1. Project Data

GEF Project ID	1092
IA/EA Project ID	P075219
Focal Area	Biodiversity
Project Name	Integrated Ecosystem Management in Indigenous Communities
Country/Countries	Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama)
Geographic Scope	Regional
Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects	IADB and WB Joint (2 components each)
Executing Agencies involved	Central American Indigenous and Peasant Coordination Association for Community Agroforestry (ACICAFOC) and the Central American Commission on the Environment and Development (CCAD)
Involvement of NGO and CBO	Among the executing agencies
Involvement of Private Sector	No- Not Involved
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	OP 3 Forest Ecosystems and OP 4 Mountain Ecosystems
TER Prepared by	Sandra Romboli
TER Peer Review by	Neeraj Negi
Author of TE	John Harold Gomez Vargas
Review Completion Date	
CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	12/11/2004
Project Implementation Start Date	20/05/2005
Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation)	12/08/2011
Actual Date of Project Completion	12/06/2011
TE Completion Date	01/05/2011
IA Review Date	Not Reviewed
TE Submission Date	

2. Project Financing

Financing Source	At Endorsement (millions USD)	At Completion (millions USD)
GEF Project Preparation Grant	0.70	0.70
Co-financing for Project Preparation		
Total Project Prep Financing	0.70	0.70
GEF Financing	9.00	9.00
IA/EA own		
Government		
Other*	39.89	13.12
Total Project Financing	48.89	22.12
Total Financing including Prep	49.59	22.82

*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

3. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF Evaluation Office TE Review
Project Outcomes	S	MS	N/A	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	High risk to GEO	N/A	MU
Monitoring and Evaluation	S		N/A	MS
Quality of Implementation and Execution	N/A		N/A	MS
Quality of the Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS

4. Project Objectives

4.1. *Global Environmental Objectives of the project:*

"The global objective of the Program is to achieve a more effective biodiversity conservation in Central America, (Guatemala, Belize, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica y Panama) by strengthening the capacities of indigenous communities to protect and manage their natural and cultural resources and by recuperating and promoting their cultural values and sustainable traditional land use practices, thereby helping: (a) prevent further land degradation that threatens environmental services, livelihoods, and economic wellbeing, and (b) conserve the region's high, though greatly threatened, biodiversity resources". (WB ICR, page 3 and Pro Doc page 10). There was no change in GEO, but some inconsistencies were reported by the WB ICR as follows: "The PAD GEO focused on biodiversity conservation as the key outcome of the project. In the Grant Agreement the GEO reads as, "achieving a more comprehensive ecosystem management by strengthening the capacity of the Indigenous Peoples to protect and manage their natural and cultural resources." The Grant Agreement GEO focuses more on the indigenous capacity building to achieve the outcome of a better ecosystem. In the Incremental Cost Analysis annex of the PAD, the goal of the project is "to promote Traditional Ecosystems Management (TEM) in indigenous lands through support to an emerging network of indigenous communities engaged in IEM in Central America". This lack of consistency in the presentation of the GEO affected the formulation of indicators (biodiversity versus ecosystem versus capacity building) (WB ICR page 10).

4.2. *Development Objectives of the project:*

The operational objective of the GEF is the conservation and sustainable use of biological resources in forest and mountain ecosystems and an equitable sharing of benefits (TE IADB, page 16). There was no change in DO.

4.3. *Changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities:*

Criteria	Change?	Reason for Change
Global Environmental Objectives		
Development Objectives		
Project Components		
Other activities		

5. GEF EO Assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

5.1. *Relevance* – ***Satisfactory***

In terms of relevance to the countries involved: "Considering the support and participation of CCAD in the PMIIE, it may be concluded that the project concept addresses the priorities of all the countries of the MBC and the outcomes are consistent not only with the countries' but also with the Region's priorities. As anticipated, the governments participated in the Program through the representative of the CCAD in the Project Council of the PMIIE" (TE page 36, IADB). Furthermore, The PMIIE has been relevant because their objectives remain fully relevant for the Region and are still a priority for the Central American countries and world institutions concerned with climate change, because the conservation and protection of the biodiversity, resources and communities in the MBC are critical for mitigating the negative effects of climate change, as reflected in the agreements reached at the Earth Summit in 1992 and Nagoya Convention on Biological Diversity in 2010. In terms of relevance to the GEF the program is consistent with the strategies and principles of the GEF Operational Strategy, supporting long-term protection of globally important ecosystems. The project supports the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area through the conservation and sustainable use of biological resources in forest and mountain ecosystems, addressing biodiversity loss and degradation issues related to these two operational programs. It also supports the GEF Strategic Priorities for (a) mainstreaming of biodiversity in productive landscapes, (b) implementation of innovative and indigenous ecosystem management practices, and (c) targeted capacity building (Pro Doc, page 10).

5.2. *Effectiveness* – ***Moderately Satisfactory***

The GEOs were achieved in varying degrees of satisfaction (overall Moderately Satisfactory rated by the WB ICR). The project contributed to regional and country-level efforts to achieve more effective biodiversity conservation and complemented local efforts by communities and international development agencies. While promoting the sustainable use of natural resources, the project helped to strengthen and introduce environmentally sustainable and culturally appropriate economic opportunities to rural and indigenous populations. The project also built substantial capacity among local communities to promote biodiversity conservation, and to incorporate biodiversity considerations into their local development plans. Furthermore, as a result of the training provided to executing agency ACICAFOC, the region now has an organization that represents indigenous communities, and has indigenous staff that has the required capacity to competently implement development and biodiversity initiatives.

Additionally, the GEF incremental benefits were realized, although not all evenly, and all sub-projects were fully operational, with productive sub-projects having robust internal rates of return. Following the preparation of the land use plans, about 163,000 hectares have been conserved under a community conservation regime and 207,000 hectares under sustainable cultural use across the region. The sheer scale of the IP knowledge-based IEM land use plans (close to 400,000 hectares) is likely to have a significant impact on biodiversity conservation according to the WB ICR (page 15). Examples of project achievements contributing to the GEO are: Target: 135,000 hectares under community conservation, and 45,000 hectares under sustainable cultural land use - achievement: 162,810 hectares under community conservation, and 207,487 hectares under sustainable cultural land use, Target: 79 (communities) Plans for sustainable cultural land use (CLAN) developed (IDB) - achievement: 236 communities participating in conservation, and sustainable cultural land use and this component continues under execution and has already resulted in 23 community plans, Target: Communities gain organizational and technical capacity to evaluate project impacts (World Bank) - achievements: While the target value for the indicator was exceeded by a factor of 10, there is little evidence that the communities have acquired the skills necessary to carry out impact evaluation of project activities. However it is still too early to fully measure (WB ICR page iii). Other project achievements were: 160% achievement in terms of the number of people trained; the number of activities and studies was exceeded, and about 50% of the number of plans was reached, 66% of the number of networks was designed and started, while 400% of the number of communities developed eco/ethno-tourism business plans for joint ventures etc.

5.3. *Efficiency* – ***Moderately Satisfactory***

The project became effective in 2005 after reaching all effectiveness conditions. Disbursements were low for the first two years of implementation because of the low financial management capacity of the execution agency. Given that the initiative was regional and involved the participation of several agencies at different levels, project implementation proved to be challenging for the various agencies involved for the first few years. At the start of implementation, ACICAFOC had no prior experience working with international Banks and therefore was not fully familiar with either World Bank or IADB norms, procedures or policies (safeguards and fiduciary). However, this weakness was eventually overcome through training and capacity building of ACICAFOC. The TE do not elaborate further on what the explicit consequences on the delays were and reporting that the "the first two years of implementation were lost" (WB ICR, page 10). The project was delayed and extended several times.

5.4. *Sustainability* – ***Medium/Significant Risks***

Both the TEs report that the risk to sustainability of project result is moderate. According to the WB ICR: It is expected that the communities and beneficiaries would be able to maintain the capacity built with the plans and subprojects. However, the poverty levels that prevail in indigenous communities and the need for immediate income could lead to an abandonment of sustainable practices to prevent land degradation, in the process compromising the GEO

achievement (WB ICR page 20). The IADB TE reports that "strengthening of product marketing networks will probably facilitate the sustainability of the objectives of the PMIIE over time. However, due to the lack of future resources for making progress with the implementation of the ICDPs and the TMCPs, combined with the existing poverty conditions and the absence of concrete action plans by the Countries to sustain the results of the PMIIE, the progress made with the decisions taken by the communities for conserving biodiversity could be reversed in the mid-term, especially as regards community conservation areas and sustainable cultural land use". The WB ICR further elaborates that "ACICAFOC and CICA as a strategic partner have been working on developing a sustainability plan that will be completed after the IADB project closes. The plan consists of a program to consolidate the community participation model using funds from other donors. To achieve this, ACICAFOC has already opened offices in Nicaragua and Honduras. The sustainability plan also includes finalizing agreements with international NGOs and community-based organizations. During the life of the Project, ACICAFOC successfully obtained about US$11 million in leveraged funds from other international agencies to continue working to realize the project's underlying objectives. Additionally, the organization is now implementing a JSDF operation of US$ 1.9 million, and a KfW-grant of US$ 6.5 million (ACICAFOC and CICA are participating in this initiative) to support strengthening the cocoa network and the community natural resources management in the MBC, respectively. It is expected that the baseline data prepared by the project would contribute to future efforts to conserve biodiversity and to foster community-based resource management. The use of this information to continue monitoring biodiversity and to include indigenous peoples in this process is one of the most important project achievements. It is expected that the new skills in territorial planning and land use management will help the region to be in a better position to raise funds from donors as they work to continue these activities.

6. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

6.1. *Co-financing*

6.1.1. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by co-financing well integrated into the project?

Not all co-financing materialized for this project. As per the IADB TE (page 44): "The complex nature of this project, which involves 10 eco-regions in seven countries, involving two Implementing Agencies, and implemented by two different institutions/networks, has not allowed the realization of the synergies with other IDB/WB projects that were planned in the original design". The project was able to leverage funds from other cooperating agencies to compensate for some of the financing lost. There is not sufficient information in the TEs to further elaborate on the Co-financing for this project.

6.1.2. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

As above, not all co-financing materialized for this project (13m instead of 39m) - "The complex nature of this project, which involves 10 eco-regions in seven countries, involving two Implementing Agencies, and implemented by two different institutions/networks, has not allowed the realization of the synergies with other IDB/WB projects that were planned in the original design". The project was able to leverage funds from other cooperating agencies to match some of the costs lost. There is not sufficient information in the TEs to further elaborate on the Co-financing for this project.

6.2. Delays

6.2.1. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

There were some delays in this project, i.e. during the first two years and a half, the execution of the PMIIE was affected by evident difficulties which resulted in accumulated delays and in the extension of the timeframes initially planned by the WB (6 months) and the IDB (12 months). The PCU repeatedly asked to adapt the Bank's proceedings (i.e. for more flexibility as the project included indigenous people), requirements demanded by IDB officials for the approval of expenses filed with the IDB, resulted in the delayed execution of the program, which especially affected component 2.

The following are some of the aspects insufficiently considered in the project design and layout, which originated difficulties and delays in its execution:

a. The Banks providing financing had distinct accounting, procurement and financial regulations which entailed double efforts for those in charge of executing the project and for beneficiaries, as they were forced to comply with different rules in the same project.

b. The executing networks' (ACICAFOC and CICA) unfamiliarity with the Banks' rules demanded greater efforts and put greater strains on the Banks' officials, executing agents and beneficiaries. Even if this situation was foreseen by the PMIIE, it was not duly addressed from the beginning of the program and caused deterioration in the interaction between the Banks, executing agents and beneficiaries and delays during the first two years. These delays kept accumulating as the program lacked the capacities necessary to deal with them.

c. Considering that the program had a great component of community participation, that it was targeted at a scattered rural community, that it was to be executed in 7

countries and 10 eco-regions and that it involved a large number of stakeholders, in order to guarantee the participation of those communities scattered throughout such an extensive territory and subject to accessibility conditions, greater field efforts and a large number of administrative proceedings would be required, which situation was not sufficiently provided for. d. The direct beneficiaries of the program were the members of 14 indigenous towns and peasant communities with 14 indigenous languages and two Indo-European languages (Spanish and English), which turned the execution of the project highly complex. The linguistic differences led to discussions about certain concepts, which resulted in delays as the meaning of certain terms was defined.

e. Since the four components were designed to be executed in a coordinated manner, delays in any of them affected the execution of the others, demanding greater efforts for implementing the program (above section from IADB TE page 35-36).

6.3. Country ownership

6.3.1. 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:

As per IADB TE: Considering the support and participation of CCAD in the PMIIE, it may be concluded that the project concept addresses the priorities of all the countries of the MBC and the outcomes are consistent not only with the countries' but also with the Region's priorities. As foreseen, the governments participated in the Program through the representative of the CCAD in the Project Council of the PMIIE (TE IADB page 36). This was a participatory project with many stakeholders which enhanced the country ownership and the outcomes. Stakeholder communities actively participated and took ownership of the PMIIE through their networks, liaison organizations and community organizations during the project design and implementation, turning their participation into a strength for the PMIIE.

To date, the PMIIE has neither faced opposition nor seen a remarkable participation on the part of the governments of the countries involved, or of the NGOs, the private sector or other institutions (IADB TE page 36).

7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

7.1. *M&E design at entry –**Moderately Satisfactory***

Overall the M&E at design was in the satisfactory range but with weaknesses. The Log frame was not in the Pro doc. As per the WB ICR (page 9), "the results framework includes indicators which are more in the form of output indicators than outcome indicators. The indicators were intended to measure the impact of the project on the three underlying factors that contributed to promoting biodiversity. One of the indicators was an outcome indicator tracking reduction of the malnutrition of children under 7 years old. This indicator was so broad in terms of the scope of poverty reduction that it proved very difficult to be measured not only because there was no

baseline data but also because the correlation between the activities of the project and the achievement of that indicator was questionable. During the MTR, it was agreed to modify this indicator. Baseline data: While the background studies and the comprehensive consultations provided the project with wide-ranging data that provided a solid foundation, there were no baseline values related to the key biodiversity indicator (Stabilized biodiversity aspects in project areas) based on which project progress could be quantitatively and accurately measured. Establishing baseline values for various aspects of biodiversity would have been a huge endeavor, perhaps beyond the capability of the project. This was a key constraint that limited the ability of the project to demonstrate tangible achievements related to the GEO".

7.2. *M&E implementation-* ***Moderately Satisfactory***

Component 4 was designed for M&E capacity building: This component was successful in building capacity in ACICAFOC to create and manage a project M&E system. However, the broad nature of the GEO as discussed above, as well as delays in building baseline data and contracting an M&E specialist for ACICAFOC, affected the establishment of a robust M&E system. These issues were noted by the 2008 QALP review and the MTR. Following changes in IADB team leadership, the transfer of team leadership from a biodiversity and forestry specialist to a social specialist, the World Bank incorporated a biodiversity expert into the Bank team in 2008. Prior to that time, given the Bank's responsibility for the income generating and project management/monitoring evaluation components, this expertise was not seen as central to the project activities. Adding such an expert to the Bank team bolstered the M&E efforts (WB ICR page 11). The baseline studies (including monitoring forest cover, ecosystem fragmentation, and presence of bird species), were completed in 2008 and based on these, an M&E system was prepared. This system utilized social and bio-diversity indicators, and was designed to furnish targeted monitoring reports. With the incorporation of a biodiversity specialist on the Bank supervision team after the 2008 MTR, the team began using the GEF4 tracking tool to monitor project impact on biodiversity conservation. These tools have been useful for capturing some impacts. Given ACICAFOC and its organizational partners' new M&E capacity, as well as the fledging capacity in indigenous communities, there is potential for more consistent community involvement in future project monitoring. Moreover, the baseline data collected in 2008, while too late to be of use for the project, has the potential to be utilized for ongoing biodiversity monitoring with the involvement of indigenous peoples in the process.

8. Assessment of project's Quality of Implementation and Execution

8.1. *Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution –* ***Moderately Satisfactory***

8.2. *Overall Quality of Implementation-* ***Moderately Satisfactory***

As per WB ICR (page 21): There were many positive attributes of Bank supervision, but there were certain aspects that were not addressed in as much depth as they should have been, and the ISRs did not sufficiently report the challenges the project faced. Overall, "supervision throughout implementation was mixed. The team supervised the project at least twice a year, and there were supervision missions dedicated exclusively to financial management and

procurement. Some supervision missions were carried jointly with IADB representatives. The Bank team recognized the need to, and did, provide support to building ACICAFOC's capacity, particularly in procurement and financial management. It also provided prompt assistance to modify the procurement procedures which facilitated expeditious implementation of project activities in remote indigenous communities. However, even in the context of the many positive attributes of Bank supervision, there were certain aspects that were not addressed in as much depth as they should have been, and the ISRs did not sufficiently report the challenges the project faced. Additionally, there was no "formal revision" of the GEO to retrofit the project's design flaws as recommended by QALP-1 had advised. A restructuring of the GEO even at a late stage in the project period could have resulted in a better assessment of project performance at the ICR stage. On the side of IADB their TE outlines difficulties for the PCU to work with IADB on financial and procurement procedures".

8.3. *Overall Quality of Execution* – ***Satisfactory***

Both IADB and WB agree on the performance of the executing agency in the respective TEs: ACICAFOC accepted the challenge of executing this project even though it was assessed as having weak capacity during project preparation. However, the organization has provided evidence of professional commitment, and a capacity to learn rapidly from project preparation and implementation experience. It is gratifying to note that the significant institutional risk associated with ACICAFOC did not materialize during implementation, and its success as an implementing agency is one of the positive highlights of the project. The organization has significantly advanced its institutional capacity, and its Board of Directors has used their experience with the project to establish their presence in the Region. ACICAFOC is now being sought by several international donors to be the implementing agency for programs they are funding in the Region (WB ICR page 22).

9. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

Criteria	Rating	GEF EO Comments
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	**Satisfactory**	Both the TEs contain an assessment of the relevant outcomes and impacts.
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	**Satisfactory**	Both reports were internally consistent. However, the evidence provided was not always convincing.
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	**Moderately Satisfactory**	Sustainability could have been more elaborated on in both of the TEs. The WB ICR addresses it more than the IADB report, but on the whole not sufficiently.
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	**Satisfactory**	Lessons are supported and comprehensive.
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	**Moderately Satisfactory**	This area could have been more elaborated on in both of the TEs. There was not sufficient information on how the co-financing contributed to the various components and how the co-financing that did not materialized affected the components. The IADB report had more information on co-financing than the WB ICR (which contained almost no information on this subject).
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	**Moderately Satisfactory**	WB ICR was ok (but very short). IADB TE did not have a sufficient section on the projects M&E system.

10. Other issues to follow up on

11. Sources of information

Annex I – Project Impacts as assessed by the GEF Evaluation Office

Did the project have outputs contributing to knowledge being generated or improved? No

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE BEING GENERATED OR IMPROVED?

Is there evidence that the knowledge was used for management/ governance? No

HOW WAS THIS KNOWLEDGE USED AND WHAT RESULTED FROM THAT USE?

Did the project have outputs contributing to the development of databases and information-sharing arrangements?

Yes

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO INFORMATION BEING COMPILED AND MADE ACCESSIBLE TO MANY?

This was a regional project with 7 countries which concentrated on 1) Cultural and Institutional Strengthening and Capacity Building, 2) Promotion of Sustainable Cultural Land Use and Traditional Ecosystem Management, 3) Development of Culturally Appropriate Products, Markets, and Services for Environmental Sustainability, in Indigenous Communities, 4) Participatory Project Monitoring and Evaluation. Hence the nature of the components included a large number of trainings courses, networks being created, regional and international meetings and conferences, workshops etc.

Is there evidence that these outputs were used? Yes

TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THESE OUTPUTS BEEN USED?
WHAT HAS RESULTED FROM INFORMATION BEING MADE ACCESSIBLE TO OTHERS?

This project included a large number of trainings courses, networks being created, regional and international meetings and conferences, workshops etc. For example the Integrated Community Development Plans (ICDPs) and Community Territorial Management Plans (TMCPs) are now in use and as a result of these plans, indigenous and peasant communities placed 162,809.85 hectares under community conservation areas and 207,487.45 hectares under sustainable cultural land use areas. Building capacity for indigenous peoples to increase their knowledge and competence in biodiversity conservation. As reported by the WB ICR (page14) " The project reached more than the targeted number of 100 indigenous communities and organizations, promoting the participation of more than 350 communities in the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources, providing capacity building to over 4,000 indigenous peoples and 357 organizations. The range of formats - traditional trainings, experiential exchanges and study tours - offered a spectrum of learning environments and provided learning opportunities that had not previously been available to these communities. The communities and institutions were considerably strengthened in their knowledge relating to systematize traditional knowledge into IEM systems which was used to prepare land use plans".

Did the project have activities that contributed to awareness and knowledge being raised? Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

Under component 1) Cultural and Institutional Strengthening and Capacity Building, e.g. 90 study visits (375 indigenous participants) took place. 1491 indigenous participants were included in experimental exchanges in areas related to community production etc. Under component 2) Promotion of Sustainable Cultural Land Use and Traditional Ecosystem Management, 6 networks were created e.g 1 network for marketing products with 386 communities.

Was any ***positive*** change in behavior reported as a result of these activities? Yes

WHAT BEHAVIOR (POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE) HAS CHANGED AS A RESULT?

An important result of this project was the development of Integrated Community Development Plans (ICDPs) and Community Territorial Management Plans (TMCPs). As a result of these plans, indigenous and peasant communities placed 162,809.85 hectares under community conservation areas and 207,487.45 hectares under sustainable cultural land use areas, thereby contributing to the global objective of the project. The Plans also serve as a guide for strengthening the capacity to manage ecosystems according to traditional practices; they contain inventories of existing biodiversity resources, delimit conservation and cultural land use areas, identify vulnerable and threatened biodiversity-rich areas, and combine the traditional techniques of indigenous communities with modern conservation techniques.

Did the project activities contribute to building technical/ environmental management skills? Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO ***TECHNICAL/ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS*** BEING BUILT OR IMPROVED?

This project contributed to technical and environmental management skills being developed. Under component 1):
3,946 indigenous participants trained through 302 capacity building activities in areas related to corporate governance, marketing, law, customary law, land use, forest management, biodiversity, information technology, empowerment and advocacy, identity and collective rights, and participatory research techniques project formulation. 375 indigenous participants trained through 90 study visits in areas related to institutional management, law, customary
law, land use, identity and collective rights, empowerment and advocacy, information technology. 1491 indigenous participants trained through 58 experiential exchanges in areas related to community production, community mapping, cultural use of land and sustainable uses, preparation of management plans and eco / ethno tourism. 50 business plans, 16
institutional development plans through 31 consultancies. Recovery of traditional ecosystems management through 38 participatory systematization activities and studies in the indigenous communities. 87 diagnostic and results
processing meetings and 1 international forum (Argentina) to increase competencies in traditional land use management, etc. (please refer to page 26-32 in WB ICR for complete list of outputs).

Is there evidence of these skills being applied by people trained? Yes

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

An important result of this project was the development of Integrated Community Development Plans (ICDPs) and Community Territorial Management Plans (TMCPs). As a result of these plans, indigenous and peasant communities placed 162,809.85 hectares under community conservation areas and 207,487.45 hectares under sustainable cultural land use areas. As reported in the WB ICR (page 15) "The skills learnt in the project are being applied explicitly, e.g. Community Plans for Territorial Management (PCGT). These are territorial/community conservation plans aimed at strengthening the capacity for traditional management of ecosystems of indigenous communities. Ten plans prepared under the project were designed in a participatory manner and executed in all countries comprising a total of about 200,000 hectares, benefitting 130 communities and 8,170 households. Furthermore, the Integrated Community Development Plans (PIDCO) are cultural land use plans that used mapping, inventories of existing biodiversity resources, delimitation of conservation areas, and the preparation of community by-laws to regulate the cultural use of the land. The project through participatory approaches prepared a total of 13 plans across the region covering 162,809.85 hectares, benefitting 15 territories, and over 300 communities. In the process of creating such plans through a participatory process, communities utilized the knowledge obtained through the capacity building initiatives under component 1, and "learned by doing" the steps involved in the preparation of such IP knowledge adapted IEM land use plans. Also, other components in the project for example Sub-GEO 3: Providing income generation opportunities compatible with conservation and sustainable natural resource management - achievements include 42 sub-projects have supported productive enterprises and building the required commercial and managerial capacities. The majority of the organizations were more socio-ethnic than economic oriented. The Project contributed to build their entrepreneurial and managerial capacities and now most of them are engaged in income generating activities (WB ICR page 16).

Did the project contribute to the development of legal / policy / regulatory frameworks? No

Were these adopted?

WHAT LAWS/ POLICIES/ RULES WERE ADOPTED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

Did the project contribute to the development of institutional and administrative systems and structures? No

Were these institutional and administrative systems and structures integrated as permanent structures?

WHAT OFFICES/ GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES WERE CREATED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

Did the project contribute to structures/ mechanisms/ processes that allowed more stakeholder participation in environmental governance? Yes

Were improved arrangements for stakeholder engagement integrated as permanent structures? Yes

WHAT STRUCTURES/ MECHANISMS/ PROCESSES WERE SUPPORTED BY THE PROJECT THAT ALLOWED MORE STAKEHOLDERS/ SECTORS TO PARTICIPATE IN ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE/ MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES?

This was a complex project with 7 countries involved. The participatory structure set-up was rather innovative and inclusive in nature,
because they included rural indigenous communities as key actors in the implementation of the
project. The pilot program turned into a learning process for all stakeholders in terms of the execution of projects aimed at biodiversity protection, involving quite different stakeholders like multilateral agencies and banks, public institutions, regional networks, national organizations, and local communities. The institutional arrangements of the PMIIE involved a large number of institutions and set-up a permanent indigenous council named Wayib, which was responsible for streamlining and overseeing the execution of the program and which was integrated by two representatives of ACICAFOC and two representatives of CICA. At local level, the project involved a large number of community organizations, at national level, the Project involved liaison organizations, at At Regional level, representing indigenous and peasant peoples from Central America, ACICAFOC acted as the executing agency in coordination with CICA network and The Central-American Commission on Environment and Development – CCAD- acted as the agency representing the interests of the States of Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama.

Did the project contribute to informal processes facilitating trust-building or conflict resolution?	UA

WHAT PROCESSES OR MECHANISMS FACILITATED TRUST-BUILDING AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION? WHAT RESULTED FROM THESE?

Did the project contibute to any of the following:		Please specify what was contributed:
Technologies & Approaches	Yes	The project set up Integrated Community Development Plans (ICDPs) and Community Territorial Management Plans (TMCPs). As a result of these plans, indigenous and peasant communities placed 162,809.85 hectares under community conservation areas and 207,487.45 hectares under sustainable cultural land use areas.
Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies	Yes	Yes, several multi-stakeholder councils were set up. Please refer to question on Structures here above.
Financial Mechanisms	Yes	There is some anecdotal evidence that the project had achieved results in terms of generating financial income from ecotourism and cocoa-related agroforestry. There was not sufficient information on this aspect in the TEs (WB and IADB) to further assess to what extent this had resulted in a higher income level/alt livelihood etc. for the families involved.

Did r**eplication** of the promoted technologies, and economic and financial instruments take place?	No

SPECIFY WHICH PLACES IMPLEMENTED WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH.

WHAT WAS THE RESULT IN THOSE PLACES (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did **scaling-up** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place? No

SPECIFY AT WHAT ADMINISTRATIVE & ECOLOGICAL SCALE AND WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS ADOPTED.

HOW WAS IT MODIFIED TO FIT THE NEW SCALE? WHAT WAS THE RESULT AT THE NEW SCALE/S (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did **mainstreaming** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place? No

SPECIFY HOW (MEANS/ INSTRUMENT) AND WHICH ASPECTS OF THE TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS INCORPORATED INTO THE EXISTING SYSTEM. WHAT WAS THE RESULT OR STATUS (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did r**emoval of market barriers** and sustainable market change take place? UA

SPECIFY HOW DEMAND HAS BEEN CREATED FOR WHICH PRODUCTS/ SERVICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO GEBs.

Based on most of the project's components and/or what it generally intended to do, what type of project would you say this is?

Institutional Capacity (governance) <--*dropdown menu*

If "combination", then of which types?

& <--*dropdown menu*

QUANTITATIVE OR ANECDOTAL DETAILS ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL ***PRESSURE HAS BEEN REDUCED/PREVENTED*** *OR ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL* ***STATUS HAS CHANGED*** *AT THE DEMONSTRATION SITES AS A CONTRIBUTION/RESULT OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES. FOR SYSTEM LEVEL CHANGES, SPECIFY THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR ECOLOGICAL SCALES.*

Was stress reduction achieved? Yes

If so, at what scales?	Please mark 'x' for all that apply					
	x	Local		Intended (local)		Unintended (local)
		Systemic		Intended (systemic)		Unintended (systemic)
How was the information obtained?	x	Measured	x	Anecdotal		

Was there a change in environmental status? No

If so, at what scales?	Please mark 'x' for all that apply					
	x	Local		Intended (local)		Unintended (local)
		Systemic		Intended (systemic)		Unintended (systemic)
How was the information obtained?		Measured	x	Anecdotal		

Evidence of intended stress reduction achieved at the **local level**

The project set up Integrated Community Development Plans (ICDPs) and Community Territorial Management Plans (TMCPs). As a result of these plans, indigenous and peasant communities placed 162,809.85 hectares under community conservation areas and 207,487.45 hectares under sustainable cultural land use areas. The TE also report that the GEF 4 tracking tool for biodiversity protection is being used and that "it is clear that there has been an enhancement of biodiversity richness in the area", and that "due to a range of factors influencing biodiversity, while it is difficult to attribute any biodiversity improvement directly to the project interventions, it is plausible that the project made contributions to the areas' conservation" (page 16 WB ICR). The WB TE further states that "the scale of the IP knowledge-based IEM land use plans (close to 400,000 hectares) is likely to have a significant impact on biodiversity conservation" (WB ICR page 15). However, neither of the TEs provide any concrete evidence on any specific increase of BD in the area.

Evidence of intended stress reduction at a **systemic level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at the **local level**

No information was given in the TEs in terms of actual species increase, however as per the WB ICR: "Following the preparation of the land use plans, about 163,000 hectares have been conserved under a community conservation regime, and 207,000 hectares under sustainable cultural use across the region. The sheer scale of the IP knowledge-based IEM land use plans (close to 400,000 hectares) is likely to have a significant impact on biodiversity conservation" (page 15). The GEF-4 Tracking Tool has gathered information about forest cover in Central American countries, mostly related to the regions where conservation activities have been initiated. This information, obtained by evaluating about 10 million hectares of land, with a forest cover of about 6 million hectares, provides some indication about the species movement and conservation of biodiversity. It is clear that there has been an enhancement in biodiversity richness in the area, including the area covered by the project. Due to a range of factors influencing biodiversity, while it is difficult to attribute any biodiversity improvement directly to the project interventions, it is plausible that the project made contributions to the areas' conservation.

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at a **systemic level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **systemic level**

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place during the project?

Environmental	Yes
Socioeconomic	Yes

To what extent were arrangements in place and being implemented during the project? Briefly describe arrangements.

M&E was one of the components of the projects (4) and : "The project has contributed to more effective management by developing the organizational and technical capacity of 307 communities to conduct evaluation of project impacts (WB ICR page 18) and "Project impacts associated with global benefits monitored and evaluated. Project goals and outputs including development of community capacities, effectiveness of community networks, and technical assistance activities monitored and evaluated every year". Socio-cultural impact of the Project intervention model evaluated every year (page 32 WB ICR). In total 307 communities have developed organizational and technical capacities for evaluation of Project impacts. In terms of project's M&E setup", although little information is included on the actual set-up of the projects M&E system, it is clear from the two TEs that indicators for outcomes GEOs and outputs were established and tracked throughout the project implementation. High level indicators were used and there is some description on how some of these were too broad for example: reduction of the malnutrition of children under 7 years old - was so broad in terms of the scope of poverty reduction that it proved very difficult to be measured not only because there was no baseline data but also because the correlation between the activities of the project and the achievement of that indicator was questionable.
The baseline studies (including monitoring forest cover, ecosystem fragmentation, and presence of bird species), were completed in 2008 and based on these, an M&E system was prepared. This system utilized social and bio-diversity indicators, and was designed to furnish targeted monitoring reports. With the incorporation of a biodiversity specialist on the Bank supervision team after the 2008 MTR, the team began using the GEF4 tracking tool to monitor project impact on biodiversity conservation. These tools have been useful for capturing some impacts. Given ACICAFOC and its organizational partners' new M&E capacity, as well as the

capacity in indigenous communities, there is potential for more consistent community involvement in future project monitoring. Moreover, the baseline data collected in 2008, while too late to be of use for the project, has the potential to be utilized for ongoing biodiversity monitoring with the involvement of indigenous peoples in the process.

To what extent did these arrangements use parameters/ indicators to measure changes that are actually related to what the project was trying to achieve?

Appropriate indicators were used to measure outcomes. For example the GEF operational objective: “conservation and sustainable use of biological resources in forest and mountain ecosystems and equitable sharing of benefits” - had indicators such as: No. 2 “Reduction in the percentage of extreme poverty in the Program’s beneficiary communities”; ii) indicator No. 3 “Stabilization or increase in the percentage of areas under community conservation within the Program’s area”; iii) indicator No. 4 “Increase in the percentage of lands under sustainable cultural land use within the Program’s area”.

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place to function after the project?

Yes

To what extent were arrangements put into place to function after GEF support had ended? Briefly describe arrangements.

As part of the project was dedicated to the development of M&E: The project has contributed to more effective management by developing the organizational and technical capacity of 307 communities to conduct evaluation of project impacts (WB ICR page 18) and "Project impacts associated with global benefits monitored and evaluated. Project goals and outputs including development of community capacities, effectiveness of community networks, and technical assistance activities monitored and evaluated every year.

Was there a government body/ other permanent organization with a clear mandate and budget to monitor environmental and/or socioeconomic status?

The M&E component built the capacity of the communities to conduct evaluations of project impacts and the component was successful in building
capacity in ACICAFOC to create and manage a project M&E system. The GEF 4 tracking tool for biodiversity conservation is being used.

Has the monitoring data been used for management?	Yes

How has the data been used for management? Describe mechanisms and actual instances.

During the project the data was used to make sure the project was on track and some indicators corrected during the MTR and as part of the PMU's work.

Has the data been made accessible to the public?	UA

How has the data been made accessible to the public? Describe reporting systems or methods.

Not clear from the TEs.

"SOCIOECONOMIC" REFERS TO ACCESS TO & USE OF RESOURCES (DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS), LIVELIHOOD, INCOME, FOOD SECURITY, HOME, HEALTH, SAFETY, RELATIONSHIPS, AND OTHER ASPECTS OF HUMAN WELL-BEING .AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, INCLUDE "BEFORE" AND "AFTER" NUMBERS, YEARS WHEN DATA WAS COLLECTED, AND DATA SOURCES.

Did the project contribute to **positive** socioeconomic impacts?	UA

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply

x	Local		Intended (local)		Unintended (local)
	Systemic		Intended (systemic)		Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

	Measured	x	Anecdotal

Did the project contribute to **negative** socioeconomic impacts?	No

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply

	Local		Intended (local)		Unintended (local)
	Systemic		Intended (systemic)		Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

	Measured		Anecdotal

Evidence on intended socio-economic impacts at the **local level**

There is very little evidence in the TEs on this, however it is mentioned that eco/ethno-tourism network (K´at) was promoted with the participation of 27 organizations and support for 69 subprojects. 42 of the subprojects were directly income generating, (agriculture, handcrafts, etc.), 12 were designed to strengthen local organizational capacity of local organizations and 15 promoted sustainable use of natural resources and biodiversity conservation (WB ICR page 30). Unable to assess more details. No evidence provided in reports.

Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report

Lessons provided pertain to coordination issues as well as use of a social approach and the need for a flexible design. As follows: Lessons from IADB TE: *The indigenous sociocultural approach is of outmost importance in building climate change agendas, *Community management is of outmost importance to biodiversity protection, *The institutional capacity of stakeholders should be guaranteed in the execution of projects with Indigenous Peoples, *The greater the complexity, the greater the flexibility in design adjustments, *Flexibility should be a necessary feature in pilot programs and projects. Lessons from WB ICR: *Utilizing a social approach to conservation, with community capacity building as an entry point, can be effective both for improving biodiversity protection and for promoting sustainable livelihoods of rural indigenous populations who depend directly on their natural environment. *When the World Bank co-manages a project with another multilateral agency, particularly when working with low-capacity community-based partners, it is as important to focus on streamlining institutional procedures as it is to ensure that responsibilities are shared according to each agency's comparative advantage. * In a regional project, it is important to create mechanisms to maintain the engagement of key political actors so that they preserve their commitment to the project and reinforce the link between the project objectives the relevant regional agenda. *

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

Recommendations were provided in the IADB TE (page 43). These pertained to procurement proceedings, dissemination of results, ensuring sustainability, coordination issues and to include indicators that measure socioeconomic impacts of these type of projects.