KFW

Ex post evaluation – Brazil, Guyana, Suriname

>>> Project of the International Climate Initiative (IKI)

IKI funding area: Funding area 3: conserving natural carbon sinks/REDD+ **Programme/Project:** "Guyana Shield Initiative"/Avoided deforestation through consolidation of existing and creation of protected areas in the Guianan region (Project number 209810607, BMUB reference 09_II_059_GUY_K/A_Guiana Shield Initiative)

Implementing agency: Conservation International (CI)

Ex post evaluation report: 2017

		Planned	Actual
Total costs	EUR million	3.40	2.97
Counterpart contribu	ution* EUR million	1.15**	0.72***
Funding	EUR million	2.25	2.25
of which IKI funds	EUR million	2.25	2.25

*) Counterpart contribution comprises further funds raised for this project by CI, **) in contract USD 0.51 million, ***) USD 0.95 million, exchange rate from 31 December 2012

CUYANA SURINAME BRAZIL

Summary: Between 2009 and 2014 the project promoted measures in the geological macroregion of Guiana Shield amounting to EUR 2.25 million. In the biodiversity corridors of Amapá and North Pará in Brazil, the activities focused on improving management of the protected areas to avoid deforestation. In Guyana and Suriname the focus was on creating national *Measurement, Reporting and Verification Systems* (MRVS) as the basis for forest area monitoring and results-based payments within the meaning of REDD+¹. The activities were coordinated by the non-governmental organisation *Conservation International* (CI). The key project partners were as follows: in Brazil the federal forestry institutes and environmental secretariats as well as the federal institute for the protection of biodiversity, in Guyana the Forestry Commission and the Climate Change Office, and in Suriname the national authorities responsible for forestry and the environment.

Objectives: Impact: Contribute to the preservation of ecosystem services and the diversity of species and habitats. Outcome: Contribute to effective protection of the primary rainforest through the protection and sustainable management of the promoted areas (Brazil) and forest area monitoring (Guyana and Suriname).

Target group: Relevant state institutions mandated to protect forests and manage protected areas, and indirectly the population in the project region. A global benefit is gained from the reduction in CO₂.

Overall rating: 3

Rationale: The project concept was overloaded, the project objective too ambitious. While the deforestation rates in the Guiana Shield dropped markedly, they rose significantly in the project countries — especially in Suriname, and in 2016 in Brazil. Sustainability is limited at the minute, particularly in Brazil and Suriname.

Highlights: The project measures triggered impulses in Guyana and Suriname and led to follow-up projects.



¹ REDD (*Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation*) expanded with forest protection, sustainable forest management and expansion of carbon sinks



Rating according to DAC criteria

Overall rating: 3

Lessons learned

- Against the background of heterogeneous problem contexts and institutional constellations in addition to increased planning and implementation costs, projects across several project countries are justified only if the same specific objectives are pursued, if substantial resources are available, and if significant synergies are anticipated.
- MRV systems create the basis for sustainable forest management. However, these technical systems can only bring about results in terms of reduced deforestation if the state develops and enforces the necessary political guidelines at the national level.

Methodology of the ex post evaluation

The ex post evaluation applied the methodology of a contribution analysis, and attributes effects to the project based on the careful analysis of data, facts and impressions, the elimination of possible contradictions, and the filtering out of similarities. The analysis is based on assumed interdependencies, described in the impact matrix developed at the project appraisal (PA) and reviewed during the ex post evaluation (EPE). This evaluation report sets out arguments as to why which influencing factors were identified for the experienced effects and why the project under investigation was likely to provide the contribution that it did. A questionnaire based on the document and literature studies was sent to the project-executing agency prior to the evaluation; semi-structured interviews formed the basis for the discussions during the evaluation. Discussions were held with national institutions and NGOs in the capitals of Brazil, Guyana and Suriname, as well as in the capitals of the Brazilian states of Amapá and Pará, and French Guiana. In Brazil, the project area around the Amapá state forest was visited, the MRV systems in Guyana and Suriname were inspected, while in Suriname a day trip to an area with a forestry concession was arranged and sampling of the forest inventory was undertaken. In addition, data obtained from multispectral satellite imagery and reported by Hansen et al.¹ was used for own calculations of forest cover and deforestation in the project region, and analyses were conducted by the Brazilian space agency INPE, the Environment Secretariat for the State of Amapá and the national forest authorities in Guyana and Suriname.

Brazil, Guyana and Suriname at a glance

	Brazil	Guyana	Suriname
Area	8,358,140km ²	196,850km ²	156,000km ²

¹ Hansen, M. C., P. V. Potapov, R. Moore, M. Hancher, S. A. Turubanova, A. Tyukavina, D. Thau, S. V. Stehman, S. J. Goetz, T. R. Loveland, A. Kommareddy, A. Egorov, L. Chini, C. O. Justice, and J. R. G. Townshend. 2013. "High-Resolution Global Maps of 21st-Century Forest Cover Change." Science Volume 342, No. 6160 (15 November 2013): 850-53. Data available at: http://earthenginepartners.appspot.com/science-2013-global-forest.



 Forest area (2015) Percentage of state as a whole Percentage in the Guiana Shield 	4,935,380km ² - 59% - 90%	165,260km ² - 84% - 91%	153,320km ² - 98% - 89%
Population / population growth (2016)	207,652,865 (+ 0.8%)	773,303 (+ 0.6%)	558,368 (+ 0.9%)
Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita (2016)	8,650 current USD (- 4.4% 2015– 2016)	4,457 current USD (+ 2.6% 2015– 2016)	6,484 current USD (- 11.2% 2015– 2016)
Population below the national poverty line	7.4% (2014)	NA	NA
Human Development Index	0.754 (rank 79)	0.638 (rank 127)	0.725 (rank 97)
Carbon emissions per capita (2015) ²	2.5t (rank 123)	2.6t (rank 122)	4.0t (rank 90)

Sources: http://databank.worldbank.org/data/ and http://www.globalcarbonatlas.org/en/CO2-emissions

General conditions, classification of project and project measures

The project area was the geological macroregion of the Guiana Shield³, which is covered with primary forest over about 90% of its area. The region, which is the largest remaining primary rainforest on earth, is home to immense biodiversity and, as a CO₂ sink, plays an important role in climate protection. The degree of settlement in the region is very low, with threats coming primarily from mining activities (especially gold and bauxite) and hunting.

As part of the project, the following measures in particular were promoted in Amapá in the Amapá National Forest (FLONA) and the Amapá State Forest (FLOTA), as well as in Pará in the Trombetas, Paru and Faro State Forests, the Grao-Pará Ecological Station (Estação Ecológica, ESEC) and the Maicuru Biological Reserve (Reserva Biológica, REBIO) (see Figure 2):

- Support in the preparation and publication of management plans;
- Implementation of workshops, development of studies and business plans for the sustainable use of natural resources;
- Support in the establishment and training of Protected Area Advisory Councils;
- Construction of a field station in the Amapá State Forest⁴,
- Development of procedures for monitoring socio-economic and biodiversity data.

² French Guiana: 2.9 tCO₂/person (rank 114), Colombia: 2.0 tCO₂/person (rank 133), Venezuela: 5.6 tCO₂/person (rank 76), global average 2015: 4.9 tCO₂/person (http://www.globalcarbonatlas.org/en/CO2-emissions)

³ Also known in German as: Bergland von Guayana

⁴ In collaboration with the Fonds Français pour l'Environnment Mondial (FFEM)



In addition to the implementation partner CI, the Federal Forestry Institutes and Environmental Secretariats⁵ as well as the Chico Mendes Institute for Biodiversity Conservation (ICMBio) played a key role in project implementation in Amapá and Pará.

An MRV system for the monitoring of forest areas and biomass was developed in Guyana in collaboration with Norwegian development cooperation (DC)⁶, while Suriname was supported in the development of a forest area monitoring system. The project partners in Guyana were the Guyana Forestry Commission (GFC) and the Office of Climate Change (OCC)⁷; in Suriname, the national authorities responsible for forestry and the environment SBB (*Stichting voor Bosbeheer en Bostoezicht*) and NIMOS (*Nationaal Instituut voor Milieu en Ontwikkeling*).

Maps of the project area

The project was implemented between 2009 and 2014. The following maps show the forest cover in the Guiana Shield (Figure 1) as well as in the supported protected areas in North Pará and Amapá (Figure 2) between 2009 and 2015. The areas of Brazil, Guyana and Suriname in the Guiana Shield show 90% forest cover.⁸ The protected areas in Amapá and North Pará (known as the *Calha Norte* of the Amazon River) shown in Figure 2 are located in the Brazilian Amazonian rainforest, which has lost nearly 20% of its area since the first measurements were taken prior to 1970. While the average deforestation rates were only 7,511km² per year between 2007 and 2016 (prior to 2006: 18,525km² per year), in 2016 they reached their highest level since 2008 at 7,989km².⁹

The forest loss data evaluated showed that forest loss in Guyana, French Guiana and Venezuela was significantly lower between 2009 and 2015 than in Suriname, Colombia and the Brazilian portion of the Guiana Shield. In Brazil, Guyana and Suriname, annual deforestation rates varied widely between 2001 and 2015. The forest loss in the Brazilian portion of the Guiana Shield was greater than the forest loss in the Guiana Shield during the project period, while the loss was slightly lower in Suriname and significantly lower in Guyana.

⁵ Instituto Estadual de Florestas do Amapá (IEF-AP), Instituto de Desenvolvimento Florestal e da Biodiversidade do Estado do Pará (IDEFLOR-bio), Secretaria de Estado do Meio Ambiente do Amapá (SEMA-AP) and Secretaria de Estado de Meio Ambiente e Sustentabilidade do Pará (SEMAS-PA) ⁶ The NORAD project was also implemented by CI; this contribution is included in the total project costs.

⁷ Formerly the National Climate Change Committee

⁸ Definition of forest cover in the data used here (Hansen et al., 2013): tree heights over 5m and tree canopy cover of at least 25%, as measured with a spatial resolution of 30m x 30m. Forest definition of the Serviço Florestal Brasileiro according to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO): tree canopy cover of at least 10%, tree heights over 5m, contiguous forest area at least 0.5ha. (http://www.florestal.gov.br/snif/recursos-florestais/definicao-de-floresta). Guyana uses the following definition: tree canopy cover of at least 30%, tree heights over 5m, contiguous forest area at least 1ha. Suriname plans to revise the national forest definition as part of the REDD+ process and is currently working with the same definition as Guyana.

⁹ http://www.obt.inpe.br/prodes/index.php

KFW

Figure 1: Illustration of forest cover in the Guiana Shield



Internal analysis and preparation. Definition of forest cover in the data used here (Hansen et al., 2013): tree heights over 5m and at least 25% tree canopy cover, which is measured with a spatial resolution of 30m x 30m. *Data sources: Project / protected areas. UNEP-WCMC and IUCN (2017), Protected Planet: The World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) [Online], 06/2017, Cambridge, UK: UNEP-WCMC and IUCN. Available at: www.protectedplanet.net Forest/deforestation. Hansen/UMD/Google/USGS/NASA [Online]. Available at: https://earthenginepartners.appspot.com/science-2013-global-forest*

KFW



Figure 2: Promoted protected areas ("project areas") in North Pará (left) and Amapá (right)

Internal analysis and preparation. Definition of forest cover in the data used here (Hansen et al., 2013): tree heights over 5m and at least 25% tree canopy cover, which is measured with a spatial resolution of 30m x 30m. *Data sources: Project / protected areas. UNEP-WCMC and IUCN (2017), Protected Planet: The World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) [Online], 06/2017, Cambridge, UK: UNEP-WCMC and IUCN. Available at: www.protectedplanet.net Forest/deforestation. Hansen/UMD/Google/USGS/NASA [Online]. Available at: https://earthenginepartners.appspot.com/science-2013-global-forest*



Relevance

In principle, the project was in line with IKI objectives for the conservation of carbon sinks, biodiversity and the adaptability of ecosystems. Of the six countries in the Guiana Shield region, Brazil, Guyana and Suriname were selected. Cross-border threat factors in the Guiana Shield — in particular illegal mining activities — were not taken into account in the design of the project measures. While the project provided for regional exchanges, and although there was a substantive textual overlap between the measures in Guyana and Suriname, three separate projects were in fact designed. These individual projects also had their own specific objectives, which, combined with the limited project funds, placed unnecessarily high expectations on the project. With regard to the results chain, no significant impact at outcome level ("effective protection of the primary rainforest") could be expected from the development of systems for forest area and biomass monitoring (in Guyana) and, in particular, from the related capacity building (in Suriname) without corresponding political guidelines.

The measures in **Brazil** explicitly supported Brazil's objectives and policies for forest and species protection, in particular the implementation of the National Nature Conservation Unit System Act (SNUC), and contributed to the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets defined by the Parties to the Biodiversity Convention in 2011 and the *Sustainable Development Goals* (SDGs) which came into force in 2016. The seven protected areas in Brazil were selected in agreement with the federal administrative bodies. With the exception of the Amapá National Forest, which was created in 1989, all protected areas promoted were established only in 2006 and, as a result, support was considered particularly important. The entire corridor of the State Forests constitutes the Amapá National Forest.

The project concepts for **Guyana** and **Suriname** were in line with the *Readiness Project Idea Notes* of both countries, submitted in 2008 to the World Bank's *Forest Carbon Partnership Facility* (FCPF), and with Guyana's *Low Carbon Development Strategy* (LCDS) of 2008. At the start of the project, both the understanding of and political interest in the REDD concept were much more pronounced in Guyana than in Suriname. Guyana was actively involved in the creation of the REDD+ architecture and considered a REDD MRV system as a natural milestone in an ongoing process. This was also linked to the fact that the MRV system in Guyana was intended to provide the basis for the implementation of the LCDS, which was to be funded through the Guyana-Norway partnership and the Guyana REDD+ Investment Fund (GRIF). Norway had promised USD 250 million for the GRIF. In Suriname, however, political awareness for avoided deforestation was much poorer. Rather, the project enabled the country to deal with the opportunities and risks of REDD+.

The implementation structure, with CI as the implementation partner for activities in three countries with numerous national partner institutions, was appropriate. CI has been active in the three project countries since 1995 and thus had a strong footing at the local level. The selected project areas were similar in terms of biodiversity and forest cover, in addition to having government commitments to "green development" in place at the time of project preparation. Closer cooperation with the French overseas department of French Guiana, for example through participation in regional workshops, would have been useful for forest conservation efforts in the region.

Conclusion: Three individual projects were designed with different and very ambitious specific objectives, but which were in line with the goals and interests of the three countries. As the project measures in Brazil differed significantly from those in Guyana and Suriname, the concentration of the limited funds in Guyana and Suriname would have been conceptually

more consistent and would have fostered a focus on activities and synergies. The implementation structure was appropriate. The relevance is rated as satisfactory.

Relevance rating: 3

Effectiveness

The project objective at outcome level was to effectively protect the primary rainforest in the project region through the protection and sustainable management of the promoted protected areas¹⁰ (Brazil) and forest area monitoring (Guyana and Suriname). The following indicators were considered to assess target achievement:

Indicator	Status PA	Status EPE
 (1) In Guyana and Suriname, forest area mapping and biomass estimates serve as a basis for a) the development and implementation of political guidelines at national level; b) payments under REDD+. 	a) No b) No	 a) Guyana: partially Suriname: partially b) Guyana: yes Suriname: no
(2) In Brazil, the management plans are a) implemented in the seven promoted protected areas in Amapá and North Pará and b) updated on a regular basis.	a) 0 b) 0	a) 7/7 b) 4/7
(3) In Brazil, the Protected Area Advisory Councils are established and hold meetings.	4	6/7
(4) In Brazil, the protected areas have a basic infrastructure that is utilised.	1	2/3

In **Guyana**, the project supported the development of the national MRV system with equipment, capacity development and consulting services. This support continued in the years which followed through further projects (OCTA¹¹, ONFI¹², NORAD¹³, CI) and allowed for annual reporting on the development of deforestation and forest degradation compared to reference levels as well as on the main drivers of deforestation in the period 2009-2014. Due to a funding gap, the report for the years 2015 and 2016 (extended reporting period of 20 months) will not be published until early 2018. The reports will be externally reviewed at the request of Norwegian development cooperation¹⁴. The generated data has been and is being used by

¹⁰ All the promoted protected areas in Brazil were already established at the time of the Project Appraisal (PA). The legal requirements regarding protected area management (including the adoption of a management plan and the establishment of a Protected Area Advisory Council) are set forth in the law and decrees of the SNUC; the tasks and competencies of the participating institutions are defined herein.

¹¹ Organização do Tratado de Cooperação Amazônica (an organisation made up of eight countries in the Amazon basin, which emerged in 2003 from the Amazon Cooperation Treaty)
¹² International department of the French National Forests Office (Office National des Forêts)

¹³ Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation

¹⁴ DNV GL AS attested in the 2016 report ("Verification of Interim REDD+ Performance indicators under the Guyana-Norway REDD+ partnership (Year 5)": "The results (...) have been obtained applying methodologies in accordance with internationally accepted good practices as defined by the verification

various state institutions¹⁵, e.g. to identify mining concessions in which exploration activities are identifiable despite the fact that only a prospecting license has been granted. The MRV system is to be expanded by 2020 as part of another NORAD project.¹⁶ With regard to the system's REDD+ funding function, only Norway has thus far committed to payments to Guyana for avoided deforestation.¹⁷ Success-based payments from other sources are not foreseeable in the medium term.

In Suriname, relevant measures to build capacity for avoided deforestation and REDD+ have been implemented. The high level of interest shown by the National Forestry Authority in the use of remote sensing data for monitoring purposes during the first workshops was one of the reasons the monitoring unit — with the support of various projects in the years which followed — was developed and rooted here. Today, the unit has 20 employees who command impressive specialist knowledge on a variety of relevant topics. The unit has a very low employee turnover rate. Official baseline data on the forest stock in the state was collected for the first time as part of the project. On this basis, the MRV system was used in the years which followed as a monitoring and enforcement instrument (e.g. near real time monitoring of deforestation) and for providing information to other institutions¹⁸. The current monitoring system records annual changes in the forest area. The national forest inventory has not yet been completed, so biomass estimates cannot yet be made. The system will be further developed through the UNDP in a REDD+ Readiness Project funded by the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF).¹⁹ In addition, in December 2016, the National Forest Monitoring System (NFMS) Roadmap was adopted, which specifies, among other things, the institutional structures for emissions reporting in accordance with international standards. The related activities will not be completed before the end of 2018.

In Brazil, the management plans in the protected areas in the state of Amapá are currently up to date, as are those in the Grao-Pará Ecological Station and the Maicuru Biological Reserve in Pará. Plans need to be updated for the three state forests in Pará — especially in the Faro State Forest, where 50% of the area cannot be used for sustainable production due to the requirements set out in the management plan. According to the management plans, the allocation of forestry concessions is planned in the promoted state forests and in the national forest, however, so far only one contract has been signed in the Amapá State Forest. The Protected Area Advisory Councils established in all seven protected areas have a key role to play in ensuring the effective protection of their regions, while taking into account the interests and needs of the population. The Protected Area Advisory Council in the Amapá National Forest is currently inactive due to budget cuts at the ICMBio. Remote protected areas in particular are not yet adequately equipped in terms of infrastructure. The field station in the Amapá State Forest, which is financed jointly with the FFEM, is today a regional coordination centre and is also used by members of the Protected Area Advisory Council. The Brazilian partner institutions stated during the evaluation mission that the exchange and capacitybuilding activities organised by CI in the institutions with a mandate to carry out forest

criteria [and] are free from omissions and misrepresentations that could lead to material misstatements" (p. 2). ¹⁵ E.g. Guyana Lands and Surveys Commission (GLSC), Guyana Energy Agency (GEA), National

Agricultural Research and Extension Institute (NAREI)

¹⁶ Near real time monitoring and thus better enforcement of environmental regulations, among other things, are to be made possible.

USD 250 million, of which according to the GRIF's financial report USD 70 million has been paid into the fund and financing decisions have been made for USD 35 million

E.g. the Commission for the Ordering of the Gold Mining Sector or the Department of Spatial Planning ¹⁹ Project: "Strengthening national capacities of Suriname for the elaboration of the national REDD+ strategy and the design of its implementation framework" (funding volume: USD 3.85 million). See https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/suriname.

protection and protected area management had high added value. It appears that the procedure developed as part of the project to monitor socio-economic indicators is currently being used for a sound analysis of the living conditions of the population in Amapá State Forest. Biodiversity monitoring does not take place in any of the supported areas, despite the developed procedures. The local people in and around the protected areas were taught about the sustainable use of resources through individual workshops.

According to information from the managing institutions, there is a continuing potential threat for fauna and flora in the promoted project areas, particularly due to illegal cross-border mining activities and hunting.²⁰ In comparison to other regions in the Amazon area, the threat potential in Amapá and North Pará has been designated as low. Irrespective of this, it was communicated very clearly that the human and financial resources for the management of the extensive and hard-to-reach protected areas promoted under the project, which cover more than 15.6 million hectares, are not sufficient for effective protection. For comparison: in Guiana Amazonian Park (French: *Parc amazonien de Guyane*) in French Guiana, which spans 3.39 million ha²¹, there are 90 employees responsible for the protection and management of the park, 60 of whom work in the park area; in the neighbouring Brazilian park, Tumucumaque National Park, with an area of 3.85 million hectares, there are only two employees.

The focus of the **cross-border project components** was on improving regional exchanges between technical units in regional workshops, not at the political level, and the joint fight against cross-border threats. It should be highlighted that the project measures marked the start of numerous follow-up projects and can thus be considered important drivers.

Conclusion: The achievement of objectives in Guyana was good to satisfactory, while in Suriname it was satisfactory. The forest area monitoring systems are used in both countries to control forest area and land use changes, and to some extent for the development and enforcement of policies by relevant government agencies. In Guyana, the MRV system is also used to calculate avoided deforestation, in order to receive REDD+ payments from Norway. In Brazil, the achievement of objectives was satisfactory: not all objectives were achieved, however, important contributions were made to the effective management of the protected areas. Overall, the effectiveness of the project was satisfactory.

Effectiveness rating: 3

Overarching climate and environmental impacts

Effective protection of the primary rainforest at the outcome level should contribute, at the impact level, to the preservation of ecosystem services (in particular the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and climate regulation) and the protection of species and habitat diversity.

At the time of the PA, no indicators had been defined at the impact level. The achievement of the overarching objectives of the project was approximated using the following indicators:

²⁰ In July 2017, an illegal runway for gold miners was discovered in the Grao-Pará Ecological Station during a flyover. In the Amapá National Forest, the illegal hunting of large mammals is a major problem, despite the constant presence of two guards and the monitoring of the river route. The ICMBio is currently able to check the area around eight times per year.

²¹ Of which 60% central area and 40% development area

Indicator	Status EPE
 (1) Forest loss¹ (% of the forested area) 2009–2015 in the Brazilian portion of the Guiana Shield, in Guyana, and in Suriname was lower than in the Guiana Shield in promoted protected areas in Amapá and North Pará was lower than in comparable protected areas in the Guiana Shield. 	 Partially achieved. Brazil: No; Guyana and Suriname: Yes Yes
(2) The average deforestation rates ¹ in the Brazilian portion of the Guiana Shield, in Guyana, and in Suriname were lower in the period 2009–2015 than in the period 2001–2008.	Mostly not achieved. Brazil: Yes (however, not in promoted protected areas); Guyana and Suriname: No.
(3) Avoided carbon emissions in the promoted protected areas in Amapá and North Pará ²	3.9 million t CO ₂ per year.
(4) Income effects associated with the project ³	No measurable effects

1) Own analysis based on data from Hansen et al. (2013) 2) The avoided carbon emissions were calculated conservatively and can be attributed not only to the relatively low German contribution, but also to the support of other projects, to the basic financing of the participating national and federal institutions and to other possible influences unobserved. The emissions were calculated as follows: 1. Cautious assumption of a forest area of 80% in the protected areas. 2. Carbon emissions per hectare of deforested rainforest estimated at 518t CO₂ (IPCC data: aboveground biomass: 300t/ha, carbon content: 47%, conversion factor: 3.67). 3. Determine the difference between the overall deforestation rate in % in the reference area and the rate of deforestation within the protected areas. 4. Multiply by the estimated forest coverage of the promoted protected areas and the estimated t CO_2 from one hectare of rainforest. 3) Nature conservation projects are characterised by a potential conflict of objectives between protecting resources and alleviating poverty. Regardless of the project objective, this indicator is used for information.

In **Guyana** and **Suriname**, the MRV systems initiated various initiatives to mitigate the negative impact of mining activities, to monitor illegal activities in protected areas and licensed mining and forestry areas, and to develop community-based MRV systems (known as "sub-national REDD+ efforts"). However, in order for the impact of such approaches to be felt at an overarching level, there is a need for wide-ranging support from policy-makers and for the development and enforcement of legislation.

In tangible terms, the MRV system in **Guyana** contributed to receiving the aforementioned Norwegian funds under the GRIF and thus to the implementation of the national *Low Carbon Development Strategy*. Due to slow progress in meeting the requirements of the agreement with Norway, the outflow of funds could not be achieved by the end of 2015 as originally planned, and was extended indefinitely. In **Suriname**, the measures implemented under the project contributed in a broader sense to the establishment of the forest cover monitoring system, as well as to the monitoring of illegal logging in near real time and to the 2013 national *Readiness Preparation Proposal for REDD*+. The *near real time monitoring* system has contributed to a significant increase in the confiscation of illegally felled timber. In 2016, 2,172m³ of wood was discovered and confiscated; in the period from January to May 2017, this

figure was already 1,839m³. However, this is still a small proportion compared to the estimate that illegally harvested timber makes up 10% of legally produced wood (2014: 494,047m³).²²

	Forest loss	Source
Guiana Shield	- Forest loss 2009–2015: 0.44%	- Hansen et al. 2013
BrazilBrazilian portion of the Guiana Shield	 Forest loss 2009–2015: 0.48% Annual deforestation rates: 0.05%–0.14% (2001–2015) Forest loss 2009–2015 0.08% in promoted protected areas Forest loss 2009–2015 0.19% in non-promoted protected areas 	 Internal analysis based on data from Hansen et al. 2013
- Amapá	 Deforestation p.a.: 70km² (2009) vs. 24km² (2016) (whole state) Annual deforestation rates: 1.16% in protected areas of sustainable use, 0.10% in unrestricted protected areas (2012) Amapá National Forest: 0.014% 2012 vs. 0.006% (2016) Amapá State Forest: 0.29% (2012) vs. 0.05% (2016) 	 http://www.obt.inpe.br/p rodes/index.php Boletim do Desmatamento no Estado do Amapá 2011/2012²³ and 2015/2016
- Pará	 Deforestation p.a.: 4,281km² (2009) 3,025km² (2016) (whole state) 	 http://www.obt.inpe.br/p rodes/index.php
Guyana	 Forest loss 2009–2015: 0.31% 0.02%–0.05% (2001–2015) 4,064ha–13,117ha (2001–2015; 0.02%–0.07% of forest stock in 2000)²⁴ 	 Hansen et al. 2013 Global Forest Watch
Suriname	 Forest loss 2009–2015: 0.41% 0.02%–0.11% (2001–2015) 3,405ha–19,507ha (2001–2015; 0.02%–0.14% of forest stock in 2000)²⁵ 	 Hansen et al. 2013 Global Forest Watch National forest authority in Suriname

 ²² According to the national forestry authority, confiscated illegally felled timber can still be "bought back" against a penalty fee of 4-27 USD/m³ for example, which is well below the market value of approximately 100-120 USD/m³ (2014).
 ²³ The forest year runs from August to July (e.g. forest year 2012: August 2011–July 2012).
 ²⁴ http://www.globalforestwatch.org/country/GUY
 ²⁵ http://www.globalforestwatch.org/country/SUR

	- 2000–2009: 0.02% and 2009– 2013: 0.06%	
French Guiana	1,890ha and 9,774ha (2001–2015; 0.02%–0.12% of forest stock in 2000) ²⁶	- Global Forest Watch

Interlocutors at the National Forestry Agencies in **Guyana** and **Suriname** welcomed the crossborder workshops that have contributed to the ongoing technical exchange on remote sensing and MRVS between the two authorities and, through other projects, with the Brazilian INPE. The monitoring units in Guyana and Suriname participate in scientific exchanges on the use of remote sensing data to analyse land cover and land use, and continue to receive technical support and contribute to innovative research and scientific publications in this area.²⁷ Both monitoring units have their own priorities for using the monitoring systems. In Guyana, for example, in addition to deforestation analyses, high-resolution data are also analysed to evaluate forest degradation. In Suriname, the focus is on the use of open source data and implementation-related research, as well as on the use of the data for *near real time monitoring*. This was achieved thanks to numerous projects from various donors, along with excellent management of the two monitoring units. The IKI project was highlighted in Guyana and Suriname as a catalyst for this development.

In **Brazil**, deforestation in the promoted protected areas was minimal and well below the deforestation rates in comparison areas and in the Guiana Shield, but worsened in 2009–2015 compared to 2001–2008 (despite the fact that six of the seven protected areas were not established until 2006!). According to data from the Environment Secretariat for the State of Amapá, deforestation in the protected areas supported by project measures declined significantly between the forest years 2012 and 2016. The deforestation data for 2016 released after the evaluation mission show a dramatic increase in deforestation in the Brazilian portion of the Guiana Shield. The conducted analyses also show that the deforestation hotspots have been growing closer to the protected areas in Amapá and Pará since 2000 (see Figure 5 and Figure 4).

Data on biodiversity and adaptability to climate change were not collected during the project. According to the Environment Secretariat for the State of Amapá, improved law enforcement in protected areas in Brazil has resulted in the displacement of illegal mining activities to the north of the Guiana Shield, and in particular to Suriname and French Guiana²⁸.

Although the authorities responsible for the management of the protected areas see the local population as key actors in the effective protection and sustainable use of protected areas, improving the living conditions of the resident population was not part of the broader objective. Temporary or sustainable effects on the incomes of the local population were not to be expected from the selectively implemented project measures and are not measurable. Zoning

²⁶ http://www.globalforestwatch.org/country/GUF#

²⁷ The Forestry Commission in Guyana has published several scientific articles, including in collaboration with Matthew Hansen and his team from the University of Maryland, one of the world's leading research groups in this field. See for example Bholanath, P., & Cort, K. (2015). National Scale Monitoring Reporting and Verification of Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Guyana. The International Archives of Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences, 40(7), 315 or Rahm, M., Jullian, B., Lauger, A., et al. Monitoring the impact of gold mining on the forest cover and freshwater in the Guiana Shield. Reference year, 2014.

²⁸ An estimated 6,000–8,000 Brazilians are involved in illegal gold mining in French Guiana.

in protected areas of sustainable use identifies land for use by the population; this is especially relevant in the Amapá State Forest.

Conclusion: While deforestation rates in the Guiana Shield and in the Brazilian areas declined significantly in 2009–2015 compared to 2001–2008, they increased significantly in Guyana and especially in Suriname. The deforestation data for 2016 show a further increase in deforestation in Guyana and Suriname and a dramatic increase in the Brazilian portion of the Guiana Shield. In Guyana and Suriname, the project activities contributed to the exploitation of remote sensing data as well as to technical exchange in this area, and served as important drivers for follow-up projects. The overall climate and environmental impacts are still considered to be satisfactory.

Overarching climate and environmental impacts rating: 3

Efficiency

In **Brazil**, USD 827,212 was invested to promote measures in seven protected areas. The limited resources were far from sufficient to achieve effective management in all seven protected areas by the end of the project, however, they did provide selective support to the managing institutions.

In **Guyana**, USD 847,563 was invested in capacity-building measures, studies and equipment, primarily to create forest area maps, establish biomass estimates, and develop a forest carbon monitoring plan (82% of the funds). In Guyana, due to the given executing agency and activity constellation, CI passed the majority of the funds directly to the National Forestry Commission. CI supervised contract awards and disbursements, supported the implementation and advised on technical issues. This system was highlighted as being particularly efficient compared to other constellations tested in Guyana, and was retained by NORAD in subsequent projects.

In **Suriname**, USD 920,155 was invested in capacity-building measures, studies and a small amount of equipment, with a focus on measures to identify historic deforestation, create a national forest area map, establish biomass estimates, and develop a forest carbon monitoring plan (49% of funding) and spatial REDD reference scenarios (30% of funds).

Implementation partner CI received a management fee for "indirect costs" at a rate of 11.5% (USD 337,341). This was higher than the 7-10% fee that CI claims it normally receives, but was below the contracted 13% rate. In addition, significant parts of the project funds went to CI as "direct costs", so CI alone received 23% of the project funds (USD 195,415) in Guyana for technical support.

While the synergies between the IKI project and the NORAD project were strong in Guyana due to the management of both projects by CI, the coordination between the numerous projects in the three countries was and is significantly more limited. There are no sensible alternatives to the chosen project approach, as the systematic monitoring of forest stock, participation in a future REDD+ payment mechanism and the effective management of protected areas should be enabled. The large protected areas in Brazil promoted under the project were in great need of support due to their relatively recent establishment. An illustration of the costs per avoided tonne of carbon emissions would not be useful, as the project effects were not exclusively attained by the relatively small German contribution.

Conclusion: The project result and thus the production efficiency are assessed as adequate in the three countries²⁹. In view of the fact that a concentration of funds would have been useful,

²⁹ The similarly designed FFEM project also had a similar financial scope.

but that certain effects are noticeable in all countries, the overall allocation efficiency is still assessed as satisfactory.

Efficiency rating: 3

Sustainability

In 2014, the mining and quarrying industry accounted for 10.6% of real GDP in Guyana, and 5.9% of real GDP in Suriname. In both countries, gold production increased between 2010 and 2014. In Brazil, the sector contributed 4.1% to real GDP in 2013.³⁰ The rise in gold prices in recent years has also contributed significantly to the increase in mining activity, and in particular to the rise in *small-scale mining*. The fact that these activities contributed significantly to deforestation, and continue to do so, has also been documented by the MRV system in Guyana. Between 2009 and 2010, 91% of deforestation was due to mining activities; in 2014, this figure was 85%. According to CI, between 2009 and 2015 some 73% of deforestation in Suriname was caused by mining activities.

In **Guyana**, the MRV system appears to be institutionally and financially secure, at least in the medium term, and NORAD only recently (August 2017) committed USD 6.63 million for a second phase of the REDD+ MRV system by 2020. Although the National Forest Commission relies on external funding to purchase high-resolution satellite imagery, most of the ongoing costs associated with the monitoring unit are borne by the national budget. If the external support is lost, the unit could continue its activities using freely available satellite data.

In **Suriname**, although the MRV system and the data are used at a technical level, they have not yet been used for policy initiatives or guidelines. To date, the MRV system has had little impact on the two main drivers of deforestation in Suriname: mining and industrial agriculture. The country is pursuing a strategy of legalising illegal mining sites without introducing any further requirements for environmentally friendly mining practices. In the midst of the economic crisis (economic growth of -11.2% in 2016), environmental protection is perceived as damaging to economic recovery. Mining accounts for 30% of GDP (timber industry: 1%) and is responsible for 73% of the deforestation. In this context, the promotion of mining activities currently receives significantly more political support and attention than the REDD+ agenda. In December 2016, the Surinamese government also granted a licence for a 50,000ha palm oil plantation to a Chinese company — this had previously been deferred due to environmental considerations. The resulting deforestation will be substantial, equivalent to eight times the annual rate of deforestation over the period 2000–2015.³¹ In addition, Suriname is currently negotiating with an Indian company to award another palm oil licence for 40,000ha. This shows that the REDD+ process in the country has failed to contribute to a rethinking in recent years at a higher political level to avoid deforestation. The financial and institutional sustainability of the system in Suriname is uncertain.

In **Brazil**, the contributions made by the project are used by the partners in varying degrees beyond the project duration. The construction plans for a field station in Pará, which were drafted as part of the project, have not yet been implemented, as the federal funds promised for

³⁰USGS 2013 Minerals Yearbook Brazil (https://minerals.usgs.gov/minerals/pubs/country/2013/myb3-2013-br.pdf), USGS 2014 Minerals Yearbook Guyana

⁽https://minerals.usgs.gov/minerals/pubs/country/2014/myb3-2014-gy.pdf), USGS 2014 Minerals Yearbook Suriname (https://minerals.usgs.gov/minerals/pubs/country/2014/myb3-2014-ns.pdf), USGS 2012 Minerals Yearbook French Guiana, Guyana, and Suriname

⁽https://minerals.usgs.gov/minerals/pubs/country/2012/myb3-2012-fg-gy-ns.pdf)

³¹ Annual deforestation rate: 5,676ha (source: UNIQUE (2017), Multi-Perspective Analysis of Deforestation, Forest Degradation and Barriers to REDD+ Activities, SBB, available at: http://sbbsur.com/)

the construction measures have not been made available. All Protected Area Advisory Councils remain active with the exception of the Protected Area Advisory Council of the Amapá National Forest. According to the project partners, the training measures have triggered structural changes, however, their sustainability was limited due to the high rate of staff turnover in the state institutions. The institutional and legal framework conditions and the interest of the Amapá and Pará state governments in the preservation, protection and sustainable use of state forests are generally in place. Reconciling the protection and sustainable use of ecosystems plays a major role in current Brazilian environmental policy ("preservar e produzir"), with various approaches being promoted in this area.³² One indicator regarding the successful raising of awareness amongst the population about the protection of ecosystems is that illegal interventions are now generally pointed out directly by those who live in and around the protected areas. Against the background of the current budget restrictions in Brazil that affect ICMBio and Ibama in particular (Instituto Brasileiro do Meio Ambiente e dos Recursos Naturais Renováveis), appropriate support for protected areas in Brazil is unlikely to maintain the achieved effects in the short and medium term. The financial situation of the managing institutions could be significantly improved by the income from forestry concessions. The political pressure of the agricultural lobby also represents a major threat. This manifests itself in laws that promote³³ further deforestation and which are tolerated or supported to some extent by the federal government. This development is closely linked to the current instability of the Brazilian political system, the duration of which remains to be seen (see RENCA example in Annex 1). Although the promoted protected areas are subject to very low utilisation pressure compared to the rest of the Amazon, the analyses carried out in this evaluation show that the protected status of the areas has not hindered the progress of the deforestation front (see Annex 2).

³² For example, environmental compensation payments from companies and state funds are used to build and support what are known as *Escolas Famílias* for the rural residents of protected areas.

 ³³ (1) Retrospective legalisation of illegal land acquisitions up to 2011 on public land (surface areas up to 2,500ha). (2) Reduction of the protection status of protected areas in the Amazon Basin covering 350,000ha. (3) Proof required at a later date of the presence of indigenous peoples in already established indigenous territories since 1988.

Conclusion: The current political and economic developments in Brazil and Suriname threaten the developmental effectiveness of the project. At the same time, support from donors and NGOs in the project areas has continued unabated in recent years, and continues to this day. Sustainability is still rated as satisfactory.

Sustainability rating: 3

Coherence, complementarity and coordination

The measures were in line with the commitment of other donors, the projects in the region supported by Germany, and the environmental interests of the partner countries. In Suriname, political interest in REDD+ decreased significantly during project implementation. Both Guyana and Suriname received support from the IKI, CI, OCTA, the *Guiana Shield Facility* and French Development Cooperation to support the *REDD*+ *Readiness* process. Guyana receives funds from Germany and Norway, and both Guyana and Suriname are funded by the FCPF. At the technical level, REDD+ monitoring in the region was also supported by a TC project ("Monitoring Deforestation, Forest Use and Changes in Land Use in the Pan-Amazon Forest"). The protected areas in Amapá were supported with FFEM funds through the French NGO GRET.

The IKI project went virtually unmentioned in the documents of other donors and national institutions, raising doubts about the adequate coordination and dissemination of the achieved outputs in the donor community and at higher political levels. Other projects of a similar financial scope but which have not yet been implemented in three countries enjoyed much greater visibility. Coordination and cooperation between NGOs in the sector seemed to improve in recent years. For example, the Amazon Conservation Team (ACT), CI and WWF are working together on the *South Suriname Conservation Corridor* project and on the consolidation and expansion of the Guyanese protected area system. In subsequent projects, French Guiana contributed both financial resources and expertise. The Guiana Amazonian Park organises an exchange with Suriname and Guyana in partnership with the ACT. French Guiana could be much more involved in natural resource projects in the region by bi- and multilateral DC, e.g. in triangular cooperation frameworks, and be used as a strategic partner.

With regard to complementarity it should be noted that in Brazil, protected areas were selected that could not be supported under the current ARPA³⁴ programme which is also funded by Germany (BMZ and BMUB). The project measures were supplemented by French DC projects, and the construction of the field station in the Amapá State Forest was jointly financed.

Formal coordination of the project with other donors and, in Brazil in particular, with government agencies, did not take place during the planning phase, which led to necessary planning adjustments and delays. The activities in Brazil started about a year later than in Guyana and Suriname due to these failures, and as a result no participants from the Brazilian side were able to attend the first regional workshops. With regard to the NORAD co-financing in Guyana, it should be noted that the Norwegian commitment was made very quickly, and as a result the project concept had to be adapted unexpectedly for CI and KfW.

³⁴ Amazon Protected Areas Program

Since both the IKI and NORAD funds were implemented by CI, the activities were subsequently coordinated effectively.

Coherence, complementarity and coordination rating: 3

Project management

The project duration was around 5 years instead of the estimated 2.5 years; the implementation of the measures took place over 4.5 years. In the first two years, only a third of the project funds was disbursed³⁵. With regard to the planned small-scale measures in different priority areas, the planned duration was clearly too short.

The implementation structure — with CI as the implementation partner for activities in three countries and two states, alongside various national partner institutions — was generally appropriate. Improved coordination in the planning phase, particularly in Brazil, would probably have made it possible to limit later delays. The project management challenges associated with the cross-border nature of the project were not significant at the individual project level. According to the partners, CI worked reliably and constructively with the federal and state authorities in Brazil, Guyana and Suriname, as well as with research institutes in Brazil.³⁶

The decision in favour of the conceptually sparsely consistent inclusion of the sub-project in Brazil was justified by the fact that supporting the newly created, large-scale protected areas in the Brazilian portion of the Guiana Shield allowed for an important contribution to be made to strengthening management capacities and to information gathering ("low-hanging fruits"). However, focusing on setting up MRV systems in Guyana and Suriname — with already diverging activities — would have prevented the overburdening of the project.

CI enjoyed high visibility as the implementing organisation, while the German support and the project itself were known only to the implementing units, if at all. This may also have been due to the fact that the project was run under different names by the BMUB, CI, the IKI programme office and KfW; using the same project name across the board would have had a positive effect on the recognition value of the supported activities. The second part of the project name ("Avoiding deforestation by merging existing and creating new protected areas in the Guianan region") was also misleading, as protected areas were neither merged nor created during the project.

The coordination of planning and implementation between KfW and CI was efficient, and there was a clear division of tasks.

Project management rating: 3

³⁵ Payments 2009: 18%, 2010: 5%, 2011: 11%, 2012: 33%, 2013: 19%, 2014: 13%

³⁶ Federal University of Amapá UNIFAP (*Universidade Federal do Amapá*), *Museo Goeldi* research institute and the NGO Imazon (*Instituto do Homem e Meio Ambiente da Amazônia*)

List of Abbreviations		
ACT	Amazon Conservation Team	
ARPA	Amazon Protected Areas Program	
GDP	Gross Domestic Product	
BMUB	Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz, Bau und Reaktorsicherheit (German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety)	
BMZ	Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung (German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development)	
BRL	Brazilian real	
CI	Conservation International (NGO)	
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide	
EPE	Ex post evaluation	
ESEC	Ecological station (Estação Ecológica)	
EUR	Euro	
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	
FCPF	Forest Carbon Partnership Facility	
FFEM	Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial	
FLONA	Federal forest (<i>Floresta Nacional</i>)	
FLOTA	State forest (Floresta Estadual)	
GFC	Guyana Forestry Commission	
ha	Hectare	
HFLD	High forest cover, low deforestation	
IBAMA	Instituto Brasileiro do Meio Ambiente e dos Recursos Naturais Renováveis	
ICMBio	Federal Institute for the Protection of Biodiversity (Instituto Chico Mendes de Conservação da Biodiversidade)	



ІКІ	Internationale Klimaschutzinitiative (International Climate Initiative)
Imazon	Instituto do Homem e Meio Ambiente da Amazônia
INPE	Brazilian Space Agency (Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais)
IPAM	Instituto de Pesquisa Ambiental da Amazônia
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
LCDS	Low Carbon Development Strategy
MRVS	Measurement, Reporting and Verification System
NA	Not available
NFMS	National Forest Monitoring System
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NIMOS	National Institute for Environment & Development in Suriname
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
000	Office of Climate Change
ΟCTA	Organização do Tratado de Cooperação Amazônica
ONFI	International Department of the French National Forests Office (Office National des Forêts)
РА	Project appraisal
REBIO	Bioreserve (Reserva Biológica)
REDD	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
SBB	Suriname Forest Authority (Stichting voor Bosbeheer en Bostoezicht)
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SEMA(S)	Federal Secretariat of the Environment (Secretaria de Estado do Meio Ambiente (e Sustentabilidade))
SNUC	National Protected Area System (Sistema Nacional de Unidades Conservação)
t	Tonne
тс	Technical Cooperation
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

UNIFAP	Universidade Federal do Amapá
USD	US dollar
WDPA	World Database on Protected Areas
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature



Annex: Illustrations and analyses of threats to the promoted areas

It was only in August 2016 that President Temer issued a decree releasing the *Reserva Nacional de Cobre e Associados* (Renca) in Amapá and Pará for mining activities. The Renca has nine protected areas, three of which were promoted by the IKI project (map below). The decree was blocked by the courts and withdrawn under sustained pressure, but nonetheless demonstrates the threat potential facing protected areas in an adverse political climate.



Figure 3: The Renca region is home to three promoted protected areas

Internal analysis and preparation. Sources: WDPA/IUCN (protected areas), GEOSGB (Renca borders), GADM (national borders).

Figure 4: Deforestation hotspots in promoted protected areas in Brazil





Internal preparation of data on loss of biomass 2000–2014. Sources: Protected area borders of WDPA/IUCN and hotspot mapping by Harris, Nancy L., et al. "Using spatial statistics to identify emerging hot spots of forest loss." Environmental Research Letters 12.2 (2017): 024012, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aa5a2f.





Figure 5: Annual deforestation in Guiana Shield

Internal analysis and preparation. Sources: Hansen, M. C., P. V. Potapov, R. Moore, M. Hancher, S. A. Turubanova, A. Tyukavina, D. Thau, S. V. Stehman, S. J. Goetz, T. R. Loveland, A. Kommareddy, A. Egorov, L. Chini, C. O. Justice, and J. R. G. Townshend. 2013. "High-Resolution Global Maps of 21st-Century Forest Cover Change." Science Volume 342, No. 6160 (15 November 2013): 850-53. Data available at: http://earthenginepartners.appspot.com/science-2013-global-forest.



Figure 6: Impact of mining activities on deforestation

Source: WWF France, https://www.wwf.fr/vous-informer/actualites/le-wwf-et-ses-partenaires-alertentsur-les-impacts-environnementaux-de-lorpaillage-sur-le-plateau

Notes on the methods used to evaluate project success (project rating)

Projects (and programmes) are evaluated on a six-point scale, the criteria being **relevance**, effectiveness, efficiency, overarching developmental impact, coherence, complementarity and coordination rating and project management. The ratings are also used to arrive at a final assessment of a project's overall developmental efficacy. The scale is as follows:

Level 1	Very good result that clearly exceeds expectations
Level 2	Good result, fully in line with expectations and without any significant shortcomings
Level 3	Satisfactory result – project falls short of expectations but the positive results dominate
Level 4	Unsatisfactory result – significantly below expectations, with negative results dominating despite discernible positive results
Level 5	Clearly inadequate result – despite some positive partial results, the negative results clearly dominate
Level 6	The project has no impact or the situation has actually deteriorated

Rating levels 1-3 denote a positive assessment or successful project while rating levels 4-6 denote a negative assessment.

Sustainability is evaluated according to the following four-point scale:

Sustainability level 1 (very good sustainability): The developmental impact of the project (positive to date) is very likely to continue undiminished or even increase.

Sustainability level 2 (good sustainability): The developmental impact of the project (positive to date) is very likely to decline only minimally but remain positive overall. (This is what can normally be expected).

Sustainability level 3 (satisfactory sustainability): The developmental impact of the project (positive to date) is very likely to decline significantly but remain positive overall. This rating is also assigned if the sustainability of a project is considered inadequate up to the time of the ex post evaluation but is very likely to evolve positively so that the project will ultimately achieve positive developmental efficacy.

Sustainability level 4 (inadequate sustainability): The developmental impact of the project is inadequate up to the time of the ex post evaluation and is very unlikely to improve. This rating is also assigned if the sustainability that has been positively evaluated to date is very likely to deteriorate severely and no longer meet the level 3 criteria.

The **overall rating** on the six-point scale is compiled from a weighting of all seven individual criteria as appropriate to the project in question. Rating levels 1-3 of the overall rating denote a "successful" project while rating levels 4-6 denote an "unsuccessful" project. It should be noted that a project can generally be considered developmentally "successful" only if the achievement of the project objective ("effectiveness"), the impact on the overall objective ("overarching developmental impact") and the sustainability are rated at least "satisfactory" (level 3).