

**United Nations Development Programme
Global Environment Facility**

Paraguay

GEF – Full-sized Project

Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Land Management into Production Practices in all Bioregions and Biomes in Paraguay. (PIMS ID 4836)

Final Evaluation Report

Evaluation Team

Giacomo Morelli – International Evaluator

Emilio Valiente – National Evaluator

Date: 17/12/2020

Opening page

Project title

Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Land Management into Production Practices in all Bioregions and Biomes in Paraguay.

Award Atlas ID

00077229

Project ID

0088150

PIMS #

4836

GEF ID

4860

Evaluation period

From October to December 2020

Date of the Evaluation Report

14/12/2020

Contry

Paraguay

GEF Focal Areas

Land Degradation

Biodiversidy

Implementing agency

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Executing agency

Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible (MADES)

Evaluation Team Members

Giacomo Morelli –International Evaluator

Emilio Valiente – National Evaluator

Acknowledgement

A deep thanks to all the people who have taken the time to contribute information used in the writing of this evaluation report. A particular recognition to the Project Coordinator, the Project Assistant, the Project Communicator and the Platforms Assistant for their support to the Evaluation Team both in providing relevant documents and reports for the evaluation exercise and in organizing the entire process of remote meetings and interviews through which the assignment has been carried out.

Executive summary

Project summary table

Project title		Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Land Management into Production Practices in all Bioregions and Biomes in Paraguay.	
GEF Project ID	4860	PIF approval date:	18/04/2012
UNPD Project ID (PMIS):	4836	CEO Endorsement Date:	9/12/2013
ATLAS Business Unit, Award # Proj. ID:	88150	ProDoc Signature date:	19/03/2014
Country:	Paraguay	Hiring of Project director date:	1/07/2014
Region:	Latin America and Caribbean	Date of the inception meeting:	14/05/2014
Focal areas	Land Degradation Biodiversity Multi-focal areas: Sustainable Forest Managements, REDD+	Date of the final evaluation	14/12/2020
GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective:		Operational closing date:	19/02/2019
Trust Fund [GEF TF, LDCF, SCCF, NPIF]:	GEF Trust Fund	Revised closing date:	31/12/2020
Implementing agency / Executing agency	UNDP		
Other executing agencies	-- -- -- -- --		
Project costs	At endorsement (US dollars)	At the momento of the final evaluation (US dollars)	
[1] GEF financing	6,861,817.00	6,580,031.26	
[2] UNDP	4,489,288.00		
[3] Government	14,462,473.00		
[4] ONG	3,845,259.00		
[5] Private sector	9,984,848.00		
[6] Cofinancing [2+3+4+5]	32,781,868.00		
Total Project costs [1+6]	39,643,685.00		

Project description

The project has one objective and three expected outcomes:

Objective

The biodiversity and ecosystem functions of the Atlantic Forest eco-region are protected from existing and emerging threats from multi-sectoral production practices and is a model for replication across the country's bioregions and biomes.

Outcome 1

Effective governance framework for biodiversity conservation and SLM in multiple use landscapes.

Outcome 2

Financial and market incentives framework to promote biodiversity and sustainable land management within the target multiple-use landscape.

Outcome 3

Strengthened implementation of land set aside system and sustainable production practices.

The Project's approach to environmental problems is innovative for Paraguay. The Project seeks to support the environmental public sector and the stakeholders of the soy and meat supply chains in promoting environmental sustainability for the benefit of the Atlantic Forest ecosystem in three departments of Paraguay. Through the establishment of Platforms of the two most important commodities in terms of exports in the country, it is committed to seeking durable solutions for better agricultural development in the country.

Evaluation Ratings Table

Rating Project Performance		
Criteria	Rating	Comment
Monitoring and evaluation		
Overall quality of M&E	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	During the implementation of the Project, the Project Unit has partially corrected the deficiencies of the Results Framework
M&E design at entry	2 – Unsatisfactory	The ProDoc presented a complete M&E plan, but has had significant shortcomings. The Results Framework included in the ProDoc presents many non-relevant indicators, two duplicate indicators, others very ambitious and only some SMART. Furthermore, no tool was outlined to monitor the development of the Platforms of Commodities.
M&E Plan Implementation	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	The M&E plan has been implemented by the Project Unit. The mid-term review and implementation of its recommendations, through the second substantive review, has revealed to be key to correct at least partially the original M&E plan. During the implementation of the Project, a monitoring plan for the two platforms has not been thought to monitor their development in terms of negotiations and consensus building.
Execution of the Implementing Agency (IA) and Executing Agency (EA)		
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The rating reflects that of the following two points.
Execution of the Implementing Agency (IA)	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	NDP has shown itself capable of leading a novel process by developing the role of process facilitator with actors that are not typically its partners. The lack of a good initial M&E plan and the lack of a dedicated M&E to the Platforms, which could have been designed throughout the implementation, constitute a gap in the execution of the Project.
Execution of of the Executing Agency (EA)	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The Project has had different coordination spaces with MADES at different levels, from the macro-political to the operational. However, the leadership of MADES in the implementation of the different components in the field was not outstanding and the co-financing was not reported.
Outcomes		
Overall Quality of Project Outcomes	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	Expected project achievements have been largely only partially accomplished
Relevance	2 - Relevant	The Project is relevant. It responds to the needs of the stakeholders involved and aims to improve environmental conditions in the multiple-use landscapes of the BAAPA.
Effectiveness	5 - Satisfactory	Indicators are not sufficient to describe the work actually done by the Project. The work to support the private sector and the public sector of Paraguay has been articulated in many other aspects: support for the development of regulations / laws, support for the establishment of the CAPPRO sustainability department and the MFS secretariat. There has been a mainstreaming of the sensitivity and operability of the actors towards the environmental sustainability of agricultural production that was less before the Project. Finally, the need to collect learnings for the replicability of the positive experiences of the Project has also been met, as foreseen in the ProDoc.

Efficiency	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The inadequate M&E system from its design has negatively marked the implementation of the Project, although the two substantive reviews have shown to be very relevant and the work of the Project Unit very dedicated. The novel nature of the Project due to its links with the private sector and the lack of experience of both parties (private sector and UNDP) in managing service contracts has slowed down the work. The times of negotiation and construction of the work plans with the private sector counterparts have taken time. In fact, private sector organizations do not have the administrative capacities to handle this type of contract. The process, valued as essential and novel, therefore, has slowed down the work.
Sustainability		
Overall likelihood of risks to Sustainability	3 - Moderately Likely Moderate risks	The overall sustainability rating is a synthesis of the financial, socio-economic, institutional and governance and environmental risk and sustainability ratings.
Financial risks	2- Moderately Likely Significant risks	The risk refers mainly to the medium-long term. No discussion has yet been started within the Platforms to identify forms of self-financing of the same in the case there are no funds available from international cooperation. It has also been identified that for the short and medium term there are no other strategies to finance the guidelines of actions developed by the Departmental Platforms for soy and beef with funds other than international cooperation.
Socio-economic risks	4 – Likely Insignificant risks	No socio-economic risks have been identified that could compromise the sustainability of the Project.
Governance and institutional risks	3 - Moderately Likely Moderate risks	The risk refers mainly to the medium-long term. No discussion has yet been started within the Platforms to identify forms of government of the same in the case there are no funds available from international cooperation. Currently MADES and UNDP are the institutions that supervise the operation of the Platforms.
Environmental risks	4 – Likely Insignificant risks	No environmental risks have been identified that could compromise the sustainability of the Project.
Impact		
Environmental Status Improvement	2 - Míñimum (M)	The achievements on the ground have been below expectations. For this reason, the evaluation qualifies as minimum the improvement of the environmental status.
Environmental Stress Reduction	2 - Míñimum (M)	Achievements on the ground have been below expectations. For this reason the evaluation qualifies as a minimum the environmental stress reduction. However, at the local level, in the Naranjal District, there has been a significant impact in terms of reducing environmental stress.
Progress towards stress/status change	3 - Significant (S)	The Project lays the foundations towards the change of tension and the environmental state. The establishment of the Platforms, the drafting of the Protocol of Good Agricultural Practices, the work to support the public sector in relation to capacity improvements, support to SIAM and the improvement of the regulatory framework, and support to the private sector are the elements that pave the way towards a more sustainable vision in environmental terms of the two supply chains of soy and beef.

Annex A presents the rating scales applied.

Summary of conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations

Conclusions

Conclusion n° 1

Due to its complexity and its innovative nature, the Project is paradigmatic. It clearly visualizes the challenges and efforts that must be coordinated at different scales and with different actors to advance towards the fulfillment of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) of the 2030 Agenda.

Conclusion n° 2

The Project originates from the recognition that a broad consensus among the actors of the soy and beef supply chains towards environmental sustainability is necessary for the conservation of environmental resources. The regulatory framework, and the capacities of public institutions and their efforts to enforce laws are not sufficient to guarantee sustainable development.

Conclusion n° 3

The path towards more sustainable production has been laid out by the Project. If continuity is not assured, all work done will turn out to be largely lost.

Conclusion n° 4

The indicators in the Results Framework are, in many cases, not relevant or very ambitious. The Results Framework has proven to be a useless tool in order to monitor the Project. The formal achievements related to the achievement of the targets of the indicators, as well as those identified in the Results Framework, have fallen short of expectations regarding the elements of ecological importance that have actually been established in the field. On the other hand, the achievement of the targets has been satisfactory for all those indicators that have to do with activities related to support to public institutions and approach with small communities, including indigenous people. Finally, the evaluation highlights that the novelty of the Project, that is, the work of the Platforms, was not captured directly by any indicator in the Results Framework.

Conclusion n° 5

The issue of long-term financing of the Platforms by its members has not been addressed as a necessary issue for their sustainability. It is a matter of complicated solution due to their nature. They are platforms that bring together divergent interests that make participants interested, but, not being able to ensure certain results, they make it difficult for the participants to commit to direct financing: a company could find itself in the position of financing something that does not align with its corporate interests. This is unlikely to happen. The Project represents the first cycle of financing with international cooperation funds and other cycles will require these types of funds.

Conclusion n° 6

The work of the Platforms, by its very nature, has had a very consensus-oriented approach to field production practices. That is clearly a reflection of the primary interests of supply chain actors.

Conclusion n° 7

The Platform's work has shown that it needs long times to land with relevant actions in environmental terms with the productive sectors.

Conclusion n° 8

The Project Communication Plan by communicating the Project activities to promote the participation of the stakeholders (especially producers) and by increasing the transparency of the implementation has been established as an element of efficiency in the management of public resources.

Conclusion n° 9

The Project has been able to establish the Platform of Women Leaders of the Sustainable Commodities Productive Chain, which has been spontaneously originated as an idea by the will of women to visualize the role of women in rural development towards sustainability. The Project Team has then worked to ensure the participation of women in differentiated events in which they could express their realities and visions.

Conclusion n° 10

The establishment of the Platforms is considered an impact of the Project. The stakeholders interviewed by the Evaluation Team agree that, without the Project, the stakeholders would have continued to deal with the environmental sustainability of their operations only individually. A collective and articulated effort would not have simply taken place.

Conclusion n° 11

By generating spaces for discussions between all the stakeholders of the two most important commodities in the national agricultural sector, any representative of the salaried employees of the field was involved. The lack of participation of representatives of the salaried employees represents a gap in the implementation of the Project. This gap is therefore especially important from the institutional perspective of UNDP. However, the non-participation of employee representatives in the platforms is partially justified by two elements: they are not identified as actors in the ProDoc and there is no union organization organized at the national level.

Conclusion n° 12

The public sector co-financiers (MADES, MAG, INFONA) and the NGOs have not communicated the data regarding their planned co-financing.

Lessons learned**Lesson learned n° 1**

The novel approach envisaged in the ProDoc, that is, a mapping and stakeholder involvement plan, the effective involvement of the private sector during implementation and the creation of consensus among sometimes even divergent interests, adds to the ambition characteristic of GEF projects. It is therefore important that as soon as possible a collaboration strategy between actors is visualized to land on the ground the activities necessary to achieve the indicators.

Lesson learned n° 2

International cooperation projects can represent nuclei of agglutination of actors and catalysts of processes already existing in the countries where they are developed.

Lesson learned n° 3

The bottom-up approach that has characterized the formation of the Platforms first at the departmental level and then at the national level has allowed an effective involvement of the Project stakeholders.

Lesson learned n° 4

The Project Team is in the process of documenting five case studies:

- Platform Experience;
- Certification of Forests for Environmental Services in indigenous communities;
- Implementation of silvopastoral systems;
- Implementation of Good Agricultural Practices; and
- Process of restoration of Protective Forests of Water Channels in Naranjal

Such a documentation exercise is important for replicability and in fact documents five lessons learned.

Recommendations**Recommendation n° 1**

Related to conclusions n° 2, n° 4 and n° 5

Addressed to UNDP and MADES

Have a monitoring and reporting system for the work developed by the Platforms. The system should, in principle, describe activities and indicate progress towards greater sustainability in terms of conflict resolution and consensus building. In this regard, it is possible to take advantage of some instruments created within the framework of the Global Commodities Program such as the Ladder of Change. A monitoring of this type is very important also for communication issues between the implementing agency and the donor. The approach is new, it is not known how effective it can be in the short period of time to achieve results in the field. Documenting the consensus-building process makes it easier to understand what happened during a preceding funding cycle and allows for more realistic expectations for a successive funding cycle.

Recommendation n° 2

Related to conclusions n° 3 and n° 5

Addressed to UNDP and MADES

Introduce the issue of sustainability of the Commodity Platforms to its members, taking advantage of the fact that the platforms will continue to be financed by the Chaco Verde Project.

Recommendation n° 3

Related to conclusions n° 1, n° 2 and n° 9

Addressed to UNDP and MADES

It is suggested that the work of the platforms be used to produce scientific knowledge. The work of the platform as a process is itself an object of study for the work of researchers in the social, political and economic sciences. This type of work, although not important for implementation purposes, is necessary to foster debate on the 2030 Agenda at both the national and international levels.

Recommendation n° 4

Related to conclusion n° 7

Addressed to UNDP, MADES and MAG

The process of operationalization of the action guidelines of the platforms is a favorable space for the strengthening of capacities. It is important to do an exercise from the very beginning to define who can finance the different actions within the actors of the platforms and to see which actions related to forest restoration and ecosystem connectivity should be implemented in cooperation with indigenous communities and small communities.

Recommendation n° 5

Related to conclusion n° 11

Addressed to UNDP and MAG

Incorporate representatives of rural salaried workers in the operation of the Platforms. The inclusion of these actors is very important for UNDP to fully comply with some of its principles of promoting human rights, governance for inclusive societies, gender equality and empowerment of women. The evaluation, therefore, suggests that a mapping be made of the groups and / or associations that represent the interests of workers in the agricultural sector at the national level. Then, the identified groups can be invited on specific occasions to give talks at Platform events to promote the interests of these actors.

Recommendation n° 6

Related to conclusion n° 11

Addressed to UNDP

Update the SESP of the Green Chaco project to include as an economic-social risk the lack of representation and participation of salaried workers in the Platforms.

Recommendation n° 7

Related to conclusions n° 4 and n° 7

Addressed to UNDP

When new initiatives are formulated, with characteristics similar to the evaluated Project, it is important to identify risks and valid assumptions and define indicators that are within the scope of the Project during its implementation period. If a work is proposed with the productive sector, it is therefore important to limit the indicators to the changes that can be promoted in the supply of a given commodity. Indicators that measure achievements in the demand for a commodity are very ambitious and difficult to achieve during the term of a 5-year project. In addition, when a project has both a productive and environmental objective, it is preferable to envision, already in ProDoc, a two-way strategy that allows the achievement of the objectives through the involvement of the private sector and through typical UNDP implementation mechanisms, i.e. support to environmental NGOs, small producers and indigenous communities.

Acronyms and abbreviations

AFD	Agencia Financiera de Desarrollo
APS	Asociación de Productores de Soja
ARP	Asociación Rural del Paraguay
BAAPA	Bosque Atlántico del Alto Paraná (Upper Paraná Atlantic Forest)
BD	Biodiversity
CAP	Coordinadora Agrícola del Paraguay
CAPECO	Cámara Paraguaya de Exportadores y Comercializadores de Cereales y Oleaginosas
CPC	Cámara Paraguaya de la Carne
CAPPRO	Cámara Paraguaya de Procesadores y Exportadores de Oleaginosas y Cereales
DIM	Direct Implementation Modality (Modalidad de Aplicación Directa)
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
FAPI	Federación por la Autodeterminación de los Pueblos Indígenas
FECOPROD	Federación de Cooperativas de Producción
GAP	Good Agricultural Practice
GCP	Green Commodities Programme
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEF	Global Environment facility
GHG	Green House Gases
GoP	Government of Paraguay
IF	Institución Financiera
INDERT	Instituto Nacional de Desarrollo Rural y de la Tierra
INDI	Instituto Paraguayo del Indígena
KAP	Knowledge Attitude and Practises
MADES	Ministerio del Ambiente y del Desarrollo Sostenible (formerly known as SEAM)
MAG	Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería
MFS	Mesa de Finanzas Sostenibles
MSF	Manejo Sustentable de Forestas
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PND	Plan Nacional de Desarrollo
PU	Project Unit
MUL	Multiple use landscape
SARAS	Sistema de Análisis de Riesgo Ambientales y Sociales
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SEAM	Secretaría del Ambiente (nowadays MADES)
SENACSA	Servicio Nacional de Calidad y Salud Animal
SENAVE	Servicio Nacional de Calidad y Sanidad Vegetal y de Semillas
SIAM	Sistema Ambiental de Monitoreo

UGP	Unión de Gremios de la Producción
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDP FMAM RCU	Regional Coordination Unit of UNDP
WB	World Bank
WHO	World Health Organization of the United Nations
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

Table of Content

Opening page	i
Executive summary	ii
Project summary table	ii
Project description.....	ii
Evaluation Ratings Table	iii
Summary of conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations	v
Conclusions.....	v
Lessons learned.....	vi
Recommendations.....	vi
Acronyms and abbreviations	viii
1. Introduction	1
1.1. Purpose of the evaluation	1
1.2. Scope and methodology	1
1.2.1. Scope.....	1
1.2.2. Evaluation tools	1
1.2.3. Evaluation phases.....	1
1.2.4. Considerations and limitations	2
1.3. Structure of the evaluation report	2
2. Project description	3
2.1. Project start and duration.....	3
2.2. Problems that the project sought to address	3
2.3. Immediate and development objectives of the project	4
2.4. Baseline Indicators established	4
2.5. Main stakeholders	4
2.6. Expected results.....	6
3. Findings	7
3.1 Project Design/Formulation	7
3.1.1. Analysis of Results Framework	7
3.1.2. Risks and assumptions	9
3.1.3. Lessons learned incorporated in Project design	9
3.1.4. Stakeholders' participation	10
3.1.5. Replication approach	10
3.1.6. UNDP comparative advantage.....	10
3.1.7. Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector.....	11
3.1.8. Management arrangements	11
3.2 Project Implementation	11

3.2.1. Adaptive management.....	11
3.2.2. Effective partnerships arrangements	12
3.2.3. Monitoring and Evaluation: design at entry at execution.....	12
3.2.4. Project financing	12
3.2.5. Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management	13
3.2.6. Coordination and operational issues	13
3.3 Project results	13
3.3.1. Achievements.....	13
3.3.2. Relevance	21
3.3.3. Effectiveness and efficiency.....	23
3.3.4. Country ownership.....	26
3.3.5. Integration	26
3.3.6. Sustainability	28
3.3.7. Impact	29
4. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned	30
4.1. Conclusions	30
4.2 Lessons learned	32
4.3. Recommendations	33
Annexes.....	I
Annex A – Rating scale.....	II
Annex B – Consulted documents, reports and webpages.....	III
Annex C – Work plan – Primary data collection.....	IV

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose of the evaluation

The final evaluation of the Project “Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Land Management into Production Practices in all Bioregions and Biomes in Paraguay.” has the following objectives:

- Evaluating the scope of the Project's achievements against what was expected to be achieved;
- Providing lessons that can both improve the sustainability of the benefits of the Project, and help improve the general programming of UNDP;
- Promoting accountability and transparency.

The final evaluation is carried out based on the end of the Project term and is foresees both in the Evaluation Plan of UNDP Paraguay and in the evaluation plans of the GEF.

1.2. Scope and methodology

1.2.1. Scope

This final evaluation has reviewed the Project's performance against the expectations established in the Results Framework. The exercise has evaluated the results according to the criteria established in the “*Guía para realizar evaluaciones finales de los proyectos respaldados por el PNUD y financiados por el FMAM*”¹. As required, by the same guide and described in the inception report, the evaluation has involved all beneficiary actors, as well as those responsible for the execution and implementation of the project indicated in the Project Document (ProDoc). The approach has been mixed as the design, execution and results of the Project have been evaluated.

1.2.2. Evaluation tools

As planned in the Inception Report, the research design of the evaluation exercise has used the following research tools:

Document review: documents, reports, studies and communication materials of the Project have constituted the consolidated information available to the Evaluation Team.

Individual interviews: in general, individual interviews have been carried out with those actors who could express the official point of view of the institution of belonging and with technicians who could explain, in detail, specific aspects of the Project.

Group interviews: group interviews, made up of two, three or four people, have involved those actors who are part of institutions, communities and target groups that have participated in the Project. These meetings are important for a better understanding of the challenges that have been encountered during the implementation of the Project and to take into account the opinions of those who have benefited from the Project.

Field visits: in full compliance with the health security provisions in relation to the COVID-19 pandemic, the National Evaluator has carried out 7 visits to farms.

1.2.3. Evaluation phases

The three stages of the evaluation exercise have been the following:

Stage I – Desk Review

Dates: from October 26 to November 6, 2020

The desk review has started using the documents and reports uploaded by UNDP and therefore available to the Evaluation Team in a shared folder in a cloud on the internet.

In addition, the Evaluation Team has been able to see part of the very rich communication production of the Project that is available on the internet and on social networks.

On October 26, the Evaluation Team met with the UNDP Project Unit (PU) to arrange the organizational and logistical details necessary to carry out the evaluation.

The Evaluation Team delivered the inception report to UNDP on November 6. The same day the Evaluation Team had a start-up workshop with the Project Unit (PU). The inception report, approved by UNDP, represents the reference document on which this evaluation report is based.

¹ http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/GEFTE--Guide_SPA.pdf

The documents, reports and web pages consulted are presented in Annex B.

Stage II - Primary data collection

Dates: from November 9 to 27, 2020.

Due to the pandemic emergency of Covid-19, the International Evaluator has not been able to travel. During the first week, the Evaluation Team has worked together, conducting remote interviews and meetings (using different means of communication such as ZOOM, Skype and WhatsApp). During the second week, the National Evaluator has made a brief field mission, while the International Evaluator has continued with other interviews and remote meetings. Finally, during the third week, the Evaluation Team has once again worked together remotely.

Annex C presents the work schedule for the primary data collection stage.

The work of both remote interviews and visits and interviews in the field has been possible thanks to the precious and punctual collaboration of the Project Coordinator and the Project Technical Assistant who have been in charge of the communication, organization and coordination of the entire process of evaluation. The Evaluation Team has been able to carry out its work without having to deal with any organizational matter.

Stage III – Reporting

Dates: from November 28 to December 17, 2020.

The writing of the report has taken place in two phases. The first from November 28 to December 4, when the Evaluation Team has delivered the draft of the report. And, the second from December 14 to 17 when, upon receiving the observations and comments by UNDP and MADES, the Evaluation Team has addressed them in the final report delivered on December 14.

1.2.4. Considerations and limitations

The evaluation exercise, although it was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, has fulfilled all that was planned in the Inception Report. The Evaluation Team has been able to find representatives of all the institutions, organizations and communities as foreseen in the Inception Report.

The Evaluation Team has met all the actors foreseen in the Inception Report with the exception of the Minister of Agriculture and Livestock and the President of the Unión de Gremios de Productores. The voice of the two would surely have been valuable in terms of institutional perspective, but it has not caused any problems in terms of data collection. The evaluation has been able to satisfactorily cover all Project activities.

The occurrence of the Covid-19 pandemic and the need to conduct a large part of the evaluation remotely with a single five-day field mission has had the following implications for the development of the evaluation process:

1. The actors in the Project areas have been interviewed individually or in groups and it has not been possible to carry out focus groups.
2. The use of communication technologies has allowed the Evaluation Team to conduct 47 interviews remotely and in person.
3. The National Evaluator, complying with the health regulations related to the COVID-19 pandemic, has been able to make seven field visits.
4. in total 62 people have been interviewed.

As already mentioned in the Inception Report, the effect of remote communication on the perception of the questions (by the interviewees) and the responses (by the Evaluation Team) is not estimable.

1.3. Structure of the evaluation report

The evaluation report meets the requirements identified in the “*Guía Para realizar evaluaciones finales de los proyectos respaldados por el PNUD y Financiados por el FMAM*” and consists of three main sections:

Project description and background context

The section briefly describes the project and the context in which it was designed and implemented.

Findings

This section provides answers to the three categories of project progress, i.e. Project Design and Formulation, Project Execution and Project Results, being the last category presented answering the evaluation questions, established in the Terms of Reference of the present evaluation and confirmed in the Inception Report.

Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

The section includes an evidence-based conclusion and proposes recommendations and lessons learned so that they can be used by UNDP and MADES for their institutional work in the future.

2. Project description

2.1. Project start and duration

The Project was signed on March 19, 2014. During its implementation, it has been extended by one year and nine months, reaching an effective duration of 81 months of implementation and its closing date has been extended until December 31, 2020.

2.2. Problems that the project sought to address

The Upper Paraná Atlantic Forest (BAAPA), part of the “La Matas Atlántica Regional” complex, with an original extension of between 1 to 1.5 million km², has undergone a great transformation of its original landscape. In Paraguay, it had an estimated initial coverage of 94,000 km², which corresponds to 58.8% of the area of the eastern region of the country. At the time of project design (2013) the estimated forest remnant was 26% of the coverage original, where an important diversity of habitats with a high degree of threat converge. The BAAPA constitutes a globally important storehouse of biodiversity. Deforestation rates over time provide a clear picture of the magnitude of these land use change processes in the region. This favors fragmentation, which results in the isolation of the forest remnants and the alteration of the microclimates of the forests, reducing the presence of certain species and favoring others. Despite its high level of degradation, most of the original species of the BAAPA of Paraguay still exist, although in small isolated areas, and the remaining forest constitutes the last stronghold of several species that have disappeared from the rest of their distribution range. The BAAPA is home to 70 threatened plant species and almost 50 vulnerable.

A large part of the soy chain and part of the beef chain take place in this landscape and they are the two leading products in terms of production and exports. In fact, within the agricultural GDP, the share of soy ranges between 34% and 49%. The proportion of beef varies between 14% and 21%. In both cases, the fluctuations are due to climatic factors. The cultivated soybean area practically tripled between 1997 and 2012, from 1 million hectares (ha) to 3.2 million hectares, and occupying 60% of the total agricultural area of the country. Production is characterized by the use of large plots of land, a high degree of mechanization, and the intensive use of inputs and capital investment.

The combination of direct sowing and RR technology, a technology used for soybean production, involves an intensive use of agrochemicals (fertilizers, insecticides, fungicides and herbicides). While livestock is a very traditional activity in Paraguay. Livestock production is largely based on grazing systems (natural and cultivated pastures).

Although the country has made progress in improving conservation agriculture practices and, as mentioned above, around 90% of soybeans are currently grown through direct seeding, the cost of soil erosion is not yet acknowledged and the substantial benefits of conservation agriculture are not widely known. The most recent studies indicate that degradation processes affect 16% of the national territory, which implies 66% of the country's population. In addition to the loss of soil, large-scale mechanized agriculture has been associated, in many cases, with the indiscriminate use of agrochemicals (pesticides and herbicides). More than 30 million kilos of pesticides and herbicides are imported into Paraguay each year. For its part, in livestock production, fire is commonly used as a tool for pasture renewal, and its misuse can be highly destructive and potentially dangerous in maintaining the diversity of the remaining forests. Uncontrolled fires have caused numerous wildfires and in some cases loss of life.

These threats represent risks for the ecosystem services provided by BAAPA such as biodiversity, fresh water, soil formation, recycling processes of essential nutrients for soil fertility; and other affected ecosystem services include hydrological cycle maintenance, flood control, and carbon storage. Thus, in 2002, the World Fund (WWF) included the Atlantic Forest and its extension in Paraguay within the 238 eco-regions of world priority for conservation.

2.3. Immediate and development objectives of the project

<p>Results of UNDP Country Programme</p> <p>Result 3.2: Policies and programs for conservation and sustainable use of biological and cultural resources</p> <p>Result 3.3: Sustainable and equitable development model</p>
<p>Main Result of the UNDP Strategic Plan</p> <p>1: Inclusive and sustainable growth and development</p>
<p>Corresponding GEF Program and Strategic Objective:</p> <p>BD - SO2: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use in Production Landscapes, Seascapes and sectors,</p> <p>LD - SO3: Reducing pressure on natural resources from conflicting land uses in the broader landscape</p> <p>SFM REDD+ - SO1: Reducing pressures on forest resources and generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services</p>
<p>Corresponding GEF Expected Results</p> <p>BD Result 2. Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation</p> <p>BD Result 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity mainstreamed in regulatory and political frameworks</p> <p>LD Result 3.1: Improved intersectoral enabling environment for integrated landscape management</p> <p>LD Result 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities</p> <p>SFM REDD+ Resultado 1.2: Good management practices applied to existing forests</p>

2.4. Baseline Indicators established

<p>Results Indicators of UNDP Country Programme:</p> <p>3.2.1: Strengthened environmental institutions for decentralized environmental management</p> <p>3.2.3: Inter-institutional and inter-sectoral coordination supported for the conservation and sustainable use of biological and cultural resources</p> <p>3.3.1: Economic incentives for sustainable production</p> <p>3.3.2: Systems and technologies for the production of environmentally sustainable goods and services developed</p> <p>3.3.3: Strengthened inter-institutional and inter-sectoral coordination to mainstream sustainable development actions</p>
<p>Indicators of Corresponding GEF Expected Results</p> <p>BD Indicator 2.1: Landscapes and seascapes certified by nationally or internationally recognized environmental standards that incorporate biodiversity considerations (e.g. FSC, MSC) measured in hectares and recorded by the GEF tracking tool.</p> <p>BD Indicator 2.2: Policies and regulations managing sectoral activities that mainstream biodiversity conservation, as recorded by the GEF monitoring tool as a score.</p> <p>LD Indicator 3.1: Demonstration results strengthening the enabling environment between sectors</p> <p>LD Indicator 3.2: Area under effective land use management with maintained or increased vegetative cover</p> <p>SFM REDD+ Indicator 1.2 (2): Improved carbon sinks due to reduced forest degradation</p>

2.5. Main stakeholders

The ProDoc identifies the following stakeholders

Stakeholders	Interests/roles in the Project
GOVERNMENT	
Ministerio del Ambiente y del Desarrollo Sostenible (MADES) formerly denominated Secretaria del Ambiente	National mandate on the conservation of natural resources and ecologically managed. Authority for the Enforcement of EIA laws and environmental services. Serves as the leading national institution of the Project within the Project Board. Member of the Technical Committee and the National Platform. Provides office space for Project teams and a Project team technical liaison officer. Provides office space and equipment

y del Desarrollo Sostenible.	in three MADES departmental offices. Participate in the development of the monitoring system.
Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería (MAG)	National mandate on agricultural production. Participates as a member of the Round Table of Co-financiers, calling for institutions and companies. Member of the Technical Committee, the National Platform and Departmental Platforms. Provides a technical liaison officer for the Project team. Coordination with ongoing programs and projects in the intervention areas.
Instituto Forestal Nacional (INFONA)	National mandate on conservation and use of forest resources. Authority for the Application of the Forest Law and the Protective Forest Restoration Law. Participates as a member of the Round Table of Co-financiers, convenor of institutions and companies. Member of the Technical Committee, the National Platform and Departmental Platforms. Participate in the development of the monitoring system.
Ministerio Publico	In charge of the defense of justice and processing of infractions of environmental regulations. Designate a Focal Point for the Project. Participates in the development of the surveillance and control system and in the experimental field of the system. Provides guidance on control and judicial procedures. Participate in the development of the monitoring system.
Servicio Nacional de Calidad y Sanidad Vegetal y de Semillas (SENAVE)	Institution responsible for the development of guidelines for the quality control of agricultural products. Ensures the institutionalization of updated manuals and tools developed by the Project. Provides technical personnel to update manuals and tools developed by the Project. Appoints a Focal Point to participate in all meetings and platform workshops of the Project who has the responsibility and allocation of time to ensure internal monitoring and compliance with the agreements.
Servicio Nacional de Calidad y Salud Animal (SENACSA)	Responsible for the development of guidelines for quality control of livestock products. Provides technical personnel to update manuals and tools developed by the Project. Appoints a Focal Point to participate in all meetings and platform workshops of the Project who has the responsibility and allocation of time to ensure internal monitoring and compliance with the agreements.
Instituto Paraguayo del Indígena (INDI)	Responsible for policies for Indigenous Peoples. Provides guidance on free, prior, and informed consent procedures regarding possible Project activities with indigenous communities in the intervention areas.
Instituto Nacional de Desarrollo Rural y de la Tierra (INDERT)	Responsible for facilitating small farmers' access to land, investment, and technical assistance. Provides assistance in the planning and execution of activities directed to small farmers in the Project intervention areas. Replication of the Project results.
Servicio Nacional de Catastro	Responsible for the property registry. Participates in the development of the Monitoring System and loading of information on the properties.
Dirección de los Registros Públicos	Responsible for maintaining the land ownership records. Participates in the development of the Monitoring System and loading of information on the properties.
Departmental Governments (Alto Paraná, Amambay, Canindeyú)	Implement public policies at the departmental level. Summons and leads the departmental platforms. Appoint a representative to the Project Board.
Municipalities (20 Municipalities en 3 priority sites)	Implement public policies at the municipal level. Appoints a Focal Point to participate in all meetings and platform workshops of the Project who has the responsibility and allocation of time to ensure internal monitoring and compliance with the agreements. 4 pilot municipalities implement Delegation Agreements for local monitoring and compliance with environmental regulations. (San Cristóbal y Cedrales, in the Alto Paraná Department, Villa Ygatimí in the Canindeyú Department and Pedro Juan Caballero in the Amambay Department) and participate in the development of the Monitoring System.
Private Sector	
Producers' associations - ARP - APS - CAP - UGP	The main Producer Associations play a central role in convening companies and producers and facilitating dialogue. They appoint a Focal Point to participate in all meetings and platform workshops of the Project who has the responsibility and allocation of time to ensure internal monitoring and compliance with the agreements. Dissemination of the results of the Project among the members.

FECOPROD	It promotes the strengthening of production cooperatives. Project Partner. Convokes the associated cooperatives in the Project area, facilitate dialogue and coordination with the Project. Dissemination of the results of the Project among the members.
Cooperatives	Provide services to partners (technical assistance, credits, commercialization of production, supply of inputs). Project partners. Convokes partners, facilitates dialogue and coordination with the Project. Provide technical assistance to partners for the adoption of best practices and forest restoration.
Chambers - CAPECO - CAPPRO - CPC - CAP	Guarantee the full participation of the soy and livestock sectors in the Project. They provide the technical staff to update the manuals and tools developed by the Project. They appoint a Focal Point to participate in all meetings and platform workshops of the Project who has the responsibility and allocation of time to ensure internal monitoring and compliance with the agreements. Convoke member companies and associations and facilitate dialogue and coordination with the Project. Dissemination of project results among members
Commodities Traders (ADM, Cargill, Bunge, Noble)	Send market signals to stimulate the adoption of best practices among producers. Modify purchasing policies within MUL-target to stimulate the adoption of best practices among producers. Provide technical assistance to producers to promote environmental standards and certification systems.
NGOs	
Solidaridad	Participates as a member of the Round Table of Co-financiers, calling for institutions and companies. Member of the Technical Committee and the National Platform and Departmental Platforms. Provide a technical liaison officer from the project team.
WWF A todo Pulmón Red Paraguaya de Conservación en Tierras Privadas	Project partner. They will appoint a Focal Point to participate in all the platform meetings and workshops of the project who has the responsibility and allocation of time to ensure internal monitoring and compliance with the agreements. Share and / or replicate methodologies and approaches of successful projects.
Federación por la Autodeterminación de los Pueblos Indígenas (FAPI) Federación de Asociaciones Guaraníes de la Región Oriental del Paraguay	National level organizations representing indigenous peoples. Provide guidance on free, prior and informed consent procedures regarding possible project activities with indigenous communities in the project intervention areas.

2.6. Expected results

Project objective

The biodiversity and ecosystem functions of the Atlantic Forest eco-region are protected from existing and emerging threats from multi-sectoral production practices and is a model for replication across the country's bioregions and biomes.

Outcome 1

Effective governance framework for biodiversity conservation and SLM in multiple use landscapes.

Product 1.1

A package of modifications in regulations, policies and standards at the national level to improve the protection of the Upper Paraná Atlantic Forest

Product 1.2

Institutional strengthening of SEAM, INFONA, Public Ministry and Municipalities for better monitoring and surveillance of deforestation and compliance with environmental and forest regulations in productive landscapes.

Product 1.3

A national and three departmental platforms for inter-institutional and inter-stakeholder dialogue on compliance with land use planning regulations and incentives for the adoption of best practices within production landscapes, involving all land use managers and of supply chains

Outcome 2

Financial and market incentives framework to promote biodiversity and sustainable land management within the target multiple-use landscape.

Product 2.1

Increased and diversified financing complying with environmental standards promotes the integration of biodiversity and SLM for the MUL through financing opportunities, incentives and REDD +

Product 2.2

Differentiated markets for sustainable soy and livestock production stimulate the adoption of good environmental practices, conservation of biodiversity, and compliance with sustainable land use plans.

Outcome 3

Strengthened implementation of land set aside system and sustainable production practices.

Product 3.1

Technical assistance to medium and large-scale soybean and livestock producers incorporates best practices for sustainable production.

Product 3.2

Improved Legal Forest Reserves for small, medium and large-scale farms, increase connectivity throughout the landscape in Canindeyú

Product 3.3

Restoration of the protective forests of water courses in the MUL of the three landscapes-targets increases connectivity in highly deforested areas.

Product 3.4

Decentralized and joint enforcement approaches improve deforestation surveillance and compliance in 4 municipalities.

3. Findings

3.1 Project Design/Formulation

3.1.1. Analysis of Results Framework

The Results Framework identifies three outcomes that refer to three areas of work; i.e. support for the development of governance frameworks for the environmental and agricultural sector that help the conservation of environmental resources; the development of a financial and market system that also supports conservation and the effective implementation of environmental conservation actions. The spirit of the Project that is extrapolated from the formulation of the outcomes, is of a conservation project that seeks solutions to environmental problems (such as the loss of biodiversity, the fragmentation of the BAAPA and the degradation of soils) allying with the primary productive sector, i.e. the actors in the soy and beef supply chains in MUL.

Outcome 1 "Effective governance framework for biodiversity conservation and SLM in multiple use landscapes" aims at improving the capacity of public institutions for biodiversity and land conservation to be mainstreamed more effectively in their work and at bringing together actors from the public and private sectors to reach consensus on sustainable production strategies.

Working with the public sector falls within what is typically the UNDP/GEF approach, i.e. supporting the sector to develop capacities to improve environmental conservation. On the other hand, the Project foresees the creation of a Platform as a method to push the achievement of the outcome. This last hypothesis has not proven to be realistic: once the different actors come together, their own interests are what drive the actions of the Platforms. During the implementation of the Project, the Platforms have gone beyond their function foreseen in the ProDoc and therefore the achievement has only been partially fulfilled.

The first three indicators, i.e. ind.1.1. "Improved institutional capacities to plan, implement, supervise and effectively incorporate biodiversity in production activities at the landscape level, measured based on the % increase in the Capacity Scorecard", ind.1.2. "Percentage of increase in the amount of fines collected by SEAM for fines collected for violation of forest and environmental laws.", and ind. 1.3. "Percentage of environmental licenses approved in priority areas based on the Monitoring System." are specific, measurable, affordable, relevant and limited by time. The Project can therefore realistically achieve them.

The ind.1.4. "Level of agreement on sustainable production strategies, including deforestation-free supply chains, international certification standards, best practices for production and conservation, territorial ordering criteria for corridors, biosecurity." and its goal "Minimum environmental standards for soy and livestock production agreed by multi-stakeholder platforms." They are not specific because they neither capture the complexity of the multi-stakeholder platforms for soy and beef commodities nor the work, by quality and quantity that they develop.

With outcome 2 "Financial and Market Incentive Framework to promote biodiversity and sustainable land management within priority multiple-use landscape areas" the Project intends to promote elements of sustainability in the agro-forestry sector. These are elements that evidently arise from debates and considerations of the Project stakeholders on sustainability issues before the Project began and of which the Project is understood to be a promoter. The Ind. 2.1. "Surface area of soybeans in the 3 priority areas prepared for certification and certified under international certification schemes, contributing to a supply chain free from deforestation" and Ind 2.3. "The degree to which environmental sustainability criteria have been incorporated in the soy and meat credit operations of financial institutions (FI)" are relative to the work to promote sustainability that the Project must do on the supply side (soybean production and elaboration of banking products), while Ind. 2.2. "Percentage of soybean acquisitions in priority areas by commodity buyers that come from producers that comply with best practices", Ind. 2.4. "Number of FIs (and financial plans) granting long-term loans for reforestation / afforestation projects" and Ind. 2.5. "Number of transactions and flow of resources derived from SEAM forest certificates under the environmental services law" are relative to the demand side.

The Project develops its activities exclusively on the supply side, the goals of the Ind. 2.4. and Ind. 2.5 are, therefore, very ambitious because they measure demand, the development of which is well beyond the control of the Project Unit and also of the Soybean and Beef Platforms. These are extremely ambitious indicators. The level of ambition for a Project that is defined by many actors as pioneer makes them not relevant to measure its success. Finally, Ind. 2.2. is not relevant: traders have clearly communicated that their purchasing strategies are not related to the initiative per se, they follow other logics that have to do mainly with the development of the international soybean market.

With outcome 3 "Strengthened implementation of land set aside system and sustainable production practices" the Project aims at realizing achievements on the ground. Four indicators that are: Ind. 3.2. "Number of hectares in settlements of small producers in Caazapá with continuous forest reserves that have management plans (land use, fire control, BD monitoring) under implementation and with environmental certificates issued.", 3.3. "Increase in the connectivity index in: a) areas of high fragmentation (Alto Paraná) through the restoration of protective forests; and b) areas with greater forest remnants (Caazapá) through the increase in legal reserves and private reserves." Ind. 3.4. "Improvement in the effectiveness of monitoring and control in priority areas, measured by the number of monitoring events and processes completed in accordance with the Interinstitutional Manual for the Application of Forest and Environmental Laws.", And Ind. 3.5. "Number of soybean and livestock producers who have improved their knowledge, attitudes and practices for the implementation of best practices in order to conserve biodiversity, reduce soil degradation and plan land use in MUL of priority areas (measured by the KAP indices - knowledge, attitude and practices - including breakdown by gender)" specific, measurable, affordable, relevant and time limited. In principle, the Project can, therefore, comply with them.

On the other hand, the four goals of Ind. 3.1. "Degree of adoption of best practices by producers in the 3 priority areas" are very ambitious. In fact, the design of the Project aims to promote 4 agricultural practices that are not applied in the country. Of these, the use of live fences seems the most ambitious. In spite of being required by SENAVE regulations, living fences are not used in the country by producers. They represent a conflictual element between the productive sector and the public administration, two diametrically opposed visions of production.

Project's objective "The biodiversity and ecosystem functions of the Atlantic Forest eco-region are protected from existing and emerging threats from multi-sectoral production practices and is a model for replication across the country's bioregions and biomes" has five indicators.

Ind. 1 "a) Number of hectares of certified forests for environmental services; b) Number of certificates of environmental services issued; c) Number of hectares of legal reserves and protective forests established with management criteria." is specific, measurable, affordable, relevant and limited by time. Ind. 2 "Surface area in the MULs where sustainable production practices have been adopted based on the Best Practices Manual and contribute to establishing supply chains free from deforestation: a) Number of hectares achieved through direct intervention of the project in the 3 priority areas. b) Number of hectares that can be potentially achieved through

the indirect effect of the project intervention (replication)" is relevant only in part a of it. Part b is not relevant the concept "potentially achieved" does not measure what has actually been achieved. Ind. 3 "Direct reduction of pressures on forest ecosystems of production sectors, as evidenced by% reduction in the use of firewood from native forests by silos and grain dryers" is not measurable because no institution/organization is in charge of this measurement in the country. As it is not measurable, it cannot be considered an indicator. Ind. 4 "Percentage of increase in the coverage of native species of representative trees in the PUM (outside protected areas) in the first stages of natural succession that are characteristic of BAAPA" is specific, measurable, affordable, relevant and time limited. Finally, Ind. 5 "Tons of CO₂eq emissions avoided achieved through the protection of forests certified for Environmental Services by MADES a) Direct life time (6,000 ha) b) Indirect life time (65,000 ha)" identifies interesting information in terms of carbon sequestered, but it is not used for measuring compliance. In fact, the same differently formulated information is included in the ind. 1, i.e. the ind. 5 is equivalent to the number of trees per hectare (ind.1) multiplied by a coefficient to estimate the carbon sequestered.

In summary, the Results Framework is characterized by a set of indicators that do not allow the monitoring of the implementation. Some are not relevant or duplicates, some are very ambitious and only some are relevant. Furthermore, the process related to the Platforms is considered simply as a means of implementing the Project. There is no indicator directly related to the Platforms. The evaluation considers that the Results Framework has not been of effective support for decision-making at all levels of Project management, including Board of Directors, Technical Committee and Project Unit.

3.1.2. Risks and assumptions

The ProDoc and the Project Results Framework identify assumptions and risks that, almost entirely, cannot be identified as such, because they are neither assumptions nor risks, as indicated in the following paragraphs.

Regarding Result 1, 2 risks and assumptions are wrongly identified. The government's commitment to the Project cannot be a risk as the GoP is a co-financier of the initiative. If a lack of GoP commitment were to materialize, the Project would not be relevant to the co-funder's political agenda. Also, the lack of commitment of the actors to get involved with the platform is not a risk: in fact, it is the challenge of the Project, the reason to be, to commit the actors to safeguard the Atlantic forest.

The risks and assumptions identified regarding Outcomes 2 and 3 are wrong. They refer directly to the target groups (financial institutions, landowners, buyers) of the Project. It is clear that involving target groups is the challenge of any project. If a project does not reach its target group, it means that the project proposals are not relevant and/or the methodology for involving them it is not relevant and/or time is not enough. In all cases, it is a project design flaw.

At the objective level, two risks/assumptions again refer to a target group (landowners) and the political will of the co-financier. The only risk in the entire well-identified Results Framework is related to the impacts of climate variability and extreme weather events.

In conclusion, the evaluation does not intend to minimize the risks identified in the Results Framework, but rather to identify them for what they are in conceptual and methodological terms: challenges, which clearly show the difficulties, that the Project must face successfully to meet its expectations. The Project is very ambitious.

The Project both in its design phase and towards the end of its implementation has produced the Environmental and Social Screening Assessment (SESP). In addition, all PIR reports throughout the implementation period have reported an update of the environmental and social safeguards. However, the risk associated with the exclusion of salaried workers has not been evidenced.

3.1.3. Lessons learned incorporated in Project design

The Project originated within the framework of and collaborates with the Green Commodities Program led by UNDP in 12 countries globally. Dialogue between supply chain actors is the focus of the Green Commodities Program, which aims at improving the national, economic, social and environmental performance of the specific commodity sectors of each country.

Strengthen stakeholder cooperation towards a shared vision and collective action, seek to change mindsets, behaviors, regulations, and practices, work systematically, aware of the political and economic context, promote gender equality, transparency, accountability and good governance are the principles applied to improve the

environment that will allow sustainable production. This approach bases the creation of the platforms in the design of the Project.

The evaluation exercise has not identified any other specific good practice that has been incorporated into the Project design. The evaluation considers that the approach adopted represents both an opportunity and a challenge to achieve the results of the Project. In fact, it is a new approach in Paraguay, whose ability to generate benefits can only be evaluated during its development.

3.1.4. Stakeholders' participation

In the design of the Project, a management structure has been defined that encourages the participation of the stakeholders in all processes: Planning, Execution and Monitoring and Evaluation. Thus, it has been foreseen that an institution and/or organization in line with its roles and mandates within the environmental, forestry, agricultural, financial, would lead the activities related to each product of the Project and other sectors related to the Project. SEAM (today MADES) is expected to be responsible for leading products related to the environmental sector, such as products 1.1 ; 1.2. 3.2 and 3.4; the MAG the product 3.1 ; the INFONA the product 3.3; and products 1.3 and 2.1 were under the responsibility of national and departmental tables and platforms. Consequently, it is defined that each leading institution is responsible for coordinating the development of the product, ensuring the participation and collaboration of other stakeholders, including leading the participatory planning of the POA for the product. In this scheme, the Project Management Unit (UP) and the Technical Committee supervise and support the leading institution in the preparation of the POA, they consolidate these operational plans in the general POA of the project, which is subsequently analyzed, validated and approved by the Project Board, and then socialized to the general public.

Furthermore, in the design of the Project, several approaches have been established for the involvement of stakeholders in its implementation: i) National and Departmental Platforms; ii) Gender and Indigenous strategies; iii) training and participation programs; iv) dynamics for demonstrating alternative sustainable management practices; v) coordination with other planned programs and projects.

The design foresees the participation of many actors from the supply chains of the two Project commodities, soybeans and beef. However, it does not foresee the participation of any representative of the farm workers, although ProDoc itself identifies the conditions of the workers as the most vulnerable. This design flaw does not take into account the principle of Leave No-one Behind and the promotion of gender equality that characterize UNDP's work towards meeting the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the 2030 Agenda.

3.1.5. Replication approach

The objective of the Project has an explicit mention of the concept of replicability "... the Atlantic Forest... is a model for replication throughout the bio-regions and biomes of the country".

The replicability approach should therefore be considered as the design element that underpins the importance of the Project: promoting learning to trigger the conservation of biodiversity and the SLM throughout the country. In fact, the very title of the Project clearly quotes the entire country "... in all the bioregions and biomes in Paraguay".

Actually, the Project M&E plan described in the ProDoc identifies that each year UNDP, through the project team, takes charge of a collection of lessons learned. In addition, there is an electronic platform managed by UNDP-GEF RCU dedicated to sharing the lessons that come from different initiatives among heads of GEF UNDP projects implemented in the region of relevance.

It is evident that the replication approach is well structured both conceptually and operationally in the ProDoc and is an element that characterizes the Project.

3.1.6. UNDP comparative advantage

The project design has three specific elements as a comparative advantage of UNDP as an implementing agency in the country. The agency is present in the country and there is coherence between the Project and the UNDP assistance strategies for Paraguay. In addition, the agency's country office already had collaborative relationships with MADES (called SEAM in the Project design phase) and with other entities that co-finance the initiative.

The comparative advantage of UNDP lies in its role as implementing entity in the start-up or dynamization of development processes, facilitating dialogue as an impartial agent and helping to sustain the favorable momentum

in the implementation of the Project. The agency also has as its strength its ability to grant its initiatives the application of strict administrative and purchasing standards that guarantee a transparent execution of the Project.

In addition, UNDP is recognized, by belonging to the United Nations System, with a certain degree of prestige that allows it to reinforce its capacity as a process facilitator. This element has been very important to bring together the stakeholders in the Platforms of the two commodities.

The evaluative exercise has also noted that, being an institution alien to Paraguayan internal politics, in the opinion of many interviewees, UNDP is capable of generating trust between stakeholders, who would otherwise feel less willing to collaborate.

In addition, having a leadership experience at the global and regional level, in the implementation of development projects, UNDP can promote intervention strategies already tested in other countries and in different circumstances.

In short, UNDP's comparative advantage has been recognized as an essential element because it met the need for a impartial body to promote and facilitate dialogue and consensus on issues that are of utmost importance for the country's development.

3.1.7. Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

The Project design identifies six projects that were already being implemented during the same drafting of the project and, with all of them, it envisions elements of collaboration:

1. Paraguay Biodiversity Project (WB / GEF) implemented by MADES and MAG
2. Forest Restoration (WWF / A todo Pulmón Paraguay breathes)
3. National Program for Management, Conservation and Recovery
4. Inclusion of Family Farming in Value Chains (Inclusive Paraguay Project) (MAG)
5. Forest Preservation (Carbon Inventory) (SEAM)
6. MRV REDD + FFPRI (MADES)

The collaborations envisioned with these initiatives are obviously a significant element that aims at improving the efficiency and increasing the effectiveness of the Project and of the environmental sector in Paraguay: the goal is promoting synergies, taking advantage of learning, coordinating activities and avoiding duplication of efforts and therefore making better use of available resources.

3.1.8. Management arrangements

The Project envisaged that it would be implemented through the Direct Implementation Modality (DIM) in accordance with the UNDP Program, Policies and Operations Procedures. This modality has been chosen and included in the PRODOC because the GoP (assumed in August 2013) had announced a series of structural changes in State institutions such as Ministries and Secretariats with direct and indirect roles in the Project and, therefore, could affect the Project management mechanisms.

The Organizational structure of the Project includes the following instances: Project Board; the Technical Committee; the Project Management Unit; and Local Committees.

Choosing the DIM has represented a success according to almost all of the opinions collected during this evaluation exercise. In fact, it has facilitated the continuity of the Project during the political transition that has occurred during its implementation period.

3.2 Project Implementation

3.2.1. Adaptive management

During the implementation of the Project, two substantive reviews of the ProDoc took place.

The substantive review of December 2016 is considered by the evaluative exercise very pertinent. The change of the intervention departments of the Canindeyú and Amambay Project to Caazapá and Itapúa for security reasons and the inclusion of the grant mechanisms to make producer Cooperatives agreements are important elements that have allowed the implementation of the Project in a significant way. Without these changes, it is very likely that the Project would have encountered more difficulties in the course of its implementation.

The substantive revision of August 2019 is also considered very relevant. With the review, the work of the Mid-Term Review of the Project has been followed up, extending the duration of 15 months without additional costs, prioritizing the implementation of some products, making adjustments to the indicators and goals of the Results

Framework and reprogramming the budget in accordance with the changes. The second review has been key to reaching the Project's achievements.

3.2.2. Effective partnerships arrangements

The Project Board has led the implementation of the project. In a first phase, the Project Board was made up of representatives of MADES and UNDP and a representative of the private sector co-financiers of the Project. With the start of the project "Production and Demand of Sustainable Commodities in the Chaco - Green Chaco", the Project Board has begun to jointly take charge of the two projects and has included representatives of MADES, MAG, UNDP, Governments of Alto Paraná, Itapúa and Boquerón, and the private sector co-financiers. The Project Board has developed its role mainly by approving the Annual Operating Plans (AOP) of the two Projects and the two substantive reviews (2016 and 2018) of the Project drawn up by the Project Unit and discussed with the Technical Committee.

The Technical Committee is represented only by the co-funders of the Project. The productive component of the two supply chains is very well represented. Excluding MADES representatives, there is no expert on forest and biodiversity conservation issues on the Technical Committee. The issue of mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and conservation is completely delegated to experts from the agricultural sector both from a technical point of view and from a point of view of representation of interests. Since the objective of the Project is to promote the biodiversity and conservation of the Atlantic Forest, it is presumable, although not proven, that the inclusion of a member with experience in conservation issues in the Committee could have helped to comply more with environmental issues on the ground.

3.2.3. Monitoring and Evaluation: design at entry at execution

The Project's M&E plan has foreseen all the relevant elements for the purpose, i.e. the Results Framework as the main M&E tool, a mid-term review and this exercise as the final evaluation.

The daily monitoring of the implementation progress has been as designed in the ProDoc. The Project Unit had the responsibility of monitoring the Project. Until approximately the mid-term review of the implementation and monitoring of the Project was supervised by results; the Project Unit had a person in charge of each of the results available. Later, it has proceeded according to the indications of the review, reducing the Project Unit.

The evaluation considers having taken into account the recommendations of the mid-term review as an element that has reinforced the execution of the Project. Furthermore, it highlights that the Project Unit has implemented all the M&E elements included in the ProDoc Results Framework. The problem in terms of monitoring is represented by two facts: that no tool has been planned in the design phase to monitor the development of the Platforms and that the Results Framework it was characterized by a large number of indicators that are not suitable for measuring performance of the Project.

During implementation, no tools have been developed and adopted to monitor the Platforms and the indicators have not been modified.

3.2.4. Project financing

Project budget expenditures have been made according to the adjustments included in the second substantive review.

Table: Project budget

	USD (as per the PRODOC)	USD (executed by Sept. 30 2020)	Balance (by Sept. 30 2020)	% executed
Outcome 1	2.226.137,00	2.349.391,27	-123.254,27	106%
Outcome 2	1.918.064,00	1.116.033,25	802.030,75	58%
Outcome 3	2.390.852,00	2.820.484,48	-429.632,48	118%
Project Unit	326.764	294.122,26	32.641,74	90%
TOTAL	6.861.817,00	6.580.031,26	281.785,74	96%

The Evaluation Team has received information about the co-financing of the Project only from UNDP, from traders (ADM, LDC and Cargill) and from MFS. The other co-funders of the Project have not provided any information in this regard.

Table: Project cofinancing

Source of the funds	Institution	USD (as per the PRODOC)	USD (executed by Sept. 30)
Other projects of the environmental portfolio	PNUD	4,489,288	4,626,602
---	Gobierno	14,462,473	---
---	ONG	3,845,259	---
Own resources	Sector privado	9,984,848	10,487,233
		(ADM 1.317.276)	(ADM 2.231.190)
		(LDC 600.000)	(LDC 621.043)
		(Cargill 1,560,000)	(Cargill 1,580,000)
		(MFS 6,507,572)	(MFS 6,055,000)
	Total	32,781,868.00	15,113,835

3.2.5. Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

The only relevant element of feedback from M&E activities for the adaptive management of the Project has been represented by the second substantive review that has been approved after the mid-term review. There have been no other elements originating from the M&E system that informed implementation.

3.2.6. Coordination and operational issues

The Project has had different levels of coordination with its main partner, MADES. At the macro or political level, it has been given through the Project Board, where according to the minutes, the meetings have been chaired by the Minister of the Environment or his representative: in this instance, the strategic decisions of the Project have been made, reflected in the two substantive reviews, and the POA for each year has been approved. On the other hand, in the Technical Committee, the executive aspects where technical decisions were made have been agreed. In addition, there has been permanent coordination between the project coordinator and the MADES Focal Point to agree on the operational issues of execution. Additionally, the different Platforms have also served as a tool of coordination between the executing partners involved in the Project.

On the other hand, there has been a close collaboration between the Project and MADES for operational issues, of high importance for the dialogue between actors for the execution of the project on the ground, such as:

- Strengthening the Human Resource of MADES with; i) Training in Institutional Communication; Use of the GIS Tool; and iii) Specialization course on Environmental Governance;
- Digitization of all environmental licenses, which corresponds to the 3 pilot departments;
- Report on the Status of Biodiversity of the 3 pilot departments. Made with a MADES specialist;
- The platforms promoted by the Project, as a space for dialogue to establish a sustainable forest strategy with producers, as part of the Forest for Sustainable Growth Project.
- The implementation of SIAM, highly valued by MADES.
- Joint proposal to improve the environmental and forestry legal framework,
- It has been shown that the project has coordinated with MADES to carry out many training events.

3.3 Project results

3.3.1. Achievements

Objective of the Project - The biodiversity and ecosystem functions of the Atlantic Forest eco-region are protected from existing and emerging threats from multi-sectoral production practices and is a model for replication across the country's bioregions and biomes.	
Ind. 1 -a) Number of hectares of forests certified for environmental services; b) Number of hectares of forests under sustainable management; c) Number of hectares of legal set-asides and protective forests established with management criteria	
Target: a) 3.000 ha b) 50 certificates issues at national	Achievement: a) 14.835 ha in pilot sites and 238.271 ha at national level. In addition, the Project has begun the certification of 665 ha within indigenous communities, where 230 ha

<p>level and 15 at pilot sites level</p> <p>c) 90,000 ha of legal set-asides; 30,000 ha of protective forests</p>	<p>correspond to the Puerto Barra community in Alto Paraná and 435 ha correspond to the Karumbey community in Caazapá.</p> <p>b) 69 certificates issued at national level, including 17 at pilot sites level</p> <p>c) According to INFONA, 57,666 ha with national forest management plans. Currently, in the 3 pilot departments, the number of farms that have a forest management plan approved by INFONA is 83.</p>
<p>Target a) has been achieved with 494% compliance; goal b9 has been achieved with 106% compliance and goal c) has been partially achieved with 64% compliance in terms of forest management plans and 39% in terms of hectares of protective forests. Therefore, the achievement of indicator 1 is considered partial.</p> <p>The activities carried out with the direct support of the Project are considered very successful. As cited in the 2020 PIR “With respect to the Restoration of Protective Forests of Water Channels efforts have been concentrated in 3 pilot districts, in such a way as to give it a landscape-scale management approach. In the case of Naranjal, 1,526 ha of Protective Forests of Water Channels have been mapped and identified, where 80 ha of deficit were identified and 17 ha were restored and until the end of the project it is planned to complete the 80 ha. In conjunction with the Naranjal municipality and the Naranjal Cooperative, work is being done to protect these areas in order to reestablish and improve the connection of the forest remnants and that they serve as biological corridors. In the case of Tavaí, 6,858, 22 ha of Protective Forests of Water Channels have been mapped and identified and 8.4 ha will be restored until the end of the project in the Tebicuary river sub-basin. Biological corridors have been mapped and on that basis management (restoration) criteria have been established. The same happened in the Natalio district, Itapúa, where 3,249 ha of Protective Forests of Water Channels were identified and mapped. All the information generated was shared with producers and local municipalities and they were assisted by the technical biodiversity specialist where there was interest in restoring. With these 3 activities, it has been possible to establish management criteria for 11,633 ha, representing 39% of the target of 30,000 ha of Protective Forests of Water Channels.</p>	
<p>Ind.2 - Surface area in the MUL where sustainable production practices (1 or more) have been adopted on the basis of the Best Practice Manuals and contribute to establish deforestation free supply chains: “</p> <p>a) Number of hectares achieved through direct project intervention in the 3 priority areas.</p> <p>b) Number of hectares that can be potentially achieved through indirect effect of project intervention (replication)</p>	
<p>Meta:</p> <p>a) 500.000 ha (soy)</p> <p>b) 900.000 ha (soy)</p>	<p>Achievement:</p> <p>a) 713 farms prepared for the application of the manual and the protocol for the sustainable production of grains in around 77,000 ha. (soy)</p> <p>b) 788,624 ha (soy)</p>
<p>The indicator has not been achieved.</p> <p>GAP for grain cultivation are practiced in 77,000 ha, meeting 15.4% of the target of 500,000 ha.</p> <p>Finally, the evaluation considers the relative target b9 as not relevant.</p>	
<p>Ind.3 – Direct reduction of pressures in forest ecosystems from production sectors as evidenced by% reduction in the use of firewood from native forests by silos and grain dryers.</p>	
<p>Target:</p> <p>50%</p>	<p>Achievement:</p> <p>---</p>
<p>This indicator is not measurable because no state institution makes this type of estimate. As it is not measurable, it cannot be considered a valid indicator either.</p> <p>The PIR 2020 reports that most silos do not want to provide this information because the data is considered sensitive. And clearly, without this information it is impossible to estimate consumption. In addition, the declaration of the storage capacity (storage volume) of the silos does not account for the storage in silo bags, so the actual consumption is easily sub-quantified.</p> <p>The municipalities do not keep a record of this information either, they hardly manage the business licenses and the collection of municipal taxes from the silos in their territory.</p> <p>The traders who co-finance the project declare that they have made great efforts to reduce the consumption of firewood from native forests. In some cases they have their own plantations of exotic species to support themselves, as they have also reported during the interviews with the Evaluation Team.</p> <p>Traders have reported their consumption of wood from plantations:</p> <p>ADM: 7,975.06 m3</p> <p>LDC: 32,891.05 tons</p> <p>CARGILL: plantation of 160 ha; maintenance of 319 ha and harvest of 71 ha</p> <p>INFONA reported 6,846 tons of registered production firewood, of which 279 tons correspond to production in the pilot areas of the project.</p>	
<p>Ind.4 - Percentage of increase in coverage of representative native tree species in the MUL (outside of protected areas) in the early stages of natural succession that are characteristic of the BAAPA</p>	

Target: 20%	Achievement: 2,7%
<p>The forest cover in the Project's intervention areas has increased to 463,122 ha, which is an increase of 2.7% over the baseline. Therefore, the target has been very partially achieved. The actual achievement is negligible. It is important to clarify that all restoration processes cannot be identified by geospatial analysis in the early stages of natural succession, since they must have a minimum height of 5 meters and the plantations are recent. Although there is less than a month to go before the closing of the Project, it is expected to be able to carry out an update of this value before its completion, considering that the publication of the official INFONA / MADES forest cover maps is awaited. Finally, the evaluation reports that the Project has supported the carrying out of a Biodiversity diagnosis in the 3 pilot departments by MADES technicians. The findings have been documented and are being reviewed for publication.</p>	
<p>Ind.5 - Tons of avoided emissions of CO₂eq attained through protection of forests in the REDD+ pilot project: a) Direct lifetime (6,000 ha) b) Indirect lifetime (65,000 ha)</p>	
Target: a) 1,408,128 ton/CO ₂ eq b) 15,254,720 ton/CO ₂ eq	Achievement: a) 3.343.097 ton/CO ₂ eq* (por 14.835 ha of certified forest in pilot sites) of direct avoided emissions b) 41.132.633,85 ton/CO ₂ eq* of indirect avoided emissions estimated. (* Factor de emisión ajustado Niveles de referencia: 221,28 ton/CO ₂ /ha.
<p>The indicator targets have been formally met. The indicator captures important information in terms of carbon sequestration. At the same time, repeats the achievement, which is identical to Ind 1. The first measures the number of certified ha, the second the equivalent of carbon sequestered, therefore, this indicator is not considered relevant by the evaluation.</p>	
<p>Achievement of the objective <i>The objective of the Project has been very partially achieved. The achievement of all the indicators has been only partial. The indicators that refer directly to the Atlantic Forest and that contribute directly to its conservation have a measurement problem (ind.3) or are only partially fulfilled (ind.1c and ind.4). Compliance with the indicator relating to the reduction of bad practices and the promotion of good practices in terms of soybean cultivation has been very partial.</i></p>	
<p>Outcome 1 - Effective governance framework for biodiversity conservation and SLM in multiple use landscapes.</p>	
<p>Ind.1.1. Improved institutional capacities to effectively plan, implement, monitor and mainstream biodiversity into production activities at landscape level as measured by a % of increase in the Capacity Scorecard</p>	
Target: 80.0%	Achievement: 66,7%
<p>The target has been partially achieved. Throughout the Project, 108 public officials from MADES (49), INFONA (58) and the Ministerio Publico (1) and 3 people from the private sector have been trained. The achievement represents an increase of 20.7% over the baseline (46%) and 13.3% is missing to meet the target. One of the main problems to leave installed capacity in the institutions has been the high turnover of officials in strategic positions.</p>	
<p>Ind.1.2. Percentage of increase in the amount collected by SEAM for fines charged from infringement of forest and environmental regulations</p>	
Target: 60.0%	Achievement: 90.3%
<p>The goal in the last year of the Project has been abundantly achieved. The achievement of the last year represents an increase over the baseline (270,000 US \$ per year) of 90.3% and an increase over the goal of 18.9%. Furthermore, analyzing the PIRs compiled during the implementation of the Project, it is noted that the indicator has increased constantly in the last four years (that is, when it has been measured). This is the progression of this increase: PIR 2017 ⇒ 383.216 US\$ PIR 2018 ⇒ 416.770 US\$ PIR 2019 ⇒ 422.542 US\$ PIR 2020 ⇒ 513.858 US\$ The Project Team has actually supported MADES (when it was still SEAM) in the terms of reference for the identification and implementation of technical, legal and financial adjustments to Decree No. 2598 to regulate</p>	

<p>article 5 of Law 5146 of " Fees and Fines" in order to strengthen the administrative responsibility scheme and increase the amount collected for the fines imposed for the violation of forest and environmental regulations. Through the hiring of a legal technician, the institutional strengthening activities of the MADES and INFONA legal units, the Project has contributed significantly to streamline the process of files for the implementation of administrative procedures.</p>	
<p>Ind. 1.3. Percentage of environmental licenses approved in priority areas based on the Monitoring System</p>	
<p>Target: 100%</p>	<p>Achievement: 100%</p>
<p>The target has been fully achieved. 6,986 licenses have been issued since the beginning of the use of the Environmental Monitoring System (SIAM) that has begun to operate since January 2019. These licenses represent 100% of the licenses issued. 114 licenses correspond to Caazapá, 526 to Itapúa and 1,154 to Alto Paraná. The SIAM https://apps.mades.gov.py/siam/portal also promotes the transparency of the management being open to public consultation. The project has supported the hiring of 3 technicians for the management of SIAM, thanks to which licenses are issued and work is being done to support the installation of the Legal Advice and Inspection module in SIAM. An agreement has also been signed between INFONA and the World Resource Institute (WRI), for the use of the Global Forest Watch (GFW) Forest Monitoring Platform https://www.globalforestwatch.org to monitor the change in use of the soil, especially in wooded areas. Although work is being done to consolidate these systems, the great future challenge will be to articulate their integration and inter-institutional information flow.</p>	
<p>Ind. 1.4. Level of agreement on sustainable production approaches, including deforestation free supply chains, international certification standards, best practices for production and conservation, land zoning criteria for corridors, biosafety.</p>	
<p>Target: minimum environmental standards for soy and livestock production agreed by the multi-stakeholder platforms</p>	<p>Achievement: Minimum environmental standards have been defined for field production of grain (including soybeans), while lines of action have been defined for soybean and livestock production.</p>
<p>The target has been partially achieved. The two plans “Alto Paraná 2016 Sustainable Commodities Plan” and “Itapúa 2017 Sustainable Commodities Plan” developed within the framework of the Departmental Platforms present a course towards sustainability. These are guidelines for action. These guidelines cover six areas (environmental, social, institutional / legal, market / logistics / financing, productive, and knowledge / research / communication) and represent a first step towards the definition of minimum standards related to the six areas. The Project has managed to make part of the path towards the development of the minimum standards in the beef supply chain. The departmental platforms have reached a consensus on the principles of sustainability, but the identification of easily applicable, measurable and verifiable criteria that would constitute the minimum environmental standards has yet to be identified. Finally, it is important to highlight that the National Beef Platform has been established towards the closing of the Project, in November 2020. On the other hand, with the Soy Platforms, both at the departmental and national levels, the Project has promoted a process that has reached consensus on the “Protocol of Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) for the production of grains” that identifies minimum standards related to field production. The protocol can be considered final, although some final adjustments are missing. In addition, it is expected that it will be converted into the Paraguayan Standard for Sustainable Grain Production no later than February 2021 by SENAVE or by MAG. The Agrarian Advisory Council will define who is responsible for the promulgation between the two institutions. The protocol deals not only with soybeans, but also with other grains, due to the fact that soybean production is closely related to the cultivation of other grains (such as corn, wheat, and others) in a rotational system. Rotations, the application of green manure and direct seeding represent the soybean cultivation system in the Country. The minimum standards defined for grains are relative only to the part of field crops. The other levels of the supply chains are not considered (transport and processing). The essential contribution of the Project for the installation of the Platforms and therefore for the drafting of consensual documents is recognized by all the actors interviewed during this evaluation exercise.</p>	
<p>Achievement of outcome 1:</p>	

With two indicators fully achieved and two partially achieved, the evaluation considers that there has been a real improvement in the governance framework for biodiversity conservation and Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in multi-use landscapes. Those improvements have partially met the expectations of the ProDoc. The achievements are highly valued by all the actors encountered during this evaluation. The evaluation records that with the establishment of Platforms the Project has created an interest that has gone beyond the ProDoc. In the document, the Platforms were the means to reach the minimum environmental standards, in reality and in the perception of the actors, the Platforms, especially soybeans, have represented a very novel space for debates on production and capable of generating high interest. The different interests of the stakeholders have been shown and the work of the Platforms has necessarily been broader compared to what the ProDoc anticipated.

Outcome 2 - Financial and market incentives framework to promote biodiversity and sustainable land management within the target multiple-use landscape.

Ind. 2.1. Surface area of soy in the 3 priority areas prepared for certification and certified under international certification schemes, contributing to a deforestation free supply chain, evidenced by:

a) Number of hectares applying minimum environmental standards in preparation for certification under international schemes.

b) Number of hectares certified.

Targets:

- a) 500.000 ha
b) 250.000 ha

Achievement:

- a) 713 farms of 6 cooperatives associated with UNICOOP have 77,000 ha prepared for certification under international schemes.
b) 448,184 have certified:
- 253,833 ha certified by UNICOOP
 - At 21 Cargill operating centers, soy is processed from approximately 65,000 certified ha.
 - 32,240,865 tons of certified soy has been purchased by ADM. 12% of that amount comes from the Project areas and is equivalent to 17,468 ha.
 - LDC: 606 tons of soybeans. Equivalent to 44,833 ha.
 - 21,000 ha of producers associated with UNICOOP have been certified under international schemes.
 - Grain silos from 2 member cooperatives of UNICOOP (Narajal and Narajito) certified under the 2BSvs standard with the support of CAPPRO and traders. It is about 46,000 additional ha

The indicator targets have been formally met by 15.4% (goal a) and by 179% (goal b). The total number of hectares ready to be certified or already under certification schemes remains at 70.0%. Therefore, the indicator is not considered completely achieved.

Ind. 2.2. Percentage of soy purchases in the priority areas by commodity buyers that come from producers that comply with best practices.

Target:

50%

Achievement:

146.043 ha de soja certificadas acumuladas a la fecha, de adquisiciones de traders, lo que corresponde a un 73% de la meta del indicador.

The target has been partially met (73%). It is evident that the contribution of Project 1 cannot be considered important. Traders' purchases depend on strategic considerations that they make at the Country and global level based on market requirements. Throughout the evaluation it has become clear that the amount of certified soy purchased by LDC, Cargill and ADM cannot be considered achieved thanks to the Project. These are targets typical of large companies that are based on market demands and strategic considerations that go beyond the Project. In other words, they are quantities that most likely would have been purchased independently of the implementation of the Project as clearly reported to the Evaluation Team. With the current certification of the silos of two Cooperatives associated with UNICOOP, the missing 27% of the indicator will be easily covered. This additional achievement can be attributed to the Project that has contributed to the UNICOOP certification.

Ind. 2.3. Degree to which environmental sustainability criteria have been mainstreamed in financial institutions (FI) credit operations for soy and meat, measured by:

a) % of compliance with the pre-requisite of presenting environmental management plans as per the provisions of the EIA law

b) Number of FIs (and therefore volume of credits) that mainstream best practices in the loan approval procedures

Target:

Achievement:

- a) 14 banks are part of the MFS and require an Environmental License for loans, which represents 82% of the national portfolio.

<p>a) 80% of the soy and livestock loan portfolios b) 4 FIs and at least 50% of their loan portfolios</p>	<p>b) 100% of FIs must apply the Environmental and Social Risk Analysis System decreed by the BCP according to Res. 8/2018.</p>
<p>Target a) and b) have been achieved. The Project has contributed to the operation of the MFS itself by paying the fees of the secretary and the manager of the MSF for a few months in the years 2017 and 2018. In fact, the two goals had been substantially defined by the MSF in the framework from another project implemented with a fund from the Netherlands FMO Business Development Bank. The Project was in charge of negotiating and working with the MFS and Banco FMO to achieve this indicator. 91 trainings have been carried out related to Environmental and Social Risk Analysis System and the implementation of Guidelines for granting credit with environmental and social criteria; with 676 participants. The participants were managers, executives and analysts from the Risk and Commercial Areas, General and Finance Managers, employees from the banking sector and the financial business sector. In addition, the MFS leads the development of a territorial planning platform: Agroideal, which promotes sustainable production in the meat value chain of the Paraguayan Chaco.</p>	
<p>Ind. 2.4. Number of FI (and financing plans) granting long term loans for reforestation/afforestation projects</p>	
<p>Meta: 4 FI financing at least 100 plans</p>	<p>Logro: 2 FI financing 2 plans</p>
<p>Formally, the achievement has not been realized. Compliance is at 2%, well below ProDoc expectations. However, it is important to note that, in order to expand the plans, the MFS has been conducting agreements and training with government institutions to promote new plans. It is worth mentioning that AFD has just launched a loan aimed at the forestry sector that will soon come into effect. The granting of long-term loans at competitive rates is made difficult because the second-tier bank does not agree to reduce the interest on the loans granted. Although there is a line of credit for the forestry sector from the Development Finance Agency (AFD), it is not competitive. Finally, in 2020 the line adjustments have been completed and the demand for these credits is expected to increase in the coming years. The Evaluation Team also understands the difficulties of the Project to monitor and be aware of what happens with the loans: the banks are bound by confidentiality with their clients and this affects the flow of information from the banks to the Project.</p>	
<p>Ind. 2.5. Number of transactions and flow of resources derived from the SEAM forest certificates under the environmental services law</p>	
<p>Target: Transactions corresponding to 2,000 ha x 70 US\$/ha/yr (US\$140K/yr).</p>	<p>Achievement: 4.143 ha certified transactional for a value of de 2.031.975,78 (average 490,46US\$* por ha). * calculated at the change of Gs 6,597.48 = 1US \$, monthly average of June 2020, source: BCP and based on the averages of the Nominal Values by Ecoregion according to SEAM Resolution No. 1093/2013</p>
<p>The goal of the indicator has been achieved. It should be noted that as of today 213,809 hectares have not yet been the subject of any transaction</p>	
<p>Achievement of outcome 1: Evaluating the achievement of outcome two is not an easy exercise. The Project has worked supporting the more sustainable production of soybeans and meat, that is, in the supply of soybeans. The indicators instead refer to demand. This is well visualized by the ind. 2.5. The Project has in fact reached a number of forest certificates that are left over. The indicators 2.1. and 2.2. they are not completely attributable to the implementation of the Project as expressly reported by some of the interviewed traders. The difficulty of verifying the achievement of result 2 is therefore caused by design problems of the indicators and cannot be attributed to implementation. In fact, the evaluation values, based on the interviews carried out, the very valuable work of the Project in terms of supporting the more sustainable production of soybeans and meat. From this perspective, the only really relevant indicator is the ind. 2.3. whose goal has been accomplished.</p>	
<p>Outcome 3 - Strengthened implementation of land set aside system and sustainable production practices.</p>	
<p>Ind. 3.1. Degree of adoption of best practices by producers in the 3 priority areas, measured by: a) Number of hectares of direct sowing following the BP Manuals. b) % of increase in the use of live fences. c) Number of producers adopting best management practices of agro-chemicals</p>	

d) Number of hectares of silvopastoral systems established	
Target: Alto Paraná: a) 175,000 ha b) 10% c) 700 d) 300 ha Caazapá: a) 5,000 ha b) 5% c) 100 d) 50,000 ha Itapúa a) 40,000 ha b) 10% c) 200 d) 10.000 ha	Achievement: a) 100% of the producers associated with UNICOOP implement direct sowing on their farms (594,000 ha). In 77,000 ha, the protocol of good practices carried out on the farms is applied. b) 0. The producers do not make use of live fences that are still considered only as an additional cost that does not contribute much. c) 802 farms have adopted better agrochemical management practices in Alto Paraná (354), Caazapa (79) and Itapúa (362). d) Silvo-pastoral systems have been established in 128.8 ha in Alto Paraná (42.9%), in 199 ha in Caazapá (0.4%), and in 94.8 ha in Itapúa (0.95%), reaching a total of 422.6 ha.
<p>The achievement of three target is well below the expectations of the Project.</p> <p>The sub-indicator related to direct seeding considers the areas of farms that are in the process of applying GAP, which corresponds to 35% of the target. This taking into account that such a method of direct sowing is the reference system in the Country for the cultivation of soybeans. The sub-indicator related to living fences shows little attention to the issue of the complexity of the introduction of such a practice in the design phase. Living fences are a legal requirement that is substantially not met at the country level. Despite the efforts of the project to propose compliance with this practice with the allied cooperatives, it has not even been able to raise the baseline, since they consider it irrelevant to apply it, as stipulated in the normative. Producers consider that it is only necessary to apply it in places where it affects homes and educational and community centers. And the enforcement authority, SENAIVE, shows no interest in adapting this regulation for its applicability. The target have proven very ambitious, almost unrealistic.</p> <p>The target related to the use of agrochemicals has been met by 80.2%. This shows that the awareness-raising work that has been carried out in the departmental platforms can bear good results that are not otherwise achievable. In addition, with the application of GAP, it has been shown that compliance with this practice is considered important and a priority.</p> <p>The target related to silvo-pastoral systems have also been very ambitious and of low fulfillment. During the project execution period, there were no adequate financial offers for the forestry sector, since they have high rates and a grace period for payment of principal and interest of only two years. Towards the end of the project, the rate has been reduced from 12% to 8%, which for the future may favor expanding the areas of silvo-pastoral systems in the BAAPA. However, the targets have been very ambitious for all departments.</p>	
Ind. 3.2. Number of hectares in Caazapá with continuous forest reserves in local indigenous communities, which have management plans (land use, fire control, BD monitoring) under implementation and with environmental certificates issued.	
Target: 350 ha	Achievement: 665 ha of forests with indigenous communities are in the process of certification, in Caazapá and Itapúa.
<p>The achievement of the target can be considered full.</p> <p>the issue of the pandemic impacted the certification process. Only the MADES field verification and analysis work is missing.</p>	
Ind. 3.3. Increase in the connectivity index in: a) high fragmentation areas (Alto Parana) through restoration of protective forests; b) areas with larger forest remnants (Canindeyu) through increase in legal set-asides and private reserves.	
Target: a) Alto Paraná: the distance between the fragments was reduced by 1 point b) Caazapá: the distance between the fragments was reduced by 2 points	Achievement: a) In 2015, the connectivity index in Alto Paraná was 92.58 and in 2019 it was 92.94 (the distance between fragments decreased 0.36 points). b) In 2015, the connectivity index in Caazapá was 97.11 and in 2019 it was 97.45 (the distance between fragments decreased 0.34 points).

<p>The achievement of the target is partially accomplished. In Alto Parana it is fulfilled by 36% and in Cazaapa by 17%.</p> <p>It is noted that in the Naranjal district where the Project has cooperated closely with the municipality, the COPRONAR Producers cooperative and with INFONA, the connectivity index in 2015 was 84.07 and in 2019 it was 87.27 (the distance between fragments was reduced by 3.2 points). In the case of Tavaí, the connectivity index in 2015 was 98.41 and in 2019 it was 99.00 (the distance between fragments was reduced by 0.59 points).</p>	
<p>Ind. 3.4. Improvement in the effectiveness of monitoring and control in the priority areas measured by the number of monitoring events and finalized processes in accordance with the Inter-institutional Manual for Enforcement of the Forest and Environmental Laws</p>	
<p>Target: a) 50% in 4 pilot municipalities b) 30% in the remaining municipalities.</p>	<p>Achievement: The achievement is not definable. The Project not reported against this indicator</p>
<p>Although the achievement has not been measured according to the indicator, the evaluation considers the monitoring and control system by public institutions substantially improved.</p> <p>SIAM https://apps.mades.gov.py/siam/portal has greatly supported MADES in its environmental licensing work.</p> <p>In addition, an agreement has been signed between INFONA and the World Resource Institute (WRI), for the use of the Global Forest Watch (GFW) Forest Monitoring Platform https://www.globalforestwatch.org to monitor the change in use of the soil, especially in wooded areas. The Project has supported the implementation of the regional offices in the 3 departments, the generation of Environmental Units in the pilot municipalities, the equipping of them, the hiring of technicians to collaborate with the monitoring and control of compliance with environmental regulations and forestry. On the other hand, the technicians hired for the regional offices have received complaints of environmental crimes and have participated in the audits carried out by the officials. With the Forests for Sustainable Growth project, the protocol for joint intervention between the institutions MADES, INFONA, the National Land Registry Service and the National Police has also been worked on.</p>	
<p>Ind. 3.5. Number of soy and livestock producers that have improved their knowledge, attitude and practices for implementation of best practices to conserve biodiversity, reduce soil degradation and plan land use in the MUL of the priority areas</p>	
<p>Meta: 4,000 producers and 100 women</p>	<p>Logro: There have been 122 training / information events reaching a total of 16,383 participants. The sampling of 130 producers has revealed an improvement in their knowledge, attitudes and practices</p>
<p>The indicator is considered achieved.</p> <p>The baselines were established in 2016, with 65 respondents (of which 5 were women) from Alto Paraná and at the end of 2017, early 2018, with 130 respondents (of which 10 were women) from Itapúa and Caazapá, totaling 195 surveys. The surveys have been carried out with the same people, at the beginning (2016 and 2017-2018) and at the end (2019). Regarding knowledge, 100% of the producers have stated, at the beginning and at the end, having knowledge about direct sowing, conservation soil management and how to maintain and improve soil fertility. With the training, knowledge has increased on how to avoid contamination resulting from bad agricultural practices. Mainly, referring to the correct application of the use of phytosanitary products, to the need to carry out studies of the properties of the soil and to have a greater consideration for soil erosion. Regarding practices, on average there was an increase of 4% of producers who carry out analysis and planning of land use. 100% continue to use direct seeding and the responsible use of phytosanitary products. On average, 26% of the producers state that they have improved the erosion of their farms and 45% mention that they have stopped using harrows for soil management. It is recommended to accompany these quantitative studies of qualitative analysis of the implementation of the best practices implemented.</p>	

The low level of goal achievement is explained in a general way by two main factors:

The commodity platforms have attracted a lot of interest from all the actors involved in the Project. The platforms that aimed at the same time to be a means to obtain a product within the life of the Project (as foreseen in the Results Framework), have become mainly spaces for meeting, debates, training and consensus building that encompasses a range of interests that go beyond environmental care (as outlined in the ProDoc). In addition, being a place for debates on the supply chains of the two most important commodities in the country, they include actors

that differ greatly in terms of interests, capabilities and strategic vision. Therefore, the Platforms are spaces for management and conflict resolution and are necessarily formed as a space for negotiation. The Project hypothesis of using the Platforms as means to obtain a product has been partially held true, the reality of the agricultural business is very complex and has allowed to reach the consensus drafting of the Protocol of Good Agricultural Practices for the field production of grains. The low compliance with what concerns the livestock sector is also explained by the fact that the Project areas are not so representative of livestock production and therefore, the Project has had to support another project, commonly called "Green Chaco" to install the national platform.

Many indicators are not relevant. For its effective scope, the contribution of the existing market conditions during the various years of implementation of the Project has an extremely preponderant relevance, and attributing the achievement of these indicators to the Project would not be a rigorous exercise. It is evident that the Project has worked and promoted a lot on the production side to chart a path towards sustainability through the platforms, especially the soybean one. The vast majority of indicators are not able to show this effort or do not take into account the complexity of the production system of the two commodities. There is a complete lack of indicators to systematically monitor the progress of the Platforms. The evaluation, therefore, does not have consolidated elements to further assess their development.

The GEF tracking tool has been updated by the Project Team and reports progress on the impacts and results established at the portfolio level under the MSF / REDD + strategy. The tracking tool is consistent with the results of the evaluation.

3.3.2. Relevance

The primary sector accounts for 20% of GDP, employs 26.4% of the economically active population and contributes 65% of exports, and agriculture represents 60% of sectoral GDP. Soybeans and beef are the two most important commodities in terms of production and export. The contributions of the two items to the sectoral GDP vary from 34 to 49% for soybeans and from 14% to 21% for beef, depending mainly on the climatic factors that occur each year in the country. The two commodities are notorious and globally recognized as drivers of deforestation and soil degradation. The establishment of platforms related to the supply chains of soybeans and beef that aim at increasing environmental sustainability are obviously elements of relevance of the Project. However, the vast majority of those interviewed point out that, at present, soy and beef production are no longer the cause of deforestation in the country. And, they define illegal activities (marijuana plantations, clandestine timber extraction, arson forest fires and invasions) as the biggest driver of deforestation.

The National Development Plan (PND), which is the strategic document that aims at coordinating actions in the sectoral instances of the Executive Power, as well as with various levels of government, civil society, and the private sector, identifies as one of the main national challenges the "reconciliation of the needs of economic growth and industrialization with the sustainable use of soils, forests, biological diversity and agricultural production, which requires adaptation to climate change. In such a macro-level context, the PND assigns to agricultural policy the challenge of "sustainably increasing the competitiveness of agricultural production, with a focus on sustainable agri-food and agro-industrial systems". In addition, the PND considers environmental sustainability both as a transversal line of action and as its own strategy for inclusive economic development. The Project therefore aligns perfectly with the country's NDP.

For MADES, the Project is also relevant because the Ministry has specifically supported the inclusion in its policies of the productive dimension and its transversality with sustainable development as well visualized in the document, even in its draft state, "Update of the National Environmental Policy". In fact, by moving from Secretariat to Ministry status, the institution has taken charge not only the environment but also sustainable development. In this sense, the Project has been implemented in a favorable situation to provide this type of support. The Project is fully aligned with and contributes to the mission of the ministry "to ensure that National development is carried out according to environmental quality parameters, optimizing ecosystem goods and services, guaranteeing the conservation of natural resources for present and future generations, to through environmental governance".

The relevance for MAG is unquestionable. MAG's institutional mission is to "contribute to the sustainable agricultural development of the country, through its efficient, innovative and inclusive institutional services." The Project aims at increasing the level of sustainability of the most important supply chains at the country level.

The Project is also aligned with INFONA's mission of "promoting sustainable forest management through a participatory and inclusive policy, providing products, services and technologies that contribute to the economic, social and environmental development of the country" and with its Institutional Strategic Plan 2017-2021, which also identifies the need for better inter-institutional coordination and with private sector actors between its strategies and objectives.

The Project is also relevant for SENAIVE. In fact, the Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) protocol produced within the framework of the Project is a precious input for the institution that must turn it into a regulation.

For the private sector in general, the Project is relevant because it deals with problems that each actor had already been identifying due to their own experiences and productive and commercial demands. The sustainability of the agricultural business in general was already positioning itself as important elements for each type of actor.

Soy Platforms are extremely relevant to traders. The platforms represent a means to get to know the sector better, to gain experience and to be able to transfer it to another country. In fact, it has been reported to the Evaluation Team that the platforms give the possibility to those in charge of sustainability of traders to: find out about the existence of actors in the agri-environmental sector that they did not know before, to deepen their understanding of the sector in general, and to promote relationships both at a corporate and personal level with other actors. Substantially, it is a professional growth of those in charge of sustainability that then has an impact on the work of the same companies.

The Project has found as important allies the large cooperatives that are in the project's area of influence, and UNICOOP, which is the central that unites all cooperatives coincidentally in the BAAPA region. The Project has been highly relevant for them since it has allowed them to give continuity, expand and scale a sustainable production initiative at the territorial level.

The relevance of the Project for soybean producers lies in two central elements: on the one hand they want to free themselves from the social stigma that commonly sees them as the main responsible for deforestation, exploitation and neglect of the environment. And, on the other side they are aware that better management of their productions can lead to a more efficient use of inputs that ultimately results in better profits. Some producers consider that the sustainable production style with certification of good practices is a trend and in the future it will be a requirement by the market itself, so the Project's support at this stage is opportune to adapt on time and at a lower cost. In addition, environmental care for some of them is a value in itself. Finally, it has been reported to the Evaluation Team that the value of the environment and forests in particular, is a new and contradictory element for older producers. In fact, until the end of the 1980s, the same GoP promoted deforestation, considering forests as a barrier to agricultural development.

In general, the relevance of the Project for the livestock sector has not been clear. In fact, cattle ranching in the BAAPA landscape, mainly in the three departments targeted by the Project, is a secondary item, based on marginal soils and has lost a lot of strength in the face of the development of agriculture, pig and poultry production. However, for some actors the Project has been relevant, to install agroforestry systems, heavily subsidized, due to the lack of credit according to the item. For the national ARP, the relevance of the Project lies in the ease that the platforms present to channel the concerns of the different actors in the sector. In fact, in substantive review 2 it has been mentioned that the pilot departments are not relevant to the livestock sector, so the Green Chaco project was delegated to work strongly with the sector.

The Project is also relevant for non-governmental organizations that deal with the environment. They perceive collaboration with the agricultural and livestock production system as an element for a "realistic" environmental conservation. Pure conservation work is no longer considered a possible approach in multi-use landscapes: there is a need to reach consensus on the sustainable use of the environmental resource. This type of process is obviously gradual, long, and encounters the typical obstacles of consensus building between divergent interests. In fact, the Project has supported the tripartite collaboration between UNICOOP, ADM and A Todo Pulmón.

The Project is absolutely relevant to UNDP. It gives you the possibility to support the development process of the two commodities towards greater sustainability. This is aligned with the agency's global mission "... UNDP works to strengthen the new frameworks for development... We support the efforts of countries to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals...". It is aligned with the Paraguay Country Program 2020-2024 and specifically contributes to 3 "National and sub-national institutions of the public and private sectors and civil society will better manage natural capital for the sake of sustainable development and low emissions".

The highly participatory and transparent methodology with which the platforms are managed is considered relevant for this evaluation exercise because it represents a space for discussion for the actors of the two commodities. The evaluative exercise, however, has not been able to verify the relevance of the Project for field workers of their own voice. No representative of this category participates as much in the Departmental Platforms as in the National. However, the implication of the Project and especially of the Platforms for the working conditions of this category is obvious; e.g. it is evident that the category is highly exposed to the incorrect use of agrochemicals and the application of GAP is positive for it.

The Project has been set up as a support to the production system of the two commodities. By being implemented in the most important areas dedicated to the cultivation of soy (and grains associated with its cultivation) in the country, the Project has mainly promoted the development of dialogue between the actors in the supply chain of this production. The support work for the livestock sector has been stopped to await the parallel work that UNDP and MADES were developing in the Chaco within the framework of another project financed by the GEF “Production and Demand of Sustainable Commodities in the Chaco” given that the department of Chaco the leader of the cattle production of the country. This is the main reason for which the work with the livestock sector has been reflected in the establishment of a Beef Platform only at the end of 2020, exactly in the period during which this evaluation exercise was taking place. The consensus-building work in the Departmental Beef Platform has stopped towards the elaboration of good livestock practices and only the training work has continued: this work is important in terms of sustainability, but does not aim to fulfill expectations of the project, that is, the drafting of minimum environmental standards for livestock. As mentioned, with the second substantive review, this type of work has been passed to the Green Chaco project, which, when working in an eminently cattle-raising area, has more relevance on the subject.

Finally, the evaluation highlights the great value of the process of dialogue between stakeholders launched by the Platforms. The process is necessary for the sustainable development of supply chains, but in the short period, that is, the years of the Project, the process of dialogue has not been able to link effectively with the other expectations of the Project, the expected increase in the area of BAAPA. It has been shown that the Project hypothesis was too ambitious, the needs in terms of training and technical support of soybean producers, the involvement of local authorities, and the interests of several of the stakeholders, need more time to achieve tangible results in terms of restoration of the BAAPA. In addition, it has been clear in all the interviews with private sector actors that the reforestation process needs institutional coordination and an external source of financing that is appropriate to the forestry category, at least until the benefits of the BAAPA's ecosystem services are not viewed in terms of economic profitability.

The discourse on the sustainability of agricultural and livestock production is in its initial phase, there is an awareness of different actors. Some have been working on the sustainability issue for some years, others are just beginning. It is evident that the escalation of the issue must start with the productive plots, then reach groups of producers, then cover a district, as is happening in Naranjal, and in turn scale to the national level. The case of the Municipality of Naranjal in this regard becomes an example. In the district, the Project has found an alignment with the priorities of the local government, for which it has been strongly engaged, unlike other districts where the project has focused its landing on the ground, but which has not succeeded due to lack of alignment with the priorities of local authorities.

3.3.3. Effectiveness and efficiency

As seen in section 3.3.1. “General Results” the achievement of the results and of the Project objective has remained below the expectations displayed in the indicators of the Results Framework. In this regard, this evaluation exercise shows the following aspects that have slowed down the achievement of the Project's expectations at the same time:

Support to the private sector

UNDP and the GEF have historically predominantly supported small producers, the most vulnerable communities in the countries where they operate. The link with large producers, large national companies and multinational companies is not a typical approach of the two agencies. Working with three different levels of representatives from the private sector, i.e. large, medium and small producers, also represents a challenge for implementation that generally does not occur in other initiatives. In addition, the Project is the first exercise of this type in the Country and the target sectors, soy and beef, are the two most important in terms of GDP in the agricultural sector of Paraguay. In this regard, it is recalled that the global initiative called “Green Commodities Program” (GCP), of which the Project is a partner, is the first UNDP initiative that aims at improving the lives of farmers and their

communities and protect forests from high conservation value and important vulnerable ecosystems through direct approach with producers in the primary sector. The GCP is also a relatively recent initiative having started in 2010.

Participatory and transparent implementation approach

A variety of stakeholders with different, sometimes divergent, interests has been involved. Furthermore, they are strategic interests for the country's economy. A participatory and transparent approach necessarily requires time.

Environmental sector vs agricultural sector

The Project has been led by MADES, representative of the environmental sector, but has approached the actors of the agricultural sector, which is represented by MAG. In addition, the Project has foreseen the participation of INFONA. Some interviewees have stated that this has generated confusion among the actors involved in the process and a not easy management of institutional attributions.

The need to combine the different aspects evidences by itself the double nature of the initiative that was launched: on the one hand there was the need to implement forestry, agricultural and livestock activities on the ground, on the other hand the work was necessarily focused on in capacity building as well as in consensus building. There has definitely been a process, which is not described in the ProDoc and for which indicators had not been defined. In addition, once consensus was reached to carry out activities on the ground, there was a need to set up an administrative process, i.e. the formulation of contracts, between UNDP and the private sector. This type of work has not turned out to be easy due to lack of previous experience in the country. The two actors (UNDP and the private sector) had to negotiate in detail all the contractual aspects, which required time and efforts for both parties. This type of negotiation also occurs when agreements are reached with NGOs, non-profit associations and consultants. With these types of actors, however, both parties have previous experience and the process is easier. Therefore, the Platforms, which in the ProDoc were considered a means, have been established as a guiding element of the implementation and the UNDP has necessarily acted as a coordinator and facilitator navigating between stakeholders and interests.

However, the Project has contributed to overcoming barriers, identified in the ProDoc, that hinder the development of environmentally friendly sustainable development policies.

On the other hand, to meet certain indicators, it has been shown that the project has had to overcome important barriers such as imprecise and contradictory regulatory policies. Thus, the Project has successfully managed the adaptation of two legal regulations for the certification of environmental services: i) INFONA Resolution 352/20 that modifies Res. 1338/14, for the registration of Protective Forests; and ii) the adaptation of MADES regulations for the certification of forests of indigenous communities through Res. 193/20

Also noteworthy is the promulgation of MOPC Resolution No. 933/20 "... which approves the Regulation that establishes the regimes for certification, control and promotion of the use of bioenergy from forest plantations or managed native forests, to ensure sustainability of these renewable resources within the national territory ... ", which establishes that by the year 2025 in Paraguay 100% of biomass for energy purposes must be certified. The Project has supported the Vice Ministry of Mines and Energy of the Ministry of Public Works and Communications and followed up with INFONA to reach that resolution.

The work of the Project has affected various legal aspects of the environmental sector in Paraguay. The main conclusions of this work carried out through a consultant have been:

- A draft regulatory decree of art. 42 of Law 422/73;
- A draft bill for the creation of the Environmental Fund;
- A draft of the Law that regulates the obligation to restore and compensate;
- A proposal of applicable procedures in the EIA Environmental Impact Assessment;
- A proposed regulatory decree for article 11 of Law 3001

This same work has been reflected in the entry into force of the following regulations:

- Decree No. 7031/2017 regulating Art. 42 of Law 422 (it was modified) Forestry
- Resolution SEAM N ° 756/2016 of "Monitoring and Auditing of Certified Areas"
- SEAM Resolution No. 07/2017 on "Scenic Beauties"

- Resolution SEAM N ° 611/2017 that establishes requirements and general conditions to adhere to the regime of the Environmental Services Regime

The "insufficient economic incentives to incorporate sustainable environmental management practices into economic activity" remain in force. The market does not pay a differential for soy from certified farms. The Project has overcome this barrier through a strategy with partners, demonstrating that the application of good practice standards with an environmental management component on the farm makes the farm system more efficient, which pays off in savings and improvements in general profitability. Through the methodology of demonstrating successful cases of good practices, it has been possible to expand the number of farms in the certification process.

The barrier "limited institutional and individual capacity to comply with reserve regulations, or the adoption of standards of sustainable practices" has been partially overcome. The project could not influence public institutions so that they would lead the achievement of the expected results of the Project.

The Project has promoted, actively working to identify, motivate and consolidate a critical mass of women, gender equality. The importance of women in decision-making processes has been brought to general knowledge by women themselves. The "Platform of Women Leaders of the Sustainable Commodities Productive Chain" has been established. It operates in parallel with the Soy and Beef Platforms.

The evaluation highlights the very high number of participants in the meetings of the Platforms throughout the implementation of the project, which has 3,848 participants, of them 3,175 men and 673 women (including a total of 43 people belonging to indigenous communities)².

The Project has organized a massive number, 122, of training events involving a total of 16,383 people³.

Because the Project is DIM, it has not been audited. In 2019, it has been included, after being randomly chosen, according to UNDP standards for direct implementation projects, in the audit of the UNDP country office. However, the audit report of the UNDP Paraguay office does not report any information that could be directly related to the Project.

The two substantive reviews represent elements of efficiency. The Board of Directors has made decisions in the right direction to ensure a better implementation of the Project.

The Project has joined forces with other initiatives to take advantage of the available resources and carry out activities of common interest to different projects:

- UNDP Forests for Sustainable Growth Project
- Asunción Green City of the Americas Project of UNDP
- MAG PPI project
- Green Chaco Project
- MDS Tekopora and Tenondera projects

The design of the Project, despite presenting the DIM implementation modality, has strongly held the counterpart institutions (MADES, MAG and INFONA mainly) to lead to achieve the different results of the project. However, the involvement of these institutions, both in co-financing and in leadership in the Project execution process, has not been clear. The leadership of the UNDP has been highlighted to lead all the processes in the leadership of the platforms, for which the actors have related the project as UNDP and not as MADES. Additionally, this low involvement is also evidenced by the lack of information about the co-financing of these institutions in the framework of the execution of the Project components.

The GEF//UNDP/GoP/SEAM project "Generating Responsible Demand for Reduced Deforestation Commodities" (Green Chaco) jointly manages the two National Soybean and Beef Platforms with the Project. Thanks to the joint effort of the two projects, the relative web page <https://greencommoditiesparaguay.org> has also been created. Finally, the two projects, having common objectives, although in different geographical areas,

² The number is cumulative. The information available to the Evaluation Team does not reveal how many duplications there are. The count considers the participants to each event. The same person is therefore considered as an individual participant in each meeting to which she/he has participated.

³ The number is cumulative. Furthermore, the registration system for training participants does not allow to differentiate between men and women.

also share the same Project Board since the Chaco project began in 2018. The joint work between the two projects is clearly an element of efficiency that characterizes Project management.

To strengthen its participatory approach, the Project in 2019 has prepared a Project Communication Plan. The Plan has a strategy, clear objectives and target audiences. In addition, it has a minimum budget so that it can be operationalized. The set of objectives of the plan aims to support both external and internal communication in such a way as to position the Project's agenda, i.e. the conservation of the Atlantic Forest in the eastern zone and the Platforms of sustainable commodities both with the general public of the Country and with the actors in the same soy and beef supply chains.

The evaluation values the Project Communication Plan well articulated and capable of reaching the target audiences. In this sense, the evaluation could only find out about the capacity that the Project Communicator has to convey news to the producers about the training events that took place after 2019. In this sense, the communication launched by the Project is made as an element of its efficiency: it is capable of promoting its activities.

By producing a quantity of communication material, the Project has also increased its level of transparency towards the general public of the Country. Transparency is recognized as an essential element in the management of projects financed by public institutions. This is, therefore, considered as an additional element of the Project's efficiency.

The contribution of the private sector has been important for the achievement of the results at the field level, mainly in the area of action of Naranjal and UNICOOP; where the cooperatives, the Municipality of Naranjal, the producers and UNICOOP itself contributed to the activities developed by the project.

COVID-19 Pandemic and the Project

The United Nations World Health Organization (WHO) has declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as of March 11, 2020, and in the case of Paraguay the Government has taken preventive measures quickly, restricting travel within the country as of March 11, 2020, as well as the establishment of a 4-phase quarantine schedule.

Several of the interviewees have stated that the activities programmed as of the second quarter of the year have suffered an abrupt interruption in their execution, mainly those referring to legal procedures for certifications, training and technical assistance.

In the field trip, it was found that activities related to the reestablishment of the protective forests of water courses, forest plantations and the expansion of farms with GAP have had considerable delays in their implementation, which is due, according to the interviewees, to the mobility restrictions during quarantine.

In general, the Project has been highly proactive in the face of the restrictions caused by the pandemic. Thus, the Project Board, the Technical Committee, the meetings of the Platforms and various training events were held regularly through the digital Platforms. In short, the evaluation confirms that in the effective term of achieving the goals of the Project indicators, the pandemic has not had significant repercussions.

3.3.4. Country ownership

The Project has a very high national ownership.

In general, the Project helps the GoP to comply with its international obligations, specifically with the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity.

In particular, the Project has contributed to making adjustments to certain laws that are in force in the country:

- Decree No. 2598 to regulate article 5 of Law 5146 on "Fees and Fines" with the aim to strengthen the administrative responsibility scheme and increase the amount collected for fines imposed for the violation of forest and environmental regulations.
- Adaptation of the MADES regulations for the certification of forests of indigenous communities through Res. 193/20.
- INFONA Resolution 352/20 modifying Res. 1338/14, for the registration of Protective Forests

In addition, it has financially supported the private sector in its effort to position sustainability as a topic of its regular work. In this realm, the Project has supported the following organizations:

- UNICOOP and Cooperativa Naranjal for the territorial approach of the project with which it was possible to launch "Sustainable Naranjal" as well as the validation and implementation of GAP, spring restoration, restoration of protective forest, environmental training and conservationists paths.
- PROCOSARA for restoration and use of biological corridors from the implementation of sustainable production systems in the southern block of BAAPA - Tavai.
- A Todo Pulmón Restoration and use of biological corridors from the implementation of sustainable production systems in the southern block of BAAPA - Tavai.
- CAPPRO for the implementation of the sustainability program of the union and support for the CAPRO COOPERA Project, for the certification of silos from UNICOOP.
- MFS with the support to its secretariat and to the implementation of environmental standards in granting loans

In a participatory way, the Project has developed and validated at field level the standards and procedures for certifying farms with GAP. This document has a high degree of appropriation on the part of those involved. In interviews with SENAVE referents, they expressed their commitment that the document will have an official approval of the institution and that they will internalize it as a national standard of voluntary application.

The Project in collaboration with INFONA has produced the "Technical Manual for the administration and application of Law No. 4241/10 for the reestablishment of protective forests of water channels within the national territory and its Decree No. 9824/12", a tool considered extremely useful by the governing institution of forest policy. This manual incorporates the experience of the project as a description of two pilot sites: (i) map of deficit of protective forests, and (ii) map of reforestation to protect the water channel and biological corridor, developed in the district of Naranjal in Alto Paraná.

Finally, the evaluation highlights that for all the actors interviewed, the work of establishing the Commodity Platforms at the national and departmental level has been valued as the element with the greatest national involvement: the platforms as spaces for dialogue between the actors in the supply chain soy and meat. It is a novel fact in the national productive panorama and considered essential to advance the issue of sustainability in both sectors.

3.3.5. Integration

The Project has constituted, through the installation of the Platforms, an exercise to support better governance of the productive sectors of soy and beef. It has promoted a process that aims at improving the environmental impact of the two supply chains through two main axes, consensus between actors and compliance with the relevant laws. Therefore, it has also positioned itself as an element to promote transparency in both sectors. The Project has been aligned with the priorities of the Paraguay Country Program. The strategic partnerships and active collaboration with civil society and the private sector that have characterized the implementation of the Project are as well important elements of the same Country Program.

The Naranjal experience in this sense can be defined as paradigmatic of what can be achieved with the approach promoted by the Project. A workable collaboration between the public and private sectors can promote sustainability.

The Project has also worked a lot on the issue of gender equality, which is a focal point of UNDP intervention in Paraguay. In 2019, the Project organized the "Being a Woman in the Sustainable Commodities Production Chain" discussion, which was carried out in order to strengthen the empowerment of women in the agricultural sector. The conservatory has made possible an exchange of knowledge and experiences on the current reality of the role of women and has resulted in a discussion space called the "Platform of Women Leaders of the Productive Chain of Sustainable Commodities", which operates in parallel to the Soy and meat platform.

The evaluation notes that the Project has not yet been able to include the voices of the workers of the two sectors in the work of the Platforms. Although the Project, with its work to promote Good Agricultural Practices (GAP), has also promoted a discussion about the labor environment on farms. It is evident that, in order to fully comply with the principle "To Leave No One Behind", which characterizes the UNDP work, the voices of workers in the soybean and livestock sectors should have some space of representation in the Platforms. The evaluation considers that this gap does not diminish the value of the Project's work: in fact, there is no union of workers in the agricultural sector in the country, and the inclusion of workers' representatives institutionally is therefore not possible in a permanent way..

3.3.6. Sustainability

There is no doubt that, if the work of the Platforms were to end when the Project was closed, it would lose much of its importance and would become a work of little impact. The continuation of the work of the Platforms is essential for the sustainability of the initiative.

In the short term, the financing of the Platforms must be ensured by the project "Production and Demand of Sustainable Commodities in the Chaco" implemented by UNDP and financed by GEF, known as the Chaco Verde Project. However, the assessment identifies risks to sustainability in the medium and long term.

The mix of issues and stakeholders from the environmental and agricultural sectors poses leadership problems in the long term of the National Platforms for soy and beef. Many actors believe that by institutionalizing as National Platforms for eminent commodities, which refer to the MAG, the same ministry should be in charge of their leadership. Other actors, otherwise, believe that a space that deals with sustainability falls naturally under the leadership of MADES. This political-institutional problem reveals the complexity of the challenge of all the SDGs of the 2030 agenda that transcend the sectoral division that has characterized the organization of the institutional competencies of public administrations. Obviously, in the short term, the fact that the funds to give it sustainability are from the GEF and the objective of such funds are typically environmental, help the leadership to be from MADES.

Commodity Platforms at the national and departmental level have, because they are spaces for discussions between stakeholders with various, sometimes divergent interests, intrinsic financial sustainability problems for their ordinary functioning as a body of debate and discussion. As they are spaces for the search for consensual solutions, the platforms are active and function as long as there is the possibility of dealing with topics of interest to the different actors, although the topics are, at least in the short term, problems whose solutions are irreconcilable. If the Platforms are not seen as instances of conflict resolution or channels to converse and negotiate on specific issues with the Public Sector, or if the Public Sector does not use them as was the idea of the Project, they will soon become obsolete. It is very unlikely that a company can finance a Platform that does not resolve irreconcilable issues in its favour. For this reason, the self-financing of the Platforms does not seem realistic, at least in the short and medium term, to ensure their ordinary functioning it is essential to have external funds. In addition, the financing of the platforms by supply chain actors and/or by public institutions in the country is an issue that has not been addressed by the Platforms. The situation is different in regard to the financing of the guidelines of the action plans: their implementation can be financed according to the competence of the different actors involved. This is what has happened in the Naranjal District.

It is also clear that the platforms cannot be financed indefinitely in the long term by third-party organizations, such as the GEF, but must pass under the responsibility of the stakeholders that constitute them. In other words, it is necessary to seek solutions that allow long-term financial sustainability. This point is a concern of all the interviewees to whom the Evaluation Team has asked the question about sustainability.

The role that UNDP has played for the start-up and scaffolding of the Platforms has been key for them to work, since otherwise it would not have happened. In the short term, the continuation of UNDP's work as the coordinating agency is essential for sustainability.

The work to strengthen public institutions in terms of support to the regulatory framework and the monitoring system does not show elements contrary to sustainability. On the other hand, the training work has a very low degree of sustainability. This is mainly due to the personnel changes that take place in the country's public institutions when there is a change of government. The continuity of the efforts of international cooperation projects is consequently negatively affected.

The Project has three very significant sustainability elements:

1. The platforms have created excitement at different scales and sectors. The role of the Platforms is appreciated and recognized as important by all the stakeholders interviewed during the evaluation exercise. Interest in continuing to participate in the activities of the Platforms is very high. The evaluation considers that the level of participation in the activities organized within the framework of the Platforms by the different actors will not decrease significantly in the future. This will depend on who is leading them and whether the issues addressed are still meaningful to the parties.
2. SIAM has been remarkably improved. The certification process is now transparent and this can lead to better relations between producers and MADES.

3. The Naranjal Sustentable initiative and the one undertaken with UNICOOP for the certifications present elements of sustainability and shows that the Project is scalable with the joint efforts of different institutions and organizations.

Finally, the two commodities, and therefore the effectiveness of the Platforms in promoting the sustainability of production, may take advantage of (suffer) from favorable (unfavorable) contingencies that occur in the international market. According to what the representatives of the traders have reported, the international soybean market is the determining factor for their corporate decisions. The international market therefore represents an opportunity and a risk for the sustainability of the Project. The evaluation exercise does not have the necessary scope to provide more details in this regard.

Finally, the evaluation highlights that no environmental risks have been identified that could compromise the sustainability of the Project.

3.3.7. Impact

The installation of a governance and dialogue framework between the main actors of the agri-environmental sector in the pilot territories and with national effect on the adjustments of strategic regulations, referred to in Result 1, will clearly mean an important impact of the project.

The Soy and Beef Platforms lead to the achievement of the reduction of ecological tension in BAAPA in the long term since they facilitate the dialogue of the productive and environmental sector. They can encourage official regulations and actions of the private sector to improve environmentally friendly practices and restore degraded areas in the soybean and livestock production landscape, tending, in the long term, to greater biological connectivity.

Several of the interviewed actors agree that, thanks to the Project, the link of environmental aspects with soybean and beef production has been installed in the different spheres of action. This is evidenced in the great effort of the Project in promoting Good Agricultural Practices, as a tool for the productive, environmental and social management of the farm. A process started, and it is not exclusively productivist, as was generally understood by the main unions of production and government referents.

The Project has generated the GAP Manual for the cultivation of soybeans and other grains, a validated instrument to facilitate field work in reducing environmental pollution, restoring water channels and other environmentally friendly practices in soybean production. This instrument has been able to generate a high degree of appropriation on the part of the relevant actors of the productive sector and around this has generated consensus. If it can be institutionalized, with probable permanence as a normative instrument, it may generate environmental impacts directly related to the adoption of good practices.

Almost all of the interviewees consider the establishment of the two Platforms at the national and departmental level a change in the panorama of relations between the actors of the two supply chains. It is the conviction of the interviewees that without the implementation of the Project, such a change could not have occurred on the initiative of the actors of the two sectors. From this perspective, the establishment of the two Platforms can be considered an impact of the Project. In short, without the Project, the dialogue between the actors would not have occurred in the same way and intensity. Most likely, the actors in the sector would have continued with their own individual initiatives disconnected from each other.

According to the interviews carried out by the Evaluation Team, the soy and beef Platforms by facilitating the meeting and dialogue between actors can promote sustainability not only in the environmental sphere, but in other areas that complement the concept of sustainability beyond the environment. These areas, already identified in the Sustainable Commodities Plans of Alto Paraná and Itapúa drafted and agreed upon within the framework of the two departmental Platforms, are the following:

1. Environmental area considers the problems and causes that affect the set of physical, chemical, biological components in the space, in which the production of commodities takes place (living beings, objects, water, soil, air and the relationships between them), in the project intervention areas and at a specific time, which influence the life of human beings today and in future generations.
2. Social area addresses the problems and causes that affect society due to the practices derived from the production of commodities in the country.
3. Institutional / Legal area considers the problems related to existing regulations and to organizations of the State, the private sector or organized civil society.

4. Market, Logistics and Financing area considers problems related to the supply and demand of commodities, as well as the logistical aspects derived from their productive chains and the necessary financing.
5. Production area refers to the activities of production or related to it; and it is related to the problems and causes that arise in the productive process and the productive capacity of the country with regard to soy and beef commodities.
6. Knowledge, Research and Communication area is defined by the action of knowing facts or information by a person through experience or education, the theoretical or practical understanding of a matter or topic.

It is important to note that, up to the moment of this evaluation, the Platforms have not generated a significant impact, in terms of actions on the ground that goes beyond the project results⁴.

The evaluation records the following important data in terms of impacts that have occurred during the implementation of the Project⁵:

- Gender ⇒ The role of women in the two supply chains has been visualized and made known.
- Capacities ⇒ There have been 122 training / information events reaching a total of 16,383 participants.

The assessment did not have the scope necessary to assess the gender and capacity impact at the supply chain level in detail. It is, however, very likely that the effort launched by the Project and the Platforms has caused positive progress in terms of gender equality and capacities. In this regard, the evaluation records a general appreciation of the interviewees towards the Project's commitment in the two areas.

The other clear impact of the Project are those achieved around the Environmental Monitoring System (SIAM). This innovative computer platform for the national environmental system is generating transparency in environmental management processes and even democratization of management, by facilitating complaints and transparency in monitoring them. This will pay off in reducing stresses on the environment.

Finally, in Itapuá and Alto Paraná there are now guidelines for actions agreed upon by the departmental platforms both in the soy sector and in the livestock sector: the challenge now is to carry them out effectively. This includes also finding sources of funding and identifying the responsibilities of the stakeholders involved.

4. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

4.1. Conclusions

The evaluation exercise formulates 12 conclusions:

Conclusion n° 1

Due to its complexity and its innovative nature, the Project is paradigmatic. It clearly visualizes the challenges and efforts that must be coordinated at different scales and with different actors to advance towards the fulfillment of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) of the 2030 Agenda.

Conclusion n° 2

The Project originates from the recognition that a broad consensus among the actors of the soy and beef supply chains towards environmental sustainability is necessary for the conservation of environmental resources. The regulatory framework, and the capacities of public institutions and their efforts to enforce laws are not sufficient to guarantee sustainable development. To generate consensus, the Project has been set up as a pilot experience specifically related to the establishment of the Soy and Beef Platforms. It has generated enthusiasm in the participating actors and has laid the foundations for future work with the drafting of the Sustainable Commodities Plan. The work of translating the plans into concrete actions in the field that include defined work strategies, financial resources, responsibilities and concrete goals is still pending. It is highlighted that the Platform process was not described in the ProDoc and therefore there were no defined indicators.

Conclusion n° 3

The path towards more sustainable production has been laid out by the Project. If continuity is not assured, all work done will turn out to be largely lost. Due to the divergent interests that require a broad and articulated negotiation work, it is evident that such continuity must be guaranteed both in the short and long term. In the short

⁴ These are already analyzed in sections 3.3.1. Achievements and 3.3.3 Effectiveness and efficiency

⁵ Details are included in section 3.3.3 Effectiveness and efficiency

term, GEF resources, already available to UNDP under the project known as Green Chaco, will provide the necessary support.

Conclusion n° 4

The indicators in the Outcome Framework are, in many cases, not relevant or very ambitious. This occurrence has made the Outcome Framework a tool of little utility in order to monitor and report on the activities and achievements of the Project.

The formal achievements related to meeting the indicator targets, as identified in the Results Framework, have fallen short of expectations. In particular, the evaluation registers a low fulfillment of the goals related to elements of ecological importance that have been really grounded in the field both in the part of improving agricultural practices and in the part of forest restoration.

On the other hand, the fulfilment of the goals has been satisfactory for all those indicators that have to do with the activities related to the support to the public institutions and the approach with small communities, including indigenous ones. This type of work is not new to UNDP / GEF projects.

Finally, the evaluation highlights that any indicator in the Results Framework did not directly capture the novelty of the Project, i.e. the work of the Platforms as a means of negotiation and search for consensual solutions. All work done in this regard by the Project is substantially not systematically measured in any document. The Project Implementation Review (PIR), i.e. the main reporting tools of the GEF / UNDP Projects, does not allow the reader to perceive the complexity of the process. The Evaluation Team itself has learned about the complexity only through interviews with the actors involved.

Conclusion n° 5

Throughout the implementation of the Project, the issue of long-term financing of the Platforms by its members has not been addressed as a necessary issue for their sustainability. It is a matter of complicated solution due to their nature. They are platforms that bring together divergent interests that make participants interested, but, not being able to ensure certain results, they make it difficult for the participants to commit to direct financing: a company could find itself in the position of financing something that does not align with its corporate interests. This is unlikely to happen. The Project represents the first cycle of financing with international cooperation funds and other cycles will require these types of funds. It is evident to all the interviewed stakeholders that the commodity platforms in the long term must have the capacity to finance their institutional operation with their own resources. However, the need for successive cycles of external funding should not be considered a failure of the Project. None of the national platforms of the Green Commodities Program is currently capable of self-financing⁶.

Conclusion n° 6

The work of the Platforms, by its very nature, has had a very consensus-oriented approach to field production practices. That is clearly a reflection of the primary interests of supply chain actors. The ability of the Commodity Platforms to generate changes outside of what directly concerns the productive plots and the beef and soy processing establishments has not been fully understood by the evaluation process. It is, however, evident that soybean plots and livestock establishments are the areas where the interests and investments of producers and processors are concentrated. The ability to promote the creation and restoration of native forests and biological corridors is, in the short and medium term, beyond the reach of the Platforms. Such activities stay necessarily under the responsibility of public institutions.

Conclusion n° 7

The Platform's work has shown that it needs long times to land with relevant actions in environmental terms with the productive sectors. The work that is typically done with NGOs and indigenous and family farming communities has proven faster and more effective in the short term. This is an almost obvious finding, but it is an important one. The capacities to generate changes in the BAAPA MULs in terms of biodiversity and connectivity in the life years of GEF projects is undoubtedly more viable by concentrating efforts in the areas of influence of the protected areas and working with indigenous communities and small farming communities. Working with the productive sectors implies deeper systemic change that by their very nature takes more time to take place. A more balanced action between the two implementation routes could have achieved the results stipulated in the Project.

⁶ The Green Commodities Programme includes 12 countries and works with 8 commodities at global level (coffee, fishery, pineapple, livestock, cashmere, palm oil, soy and cocoa)

Conclusion n° 8

The Project Communication Plan by communicating the Project activities to promote the participation of the stakeholders (especially producers) and by increasing the transparency of the implementation has been established as an element of efficiency in the management of public resources.

Conclusion n° 9

The Project has promoted gender equality. However, the evaluation has not been able to measure its implication in supply chains in detail. However, the Project has been able to establish the Platform of Women Leaders of the Sustainable Commodities Productive Chain, which has been spontaneously originated as an idea by the will of women to visualize the role of women in rural development towards sustainability. The Project Team has then worked to ensure the participation of women in differentiated events in which they could express their realities and visions.

Conclusion n° 10

The establishment of the Platforms is considered an impact of the Project. The stakeholders interviewed by the Evaluation Team agree that, without the Project, the stakeholders would have continued to deal with the environmental sustainability of their operations only individually. A collective and articulated effort would not have simply taken place.

Conclusion n° 11

By generating spaces for discussions between all the stakeholders of the two most important commodities in the national agricultural sector, any representative of the salaried employees of the field was involved. The lack of participation of representatives of the salaried employees represents a gap in the implementation of the Project: it is notorious that the conditions of workers in the agricultural sector, national and global, do not always comply with decent work standards. It is equally well known that they are the most vulnerable, due to economic and social conditions, of the two supply chains of the sector. Furthermore, women are the most vulnerable. Among them, the condition of workers, indigenous and migrants is extremely exposed to vulnerabilities, sometimes even their human rights are not respected. Result 2 of the UNDP Paraguay Country Program promotes decent work and takes into account rights and gender. The UNDP National Report on Human Development (2013) identifies forced labor problems in Chaco and the consultancy report "Inclusion of the Gender Perspective in Good Agricultural and Livestock Practices", carried out within the framework of the Project, also exposes very critical points regarding the conditions of women. This gap is therefore especially important from the institutional perspective of UNDP. However, the non-participation of employee representatives in the platforms is partially justified by two elements: they are not identified as actors in the ProDoc and there is no union organization organized at the national level. The lack of inclusion of salaried workers represents a social risk of the Project, which has not been identified by the UNDP.

Conclusion n° 12

The public sector co-financiers (MADES, MAG, INFONA) and the NGOs have not communicated the data regarding their planned co-financing.

4.2 Lessons learned

The evaluation has identified four lessons learned of interest to UNDP and MADES relevant to their areas of commitment and institutional work.

Lesson learned n° 1

GEF projects are projects oriented to action and to determine systemic change. They call for the realization of products and the achievement of results and include knowledge generation, capacity building and collaboration with many partners. In terms of implementation and execution, the GEF encourages broad participation from a variety of stakeholders, covering the public and private sector, communities, academia, and NGOs. Due to these characteristics, the GEF are complex and ambitious projects and, for this reason, they imply that the partners share as soon as possible a common vision of the path towards results and a clear division of roles. As these conditions are not met, the delays and implementation problems, that are generated, are difficult to recover in terms of achievements. The novel approach envisaged in the ProDoc, that is, a mapping and stakeholder engagement plan, the effective involvement of the private sector during implementation, and the creation of consensus among sometimes even divergent interests, adds to the typical ambition of GEF projects. It is, therefore, important that as soon as possible a collaboration strategy between actors is visualized to land the activities necessary to fulfill the indicators on the ground.

Lesson learned n° 2

The actors of the soybean and livestock sectors of the country were aware of the need to give sustainability to their way of operating. However, they were individual concerns at the level of the company and private sector unions, which did not by itself, have the potential to promote a process of reflection at the national level. They lacked an operational framework of reference to come together and start a dialogue that would collect these concerns and allow the identification of sector solutions. With the Project, the need for sectoral and inter-sectoral coordination has become evident to advance the issue of sustainability in the production of commodities that have a very significant environmental impact at the country level.

International cooperation projects can represent nuclei of agglutination of actors and catalysts of processes already existing in the countries where they are developed.

Lesson learned n° 3

The bottom-up approach that has characterized the formation of the Platforms first at the departmental level and then at the national level has allowed an effective involvement of the Project stakeholders. In fact, agricultural production is located in a territory far from the capital. Recognizing the role of the actors at the territorial level has been a key element in the formation of the Platforms and has strongly influenced the achievements on the ground. The case of Naranjal and UNICOOP from this point of view are considered paradigmatic for this evaluation.

Lesson learned n° 4

The Project Team is in the process of documenting five case studies:

- Platform Experience;
- Certification of Forests for Environmental Services in indigenous communities;
- Implementation of silvopastoral systems;
- Implementation of Good Agricultural Practices; and
- Process of restoration of Protective Forests of Water Channels in Naranjal

Such a documentation exercise is important for replicability and in fact documents five lessons learned.

4.3. Recommendations

The evaluation exercise has identified seven recommendations:

Recommendation n° 1

Related to conclusions n° 2, n° 4 and n° 5

Addressed to UNDP and MADES

Have a monitoring and reporting system for the work developed by the Platforms. The system should, in principle, describe activities and indicate progress towards greater sustainability in terms of conflict resolution and consensus building. In this regard, it is possible to take advantage of some instruments created within the framework of the Global Commodities Program such as the Ladder of Change. Such an instrument monitors the incremental change of nine success criteria on a scale of 1 to 5:

- Representation of the Actors
- Actors' Attitudes Towards Dialogue
- Actors' Understanding and Attitude Towards Root Causes and Sensitive Issues
- Alignment of Interests of the Actors
- Commitment of the Executives
- Collective Action
- Financing
- Platform / Institutionalization
- Gender

It is recalled that the instrument is not formally institutionalized in the Green Communities Program but has already been used in some context of the program.

Monitoring of this type is very important also for communication issues between the implementing agency and the donor. The approach is new, it is not known how effective it can be in the short period of time to achieve results in the field. Documenting the consensus-building process makes it easier to understand what happened during a preceding funding cycle and allows for more realistic expectations for a successive funding cycle.

Recommendation n° 2*Related to conclusions n° 3 and n° 5***Addressed to UNDP and MADES**

Introduce the issue of sustainability of the Commodity Platforms to its members, taking advantage of the fact that the platforms will continue to be financed by the Chaco Verde Project. The Global Commodities Program in this regard has developed in 2018 a “Guidance Note on National Commodity Platforms –sustainability and exit strategies”. This guide identifies institutional capacity and long-term financing as the central themes for developing a sustainability strategy for the Platforms.

Recommendation n° 3*Related to conclusions n° 1, n° 2 and n° 9***Addressed to UNDP and MADES**

It is suggested that the work of the platforms be used to produce scientific knowledge in the field of promoting sustainability, building consensus and practical routes towards shared objectives through the involvement of interested academic institutions. The work of the platform as a process is itself an object of study and can be assimilated to a laboratory capable of generating inputs for the work of researchers in the social, political and economic sciences. This type of work, although not important for implementation purposes, is also necessary to foster debate on the 2030 Agenda at both the national and international levels.

Recommendation n° 4*Related to conclusion n° 7***Addressed to UNDP, MADES and MAG**

The process of operationalization of the action guidelines of the platforms is a favorable space for the strengthening of capacities. It is important to do an exercise from the very beginning to define who can finance the different actions within the actors of the platforms and to see which actions related to forest restoration and ecosystem connectivity should be implemented in cooperation with indigenous communities and small communities. In this way, it is possible, on the one hand, to advance with the negotiation work and improvements towards the sustainability of agricultural production systems, and on the other, in the typical period of time of development projects, that is, 5 years, to achieve more significant objectives in terms of environmental conservation. In addition, this type of exercise can visualize the degree of commitment of each actor to the conservation and restoration of ecosystems both in the short and medium term and therefore start a planning of interventions that take into account the real possibilities of private sector involvement.

Recommendation n° 5*Related to conclusion n° 11***Addressed to UNDP and MAG**

Incorporate representatives of rural salaried workers in the operation of the Platforms. Although there is no reference union for the sector, it is very likely that there are formal or informal associations and groups promoting labour rights that deal with agriculture and livestock. The inclusion of these actors is very important for UNDP to fully comply with some of its principles of promoting human rights, governance for inclusive societies, gender equality and empowerment of women. The evaluation, therefore, suggests that a mapping be made of the groups and / or associations that represent the interests of workers in the agricultural sector at the national level. Then, the identified groups can be invited on specific occasions to give talks at Platform events to promote the interests of these actors.

Recommendation n° 6*Related to conclusion n° 11***Addressed to UNDP**

Update the SESP of the Green Chaco project to include as an economic-social risk the lack of representation and participation of salaried workers in the Platforms.

Recommendation n° 7*Related to conclusions n° 4 and n° 7***Addressed to UNDP**

When new initiatives are formulated, with characteristics similar to the evaluated Project, it is important to identify risks and valid assumptions and define indicators that are within the scope of the Project during its implementation period. If a work is proposed with the productive sector, it is therefore important to limit the indicators to the changes that can be promoted in the supply of a given commodity. Indicators that measure achievements in the demand for a commodity are very ambitious and difficult to achieve during the term of a 5-year project. In

addition, when a project has both a productive and environmental objective, it is preferable to envision, already in ProDoc, a two-way strategy that allows the achievement of the objectives through the involvement of the private sector and through typical UNDP implementation mechanisms, i.e. support to environmental NGOs, small producers and indigenous communities.

ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

To the comments received on 11/12/20 from the Terminal Evaluation of Paisajes de Producción Verde – Green Commodities The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator's name) and track change comment number ("#" column):

Institution/ Organization	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken
MADES	1	General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. El informe de evaluación se centra mucho en los resultados de la Plataforma de Commodities Sustentables, el cual es solo uno de los resultados del proyecto PPV. 2. Se solicita mayor detalle en la valoración de los productos adicionales (Ejemplo, el SIAM). <p>Considerando que los resultados del proyecto y de esta evaluación final, serán utilizados como línea de base para otros proyectos de fines similares, se recomienda:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Ser más específicos y detallados en la valoración del cumplimiento de todos los indicadores del proyecto. 4. Enfatizar y detallar las limitaciones y deficiencias observadas en el cumplimiento de los objetivos e indicadores. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Es una consecuencia del hecho que los actores entrevistados, con la excepción de PNUD y instituciones nacionales, estaba enterados de las actividades de las Plataformas. Además, el trabajo de apoyo al sector público en relación a las mejoras de capacidad, al apoyo al SIAM y la mejora del marco regulatorio son los elementos que constituyen el impacto en la tabla de calificación. 2. Son valorados como se dice en el punto 1 3. Los indicadores son detallados y valorados en el apartado 3.3.1 que es redactado específicamente con este fin. 4. Véase el punto precedente. Además en el apartado 3..1.1 hay el análisis de cada indicador.
UNDP Panamá	2	General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Favor revisar la redacción y ortografía del documento en general (ver temas resaltados en amarillo que requieren corrección). 2. No se indica si las recomendaciones de la MTR se acogieron y si fueron de utilidad para la consecución de resultados. 3. Las conclusiones hacen énfasis en los hallazgos relacionados a la plataforma de manera prioritaria, cuando este enfoque debería darse a los hallazgos del prodoc evaluado en su totalidad. Aplica lo mismo para las recomendaciones. 4. En la conclusión 11 se menciona problemáticas de falta de inclusión en las plataformas de grupos vulnerables y de mujeres en particular, lo que es un desencadenante de los estándares del SES del PNUD, lo que implica que se debe revisar cuando se dice en el informe que no hay riesgos socio-ambientales asociados; y además, habría que actualizar el SESP por estos riesgos. 5. Notar que no hay conclusiones relacionadas con género, riesgos, cofinanciamiento e involucramiento de actores. 	<p>Esto puntos son repetidos en otras partes del informe como comentarios individuales. Se proporcionan respuesta a cada comentario.</p> <p>La redacción y ortografía del documento ha sido revisada. Es verdad, lamentablemente había algunos errores de tipeo, sobretodo falta de concordancia en el numero entre sustantivos y adjetivos (sustantivos declinados al plural con adjetivos declinados al singular)</p>

			6. Las recomendaciones deben estar redactadas como acciones a realizar. Favor revisar este hecho en la sección respectiva.	
UNDP Panamá	3	p. ii Resumen Ejecutivo	Extender celda para que se vea toda la tabla	Hecho
UNDP Panamá	4	Tabla de calificación de la evaluación - Efectividad	Favor tomar nota que esto es en función a lo que dice el Prodoc	Eso es en línea con el ProDoc. No se limita solo al cumplimiento de los resultados, sino busca investigar otros efectos del Proyecto sobre todo en enfrentar las barreras evidenciada en el Prodoc.
UNDP Panamá	5	Tabla de calificación de la evaluación - Eficiencia	Favor tomar nota que esto es en función a lo que dice el Prodoc	El Proyecto sufrió de un diseño muy débil. Los cofinanciadores privado pusieron el dinero establecidos en las cartas de co-financiamiento. Las dos revisiones han sido pertinentes. No se podían cambiar muchos indicadores. Nosotros hemos visto que el trabajo en termino de manejo fue importante, aunque chocara con un Prodoc y un Marco de Resultados no funcionales a una buena implementación. El rating resalta tanto los problemas del Prodoc cuanto los esfuerzos puesto en marcha para sobrepasar los problemas del diseño (buena gestión adaptativa).
UNDP Panamá	6	Tabla de calificación de la evaluación - Riesgos socio-económicos	Revisar en relación a mis comentarios generales en relación a la conclusión 11..	Estos riesgos para la sostenibilidad son bajo. La falta de inclusion de los trabajadores asalariados no constituye un riesgo para la sostenibilidad
UNDP Panamá	7	Tabla de calificación de la evaluación - Riesgos institucionales y de gobernanza	Revisar en relación a mis comentarios generales en relación a la conclusión 11..	Esto riesgos son definidos moderados
UNDP Panamá	8	Tabla de calificación de la evaluación - Riesgos ambientales	Revisar en relación a mis comentarios generales en relación a la conclusión 11..	No hay riesgos ambientales
UNDP Panamá	9	Resumen de conclusiones, lecciones aprendidas y recomendaciones Conclusiones	Revisar mis comentarios en las conclusiones y recomendaciones al final	Hecho. Se responde a cada comentario individualmente.
UNDP Panamá	10	Abreviaturas y siglas	Mantener abreviaturas en español, y si procede entre paréntesis su traducción en inglés.. mismo formato para todas	Hecho
UNDP Panamá	11	El Ind. 3 "Reducción directa de presiones en ecosistemas de bosques de sectores de producción,	Parte de la MTR y/o del proyecto mismo es evaluar cómo medir sus indicadores, y de no ser posible, proponer los cambios respectivos	Habían mucho "errores" relativos a indicadores. El Proyecto no pudo hacer cambios a todo el marco de resultados. Ese apartado refiere al diseño. Además, la

		tal como se evidencia por % de reducción en el uso de leña de bosques nativos por parte de silos y secadoras de granos.” no es medible porque ninguna institución/organización se encarga en el país de esta medición. Al		MTR no recomienda nada específico en términos de cambio de indicadores.
UNDP Panamá	12	La evaluación considera que el Marco de resultados no ha sido de apoyo efectivo para la toma de decisiones a todos los niveles de manejo del Proyecto, es decir Junta Directiva, Comité Técnico y Unidad de Proyecto.	Se debería mencionar algo en relación a la MTR y como debía aprovecharse esta para mejorar el marco de resultados del proyecto.	Ese apartado refiere al diseño. Además la MTR ha evidenciado simplemente que los indicadores no eran adapto. El punto es que se debían cambiar muchísimos de ellos. Es realmente un marco lógico que según nuestro análisis no permite el SyE. Necesitaria de cambio profundísimos. Todo el apartado describe 10 indicadores como adapto, 5 como no adapto y 3 con problemas (o sea casi el 50% de los indicadores).
UNDP Panamá	13	El monitoreo diario del avance de la implementación ha sido como diseñado en el ProDoc. La Unidad de Proyecto tenía la responsabilidad de monitorear el Proyecto. Hasta aproximadamente a la revisión de medio término la implementación y el monitoreo de proyecto supervisada por resultado, la Unidad de Proyecto tenía a disposición un encargado por cada uno de los resultados. Luego se ha procedido según las indicaciones de la revisión,	Ver redacción.. Además se puede decantar que si el marco de resultados no se diseñó de manera satisfactoria, lo propio el protocolo de M&E	Redacción corregida. Además, añadimos algo sobre el tema indicadores al final del apartado y que en el marco de resultados fuese caracterizado por un gran número de indicadores inapropiados a medir el desempeño del Proyecto

		<p>achicando la Unidad de Proyecto.</p> <p>La evaluación considera el haber tomado en cuenta las recomendaciones de la revisión de medio término como elemento que ha reforzado la ejecución del Proyecto. Además, resalta que la Unidad de Proyecto ha puesto en marcha todos los elementos de SyE incluidos en el Marco de resultados del ProDoc. El problema en termino de seguimiento es representado por hecho que no se han planificado en fase de diseño ninguna herramienta para monitorear el desarrollo de las Plataformas. Durante la implementación tampoco se han desarrollado y adoptado herramienta a tal fin.</p>		
UNDP Panamá	14	<p>El Equipo Evaluador ha recibido información sobre la cofinanciación del Proyecto solo por parte de dos traders, ADM y LDC. Los otros co-financiadores del Proyecto no ha enviado ningún tipo de información al respecto.</p>	Hay que garantizar la complementación de esta información al cierre del informe	Pusimos los datos de cofinanciación que hemos recibido por los socios de proyectos
UNDP Panamá	15	3.3 Resultados del proyecto	Falta incluir la valoración de la evaluación para este indicador	No hay valoración, porque el indicador no es medible.

		<p>3.3.1. Resultados generales (logro de los objetivos)</p> <p>.....El INFONA reportó 6.846 Tn de leña de producción registrada, de los cuales 279 Toneladas corresponden a producción en las áreas piloto del proyecto.</p>		
UNDP Panamá	16	<p>3.3 Resultados del proyecto</p> <p>3.3.1. Resultados generales (logro de los objetivos)</p> <p>.....Por lo tanto, la meta ha sido alcanzada muy parcialmente.</p>	???? 2,7% de 20% parcialmente??	Muy parcialmente. El comentario es muy pertinente. Se añadió el cumplimiento es insignificante.
UNDP Panamá	17	<p>3.3 Resultados del proyecto</p> <p>3.3.1. Resultados generales (logro de los objetivos)</p> <p>.....El Proyecto espera poder realizar una actualización de este valor antes de la finalización del mismo, considerando que se aguarda la publicación de los mapas oficiales de cobertura forestal del INFONA/MADES.</p>	No creo q quede tiempo para hacer esto...	<p>El Proyecto espera poder realizar una actualización de este valor antes de la finalización del mismo, considerando que se aguarda la publicación de los mapas oficiales de cobertura forestal del INFONA/MADES</p> <p>Cambiado en</p> <p>Aunque falte menos de un mes al cierre del Proyecto, se espera poder realizar una actualización de este valor antes de la finalización del mismo, considerando que se aguarda la publicación de los mapas oficiales de cobertura forestal del INFONA/MADES</p>
UNDP Panamá	18	<p>3.3 Resultados del proyecto</p> <p>3.3.1. Resultados generales (logro de los objetivos)</p> <p>.....Las metas del indicador han sido formalmente cumplidas.</p>		

UNDP Panamá	19	Las metas del indicador han sido formalmente cumplidas por el 15,4% (meta a) y por el 179% (meta b). El número total de hectáreas lista para o ya bajo esquemas de certificación queda al 70,0%. No se considera por lo tanto el indicador completamente cumplido.	No se entiende muy bien esta parte	Se ha cambiado la formulación: Las metas del indicador han sido formalmente cumplidas por el 15,4% (meta a) y por el 179% (meta b). El número total de hectáreas listas para ser certificadas o ya bajo esquemas de certificación queda al 70,0%. No se considera por lo tanto el indicador completamente cumplido
UNDP Panamá	20	Teniendo en cuenta esta consideración, la evaluación afirma que las metas del indicador han sido sustancialmente cumplida por el	Con 15,4%, sustancialmente cumplida?? No queda claro	Verdad. Eliminado el adverbio sustancialmente
UNDP Panamá	21	146.043 ha de soja certificadas acumuladas a la fecha, de adquisiciones de traders, lo que corresponde a un 73% de la meta del indicador.	No se sobrepaso la meta entonces??	La meta es 50%. El cumplimiento es el 73% del 50%
UNDP Panamá	22	La herramienta de seguimiento FMAM (tracking tool) ha sido actualizada por el Equipo de Proyecto y reporta el progreso en los impactos y resultados establecidos a nivel de cartera bajo la estrategia MSF / REDD+.	Favor indicar si el TT es coherente con los resultados encontrados en esta evaluación	Al final del apartado se ha añadido El tracking tool es coherente con los resultados de la evaluación.
UNDP Panamá	23	Definitivamente se ha dado un proceso, que no está descrito en el ProDoc y por el cual no se habían definidos indicadores.	Esta debería ser una conclusión	Añadido a la conclusion 2
UNDP Panamá	23	Conclusión n° 4	Favor notar que la evaluación debe concluir en relación a lo que se tenía en el ProDoc.. en este set de conclusiones estamos haciendo más énfasis a las plataformas en lugar del ProDoc. Aun cuando la plataforma persé no era una	La conclusiones estan alineadas con el Informe de Arranque aprobado por PNUD. Los hallazgos refieren al Prodoc y como se ha dado el Proyecto. De hecho, los

			meta del proyecto, según se ha indicado en varias ocasiones. Se sugiere hacer más énfasis en las conclusiones que decantan de los hallazgos de lo que se tenía en el prodoc	hallazgos estan divididos en tres partes (diseño, ejecucion y implementación). La parte del diseno 3.1 (y sus apartados) y el Apartado 3.3.1 se ancla claramente al Prodoc. Los otros apartados del 3.3. no son necesariamente anclados al ProDoc sino responden a los criterios de Relevancia, Eficacia, Eficiencia, Impacto y Sostenibilidad por como como se ha venido implementando el Proyecto. La plataforma es lo que la gente entrevistada conoce del Proyecto: los traders, los productores, las municipalidades conocen las plataformas. El trabajo de apoyo al MADES/INFONA y al desarrollo de leyes/normativas no lo conoce la gente sino la representante del MADES/INFONA. Se habla de estas cosas, son acierto del Proyecto. Los mismo va con el trabajo del Reforestacion hecho por el Proyecto. La gente involucrada fue entrevistada. Ademas, el cumplimiento de muchos indicadores se ha dado a través de las Plataformas, es por eso que en las conclusiones de una u otra forma se abordan a las mesas
UNDP Panamá	24	Conclusión n° 4.....Esta ocurrencia ha hecho que el Marco de resultado sea una herramienta de poca utilidad a fin de monitorear y reportar sobre las actividades y los logros del Proyecto.	Se debería concluir en relación al diseño del proyecto	Esta es sobre los indicadores, que son parte del diseño
UNDP Panamá	25	Conclusión n° 11	Lo que se indica en esta conclusión es que si hay riesgos socio-ambientales, según lo que se indica en el SES del PNUD y se refleja en el SESP.. favor revisar los textos asociados y hacer los cambios que procedan. Con esto, el SESP debe ser actualizado	A pagina 10 se añadió . Sin embargo, no se ha evidenciado el riesgo asociado a la exclusión de las trabajadoras y trabajadores asalariados. Acá no añadimos algo porque este riesgo no implica mucho para la sostenibilidad de la iniciativa
UNDP Panamá	26	Conclusión n° 12	Notar que no hay conclusiones relacionadas con género, riesgos, cofinanciamiento e involucramiento de actores.	Las conclusiones n.1, n.2, n.4, n.5 y n.8 son relacionada al involucramiento de actores La conclusión n.9 es relacionada con género. El cofinanciamiento no lo teníamos. Ahora ya tenemos la conclusión n. 12

				Los riesgos no son tales de merecer una conclusión. Las conclusiones 3 y 5 incluyen el concepto de riesgo a futuro implícitamente en su formulación.
UNDP Panamá	27	Recomendación n° 1	Las recomendaciones deben estar redactadas como acciones a realizar. Favor revisar este hecho	Son redactadas como acciones a realizar. No entiendo el comentario. No tenemos un horizonte espacial y temporal porque no podemos saber cómo va a seguir en detalle. Por ejemplo, la conclusión n.3 en ese sentido es clara "El camino hacia una producción más sostenibilidad ha sido trazado por el Proyecto. Si no se le asegura continuidad, todo el trabajo hecho resultará en gran parte perdido." La recomendación n. 2 dice claramente que el tema sostenibilidad debe ser discutido en las plataformas aprovechando del proyecto Green Chaco. Más de este no podemos decir, no sabemos lo que va a pasar. No es una revisión de medio término en la cual se podía también incluir un timeline. Aca identificamos los actores a los cuales va dirigida la recomendación, identificamos el anclaje con las conclusiones que están relacionada directamente a los hallazgos,
UNDP Panamá	28	Recomendación n° 1 Relacionada a las conclusiones n° 2, n° 4 y n° 5	No se recomienda nada en relación con el diseño del proyecto. Si bien es cierto, el M&E es muy importante, este no va a ser posible sin un buen diseño del proyecto.. Favor recomendar al respecto	Se escribió la rec. n.7
UNDP Panamá	29	Recomendación n° 4	Acá la recomendación debería complementarse indicando que es necesario revisar el SESP del proyecto Green Chaco, para que este riesgo se valore.. y lo propio para el tema de género en la participación de las plataformas	Escritas tres recomendaciones más (las n. 4, 6 y 7). La rec. n. 5 ya trataba de persona vulnerables (trabajadores y trabajadoras).
UNDP Panamá	30	VARIAS SECCIONES	Correcciones varias de gramática	Revisado
UNDP Paraguay	31	p. iii Tabla de calificación de la evaluación (Seguimiento y evaluación)	No se considera insatisfactorio. No le corresponde al Equipo corregir una deficiencia en el marco de resultados, todas las instancias se adhieron al S&E planteado con creces. En todo momento se trabajó con el Comité Técnico para revisar el POA del proyecto, revisar avances y otros documentos; es decir, se excedieron los monitoreos ya que no solo se hicieron cada 3 meses, sino de forma periódica, para avanzar en la dirección correcta. El Equipo tomó en cuenta lo que se planteó en la Evaluación de Medio Término.	Ese es un promedio de los dos siguientes
UNDP Paraguay	32	p. iii Tabla de calificación de la evaluación (Seguimiento y evaluación)	El marco de seguimiento fue estructurado con instancias multidisciplinarias (respondiendo a objetivos trazados por el GEF) y este Proyecto se considera innovador porque fue uno de los primeros en trabajar en 3 áreas inexploradas por otros: aterrizaje en terreno, trabajo con commodities e involucramiento	No se puede cambiar. Este punto justamente tiene que ver con el PRODOC (diseño al comienzo del proyecto). Los indicadores no son útiles a fin de monitorear el Proyecto.

			<p>del sector privado. Sobre este punto, en las revisiones sustantivas no hubo mayores correcciones.</p> <p>Es importante resaltar que al inicio del proyecto se estaba comenzando recién el proceso de construcción de plataformas, por ello no se delinearón herramientas de SyE independientes para la Plataforma. De todos modos, consideramos una buena recomendación contemplar herramientas de seguimiento a la Plataforma.</p>	
UNDP Paraguay	33	p. iii Tabla de calificación de la evaluación (Seguimiento y evaluación)	<p>Como mencionado en el punto anterior, las plataformas nacionales son muy recientes, la Nacional de Soja (lanzada a fines de 2019) recién está tomando cuerpo este año y la Nacional de Carne recién se lanzó el mes pasado, por lo que a nuestro criterio correspondería una calificación superior.</p> <p>Las plataformas no contemplaban un SyE específico porque estaban contempladas dentro del plan de SyE del Proyecto, debido a que las plataformas son un resultado más del proyecto. No obstante, esta recomendación se considera útil trasladar a instancias de decisión de las plataformas para que la implementación de las 2 Plataformas Nacionales (carne y soja), puedan iniciarse con el diseño de un plan de monitoreo específico con indicadores específicos para medir la creación de consenso y las negociaciones.</p> <p>¿Qué propuestas tienen los Evaluadores para implementar, especialmente para el caso de Carne que está recién arrancando?</p> <p>Si bien no tuvo un plan de seguimiento específico, siempre se midió el nivel de participación y los avances en las Plataformas.</p> <p>Se puede tomar en cuenta esta recomendación y trabajar en la construcción de indicadores de Seguimiento.</p>	<p>Ese se considera un punto esencial del ejercicio evaluativo. Lamentablemente no se puede cambiar. Es un hecho que el trabajo de plataforma, que es en la opinión de todos los entrevistados, el GRANDE TEMA INOVADOR del Proyecto, no tuvo una herramienta de seguimiento. Esta herramienta es de fácil acceso, era suficiente pedírsela al macro-proyecto Global Green Commodities que tiene, aunque no institucionanlizado, el instrumento ladder of change.</p> <p>Nosotros proponemos el ladder of change. Como instrumento para las dos commodities.</p>
UNDP Paraguay	34	p. iii Tabla de calificación de la evaluación (Ejecución de los OA y OE)	<p>Ya respondido lo de Plataforma en el punto anterior (se monitorearon las plataformas dentro del POA y plan de monitoreo del Proyecto). Dentro del Marco de resultados solo un indicador responde a la Plataforma; sin embargo, sería importante como lección aprendida indicar que por su importancia las plataformas deberían tener un propio plan de monitoreo con indicadores específicos, como explicado en el punto anterior.</p>	
UNDP Paraguay	35	p. iii Tabla de calificación de la evaluación (Ejecución de los OA y OE)	<p>Se considera que ha sido destacado el rol del MADES, ya que desde los inicios asumió el liderazgo del proyecto, a pesar de las restricciones estructurales y presupuestarias (no existe una Dirección de Producción Sostenible en la institución, donde el proyecto se pueda encuadrar, sino que fue asumido por la Dirección de Planificación del MADES, por encima de todas las múltiples actividades que lleva esa dirección).</p> <p>¿Cómo recomiendan los evaluadores que podría mejorar el liderazgo del MADES en el abordaje de proyectos de esta naturaleza y envergadura?</p>	<p>El MADES acompañaba el Proyecto. Pero la conducción era del PNUD. Los actores referían al PNUD no al MADES. Su rol no estaba percibido por los actores entrevistados, por eso se dice que no hubo liderazgo de la institución.</p> <p>No tenemos una recomendación para mejorar el liderazgo del MADES (hemos hablado con una persona del MADES y su rol no estaba percibido por los actores entrevistados). No podemos ignorar este hecho.</p>

UNDP Paraguay	36	p. iii Tabla de calificación de la evaluación (Resultados)	<p>En el cuerpo del documento no se aprecian indicadores que den a entender que se pueda calificar como moderadamente insatisfactorio.</p> <p>Se sugiere revisar esta calificación (hacia una superior), considerando la efectividad y eficiencia y los logros obtenidos por el proyecto, citados en el documento:</p> <p>como citado en el cuerpo del documento más abajo: <i>Del otro lado, el cumplimiento de las metas ha sido satisfactorio por todos aquellos indicadores que tiene que ver con las actividades relativas al apoyo a las instituciones públicas y de abordaje con comunidades pequeñas, inclusive indígenas.</i></p> <p>Así también, lo indicado en la Conclusión N°10</p>	<p>Lo sentimos. Pero los indicadores en el apartado relevante 3.3.1 tienen nivel muy bajo de cumplimiento. El análisis viene de los PIR de Proyecto, tampoco es un hallazgo de la evaluación. En ese apartado se mencionan varios indicadores que se cumplieron solo parcialmente</p>
UNDP Paraguay	37	p. iii Tabla de calificación de la evaluación (Resultados)	<p>¿Esto se refiere a los Acuerdos de parte, verdad? No a los contratos de servicios. A pesar de poder avanzar, administrativamente hablando, los tiempos de negociación y construcción con la contraparte de los planes de trabajo igual toman su tiempo.</p> <p>No todas las organizaciones tienen la capacidad administrativa de llevar adelante la gestión de un Acuerdo de parte. Lo que requería tiempo era justamente el análisis, de parte nuestra, sobre la capacidad administrativa de la otra parte para poder llevar adelante un acuerdo, por la extensa documentación que debían presentar.</p>	<p>Se añadió algo para especificar mejor</p> <p>Los tiempos de negociación y construcción con las contrapartes del sector privado de los planes de trabajo han tomado tiempo. De hecho, las organizaciones del sector privado no tienen las capacidades administrativas para manejar este tipo de contrato. El proceso por lo tanto ha ralentizado el trabajo.</p>
UNDP Paraguay	38	p. iv Tabla de calificación de la evaluación (Sostenibilidad)	<p>Se sugiere replantear la calificación a un riesgo menor, considerando las discusiones informales en el seno de las plataformas sobre la sostenibilidad y la intención de los participantes de que se continúe con las actividades. Se confirmó en el lanzamiento de ambas plataformas la intención de continuar y considerar que ya se tiene el resultado de una consultoría, que se pondrá a discusión a través del proyecto Green Chaco.</p> <p>Respecto a lineamientos de acciones, considerar que a nivel departamental varios ya fueron ejecutados sin requerimiento de fondos del proyecto, como por ejemplo los caminos conservacionistas de Naranjal, Alto Paraná, que fueron financiados por el Municipio.</p> <p>Sobre continuar las discusiones, con Green Chaco se va a aterrizar la estrategia de sostenibilidad en las próximas reuniones, con fondos propios o de otras cooperaciones.</p> <p>Para el 2021, hay buenas probabilidades de encontrar el nicho adecuado para la sostenibilidad de las plataformas. Además, en 2 reuniones de la junta de proyecto se ha ratificado la intención de la continuidad de las plataformas.</p> <p>Sobre el costo, se debería analizar mejor, puesto que el costo de la creación e implementación preliminar de una Plataforma se considera mucho mayor a lo que implicaría el mantenimiento de un secretariado de la misma.</p> <p>Para mayor aclaración, el papel del PNUD es mantener el funcionamiento de la plataforma como espacio de diálogo, pero no comprometerse a costear todas</p>	<p>Acá el tema se refiere al financiamiento del trabajo rutinario de las plataformas. El punto que subraya Oscar es claro a nosotros del Equipo Evaluador. El punto principal es que a la pregunta sobre la financiación de la plataforma nadie nos ha dicho algo. Los entrevistados se quedaban sorprendidos por la pregunta. Como Equipo Evaluador no podemos disminuir el hecho que los que hemos entrevistados (todas personas de alto nivel jerárquico dentro sus organizaciones) nos han dicho que el tema de autofinanciación no ha sido encarado. Lamentamos no poder cambiar el rating</p>

			las líneas de acción. El planteamiento de las plataformas siempre fue que se busque la autosustentación de las líneas.	
UNDP Paraguay	39	p. iv Tabla de calificación de la evaluación (Impacto)	Nos gustaría que se mencione que, si bien el impacto a nivel general fue mínimo, a nivel de distritos piloto hubo un importante impacto, como el caso de Naranjal en el que se visualiza el esfuerzo de los productores para mejorar sus prácticas productivas y adecuarse a la legislación ambiental y sobre todo el cambio en la mentalidad del productor. El plan regional de BPA apoyará en el aumento del número de productores que implementan BPA y se contribuirá a una mejora en el estado ambiental. Un claro ejemplo de lo que se indica es que ninguno de los actores asociados al proyecto ha reclamado la extensión de la ley de deforestación cero, la cual se ha prolongado por 10 años más, más bien la han apoyado. La nueva ley es la 6.676/20.	Lamentablemente no se puede cambiar. El logro de los indicadores está bajo.
UNDP Paraguay	40	p. iv Tabla de calificación de la evaluación (Impacto)	Se sugiere poder indicar el impacto a nivel local-distrital (Naranjal)-y que hay posibilidad de replicabilidad en otros distritos o a nivel departamental, incluso en otros departamentos que no eran los piloto y con otras cooperativas. También sería importante resaltar los logros con respecto a BPA, ya que; si bien no se han logrado las hectáreas solicitadas en el indicador, se ha avanzado enormemente en la concienciación del productor, sobre la importancia de la implementación de las BPA.	Añadimos Naranjal. La menciona las BPA se incluye en Progreso hacia el cambio de la tensión y el estado ambiental
UNDP Paraguay	41	p. iv Resumen de conclusiones, lecciones aprendidas y recomendaciones Conclusiones (Conclusión 2)	A criterio de los evaluadores, ¿qué faltaría para garantizar el desarrollo sostenible?	Acá hablamos del origen del Proyecto. La evaluación no tiene respuesta a una pregunta tan general. Los desafíos del Proyecto era muy grande como evidenciado también en nuestra evaluación.
UNDP Paraguay	42	p. iv Resumen de conclusiones, lecciones aprendidas y recomendaciones Conclusiones (Conclusión 4)	Identificar indicadores de resultados que puedan ser apuntalados en nuevas iniciativas. ¿Qué indicadores de resultado u objetivo han identificado, que puedan servir para apuntalar o considerar nuevos proyectos o propuestas?	Es importante dejar los indicadores de relevancia ambiental a nivel de producción y de conservación cuando se trate de proyecto GEF. Y también los indicadores de apoyo a las capacidades públicas. Son lo evidenciado en verde el apartado 3.1.1...pero no podemos sugerir indicadores si no conocemos un proyecto.
UNDP Paraguay	43	p. v Resumen de conclusiones, lecciones aprendidas y recomendaciones Conclusiones (Conclusión 9)	Este no ha sido un proceso "espontáneo", ya que fue un arduo trabajo del equipo técnico para poder llevar a cabo la participación de las mujeres en eventos diferenciados, en los cuales podían expresar sus realidades y visiones. Es decir, ha sido un proceso elaborado: pensado, planificado y ejecutado a través de términos de referencia previamente establecidos, identificación de actores (mujeres) clave, reuniones individuales y grupales, agenda, etc. previas a la convocatoria de las reuniones.	Se ha cambiado la conclusión en

UNDP Paraguay	44	p. v Resumen de conclusiones, lecciones aprendidas y recomendaciones Conclusiones (Conclusión 11)	Como aclaración, si bien no se estableció en el PRODOC, también se incorporó al proceso de Plataformas a los productores miembros de la agricultura familiar y a pequeños productores de soja.	El establecimiento de la Plataforma de Mujeres Líderes de la Cadena Productiva de Commodities Sustentables por el Proyecto se ha dado en forma espontánea como idea por voluntad de las mujeres para visualizar el rol de las mujeres en el desarrollo rural hacia la sostenibilidad. El Equipo técnico ha luego trabajado para poder asegurar la participación de las mujeres en eventos diferenciados, en los cuales podían expresar sus realidades y visiones.
UNDP Paraguay	45	p. v Resumen de conclusiones, lecciones aprendidas y recomendaciones Conclusiones (Conclusión 12)	El 03/12/20 la Cámara de Senadores aprobó por amplia mayoría la extensión por 10 años de la ley de deforestación cero. Nuevamente se menciona que ninguno de los asociados puso objeciones para la extensión de esta ley, sino por el contrario, la misma fue apoyada.	Se ha borrado Era relevante cuando el borrador fue entregado
UNDP Paraguay	46	p. v Resumen de conclusiones, lecciones aprendidas y recomendaciones Conclusiones (Lección aprendida n° 1)	En la etapa de diseño se hizo un mapeo y plan de involucramiento de actores se han realizado al inicio del proyecto y están contenidos en el PRODOC. La estrategia de colaboración de actores para el proyecto incluye al comité técnico del proyecto en el cual están representes de instituciones del sector público y privado, y con los cuales se trabajaron y consensuaron cada uno de los 6 POAs del proyecto, monitoreado periódicamente a lo largo de cada año, así como también con la Junta del Proyecto. Adicionalmente, en el seno de las plataformas se conformaron Juntas y Grupos de trabajo con el objetivo de maximizar la colaboración entre actores. A través de los acuerdos con los gremios, el sector privado, municipalidades y gobiernos departamentales, se acordaron las colaboraciones para las acciones en terreno. También se trabajó con las binacionales (EBY e Itaipu) y la Academia	Se ha cambiado la redacción en El abordaje novedoso previsto en el ProDoc, es decir un mapeo y plan de involucramiento de actores, el efectivo involucramiento del sector privado durante la implementación y la creación de consenso entre intereses a veces hasta divergentes, suma a la ambición característica de los proyectos FMAM. Es importante por lo tanto que lo más pronto posible una estrategia de colaboración entre actores sea visualizada para aterrizar en terreno las actividades necesarias al cumplimiento de los indicadores.
UNDP Paraguay	47	p. vi Resumen de conclusiones, lecciones aprendidas y recomendaciones Conclusiones (Lección aprendida n° 4)	Uno de los mayores logros es la exención de tasas para las comunidades indígenas, para la adhesión al régimen de servicios ambientales del MADES. Así también, el MADES ha eliminado el cotejo del plano por parte del Servicio Nacional de Catastro (gestión que demoraba a veces hasta un año, por la falta de capacidad institucional), siendo ahora solo necesario que sea el INDI quien coteje esa información y emita un dictamen. Bajo la Resolución 193/2020.	Eso no se reporta. Acá, se reporta el hecho que hay lecciones aprendidas al respecto.
UNDP Paraguay	48	p. vi	En lo que respecta a SSP, si bien no se lograron las hectáreas solicitadas en los indicadores, se ha visto que posterior al apoyo del proyecto, varios beneficiarios han ampliado sus extensiones de SSP con fondos propios, como	Eso no se reporta. Acá, se reporta el hecho que hay lecciones aprendidas al respecto.

		Resumen de conclusiones, lecciones aprendidas y recomendaciones Conclusiones (Lección aprendida n° 4)	el caso de Agropeco; están planificando ampliar 900 ha, Colonias Unidas; están planificando aumentar porque varios productores mostraron interés luego de ver las experiencias de éxito de otras cooperativas de UNICOOP, Doria; realizó 19 ha adicionales al momento en el que se lo apoyó y Kennedy; plantea ampliar 40 ha adicionales.	
UNDP Paraguay	49	p. vi Resumen de conclusiones, lecciones aprendidas y recomendaciones Conclusiones (Lección aprendida n° 4)	A través del plan de BPA Regional y el pedido de varios productores de adherirse a las BPA se vislumbra la replicabilidad que tuvo la aplicación de BPA con apoyo del proyecto. Se destaca el trabajo con el SENAVE para la institucionalización del proceso, tanto de la implementación como del establecimiento de un marco normativo para el efecto.	Eso no se reporta. Acá, se reporta el hecho que hay lecciones aprendidas al respecto.
UNDP Paraguay	50	p. vi Resumen de conclusiones, lecciones aprendidas y recomendaciones Conclusiones (Lección aprendida n° 4)	El INFONA está trabajando en el proceso de implementación de restauración de BPCH, con la donación de plantines, ofreciendo asistencia técnica y mapeando los BPCH que se van registrando. Asimismo, han realizado el ajuste al marco normativo para flexibilizar el registro de BPCH, y con esto dar posibilidad a que más propietarios puedan registrar.	Eso no se reporta. Acá, se reporta el hecho que hay lecciones aprendidas al respecto.
UNDP Paraguay	51	p. vi Resumen de conclusiones, lecciones aprendidas y recomendaciones Conclusiones (Recomendación n° 1)	Se solicitan algunas recomendaciones en fortalecimiento de capacidades, debida inserción sobre el sector privado en general, perspectiva de género y algunos puntos más vinculados al proyecto.	De 4 recomendaciones pasamos a 7
UNDP Paraguay	52	p. vi Resumen de conclusiones, lecciones aprendidas y recomendaciones Conclusiones (Recomendación n° 1)	Se ha consultado con Leif Pedersen (<i>Senior Commodities Advisor</i> del GCP) sobre la herramienta LADDER OF CHANGE y el mismo ha mencionado que ésta aún no se encuentra institucionalizada, es decir, es un instrumento a ser creado, aún no está disponible en su versión final, pero será finalizado en 2021 y allí podría plantearse su aplicación.	El ladder of change ya existe. No es institucionalizado, pero nada impide que se use, se cambie, se adapte al contexto de Paraguay y de las dos commodities dentro de un proyecto GEF.
UNDP Paraguay	53	p. 8 Hallazgos	Favor aclarar este punto	Acá se dice que el Ind. y su meta no rinden la idea del trabajo hecho por las plataformas y por lo tanto no son específico. Se evidencia solo la creación de estándares mínimos.
UNDP Paraguay	54	p. 9 Hallazgos	¿Se podría identificar cuáles son los indicadores considerados relevantes por los evaluadores? La Plataforma no es un medio de implementación del Proyecto, ya que es un resultado del mismo. Por otra parte, el Proyecto ya tenía sus resultados, metas e indicadores establecidos previamente al proceso de instalación de las Plataformas, por lo que las propuestas de los Planes de Acción solo en contados casos podían ser aplicados en el Proyecto.	Los indicadores son descritos justa arriba del párrafo. Las Plataformas son consideradas un medio en el PRODOC. No un resultado. Son un producto que sirve para generar un resultado.

			No puede haber ningún indicador relacionado con las Plataformas, porque el único resultado previsto era su instalación y elaboración de los Planes de Acción respectivos, departamentales, regionales y nacionales. Esto, es una de las principales lecciones aprendidas, en proyectos de esta naturaleza (que incluyan conformación de Plataformas), estas deberían instalarse previamente y luego financiar la implementación de las actividades/proyectos resultantes de sus planes de acción.	
UNDP Paraguay	55	p. 14 Resultados del Proyecto	Todos los indicadores referentes a carne fueron excluidos en la revisión sustantiva 2.	Verdad, eso fue nuestro error de compilación. Cancelado
UNDP Paraguay	56	p. 15 Resultados del Proyecto	Todos los indicadores referentes a carne fueron excluidos en la revisión sustantiva 2.	Verdad, eso fue nuestro error de compilación. Cancelado
UNDP Paraguay	57	p. 15 Resultados del Proyecto (Ind. 3)	No se reporta un gran resultado del proyecto que es la promulgación de la resolución 933/20 del MOPC que aprueba el reglamento que establece los regímenes de certificación, control y promoción del uso de bioenergías provenientes de plantaciones forestales o bosques nativos manejados, para asegurar la sostenibilidad de estos recursos renovables dentro del territorio nacional". Esta resolución establece un proceso gradual el uso de leña certificada hasta llegar a al 100% de la matriz energética del país al 2025.	Esto se reporta en el 3.3.3. Aquí se habla de los indicadores
UNDP Paraguay	58	p. 16 Resultados del Proyecto	Con referencia a ganadería, como mencionado, todos los indicadores referentes a carne fueron excluidos en la revisión sustantiva 2. Con referencia a leña, ver comentario previo.	Cancelado
UNDP Paraguay	60	p. 17 Resultados del Proyecto (Ind. 4)	En la revisión sustantiva 2 se pasa esta responsabilidad al proyecto Green Chaco	Cancelado el texto pero no definen estándares a cumplir para la producción de carne
UNDP Paraguay	61	p. 17 Resultados del Proyecto (Ind. 4)	Los estándares mínimos estaban acotados claramente a la producción, no así al transporte y procesamiento	Exacto. Por eso lo aclaramos también nosotros. Es un punto del proyecto y de la evaluación, se trabajó en producción. El decir que transporte y procesamiento no son considerados es un hecho, no una valoración negativa
UNDP Paraguay	62	p. 18 Resultados del Proyecto (Ind. 2.1)	Aparentemente hay una confusión, el indicador habla de número de hectáreas certificadas, en el siguiente indicador se menciona la compra de soja certificada. No me parece que lo que estaba incluido como cofinanciamiento del proyecto por los traders no se consideren como logros del proyecto. Se ha trabajado con los traders para promocionar la certificación de soja bajo estándares internacionales, haciendo análisis de los beneficios económicos, sociales y ambientales asociados a la soja certificada y los hallazgos de este documento fueron utilizados para capacitar a cientos de productores y técnicos que trabajan con los traders. Igualmente, se está certificando los silos de 2 cooperativas de UNICOOP.	Verdad. Las consideraciones sobre el ind 2.1. y 2.2 han sido reformuladas

UNDP Paraguay	63	p. 18 Resultados del Proyecto (Ind. 2.2)	Si bien quizás el Proyecto no incidió en que los traders compren soja certificada, sí ha generado el clima favorable para que los productores certifiquen y los traders puedan comprar el producto certificado. Igualmente, considero que las acciones de cofinanciamiento deben sumar a los resultados del proyecto, están escritas en las notas de compromiso de cofinanciamiento.	Las consideraciones sobre el ind 2.1. y 2.2 han sido reformuladas. Eso es verdad. Pero a nosotros el Equipo Evaluador han dicho claramente que eso no es atribuible al proyecto. No lo podemos disminuir. Se trata del problema de atribución que es al centro de la evaluaciones...en ese caso es indudable que no es atribuible al proyecto porque los actores implicados nos lo han dicho.
UNDP Paraguay	64	p. 20 Resultados del Proyecto (Ind. 3.1)	En lo que respecta a siembra directa, las 594.000 ha de productores asociados a UNICOOP implementan Siembra Directa. En las 77.000 ha mencionadas, se implementan BPAs. Personalmente, tomaba este indicador como cumplido por lejos	El indicador refiere a siembra directa y buenas practicas atendiendo que ya la siembra directa es la forma de producir prevalente en el país. El PRODOC menciona que la siembra directa ya se daba como prevalente en el país (90%).
UNDP Paraguay	65	p. 21 Resultados del Proyecto (Ind. 3.4)	Por un error involuntario, en el último PIR no se hizo una compilación de todas las acciones concretas: se omitió el apoyo para la implementación de las oficinas regionales en los 3 departamentos, la generación de las Unidades Ambientales en los municipios piloto, el equipamiento de las mismas, la contratación de técnicos para colaborar con el monitoreo y control del cumplimiento de las normas ambientales y forestales. Por otro lado, los técnicos contratados para las oficinas regionales recibían denuncias de delitos ambientales y participaban de las fiscalizaciones realizadas por los funcionarios. Con el proyecto Bosques para el Crecimiento Sostenible se trabajó el protocolo de intervención conjunta entre las instituciones MADES, INFONA, Servicio Nacional de Catastro y la Policía Nacional. El borrador final aguarda su aprobación final para su aplicación.	Lo añadimos en la parte descriptiva
UNDP Paraguay	66	p. 23 Relevancia	En la revisión sustantiva 2, se menciona que los departamentos piloto no tienen relevancia para el sector ganadero, por lo que se delegaba al proyecto Green Chaco trabajar fuertemente con el sector.	Añadido De hecho, en la revision sustantiva 2 ha sido mencionado que los departamentos piloto no tienen relevancia para el sector ganadero, por lo que se delegaba al proyecto Green Chaco trabajar fuertemente con el sector
UNDP Paraguay	67	p. 24 Relevancia	No corresponde lo de ganadería porque quedó a cargo de Green Chaco.	Añadido Como mencionado, con la segunda revisión sustantiva se ha pasado este tipo de trabajo al proyecto Green Chaco que al trabajar en una zona eminentemente ganadera tiene más relevancia en el tema
UNDP Paraguay	68	p. 24 Relevancia	Cambió la situación, ya explicado antes que se logró la extensión a 10 años.	Sa ha borrado todo el parrafo

UNDP Paraguay	69	p. 26 Efectividad y eficiencia	Al apoyo fue al viceministerio de minas y energía del Ministerio de Obras Públicas y Comunicaciones. Sí se hizo seguimiento con el INFONA para su aprobación.	Se ha cambiado la redacción
UNDP Paraguay	70	p. 26 Efectividad y eficiencia	No solo se ha promocionado, sino que se ha trabajado activamente para identificar, motivar y consolidar una “masa crítica” de mujeres, que han participado en las actividades del Proyecto y se han comprometido a seguir participando a través de la “Plataforma de Mujeres Líderes de la Cadena Productiva de Commodities Sustentables”	Es lo que decimos sintéticamente. Se añade después de promocionado trabajando activamente para identificar, motivar y consolidar una “masa crítica” de mujeres
UNDP Paraguay	71	p. 26 Efectividad y eficiencia	No precisamente en el marco de las Plataformas, las capacitaciones se realizaron en el marco del proyecto en sí, con las contrapartes (MADES, INFONA, MAG, Cofinanciadores, etc.) y actores interesados (DEAg, ARP, UGP, etc.).	Cancelado en el marco de las Plataformas
UNDP Paraguay	72	p. 29 Integración	Se toma en cuenta la recomendación, que será incluida en los procesos a seguir en las Plataformas. Sin embargo, es de destacar una contribución importante de las Plataformas al visualizar a los “pequeños productores de soja” los cuales no fueron identificados en el ProDoc y que son responsables del 30% del área cultivada del commodity y hoy forman parte activa de las Plataformas. Estos representan a trabajadores directos en la producción de soja, tanto en sus parcelas como en las de empresas, por lo que su visión es muy importante para entender el contexto social y económico de esta cadena productiva y proponer alternativas.	Que pequeños, medianos y grandes productores son miembros de la plataforma en otras partes del informe
UNDP Paraguay	73	p. 30 Sostenibilidad	Situación que ha cambiado, ya explicado en puntos anteriores.	Borrado
UNDP Paraguay	74	p. 33 Conclusión 9	Este no ha sido un proceso “espontáneo”, ya que fue un arduo trabajo del equipo técnico para poder llevar a cabo la participación de las mujeres en eventos diferenciados, en los cuales podían expresar sus realidades y visiones. Es decir, ha sido un proceso elaborado: pensado, planificado y ejecutado a través de términos de referencia previamente establecidos, identificación de actores (mujeres) clave, reuniones individuales y grupales, agenda, etc. previas a la convocatoria de las reuniones.	Se ha reformulado la conclusión
UNDP Paraguay	75	p. 35 Recomendación 2	Lamentablemente no se pudo entregar al Evaluador el documento elaborado por el Proyecto para la “Propuesta de Institucionalización y Sostenibilidad Financiera de las Plataformas en Paraguay”, cuyo Primer Borrador se encuentra en revisión por la Junta Directiva de las mismas. Una vez que los mismos emitan sus opiniones sobre el mismo, se procederá a su revisión y análisis en las plataformas departamentales, regionales y nacionales.	No requiere respuesta

Comentarios del equipo técnico del Proyecto al informe de la evaluación final

Oscar Gadea

De: Oscar Gadea
Enviado el: lunes, 21 de diciembre de 2020 12:37
Para: AnaMaría Nunez; Alfonso Fernandez; Veronique Gerard; María Gabriela PINTO; Catherine Galeano; Oscar Emilio Fernelo; Amílcar Caza; Cesar Meden; Paloma Nunez; Celeste Flores; Ana Mariol Jara; Virginia Fernandez
Asunto: Informe Final de Evaluación Proyecto PPV
Datos adjuntos: Audit trail_Eval Final_PPV.docx; Informe_Eval Final_PPV Español.docx; Report_Final Eval-PPV Inglés.docx

Estimada Ana María, por este medio quisiera compartir las apreciaciones del equipo de proyecto en referencia al informe final de la evaluación.

Primeramente, significar que el evaluador no ha realizado ningún cambio significativo solicitado por el equipo PNUD Paraguay de las calificaciones referente al seguimiento y evaluación, resultados, sostenibilidad e impacto, pese a las sugerencias realizadas, las cuales fueron argumentadas debidamente en el borrador. Los motivos/razones por los cuales no ha realizado los cambios están documentados en el Audit Trail de la evaluación (documento anexo al correo).

Con relación al cumplimiento de los términos de referencia y la guía para realizar evaluaciones finales de los proyectos respaldados por el PNUD y financiados por el FMAM, es mi parecer que el documento final cumple con ambos.

Con relación a las conclusiones puedo mencionar que si bien están fundamentadas con evidencias/hallazgos identificadas en las entrevistas llevadas a cabo durante la misión a campo, algunas son irrelevantes (1 y 2) y gran parte de ellas (58%) enfocadas a las plataformas (2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10 y 11), siendo que todas las partes revisoras han sugerido poner mayor foco en las demás actividades del proyecto. Los ajustes sugeridos por vos, en relación a darle más contenido a las conclusiones, fueron parcialmente atendidas, para lo cual también me gustaría contar con tu opinión. Un punto significativo y observado también por vos, es que si existiesen riesgos sociales, por la no participación en las plataformas de los trabajadores rurales, se debería ajustar el SESP del proyecto. Finalmente, el evaluador aclara que la no participación de los trabajadores rurales no evidencia un riesgo social para el proyecto. Por tal motivo, en la recomendación 6 sugieren actualizar el SESP del proyecto Green Chaco, a fin de que este punto sea considerado en las actividades de plataformas realizadas en la región Occidental, no así el SESP del Proyecto Green BAAPA.

Con relación a las recomendaciones, obviamente la mayoría de ellas también están centradas a las plataformas (6 de las 7). En ese sentido, no deja ninguna recomendación significativa en relación a otras actividades del proyecto, como por ejemplo estrategias para escalar ciertas acciones piloto exitosas (BPA, restauración, conectividad, SSP, etc). Esto es sólo mencionado como una lección aprendida (4), la cual señala la importancia de la documentación de los estudios de caso/lecciones aprendidas y su utilidad para la replicabilidad.

En cuanto a las lecciones aprendidas, de las 4, ninguna de ellas representa alguna que no haya sido identificada de ante mano por el equipo del proyecto y no se ha sumado ninguna que represente, efectivamente, un elemento diferenciador que contribuya a ofrecer nuevas hipótesis o recomendaciones para nuevos proyectos, como por ejemplo el proyecto FOLUR.

Es nuestro parecer, que el Consultor no demuestra ninguna predisposición a intercambiar criterios y mucho menos a recibir sugerencias. Por ejemplo:

1. Si bien no hubo una nueva revaloración de las calificaciones, tampoco hubieron mayores explicaciones;
2. A pesar del pedido expreso del equipo de proyecto y del MADES, no ha incorporado más conclusiones y recomendaciones sobre el Proyecto, se concentran más en Plataformas. Si no quería sacar o cambiarlas, sencillamente podría haber agregado algunas.

Como ejemplo de su actitud, tomamos como ejemplo y casi dábamos sin importancia, el tema de "espontáneo" en la Plataforma de Mujeres. A pesar de nuestra sugerencia, mantiene la palabra y utiliza los textos que les habíamos hecho llegar para decir que a consecuencia de la "acción espontánea de las mujeres" nosotros actuamos. Si con esa nimiedad no se muestra abierto, muy poco podemos esperar en temas más complejos.

Por este medio quisiera consultarte, cuál serían los siguientes pasos? Necesito confirmación para realizar el pago al consultor, tenemos nosotros que dar aún algún tipo de devolución?, matriz de respuesta por ejemplo, cuándo debemos hacerlo y a quién debería ir dirigida?. Entiendo también que el documento debe pasar por una evaluación de calidad por la Oficina de Evaluación Independiente (OEI) del PNUD, de eso no tengo conocimiento del procedimiento, se debe cargar en alguna plataforma o debemos remitir el informe a alguna persona?.

Aguardo instrucciones.

Saludos.



Oscar Rafael Gorda Quiñones
Coordinador del Proyecto
Países de Producción Verde
Comodidad Sostenible
Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo
World Trade Center – Torre I – Piso 8
Ave. Aviadores del Chaco 2060
oscar.gorda@undp.org
Tel +595216002067 Ext. 102, Cel: +595960729054

Al servicio
de las personas
y las naciones

www.undp.org Follow us:    

5. Clearance Form

Terminal Evaluation Report for Project "Integrando la Conservación de Biodiversidad y Manejo Sustentable de la Tierra en las prácticas de producción en todas las biorregiones y biomas en Paraguay (Nº PIMS 4836)" Reviewed and Cleared By:


Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Name: Veronique Gerard

Signature:  _____ Date: 12/23/2020

Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

Name: Ana María Núñez

Signature:  _____ Date: 12/23/2020

Annexes

Annex A – Rating scale

This table includes the rating scales according to the “*Guía para realizar evaluaciones finales de los proyectos respaldados por el PNUD y financiados por el FMAM*”.

Rating scale		
Ratings /Results, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E and Application and Execution	Sustainability ratings	Relevance ratings
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS) No shortcoming 5: Satisfactory (S) Minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) Moderate shortcomings 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) Significant shortcomings. 2: Unsatisfactory (U) Major shortcomings 1: Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) Severe shortcomings	4: Likely (L) Negligible risks. 3: Moderately Likely (ML) Moderate risks. 2: Moderately Unlikely (MU) Substantial risks 1: Unlikely Severe risks	2: Relevant (R) 1: Not Relevant (NR)
		Impact ratings 3: Significant (S) 2: Minimum (M) 1: Insignificant (I)

Annex B – Consulted documents, reports and webpages

Documents and reports

- Actas de las reuniones de la Junta de Proyecto del 18.02.2014, 01.09.2015, 01.06.2016, 05.04.2017, 28.08.2019 y 30.06.2020.
- Audit of the UNDP Country Office in Paraguay – Report N. 204 – Office of Audit and Investigations
- Documento Programa País Paraguay 2020-2024 (UNDP)
- Documento Victima - Actualización de la Política Ambiental Nacional (MADES)
- Guía Ambiental y Social para el Financiamiento de la Actividad Agrícola en el Paraguay (MSF)
- Guidance Note on National Commodity Platforms –sustainability and exit strategies (UNDP, 2018)
- Informe “Inclusión de la Perspectiva de Género en las Buenas Prácticas Agrícolas y Ganaderas” (2016)
- Informe Nacional sobre Desarrollo Humano Paraguay 2013 – Trabajo Decente y Desarrollo Humano
- Plan de Commodities Sustentables Alto Paraná 2016
- Plan de Commodities Sustentables Itapúa 2017
- Plan de comunicación – Proyecto Paisajes de Producción Verde año 2019
- Plan Estratégico Institucional 2017 -2021 – INFONA
- Plan Nacional de Desarrollo Paraguay 2030, Diciembre 2014
- Primera Revisión Sustantiva del ProDoc
- ProDoc
- *Project Implementation Review* (PIR) de los años 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020
- Protocolo de Buenas Prácticas Agrícolas (BPA), para la producción de granos.
- Revisión intermedia (Evaluación de Medio Término) del Proyecto
- Segunda Revisión Sustantiva del ProDoc

Webpages

<https://apps.mades.gov.py/siam/portal> <https://www.facebook.com/greencommoditiesparaguay>

<https://www.greencommodities.org>

<https://greencommoditiesparaguay.org>

<http://www.mades.gov.py/>

<http://www.mag.gov.py>

<https://medium.com/pnudparaguay/aportan-las-mujeres-a-la-cadena-productiva-92223207648c>

<http://www.mfs.org.py>

<https://www.py.undp.org/content/paraguay/es/home/projects.html>

<https://www.thegef.org/>

<https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/sustainable-development-goals.html>

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xamjOtQ1KE4&feature=emb_title&ab_channel=PNUDParaguay

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DJevEPbmv8&t=35s>

<https://youtu.be/xamjOtQ1KE4>

Annex C – Work plan – Primary data collection

First week

Remote interviews and meetings held by the Evaluation Team.

Monday, Nov. 9, 2020			
Time	Interviewees	Institution	Position
8:00 to 9:00	Silvia Morimoto Veronique Gerard,	UNDP Paraguay	Representante Residente del Paraguay Oficial de Programa de la Cartera de Desarrollo Sustentable
9:00 to 10:00	Graciela Miret	Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible (MADES)	Directora de la Dirección de Planificación Estratégica del MADES.
10:00 to 11:00	Rafael Gadea	UNDP Paraguay	Coordinador Proyecto
11:00 to 12:00	Oscar Ferreiro	UNDP Paraguay	Coordinador Plataforma
13:00 to 14:00	Ana María Núñez	UNDP	RTA
14:00 to 16:00	Paloma Núñez	UNDP Paraguay	Asistente técnico del Proyecto
16:00 to 17:00	Ana María Macedo	Red Paraguaya de Conservación en Tierras Privadas (ONG)	Directora Ejecutiva
17:00 to 18:00	Ana Marisol Jara	UNDP Paraguay	Comunicadora del proyecto
Tuesday, Nov. 10, 2020			
Time	Interviewees	Institution	Position
10:00 to 11:00	Cesar Meden	UNDP Paraguay	Especialista carne Plataforma
11:00 to 12:00	Amílcar Casal	UNDP Paraguay	Especialista soja Plataforma
15:00 to 16:00	Diana Aquino	ADM	Encargada del área de sustentabilidad
16:00 to 17:00	Eduardo Allende	UNDP	Oficial Programa (ex coordinador del proyecto)
Wednesday, Nov. 11, 2020			
Time	Interviewees	Institution	Position
9:00 to 10:00	Celeste Flores	UNDP	Asistente Plataforma, encargada género Proyecto
10:00 to 11:00	Paula Durruty	MAG	Ex Directora de Planificación Estratégica del MAG
11:00 to 12:00	Oswaldo Turlan	A todo pulmón (ONG)	Director de Proyectos
15:30 to 16:30	Julián Ferrer	Cargill	Encargado del área de sustentabilidad
16:30 to 17:00	Mirta Martínez	Mesa de Finanzas Sostenibles	Gerente de la MFS
17:00 to 18:00	Edith Barreto Omar Fernández Larissa Fernández	Mesa de Finanzas Sostenibles	Presidenta de la MFS (Cargo reciente) Ex presidente de la MFS Especialista Ambiental de la MFS
Thursday, Nov. 12, 2020			
Time	Interviewees	Institution	Position
8:00 to 9:00	Cristina Goralewski Hermelinda Villalba	Instituto Forestal Nacional (INFONA).	Presidenta del Instituto Forestal Nacional (INFONA). Directora del Sistema Nacional Forestal y Punto Focal del Proyecto
9:00 to 10:00	Claudia González	MAG- Viceministerio de Ganadería - Dirección de Ganadería Sostenible	Directora
10:00 to 11:00	Rodrigo González	Servicio Nacional de Calidad y Sanidad Vegetal y de Semillas (SENAVE).	Presidente
16:00 to 17:00	Esteban Vasconsellos	Comisión de Medio Ambiente y Forestal de la Asociación Rural del Paraguay	Presidente

Friday, Nov. 12, 2020			
Time	Interviewees	Institution	Position
9:00 to 10:00	José Anegui	Comunidad Ache de Puerto Barra – Alto Paraná	Ex cacique
10:00 to 11:30	Paloma Nuñez	UNDP Paraguay	Asistente técnico del proyecto
15:00 to 16:00	Sandra Noguera	Cámara Paraguaya de Procesadores de Cereales y Oleaginosas (CAPPRO).	Gerente
17:00 to 18:00	Rafael Gadea	UNDP Paraguay	Coordinador Proyecto

Second week

Remote interviews and meetings held by the International Evaluator

Monday, Nov. 16, 2020			
Time	Interviewees	Institution	Position
8:00 to 9:00	Dr. José L. Laneri	Ministerio de Industria y Comercio - REDIEX	Director, Plataformas de Negocios REDIEX (Red de Inversiones y Exportaciones)
9:00 to 10:00	Andrew Kennedy	Consultor	Consultor que ha diseñado el proyecto
15:00 to 16:00	Emilio Aguilar	LDC	Encargado del área de sustentabilidad
Tuesday, Nov. 17, 2020			
Time	Interviewees	Institution	Position
10:30 to 11:30	Mirta Pereira Alberto Vázquez	FAPI ACIDI	Representante legal Líder de la Asociación
Friday, Nov. 20, 2020			
Time	Interviewees	Institution	Position
12:00 to 12:30	Virginia Fernández	UNDP	Administradora Proyecto

Second week

Agenda of the field mission of the National Evaluator. The interviews highlighted in gray have also had the remote participation of the International Evaluator.

Monday, Nov. 16, 2020			
Time	Interviewees	Institution	Position
10:30 to 11:30	Manuel Morel	DEAg Caazapá	Asesor Técnico
13:30 to 14:30	Miguel Bogado	Municipalidad de Tavai	Intendente
14:30 to 16:00	Samuel Vera (Visita a finca)		Productor
Tuesday, Nov. 17, 2020			
Time	Interviewees	Institution	Position
08:15 to 09:15	Alicia Eisenkolbl Celia Garayo	PROCOSARA	Directora Gerente
09:30 to 10:30	Marcio de Souza Sonimar Risardi	UGP	Coordinador Distrital Productor
11:10 to 12:30	Ricardo Lohse Antonio Fariña Tamara Villalba Edgar Rodríguez	Gobernación de Itapúa SENACSA	Secretario General Asesor Secretaria de Medio Ambiente Director Regional
13:30 to 15:30	Solano Gamarra. (Visita a finca)	ARP Regional Itapúa	Presidente
16:30 to 17:30	Osvin Shulz (Visita a finca) Wilson González	Implementador de BPA de la Cooperativa Naranjito	Productor Técnico
Wednesday, Nov. 18, 2020			
Time	Interviewees	Institution	Position
08:00 to 10:30	Raquel Cáceres Darci Bortoloso, Eduardo Schaffrat	UNICOP Municipalidad de Naranjal	Asesora Técnica Intendente Presidente

	Rubén Zoz. Enrique Molas	Coop. Naranjal	Gerente
10:30 to 12:00	Valdecir Dala Valle (Visita a finca)	Implementador de BPA de la Cooperativa Naranjal	Socio.
14:00 to 15:30	Celso Mattei (Visita a finca)	Implementador de BPA de la Cooperativa Unión Kurupayty	Socio
16:00 to 17:30	Joao Poletto (Visita a finca)	Implementador de BPA de la Cooperativa Unión Kurupayty	Socio

Time

Time	Interviewees	Institution	Position
08:00 to 09:00	Enrique Molas		Asesor
13:00 to 13:30	Carlos Bortoloso Eloi Borges	Cooperativa Naranjal Cooperativa Naranjal	Socio Técnico
14:00 to 16:00	Pablo Macarini (Visita a finca)	Implementador de BPA de la Cooperativa Naranjal	Socio

Friday, Nov. 20, 2020

Time	Interviewees	Institution	Position
08:30 to 09:45	Antonio Aquino.	Universidad Católica	Director de carrera
10:00 to 10:30	Clara Riquelme Diego Riveros	Gobernación de Alto Paraná	Secretario de Medio Ambiente

Third week

Remote interviews and meetings held by the Evaluation Team.

Monday, Nov. 23, 2020

Time	Interviewees	Institution	Position
11:00 to 12:30	Óscar Ferreiro Celeste Flores Amilcar Casal César Meden	PNUD Paraguay	Coordinador Plataforma Asistente Plataforma Especialista soja Plataforma Especialista carne Plataforma
16:00 to 17:00	Veronique Gerard	PNUD Paraguay	Oficial de la Cartera de Desarrollo Sostenible

Tuesday, Nov. 24, 2020

Time	Interviewees	Institution	Position
15:30 to 17:00	Rafael Gadea	PNUD Paraguay	Coordinador Proyecto

Wednesday, Nov. 25, 2020

Time	Interviewees	Institution	Position
9:00 to 10:00	Graciela Miret	Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible (MADES)	Directora de la Dirección de Planificación Estratégica del MADES.
16:00 to 17:00	Andrew Bovarnick Andrea Bina	UNDP Panama	Global Head of the Global Green Commodities Programme Monitoring, Learning and Evaluation Specialist

Friday, Nov. 27, 2020

Time	Interviewees	Institution	Position
10:30 to 12:30	Rafael Gadea	PNUD Paraguay	Coordinador Proyecto