-in, and ensure continuity in the event of future management changes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The implementation of a results-based analytical framework ensures that monitoring and evaluation captures all contributions to project outputs and outcomes. • Ensure that adaptive management is well integrated into the project context and design. • Identify and resolve design gaps or weaknesses throughout the implementation phase. • Use monitoring tools to assess progress and facilitate quick, effective changes if the project is at risk • Apply planning methodologies that are compatible with the tools of the donor and the agency implementing the project. |
|--|--|

2.9. Stories

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Stories to be shared | <p>The Golden Lion Tamarin Association that has established a partnership with the project for the new phase (post MTR) has a long time expertise in the pilot area of the Atlantic Forest, documented in the video at this link - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2A0iF6SM7go</p> |
|----------------------|---|

3 Performance

3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes

| Project Objective and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline level | Mid-Term Target or Milestones | End of Project Target | Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only) | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June | Progress rating |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------|--|---|---|-----------------|
| Objective: Scale up sustainable landscape management and contribute to biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services provision in private areas in Brazil | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 1.1. Increased vegetative cover, reduced degree of fragmentation in production landscapes and increased habitat availability for 'Golden Lion Tamarin' in the Atlantic Forest pilot area of the São João APA (KBA area in the State of Rio de Janeiro) | a) Area under restoration as per legally binding forest recovery plans | a) No legally binding forest recovery plans yet implemented | a) N/A | a) 4,000 hectares under restoration as per legally binding forest recovery plans | a) 0% | In the previous PIR this Outcome was rated as having achieved 40% of the target, but an evaluation conducted during the MTR demonstrated that this intervention had not advanced, in terms of ensured restoration area, in hectares, due to the project actions. The 40% rate refers to the execution of preliminary activities, such as training provided to local actors, for the effective implementation of the restoration. The Project has finalized the planning of the new project phase (post MTR) including a review of the main indicators that need to be adjusted given the local reality of the pilot area (i.e. APA São João) in relation to the implementation of private properties' Rural Environmental | U |

| Project Objective and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline level | Mid-Term Target or Milestones | End of Project Target | Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only) | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June | Progress rating |
|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | | Registry (CAR) and, consequently, the elaboration of the commitments with land restoration (i.e., PRADAs), which was the basis for the calculation of the indicator of this Outcome. Nevertheless, the initially proposed number of restored areas within the APA São João is proven to be much higher than existing degraded areas within the private properties involved with the project. | |
| | b) Habitat availability for key endangered species population of Golden Lion Tamarin | b) Habitat Availability Index: 0.042 | b) N/A | b) 81% increase in habitat availability for the endangered species population of Golden Lion Tamarin | b) 0% | In the previous PIR this Outcome was rated as having achieved 40% of the target, but an evaluation conducted during the MTR demonstrated that this intervention had not advanced for ensuring the increase in habitat availability for the Golden Lion Tamarin, due to the project actions. The 40% rate refers to the execution of planned activities, not the indicator or outcome. A partnership with the Golden Lion Tamarin Association (AMLD), with more than 30 years of expertise with monitoring this species has been established and after leading the local workshop for the revision of the project activities at the APA São João. The association is ahead of the interventions of the new phase of | MU |

| Project Objective and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline level | Mid-Term Target or Milestones | End of Project Target | Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only) | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June | Progress rating |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | | the Project. | |
| | c) Assessment of Golden Lion Tamarin population | c) Work on Baseline information with local partners to start at inception | c) Population data confirmed with local partners | c) Assessment shows population stable or not declined from baseline | c) 0% | In the previous PIR this Outcome was rated as having achieved 30% of the target, but an evaluation conducted during the MTR demonstrated that this intervention had not advanced due to the project actions. The 30% rate refers to the execution of planned activities, not the indicator or outcome. The project is in the process of reviewing its actions and activities. This is an indicator that has the potential to present improvement once the AMLD has been involved in the new phase of the project. | MU |
| Outcome 1.2. Reduced conversion rates and degree of fragmentation of current area of native vegetation cover in production landscapes and improved conservation actions for key endangered species populations in the Cerrado pilot area of the Pouso Alto APA (KBA are in the State of Goiás) | a) Number of stakeholders (e.g. landowners, community associations), both women and men, trained regarding implementation of conservation actions in private areas | a) 0 | a) At least 200 stakeholders | a) At least 600 stakeholders (300 women + 300 men) | a) 40% | In the previous PIR this Outcome was rated as having achieved 40% of the target. Still, an evaluation conducted by the technical team of the Ministry of Environment demonstrated that this intervention had not advanced in the reporting period. The Mapping of the main Institutions/stakeholders involved in agroextractivism and ecotourism in the APA Pouso Alto is being updated. The main challenges and opportunities associated with these stakeholders are related to capacity-building courses on relevant conservation actions. Some training has | MU |

| Project Objective and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline level | Mid-Term Target or Milestones | End of Project Target | Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only) | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June | Progress rating |
|--------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|--|---|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | | been conducted during previous reporting periods, but currently, there have not been any progress. For the new phase of the project, the proposed approach prioritizes youngsters and female stakeholders. | |
| | b) Area under refined and implemented management plan that supports SLM | b) Pouso Alto APA management plan not yet implemented and has little receptivity by local actors | b) NA | b) 872,000 hectares under refined and implemented Pouso Alto APA Management plan [Total area of the APA] | b) 0 hectares | In the previous PIR this Outcome was rated as having achieved 50% of the target, but, as a matter of fact, an evaluation conducted during the MTR demonstrated that this intervention had not advanced for ensuring the implementation of the Management Plan da APA Pouso Alto. The 50% rate refers to the execution of planned activities, not the indicator or outcome. The project actions for this Outcome included all the APA Pouso Alto territory due to the focus on ensuring the implementation of the area management plan. The project interventions shall be able to promote improved management practices within the areas of private properties involved with the project. The identification of these areas and the calculation of the improved management areas is an ongoing effort for the new phase of the project. | U |
| | c) Number of endangered species with improved | c) Zero. Improved | c) None | c) At least 10 | c) 10 species | The previous PIR has an estimate of 60% of the achievement of the target. At | S |

| Project Objective and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline level | Mid-Term Target or Milestones | End of Project Target | Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only) | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June | Progress rating |
|--------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| | monitoring | monitoring not yet in place | | | | present 100% of the target has been achieved. The survey of the selected endangered species at the APA Pouso Alto (Cerrado biome) has been concluded and monitoring is ongoing by the partner organization Funatura. The obtained information shall contribute to the long-term plan for the monitoring and protection of these species designed and conducted by ICMBio. | |
| | d) Endangered species monitoring incorporated into endangered species national Action Plans | d) Zero. Improved monitoring not yet in place | d) None | d) At least 1 | d) 0% | In the previous PIR, this Outcome was rated as having achieved 40% of the target, but an evaluation conducted during the MTR demonstrated that this intervention had not succeeded in including the monitoring information of the endangered species into the National Action Plans of such spp. The 40% rate refers to the execution of planned activities, not the indicator or outcome. The survey conducted by Funatura of endangered species of medium and large-sized mammals provided data that has been supplied to ICMBio's Action Plan Technical Advisory Group. For the new phase of the project, it will be defined the species whose monitoring data will be incorporated in a National Action Plan. MMA shall | MU |

| Project Objective and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline level | Mid-Term Target or Milestones | End of Project Target | Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only) | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June | Progress rating |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | | coordinate with the Action Plan Technical Advisory Group to ensure the incorporation of the results into the plans and the achievement of the target "At least 1 threatened species monitoring embedded in a PAN." | |
| | e) Selection of key indicator species that reflect conservation status | e) Zero. Improved monitoring not yet in place | e) Key indicator species selected | e) Assessment shows population stable or not declined from baseline | e) 0% | In the previous PIR, this Outcome was rated as having achieved 70% of the target, however, this indicator has been analyzed by the Ministry of Environment Technical team and in the revision of activities for the new phase of the project concluded that demonstrating population stability or non-decline of an endangered species, despite that, the implementing monitoring practices will be kept till the end of the project to support the management actions. | U |
| Outcome 1.3. Biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services provision, SLM, SFM and recovery of native vegetation in private areas in the two pilot areas enhanced by the development of direct and indirect incentives schemes | a) Number of stakeholders (e.g. landowners, extension agents, private sector, community associations), both women and men, trained regarding incentive schemes for SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas | a) None | a) At least 200 | a) At least 800 stakeholders (400 women + 400 men) | a) 0 | In the previous PIR, the estimated for this target was 10% of achievement, but the MTR demonstrated that the training that has been provided so far could not ensure that the project stakeholders have been adequately trained regarding incentive schemes for SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas. Thus, this indicator will be reviewed considering the Mid-Term Review recommendation, which | U |

| Project Objective and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline level | Mid-Term Target or Milestones | End of Project Target | Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only) | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June | Progress rating |
|--------------------------------|---|----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | | suggestsintegrating this outcome into 1.1 and1.2. There has been no progress since thelast report, but the planning for thenew phase of the project, there havebeen included in activities that attend tothis indicator. | |
| | b) Number of incentive schemes for SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas developed/improved | b) None | b) None | b) At least three incentive schemes | b) 0 | In the previous PIR, the estimated for this target was 10% of achievement, but the MTR demonstrated that no progress has been achieved in theimplementation of financialmechanisms that are most appropriate forprivate properties in both pilot areas(Atlantic Forest and Cerrado biomes) forthe recovery of native vegetation. So, in the new planning was proposedguidelines to increase access to MSP andMSF financing and recovery of nativevegetation and identify financialmechanisms that are most appropriate forprivate properties in both pilot areas(Atlantic Forest and Cerrado), likecoordinate with public governmentministries and secretariats to identifypublic financial incentive policies;create a strategy to strengthen publicpurchasing, e.g.: national schoolfeeding plan; establishment andregulation of payments for environmentalservices | U |

| Project Objective and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline level | Mid-Term Target or Milestones | End of Project Target | Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only) | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June | Progress rating |
|--|---|--|-------------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | | (PSA, acronym in Portuguese);promoted good practices between the territories; alternatives for remunerating rural property owners for protecting biodiversity/ecosystem services (avoided deforestation). | |
| Outcome 2.1. Biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services provision, SLM and SFM in areas of highest conservation value managed by Forestry sector companies enhanced through an agreement for the implementation of improved conservation and restoration guidelines | a) Area occupied by the companies that signed the agreement for improving and implementing protocols for biodiversity monitoring, SLM and SFM | a) None (There are no current agreements with the forestry sector companies) | a) 150,000 hectares | a) 500,000 hectares | a) 0 hectares | In the previous PIR, the estimated achieved target was 30% achievement. Still, the MTR demonstrated that no plantation sector companies have signed yet an agreement for improving and implementing protocols for biodiversity monitoring, SLM and SFM. The companies linked to IBÁ, the private forestry sector association the project is working with, already adopt the biodiversity monitoring protocols, and the standardization proposed by the project was not developed or promoted. There-establishment of the partnership with IBÁ is under negotiation and the objectives of this Outcome will be jointly revised. | U |
| | b) Percentage area of high value for conservation where biodiversity monitoring, SLM and SFM protocol are implemented | b) Zero – areas of high value for conservation managed by forestry sector | b) Zero | b) At least 40% of the high value areas for conservation | b) 0% | In the previous PIR, the estimated achieved target was 10%, but the MTR demonstrated that so far, no percentage area of high value for conservation where biodiversity monitoring, SLM and SFM protocol were implemented. For the new phase of the project, a diagnostic | U |

| Project Objective and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline level | Mid-Term Target or Milestones | End of Project Target | Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only) | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June | Progress rating |
|--------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| | | companies are not identified | | | | indicated which data could be used for modeling. The development viability of a methodology for the evaluation of the conservation value for the native forest areas within the properties of the Forestry Sector of planted trees (i.e., IBÁ) is being assessed. Nevertheless, this strategy must be incorporated by IBÁ members cooperating with the project. | |
| | c) Percentage of partner forestry companies' areas under restoration that consider the spatial prioritization developed by the project | c) None (Spatial prioritization not yet developed) | c) Zero | c) At least 40% | c) 0% | In the previous PIR, the estimated achieved target was 20% progress, but an evaluation of the Ministry of Environment technical team concluded that this target was inappropriately chosen. The project activities do not include on-the-ground restoration actions within the Forestry Sector companies. Nevertheless, the planted forest companies conduct practices for the restoration of the native vegetation within their private properties. Thus, the challenge is for MMA to obtain the data from these companies. With the re-establishment of the contact between MMA and IBA, it might be possible the identification of a mechanism of cooperation for the promotion of this objective. | U |
| Outcome 3.1. Biodiversity | a) Number of engaged | a) There are | a) At least | a) At least 50 | a) 50 | In the previous PIR, the estimated | MS |

| Project Objective and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline level | Mid-Term Target or Milestones | End of Project Target | Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only) | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June | Progress rating |
|---|--|---|-------------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------|
| conservation and ecosystems services provision mainstreamed into national regulatory framework to support SLM, SFM and restoration in private areas | stakeholders (both women and men) to point bottlenecks and solutions regarding sustainable native vegetation management in LRs | no studies that identify the bottlenecks related to native vegetation management in LRs, their regulation and possible solutions. | 30 | (25 women + 25 men) | | achieved target was 100% progress. This indicator is skewed concerning the Outcome objectives. During previous reporting period a survey on the technical, economic and legal bottlenecks (at the federal and state levels) related to the sustainable management of native vegetation at the properties Legal Reserve (RL) was conducted to generate subsidies for the elaboration of a strategy of solutions for the existing problems. Although this the study was concluded - with the consultation with 50 survey respondents, no further measures were implemented to ensure the mainstreaming of regulatory framework to support SLM, SFM and restoration in private areas. | |
| Outcome 3.2. Conservation value of private areas mainstreamed into public policies and tools | a) Number of spatial databases on conservation value of private areas for biogeographical regions integrated into the SiCAR | a) None | a) 2 | a) 5 developed spatial databases (5 biogeographic regions) | a) 0 | In the previous PIR, the estimated achieved target was 60% progress. Nevertheless, so far, no spatial databases on the conservation value of private areas for biogeographical regions have been integrated into the SiCAR. The 60% rate refers to executing planned activities, such as special data bases development for Cerrado and Atlantic Forest, not the indicator or outcome. For the new phase of the | MU |

| Project Objective and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline level | Mid-Term Target or Milestones | End of Project Target | Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only) | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June | Progress rating |
|--------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | | project these actions and activities are underrevision. This indicator should be maintained, but the development strategy is being revised. The databases that have already been compiled for the Cerrado and Atlantic Forest will undergo a consultation and validation process with experts for these two biomes. For the Caatinga, Pantanal and Pampa biomes, workshops will be held to validate the methodology for modeling their conservation value. | |
| | b) Number of public policies incorporating spatial databases on conservation value of private areas | b) There are no spatial databases on conservation value of private areas | b) None | b) At least 3 public policies | b) 0 | In the previous PIR, the estimated achieved target was 40% progress. Nevertheless, so far, no public policies incorporating spatial databases on the conservation value of private areas have been developed or adopted. The 40% rate refers to the execution of planned activities, not the indicator or outcome. For the new phase of the project, it is planned the following activities: 1) Workshop with stakeholders to identify potential public policies to incorporate the databases and develop a feasibility assessment of database incorporation into public policies; 2) Definition of the 3 public policies | U |

| Project Objective and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline level | Mid-Term Target or Milestones | End of Project Target | Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only) | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June | Progress rating |
|--------------------------------|---|----------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | | that will be the focus of the project; 3) Articulation with the governments responsible for the 3 selected public policies; 4) Government commitment to incorporate the databases into the 3 public policies. | |
| | c) Number of federal and state public sector and third sector key stakeholders (both women and men) trained and engaged to apply the conservation value of private areas database | | c) At least 25 | c) At least 75 (35 women + 40 men) | c) 0% | In the previous PIR, the estimated achieved target was 20% progress. However, there has been no progress in this Outcome. The 20% rate refers to the execution of planned activities, not the indicator or outcome. In the new phase of the project, it is intended to systematize results and elaborate an executive summary to facilitate the insertion of database into public policies by disclosing the results. | U |

3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs (Implementation Progress)

| Component | Output/Activity | Expected completion date | Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%) | Implementation status as of current reporting period (%) | Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay | Progress Rating |
|------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|--|--|-----------------|
| 1 Pilot implementation | Output 1.1.1 Programme for implementation of SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas at the São João APA (KBA area in the State of Rio de Janeiro) | 2026-06-30 | 49 | 0 | Although the previous PIR had reported an implementation status of 74%, the Ministry of Environment technical team has revised this Output and concluded that the implementation status was much lower for the previous period. The 49% rate is based on the latest Half Yearly Report (2023), which provided a new analysis of the execution of planned activities to achieve the indicators. The new administration of MMA conducted an internal process of evaluation and planning for the new phase of the project (post MTR). After consultations with local partners, this output will focus on the implementation of Demonstrative Units (DU) with best practices for MSP, MSF, and initiatives to demonstrate the potential of the native vegetation recovery in the properties in the APA São João. Complementary it will be developed a training program for extension agents (and other stakeholders), focused on the implementation of LSM, FSM. | U |
| | Output 1.2.1 Programme for implementation of conservation actions of the Pouso Alto APA's management plan in private areas | 2026-06-30 | 55 | 0 | In the previous PIR it was reported an implementation status of 65%, but the | U |

| Component | Output/Activity | Expected completion date | Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%) | Implementation status as of current reporting period (%) | Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay | Progress Rating |
|-----------|---|--------------------------|---|--|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | <p>Ministry of Environment technical team has revised this Output and concluded that the implementation status was lower for the past period. The 55% rate is based on the latest Half Yearly Report (2023), which provided a new analysis of the execution of planned activities to achieve the indicators. The new administration of MMA conducted an internal process of evaluation and planning for the new phase of the project (post MTR). After consultations with local partners, this output will involve activities such as the continuity of the “Monitoring of threatened species co-developed with key research institutions”; the strengthening of agroextractivism practices and the “Development of ecotourism through the implementation of the Caminho dos Veadeiros Trail.</p> | |
| | Output 1.3.1 Incentive package for SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas in the two pilot areas | 2026-06-30 | 10 | 0 | <p>In the previous PIR it was reported an implementation status of 30%, but the Ministry of Environment technical team has revised this Output and concluded that the implementation status was lower for the past period. The 49% rate is based on the latest Half Yearly Report (2023), which provided a new analysis of</p> | U |

| Component | Output/Activity | Expected completion date | Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%) | Implementation status as of current reporting period (%) | Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay | Progress Rating |
|---|--|--------------------------|---|--|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | the execution of planned activities to achieve the indicators. The new administration of MMA conducted an internal process of evaluation and planning for the new phase of the project (post MTR). After consultations with local partners, this output will involve activities such as the development of "Business plans adapted to different methods of recovery of native vegetation in the APA São João" and "Guidelines for increasing access to SLM and SFM financing and recovery of native vegetation". | |
| 2 Sectoral Agreement with the Forestry Sector | Output 2.1.1. Programme for the identification of high value for conservation identified and protocols for biodiversity monitoring, SLM, and SFM | 2025-12-31 | 13 | 0 | This output involves 2 main activities that have not seen progress during the reporting period. For the new phase of the project, it is planned to resume articulation with companies in the forestry sector to identify opportunities and define a new technical cooperation agreement design considering the conservation, monitoring and management actions of forests carried out by companies and the opportunities for improvements through the implementation of updated conservation and restoration guidelines. | U |
| | Output 2.1.2. Spatial database related to the prioritization for | 2026-04-30 | 12 | 0 | This output has not advanced during the | U |

| Component | Output/Activity | Expected completion date | Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%) | Implementation status as of current reporting period (%) | Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay | Progress Rating |
|---|---|--------------------------|---|--|---|-----------------|
| | restoration in forestry sector companies' areas | | | | reporting period. For the new phase of the project, the re-establishment of the partnership with IBA is under negotiation and the new activities will be defined. | |
| 3 Improvement of public capabilities to plan and implement conservation policies in private areas | Output 3.1.1 Sustainable Native Vegetation Management Regulation proposal to support SLM, SFM, and native | 2026-03-31 | 43 | 0 | This output has not advanced during the reporting period, as the project is being revised. For the new phase of the project, a continuation of the consultancy, conducted in previous periods, is being planned to ensure continuity focused on the following proposals: Solutions for RL management: (i) Rediscuss this output with the SFB and MMA and make eventual adjustments and updates to assure alignment with the new government guidelines; (ii) Approve pending products; (iii) Consider the reestablish the partnership with Ortus Consultancy to conduct the validation workshop for the developed strategy.- Guiding document for the regulation of RLA management: (i) Adjust the scope to fit the activities within the projected project completion time; (ii) Validate with the SFB and MMA the most appropriate type of document to be produced for reaching the states, and based on this, assess whether the planned legal consultancy is still | MU |

| Component | Output/Activity | Expected completion date | Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%) | Implementation status as of current reporting period (%) | Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay | Progress Rating |
|-----------|---|--------------------------|---|--|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | needed; (iii) Define with the SFB and MMA the approach for the advocacy activity and adjust the necessary time accordingly. | |
| | Output 3.2.1 Public policies incorporating spatial databases with conservation value of private areas | 2026-03-31 | 35 | 0 | This output has not advanced during the related period. In the new phase of project, the databases that have already been compiled for the Cerrado and Atlantic Forest will undergo a consultation and validation process with experts for these two biomes. For the Caatinga, Pantanal and Pampa biomes, workshops will be held to validate the methodology for modeling their conservation value. | U |
| | Output 3.2.2 Capacity building and dissemination programme for mainstreaming conservation value | 2026-03-31 | 32 | 0 | This output has not advanced during the related period. The proposal in this new phase is to elaborate a strategy to execute the activities to achieve this output, based on the results obtained in the previous output (3.2.1). | U |

The Task Manager will decide on the relevant level of disaggregation (i.e. either at the output or activity level).

4 Risks

4.1 Table A. Project management Risk

Please refer to the Risk Help Sheet for more details on rating

| Risk Factor | EA Rating | TM Rating |
|---|-------------|-------------|
| 1 Management structure - Roles and responsibilities | Substantial | Substantial |
| 2 Governance structure - Oversight | Moderate | Moderate |
| 3 Implementation schedule | High | High |
| 4 Budget | High | High |
| 5 Financial Management | Moderate | Substantial |
| 6 Reporting | Moderate | Moderate |
| 7 Capacity to deliver | Substantial | Substantial |

If any of the risk factors is rated a Moderate or higher, please include it in Table B below

4.2 Table B. Risk-log

Implementation Status (Current PIR)

Insert ALL the risks identified either at CEO endorsement (inc. safeguards screening), previous/current PIRs, and MTRs. Use the last line to propose a suggested consolidated rating.

| Risks | Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs | CEO ED | PIR 1 | PIR 2 | PIR 3 | PIR 4 | PIR 5 | Current PIR | Δ | Justification |
|---|-----------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------------|---|--|
| Stakeholders of the pilot areas do not engage in project`s activities | Outcome 1.1. 1.2. and 1.3 | L | N/A | L | L | L | M | M | ↑ | From the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5). the risk has increased to Moderate because in the new phase. the project must succeed to involve |

| Risks | Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs | CEO ED | PIR 1 | PIR 2 | PIR 3 | PIR 4 | PIR 5 | Current PIR | Δ | Justification |
|--|-----------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | the local stakeholders. |
| Non-compliance of landowners with the LPVN | Outcome 1.1. | M | M | M | M | M | M | M | = | From the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5). the risk remained Moderate because despite the support of MMA to the State Institute of the Environment of Rio de Janeiro (INEA). the proposed interventions have to provide a stimulus for private landowners complying with the regularization of their properties. |
| Non-validation of the CAR in the next years | Outcome 1.1. | H | M | M | H | H | H | H | = | From the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5). the risk remained High because despite the support of MMA in advancing the dialogue and coordination of activities with the State Institute of the Environment of Rio de Janeiro (INEA). for the implementation and validation of the CAR at the private properties within the APA São João and surrounding areas. it depends not only on the improvement of services but also in the adherence of landowners. |
| Inefficient establishment of PRAs by state governments | Outcome 1.1. | M | M | M | M | M | H | H | ↑ | From the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5). the risk increased to High because although MMA is providing support to the State Institute of the Environment of Rio de Janeiro (INEA). private landowners will have to |

| Risks | Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs | CEO ED | PIR 1 | PIR 2 | PIR 3 | PIR 4 | PIR 5 | Current PIR | Δ | Justification |
|--|-----------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | adhere to the regularization of their properties. |
| Mechanisms of incentives for native vegetation conservation and recovery are not implemented | Outcome 1.1 and 1.3 | L | | L | S | M | M | M | = | From the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5). the risk remained Moderate because the project in its new phase must succeed to involve the local stakeholders |
| Agreement with the Forestry sector companies is not signed | Outcome 2.1 | L | N/A | H | H | H | H | H | = | From the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5). the risk remained High because although the dialogue with the association IBá -representing some companies from the forestry sector -has been resumed and there are plans to establish an updated agreement. the member companies will have to adhere to the agreement. |
| Responsible bodies do not incorporate proposals of spatial database and changes in related public policies | Outcome 3.1 and 3.2 | M | M | H | H | H | H | H | = | From the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5). the risk remained High because the governance for ensuring the implementation of public policies is beyond the scope of the project even with the involvement of MMA. |
| Research group do not make databases available for the spatial modelling regarding biodiversity value | Outcome 3.2 | L | N/A | L | L | L | L | L | = | From the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5). despite the lack of action. the risk remains Low because this intervention is under the governance of MMA. The proposed action for the new phase of the project is to conduct a consultation process with |

| Risks | Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs | CEO ED | PIR 1 | PIR 2 | PIR 3 | PIR 4 | PIR 5 | Current PIR | Δ | Justification |
|--|-----------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | experts on the Cerrado and Atlantic Forest biomes and to obtain the validation of the methodology used for developing the remaining studies - for the Caatinga, Pantanal and Pampa biomes. |
| Some strategies of the Management plan of the APA of Pouso Alto are not implemented in every municipality in the APA | Outcome 1.2 | H | M | H | H | H | H | H | = | From the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5), the risk remains High despite the advances for the new phase of the project that involves the local stakeholders. Nevertheless, the governance for ensuring the implementation of the Management Plan of the APA Pouso Alto is beyond the scope of the project even with the involvement of MMA and SEMAD. |
| The rural landowners do not improve biodiversity conservation in their properties | Outcome 1.1 and 1.2 | M | M | L | L | L | M | M | ↑ | From the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5), the risk has increased to Moderate because in the new phase of the project, the local stakeholders must adhere to the adoption of better practices. |
| Rural landowners do not give access to their properties | Outcome 1.1 . and 1.2 | L | N/A | L | L | L | M | M | = | From the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5), the risk has increased to Moderate because in the new phase of the project the local stakeholders must yet agree to give access to their rural properties. |
| Low replicability, sustainability and | Outcome 1.1. 1.2 . 1.3 and 3.2 | L | N/A | L | S | L | M | M | ↑ | From the last PIR (4) to the current |

| Risks | Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs | CEO ED | PIR 1 | PIR 2 | PIR 3 | PIR 4 | PIR 5 | Current PIR | Δ | Justification |
|--|-----------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------------|---|--|
| amplification of the project | | | | | | | | | | PIR (5). the risk has increased to Moderate because although the MTR recommendations were observed in the reorganization of Project actions - with more focus on training - private landowners will have to adhere to the practices that have been taught. during and after the conclusion of the project. |
| Climate Change and extreme weather events affect negatively the project implementation SLM. SFM and native vegetation recovery and biodiversity conservation | Outcome 1.1 and 1.2 | H | S | L | L | L | L | L | = | From the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5). the risk has remained Low because weather conditions. in the two pilot areas. so far. has not influenced the proposed interventions. |
| Changes in governance of key partners institutions that were previously aligned with the project | Outcome 1.1 and 1.2 | N/A | H | H | H | M | M | M | = | From the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5). the risk has remained Moderate because key partner institutions are open to dialogue but with weakness for the implementation of the 'proposed activities. |
| The yellow fever might have affected some of the Golden Lion Tamarin populations | Outcome 1.1 | N/A | H | H | H | M | L | L | ↓ | From the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5). the risk has decrease to Low because AMLD has been working with Fiocruz to immunize the Golden Lion Tamarins at APA São João. At the end of 2023. 396 individuals were already vaccinated. and the objective is to |

| Risks | Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs | CEO ED | PIR 1 | PIR 2 | PIR 3 | PIR 4 | PIR 5 | Current PIR | Δ | Justification |
|--|-----------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | immunize 500 individuals or more to guarantee a viable population in the event of a new outbreak of the disease. |
| Low motivation of local stakeholders to engage in project activities due to the many other projects being carried out in the pilot areas without articulation among them and without involvement of the local population | Outcome 1.1. 1.2 and 1.3 | N/A | L | L | L | L | M | M | ↑ | From the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5). the risk has increased to Moderate because in the new phase of the project the local stakeholders must adhere to the adoption of better practices. |
| A protocol to deal with the gender issue had not yet been developed. This may be an important issue in the project. especially considering the presence and participation of women in decision making in the pilot areas | Outcome 1.1. 1.2 and 1.3 | N/A | L | L | L | L | M | M | ↑ | From the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5). the risk has increased to Moderate because the project has yet to develop specific guidelines regarding gender-related issues. |
| Sustainability of results after the end of the execution period | Outcome 1.1. 1.2 and 1.3 | N/A | L | L | L | L | M | M | ↑ | From the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5). the risk has increased to Moderate because although the MTR recommendations were observed in the reorganization of Project actions - with more focus on training - private landowners will have to adhere to the practices that have been taught. during and after the conclusion of the project. |
| Need to refine the initial project planning within the open standards for conservation method | N/A | N/A | L | L | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | = | The open standards methodology for conservation are not being used in the new phase of the project. |

| Risks | Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs | CEO ED | PIR 1 | PIR 2 | PIR 3 | PIR 4 | PIR 5 | Current PIR | Δ | Justification |
|--|-----------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------------|---|---|
| Not performing the necessary refinement in planning on the components that are running | All Outcomes | N/A | N/A | N/A | H | L | L | L | = | From the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5). the risk has remained Moderate because. the proposed arrangement of activities for the new phase of the project is focusing on the improvement of the implementation strategy. |
| Very time-consuming acquisition processes even for small purchases | N/A | N/A | N/A | L | L | L | L | L | = | N/A |
| Delays in achieving a viable date for holding meetings and workshops with partners | N/A | N/A | L | L | L | L | L | L | = | N/A |
| Delays in the project execution caused by low communication between the two executing agencies and reduced efficiency in the project management | All Outcomes | N/A | L | H | H | M | L | L | ↓ | From the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5). the risk has decreased because adjustments were done in the governance of the project and the flow of communication has improved. tackling the execution bottlenecks identified during the MTR. |
| Social isolation due to the Covid-19 pandemic has delayed several of on-the-field actions of the project. particularly in the pilot areas. arrangements of meetings and delays in handing in results and products. | N/A | N/A | H | H | M | M | N/A | N/A | = | N/A |
| Substantial changes of project strategies requests of activities replanning and activities put on hold by UCP/MMA delayed the development of the project. | All Outcomes | N/A | N/A | N/A | H | L | M | M | ↑ | From the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5). the risk has increased to Moderate because adjustments to the project's governance were made to improve these execution |

| Risks | Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs | CEO ED | PIR 1 | PIR 2 | PIR 3 | PIR 4 | PIR 5 | Current PIR | Δ | Justification |
|--|-----------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | bottlenecks. but the new phase of the project must succeed in implementing the proposed activities. |
| Problems with execution and high operating cost caused by project's implementation arrangement bottlenecks | All Outcomes | N/A | N/A | N/A | H | L | L | L | = | From the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5). the risk has remained Low because adjustments to the project's implementation arrangement decreased drastically the personnel of IIS directly involved with the day-to-day execution of the project. |
| Management structure - Roles and responsibilities | All Outcomes and Outputs | N/A | | | | | H | S | ↓ | The project revision based on the mid-term report led to a restructuring of the management structure, contributing to the change in the assessment of this risk. |
| Governance structure - Oversight | All Outcomes and Outputs | N/A | | | | | M | M | = | The project revision based on the mid-term report led to a restructuring of the governance structure, contributing to the stabilization of this risk. |
| Implementation schedule | All Outcomes and Outputs | N/A | | | | | H | H | = | The project revision based on the mid-term report led to a restructuring of the implementation schedule, contributing to the stabilization of this risk. |
| Budget | All Outcomes and Outputs | N/A | | | | | H | S | ↓ | The project revision based on the mid-term report led to a restructuring of the budget, contributing to the change in the assessment of this risk. |

| Risks | Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs | CEO ED | PIR 1 | PIR 2 | PIR 3 | PIR 4 | PIR 5 | Current PIR | Δ | Justification |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------------|---|--|
| Financial Management | All Outcomes and Outputs | N/A | | | | | M | S | ↑ | The project revision based on the mid-term report led to a restructuring of the Financial Management, contributing to the change in the assessment of this risk. |
| Reporting | All Outcomes and Outputs | N/A | | | | | M | M | = | The project revision based on the mid-term report led to a restructuring of the reporting, contributing to the stabilization of this risk. |
| Capacity to deliver | All Outcomes and Outputs | N/A | | | | | S | S | = | The project revision based on the mid-term report led to a restructuring of the capacity to deliver, contributing to the stabilization of this risk. |
| Consolidated Project Risk | All Outcomes and respective Outputs | L | L | M | M | H | M | M | ↓ | The overall risk of the project from the from the last PIR (4) to the current PIR (5), has decreased because it is expected that the new execution arrangement and the effective involvement of MMA will improve the implementation process. |

4.3 Table C. Outstanding Moderate, Significant, and High risks

Additional mitigation measures for the next periods

| Risk | Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.) | Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period | What | When | By Whom |
|---|---|---|---|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Non-compliance of landowners with the LPVN | Resume the coordination with INEA and understand the steps and timeline necessary for the progress of the related interventions, such as the elaboration of maps for the analysis of the CAR of the private properties within the pilot areas; And the Mico Leão Dourado connectivity map should be evaluated by MMA. | The Brazilian Forest Service (SFB acronym in Portuguese) developed the Dynamic Analysis Module, with the aim of bringing greater speed to the analysis flow.. since the platform uses the bases reference maps of the federative units for implementing the system automatic analysis. | The project is supporting the contract of services to update the mapping of the land cover and hydrography in the region of the APA São João and its surroundings. to feed the CAR's dynamic analysis database. | From July to December/2024 | MMA (SBio Coordination) and INEA/RJ |
| Non-validation of the CAR in the next years | Resume the coordination with INEA and understand the steps, time, and necessary bureaucracy for the progress of sub-strategy 1.1.1.4. The prioritization maps for CAR analysis, the terms of reference for hiring technicians, and the Mico Leão Dourado connectivity map should be evaluated by MMA to | The Brazilian Forest Service (SFB) developed a Dynamic Analysis Module to streamline the CAR validation flow. The Project will support the updating of land cover images, necessary to carry out the analyses. In return, INEA will prioritize the analysis of the CAR of properties in APA municipalities. | The project will support the hiring of a consultancy to update the mapping of the territorial coverage and hydrography of the APA São João region and its surroundings. to feed the database necessary to carry out the CAR's dynamic analysis. | From July to December/2024 | MMA, IIS e INEA/RJ. |

| Risk | Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.) | Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period | What | When | By Whom |
|--|---|---|---|----------------------------|-------------------|
| | conduct technical review workshops. | | | | |
| Inefficient establishment of PRAs by state governments | Resume the coordination with INEA and understand the steps, time, and necessary bureaucracy for the progress of sub-strategy 1.1.1.4. The prioritization maps for CAR analysis, the terms of reference for hiring technicians, and the Mico Leão Dourado connectivity map should be evaluated by MMA to conduct technical review workshops. | The Brazilian Forest Service (SFB) developed a Dynamic Analysis Module to streamline the CAR validation flow. The Project will support the updating of land cover images, necessary to carry out the analyses. In return, INEA will prioritize the analysis of the CAR of properties in APA municipalities. The project is supporting the contracting of services to update the mapping of land cover and hydrography in the São João APA region and its surroundings to feed the CAR's dynamic analysis database. The project will support the hiring of a consultancy to update the mapping of the territorial coverage and hydrography of the APA São João region and its surroundings, to | The project will support the hiring of a consultancy to update the mapping of the territorial coverage and hydrography of the APA São João region and its surroundings, to feed the database necessary to carry out the CAR's dynamic analysis. | From July to December/2024 | MMA, IIS, INEA/RJ |

| Risk | Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.) | Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period | What | When | By Whom |
|--|---|---|--|------------------|---|
| | | feed the database necessary to carry out the CAR's dynamic analysis. | | | |
| Mechanisms of incentives for native vegetation conservation and recovery are not implemented | What approach will be taken for this sub-strategy has to be discussed during the technical review of the project. If the decision is to resume from where the project left off. it will be necessary to update the planned actions. | These demands were considered in the Project review both in the pilot areas and in the other components of the Project. | The project review included promoting the recovery of 10 hectares in the São João APA. acting concretely in the recovery of native vegetation. Furthermore. the topic of conservation and recovery of native vegetation will be addressed in educational activities for local producers. information campaigns on the mandatory environmental adequacy of private property and propose guidelines to increase access to MSP and MSF financing and recovery of native vegetation. | Before June/2026 | MMA. SFB. ICMBio. IIS. Funatura. AMLD. Ibá. |
| Agreement with Forestry sector companies is not signed | The technical review of the project should include a discussion about the interest of MMA. Ibá and the companies in this | MMA resumed its articulations with SFB and Ibá to establish a new text for the agreement to be signed. adapted to current | Consolidate and implement the new agreement with the forestry sector. | Before June/2026 | MMA. SFB. Ibá |

| Risk | Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.) | Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period | What | When | By Whom |
|--|--|--|--|------------------|------------------------|
| | strategy. MMA should lead the coordination with the Brazilian Forest Service (BFS). IBA. companies and IIS to ensure the progress of the planned activities. | demands. | | | |
| Responsible bodies do not incorporate proposals of spatial database and changes in related public policies | "Potential users of the generated information in support decision making processes must be involved in the whole analysis process from scratch. including the variables and input layer definition. to assure a participative character and to build trust among users. The engagement with the BFS should be strengthened with focus on the incorporation of spatial databases in Native Vegetation Protection Law implementation process such as CAR register. PRA regulation and PRADA validation. Additionally. engage other bodies that | During the period there was only a review of the execution strategy that was incorporated into operational planning. | Emphasis will be placed on holding events involving stakeholders. including researchers. in different stages to validate the methodological proposal and discuss products for each biome. In addition to the preparation of an Executive Summary that will have the role of disseminating results to the public. | Before June/2026 | MMA. SFB. ICMBio. IIS. |

| Risk | Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.) | Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period | What | When | By Whom |
|--|--|--|---|------------------|--|
| | are potential users of the spatial analysis in other public policies. It is important to reinforce the leadership role of MMA in this dialogue with SFB. State Environmental organizations and agencies. and other partners to achieve the expected outputs and outcomes of 3.1 and 3.2 strategies. " | | | | |
| Some strategies of the Management plan of the APA of Pouso Alto are not implemented in every municipality in the APA | Adjusting the respective indicator after the mid-term review. The new indicator should reflect the actual Project's contribution to better management practices in the APA Pouso Alto. considering the progress of the redesigned strategies. This topic will be discussed during the thematic workshops for the technical review of the project. scheduled for the second semester. | These demands to reinforce the involvement of municipalities in the management of the APA Pouso Alto region were considered in the Project review. with reinforcement of the articulation with Semad/GO. ICMBio and the role of Funatura. The review of the indicators will still be worked on in the second half of 2024. | Continuity of interinstitutional articulations with reinforcement of APA governance and themes involving family agroextractivism. fauna monitoring. ecotourism. | Before June/2026 | MMA. ICMBio. Semad/GO. Funatura. and municipal councils. |
| Low replicability. | Discussing this topic taking | The MTR recommendations | Actions will be promoted | Before June/2026 | MMA. SFB. ICMBio. |

| Risk | Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.) | Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period | What | When | By Whom |
|---|---|---|--|------|--|
| sustainability and amplification of the project | into account the midterm evaluation is crucial to ensure the sustainability of the project. This theme should be addressed during the thematic workshops that will be conducted for the project review. | were observed in the replanning of Project actions with reinforcement of training in components 1 and 3. of actions to strengthen governance in themes such as family farming and socio-biodiversity with the inclusion of young people and women. RPPN owners. of environmental educommunication. fauna monitoring. of trails; in addition to the preparation of the Communication Plan that will support the dissemination of actions. increase the involvement of actors and results. facilitating the dissemination of good practices adopted in landscape and forest management. | that will benefit and train the local population of family farmers and extractivists. RPPN owners. personnel from the ecotourism chain. This way. By benefiting and training. these actors must become multipliers to maintain the sustainability of landscape and forest management. During execution. the strengthened articulations between the different stakeholders should also increase the management capacity in the APAs with involvement from the 3 spheres of government and society. The same should be true of actors in the forestry sector. The internalization of results into public policies either through the regulation of APA guidelines. RPPNs. creation of a Mosaic of Conservation Units and adoption of the | | Semad/GO. Inea and Seas/RJ. IIS. Funatura. AMLD. Ibá |

| Risk | Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.) | Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period | What | When | By Whom |
|---|---|---|---|------------------|---|
| | | | landscape value modeling platform are examples of results that. once achieved by the project. should enable new financial support for the replication of actions. expanding those involved and the area of coverage or application in new areas. | | |
| Sustainability of results after the end of the execution period | MTR: No financial sustainability strategy appears to have been proposed in project design. Rather future funding for project outcomes appears to be largely based on government funding with little evidence of effort to capture other sources of potential financing. This is a risky assumption for any project and should be addressed in the second half of the Project. in particular with respect to outcomes proposed for the two pilots. Similarly. an | The MTR recommendations were observed in the replanning of Project actions. | The new phase of the project must succeed in involving the local stakeholders. It is expected that the local family farmers. extractivists. owners of RPPNs and personnel in the ecotourism chain will become multipliers of the sustainable practices promoted by the project to guarantee the conservation of biodiversity and connectivity of the habitats for endangered fauna species. Through the strengthened networking | Before June/2026 | MMA. SFB. ICMBio. Semad/GO. Inea and Seas/RJ. IIS. Funatura. AMLD. Ibá. |

| Risk | Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.) | Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period | What | When | By Whom |
|--|---|--|---|-------------------------|---|
| | <p>explicit exit strategy should be prepared early in the project's second half. Finally, while several arguments were given for the potential for replication and scaling up of project outcomes in the PRODOC, no detailed strategy was found</p> | | <p>between the different stakeholders, it should increase the management capacity in the APAs with the involvement of the three spheres of government (federal, state and municipal). Similarly, from the forestry sector it is expected the adoption and dissemination of the biodiversity monitoring protocols and practices to disseminate the obtained information. And finally, the internalization of the results of landscape value modeling studies, shall guide the design of public policies such as the support for the creation of Mosaics of Conservation Units.</p> | | |
| <p>Delays in the project execution caused by low communication between the two executing agencies and reduced efficiency in the project management</p> | <p>Continue holding joint meetings to ensure the implementation of the recommendations from the midterm evaluation and carry out the necessary</p> | <p>Adjustments to project governance and communication flow were made to improve these execution bottlenecks. Furthermore, a</p> | <p>Implementation of the new governance strategy, encouraging the involvement of stakeholders in different instances. The MMA will</p> | <p>Before June/2026</p> | <p>MMA, SFB, ICMBio, Semad/GO, Inea and Seas/RJ, IIS, Funatura, AMLD, Ibá</p> |

| Risk | Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.) | Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period | What | When | By Whom |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------|--|
| | updates/revisions to allow for the project extension. | Communication Plan was drawn up. with general and specific objectives. themes. key messages. products to be developed and communication channels to be maintained. | coordinate the implementation of the Communication Plan. | | |
| Stakeholders of the pilot areas do not engage in project`s activities | MTR: Progress has been limited with respect to engagement of stakeholders when compared to the number of potential stakeholders identified in the PRODOC. Few of the stakeholders initially identified in the PRODOC were subsequently engaged in project implementation. The main challenges appear to be lack of outreach to some of the stakeholders and MMA's use of its convening power for project purposes. | A Communication Plan was developed to increase stakeholder engagement by publicizing events and results. | The project review considered the inclusion of events with the participation of stakeholders (in particular in the two pilot areas). at different times. | Before June/2026 | MMA. SFB. ICMBio. IIS. Funatura. AMLD. Ibá |
| The rural landowners do not improve biodiversity conservation in their properties | In the previous period this was considered a low risk. and the representatives of landowners only need to be | The MTR recommendations were observed in the replanning of Project actions. The strategy is to | 02 meetings at the pilot areas were realized to debate with the partners to planning the new actions | January and February/2024 | MMA. IIS. Funatura and AMLD |

| Risk | Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.) | Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period | What | When | By Whom |
|--|--|---|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| | monitored. | bring these rural landowners to planning instances to improve their knowledge about the importance of good practices of LSM. FSM. recovery native vegetation and fauna monitoring. | and activities. | | |
| Rural landowners do not give access to their properties | In the previous period this was considered a low risk. and the representatives of landowners only need to be monitored. | The MTR recommendations were observed in the replanning of Project actions. The strategy is to bring these rural landowners to planning instances to improve their knowledge about the importance of good practices of LSM. FSM. recovery native vegetation and fauna monitoring. | 02 meetings at the pilot areas were realized to debate with the partners to planning the new actions and activities | January and February/2026 | MMA. IIS. Funatura and AMLD |
| Changes in governance of key partners institutions that were previously aligned with the project | In the previous period this was considered a Moderate risk due to government instability and uncertainties related to the restructuring of the project | The new phase of the project must succeed to involve the local stakeholders. Some knew agreement are being established by MMA with IIS. Funatura and AMLD. | The project will be relaunched and there will be a strategic advice working as a forum to promote articulation between stakeholders as executors. co-executors and partners. | From August/2024 to before June/2026 | MMA. SFB. ICMBio. Semad/GO. Inea and Seas/RJ. IIS. Funatura. AMLD. Ibá. |

| Risk | Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.) | Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period | What | When | By Whom |
|--|---|---|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| Stakeholders of the pilot areas do not engage in project's activities ALREADY DESCRIBED ABOVE | In the previous period this was considered a Low risk and it has increased to Moderate. | | | | |
| Low motivation of local stakeholders to engage in project activities due to the many other projects being carried out in the pilot areas without articulation among them and without involvement of the local population | In the previous period this was considered a Low risk and it has increased to Moderate. | The risk has increased to Moderate because in the new phase of the project the local stakeholders must adhere to the adoption of better practices. Two regional workshops were held to consult stakeholders on the continuity of the project as well as review actions on the planned themes. In the APA Pouso Alto. 64 people were present. and in the APA São João. 62 people participated. | There are many actions in the new planning that promote involvement of the local stakeholders. including field activities. participative events. capacitation. environmental education. and exchange between pilot areas. Another point to consider is the effect of implementing the communication plan (already prepared) supporting the dissemination of actions and results. | From August/2024 to before June/2026 | MMA. ICMBio. Semad/GO. Inea and Seas/RJ. IIS. AMLD. and Funatura. |
| A protocol to deal with the gender issue had not yet been developed. This may be an important issue in the project. especially considering the presence and participation of women in decision making in the | In the previous period this was considered a Low risk and it has increased to Moderate. | The project has yet to develop specific guidelines regarding gender-related issues. | UCP/MMA will develop a Gender Action Plan. then will discuss the proposal with main partners and submit it to the Project Steering Committee (PSC). | August/2024 to March/2025 | MMA. SFB. ICMBio. Semad/GO. Inea and Seas/RJ. IIS. Funatura. AMLD. Ibá. |

| Risk | Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.) | Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period | What | When | By Whom |
|--|---|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| pilot areas | | | | | |
| Substantial changes of project strategies requests of activities replanning, and activities put on hold by UCP/MMA delayed the development of the project. | In the previous period this was considered a Low risk and it has increased to Moderate. | Adjustments to the project's governance were made to improve these execution bottlenecks, but the new phase of the project must succeed in implementing the proposed activities. | UCP MMA is developing some internal commitment mechanisms, such as formalizing the appointment of SBio employees involved in the Project, and instructions for executing the Project as flowcharts. | August/2024 to October/2024 | UCP/MMA |
| Management structure - Roles and responsibilities | PIR 2023: High: Unstable Management Structure and Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems. High likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery. | The project revision based on the mid-term report led to a restructuring of the management structure, contributing to the change in the assessment of this risk. | The Operational Manual (MOP, from Portuguese) is being revised, and a new Cooperation Agreement between IIS and MMA, clarifying roles and responsibilities, is in the process of being formalized. | Until September/2024 | SBIO/MMA and IIS. |
| Governance structure - Oversight | PIR 2023: Moderate: Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet at least once a year and Active membership and participation in decision-making processes. SC provides direction/inputs. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact | The project revision based on the mid-term report led to a restructuring of the governance structure, contributing to the stabilization of this risk. | The governance structure was revised to expand the participation of key stakeholders, including strategic partners and co-executors, and to incorporate a Project Strategic Advisory Board (CPE, from Portuguese). | The next meeting of the steering committee, scheduled for early September/24, will be focused on the presentation of the new governance arrangements and the MOP, in addition to the approval of the new operational plan. | UNEP, SBIO - SFB/MMA and IIS. |

| Risk | Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.) | Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period | What | When | By Whom |
|-------------------------|---|---|--|------------------------------|--|
| | on the project delivery. | | | | |
| Implementation schedule | PIR 2023: High: Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation and No measures taken and no adaptive management. High likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery. | The project revision based on the mid-term report led to a restructuring of the implementation schedule, contributing to the stabilization of this risk. The restructuring of the project's annual operational plan until 2026 involved the participation of different co-executors and strategic partners in order to agree on the actions and activities to be carried out, also considering the revision of governance in parallel, with the aim of mitigating this challenge. | The UCP should take a more active role in the technical coordination of the Project, in addition to seeking ways to strengthen internal arrangements and partnerships for the project's development. | From August to October/2024. | UCP/SBIO/ MMA, SFB, ICMBio, INEA/RJ, Semad/GO, IBÁ, IIS, Funatura and AMLD |
| Budget | PIR 2023: High: Major budget reallocation (>10%) across components or significant changes in budget lines (including any increase >5% from original budget) and Poor budget utilization or exhaustion of PMC before project | The project revision based on the mid-term report led to a restructuring of the budget, contributing to the change in the assessment of this risk. | In the new execution arrangement, the IIS receives the contracting requests from the UCP/MMA, which will more closely supervise the financial management of the Project, carried out by the IIS. | From 2024 to 2026 | UCP/MMA and IIS |

| Risk | Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.) | Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period | What | When | By Whom |
|----------------------|--|--|--|-------------------|--|
| | completion. High likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery. | | | | |
| Financial Management | PIR 2023: Moderate: Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for and Audit reports provided regularly and confirm correct use of funds. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery. | The project revision based on the mid-term report led to a restructuring of the Financial Management, contributing to the change in the assessment of this risk. | The IIS continues with the financial management of the project, under closer supervision by the UCP/MMA, in addition to UNEP. | From 2024 to 2026 | UCP/MMA, IIS and UNEP |
| Reporting | PIR 2023: Moderate: Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and Reports are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery. | The project revision based on the mid-term report led to a restructuring of the reporting, contributing to the stabilization of this risk. | The preparation of the reports is being carried out in coordination between the UCP/MMA and IIS teams, with oversight by UNEP, and this approach will continue until the end of the Project. | From 2024 to 2026 | UCP/MMA, IIS and UNEP |
| Capacity to deliver | PIR 2023: Substantial: Weaknesses persist and have been identified Or Capacity gaps require longer time to address and | The project revision based on the mid-term report led to a restructuring of the capacity to deliver, contributing to the | The teams from UCP/MMA, IIS, co-executors, and partners should work in a more coordinated manner to achieve the project's | From 2024 to 2026 | UCP/SBIO/ MMA, SFB, ICMBio, INEA/RJ, Semad/GO, IBÁ, IIS, Funatura and AMLD |

| Risk | Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.) | Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period | What | When | By Whom |
|------|---|--|---|------|---------|
| | are continuously being addressed. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery | stabilization of this risk. Additionally, the UCP/MMA team has been strengthened with the hiring of a technical coordinator, a monitoring coordinator, a communication coordinator, and a technical assistant. | results, taking into account the new governance and MOP guidelines. | | |

High Risk (H): There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks. Significant Risk (S): There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks. Moderate Risk (M): There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks. Low Risk (L): There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.

5 Amendment - GeoSpatial

Project Minor 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 Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines. Please tick each category for which a change occurred in the fiscal year of reporting and provide a description of the change that occurred in the textbox. You may attach supporting document as appropriate

5.1 Table A: Listing of all Minor Amendment (TM)

| Minor Amendments | Changes |
|--|---------|
| Results Framework: | Yes |
| Components and Cost: | No |
| Institutional and implementation arrangements: | Yes |
| Financial Management: | No |
| Implementation Schedule: | |
| Executing Entity: | No |
| Executing Entity Category: | No |
| Minor project objective change: | No |
| Safeguards: | No |
| Risk analysis: | Yes |
| Increase of GEF financing up to 5%: | No |
| Location of project activity: | No |
| Other: | |

Minor amendments

Results framework - until the last PIR (#4 - 2023) the results framework was based upon the IUCN methodology on Open Standards. Once these guidelines are not in accordance with the GEF, the Outputs are now the focus of the project deliveries.

Institutional and implementation arrangements - following the MTR recommendations, the Ministry of Environment (MMA) assumed a pro-active role regarding the technical aspects and the EA (i.e., IIS) has a financial and administrative role.

In general, the changes in risk analyses are due to the project's review for this new phase (2024-2026). It should be noted that this review resulted from the Mid-Term Review (MTR) and involved a reassessment of actions/activities while maintaining the planned results and objectives, as well as a review of the project's governance, with renegotiation among partners and co-executors, and the Operational Manual (MOP).

5.2 Table B: History of project revisions and/or extensions (TM)

| Version | Type | Signed/Approved by UNEP | Entry Into Force (last signature Date) | Agreement Expiry Date | Main changes introduced in this revision |
|-------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| Amendment 1 | Amendment & Extension | 2023-10-24 | 2023-11-07 | 2026-12-31 | Budget, workplan and activities |

GEO Location Information:

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as OpenStreetMap or GeoNames use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking here

| Location Name | Latitude | Longitude | GEO Name ID | Location Description | Activity Description |
|----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------|--|
| APA Pouso Alto | -14.18297311 | -47.53514846 | 5200605 | Alto Paraíso de Goiás | Participatory Workshop - Cerrado Pilot |
| APA São João | -22.56772589 | -42.41329186 | 330560405 | Silva Jardim | Participatory Workshop - Atlantic Forest Pilot |

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate. *

[Annex any linked geospatial file]

Additional Supporting Documents:

| Filename | File Uploaded By | File Uploaded At | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| 9413 ESERN Brazil Private Lands.docx | BDDL TM | 2024-08-01 14:31:55 | Download |