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**Context, background and findings**

*(Insert here up to several paragraphs on context and background and UNDP’s response to the validity and relevance of the findings, conclusions and recommendations)*.

**CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (from MTR reviewer)**

The Theory of Change is based to a significant extent on compliance with the Brazil Forest Code and on local government capacities to enforce it. Project assumptions may have overlooked sensitive dynamics of producers, governments, and CSOs, and the fact that other drivers and conditions could have exerted the expected results if given more preponderance. Among these other drivers and conditions are the cost-effectiveness of new agricultural technologies advanced by EMBRAPA, the strengthening of institutional capacities of OEMAS, and greater emphasis on transactional and demand drivers.

The assumption that the rural environmental registry (CAR) would prove to be an effective monitoring tool and that deforestation rates would decrease cannot be confirmed until the system operates effectively, and farms start implementing plans for regularization, a complex process that can take several years.

Evidence points to the fact that there was insufficient time or resources for the preparation phase. State environmental secretaries were not consulted and the Sociedade Rural Brasileira was not aware of some of the project targets.

A challenging Results Framework, with a few unrealistic and unfeasible indicators and targets, was identified by the reviewer. Eleven (11) targets and their indicators do not sufficiently comply with SMART criteria. Moreover, there is question as to whether their achievement can be attributable to the Project.

Given the complexity of the MATOPIBA region, and the diversity of stakeholders involved in the project execution, it was assertive relevant to consider an open dialogue to construct a shared vision on the sustainability of MATOPIBA. However, communicational and organizational aspects remain to be improved. A lead role for coordinating multiple partners, agencies and stakeholders is lacking, and should be resolved for a more consolidated project and results.

Management has been generally efficient in terms of work planning, monitoring, and financial and substantive execution in the context of the multiple obstacles faced during project execution. Since 2018, there were difficulties already experienced by the project due to the negotiations of the Forest Code, with the consequent resistance by farmers to observing the Code, as it was. The Bolsonaro government made important institutional changes, impacting the Ministry of Environment and project counterparts. In addition, the President’s prejudice against environmental CSOs has been evident, also affecting producers’ positions and consequently encumbering project progress. Adaptive management has been a constant challenge in project execution, and a strength of the project at the same time.

Notwithstanding the complexity and setbacks of the first two years of project execution in building a shared vision on the sustainability of the MATOPIBA region among a wide range of institutions and organizations, advances have been made through the MATOPIBA Coalition and other bodies of project governance. The withdrawal from the Project of the SRB in April 2019 as an important project partner, and the distancing of the Ministry of Environment, have negatively affected Project results. However, a more aligned group of stakeholders and partners is now integrated by the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Supply (MAPA), EMBRAPA, state environmental and agricultural agencies, and multiple CSO organizations.

One successful measure of the adaptive management of the Project was to build a stronger collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Supply (MAPA) and the state environmental secretaries. EMBRAPA, as part of MAPA, is serving as intermediary with producers, an essential role for project execution after SRB’s withdrawal. The collaboration with EMBRAPA to support the ABC loans to farmers, directed at low-carbon, high productivity and better water management practices, has been of great significance. A newly created Program, ABC Soy, is the result of Project collaboration with EMBRAPA which is a key government counterpart for the project execution and sustainability.

Cooperation Agreements between CI Brazil and the state environmental agencies SEMARH/Naturatins (Tocantins state) and SEMA/INEMA (Bahia state) during 2018 are directed at accelerating the analysis and validation of properties registered in SICAR, which is a critical step to fostering the CAR and restoration plans. However, there are delays with respect to CAR-related project targets, with consequent delays in other results and objectives.

The support given to the State of Tocantins’s Agricultural Secretary to develop a Consortium with the other state agricultural and environmental secretaries of Bahía, Maranhão, and Piaui represents an important opportunity to contribute to the sustainability of project results.

The Project Document indicates that this child project will be responsible for overall program coordination among the different child projects in order to, among other objectives, ensure a clear identity for the IAP. Component 4, Supply Chain Integration, includes specific activities to be implemented by WWF (Demand child project) and IFC-UNEP-FI (Transactions and Finance child projects). Close coordination, including planning and reporting activities integrating outputs under the responsibility of the other child projects, needs to be fulfilled according to project document.

The project is producing crucial data and information regarding areas or farms recommended for environmental and socially friendly soy sourcing. These outputs need to be accelerated to provide traders, financial institutions with precise and timely information. The project may be able to contribute to safeguarding traditional communities in agreement with local governments, farmers, and traders, as suggested in the annotated and updated version of the Project Results Framework. Given the current socio-political context by the new government of Brazil, it is not probable that safeguards will be agreed at the federal level as indicated by the AMTROPICA assessment.

The financial execution of the project as of January 2020 is 57.46% showing a moderate delay. The main lag in execution is in Outcome 2, Farmer Support Systems. The audits reveal that the project has proven to be efficient in its management, has maintained satisfactory internal controls and has made appropriate use of the funds. The limited budget execution is duly justified by emerging barriers and circumstances confronted by the Project. In the early stages, and as shown in the PIRs, the Project Team observed high transactional costs of coordination and meetings. It was noted that as of January 2020, the Project had spent almost all the budget allocated for Project Management.

The MATOPIBA Coalition will be key as to influence traders’ decision-making processes concerning responsible commodities production and sourcing.

The monitoring of gender issues is a pending task. The project is categorized by UNDP as Gender Marker 2, which implies the inclusion of activities that have gender equality as a significant objective. Although the Gender Assessment finalized in 2018 included recommended actions and the corresponding monitoring of gender indicators, these actions have not yet advanced.CI is building a strategy for implementing gender-focused actions for 2020 and 2021 with support from the UNDP CO Gender Officer and key project actors.

The reviewer encountered a great number of lessons learned, assessments and studies produced by the Project; however, they need to be disseminated. Opportunities to do so exist, for example, through contributions to the various knowledge products and the platform Evidensia, managed by the GGP global A&L child project. The project has missed opportunities for contributing to publications and papers such as the global publication on gender mainstreaming and the yearly GGP Highlights Report, as well as other knowledge products.

The project is not on track to achieve the project objective within the project timeline and based on the target of reducing deforestation by 1,000 km2 by the end of the project. It must be borne in mind that the outcome indicators as designed may need to be revised, not only because of the national environmental political context, but also because they have proven to be unsuitable, unrealistic or unfeasible to achieve within the project timeline.

Project results can be improved in the coming months as there are ongoing efforts to attain them. Nevertheless, there are time constraints that need to be addressed to effectively deliver results that can be further developed benefiting farms, government and stakeholders, even after the project ends. Project results might not be seen in the coming months, but rather in the mid and long term.

**Recommendations and management response**

*(One recommendation per table. Insert as many tables as needed).*

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 1.** Revise outcome indicators and targets to correspond to the SMART criteria, adaptive management measures, time constraints, and political context. **JUSTIFICATION:** Several outcome indicators and targets are ambitious and not suitable. Also, the political context has affected project execution. |
| **Management response:** In February 2018, CI pledged to revise the indicators precisely due to the topics highlighted by the reviewer. However, we received the information that any changes of this nature with the GEF should happen after the MTR. Since MTR took place only by the end of Year 3 and this is GGP’s last year (2020/2021), we believe it’s not appropriate to modify outcomes’ indicators and targets at this point of project implementation. Since 2018, CI is monitoring other indicators, which complement those listed on Prodoc and are more accurate concerning activities’ implementation under project Outcomes and Outputs.  |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)**CI, UNDP CO, Regional Technical Center. | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status[[1]](#footnote-1)** |
| *1.1 Revise GGP indicators proposed by CI and technically justify their adoption in GGP’s monitoring (not in the Prodoc)* | *December 2020**(Q4 2020)* | *CI* |  |  *Pending* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 2.**Revise the Matrix of project risks.**JUSTIFICATION**: Higher and new risks were identified by the reviewer |
| **Management response:** Revising the project’s risk matrix is aligned with closer oversight actions to be implemented by UNDP CO. This action will be coordinated with RTA and will also be reflected in the annual Project Implementation Report. Overall risks will be mapped out, including risks related to COVID-19, as well as the key challenges impacting the individual project components.  |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** UNDP CO, Regional Technical Center. | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| *2.1 To revise the Risk Matrix, UNDP CO proposes a working session with CI to map the* ***high impact*** *and* ***high likelihood*** *risks to deliver each output/product, including mitigation actions.* | *By December 2020**(Q4 2020)* | UNDP CO, Regional Technical Center. |  | *In progress* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 3.**Revise project budget**JUSTIFICATION**: According to the adaptive management measures undertaken by the project, and the recommendations of this MTR, a budget revision may be needed. Also, because the currency exchange, US Dollars to Brazil Reais, has significantly increased during project execution. |
| **Management response:** As agreed between UNDP CO & CI, project budget is under revision since June and will finalize the process in December 2020. This exercise will address the issues of currency exchange, expenses reallocations and activities implementation in the last 6 months of Year 4 (until Jun.21), as well as the impact of restraints imposed by Covid-19 pandemic in Brazil since March 2020. |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** UNDP CO, CI, and Project Board. UNDP Regional Technical Center (for approval). | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| *3.1 Revise project budget (2020/2021)* | *December 2020* *(Q4 2020)* | *CI, UNDP CO* |  | *Partially Completed* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 4.**Oversee project implementation more closely and enhance communication with CI.**JUSTIFICATION**: Next phase may require more effective communication with CI and support to undertake some of the recommended actions |
| **Management response:** UNDP CO has discussed this recommendation with CI and has agreed to hold regular monthly meetings, in addition to eventual meetings to deal with urgent matters. UNDP CO will also provide additional support to CI in liaising with political entities, including the ministries at the federal level (Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Environment). The CO has already contacted the new Secretary of External Relations at the Ministry of Environment, reintroduced the project, shared material and contacts at the Ministry of Agriculture. |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** UNDP CO | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| *4.1 UNDP CO to hold regular monthly meetings with CI, as from August 2020. Also to support CI to engage with the Ministries in Brasília.*  | As from August 2020 | *UNDP CO* |  | In progress |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 5.**Clarify and discuss with the other implementing agencies (IFC, WWF, and UNDP-FI) the role of the Project Management Unit concerning overall project coordination in terms of the integrated approach. **JUSTIFICATION**: Outlined in the Prodoc (paragraphs # 182 and 186) and detailed in paragraph 22 of this MTR. |
| **Management response:** Address the topic of Project Management Unit role concerning GGP’s integrated approach in the next round of Governance meetings (aka the Executive Committee Meeting with WWF, IFC and UNEP-FI) at UNDP Brazil headquarters in Brasília, DF. |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)**CI with support of UNDP CO | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| *5.1 Schedule next Executive Committee meeting and coordinate with UNDP on the discussed agenda* | *Next round of Governance Meetings (Q4 2020)* | *CI with support of UNDP CO* |  | *Pending* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 6.**Support CI in bringing together the other implementing agencies (IFC, WWF, UNEP-FI) for the construction of a joint plan for the remaining months of the project.**JUSTIFICATION**: UNDP can contribute to convening and catalyzing interests and responsibilities under the project objectives as the GEF implementing agency of this project. |
| **Management response**: UNDP CO and CI agreed to hold preparatory meetings prior to Board meeting to better explore synergies with other implementing agencies. Trilateral preparatory meeting with each other implementing agencies may be held to seek concrete actions to be taken by the end of the project, including those that may contribute to the socioeconomic response post-COVID 19. |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)**UNDP CO | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| *6.1* UNDP CO to facilitate and support more joined up work (including IFC, WWF, UNEP-FI) in the next meeting to be held in x 2020. | Date to be defined. | *CI and UNDP CO* |  | *Pending* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 7.**Foster synergies and knowledge sharing with other GEF supported projects including the SGP, World Bank projects, as well as with the Brazil’s REDD+ Strategy, (when suitable and feasible) as mentioned in paragraphs #49 and # 84 of this MTR and as indicated in the Project Document.**JUSTIFICATION**: The experience, studies and advances of other projects with similar objectives may benefit this Brazil child project. |
| **Management response:** UNDP CO will invite CI representatives to have meetings with other managers in charge of other GEF supported projects (e.g Bem Diverso, etc.), as well as with the Brazil’s GCF REDD+ project in other to seek synergies, exchange lessons learned and mitigate similar risks. Moreover, UNDP CO with bridge interaction between CI and the integration crop-farming-forest’s network.  |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)**UNDP CO | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| *7.1 CI and UNDP CO to present the Matopiba project to other sections (GEF lead officer, REDD+ Project Manager, and others) and explore synergies by December 2020.* | By December 2020Q4 | *UNDP CO and project managers of other projects* |  | Pending |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 8.**Integrate EMBRAPA in the Project Board together with MAPA for successful project execution and sustainability.**JUSTIFICATION**: EMBRAPA is fundamental due that farmers highly trust this public enterprise and because of the successful ABC Programs and broader partnerships that can leverage the results of this project. The Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Supply is participating in the Project Board but is not a formal member according to project design. |
| **Management response:** The Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Supply (MAPA) is an active member of Project Board since August 2018 (Year 2 of the project), despite not formally present in the Prodoc. The Project Board is the sphere of deliberation composed by CI, UNDP and Brazilian federal government representatives, namely the Ministries of Environment and Agriculture. Embrapa is a member of the Steering Committee since 2019. Since the Ministries are also part of GGPs Steering Committee, they have an opportunity to engage with Embrapa and discuss its relevant results benefiting project implementation. |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)**UNDP CO, Project Board, CI | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| *8.1 Provide quarterly updates on specific developments under EMBRAPA’s cooperation agreement to Project Board* | *Next round of Governance Meetings (Q4 2020)* | *UNDP CO, Project Board, CI* |  | *Pending* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 9.**Define the target for the number and size of traditional lands protected trough safeguards.**JUSTIFICATION**: This action is critical for project monitoring and evaluation. |
| **Management response:** CI’s team has been revising the recommendations on socioenvironmental safeguards for Matopiba prepared in 2019 to integrate those results with the river basins mapped in the focal areas of GGP. Together with close state government collaboration, this will be part of the criteria to define targeted traditional lands (number/size) to be protected through project safeguards.  |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)**CI | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| *9.1 Identify traditional lands (number and size) within GGPs geographical scope (selected river basins) to be targeted by project activities* | *October 2020**(Q4 2020)* | CI |  | *Partially Completed* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 10.**Extend the project execution by 6 months at no additional costs.**JUSTIFICATION**: The project is delayed and will need additional time to finalize key outputs. Furthermore, the COVID-19 will significantly affect project execution. |
| **Management response:** Due to some constraints faced along project implementation (political environment and COVID pandemic), it may be needed to extend the project. UNDP will seek clarifications with UNDP-GEF on the conditions and procedures for such an extension and will explore the possible length of the extension request with CI. In this scenario, CI would need to assess the budgetary implications of such an extension in order to achieve the full commitments as stated in the ProDoc, keeping in mind that the PMC amount established in the ProDoc cannot be exceeded.  |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)**UNDP CO, UNDP Regional Technical Center | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| *10.1* assess the budgetary implications of such an extension in order to achieve the full commitments as stated in the ProDoc*10.2 UNDP will* explore the possible length of the extension request with CI*10.3* UNDP will seek clarifications with UNDP-GEF on the conditions and procedures for such an extension |  | *CI, UNDP CO, UNDP Regional Technical Center* |  | Ongoing |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 11.**Reinforce capacities of Tocantins and Bahia state environment secretaries towards the implementation of the SICAR and the PRA through the ongoing project support. Also continue efforts to support the Consortium among the secretaries of environment and agriculture**JUSTIFICATION**: Registration, analysis, validation, and proposed restoration plans are core results to accomplish the project objective. The Consortium may contribute to the sustainability of project impacts. |
| **Management response:** CI signed cooperation agreements with state governments of Tocantins and Bahia in 2018 and has been carrying out the activities defined in the work plans since Year 2. One of the main bottlenecks identified by both states was the support in CAR validation and technical experts were hired in 2019 to meet this demand. However, during discussions held with the local secretaries, it was identified the requirement to extend experts’ contract until December 2020, in order to meet CAR validation targets mutually agreed by CI and the states. Concerning the Consortium of Secretaries, CI continues to engage in the consolidation of this strategic governance forum in Matopiba, through the support of the elaboration of their workplan, as well as securing co-financing budget to support their meetings’ organization in throughout 2021. |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)**CI | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| *11.1 Extend contract with technical experts to support CAR analysis with state government until December 2020**11.2 Gather results on CAR analysis supported by GGP and discuss actions targeted at advancing PRAs with state government* *11.3 Hire a consultancy to support the elaboration of the Consortium of Secretaries’ work plan**11.4 Support Consortium meetings and dialogues* | *July 2021**February 2021**July 2020**July - April 2020* | *CI**CI**CI**CI* |  | *Completed**Pending**Completed**Pending* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 12.**Continue and focus on the ongoing actions carried on through the MATOPIBA Coalition for the discussion and presentation to decision-makers of policies with potential long-term impacts.**JUSTIFICATION**: This action is key to ensure project mid and long-term impacts |
| **Management response:** The discussions under the Matopiba Coalition are taking place on a quarterly basis, bringing together representatives of traders and financial institutions to act upon a shared vision of sustainable production in the region established in 2019 together with a workplan (properly aligned with GGP goals). This shared vision will be further explored through a series of interviews with Matopiba Coalition partners, bringing their perspectives on ecosystems’ services relevance within commodities production. Together with a set of farmers’ case studies, this effort will culminate in a publication – to be launched in May 2021. This will be widely disseminated among key stakeholders in different sectors to support decision-making for the Matopiba region. |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| *12.1 Engage with Matopiba Coalition partners, by gathering in a quarterly basis to foster discussions and monitor workplan implementation.* | *July 2020 – May 2021* | *CI* |  | *Partially Completed* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 13.**Continue and increase collaboration to EMBRAPA’s ABC programs aimed at stimulating the number and quality of loans.**JUSTIFICATION**: This action could exert a significant and sustained impact in the focus area, with potential for replicability. |
| **Management response:** Since early 2020, CI’s team is focused on increasing collaboration with Embrapa to support other ABC initiatives exploring the potential of the integration between soy and cattle supply chains in Tocantins. Cooperation agreements are planned to be finalized in Q3 2020. |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)**CI | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| *13.1 Sign cooperation agreements with EMBRAPA to support their ABC initiatives in the region (ABC Carne and ABC Leite)**13.2 Monitor activities’ implementation* | *October 2020* *May 2021* | *CI**CI* |  | *Partially Completed* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 14.**Accelerate the mapping of land use, which is crucial for promoting responsible soy sourcing and protected areas.**JUSTIFICATION**: Through this mapping of land use, the project may propose the areas under integrated management. |
| **Management response:** GGP results under partnerships with FBDS, TNC, IEB and Lina Galvani Institute (PVC) provided relevant data to be integrated in a comprehensive landscape management strategy for Matopiba. These efforts will culminate in a proposal to public and private sector stakeholders, considering elements of prioritization for conservation and restoration, hydrographical basins mapping, potential of protected areas implementation and suitable zones to sustainably expand soy production. |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)**CI | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| *14.1 Integrate GGP results to develop a proposal of integrated land use management to public and private decision-makers.* | *March 2021* | *CI* |  | *Pending* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 15.**Continue and reinforce the tools and mechanisms directed at traders, financial institutions, and companies involved in the soy market chain, through for example, the WBCSD Natural Capital Protocol, the Soy Toolkit developed by Proforest, or the Agroideal through TNC.**JUSTIFICATION**: Encouraging responsible soy sourcing processes contributes significantly to achieving project objectives. |
| **Management response:** CI understands that recommendation 15 must be addressed by the Demand Child, since this is primarily within the scope of WWF interventions under GGP. Considering CI’s limited role and budget on this matter, it’s important to point out that suchrecommendation is not applicable. |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 15.1  |  | WWF |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 16.**Monitor and foster gender mainstreaming, following recommendations of the Gender Assessment conducted in 2018. Include the gender balance approaches in future project contracts and agreements. Provide spaces and attention to women’s contributions in project meetings and workshops.**JUSTIFICATION**: These actions on gender ensure equal and active participation by women in the agriculture sector and within the project management. |
| **Management response:** The collaboration with the State secretary of Agriculture of Tocantins (SEAGRO) and with Embrapa in 2019 were key to advance farmers targeted actions and build a less hostile environment towards gender focused activities, as perceived in Year 2. The 2020 – 2021 gender-focused plan was prepared by CI’s team and revised by UNDP. This approach is aligned with GGP Program report prepared in December 2019 by Leisa Perch (UN Women) and considered the recommendations in the Gender Assessment produced in 2018. It aims to (1) engage women's organizations that work in agricultural production primarily in the states of Matopiba; (2) elaborate a consolidated vision on sustainability from the perspective of women working in the soy supply chain (based on a qualitative and quantitative survey in Tocantins and Bahia); (3) Disseminate results and booklets in different communication channels and promote exchange of knowledge in workshops and events and (4) Promote technical training for rural producers in Matopiba, by developing capacity building modules on selected topics according to the demands and bottlenecks pointed out in the survey.  |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)**CI | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| *16.1 Implement GGP Brazil 2020 – 2021 gender plan* | *July 2020 – May 2021* | *CI* |  | *Partially Completed* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 17.**Draft a work plan for the remaining months of project execution jointly prepared with the WWF, IFC, UNEP-FI, particularly focusing on impacts and sustainability of project outcomes.**JUSTIFICATION**: It is critical to carry out a detailed revision of the workplan (activities and realistic deadlines), and to discuss the issue of indicators. Before the project ends, it is critical to plan for the project’s exit strategy to ensure continuity of project results, incorporating lessons learned. |
| **Management response:** Coordination between GGP implementing agencies (WWF, IFC, UNEP-FI) take place on a quarterly basis in the Executive Committee governance meetings conducted by CI. In early 2020, a few activities were already identified for jointly implementation in order to achieve greater impact in the region. |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)**CI with support of UNDP CO | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| *17.1 Carry out Executive Committee meetings focusing on the monitoring of integrated activities’ implementation and indicators discussion* | *December 2020* | *CI with support of UNDP CO* |  | *Pending* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 18.**Prepare a strategy for the sustainability of the MATOPIBA region through the MATOPIBA Coalition or other fora.**JUSTIFICATION**: The MATOPIBA Coalition is the forum through which a strategy or project exit strategy for the sustainability of the MATOPIBA region can be prepared. Assessments and studies carried out by the project may support this strategy. |
| **Management response:** A shared vision for the development of activities towards a sustainable production model in Matopiba was already consolidated in partnership with the Matopiba Coalition in 2019. A workplan is under implementation with the support of traders and financial institutions. These opportunities can be perceived also in the ongoing collaboration between CI and the Consortium of Secretaries, another strategic forum with the potential to provide financial sustainability and institutional robustness, as well as scaling-up GGP actions in the long-term. |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)**CI and the MATOPIBA Coalition | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| *18.1 Coordinate discussions with the Matopiba Coalition and Consortium of Secretaries towards a strategy for the sustainability of Matopiba* | *July 2020 – May 2021* | *CI and the MATOPIBA Coalition* |  | *Pending* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 19.**Elaborate and execute a strategy of communication that considers implementing partners, implementing agencies, UNDP and the public. Consider adding more information on the project webpage.JUSTIFICATION: A common message and the sharing of information would enhance project understanding and sustainability by stakeholders and the public. |
| **Management response:** Due mainly to political risk throughout Year 3 and the scaling-up of polarization between agriculture and environment agendas, CI had to adjust GGP’s communication strategy to avoid reactions from stakeholders, which could potentially impact activities implementation and government engagement. Our communication plan for Year 4 in under revision until the end of July. It aims to establish clear actions for the next 12 months focused on showcasing project main results and achievements, through case studies, media coverage, publications, web platforms and events. |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)**CI | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| *19.1 Finalize communication plan revision**19.2 Implement communication plan activities engaging GGP partners* | *August 2020**August 2020 – June 2021* | *CI* |  | *Partially Completed**Pending* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 20.**In the strategy of communication, include a joint plan with EMBRAPA and Banks to effectively disseminate the good practices under the EMBRAPA’s programs, some of which have been supported by the CI Brazil child project.**JUSTIFICATION**: It is essential to highlight the ABC Soy, ABC Beef, ABC Milk, and the crop-livestock-forest integration (ILPF) programs. The farming integrated approach or diversification of their production has proven to be highly beneficial. The ABC Programs contribute to reducing deforestation in MATOPIBA, to better water and soil management, and to increase the resilience of the MATOPIBA region, along with farm productivity. |
| **Management response:** GGP Brazil communication plan for Year 4 in under revision until the end of July. It aims to establish clear actions for the next 12 months focused on showcasing project main results and achievements, through case studies, media coverage, publications, web platforms and events. CI’s team will include coordinated activities with EMBRAPA and financial institutions, focusing on the support to ABC programs, to disseminate main results achieved. |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)**CI | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| *20.1 Revise GGP Brazil communication plan to include activities with Embrapa and partners focused on promoting the impact on ABC agenda in the region* | *October 2020* | *CI* |  | *Pending* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Midterm Review recommendation 21.**Engage in knowledge exchange on applying the integrated supply approach through meetings of the GGP Global Secretariat and through spaces provided by the Adaptive Management and Learning child project, including the sharing of lessons learned and knowledge products.**JUSTIFICATION**: Since this is a GEF demonstrative project, part of a global initiative, it is key to share information with the community and through the Adaptive Management and Learning child project. |
| **Management response:** CI’s team participates in the GGP Global Secretariat calls and continuously provides materials and information to A&L child project reports, as well as attending workshops and meetings. In Year 4, as part of the communication plan, CI aims to consolidate GGP Brazil knowledge products, lessons learned and public policies’ recommendations in order to broadly share with partners (also through A&L exchange platforms). |
| **Key action(s)** | **Time frame** | **Responsible unit(s)**CI | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| *21.1 Share knowledge products, lessons learned and recommendations with GGP community* | *April-May 2021* | *CI* |  | *Partially Completed* |

1. Status of Implementation: Completed, Partially Completed, Pending. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)