

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		5839	
GEF Agency project ID		ATN/FM-14542-PE	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		IADB	
Project name		Mitigating Deforestation in Brazil Nut Concessions in Madre de Dios, Peru	
Country/Countries		Peru	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		CCM-5	
Executing agencies involved		Peruvian Trust Fund for National Parks and Protected Areas (Profonanpe)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Cooperaciones e Svilupp Cesvi; Research Institute of the Peruvian Amazon (IIAP); Peruvian Society of Environmental Law (SPDA), Association of Brazil Nut Concession Holders of the Tambopata Reserve "Los Pioneros" (Ascart); Organic Collectors of the Amazon Nut of Peru (Ronap); Association of Palm harvesters of San Juan de Madre de Dios (Palsamad)	
Private sector involvement			
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		June 13, 2014	
Effectiveness date / project start		December 4, 2014	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		May 5, 2019	
Actual date of project completion		August 31, 2019	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		1.56	1.56
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government		
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector	1	.81
	NGOs/CSOs		
	Other	2	3.07
Total GEF funding		1.56	1.56
Total Co-financing		3	3.89
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		4.56	5.45
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December 2019	
Author of TE		Maritza Mayo D'Arrigo	
TER completion date		June 18, 2020	
TER prepared by		Laura Nissley	

TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	
--	--

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	--	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		NR	--	ML
M&E Design		NR	--	U
M&E Implementation		NR	--	MU
Quality of Implementation		NR	--	MS
Quality of Execution		NR	--	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		--	--	--

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The objective of the project was to “conserve and sustainably manage the forests in brazil nut concessions, in order to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions caused by their deforestation and degradation” (Request for CEO Endorsement, pg. 1).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Project Document does not indicate any development objectives separate from the project’s global environmental objective.

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

The TE indicates that there were some changes made to the expected results and indicators of the project after project approval. Specifically, Output 1.1: *Signed agreements with associations of brazil nut concessionaries* was changed to *Subscription of conservation agreements with associations of brazil nut concession holders covering 100,000 hectares*. Or rather, the focus changed to hectares covered by the project as opposed to the number of agreements with the concession holders’ associations. The TE indicates this change was due to the “concession holders’ distrust of the leaders in their associations” (pg. 18).

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE assesses the project as relevant, as it “contributes to the chain of development, environment, and climate change outcomes at departmental (regional), national, and international levels” (pg. 16). The project’s objective is consistent with the GEF-5 climate change mitigation focal area, specifically Objective 5: *Conserve and enhance carbon stocks through sustainable management of land use, land-use change, and forestry*. Under this objective, the project contributes to the following expected outcomes: 1.1: *Good management practices in LULUCF [Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry] adopted both within the forest land and in the wider landscape*, and 2.1: *GHG emissions avoided and carbon sequestered* (Request for CEO Endorsement pg. 1). The TE indicates that the project was also consistent with the national priorities and policies of Peru, in particular the Bicentennial National Plan, which promotes the “conservation and sustainable use of natural resources and biodiversity with an integrated ecosystem approach” (pg. 17). Additionally, the project contributes to the Regional Concerted Development Plan of Madre de Dios 2014-2021, which lays out guidelines for the development of natural resources and biodiversity for one of the most diverse regions in Peru (TE pgs. 17-18). Overall, this TER provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project relevance.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--------------------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project effectiveness, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The TE indicates that the project did contribute to reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions caused by deforestation and degradation. Overall, the TE estimates that actual GHG emissions in the project area in 2015-2018 were 151,774 tCO₂e ha⁻¹, less than what was expected based on historical trends. The project did, however, fall short in some key areas, particularly regarding microcredit loans for individual concession holders and associations. There was also no data available to assess changes in the income of brazil nut concession holders or changes in invasion cases in the project area.

A summary of the project’s achievements, by component and outcome, is provided below:

Component 1: Conservation Agreements

Outcome 1.1: No deforestation in concessions that participate in conservation agreements

The project did not achieve zero deforestation by project end. The TE does indicate that actual deforestation rate in the project area (73.8 ha/year) was less than the projected rate for 2015-2018 based on historical trends (76.6 ha/year). It was also expected that 100,000 hectares would be under conservation agreements. At the beginning of 2018, 84 conservation agreements were signed, covering 65,618.31 hectares. However, the TE indicates that 7 of these agreements were terminated due to low interest and participation (pg. 35).

Outcome 1.2: 50% increase in the income of brazil nut concession holders

The TE indicates that there was no information available on brazil nut concession holders' income. However, the TE does indicate that by project end, financial and technical mechanisms for forest conservation in brazil nut concessions were implemented as expected (pg. 29). It was also expected that 20 microcredit contracts would be signed between financial institutions and individual concession holders or associations. The TE indicates that this was not achieved due to a financial crisis at the financial institution, Agronbanco (pg. 19).

Component 2: Organizational strengthening and local control system improvement

Outcome 2.1: Cases of invasions to brazil nut concessions land reduced from 33% to 10%

The TE indicates that there is no data available to assess changes in invasion cases in the project area. It was also expected that local control and surveillance systems would be in place, covering 100,000 hectares. By project end, the TE estimates that 94,523 hectares had systems in place, just short of the target. It was also expected that 100 concession holders would be trained in local control and surveillance methods. By project end, 150 people were trained, exceeding expectations (TE pg. 30).

Component 3: Monitoring, evaluation and dissemination of results

Outcome 3.1: Project results and lessons learned used for replication in similar areas

Under this outcome, it was expected that a communication strategy, as well as materials on project results and lessons learned from implementation, would be disseminated. The TE indicates that this outcome was satisfactorily achieved (pg. 39).

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
----------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project efficiency, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The TE indicates that the project experienced delays in implementation due to a number of factors: (1) flaws in the formulation of some of the project results; (2) delay in executing the baseline studies; (3) lack of materialized co-financing from the Blue Moon Fund; and (4) poor leadership of the first project coordinator (pgs. 6; 42). The TE notes that none of these problems were identified as

potential risks in the project design (pg. 19). Following recommendations in the mid-term evaluation, the project sought additional funding sources to replace the pledged resources from the Blue Moon Fund would not materialize. The concept notes developed for the Green Climate Fund and the Governors' Climate and Forests Fund were ultimately unsuccessful. The project did eventually secure in-kind contributions from other sources, however (TE pgs. 40-41). The TE indicates that budget implementation accelerated in the project's third year, "due to the dynamism provided by the new coordinators" (pg. 42).

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
--------------------	----------------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for the likelihood of project sustainability, however it does note a number of risks to sustainability. Taking these risks into consideration, this TER provides a rating of **Moderately Likely** for project sustainability.

Financial Resources

The TE indicates two moderate economic risks to the project: (1) Due to climate variability, incomes of concession holders' decreases, and (2) Brazil nuts demand decreases causing a reduction of prices in the market. The TE indicates that the project's investment in training for concession holders on sales alternatives to obtain better prices for their products will mitigate some of these risks (pgs. 47-48).

Sociopolitical

The TE indicates two low risks: (1) The Brazil nut concession holders do not continue with the good practices left by the project; and (2) The generational relay of the concession holders is not applied. One moderate risks is also noted: Roads are built through the brazil nut concession lands which affects change in land use. One substantial risk is noted: The number of invasions, or illegal occupation of concessions, increases. The TE indicates that the surveillance systems established under the project will mitigate this risk if they remain active (pg. 49).

Institutional Framework and Governance

This TE indicates two substantial risks to institutional sustainability: (1) regional officials do not commit to the progress left by the project; and (2) the authorities show no interest in working on deforestation mitigation issues. The TE indicates that the concession holders will have to continue to be organized to mitigate these risks (pg. 50).

Environmental

The TE indicates one moderate risk to sustainability: Occurrence of uncontrolled fires caused by the expansion of agricultural areas. A substantial risk is also noted: Climate change reduces brazil nuts production. The TE indicates that climate change monitoring will be key, as well as establishing intervention strategies through the brazil nuts technical group (pg. 49).

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Actual co-financing (\$3.89 million) exceeded expected co-financing (\$3 million) by approximately 30%. However, the original co-financer, the Blue Moon Fund, did not contribute as expected. The TE indicates that the lack of co-financing early in the project led to delays in implementation. The project team was able to secure in-kind contributions following the mid-term evaluation from the Research Institute of the Peruvian Amazon (IIAP), the Peruvian Society of Environmental Law (SPDA), the Association of Brazil Nut Concession Holders of the Tambopata Reserve (Ascart), and the Organic Collector of the Amazon Nut of Peru (Ronap) (TE pgs. 40-41).

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The TE indicates that the project faced a number of factors which caused delays in implementation, including: (1) flaws in the formulation of some of the project results; (2) delay in executing the baseline studies; (3) lack of materialized co-financing from the Blue Moon Fund; and (4) poor leadership of the first project coordinator (pgs. 6; 42). As a result, the project received an eight-month extension until August 31, 2019.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The TE does not directly address country ownership. The TE does indicate that project did not achieve the desired commitment from the regional government, but it "achieved a level of coordination" (pg. 45). On the other hand, the project worked closely with a number of national and local organizations. For example, the project worked closely with the SPDA on the control and surveillance system. Ascart, an association that provides services for peeling and marketing brazil nuts, provided beneficiaries with post-harvest techniques. Ronap, pledged to monitor fieldwork, and Palsamad provided training in the sustainable harvest of palm tree fruits (TE pg. 46).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Unsatisfactory
-------------------------	-------------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for M&E design at entry, which this TER rates as **Unsatisfactory**. The project's results framework does not sufficiently delineate between outputs, outcomes, and objectives. The framework provides a handful of indicators for "expected results," however it is unclear what level of change is targeted. The indicators themselves are not SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and timely). For example, the indicator of "zero deforestation" is not specific or achievable. As the TE notes, the law permits concession holders to use wood up to 5m³ per year, with the necessary permits (pg. 24). The Project Document does include an M&E plan which outlines activities and provides an M&E budget of \$30,000.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
------------------------	--

The TE does not provide a rating for M&E implementation, which this TER rates as **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. As noted above, some changes were made to the wording of results and indicators during implementation "to better respond to the expected outputs." However, the TE indicates that some of the results and indicators remained unrealistic, such as a "50% increase in the income of concession holders" and "zero deforestation" (pgs. 19; 27). The TE does not provide sufficient information on M&E activities, however it appears from its analysis that data was not collected on some indicators, including changes in the income of brazil nut concession holders and changes in invasion cases in the project area. The TE does indicate that a midterm evaluation was conducted in 2017. One of its key recommendations was to diversify co-financing sources, which the project implemented (pg. 39).

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
---------------------------------------	--

The TE does not provide a rating for the quality of project implementation, which this TER rates as **Moderately Satisfactory**. The implementing agency for the project was the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB). The TE indicates that IADB “showed a collaborative attitude during the design, implementation, and closure stages of the project.” For example, IADB made adjustments to its procurement and contracting plans to allow the executing agency to receive money directly for implementing agro-forestry activities (pg. 44). However, as noted above, the project’s results framework was largely inappropriate as a monitoring and evaluation tool. The TE does not indicate the quality of IADB’s supervision of project implementation.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
----------------------------------	--

The TE does not provide a rating for quality of project execution. The executing agency for the project was the Peruvian Trust Fund for National Parks and Protected Areas (Profonampe). Profonampe had a team in Lima which provided technical support and monitored progress, as well as a local team in Madre de Dios. The TE indicates that coordination and communication between these two units generally went smoothly, although the local team did report some difficulty meeting the administrative and procurement requirements set by the team in Lima (pgs. 44-45). The TE also indicates that the first project coordinator, based in Madre de Dios, was ineffective, which led to delays in implementation. The project was able to gain momentum under the second coordinator and was bolstered by new partnerships and new co-financing sources (pgs. 19; 44). Overall, this TER assesses the quality of project implementation as **Moderately Satisfactory**.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE indicates that 65,618.31 hectares were under conservation agreements by project end. Additionally, the TE notes that the actual deforestation rate for 2015-2018 (73.8 ha/year) was lower than the rate predicted was less than the projected rate for 2015-2018 based on historical trends (76.6 ha/year). Actual GHG emissions (151,774 tCO₂e ha⁻¹) in the project area in 2015-2018 were also less than expected based on historical trends (TE pg. 23).

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE did not have relevant data to assess changes in brazil nut concession holders' income. However, the TE does indicate that financial and technical mechanisms for forest conservation in brazil nut concessions were in place by project end (pg. 29).

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The project trained 150 people, including concession holders and their relatives, in control and surveillance methods. Additionally, 94,523 hectares had surveillance systems in place by project end (pg. 30).

b) Governance

By project end, 77 conservation agreements were signed (accounting for the 7 agreements that were terminated due to low interest and participation) (TE pg. 35). The TE also indicates that the project supported the reactivation of the Technical Group of Brazil Nut (pg. 28).

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

The TE does not indicate any unintended impacts that occurred by project end.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The TE does not indicate any GEF initiatives that were adopted at scale by project end.

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report, including how they that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE provides the following lessons learned (pgs. 51-52):

1. If the funds of a project are delayed or canceled, action must be taken as soon as possible in order to obtain others. Waiting for their concretion slows down the implementation of the project. The same is applied for other circumstances that negatively affect a project. It is necessary to react as immediate as possible.
2. It is important that the fundamental diagnosis stage is carried out during the project design stage. The Brazil Nuts Project invested a lot of time in conducting these studies.
3. Hiring directly independent consultants proved to be more efficient than hiring consulting companies, since many times they include staff members that do not necessarily meet the expected profile.
4. In a scenario of general mistrust, it is convenient that the team is composed of people acquainted and familiar with the locals and their idiosyncrasy, as happened in the Brazil Nuts Project with the participation of the second coordinator and the field coordinator. These professionals already had a wider acceptance in the project area.
5. The involvement of concession holders in field work is key. Their participation as local stakeholders should be promoted. Likewise, staff must be open to listen and address any concerns and collect their proposals.
6. For the DEMA, the file of each concession must have all the relevant documentation that gives account of the status of the concession paperwork situation, including local problems or other issues such as, for example: preliminary agreements of boundaries, identified threats, etc.
7. Learning from other experiences through internships was motivating and contributed to the commitment of the concession holders during training sessions.
8. Considering the administrative and financial topics within the trainings allowed progress towards greater profitability of the brazil nut production.
9. It was very beneficial for the project to work on the issue of generational relay. This made some of the tasks more successful between the elder family members and made the younger more committed.
10. In relation to agro-forestry systems, an orderly sequence with specific times must be taken into account, considering rainy and dry seasons to ensure the proper development of the plants. The recommended sequence provided by the project team is as follows:
 - a) Report in the DEMA papers, the intention to develop AFSs in degraded areas within the concessions.
 - b) Perform the evaluation of potential degraded areas for cultivation and analyze the soils by the middle of the year.

- c) Deliver tools and mesh protection for seedlings.
 - d) Clean, mark and put signs on the selected areas before the end of the third quarter of the year.
 - e) Deliver and plant the seedlings before and at the beginning of the rainy season, to ensure their good development and prevent their mortality.
 - f) Monitor, prune and fertilize plants according to the conditions of each land plot.
 - g) Complete the replacement of dead plants one year after the installation of the plots and, if possible, repeat this action the following year.
 - h) Train people at each stage in parallel with the described activities
 - i) Provide permanent technical assistance preferably through professionals living nearby where the plantation plots are located.
 - j) Accompany the development of the agro-forestry plots preferably for a minimum period of five years.
11. Since the harvest of the palm fruit “aguaje” and the brazil nut occur at the same time, is important to plan its use in advance as follows:
- a) The census of palm trees and cabinet work to develop the DEMA, should be done in April or before the harvest time, so that the concession holders can organize themselves in advance.
 - b) Training in harvesting, fruit selection and handling techniques, should be done before starting the harvesting season.
 - c) Aguaje harvesting should be done using a work team different from the one used for brazil nut harvesting.
 - d) Support to concession holders producing aguaje should be provided in stages of harvesting, first sales and organizational processes, to ensure their success and generate the habit among the participants.
12. The time required for legal support should be considered when planning activities, as the legal processes can take over a year.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations (pgs. 52-53):

1. The set of actions of the Brazil Nuts Project is considered replicable as it has worked various dimensions of the problems faced by the brazil nuts concession holders. For this reason, the design of a similar project or with some of its matching objectives should consider the lessons learned by the project and the recommendations raised in this document.
2. The following elements are key for both project replication and scalability:
 - a) Being flexible and listening to potential beneficiaries.
 - b) Have a good diagnosis at the project design stage.
 - c) Establish partnership with various actors in order to produce synergies.
 - d) Have a team that understands local idiosyncrasy.

3. Have special care when formulating objectives and indicators as they are the guiding lines of the work. These must be realistic.
4. The Brazil Nuts Project hired a consultancy to conduct five studies. This activity was not as efficient as expected since the studies did not progress in parallel. If several studies need to be carried out simultaneously, as where the outcome of one does not depend on another, it is recommended that they are commissioned to different companies or consultants in order to advance faster.
5. Clearly define the scope and main aspects that need to be considered in consulting products.
6. Develop administrative arrangements that facilitate procurement in the areas of intervention of the project, since it is not easy to obtain vouchers in places outside the city of Puerto Maldonado. It is also recommended to define a minimum amount of purchases that can be made without the need of bid offers. This will speed up processes and reduce the investment of man-hours in these tasks.
7. Make the necessary arrangements one year in advance to guarantee seeds and seedling plants. Specialized personnel should also be considered to verify the quality of these.
8. A pending theme is the associability between the concession holders. Progress has been made on a joint commercialization of the nut, but it is necessary to improve their own organizational capacity. This will allow them to demand regulatory changes when needed and/or have better legal protection.
9. Safeguards are important elements during project execution because they provide a framework of considerations that help in the success of the experience.
10. An important contribution of the Brazil Nuts Project is its analysis of risk factors which can be taken into account in a similar intervention. The brazil nut concessions are exposed to different risks. For the Brazil Nuts Project, areas with a tendency to develop livestock activity were identified; other sites, because of their proximity to the Interoceanic highway, proved to be more vulnerable than others. Knowing these risks allows to design particular working strategies for different groups of brazil nuts concessions. In addition, it is important to constantly monitor and see the impact of the trainings and advice given on each of these groups. This monitoring allows the adjustment of strategies of intervention according to the different beneficiary groups and their advances within the project. See the report on: Risk of deforestation for the Brazil Nuts Project (2019).
11. By the end of the Brazil Nuts Project there are elements to propose local and regional regulations. It is recommended that these continue to be shared and that workshop is organized with experts to present the results, so other proposals are generated.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE adequately assess the outcomes and impacts of the project, however the report could have been organized better to facilitate a comparison of actual and expected results.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent, and the evidence presented is convincing. However, ratings were only provided for project relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency. The project effectiveness rating is mildly inflated.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The addresses risks to sustainability and provides mitigation methods. However, the likelihood of these risks is not addressed.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported by evidence in the report.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes actual project costs and actual co-financing used.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE does not directly assess the project's M&E system. Some information can be gleaned from other sections of the report.	MU
Overall TE Rating		MS

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).