UN Environment GEF PIR Fiscal Year 20__ July 2018 to 30 June 2019)

1. Identification		GEF ID.: 9413	*Insert Umoja no.:*
Project Number + Project Title		Realizing the Biodiversity Conservation potential of Private Lands in Brazil (GEF Áreas Privadas – Conservando biodiversidade e paisagens rurais).	
Duration months	*Planned*	60	
	Extension(s)	0	0
Division(s) Implementing the project		*Insert name of Division, Unit, Branch*	
Name of co-implementing Agency		*Insert name of co-implementing Agency, if any [indicate if lead] (delete row if project has no co-implementing Agency)*	
Executing Agency(ies)		Brazilian Ministry of the Environment (MMA); International Institute for Sustainability (IIS)	
Names of Other Project Partners		FBDS	
		CSRio/PUC-Rio	
Project Type		*[Medium Size Project; Full Size Project; Program Framework Document; Child Project (delete as appropriate)]*	
Project Scope		National	
Region *(delete as appropriate)*		Latin America and Caribbean	
Names of Beneficiary Countries		Brazil	
Programme of Work		*Insert the relevant Programme of Work biennia and subprogrammes to which this project contributes*	
GEF Focal Area(s)		*Biodiversity, Land Degradation, Sustainable Forest Management*	
UNDAF linkages		*Where appropriate, insert the UNDAF strategic objective to which achievement the project contributes.*	
Link to relevant SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s)		*Goals 2, 13 and 15*	
GEF financing amount		USD 8,953,425	
Co-financing amount		USD 33,892,917	
Date of CEO Endorsement		February 1st, 2018	
Start of Implementation		May 10th, 2018	
Date of first disbursement		*06/08/2018*	
Total disbursement as of 30 June		*USD 1,269,818*	
Total expenditure as of 30 June		*USD 777,192.67*	
Expected Mid-Term Date		*Insert the expected Mid-Term Review/Evaluation completion date*	
Completion Date	*Planned*	May 9th, 2023	
	Revised	May 9th, 2023	
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date		*Insert the estimated TE completion date*	
Expected Financial Closure Date		November 9th, 2023	

2. OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

To be completed by UNEP/GEF Task Manager

UN Environment Subprogramme(s) *Insert the Subprogramme(s) and biennia of the PoW to which the project contributes*	Specify the relevant Expected Accomplishment(s) & Indicator(s) *Insert the Subprogramme's Expected Accomplishment(s) and Indicator(s) to which the project contributes*
Describe any progress made towards delivering the stated PoW Expected Accomplishments and Indicators. State key changes since previous reporting period. [Section to be shared with relevant Regional and Global SubProgramme Coordinators]	

For all GEF 6 and later projects:

GEF Core Indicators *Insert core indicator(s) from Core Indicator Worksheet to which the project contributes*	Indicative expected Results *[add figure approved at CEO endorsement/ approval]*
1.2, 3.1, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 6.1, 11	Indicative expected Results *[add figure approved at CEO endorsement/ approval]* • *1.2 Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness = 859,700* • *3.1 Area of Degraded agricultural land restored = 7,275* • *4 Area of landscape under improved practices = 859,700* • *6.1 Carbon Sequestered or emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector = 44,635,758* • *11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment = 45,081*
As this is a GEF 6 project, we´ve retrofitted and included indicators from CEO endorsement and Tracking Tools accordingly, assuring these would correspond to the new GEF 7 core indicators.	

To be completed by Project Manager, as relevant

Planned linkages with UNDAF	*Describe progress towards the UNDAF strategic objective to which the project contributes.* *[Section to be shared with Monitoring Unit within PPD]*

Planned contribution to relevant SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s)	*Describe progress towards the stated SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s) to which the project contributes* *[section to be shared with SDG unit]* *The project can directly and indirectly contribute to four Goals predicted in the SDG, being: Goal 2. End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture; Goal 6. Clean water and sanitation; 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.* *Even though the Project is in its initial stages and hasn´t yet achieved significant results, it is working positively towards contributing to the expected targets. We describe below the main strategies that might influence each of the goals, and its targets.* ***1) Goal 2. End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture.** Main targets: 2.3 By 2030, double the agricultural productivity and incomes of small-scale food producers, in particular women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers, including through secure and equal access to land, other productive resources and inputs,*

knowledge, financial services, markets and opportunities for value addition and non-farm employment; 2.4 By 2030, ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agricultural practices that increase productivity and production, that help maintain ecosystems, that strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters and that progressively improve land and soil quality; 2.5 An increase investment, including through enhanced international cooperation, in rural infrastructure, agricultural research and extension services, technology development and plant and livestock gene banks in order to enhance agricultural productive capacity in developing countries, in particular least developed countries.

These targets will be directly influenced as the project will be dealing with private property owners that develop agricultural practices. Particularly in Component 1, the project will be implementing training courses and creating the necessary conditions to improve sustainable productivity among producers.

***2) Goal 13. Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts. 13.2**-Integrate climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning*

Goal 13 will be indirectly tackled by the Project. The Project will be contributing to 1) create conditions to increase forest restoration and 2) reduce native vegetation conversion in different biomes. This will contribute to reduced Carbon emissions and increase carbon sequestration, helping to mitigate Climate Change. Finally, by strengthening environmental policies and mainstreaming biodiversity into them, the project will be contributing to include the environmental agenda into the spotlights of other sectors and to their national planning.

***3) 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. 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; 15.2 By 2020, promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally; 15.5 Take urgent and significant action to reduce the degradation of natural habitats, halt the loss of biodiversity and, by 2020, protect and prevent the extinction of threatened species; 15.9 By 2020, integrate ecosystem and biodiversity values into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts.*

Indicators: 15.1.1 Forest area as a proportion of total land area; 15.2.1 Progress towards sustainable forest management; 15.5.1 Red List Index

Goal 15 will be directly influenced by the project. Component 1 will promote the conditions to increase restoration and reduce native vegetation conversion in terrestrial ecosystems, preventing biodiversity loss. This includes monitoring of endangered species in Key Biodiversity Areas and promoting actions to increase its populations. Components 2 and 3 will also contribute by integrating biodiversity values, both from Forestry Sector companies and other private lands, that will be incorporated into the national planning and private sector planning.

[complete the fiscal year and select: 1st PIR; 2nd PIR; …. Final PIR. Add more columns if needed]

Implementation Status	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
	X 1st PIR X	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR
	At the second half of the first year of the project, we´ve raised the need to refine some of the actions proposed under each output through the Open Standards for Conservation methodology. As a result of this refinement, although some activities were delayed, others that				

	could have unintended consequences (e.g. questionnaire implementation with landowners, in component 1) were re-evaluated and some other actions were included (e.g. inclusion of a workshop with potential users of the Layers of conservation value, in component 3). *Some great challenges regarding the processual steps are extremely necessary in the first year of a project implementation. These activities are material acquisition, staff hiring, engagement with local stakeholders and experts, development of collaborations and partnerships, and the development of a complete diagnosis of the two pilot areas, which will be used throughout the project. Most of these steps were finished in the first year of the project. Overall, it was considered that the progress towards project implementation was satisfactory, as actions are more robust and coming to speed.*

Development Objective Rating FY	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
	S	not rated	not rated	not rated	not rated

*Describe progress made towards achieving the project results as per table 3.1. State key changes since previous reporting period. **The information here must be consistent with the assessment and justification provided under 3.1.***

It is expected that the project implementation follows an "s" curve, and the refinement and the establishment of the necessary conditions result in increased and more positive outcomes. In other words, in the first stages of the project, the focus is mainly in building the necessary conditions for the project execution. As soon as these conditions are established, progress improves and consequently results are achieved such as staff hiring, stakeholder engagement, articulation, implementation of articulation and adaptive management of activities have been made, it was concluded that the project progress towards achieving the project results is Satisfactory.

The above-mentioned activities are setting the scene for better implementation of further actions. For instance, refining the project results chain promoted a robust adaptive management even if it delayed a few activities. Further, as a result from our bottom-up approach, particularly in Component 1, the suggested changes were more appropriate for local actors, which will likely result in better project results and its sustainability. More details can be found in section 3.1.

Implementation Progress Rating	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
	S	not rated	not rated	not rated	not rated

*Describe annual implementation progress, including any significant [expected and unexpected] environmental or other changes (Results) attributable to project implementation. Also, please discuss any major challenges to meet the objectives or specific project outcomes. [section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal 'Information on Progress, challenges and outcomes on project implementation activities' and is the primary report that viewers can see before opening the detailed PIR]. **The information must be consistent with the assessment and justification provided under 3.2.***

The initial step agreed to be made in order to assure correct project implementation was the refinement of the proposed project activities. For that purpose, Open Standards for Conservation methodology is being used for project planning.
As Project implementation follows an "s" curve, as soon as the actions are refined and that the necessary conditions are established, progress will increase. Some of the challenges faced in the first year of project implementation were: time consuming acquisition activities, staff hiring, engagement with local stakeholders and experts, establishment of collaborations and partnerships, and the development of a complete diagnosis of the two pilot areas, which will be used throughout the project. Even though these steps took longer than we expected, we have finished most of them in the first year of the project, and now have practically the main

information to follow the project next steps.

Finally, as a result of this refinement, activities that could have unintended consequences (e.g. questionnaire implementation with landowners) were removed, and some other actions were included (e.g. inclusion of a workshop with potential users of the Layers of conservation value).

*Based on the above, we consider the progress toward project implementation **Satisfactory**. More details can be found in section 3.2.*

*[complete the fiscal year in the first line; select **H; S; M; L;** to rate the fiscal year you are reporting. Add more columns if needed]*

Risk Rating	FY 2019	FY 20__	FY 20__	FY 20__	FY 20__
	L				

Describe key changes since previous reporting period. Projects with ESERN rating high medium/ high risk must refer to the safeguards implementation plan and its implementation.
[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal and in UN Environment Open Platform]
The information here must be consistent with the assessment and justification provided under 3.3

The current risk rating was evaluated as Low. The main reason is that most of the risks defined in the Endorsement were not yet identified during the implementation phase, particularly the Medium and Hight risks. The new risks identified at the implementation phase are mainly Low, and there are already actions to reduce its impacts.

There are three risks rated as high that have been identified. These are: i) Non-validation of the CAR (CEO endorsement;) ii) Changes in governance of institutions that were previously aligned with the project (new risk); and iii) yellow fever might have affected some of the Golden Lion Tamarin populations (new risk).

All three risks rated as high are being addressed, through: i) meetings with strategic partners to prioritize areas to do the CAR; ii) meetings with the current institution leaders in order to resume and re-establish synergies and actions; iii) meetings with the monitoring partner to understand which measures are necessary to reduce losses.

More details can be found in section 3.3

Stakeholder engagement	*Describe progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO endorsement)* *[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]* *Since the initial stages of development, this project has counted on significant stakeholder participation and engagement. During the Planning phase, several meetings and workshops were developed in order to discuss the most important strategies and actions to be implemented. Stakeholder engagement is extremely important in all three Components of the Project.* *Particularly in Component 1 due to the implementation of the Pilot Projects, since the beginning we have held meetings with several stakeholders such as civil society organisations, local producers, amongst others. Interactions with both (regional and state governments) were particularly productive. All of these meetings have been contributing strongly to the project implementation, particularly helping us to define all strategies, such as what is the most effective engagement strategy and actions, which training courses are more appropriate, and even to decide which type of Demonstration Units should be implemented.* *At the same time that these meetings contribute to project development they also help to increase local stakeholders' engagement and participation in the activities promoted by the project. As a result, they feel more empowered and interested in participating and telling others to do so. So far, local meetings have had a satisfactory number of attendants and received good feedbacks from local stakeholders.* *One successful example of an engagement initiative was the First Meeting with*

	Landowners of Sao João River Basin Area, in August 2019. More than 120 people participated in the event know more about GEF Private Lands Project and to discuss issues and solutions for the region. The catering was provided by local producers, and the meals were fully prepared with organic ingredients produced by family farmers of the region *Video about the event on the link:* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a4lUX0jC-Dw *For component 2, a thorough articulation has been planned and is already underway to engage forest sector representatives in the actions envisaged for this component. To ensure the establishment of a bridge of communication between the forest sector and the federal and state government, with the aim of establishing an agreement between these parties, both are being engaged in different stages of the processes.* *Considering component 3, the steps to develop prioritization tools to be incorporated into public policies for large-scale biodiversity conservation include decision makers in the early stages of the process. These meetings are already being organized to take place later this year.* *The engagement of stakeholders showed extremely important in these initial stages of the project. The ongoing actions have already shown good results of engagement, and we expect that stakeholder engagement increases even more regarding the Forestry Sector Companies and decision-making actors.*
Gender mainstreaming	*Describe progress, challenges and outcomes related to the gender-responsive measures documented at CEO Endorsement/ Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent. Older projects that were designed before gender mainstreaming should proactively report any possible gender benefits, as appropriate. [section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]* *In a project of wide implementation and large number of stakeholders, it is important to promote gender equality through its actions and results. Therefore, it is being developed a gender safeguard protocol to be incorporated into the project, which will be used to address gender equality and women's empowerment issues. IUCN´S Gender-responsive restoration guidelines and Gender Responsive ROAM/FLR Analysis Framework is being used as a reference.* *The basic principles for structuring this protocol were: (i) information - to understand if there are gender issues that limit the participation of groups in the activities of the Project; (ii) impact assessment – to understand the potential impacts of gender issues in the decision-making, engagement and implementation phases of the activities; (iii) inclusion – to adapt the approach and develop recommendations to ensure that all stages of project execution are inclusive and successful.* *In this sense, the workshops developed in both pilot areas have applied the first principle, to map if there are gender issues in relation to the presence and participation in such events. From this analysis, the impact assessment will be considered, and actions will be planned to promote inclusion for future Project activities.*
Knowledge activities and products	*Provide a narrative of knowledge activities/ products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement/ Approval [section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]* *One of the most effective ways to improve and disseminate sustainable practices and to change behaviour is through knowledge exchange. Non-sustainable*

	practices are mainstream throughout the world, and any attempt to change them depend on capacity building, dissemination of positive results, capacity of showcasing the economic viability of sustainable practices and communication. Therefore, this project counts on several activities and products related to knowledge sharing and dissemination. First, all the three components include lessons learn and dissemination strategies in order to communicate both challenges and positive results faced during its implementation. Further, Component 1 will develop trainings with local landowners and stakeholders, which will improve their knowledge on sustainable practices. Environmental Education with several stakeholders will also include themes raised by local landowners and will contribute with knowledge dissemination. *Additionally, the project will count with a bespoke website and a regular newsletter that will be disseminated both to project partners and stakeholders as well as to the general public. The aim is to disseminate the Project objectives and benefits and to keep both audiences updated on the project deliverables, activities, events and results as well as on news related to the Project subject areas.* *Furthermore, to closely engage stakeholders with Component 1 specific audience (landowners of Pilot Areas), social media, and instant messaging are being used, as they were identified as the media with higher penetration and usage amongst stakeholders. Featured content included videos and animations using simple and straightforward messaging, as an example of the video produced to present the Project to Sao João River Basin landowners, shared via social media:* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NWvZ-6MsJ58

Stories to be shared	*Optional for mature projects: Provide a brief summary of any especially interesting and impactful project results that are worth sharing with a larger audience, and/or investing communications time in, if any.* *[section to be shared with communication division/ GEF communication]* *Considered an important tool for project evaluation and to disseminate results and lessons learned, stories to be shared have been already incorporated into the project communication plan. Therefore, the project staff is tracking these types of perceptions during its workshops and meetings developed particularly in the pilot areas.* *In synergy with these actions, IIS is simultaneously applying for a National Geographic Society Grant, in the "Story Telling" category, with a documentary film project. The objective is to recognize and disseminate real stories of small landowners' residents in both Pilot Areas who first adopted sustainable agricultural practices in their properties and how it positively affected the environment and their income. From a gender mainstreaming perspective, we will search and prioritize women protagonists.*

3. **RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK**

Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the **UNEP Task Manager**[1] *will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:*
(i)   Progress towards achieving the project Results(s)- see section 3.1
(ii)   Implementation progress – see section 3.2

Section 3.3 on Risk should be first completed by the Project Manager. The UNEP Task Manager will subsequently enter his/her own ratings in the appropriate column.

3.1   Rating of progress towards achieving the project Results(s) [copy and paste the CEO Endorsement (or latest formal Revision) approved Results Framework, adding/deleting outcome rows, as appropriate]

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator[2]	Baseline level[3]	Mid-term target[4]	End-of-project target	Observations/ justification on rating	Progress rating [5]
Objective[6]: Scale up sustainable landscape management and contribute to biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services provision in private areas in Brazil						
Outcome 1: 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	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 (PRA)	The development of a technical specification for the selection process for hiring two technical professionals to rectify the CAR was initiated, which is the previous step necessary for PRA development.	MS

---

[1] For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.
[2] Add rows if your project has more that 3 key indicators per objective or outcome.
[3] Depending on selected indicator, quantitative or qualitative baseline levels and targets could be used (see Glossary included as Annex 1).
[4] Many projects did not identify Mid-term targets at the design stage therefore this column should only be filled if relevant.
[5] Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). See Annex 2 which contains GEF definitions.
[6] Add rows if your project has more than 4 objective-level indicators. Same applies for the number of outcome-level indicators.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator[2]	Baseline level[3]	Mid-term target[4]	End-of-project target	Observations/ justification on rating	Progress rating [5]
Janeiro)	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	A partnership was established with the Rio de Janeiro State Environment Secretariat to develop a native vegetation recovery project at APA São João. These partnerships, in parallel with the actions planned and supported by the project, will enable the achievement of even greater results. Further, initial activities such as stakeholder engagement will provide enabling conditions for their participation in the CAR validation.	S
	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	Partnership with Mico Leão Dourado Association (AMLD) and terms for monitoring the golden lion tamarin population are being defined between IIS and AMLD. It should be noted that it was observed that the project execution time will not be enough to directly impact the change in the golden lion tamarin population.	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator[2]	Baseline level[3]	Mid-term target[4]	End-of-project target	Observations/ justification on rating	Progress rating[5]
Outcome 2: 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)	Contact with local stakeholders to understand what other projects are already on course in order to create synergy and define specific actions, it was found that it is necessary to refine the planning of the activities and strategies of this outcome to better achieve the indicators and enable better long-term results through synergy with projects that are already underway in the region.	S
	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]	Activities related to this indicator are being refined with local stakeholders: have been mapped and engagement with them has started.	MS
	c) Number of endangered species with improved monitoring	c) Zero. Improved monitoring not yet in place	c) None	c) At least 10	Local research associations such as ICMBio and UNB Cerrado have been mapped and engaged.	S

10

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator[2]	Baseline level[3]	Mid-term target[4]	End-of-project target	Observations/ justification on rating	Progress rating [5]
	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	Local research associations such as ICMBio and UNB Cerrado have been mapped and engaged.	S
	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	Local research associations such as ICMBio and UNB Cerrado have been mapped and engaged.	S
Outcome 3: 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)	Actions are planned to be initiated in the second year of the project.	NA

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator[2]	Baseline level[3]	Mid-term target[4]	End-of-project target	Observations/ justification on rating	Progress rating [5]
	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	Actions are planned to be initiated in the second year of the project.	NA
Outcome 4: 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	Selective process in progress to hire consulting to articulate and establish agreement with companies in the forestry sector.	S
	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 companies are not identified	b) Zero	b) At least 40% of the high value areas for conservation]	A workshop is planned for the second half of 2019 to define the approach and factors to be considered in modeling area of high value for conservation.	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator[2]	Baseline level[3]	Mid-term target[4]	End-of-project target	Observations/ justification on rating	Progress rating[5]
	c) Percentage of partner forestry companies' areas under restoration that consider the spatial prioritisation developed by the project	c) None (Spatial prioritisation not yet developed)	c) Zero	c) At least 40%	Some meetings have already been held with institutions representing forestry sector companies, however more meetings will be held with the sector after the start of the contract related to the selection process that is underway. It will enable the establishment of the proper articulation with the sector and the development of spatial prioritization for the restoration of native vegetation to be used by them.	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator[2]	Baseline level[3]	Mid-term target[4]	End-of-project target	Observations/ justification on rating	Progress rating[5]
Outcome 5: 3.1. Biodiversity conservation and ecosystems services provision mainstreamed into national regulatory framework to support SLM, SFM and restoration in private areas	a) Number of engaged stakeholders (both women and men) to point bottlenecks and solutions regarding sustainable native vegetation management in LRs	a) There are no studies that identify the bottlenecks related to native vegetation management in LRs, their regulation and possible solutions.	a) At least 30	a) At least 50 (25 women + 25 men)	The Brazilian Forest Service (SFB) was transferred from the Ministry of Environment (MMA) to the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Supply (MAPA). Additionally, their board of directors was altered. These changes along with the delay in the hiring of the Director of Component 3 delayed the mapping and engagement of stakeholders that work with legislation related to native vegetation management in private areas (Outcome 3.1). Such activities support the development of a Sustainable Native Vegetation Management Regulation proposal to support SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas.	NA

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator[2]	Baseline level[3]	Mid-term target[4]	End-of-project target	Observations/ justification on rating	Progress rating [5]
Outcome 5: 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)	Changes in the SFB along with the delay in the hiring of the Director of Component 3 delayed the mapping and engagement of stakeholders that work with legislation related to native vegetation management in private areas (Outcome 3.1). Such activities support the development of a Sustainable Native Vegetation Management Regulation proposal to support SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas.	MS
	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	Some policies have been mapped according his potential to incorporating spatial databases on conservation value of private areas.	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator[2]	Baseline level[3]	Mid-term target[4]	End-of-project target	Observations/ justification on rating	Progress rating [5]
	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) There are no spatial databases on conservation value of private areas	c) At least 25	c) At least 75 (35 women + 40 men)	Planning action with engaged people	NA

Overall rating of project progress towards meeting project Result(s) (*To be provided by UNEP GEF Task Manager.*)

FY2018 rating [previous]	FY2019 rating [current]	Justification of the current FY rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods.
NA	S	*Summarize the annual progress towards meeting project results. Describe any significant [expected and unexpected] environmental or other changes (Results) negative and or positive attributable to project implementation. State any key changes since previous reporting period. Also, please discuss any major challenges to meet the objectives or specific project outcomes. Whenever possible, please provide evidence of attribution between the UNEP/GEF project's intervention and observed changes towards the achievement of direct outcomes. In cases where several actors are collaborating to achieve common outcomes, evidence of the nature and magnitude of the UNEP/GEF project's 'substantive contribution' and/or 'credible association' should be described.* *This information provides the rationale for the Development Objective Rating in Section 2.* *The initial stages of the project implementation focused on building the necessary conditions for the project execution. Thus, its implementation progress follows an "s" curve. Considering this report regards the first year, the project hasn´t yet achieved the results but has developed several steps towards its achievement. To begin with, the project has been under adaptive management as its initial actions were refined. Even though no outcome changes have been made, the activities through which we will achieve the outcomes now consider the new political scenario and the input from other local partners and stakeholders. Additionally,* the Project has already hired most of the Staff and developed activities such as stakeholder engagement, articulation, and acquisition. *In general, the actions being implemented are being successful, particularly the ones related to engagement of stakeholders in pilot*

16

FY2018 rating [previous]	FY2019 rating [current]	Justification of the current FY rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods.
		areas under Component 1. For instance, one of our workshops with strategic stakeholders from São João APA engaged almost 40 people; the workshop with local landowners in this APA had 120 people; and 30 local strategic stakeholders participated in the workshop in Pouso Alto APA. The strategy to engage stakeholders in the São João APA is being organized in a document to be shared and used in other projects and regions with similar context. *Although some activities that support the implementation of SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas at the São João APA are delayed (such as hiring of technicians to validate the CAR in the São João APA), this process is being strengthened due to an Agreement made with INEA, which will catalyse the ratification and validation of the CAR.* *Except for an isolated delay in the mapping and engagement of key community associations for sustainable extractivism the implementation of conservation actions of the Pouso Alto APA's management plan in private areas is in accordance with project workplan.* *In addition to that monitoring of endangered species in both pilot areas, as predicted in the Component 1, are being done in collaboration with local institutions and the government, assuring its effectiveness and sustainability.* *With respect to the status of Component 2, meetings with IBA and other Forestry Sector Companies are being an important communication channel to catalyse agreements.* *Finally, in relation to Component 3, mapping and engagement of stakeholders that work with legislation related to native vegetation management in private areas, which support the delivery of a Sustainable Native Vegetation Management Regulation proposal to support SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas, are delayed (Outcome 3.1). Mapping and engagement of key institutions and research groups within each biogeographical region included in the project to co-develop the spatial databases on conservation value of private areas (Outcome 3.2) are also delayed. In spite of that decision makers that will use the conservation value layers are being consulted and networks are being created. Research groups are already being engaged, and data, particularly from the Atlantic Forest is being gathered through established networks. The project execution team has already planned the development of the next Project activities so that the intermediate goals are met.* *Considering all the listed above, we conclude the project progress towards achieving the project results are **Satisfactory**.* *NA ratings are related to Outcomes with activities that weren´t predicted to occur in the first year.*

Risks to the delivery of results

Problems/risks identified	Description of the problem/risk	Agreed recommended actions
on achieving targets	1- Changes in governance of institutions that were previously aligned with the project.	1- Meetings with the current institution leaders are being scheduled in order to resume and re-establish synergies and actions. Further, actors that belong to other government scales (state, municipality, other Ministries) are being contacted and new collaborations are being made.
	2- The yellow fever might have affected some of the Golden Lion Tamarin populations.	2- We are collaborating with the main institution that monitors and reintroduces the species in the area in order to evaluate the damage to the populations.
on stakeholder engagement	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.	Actions and projects that were already underway in the regions were mapped and engaged. Bottom up planning, involving important and diverse local stakeholders is being made, and repetitive activities, such as questionnaires, are being avoided.
on gender actions	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.	A protocol is being developed by IIS to address the gender issue. In this context, the next 2 workshops that will be held in the pilot areas of the project will be used as a basis for analysis of the current situation.
on safeguards	NA	NA
on delivering GEF Core Indicators	1- The yellow fever might have affected some of the Golden Lion Tamarin populations	1- We are collaborating with the main institution that monitors and reintroduces the species in the area in order to evaluate the damage to the populations
	2- Non-validation of the CAR (in the São João APA) in the next years	2- IIS is establishing a partnership with INEA in order to contribute to this stage of the process, through the hiring of two technical professionals. As counterpart, INEA will include the project in ongoing actions for ecological restoration and will be committed to the development of PRA in the region
	3- Agreement with Forestry sector companies is not signed	3- In order to minimize this risk, meetings with IBA are being made even before the consultancy is hired.
	4- Institution that manages SiCAR doesn't incorporate into such system the five spatial databases on conservation value of private areas.	4- Institutions are being involved in the whole process of layers elaboration. An initial meeting is planned to be held with them to map out how the tool can be used and to detect potential bottlenecks. From this perception, a strategy will be outlined to be considered both in the generation of maps and in the training of

Problems/risks identified	Description of the problem/risk	Agreed recommended actions
		decision makers.
on delivering of PoW EA		
on sustainability of results	*A risk for any projects with defined scope and time is the sustainability of results after the end of the execution period.*	*To mitigate this risk, it was concluded that it is essential that the project builds local partnerships with Projects and institutions acting in a long-term context. In this way it is possible to create an action structure that guarantees the sustainability of the project results. Further, it is important to engage leaders from the region to learn and disseminate tools provided by the project.*
Others	*NA*	*NA*

3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs

Outputs [7]	Expected delivery date[8]	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2018[9]	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2019)	Progress rating justification (as much as possible, describe in terms of immediate gains to target groups, *e.g. access to project deliverables, participation in receiving services; gains in knowledge, etc*)	Progress rating[10]
Output 1.1.1 Programme for implementation of SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery i.n private areas at the São João APA (KBA area in the State of Rio de Janeiro)	05/2023	NA	20%	Socio-environmental Diagnosis of the area elaborated; awareness and engagement plan elaborated; local focal point contracted; meetings with local stakeholders developed; participation in events to publicize the project and to engage local actors; assessment of experiences in other areas; collaboration established with INEA, among other local action institutions; an event with stakeholders was hold for project initiation; another workshop with land owners was developed; criterion for selection of demonstrative units is being defined, in synergy with the actions to train extension workers and develop a business plan for the sustainable activities development. Technicians to develop the CAR	20%

---

[7] Outputs as descry
bed in the project logframe or in any updated project revision.
[8] As per latest workplan (latest project revision)
[9] Implementation may be assessed by qualitative assessments, percentage of delivery, and/or budget expenditure (planned and actually spent). The 2018 assessment should be copied from previous PIR.
[10] To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager

Outputs [7]	Expected delivery date[8]	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2018[9]	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2019)	Progress rating justification (as much as possible, describe in terms of immediate gains to target groups, *e.g. access to project deliverables, participation in receiving services; gains in knowledge, etc*)	Progress rating[10]
				being hired.	
Output 1.2.1 Programme for implementation of conservation actions of the Pouso Alto APA's management plan in private areas	05/2023	NA	10%	The socio-environmental diagnosis of the region is being elaborated; local meetings were carried out with institutions that play an important role in the area; the process of dissemination of the project and local mobilization began; a meeting with stakeholders working in the region to detail bottom-up activity planning was developed; the hiring process of the local focal point was finished.	10%
Output 1.3.1 Incentive package for SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas in the two pilot areas	05/2023	NA	9%	An economist has been hired to lead the activities of this output. Activities are due to start in the second year of the project.	9%
Output 2.1.1. Programme for the identification of high value for conservation identified and protocols for biodiversity monitoring, SLM, and SFM	05/2023	NA	7%	A consultancy has been contracted to articulate with the forestry sector companies. Meetings with IBA and other Forestry Companies have been made.	7%
Output 2.1.2. Spatial database related to the prioritization for restoration in forestry sector companies' areas	05/2023	NA	30%	Program for dissemination and lessons learned developed. Even though activities related to the prioritization are due to start in the second year of the project, several aspects of its methodology were already discussed and are advanced.	30%
Output 3.1.1 Sustainable Native Vegetation Management Regulation proposal to support SLM, SFM, and native	05/2022	NA	2%	Meetings with government and partner institutions are being scheduled. Due to rearrangements in government governance, some of the actions predicted are being re-discussed.	2%

Outputs [7]	**Expected delivery date[8]**	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2018[9]	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2019)	**Progress rating justification** (as much as possible, describe in terms of immediate gains to target groups, *e.g. access to project deliverables, participation in receiving services; gains in knowledge, etc*)	**Progress rating[10]**
vegetation recovery in private areas					
Output 3.2.1 Public policies incorporating spatial databases with conservation value of private areas	05/2023	NA	8%	The first activities planned for this output are meetings with government members to define the scope of implementation and workshops with national and international researchers to define the method of conservation value modelling. Furthermore, we´ve created the Atlantic forest group and have engaged in activities that will catalyse data gathering for several biomes (e.g. PPBIO).	8%
Output 3.2.2 Capacity building and dissemination programme for mainstreaming conservation value	05/2023	NA	20%	The communication strategy was already developed, and materials and documents for dissemination are being developed. Meetings with international institutions have been made in order to maintain the engagement and to share experiences from other parties.	20%

Overall project implementation progress [11] *(To be completed by UNEP GEF Task Manager.):*

FY2018 rating [previous]	**FY2019 rating** [current]	**Justification of the current rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods**.
NA	S	*The rating of progress in the delivery of outputs should be assessed in terms of both quantity and quality. The assessment must consider ownership by, and usefulness to, intended beneficiaries and the timeliness of their delivery. Use the comments column to explain the reasons behind the success or shortcomings of the project in delivering its programmed outputs and meeting expected quality standards.* *At the second half of the first year of the project, we´ve raised the need to refine some of the actions proposed under each output through the Open Standards for Conservation methodology. As a result of this process, the development of some of these activities has been delayed, reducing the progress rating of some outputs. Nevertheless, considering that project implementation follows an "s" curve, as soon as the refinement and necessary conditions are established, progress improves. Furthermore, after this refinement, we are sure that the activities will lead the project to achieve both the outputs and its outcomes.* *Examples of changes in activities were: i) the exclusion of a questionnaire to be applied to local landowners in the São João APA. This was due to concerns that previous projects have applied several*

---

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

questionnaires, and local actors are averse of that. Ii) the inclusion of a very strategic meeting with actors that might be the final users of the Layer of conservation value, expected as an output under Component 3. This meeting will give insights on the exact format of the layer, optimizing its use.

Each of the activities listed in the project depend on the several processual steps, such as acquisition, staff hiring, among others. These processes must be transparent and carefully made, and thus took longer than what we had expected. Most of these activities have been finished by the first year of the project, and thus the project management team expects that progress will be at full speed from the second year of project implementation on.

Regarding Component 1, the Stakeholders of both APAs are engaged, particularly of São João APA. Not only have meetings and workshops been made, but also the focal point is articulating with producers and local institutions to engage them in the project. An engagement plan is being finished, in order to share strategies for landowners engagement. Furthermore, we´ve expanded the group of people that will be trained by the project: initially, only extension agents would be included. However, several stakeholders draw the attention to the fact that other landowners were interested and could act as dissemination agents. Therefore, we´ve decided to include some landowners.

According to the initial planning schedule,some activities that support the implementation of SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas at the São João APA are delayed (selection of Demonstration Units - DUs, selection of extension agents to be engaged in the creation of DUs, definition of practices to be implemented in DUs, hiring of technicians to validate the CAR in the São João APA) though, due to important previous steps, such as: a longer period of articulation with stakeholders and the refinement of the result chains of Open Standards for Conservation.

In Component 2, the IBA has gathered with the Project Coordinator in order to discuss the project initiatives, which will catalyse the activities of the Consultancy hired to promote the agreements. Also, the method for prioritization for restoration had advances as its methodology was already discussed among researchers and the project staff.

Finally, in Component 3, mapping and engagement of stakeholders that work with legislation related to native vegetation management in private areas, which support the delivery of a Sustainable Native Vegetation Management Regulation proposal to support SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas, are delayed (Outcome 3.1). Mapping and engagement of key institutions and research groups within each biogeographical region included in the project to co-develop the spatial databases on conservation value of private areas (Outcome 3.2) are also delayed. In spite of that researchers are being engaged and data is being gathered for the development of the layers. Still, the Project Management team raised the need to first discuss with institutions that will use the layers in order to understand exactly what kind of information they need, and its format. The project execution team has already planned the development of the next Project activities so that the intermediate goals are met.

Considering the above mentioned, we consider the progress toward project implementation satisfactory, as actions are more robust and

		coming to speed. Furthermore, the main actions developed throughout the first year are key for its satisfactory implementation.

Risks in implementation

This section should be completed by the Project Manager and summarize implementation risks (e.g. procurement delays, reputational risks etc).

The first column should be completed by the Project Manager and the second column should summarize the recommendations that the Project Manager and Task Manager have agreed upon to address the problem/risk. This section should inform the risk rating in section 3.3.

Problems/risks identified	Agreed recommended actions	By whom	When
Delay caused by the need to refine the initial project planning within the open standards for conservation method	*It was agreed that the necessary refinement would be done based on the Open Standards for Conservation methodology, assuming a continuous adaptive management of the project planning*	*IIS - MMA*	*August/September/2019*
Very time-consuming acquisition processes, even for small purchases.	*MOP revision*	*IIS-MMA*	*December/2019*
Delays in achieving a viable date for holding meetings and workshops with partners	*It was agreed that a lessons-learned protocol would be developed focusing on these strategic meeting so that the staff can improve the efficacy of the meetings. In addition, other meeting strategies are also being used so that presential meetings are only schedule when necessary.*	*IIS*	*May/2019*

3.3. Risk Rating *[Insert the **Medium and High Risks** and mitigation measures identified at CEO endorsement (e.g. Section A.5) and any relevant risk from safeguards screening and/or management plans.] Expand the table to include medium and high risks observed during implementation, e.g. problems identified in sections 3.1. and 3.2.*

Risk	Mitigation at CEO approval	Mitigation at implementation	Rank
Non-compliance of landowners with the LPVN	*Although LPVN is already in force, landowners involved in the project (within the Atlantic Forest's pilot area) might risk not complying with this law. In such pilot area the main goal is to support forest recovery so that landowners comply with the LPVN. The process of law compliance will be speeded since the project will have activities for CAR validation and PRA initiation. Once CAR is validated, landowners in the São João APA can implement PRA and start recovering native vegetation in their lands. Hence, the risk of non-compliance in this region is minimized. Nevertheless, in other regions in Brazil this risk is medium, because it will be mitigated only after the dissemination of the lessons*	*The risk has not yet been identified as a real problem. The mitigation actions continue the same as described in the CEO endorsement.*	CEO: M TM: PM: M

	learned in this pilot area.		
Non-validation of the CAR in the next years	*State governments are responsible for validating CAR. Although the risk of non-validation of the CAR for the entire territory is high, this risk is reduced in the São João APA, where validation is most essential for the project development. As mentioned above, in the São João APA the project will support CAR validation, so this risk is mitigated in this region. In the Pouso Alto APA TFCA project (see sub-section 2.7) is promoting CAR and, consequently, enabling validation afterwards, so that the risk of non-validation is reduced. Therefore, although the risks are high for the national territory, our mitigation strategies reduce them for the two pilot areas.*	*For the pilot implementation at the São João APA, it was identified that the CAR validation and rectification process has not yet been completed. In this sense, IIS is establishing a partnership with INEA in order to contribute to this stage of the process, catalyzing the registry in this pilot area. As counterpart, INEA will include the project in ongoing actions for ecological restoration and will be committed to the development of PRA in the region.*	CEO: H TM: PM: H
Inefficient establishment of PRAs by state governments	*As the project team is in close contact with Brazilian Forest Service, which is in charge of technically supporting and monitoring PRAs in the states, the risk of inefficient PRA implementation is mitigated. Besides, this risk is additionally mitigated by some project activities such as raising awareness among landowners and training of extension agents with focus on compliance with LPVN (which includes PRA implementation), supporting CAR validation and PRA initiation, developing incentive packages for native vegetation conservation and recovery.*	*The risk has not yet been identified as a real problem. The mitigation actions continue the same as described in the CEO endorsement.*	CEO: M TM: PM: M
Regulation bodies do not incorporate proposals of spatial database and changes in regulations	*During the development phase of the project, the team set several meetings with regulation agencies (e.g. Brazilian Forest Service) to engage them in the project. Furthermore, the project plans to develop an advocacy strategy to minimize the risk of such bodies not incorporating project proposals.*	*This year the Brazilian Forest Service (SFB), which manages the SiCAR, was transferred from the Ministry of Environment (MMA) to the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Supply (MAPA) and the board of directors was altered. However, the project team is setting new meetings with members of SFB to engage them in the project.*	CEO: M TM: PM: M
Some strategies of the Management plan of the APA of Pouso Alto are not implemented in every municipality in the APA	*The Pouso Alto APA has a great variety of rural landowners, from small to large ones. The activities to be implemented in the project (and based on the Management plan) will hardly be completely implemented in every municipality in the APA. Therefore, the project will focus on the municipality of Alto Paraíso (the only municipality whose area is completely inside the APA and where the touristic potential is best developed), but certain strategies can be focused in other municipalities. Thus, there can be a balance between strategy risk and effectiveness. In addition, during the development and execution of the project, the lessons learned from other projects and from this project will be considered to ensure effectively and replicability in other municipalities.*	*The risk has not yet been identified as a real problem. The mitigation actions continue the same as described in the CEO endorsement.*	CEO: H TM: PM: H
The rural	*The project will conduct activities that will*	*The risk has not yet been identified*	CEO: M

landowners do not improve biodiversity conservation in their properties	*raise landowner's awareness (bottom-up approach) so that they recognize the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services and understand practices that reconcile biodiversity conservation with farming production. Furthermore, extension agents will be trained on how to assist landowners to achieve that. Incentive packages for native vegetation conservation or recovery will be negotiated with banks so that they are available to landowners. Finally, the lessons learned and examples in the pilot areas will provide proof of the economic and environmental benefits of conservation should minimize the risk of landowners not improving biodiversity conservation in the other biogeographical regions in Brazil.*	*as a real problem. The mitigation actions continue the same as described in the CEO endorsement.*	TM: PM: M
Climate Change and extreme weather events affect negatively the project implementation, SLM, SFM and native vegetation recovery, and biodiversity conservation	*The project considers possible climate change and variations in weather into its strategies in order to make them more resilient, as well as to mitigate these effects. For instance, the selection of the species to be used in the restoration initiatives will take into account each species vulnerability to climate change. In the Pouso Alto APA, the environmental education and training programmes will pay particular attention to climate adaptation measures, including improved fire management and water resources management techniques. Further, the implementation of the project on the ground practices (such as Demonstration Units) and all awareness, training and capacity building efforts will consider practices that contribute to reducing GHG emissions, as well as increasing climate resilience through climate-smart agriculture and ecosystem-based adaptation. Finally the potential of specific regions to act as climate refugia in the context of climate change will be considered in the development of the databases of the conservation value of private lands.*	*The risk has not yet been identified as a real problem. The mitigation actions continue the same as described in the CEO endorsement.*	CEO: H TM: PM: H
Changes in governance of institutions that were previously aligned with the project	*Non-Applicable*	*Meetings with the current institution leaders are being made in order to resume and re-establish synergies and actions. Further, actors that belong to other government instances (state, municipality, other Ministries) are being contacted and new collaborations are being made.*	CEO: NA TM: PM: H
The yellow fever might have affected some of the Golden Lion Tamarin populations	*Non-Applicable*	*We are collaborating with the main institution that monitors and reintroduces the species in the area in order to evaluate the damage to the populations*	CEO: NA TM: PM: H
Low motivation of local stakeholders to	*Non-Applicable*	*Actions and projects that were already underway in the regions were mapped and engaged. Bottom*	CEO: NA TM: PM: L

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		*up planning, involving important and diverse local stakeholders is being made, and repetitive activities, such as questionnaires, are being avoided*	
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	*Non-Applicable*	*A protocol is being developed by project team to address the gender issue.* *In this context, the first 2 workshops that were held in the pilot areas of the project were used as a basis for analysis of the current situation*	CEO: NA TM: PM: L
A risk for any projects with defined scope and time is the sustainability of results after the end of the execution period	*Non-Applicable*	*To mitigate this risk, it was concluded that it is essential that the project builds local partnerships with Projects and institutions acting in a long-term context. In this way it is possible to create an action structure that guarantees the sustainability of the project results. Further, it is important to engage leaders from the region to learn and disseminate tools provided by the project. The project team is planning to develop an "exit strategy" for the project including these steps in order to avoid such risk.*	CEO: NA TM: PM: L
Need to refine the initial project planning within the open standards for conservation method	*Non-Applicable*	*It was agreed that the necessary refinement would be done based on the Open Standards for Conservation methodology, assuming a continuous adaptive management of the project planning*	CEO: NA TM: PM: L
Very time-consuming acquisition processes, even for small purchases	*Non-Applicable*	*Review and adjustment of flows and procedures in the project operational manual*	CEO: NA TM: PM: L
Delays in achieving a viable date for	*Non-Applicable*	*It was agreed that a lessons-learned protocol would be developed focusing on these strategic*	CEO: NA TM: PM: L

holding meetings and workshops with partners		meetings so that the staff can improve the efficacy of the meetings	
		Overall Risk Rating Project Manager	L
		Overall Risk Rating Task Manager	

FY2018 rating [previous]	FY2019 rating [current]	Justification of the current risk rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods.
NA	L	*The current risk rating was established as Low because most of the risks defined in the Endorsement were not yet identified during the implementation phase, particularly the Medium and Hight risks. The new risks identified at the implementation phase are mainly Low, and there are already actions to reduce its impacts.* *One of the risks evaluated as High reported during project implementation is the Non-validation of the CAR. We assumed at the project start that the CAR would be completed, and thus that one of the strategies would be to validate the registry. The registry validation is the next step after the registry toward compliance in Private Areas and is a necessary step to define areas that need to be restored. However, due to difficulty in the process of reporting, such as number of incorrect registries and low number of staff to help with perform the activities together with landowners, this was not completed. As a mitigation measure, the Project Staff is already establishing a partnership with INEA, the Rio de Janeiro state institution responsible for implementing the LPVN. This partnership aims at contributing to catalyze the registry in this pilot area. As counterpart, INEA will include the project in ongoing actions for ecological restoration and will be committed to the development of PRA in the region.* *The Project Staff has raised two new risks rated as high at the project implementation phase that was not predicted at the beginning of the endorsement. The first risk is that there were Changes in governance of institutions that were previously aligned with the project. In order to reduce the impacts of these changes, the project staff is already setting meetings with the current institution leaders in order to resume and re-establish synergies and actions. Further, actors that belong to other government instances (state, municipality, other Ministries) are being contacted and new collaborations are being made. The second risk is that the yellow fever might have affected some of the Golden Lion Tamarin populations. Meetings with AMLD, the partner institution who monitors the populations are in course in order to investigate the impact of yellow fever and the potential actions that can be made.*

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.
Substantial 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.
Modest 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.

Optional Annexes and/or Links:
- **Project Steering Committee Minutes of the year reported**
- **Half yearly Report**
- **Quarterly Reports**
- **Risk Factor Table form previous template (recommended for substantial and high-risk projects)**

Risks Factor Table
There are two tables to assess and address risk: the first "risk factor table" to describe and rate risk factors; the second "top risk mitigation plan" should indicate what measures/action will be taken with respect to risks rated **Substantial** *or* **High** *and who is responsible to for it.*

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.
Substantial 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.
Modest 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.

RISK FACTOR TABLE
Project Managers will use this table to summarize risks identified in the *Project Document* and reflect also *any new risks* identified implementation. The *Notes* column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific pr "Notes" column has one section for the Project Manager (**PM**) and one for the UNEP Task Manager (**TM**). If the generic risk factors ar not relevant to the project rows should be added. The **UNEP Task Manager** should provide ratings in the right hand column reflecting project risks.

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	
INTERNAL RISK										
Project management										
Management structure [Roles and responsibilities]	Stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood	Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others	Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems							PM : TM:
Governance structure [oversight]	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet periodically and provide effective direction/inputs	Body(ies) meets periodically but guidance/input provided to project is inadequate. TOR unclear	Members lack commitment Committee/body does not fulfil its TOR							PM : TM:

28

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	
INTERNAL RISK										
Project management										
Internal com-munications	Fluid and cordial	Communication process deficient although relationships between team members are good	Lack of adequate communication between team members leading to deterioration of relationships and resentment							PM: TM:
Work flow Budget	Project progressing according to work plan	Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall timetable	Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation							PM: TM:
Co-financing	Co-financing is secured and payments are received on time	Is secured but payments are slow and bureaucratic	A substantial part of pledged co-financing may not materialize							PM: TM:
Budget	Activities are progressing within planned budget	Minor budget reallocation needed	Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget							PM: TM:
Financial management	Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for	Financial reporting slow or deficient	Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds							PM: TM:
Reporting	Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues	Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues	Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of project reporting							PM: TM:
Stakeholder engagement	Stakeholder analysis done and positive feedback from	Consultation and participation process seems strong but	Symptoms of conflict with critical stakeholders or							PM:

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	
INTERNAL RISK										
Project management										
	critical stakeholders and partners	misses some groups or relevant partners	evidence of apathy and lack of interest from partners or other stakeholders							TM:
External com-munications	Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public understand project and are regularly updated on progress	Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is successfully transmitted	Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners or misunderstand-ings concerning objectives and activities evident							PM: TM:
Short term/long term balance	Project is addressing short term needs and achieving results with a long term perspective, particularly sustainability and replicability	Project is interested in the short term with little understanding of or interest in the long term	Longer term issues are deliberately ignored or neglected							PM: TM:
Science and technological issues	Project based on sound science and well established technologies	Project testing approaches, methods or technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks	Many scientific and /or technological uncertainties							PM: TM:
Political influences	Project decisions and choices are not particularly politically driven	Signs that some project decisions are politically motivated	Project is subject to a variety of political influences that may jeopardize project objectives							PM: TM:
Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary										PM: TM:

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	
EXTERNAL RISK										
Project context										
Political stability	Political context is stable and safe	Political context is unstable but predictable and not a threat to project implementation	Very disruptive and volatile							PM: TM:
Environmental conditions	Project area is not affected by severe weather events or major environmental stress factors	Project area is subject to more or less predictable disasters or changes	Project area has very harsh environmental conditions							PM: TM:
Social, cultural and economic factors	There are no evident social, cultural and/or economic issues that may affect project performance and results	Social or economic issues or changes pose challenges to project implementation but mitigation strategies have been developed	Project is highly sensitive to economic fluctuations, to social issues or cultural barriers							PM: TM:
Capacity issues	Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners	Weaknesses exist but have been identified and actions is taken to build the necessary capacity	Capacity is very low at all levels and partners require constant support and technical assistance							PM: TM:
Others, please specify										

If there is a significant (over 50% of risk factors) discrepancy between Project Manager and Task Manager rating, an explanation by the Task Manager should be provided below

31

TOP RISK MITIGATION PLAN
Rank – importance of risk
Risk Statement – potential problem (condition and consequence)
Action to take – action planned/taken to handle the risk
Who – person(s) responsible for the action
Date – date by which action needs to be or was completed

Rank	Risk Statement[12]		Action to Take	Who
	Condition	Consequence		

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High) (*Please include PIR risk ratings for all prior periods, add columns as necessary*):

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and any changes (positive or negat previous reporting period
		If a risk mitigation plan had been presented for a previous period or as a result of the M please report on progress or results of its implementation

---

[12] Only for Substantial to High risk.