

### GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 1020		Review date: 1/23/07		
		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)		<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	Grant TF No. 028438	GEF financing:	0.725	0.727
Project Name:	Conservation and Sustainable Development of the Mataven Forest	IA/EA own:	0.025	0.025
Country:	Colombia	Government:	0.320	0.309
		Other*:	0.330	0.369
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	<b>0.650</b>	<b>0.678</b>
Operational Program:	3	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	<b>1.400</b>	<b>1.43</b>
IA	WB	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:		Work Program date		Not applicable (MSP)
		CEO Endorsement		01/23/2001
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		05/18/2001
		Closing Date	Proposed: 04/01/2004	Actual: 12/31/2004
Prepared by: Antonio del Mónaco	Reviewed by: Aaron Zazueta	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 3 years	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 44 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 8 months
Author of TE:		TE completion date: 5/26/05	TE submission date to GEF OME: 3/6/2006	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 10 months

\* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

### 2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

Please refer to document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes		No rating	N/A	S
2.2 Project sustainability	<b>N/A</b>	No rating	N/A	L
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	<b>N/A</b>	No rating	N/A	HS
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	N/A	S

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why? A few sections can be considered good practice such as the presentation of actual project costs broken down by activity and donor and the financial audits of accounts, the assessment of sustainability and lessons of broad applicability.

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? None

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives? Any changes during implementation?** From the project brief: The objective of the project is to support the indigenous communities of the Matavén Forest to manage and conserve the area's biodiversity in a sustainable way, thereby contributing to an improvement in quality of life and the preservation of their natural and cultural heritage. No changes indicated in the TE.
- **What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation?** The project development objective is to support sixteen Matavén Forest indigenous communities (known as *resguardos* or sectors) to manage and conserve the area's biodiversity in a sustainable way, thereby contributing to an improvement in their quality of life and the preservation of their natural and cultural heritage. Projected benefits to local communities include: the legal recognition of Matavén's central region as ancestral and indigenous communal property, the design of participatory management plans to improve communities' socio-economic well-being, the recollection and publication of communities' ecological and cultural topologies and an increased female participation in decision making and handicraft production. No changes indicated in the TE.

#### 3.2 Outcomes

- **What were the major project outcomes as described in the TE?** As described in the TE: First, the project obtained the national government's recognition of indigenous land rights over 900,000 hectares encompassing the central region of the Matavén Forest. Second, the project supported the creation of an association of indigenous authorities (ACATISEMA) including leaders from the 16 indigenous *resguardos* (protected areas), which helped to obtain the central zone's legal recognition as indigenous *resguardo* and promoted various project activities. Third, the project achieved increased female participation in activity design and execution. Fourth, the project promoted handmade crafts as an economically and ecologically viable production alternative for Matavén communities. Fifth, the project trained local representatives, reinforcing local communities' leadership capabilities and improving inter-*resguardo* communication. Finally, the project supported the creation and distribution of publications conveying information relevant to indigenous communities and validating their traditional, conservationist approach to natural resource management.

### 4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT

#### 4.1.1 Outcomes

##### A Relevance

Rating: HS

Colombia ratified the CBD on 24 November 1994 in national law 165 of 1994. Within that context, the project contributed to the development of the National Biodiversity Policy, Strategy and Action Plan, as proposed by the Colombian Government: it sought alternatives to halt the further deterioration of biodiversity, through the strengthening of traditional indigenous knowledge and the promotion of systems for the sustainable use of the environment. The project was in line with the National Biodiversity Policy (1996) and proposed Strategy and Action Plan<sup>1</sup> (1998) which concentrated on three lines of action: conservation, equitable and sustainable use, and improved knowledge. In the National Biodiversity Report (1998), the Orinoquian and Amazonian regions were identified as leading regional priorities in terms of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. The project was also consistent with the Land Use Planning, and with local government development plans (municipal and departmental), within which the Matavén Forest region is included as a zone destined for biodiversity conservation.

The Colombian Government following the recommendation of the 1<sup>st</sup> Latin American Congress on National Parks and Other Protected Areas - Santa Marta, Colombia (May 1997), started to work on the creation of a new category of protected areas: indigenous natural parks. The Environment Ministry is supportive of *resguardos* and other indigenous territories as an appropriate means for biodiversity

<sup>1</sup> Colombia Biodiversidad Siglo XXI: Propuesta Técnica para la Formulación de un Plan de Acción Nacional en Biodiversidad Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt. Edited by M.C. Fandiño y P. Ferreira. Santafé de Bogotá. IAvH, Ministerio del Medio Ambiente, DNP. 1998.

<p>protection.</p> <p>The project was also consistent with the current Government Policy for the development of a system of regional protected areas, based on social participation for biodiversity conservation (UAESPNN, 1999). In addition, there was new legislation for the development of the private and/or collectively-owned protected areas (Nov. 1999).</p> <p>At the local level, the project built upon the longstanding efforts of Fundación Etnollano within the context of the COAMA program. This program is an initiative involving various NGOs seeking to consolidate around twenty million hectares of tropical forest as indigenous resguardos. Since 1985, Etnollano has promoted participatory processes with indigenous communities in the Matavén Forest on themes of health, biodiversity and sustainable production alternatives.</p>	
<b>B Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
<p>The TE indicated that the project assisted indigenous communities to effectively manage at least 50% of the Matavén Forest using conservation criteria. The project assisted in the development of environmental management plans including sustainable production activities for indigenous communities in 12 of the 16 indigenous protected areas. However, a management plan for the central region was not possible because local communities preferred that the project focused on the land titling instead of the management plans. The project increased capacity of an association of indigenous leaders (Cabildos) and traditional indigenous authorities of the Matavén Forest by consolidating ACATISEMA, an association of traditional cabildos which obtained participation from the 16 protected areas and is receiving annual government funds worth Col\$1.1bn for managing the central zone and investing in projects approved in management plans. Etnollano (the local NGO coordinating the project) increased ACATISEMA's institutional and administrative capacities, helping them open an office in the town of Cumaribo to conduct their administrative operations. The Matavén Forest was included as conservation area in Cumaribo's basic territorial ordering plan, as evidenced by a communication from Cumaribo mayor to the Environment Ministry in May 1999. Twelve productive micro-projects are in operation. A training process was undertaken to promote handmade crafts as an economically and ecologically viable alternative for the Matavén communities. The so-called "ethnic Matavén handicraft," primarily elaborated by women, is currently well-positioned in the national market with high quality baskets and possesses solid export potential. Indigenous communities have increased the sales of handicrafts and they are annually participating in the National Handcraft Fair.</p>	
<b>C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</b>	<b>Rating: HS</b>
<p>The project very cost effective given the resources used (MSP), completion time and specially the successful outcomes and their sustainability.</p>	

**4.1.2 Environmental Impacts**

According to the TE, the project obtained the national government's recognition of indigenous land rights over 900,000 hectares encompassing the central region of the Matavén Forest.

**4.2 Likelihood of sustainability.** Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of risks to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE.

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<p>The risks to financial sustainability are low. The approach towards achieving financial sustainability was narrowed down during project execution to include two initiatives: consolidation of central government transfers to resguardos and obtaining international funding. The Matavén Forest, including the central zone, receives approximately US\$480,000 in annual government transfers to be spent on social development projects and environmentally sustainable production alternatives. Through the creation of ACATISEMA, these resources arrive directly to the organization, which in turn must distribute them among the 16 resguardos. The project was also successful in obtaining international funding. ACATISEMA is receiving international donations directly as of 2004. As long as ACATISEMA invests these resources wisely, sustainable funding from international organizations is likely.</p>	
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
<p>The TE indicates that social sustainability was guaranteed through the formation of the central resguardo and through various project initiatives designed to improve quality of life among local communities. By promoting the connection between health and ancestral natural resource management practices, the project promoted conservation efforts in accordance with local beliefs. Socio-political sustainability was also guaranteed as a result of titling the central zone as a resguardo, which offers the sustainable use of its</p>	

<p>natural resources.</p> <p>A potential risk exists that ACATISEMA will not work in the same participative and consultative manner that ensured Etnollano's success. Etnollano's methodology made constant consultations with local communities mandatory to decision making. Consensual local agreements led to active community support to project activities. However, the region's political instability may affect the democratic and participative nature of the relationship between ACATISEMA and its local constituents.</p> <p>Regarding socio-political instability, the TE mentions that the ever-changing situation of public safety in this region of Colombia also affected project implementation. Although Matavén is not a scenario for direct confrontation, armed conflict has interrupted the working dynamics in the region and has affected communications between support entities and communities, as well as between communities.</p> <p>Another circumstance affecting the project according to the TE, is the unstable political situation in Venezuela, which can affect gasoline supplies to the Matavén region. Political crises between the governments of Colombia and Venezuela can affect the supply and prices of gasoline in the region, upon which most of the regional communications depend. In prior occasions, strikes in the Venezuelan petroleum company (PDVSA) led to gasoline scarcities that interrupted the implementation of some project activities.</p>	
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<p>Risks to institutional frameworks and governance are relatively low. Obtaining legal recognition of the central zone of the Matavén Forest was critical to the project's sustainability. The project executors took advantage of the Colombian government's longstanding and continuous support to biodiversity conservation through the recognition of indigenous territories. Indeed, during the past two decades over twenty million hectares have been legally declared as resguardos in the Colombian Amazon. In addition, the Matavén Forest is included within its respective Departmental Development Plan as a conservation zone and as the historical seat of indigenous cultures.</p> <p>From project onset, it became clear that indigenous communities preferred the option of creating an indigenous resguardo over a National Park, because it would allow them to retain their autonomy and because of a negative precedent with the creation of a national park. A negative precedent existed when the central government's National Parks Authority created the Tuparro National Park, located north of the Matavén Forest. This park generated conflict with the region's indigenous people over the degree of co-management to be allowed and resulted in the death of various indigenous people as well as of the park's administrator.</p> <p>To further institutional sustainability, the project focused on educational work and the participatory research of the different resguardos through the health promoter organizations that have led the "heart of health" vision in the Matavén Forest. In addition, to tackle issues such as land governance the project worked directly with indigenous authorities (captains, leaders and traditional doctors). These efforts led to the creation of ACATISEMA, an indigenous community organization representing the region's 16 resguardos.</p> <p>This indigenous organization wrote statutes, became legally registered and can conduct various financial and operational transactions in Colombia. ACATISEMA consolidated itself in such a way that it could participate directly in the administration and execution of some of the project's components and activities, through partnerships with NGOs and other entities. Currently, ACATISEMA manages some of the financial resources and new projects, and receives international donations directly.</p> <p>The project created an inter-institutional entity to advance the titling process. An organism called Inter-Institutional Support Group (known as GIA for its name in Spanish) was created with the membership of the People's Defense Council, the administrative unit of the National Parks System, the mayor's office in Cumaribo, the Colombian land reform institute (INCORA) and Etnollano. This entity worked efficiently to obtain the resguardo's legal recognition and lobby at the central government level. The organization was dissolved once it achieved its principal objective, allowing ACATISEMA to follow up on the process. Knowing how and when to make way for the consolidation of indigenous organizations was an important lesson learned in this process.</p>	
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<p>Environmental sustainability risks are relatively low. The project placed considerable emphasis on education and communication activities as well as on the generation of ecologically sustainable production alternatives. For example, the project trained local communities to produce and commercialize their handicrafts. This output was achieved following various meetings with community leaders. During these meetings, productive projects were identified and their environmental sustainability determined. In</p>	

addition, during the collection of biological and socio-cultural information, key natural resources used in the production of handicrafts were identified and a common vision was developed during these participative meetings to ensure wise use of natural resources.

Provide only ratings for the sustainability of outcomes based on the information in the TE:

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: HS</b>
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>

**4.3 Catalytic role**

**a. Production of a public good**

**b. Demonstration:** The TE indicates that it is probable that this project will be replicated nationally and internationally. Indeed, indigenous communities in Venezuela and in the northern Llanos region have already visited the Matavén zone in order to learn from their experiences. Matavén is being exposed internationally as a prime example of a community-led conservation area.

In order to disseminate the positive results achieved in the Matavén project, the project included among its activities: visits by indigenous leaders from Matavén to other protected areas for the exchange of experiences, the strengthening of COAMA as a network of NGOs working throughout the Amazon region, and references to Matavén in national and international publications.

During the project several indigenous leaders from ACATISEMA visited the Kuna (Kuna-Yala) region in Panama, meeting with the group’s leaders and artisans. This allowed ACATISEMA leaders to understand how the Kunas managed their lands and to learn about their production and commercialization of handicrafts. A year later, also with support from the World Bank, a group of Kuna leaders and female artisans from the Mola Cooperative traveled to Matavén to learn about the enlargement and administration of the group’s reservation, as well as its work with handmade crafts. Due to these experiences, Matavén leaders widened their perspective regarding the project’s possibilities and increased their confidence in indigenous land governance.

**c. Replication**

**d. Scaling up**

**4.4 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE**

**A. M&E design**

**Rating: HS**

Project monitoring and evaluation was based on indicators defined within the project activities. The relevant data for their analysis was collected during the various project activities and in biannual reports submitted by Etnollano. Parallel to this process, work was carried out using a methodology of participatory action research developed with the indigenous health promoters of the Matavén Forest and that enabled the involvement of communities in the evaluation of their processes of change. Technical and financial reports were presented annually and included detailed evaluations of the various efficiency indicators, as well as their impact on biodiversity conservation and improvements in the quality of life among local communities.

**B. M&E plan Implementation**

**Rating: HS**

The biannual reports submitted by Etnollano were analyzed each semester to monitor project development and results were discussed at internal team meetings within the Foundation and at meetings with community leaders in the region. This also allowed to involve the communities and their leaders directly in project monitoring and in the detailed planning of future activities. As a result of this process, a significant amount of biological and socio-economic information was gathered with the support of indigenous communities. This data constructed a valuable biodiversity baseline for the region, supporting project activities and used for the direct benefit of the region’s indigenous communities.

**C. M&E budgeted and properly funded**

**Rating: HS**

Yes, the TE presents a breakdown of costs for information and data collection and indicates that the GEF funds were also used to fund the following activities such as the recollection and standardization of the region’s cultural, ecological and socio-economic information through participatory research carried out

with indigenous communities and strengthening health promoter organizations, which were also involved in the project M&E activities.

**Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice?** Yes. The project seemed to have a sound M&E design with proper indicators and the system was used for project management and to measure progress towards the objectives. This was also a reflection of the M&E activities properly budgeted and planned from the project design.

#### 4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

#### **What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?**

The principal lessons learned during project execution were the following:

- Two critical success factors are land rights and indigenous land governance. Support for indigenous land management should be a core element of WB projects, whether it is in obtaining legal land titles or in effective land management. It must also be recognized that Protected Areas and Co-Management conservation approaches have affinities, but that negative precedents exist between governments and indigenous organizations. The Bank has good examples of positive synergies between protected areas and co-management that should be made evident with indigenous partners in protected areas.
- The WB should present the Safeguard Policies to stakeholders from the beginning and apply their principle of participation. When indigenous communities learn the Safeguard Policies, they increase their trust in the WB; in turn, information regarding the WB's principles of action becomes clear to all project partners.
- Demand-driven subprojects favor local communities' ownership. In Matavén the project team supported handmade craft production at the indigenous communities' request.
- The WB team should clarify NGO roles to create effective teams with indigenous organizations. Role distribution between NGOs and indigenous organizations should follow four guidelines: (i) the role must be useful to the project; (ii) the organization who assumes the role must be capable of meeting its requirements; (iii) whoever assumes a job must be satisfied with its functions, and (iv) all organizations must agree that the role should be awarded to that specific entity. As indigenous organizations consolidate and take on more responsibilities, the roles that NGOs assume should become more limited.
- The WB should prepare indigenous organizations for responsible financial management. Indigenous organizations tend to be inexperienced in the simultaneous management of power, self-determination and financial resource management. This situation may demand the presence of responsible third parties throughout project execution.
- Miscommunication between stakeholders is more frequent than assumed. Information sharing and dissemination is essential to project success. Good communication must be constantly enforced by a specialist or a staff member with experience on this subject. Furthermore, it is essential to build a timetable agreed on by all project partners.
- Stakeholders have different priorities; respect differences and find synergies. Links between indigenous community development priorities and conservation efforts should be made evident. However, it cannot be assumed that indigenous communities are always conservation friendly, and their political agenda should not be underestimated.
- Project exchange visits are more important than exchanging theoretical arguments. Visits to projects contribute to a stronger sense of trust in the WB. The WB team should create mechanisms in the preparatory phases for these visits, focusing on land titling, traditional knowledge, property rights and sustainable production systems, among other themes.
- An important lesson learned in the process of gathering data for project monitoring was that it had to be made clear to indigenous communities that the WB team was not going to appropriate traditional knowledge. The project execution team should be very careful in handling sensitive information, and should involve the indigenous communities in every step of the information-gathering process. In addition, it should be agreed with the communities which information will be published and which will be respected, according to their ancestral practices.

**4.6 Quality of the evaluation report** Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory

= 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

<b>4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings from other sources such as GEF EO field visits, etc.</b>
None

<b>4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<b>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b> Yes, very good and comprehensive assessment. The report mentions that the project had an impact on biodiversity conservation and improvements in the quality of life among local communities. It would have been useful to include a more detailed assessment with examples to better support this statement.	S
<b>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</b> Yes, but no ratings were provided.	S
<b>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> The sustainability assessment is exhaustive and addresses all the key aspects of sustainability. This level of depth and insight if this assessment can be considered a good practice. Particularly noteworthy was how the project built on an existing government initiative to create protected areas under indigenous management (instead of national parks without regard to the local inhabitants).	HS
<b>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> Lessons presented were supported by the evidence and of broad applicability to other projects involving the creating of protected areas where indigenous communities live and dealing with land tenure issues.	HS
<b>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> Yes, the report presented a very detailed breakdown of the proposed and actual use of GEF and cofinancing funds per component and donor. Accounts were audited every year and the principal conclusion was that the Etnollano Foundation (the Grant Recipient) managed the funds in a satisfactory manner and that financial information was presented in a reasonable manner, despite a few issues raised such as the lack of notes in the financial statements and selected accounting information still pending. However, the Bank's Internal Financial Management team reviewed the report and considered it acceptable after a series of recommendations regarding improved account disclosure, were cleared by the target dates. The auditing report of the last project period, which covers January to December 2004, was received on May 16, 2005. The Bank's Internal Financial Management team is reviewing the report.	HS
<b>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&amp;E systems?</b> Yes, but it would have been useful to include a more detailed discussion on the indicators used to measure the impact of the project on biodiversity conservation and improvements in the quality of life among local communities (this was just mentioned in the report). Also, a more detailed assessment of how the significant amount of biological and socio-economic information gathered was used. The report only indicates that this data constructed a valuable biodiversity baseline for the region, supporting project activities and used for the direct benefit of the region's indigenous communities.	MS

**4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended?** Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.

<b>Yes:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>No:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------------

Explain: It would be interesting to visit this project location a couple years to assess the impacts of the GEF intervention and their sustainability.

**4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)**

Project brief

October 16, 2006