

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. Project Summary Table

Table 1: Project Summary

Project Details		Project Milestones	
Project Title	Reducing Deforestation from Commodity Production	PIF Approval Date:	04/06/2015
UNDP Project ID (PIMS #):	5664	CEO Endorsement Date (FSP) / Approval date (MSP):	25/01/2017
GEF Project ID:	9180	ProDoc Signature Date:	Project Document (ProDoc) Signature Date (date project began): 15/06/2017 for PRODOC under the Panama RH covering Global, Indonesia and Liberia; 3/07/2017 for the Paraguay ProDoc under UNDP Paraguay
UNDP Atlas Business Unit, Award ID, Project ID:	00098209 for UNDP Panama RH 00097177 UNDP Paraguay	Date Project Manager hired:	30/08/2017
Country/Countries:	Global	Inception Workshop Date:	26 November 2017 (Panama) December 2018 (Paraguay)
Region:	NA	Mid-Term Review Completion Date:	31/12/2019
Focal Area:	NA	Terminal Evaluation Completion date:	31/03/2022
GEF Operational Programme or Strategic Priorities/Objectives:	IAP-Commodities; BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4; SFM-1; SFM-1	Planned Operational Closure Date:	31/03/2022
Trust Fund:	GEF		
Implementing Partner (GEF Executing Entity):	UNDP -Regional Hub for Latin America and the Caribbean UNDP- Paraguay		
NGOs/CBOs involvement:	Conservation International, World Wildlife Fund Indonesia		
Financial Information			
Project Financing	at CEO Endorsement (US\$)		at TE (US\$)
[1] GEF financing:	14,584,403		13,009,023
[2] UNDP contribution:	400,000		-
[3] Government:	161,079,968		360,628,847
[4] Other partners:	3,436,150		5,303,446
[5] Total co-financing [2 + 3+ 4]:	164,700,268		365,932,293
PROJECT TOTAL COSTS [1 + 5]	179,284,671		378,941,316

1.2 Project Description

The focus of this evaluation is the *Reducing Deforestation from Commodity Production* (Production) project – a child project funded under the UNDP-GEF 6 Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP) programme titled *Taking Deforestation out of Commodity Supply Chains (also known as the Good Growth Partnership, GGP)*. The programme advances an integrated supply chain approach addressing a root cause of 70% of global deforestation attributed to agriculture commodities, specifically beef, oil palm, and soy.

The GGP combines production, demand, and investments as integrated tracks in the supply chain to enhance incentives and demand for sustainably produced agricultural commodities. The program, launched in 2017, is led by The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and implemented in collaboration with Conservation International (CI), the International Finance Corporation (IFC), UN Environment (UNEP) and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF). The GGP also works in partnership with the governments of Brazil, Indonesia, Liberia and Paraguay, civil society and private sector actors with interests in palm oil, beef and soy commodities.

The GGP consists of the following five GEF- 6 funded “child” projects:

- The **Adaptive Management & Learning (A&L) Project**: a UNDP coordinated “hub” between the 5 projects for sequencing activities, platform-level monitoring and evaluation and knowledge management with an evidence-based component to understand the effects of Voluntary Sustainability Standards on Deforestation led by WWF.
- The **“Production” Project**, implemented globally by UNDP, improves the enabling environment for sustainable commodity production through dialogue platforms, policy reform, land use planning, and farmer training/support. The project targets palm oil in Indonesia and Liberia and beef production in Paraguay.
- The **“Demand” project**, led globally by WWF-US, raises awareness and strengthens demand for sustainable beef, palm oil and soy among consumers, policy makers, companies, and investors.
- The **“Transactions” project** is co-managed by IFC and the UN Environment's Finance Initiative (UNEP-Fi) to make sustainable financing accessible for businesses, farmers and producers who require capital to invest in environmentally sound practices.
- The **“Brazil” project**, led by CI, combines the production, demand, and transaction streams into a single project in a single country including a landscape focus in the MATOPIBA region.

The Production Project’s objective is to encourage sustainable practices for oil palm in Indonesia and Liberia and beef production in Paraguay while conserving forests and safeguarding the rights of smallholder farmers and forest-dependent communities. The Project does so through four components:

- **Dialogue, Action Planning, Policies and Enforcement**: Partnerships are built, and national and global dialogue increased by establishing, extending and connecting national and sub-national commodity platforms for dialogue, planning, consensus building and knowledge sharing in the targeted commodity chains enabling more effective policies and the utilization of related enforcement standards and regulations.
- **Farmer Support Systems**: Unsustainable practices are addressed, and productivity increased particularly for smallholders producing targeted commodities through Farmer support systems.
- **Land Use Plans and Mapping in Targeted Landscapes**: Support systems for mainstreaming national and global benefits associated with protecting tropical forests into land use planning in areas where forests are currently threatened by commodity expansion.

- **Knowledge Management, Monitoring and Evaluation** ensures the effective and systematic gathering, dissemination and sharing of lessons and knowledge.

The Project is a GEF, full-sized project, which started in March 2017 and will close in June 2022, is in its 5th year of implementation. Due to institutional matters related with the internal delivery architecture of UNDP and request from governments, the impacts were realized through two separate UNDP projects¹ with one covering oil palm production in Indonesia, Liberia and global support, and the other covering beef production in Paraguay as per the project document titled *Apoyo a la Reducción de la Deforestación en la Producción de Commodities en Paraguay*. The Production project budget is \$14,584,403 U.S. with planned co-financing of \$164,700,268 U.S., for a total project budget of \$179,284,671 U.S.²

1.3 Evaluation Ratings Summary

The target of this evaluation is The *Reducing Deforestation from Commodity Production* (Production) project, a successful project funded under the UNDP-GEF 6 Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP) programme titled, *Taking Deforestation out of Commodity Supply Chains (Good Growth Partnership – GGP–)* a global program of five projects working simultaneously on production, demand, and finance, in Brazil, Paraguay, Indonesia and Liberia to enable sustainable development in three global commodity supply chains: soy, beef, and palm oil. The Program promotes an integrated supply chain approach to reduce the drivers of deforestation caused by the expansion of commodity production, into High Conservation Value Areas. Commodities such as beef, oil palm, and soy contribute to nearly 70% of global deforestation.

The “Production” project, led by The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and executed nationally by UNDP’s Country Offices in Indonesia, Liberia and Paraguay in collaboration with Conservation International (CI), and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) launched in 2018 works in partnerships with governments at all levels and with private sector and civil society partners to foster dialogue, collaboration, capacity building, policy, Farmer Support Systems, and knowledge management. Despite the challenges related to working globally between different languages, cultures and incompatible time zones, the Project Management Unit (PMU) established within UNDP’s Regional Hub for Latin America (RH LAC), managed the effects of COVID-lockdowns, national elections, drought and flooding to realize over 90% of the Project’s targets and full execution of the Project’s total budget of \$14,584,000 U.S. to produce, with \$366 Million U.S. in cofinancing, Economic, Social and Environmental benefits, such as 847,000 ha. of HCV areas and forest preserved and estimated 129 million tons of CO2 equivalent captured or avoided. These gains, despite the challenges, rank the project in the 90th percentile for a Ranking of **Satisfactory**.

As a pilot project, the Production project was successful in defining our understanding of how the core “levers” to eliminating commodity driven deforestation can be addressed. The following summarize the achievements of each component and provide justification for the overall ranking. This group of actions was devised through a participative process taking into consideration the Relevance of the Project to national policies, sector strategies and taking into account global agreements and targets as well as conformity to the programming of the principal investor, the Global Environment Facility. The **Relevance** of the project to the mentioned was considered **Highly Satisfactory**. Most importantly, the Project’s actions at the ground level are relevant to the interests of local farmers and authorities with tools and techniques for improving their situation and protect forests.

¹ both projects share the same GEF ID 9180

² Production IAP GEF CEO Endorsement

The Theory and strategy behind the Project were to invest in collaborative spaces for dialogue and planning and using that experience to fill policy gaps, invest in capacity building and decision-making support tools, and invest in Farmer Support Systems and Knowledge tools and opportunities. The Project was **Effective** in executing the defined components receiving a ranking of Satisfactory, despite the mentioned challenges. The PMU staff did an admirable job in producing all of the Project's outputs that collectively yielded the expected Outcomes (Results). The following paragraphs briefly summarize the experience of the Project's four components.

Dialogue, Collaboration, Policy and Decision-making support:

To achieve the Project's objectives and targets, meaningful dialogue within safe spaces was an important first step. Using UNDP's accumulated experience and with qualified consultants, toolkits etc. the Project achieved National and Subnational platforms for palm oil in Indonesia and Liberia, and for beef in Paraguay. These structures united Public and Private sector actors to discuss and plan a pathway for reducing commodity related impacts on HCV areas and forests. The Project achieved a total of 2 national, 4 subnational and 4 landscape-level *fora*. At present, all are "works-in-progress" currently formalizing their institutional status and operational identities. Most importantly, short term government and private financing will enable these structures over the short-term.

The number of participating organizations surpassed expectations and, COVID considered, so did the number of platforms consolidated. The national platforms are works-in-progress that will need continued support. What is important is that they are the product of multi-stakeholder dialogue in jurisdictions, some of which have strong social divisions, political differences, and capacity restraints. Regardless, traditional antagonists, such as private sector producers and regulators, have been finding common ground and that over 300 organizations of processors, producers, governments and community based organizations are much closer to understanding each other. It is also clear that businesses are slowly buying into the model. In Paraguay, for example, cooperatives which are the financial drivers of the beef sector are actively participating in the process, which would indicate that institutions are open to listening about a better way to sustain business. The same is happening in the Oil Palm sector in Liberia and Indonesia where International processors are in dialogue with communities, producers and Clans finding a workable model beneficial to buyers, sellers and the environment.

The first test of collaborative effort were the development and approval of Action Plans at the national, subnational and, in Indonesia, at the district level. The Action Plans define the way the stakeholders will work to reduce deforestation and secured commitments to continue work were gaining support at the end of the project. They also address cross-cutting issues such as stakeholder engagement, gender and women's empowerment, among others. The process was very successful. National-level plans with high-level endorsement are in-force in Indonesia and Liberia. A total of two national plans are approved in Indonesia and Liberia, three subnational plans in Indonesia and one subnational plan in Paraguay. Three district strategies were also developed and adopted in Indonesia, at the district level. The plans are a motivating first victory for the participants.

In the policy space, the project sought to improve policies in three areas: (i) that address systemic barriers to government oversight of and support for sustainable, reduced-deforestation commodity production practices; and (ii) related to land use allocation for commodity production; and (iii) that increase protection for and conservation of HCV and HCS areas. The policy aspects took a long time to develop, but once the collaborative structures were in-place and COVID lessened, the results were admirable. In the first category, on commodity production, eight policies were developed with four approvals. These support spatial regulations, protection of endangered species, and importantly regulations to stimulate private sector investment in Corporate and Social responsibility, Public Private partnerships, and sustainable development policy. etc. In the second and third groups, a suite of land-use planning

regulations, designations, and resolutions defining HCV criteria, etc. Of this last group, eight regulations are in-force with an additional ten in the approval pipeline. The results were a suite of legislation in each country that were both normative and regulative.

What the first component teaches us is that trust is a key factor that must be planned for and that stakeholders are willing to come to dialogue over common interests if the space is safe. The tools and technical assistance on multi-stakeholder processes were essential in preparing leadership to manage a dialogue. Finally, the steps, effort, and timeframes needed to achieve a policy outcome were underestimated and underbudgeted. Based-on the experience, the following blueprint emerged: (i) a policy proposal with a win-win proposition developed through a participative process effectively leveraging or responding to demand for the policy; (ii) strategic communications to consolidate demand for the policy; (iii) effective advocacy and stakeholder engagement strategies targeted to different levels; (iv) strategic communications at the decision-making juncture to support the policies through the political process and maintain momentum through a generally protracted process; (v) a highly visible and trustworthy champion that can broker trust and facilitate decision-making; and (vi) targeted capacity building and planning support to enable the process, ensure adequate preparation for implementation and establish rules for discourse. These can be done by UNDP in collaboration with partners who may be better placed than UNDP to act on some of these points.

Farmer Support Systems:

By the numbers, the most successful component dealt with was component 2 on Farmer support systems. This component goes to the heart of the interests of the producer by providing training needs assessments, subsequent training programs, and finally farmers support development strategies. A total of 2,752 smallholders (897 females and 1,855 males) were trained in Indonesia, where the implementation of Good Agricultural Practices (GAPs) averages 89%. In Paraguay, 4,915 persons were trained (1,302 females and 3,613 males), and the average implementation of GAPs was 79%. In addition, strategies for strengthening farmers support system were developed in the three countries. The most important activity for producers were targeted pilots that demonstrated the effectiveness of agronomic techniques in intensifying production. These also appealed to farmers interest and helped build trust, whereas policy development focusing on deforestation, a delicate theme for the producers, does not appeal as much to their interests and causes suspicion.

The suite of activities piloted increased yields for farmers by amounts comparable to other projects and between countries roughly a 2 to 3x increase in yields, which is bankable. In addition, other returns to producers were noted, such as an increase in the price of their lands following certifications, etc. The techniques must also consider technologies, such as pre-processing equipment, genetic improvement, etc. Many of these factors are known to some partners, companies, agriculture academics and to producer groups. These need to be better quantified, analyzed for their different levels of returns and, if warranted, synthesized for financing proposals for cooperatives, micro-businesses, etc. The results would be measured in tons/ha./year, or other weights or volume yields and also financial yields. Follow-on initiatives or corporate partners could explore these possibilities. Nonetheless, the Project, together with results from other initiatives demonstrates that farmers are willing to participate, they have received increases from the practices promoted, and there is interest in cooperatives (Paraguay) and corporations (Indonesia, Liberia) in continuing the process (all countries). Like the first component, an additional take-away is the deep distrust of outsiders by farmers and the lengthy time it took for Project technicians to gain trust. Technicians themselves advised that when available to use local talent that have local reputations and can reduce the time of acceptance.

Component 3 seeks to set aside High Carbon Value areas and Forests based on the assumption that the political sector or power centers would be willing to set-aside land. Establishing go/no-go zones is the

result of a very difficult political process that requires a policy strategy based on the information produced from the mapping of High Conservation Values (HCVs) and High Carbon Stocks (HCS) followed by a well-established dialogue and political and communications strategy. The combination of enabling structures (platforms), information (maps), and a vehicle for sharing these with a synthesized interpretation (platforms) are important elements in achieving an agreement for set-asides. These must be combined with effective communications, consciousness-raising and stakeholder engagement from trusted individuals or entities. The project therefore was initiating a process with many moving parts.

First among everything is the ability to define HCV and High Carbon Stock (HCS) lands. The project supported the governments to develop and approve these criteria. Indonesia was ahead of the curve with a considerable amount of science developed. By the end of the project, Paraguay reached the technology goal of mapping Land Use Cover Change (LUCC) in HCV and HCS areas and forests. Liberia still needs support in installing the technology and completing the Cartography. Indonesia's "Ecosystem" tool and an app were developed, to see LUCC in very short cycles and on a smart phone. By the end of the Project, the technology was positively tested but not yet rolled-out at the provincial or district levels. These are regardless exciting developments that will help all in the mid-term and have high replication potential. Maps are in essence decision support tools that when combined with policy experience and platforms for dialogue, can help the countries moving closer to an adequate level of Land Use Planning.

In Liberia, adjustments to failed concessions may be taking place. MPOI/MANCO and the National Concessions Directorate are exploring the possibility of an updated agreement between the Liberian government and formal relationships with Non-Government Organizations to assist them to work with the Zodia community in a productive public-private partnership. Similar results have been obtained in Paraguay and Indonesia. The important aspect is that the capacity to correctly define and map HCV and HCS resources will be needed very soon and will be important to inform decision-making in areas that were previously politically charged. These structures will continue to provide benefits to the Liberian process.

Regardless, and thanks to negotiation, the Project did realize the set-aside of lands ranging from small, protected areas to larger tracks of connected areas totaling 847,330 ha. with a carbon equivalent of 129 Million tons CO₂ eq. The spatial policies mentioned earlier will greatly improve this process and enable dialogue on larger tracks and more strategic set asides in concessional land in oil palm concessions for example.

Knowledge Management

Component 4 supported the knowledge aspects of the Project by ensuring that the project gathered and shared lessons systematically and effectively. It also supports adaptive management, so that the project integrates and reacts to the success and failures of relevant activities, both within and outside the Programme and project. Specifically, the project sought increased knowledge of factors underpinning the readiness of landscape-level environments to adopt reduced-deforestation commodity production so this improves the design and future implementation of intervention and capacity building strategies and tools for improving the sustainability of commodity production.

The project developed a tool for tracking the status and dynamics of change at the landscape level, as well as how the impacts of commodity production on deforestation may be influenced and the impact of the Project's interventions. Based on this process, the Project developed thematic studies, policy briefs, a range of communication materials for sharing in various fora and online awareness and communications materials for dissemination. The Project also provided training and capacity building to promote learning and uptake and sharing and dissemination of knowledge with regional and global policy and programme development and implementation.

Tools created include a landscape assessment tool developed by Conservation International in 2019 through a peer reviewed process. Using this tool, five baseline assessments were developed, one for each target landscape. Following refinement, the tool was rebranded as Causality Assessment for Landscape Interventions (CALI), which was piloted in all 5 landscapes, with 5 contribution assessment reports completed. Lessons learned from these end-of-project assessment reports feed into the development of a final version of CALI. In addition, 8 guidelines and 17 country knowledge products were developed and available through GGPs online Green Commodities Community.

Despite the challenges, most of the project results were achieved to an acceptable degree with some targets already exceeded with a high quality associated with the activities, products and services associated with the project. With COVID and many other challenges, many products were realized too late in the project to be applied and tested. For that reason, a rating of **Satisfactory** was awarded.

Efficiency

The results demonstrate that the execution of all components was efficient. The most efficient was Component Four with all outputs being achieved on 73% of the funds budgeted. Likewise, Components Two and Three delivered on their targets slightly under budget. Component One was the outlier with a 14% gap in achieving the targets in spite of delivering 95% of the funds. Overall, the Project delivery was **Satisfactory** in terms of efficiency.

Adaptive Management

The project was well managed, and implementation proceeded with delays as start-up and due to COVID. The management team achieved positive rankings in all cross-cutting areas, including gender mainstreaming, environmental safeguards, and sustainability criteria, Monitoring and Evaluation and Adaptive Management was **Highly Satisfactory**.

Overall, the project established the basis for further catalyzing the systemic change needed to guide the palm oil and beef sectors towards a more sustainable future – including through the lessons learned that should be applied in future initiatives which should focus on enabling “good growth” by increasing farm yields, access to finance and return on labor, all while better managing natural resources with effective and informed policy.

1.4. Concise Summary of Conclusions

Conclusions are presented in each section of the Terminal Evaluation Report. The salient conclusions are summarized as follows:

Project Design:

- The project context provided justification for the “levers” needed for reducing commodity based deforestation. The justification is heavy on policy and light on production aspects. While there is a thorough policy baseline, the agronomic baseline for the Project was missing for the commodities targeted. There was no analysis of the BAU condition in terms of yields, water use, pesticide use, etc. against which the expected changes within the pilots could be measured. This might have been useful in validating the results of piloted techniques for agricultural intensification. There is no communications baseline that enables a comparison of the EOP condition and the BAU scenario making it difficult to gauge the effects of the knowledge management actions. The response areas of the project are however justified.
- The indicators do not tell the story of the project. The report lists many situations where the

indicators are not specific to the result. The “*number of direct project beneficiaries among groups including smallholder farmers and forest-dependent communities*” does not capture the details of the production aspects related to Farmer Support Systems work. As a result of the pilots and baseline and parallel projects consulted in Indonesia, Liberia and Paraguay, yields increased 2 to 3x depending on the commodity, a considerable difference. Adequate measuring and reporting of the results of the Project’s effect on agronomic parameters, such as changes in yield, could prove that the practices employed contribute to the “sustainable intensification” thesis within the Theory of Change (TOC)

- The policy approval process suffered from changing national priorities and context, the slow process of policy approval, unrealistic assumptions, and underestimated effort and costs associated with policy development aspects associated with successful policy development were missing or understated. There was no systematic or sufficient estimation of the demand for the proposed policies during design phase, a strategic communications process, provision for effective advocacy or a clear champion, all important for generating support for policies and neutralizing strong interests. The Action Plans, delivered late in the project, provide policy guidance for the future.
- In theory, the Project’s architecture was solid. However, the stated outcomes were not sufficient to achieve the Project’s objective due to delays and financing constraints generally due to unrealistic estimates of capacity, timeframes, and costs. Assumptions were not presented for 7 of 11 outcomes. National-level barriers were underestimated at the formulation stage. For example, the cost of garnering trust in terms of time and management energy was underestimated making targets, such as a *1,000,000 ha. set aside* a politically difficult proposition, especially for local authorities under pressure to keep-up production. Another contributing factor is the heavy design footprint. The Project’s design 4 components are parsed into 11 outcomes supported by 42 outputs. The Project could have potentially been handled as two integrated and targeted Policy and Production projects, each with focused design, well targeted indicators based on pertinent baselines and an adequate budget.
- The indicators lack process criteria and do not tell the story of the project. The Impact and Outcome indicators are structure indicators and do not allow credit to the project managers for many well done outputs. A blend of structure and process indicators is necessary.
- A strategic communications function is critical to policy development and must be included in any project with policy design. The communications strategy from the overriding A&L Child Project was focused on dissemination of information with good outcomes. The project in each country required a strategic communications plan to support the policy development process, especially the National Action Plan (NAP) approval process. Strategic communication was not thoroughly planned or budgeted around policy development and legalization, or inadequate capacity did not allow to efficiently support the policy work.
- The experience of the project demonstrates that the interest of the producers in all markets and landscapes is increasing profits/livelihoods and selling to a stable market. The Good Agricultural Practices developed and piloted spoke to their interests, achieved buy-in, built trust and increased yields.

Project Effectiveness, Efficiency, Relevance:

- Efficiency: The project executed 89% of its budget by December 2021 for \$13,009,023 of 14,584,403. The amount of co-financing reported at TE was \$365,932,293 exceeding the target by 222%. Regardless, Paraguay, Liberia and the Indonesia components reported budget constraints. In Liberia these were acute and affected project implementation. The Co-financing was not available or was ineffective in responding to underestimated budgets in Liberia and Paraguay. The efficiency rating for the Project is “Satisfactory.”

- **Relevance:** The Production Project conforms to GEF Biodiversity Focal Area, goals and objectives BD4(Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors), the UNDP strategic framework, CCM2 (Climate Change Mitigation Focal Area Strategy), SFM1 (Sustainable Forest Management Strategy) and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): 1, 2, 12, 13, 15 and 17, Aichi BD Targets, UNFCCC Paris 2015, UNFF Global objective on forests. The Production Project is aligned with the national priorities in the three target countries. The Relevance rating is “Highly Satisfactory” (6).
- **Effectiveness:** The multi-stakeholder platforms are productive spaces. Corporate and government officials interviewed in all countries indicated that differences between stakeholders have been mitigated and that the private sector processors, producers, and governments are much closer to understanding each other and seeking opportunities. The Action Plans developed are important to orient the development of the respective sectors in a post-COVID economy. In addition, the project successfully developed national and subnational action plans, policies for commodity production practices, improved land-use allocations for commodity production and set-asides, and improved monitoring and endorsement for policies and regulations. The project achieved 86% of its targets.
- **Effectiveness:** Farmer support systems were furthered through needs assessments, technical assistance, and technical trainings. The pilots were successful in convincing farmers to participate with visible results from the practices proposed. Component 2 achieved 100% of targets related to Farmer support systems.
- **Effectiveness:** All countries advanced in developing the tools for mapping deforestation in High Conservation Value (HCV). The tools developed had not been deployed to the field level, so it will take time and follow-up to get these into the hands of local users and field-test them as decision-making support tools. Liberia was still early in the development process. The time needed to build and test the systems was underestimated. Component 3 achieved 847,330 ha. (92% of target) of HCV land set-aside and 129 Million tCO₂ eq. sequestered or avoided. The project achieved 96% of its targets.
- **Effectiveness:** The lessons learned from the project were captured in multiple knowledge products and publications, such as the Farmer Support System Toolkit and Scorecard, a Multi-stakeholder Collaboration Guidance, Recommendations for Sustainable Financing of Platforms, and information products such as the Causality Assessment for Landscape Intervention (CALI), amongst others. The products were of high quality, used by their target audiences, and facilitated management. Due to time drags, certain key products, such as CALI, were only available late in the project. The Component achieved 100% of its targets. The composite Effectiveness rating for the Project is “Satisfactory”

Sustainability

- **Financial:** The multi-stakeholder platforms are not yet legally and financially viable. National-level and subnational structures in Paraguay and Liberia are not officially registered or formally taken in by government. Some are legal status while others seek formalization within government. The latter have precarious financing. UNDP has developed short-term arrangements with Development assistance organizations for short-term assistance. Please read more details under Annex 25.
- **Institutional:** The main achievement was the creation and operation of the Regional Platform that works on technical and political issues with a very varied arc of actors, representing diverse institutions such as public government, academia, indigenous groups, producers, agricultural technicians, leaders of production cooperatives, among others. The work plan reflects the multiple interests, problems and challenges of the actors of the territory. public government, academia, indigenous groups, producers, agricultural technicians, leaders of production cooperatives, among others. The action plans also reflect the multiple interests, problems and challenges of the actors of the territory. The capacities and dialogue

spaces and action planning were effective in garnering multi-stakeholder support in producing lessons learned that will enable future actions towards the elimination of commodity-based deforestation.

- **Socio-political:** The project achieved the participation diverse economic and political actors with greater availability of land and access to influence, financial resources and technologies to expand the agricultural frontier. The alliance and articulation between them will help to safeguard against unchecked expansion in combination with reasonable enforcement. The integration of groups of respected citizens, such as the Pioneers of the Chaco Foundation, will be key to the sustainability. Public-private partnerships reduce and mitigate the risks associated with changes in political administration.

Environmental: The benefits obtained from the GEF increment, carbon sequestration, cover, water retention, etc. The lands protected and the farm improvements will produce benefits yearly for many decades. This is an opportunity for academia, government and others to study the effects and associated values on production and on the environment.

Table 2 illustrates Evaluation ratings. Overall evaluation rated as “Satisfactory” and the quality of activities for coordination, communication, and reporting has been “Highly Satisfactory” in general. The results of the project are “Moderately Likely” to be sustained. A summary of the ranking system is included in [Annex 2](#).

Table 2. Evaluation Ratings Table

1. Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating
M&E design at entry	S
M&E Plan Implementation	HS
Overall Quality of M&E	S
2. Implementing Agency (IA) Implementation & Executing Agency (EA) Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	S
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	HS
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	HS
3. Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	HS
Effectiveness	S
Efficiency	S
Overall Project Outcome Rating	S
4. Sustainability	Rating
Financial sustainability	ML
Socio-political sustainability	ML
Institutional framework and governance sustainability	L
Environmental sustainability	ML
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	ML

L= Likely; ML= Moderately Likely; MU=Moderately Unlikely; U=Unlikely (U/A=Unable to Assess)

(HS) Highly Satisfactory; (S) Satisfactory; (MS) Moderately Satisfactory; (MU) Moderately Unsatisfactory; (U) Unsatisfactory; (HU) Highly Unsatisfactory

1.5 Recommendations Summary

The following summarized the recommendations from the evaluation. They are intended to inform the design, monitoring and evaluation of future programs and projects. More detailed recommendations are included in the text.

Rec #	TE Recommendation	Entity Responsible
A	Category 1: Project Strategy and Design	
A.1	When designing a Production project, especially a “Pilot,” the PIF and PPG phases should identify and provide sufficient resources to analyse the variables appropriate for the specific commodities and components (policy, science, regulation, capacity, etc) for all of the results expected of the investments and effort made. This would include a blend of appropriate indicators that are oriented to expected results. If the project invests in techniques to increase yields in palm oil, then the indicator of the result would be a time-bound yield measurement at x months following training and a process indicator might be how the farmers feel about it on a scale of 1 to 5, etc. The same recommendation goes for policies and structures. A pilot project needs to know (a) if the policies are in-force and (b) are they providing the intended result. The former is applied in this project and the latter is absent. The PPG phase should also define the means of verification and the cost and effort, or partnerships required, even for monitoring that goes beyond the project as is common in GEF BD projects. results with a sufficient baseline to be able to do this. If these tasks are deferred to the project implementation phase, then the time to develop the baseline must be factored into the expectations and costs of the project keeping in mind that it could take several crop cycles or multiple measurements at different times, such as opinion polls, statistics on fires, etc. to gauge the results. The resulting information will loop back to both project implementation and financial, institutional and socio-political dialogues.	GEF
A.2	When considering policy actions as part of project design, successful policy gains have certain core elements of success: (i) a policy proposal with a win-win proposition developed through a participative process effectively leveraging or responding to demand for the policy; (ii) strategic communications to develop or consolidate demand for the policy; (iii) effective advocacy strategies targeted to different levels; (iv) strategic communications to augment public opinion and to influence decision-makers at critical times in the decision-making juncture to push the policies through the political process and maintain momentum through a generally protracted process; and (v) a highly visible and trustworthy champion to facilitate advocacy. These elements need to be	GEF

	considered for their level of effort, costs and timeframes when designing projects expected to produce approved policies.	
B	Progress towards objectives (Catalytic Effect)	
B.1	Consider producing brief 1 minute video “newscasts” that can be shared via whatsapp, email, or Instant messaging to decision-makers. Key decision-makers are more likely to watch a 1 minute video than read a 2 page memo. This type of strategy can contribute to advocacy efforts reinforcing demand for policies – adding value to other communications strategies employed.	UNDP Green Commodities Programme
B.2	<p>Although the project has been completed and this recommendation is not directly actionable by the PMU, it is recommended that in future similar projects, the executing partners seek expressions of interest from other interested parties to document the results of the training and piloting of agricultural intensification efforts in terms of changes in yield, cost and/or efficiencies etc. and compare these to production data from other interventions such as IFC IPOD (Indonesia), Solidarity W.A. (Liberia), corporate agronomic records, etc. The anecdotal yield differences reported indicate that the practices might be “bankable.”</p> <p>The GEF, UNDP, FOLUR, could share and seek partners to team with Roundtables to assist in disseminating this type of information. If determined to be “bankable” the practices could be scaled-up through leveraged financing such as through corporate partnerships or agricultural loans, which can then provide a source of incentives for practices, such as integrated Pest management, that could recognize the positive externalities associated.</p> <p>Related to the previous comment, these situations require a more robust M&E design approach to facilitate monitoring and up-scaling.</p>	UNDP Green Commodities Programme
C	Sustainability	
C.1	Because the support to the platforms in the short term is partially government and donor driven, it may therefore not be permanent. If not already completed, GGP should translate the Guidance on the Financial Sustainability of Multi-stakeholders Platforms into Spanish and Bahasa for distribution to key partners within the platforms and donor organizations providing short term support to the platforms (FOLUR Country Projects implementing partners, Proforest, SECO, et.al.) with the aim of working with the public and private stakeholders to move towards financial sustainability models appropriate to each.	UNDP Green Commodities Programme
C.2	<p>Paraguay: strategy for a common vision on sustainable beef</p> <p>Define "sustainable beef production". Systems approaches are often very valuable for getting collective agreement over defining what sustainable beef production looks like.</p>	UNDP (Paraguay CO)
C.3.	<p>Liberia: HCV/HCVS Planning</p> <p>Liberia has yet to complete mapping of HCV/HCVS values and use that base to indicate Land Use Cover Change in those areas. It is important for the government, UNDP, FOLUR if applicable and others to plan this process, train</p>	UNDP (Liberia CO)

	<p>and field test technicians and field test the use of the maps and dialogue.</p> <p>With evolving concession agreements, this infrastructure should be in place as soon as possible as a tool for dialogue and conflict resolutions. Discuss with MPOI/MANCO the possibility of donating resources and assure participation of the other commodities companies that might make good use of the tool in their traceability programs. This is a very important piece for NOPPOL to put into place.</p>	
C4	<p>Indonesia: As the concession agreements are coming into line, facilitate a dialogue with Musim Mas in Indonesia to discuss how their arrangements work with smallholders, the benefits, challenges, etc. UNDP could coordinate that dialogue. We would recommend a similar in-country dialogue with Maryland and their Oil Palm producers.</p>	<p>UNDP (Indonesia CO)</p>