

**GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4**

<b>1. PROJECT DATA</b>				
GEF Project ID: 1301		Review date:		
IA/EA Project ID:		<b>GEF financing:</b>	<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Pastaza Biodiversity Conservation Project	IA/EA own:	.79	.79
Country:	Ecuador	Government:		
		Other*:		
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	.25	.63
Operational Program:	OP3: Forest Ecosystems	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	1.04	1.43
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Inter-institutional Environment Administration Network of Pastaza; Amazon Institute for Science and Technology (Amazanga); Centro Tecnológico de Recursos Amazonicos (CTRA); Fundacion OMAERE; Instituto Quichua de Biotecnología Sacha Supai (IQBSS)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		2003 January
		Closing Date	Proposed: 2004 August	Actual: 2005 October
Prepared by: Shaista Ahmed	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 19 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 33 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 14 months
Author of TE: Bolivia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela Country Managing Unit Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Sector Unit Latin America and the Caribbean Region		TE completion date: 2006 September	TE submission date to GEF EO: July 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 22 months

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

<b>2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS</b>
---

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	S	NA	NA	S
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	L	NA	NA	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	S	NA	NA	S
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	NA	NA	NA	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	NA	S

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?  
 The terminal evaluation report can be considered, for the most part, a good practice. While the report does not provide any ratings, it provides an extensive assessment of the project outcomes broken down by indicator, an extensive breakdown of the lessons learned from the project and the project costs and the actual co-financing used.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?  
 No.

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

##### a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

According to the project document the global environmental objective of the project is:

“...to carry out in-situ conservation and management of the ecosystems and the biodiversity found in the Southeastern Amazon forest of selected indigenous communities of Pastaza.”

According to the terminal evaluation report there has been no change in the global environmental objectives during the implementation of the project.

##### b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

According to the project document the following are the original development objectives of the project:

1. Management plans for the communities of Nina Amarun, Yana Yacu and Shiona, comprising surveys, geographic, biological, socioeconomic and cultural studies; environmental protection community programs and collective monitoring and impact evaluation methodologies, including the implementation at a pilot level of sustainable management projects for selected species of flora and fauna.
2. A socio-environmental information center to plan, administrate and monitor the indigenous territories of Pastaza, fully equipped with hardware and software.
3. Members of ten communities trained in planning, monitoring, administration and sustainable use of natural resources (training for Network specialists, local technical staff and community members).

The terminal evaluation report indicates there was only one change during the project implementation: the

Shiona community was replaced with the Lorocachi community. Below are the development objectives that were specified in the terminal evaluation report (the latter two objectives are refined versions of those presented in the project document):

- 1) Design and application of Management Plans in the three community territories: Nina Amaran, Yana Yacu and Lorocachi
- 2) Establishment of a Socio-Environmental Information Center for the Indigenous Territories of Pastaza
- 3) Design and implementation of a Capacity-Building program on Environmental and Natural Resource Management

**(describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)**

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components		Any other (specify)
	<b>X</b>			
<b>c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)</b>				
Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, causing a change in objectives	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)
	<b>X</b>			The prolonged absence of the majority of families in the Shiona community limited the capacity for community organization for the implementation of the project's strategy of natural resources management. Instead project activities were relocated to the Quichua community of Lorocachi upon World Bank approval.

#### 4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

**4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)**

**a. Relevance (of outcomes to focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities) Rating:**

A.1. What is the relevance of the project outcomes/results to:

(i) the national sustainable development agenda and development needs and challenges?

According to the project document the overexploitation of the natural resources in Ecuador's Pastaza region has contributed increased poverty in the region. The project document indicates that the local indigenous communities "lack economic alternatives to carry out a sustainable use" of the local natural resource base. A key developmental objective of the project involves the design and implementation of a capacity-building

<p>program on environmental and natural resource management which would train members of Pastaza's ten communities in planning, monitoring, administration and sustainable use of natural resources. This project objective directly addresses the sustainable development challenges Ecuador faces within the Pastaza region.</p>	
<p>(ii) the national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?</p>	
<p>The project is consistent with several policies outlined in Ecuador's National Strategy for Sustainable Development which promotes the development of a "participatory plan" for the sustainable use of natural resources and sustainable forest management. The project objectives which address the expansion of unsustainable agricultural practices and increased community participation in the decision-making process regarding the conservation of natural forests are consistent with Ecuador's Law for the Sustainable Use and its Forestry Law. Additionally, Ecuador's National Environmental Law approved in July 1999, defines "clear mechanisms for the open participation of civil society on environmental issues, including the conservation of natural areas" which support the project objectives.</p>	
<p>(iii) the achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?</p>	
<p>One of the project's main goals is to design and implement a capacity-building program on environmental and natural resource management. This program will help to train indigenous communities in planning, monitoring, the administration and sustainable use of natural resources surrounding the southeastern region of the Amazon forest. These project's outcomes are in line with the GEF OP3 Forest Ecosystems which supports sustainable community-based activities in forest conservation areas and also activities that apply sustainable use methods in forestry as part of integrated land management.</p>	
<p>(iv) the implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives)</p>	
<p>Ecuador ratified the CBD – Convention on Biological Diversity in 1993. The project will facilitate Ecuador in meeting its obligations under the CBD.</p>	
<p>A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership<sup>1</sup></p>	
<p>NA</p>	
<p><b>b. Effectiveness</b></p>	<p><b>Rating: S</b></p>
<p>Although the project experienced delays due to the distribution of disbursement of funds and there was a modification in the project objective with the Lorocachi community replacing the Shiona community, the TE indicates the project's key objectives were largely achieved. The following are the project's major achievements as specified in the TE:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Three management plans for the Quichua territories of Yana Yacu, Nina Amarun and Lorocachi implemented in a "participatory manner" by Quichua families, in a surface area of 250.000 Ha. of tropical rainforests. (13 workshops established for the review, study, approval and analysis of management plans; 64 land-management related maps created)</li> <li>2. A Socio-Environmental Information Center of the Quichua Territories of Pastaza established, with trained personnel and equipment.</li> <li>3. Capacity-building program in natural resource management established for technicians and indigenous leaders for the management of the resources of the communities and the community organization of the Quichua communities of Pastaza (approximately 325 people trained; 18 family micro-projects established in the cultivation and production of useful species).</li> </ol>	
<p><b>c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</b></p>	<p><b>Rating: MS</b></p>
<p>The development objective was revised slightly early in the project implementation phase. The prolonged absence of the majority of families in the Shiona community did not allow for sufficient level of community organization necessary for the implementation of natural resources management. As a result the project activities were relocated to the Quichua community of Lorocachi. Additionally the TE asserts there was a "considerable delay" in the delivery of the first and third disbursements of the project funds. While the TE is not clear how long-if at all-this contributed to delays in the project implementation, it claims that "respective adjustments to planned activities" were made which allowed for the "successful compliance with the indicators originally established by the project".</p>	

<sup>1</sup> Please consider for regional and global project only

Initially the total amount that was proposed to be co-financed by the Network of local indigenous organizations and international partner NGOs was US\$ 248,744. At the end of the project, the total amount of co-financing increased substantially to a total of US\$ 630,913 due to IQBSS's management of the project. According to the TE the additional co-financing was put towards the implementation of sustainable management project activities.

d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated) – this could happen both during the designing of the project where some choices are made that lead to preference for one priority over the other, and during implementation of the project when resources are transferred from addressing environmental priorities to development priorities and vice versa. If possible explain the reasons for such tradeoffs.

No trade-offs were identified.

**4.1.2 Results / Impacts<sup>2</sup> (Describe Impacts) (please fill in annex 1 – results scoresheet and annex 2 – focal area impacts (against GEF Strategic Priority indicators, where appropriate and possible)**

**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. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

<b>a. Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
The TE indicates that IQBSS has consistently worked within the project area designing and implementing conservation strategies and seeking new funds so that existing conservation efforts it supports have the necessary funding to continue in the long run. According to the TE in November 2005 a capacity-building project for the 12 Amazon Communities of the province of Pastaza regarding the sustainable management of their territories and natural resources began. The project aims to increase the social and economic self-management of the Quichua communities of the province of Pastaza, utilizing “ancient knowledge and sustainable techniques”. These objectives are consistent with the objectives of the Pastaza Biodiversity Conservation Project. The project was allocated €421,335 which it plans to put towards strengthening the process of territorial organization, community zoning development and to implement natural resource management projects that will help ensure the fiscal sustainability of the project's outcomes.	
<b>b. Socio-economic / political</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
According to the TE there is a high likelihood the project's achievements will be sustained beyond the project's end due to the substantial stakeholder ownership in the project activities and outcomes. According to the TE a “culturally respectful and participatory nature of the approach” was utilized in designing and implementing the project and the project “successfully” integrated local knowledge and customs into conservation strategies. The management plans across the three communities took into consideration the long-term community needs and was based upon the ancestral vision of life of the Quichua people of Pastaza. Additionally the project established “mixed teams” of indigenous specialists and helped develop a capacity-building program for local leaders and youth which help encourage local support for the project objectives.	
<b>c. Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
The TE indicates the project helped in establishing community groups comprised of technical specialists and indigenous technicians who have extensive experience in the design and administration of management plans. These teams were comprised of members of the community families which reside within the territories. According to the TE, their participation assures the “permanent application” of the management plans and conservation of community territories. Additionally, the management plans were also endorsed by the Organization of Indigenous Peoples of Pastaza.	
Indigenous technical specialists from the institutions of the Inter-institutional Network of Specialists in Environmental Management in Pastaza were linked with the “ <i>apamamas</i> ” and “ <i>apayayas</i> ” who are local	

<sup>2</sup> Please consider direct and indirect global environmental results; any unexpected results; local development benefits (including results relevant to communities, gender issues, indigenous peoples, NGOs and CBOs)

ancestral knowledge experts. According to the TE, their participation was important as it led to the development of management plans based on “the fundamental Quichua philosophies of quality of life”. Also the TE indicates the project helped to establish community workshops and management committees which created a space for “constructive discussion of policies”. These workshops and committees will help in overseeing the future implementation of the management plan and support the development of sustainable alternatives.	
<b>d. Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: NA</b>
No environmental risks were identified.	
<b>e. Technological</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
According to the TE the project “successfully developed” capacity-building program for technicians and indigenous leaders, endowing local youth with technical knowledge of community organization, territorial planning and natural resource management to help them become potential community leaders. The TE indicates that each of three Quichua communities have trained technicians that have “adequate technical capacity” and necessary tools to support them in future territorial planning and natural resource management processes as well as help transfer of these technologies to other Quichua communities of Pastaza.	

### 4.3 Catalytic role<sup>3</sup>

<b>a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholders</b>	
According to the TE the implementation of the conservation projects in areas of high biodiversity and sustainable management of species of flora and fauna has increased the economic opportunities for community families. The establishment of micro projects of short cycle crops helped improved their household economy by facilitating “small-scale trade” and the surplus from the production allowed them to have a “seed bank” for future crops. The increased possibility of internal trade and the potential improvement in the economic conditions of the local families has encouraged their commitment to natural resource management. According to the TE the “participatory experience” regarding the management of the Charpa turtle across the three communities has motivated the Quichua communities of the middle basins of Curaray and Bobonaza to establish mechanisms for the exchange or sale of the young Charpa turtle and increased their participation in capacity-building for management of the turtles.	
<b>b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors</b>	
See section 4.2c.	
<b>c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?</b>	
According the TE the establishment of a community standard for the management of natural resources led to the development of community statutes to legally recognize communities such as Yana Yacu. The TE indicates that proposals to legalize the Quichua community border territories are also likely to materialize in a similar fashion.	
<b>d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project contributed to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing)</b>	
No follow-on financing was identified.	
<b>e. PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?</b>	
According to the TE, the actual results exceeded expectations. This, to a large extent, can be attributed to the “mixed team” of community technicians that have specialized ancestral knowledge which allowed them to resolve “the principal problems” surrounding the management of species. In addition the technicians also will play a vital role in facilitating the transfer of the technologies utilized during the project to other Quichua communities of Pastaza.	

<sup>3</sup> Please review the ‘Catalytic Role of GEF: How is it measured and evaluated – A conceptual framework’ prior to addressing this section.

**4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.**

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

The proposed co-financing was \$248,744 but the actual co-financing increased to \$630,913 due to IQBSS's management of the project. According to the TE, the total co-financing was allocated towards the a) design and application of the management plans (US\$ 320,499.89); b) capacity-building of human resources (\$ 160,622.97); and c) operating costs (\$ 149,790.57). The TE does not specify whether the co-financing was essential to the achievement of GEF objectives.

**b. Delays.** If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

According to the TE there was a "considerable delay" in the delivery of the first and third disbursements of the project funds. While the TE does not clarify how long-if at all-this contributed to delays in the project implementation, it reports that "respective adjustments to planned activities" were made which allowed for the "successful compliance with the indicators originally established by the project".

**c. Country Ownership.** Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability highlighting the causal links.

The level of country ownership was high throughout the various stages of the project. The project was developed by the Inter-institutional Network of Specialists in Environmental Management which is comprised of local NGOs that work on environmental issues in the province of Pastaza and technicians from the Quichua communities. The Network incorporated the Quichua Institute of Biotechnology (IQBSS), the Amazon Environmental Institute of Science and Technology ("Amazanga" IACYT-A), Technological Center of Amazon Resources and the Omaere Foundation in the project implementation.

The TE asserts the project utilized an integrated approach to the project's implementation involving various indigenous specialists and community leaders in the Quichua territories. Also the TE reports that the community socio-environmental diagnostic studies, the management plans, and the monitoring and evaluation studies were "greatly enriched" by the involvement of families across the three communities and the community technicians. In addition, technical specialists from Inter-institutional Environment Administration Network of Pastaza directly collaborated in designing the management plans and the MIS for the CISA.

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

**a. M&E design at Entry** **Rating (six point scale): S**

It appears from the outset of the project, the M&E system was sufficient to monitor the project's results and track its progress towards achieving the project's objectives. The project document provided an extensive list of performance indicators that were specific and measurable to gauge the project's progress. The project document designated the Directors of the Inter-Institutional Network of Specialists in Environmental Management (INSEM) and the Project's Implementing Unit the responsibility to monitor the project on a quarterly basis and perform evaluations every six months. The INSEM and PIU were also to be responsible for producing monitoring and evaluation reports which were to be analyzed at workshops attended by various representatives involved in project implementation. The IQBSS was assigned responsibility to use project management software and train the necessary personnel in the application of the software to assist in tracking the project's progress as well as "cash flow and timing analysis".

**b. M&E plan Implementation** **Rating (six point scale): S**

The TE indicates strategies and tools for socio-environmental monitoring and evaluation that were incorporated in the management plans for the three communities were conducted in the final stage of the project implementation. Additionally the establishment of the Center for Socio-Environmental Information of Pastaza (CISA), one of the project's main objectives, led to the development of technological tools which helped "facilitate the monitoring of future conservation of the indigenous territories in a systematized

manner". A geo-referenced database was also established which contains field data that was obtained through biological monitoring. The database was used to generate reports monitoring the diversity and abundance of species in each sample site within and across different communities.

The TE reports a team of community technicians were consolidated to form a "management committee" with specific responsibilities to conduct monitoring activities. Additionally the TE reports that technical specialists from the Inter-Institutional Environment Administration Network (IEAN) of Pastaza were trained to input and process reports to conduct analyses of the state of conservation of the territories. In addition, two technical specialists from the IEAN worked as assistants for the CISA. The TE indicates many of the technological tools developed in the monitoring and evaluation of the project's activities were utilized in other indigenous territories, a sign of the success of the project's M&E system.

According to the TE, by the end of the project implementation the community monitoring system improved significantly as families within the three communities utilized self-monitoring tools (i.e. cards for hunting, fishing and use of forest resources) and "social reports" (i.e. focused group techniques and tools, discussion groups and surveys) to "monitor resource management activities and conduct periodic inventories of fauna in the established management zones". The families met quarterly in community assemblies to process and analyze, with the support of coordinators, the compiled information which they used in the decision making on issues related to management of the zones.

b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document?  
The limited information provided in the project document makes it difficult to assess if sufficient funding was allocated toward M&E activities. While the project document does not specify a lump sum allocated toward the project's M&E activities, it breaks down funding for various project activities and embedded within the activities are various monitoring and evaluation activities.

b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation?  
Unable to assess.

b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system?  
See section 4.5b.

b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why.  
According to the TE, the actual results exceeded expectations. This, to a large extent, can be attributed to the "mixed team" of community technicians that have specialized ancestral knowledge which allowed them to resolve "the principal problems" surrounding the management of species. In addition the technicians also will play a vital role in facilitating the transfer of the technologies utilized during the project to other Quichua communities of Pastaza.

**4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution**

**a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S**

**b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S**

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.

Although the project experienced delays due to difficulties in disbursement of funds and modification in the project development objectives (the Lorocachi community replacing the Shiona community), the TE reports that the project objectives were largely achieved. According to the TE the relationship between the key executing agency, the IQBSS, and the World Bank during the implementation of the project was "positive". The TE indicates there quality of implementation was high due to participatory implementation of the project and the emphasis on incorporating and recuperating ancestral knowledge.

**c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies<sup>4</sup> (rating on a 6 point scale): S**

<sup>4</sup> Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under



Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.

The project was developed by the Inter-institutional Network of Specialists in Environmental Management, which incorporated the Quichua Institute of Biotechnology (IQBSS), the Amazon Environmental Institute of Science and Technology ("Amazanga" IACYT-A), Technological Center of Amazon Resources and the Omaere Foundation. The network is a combination of local NGOs that work on environmental issues in the province of Pastaza and technicians from the Quichua communities.

Initially Network member's participation in the implementation of the project activities was limited due to their lack of adequate technical and administrative capacity. As a result the IQBSS was "forced to take the lead" in project implementation. However, by the end of the first year of the project implementation key members of the institutions in the Network were incorporated into the capacity building activities of the project and became "capable of handling specific responsibilities under the project". Eventually, the TE asserts the institutions of the Network were "connected to the project activities, according to their practical experience and interest, strengthening the results achieved by the project."

According to the TE the socio-environmental monitoring and evaluation which was conducted in the final stage of project implementation revealed "greater results were achieved than initially planned". Despite the fact that the management plans had been recently implemented the TE indicates significant improvements had been made in "territorial management, organizational capacity and the resolution of community conflicts, as well as the participatory management and conservation of the ecosystems and biodiversity and the restoration of important related ancestral knowledge."

The project's achievements were also attributable to a large extent due to the "mixed team" of community technicians comprised of technical specialists and Quichua technical specialists with specialized ancestral knowledge. According to the TE the communities of technicians were able to resolve the problems regarding the management of species and were able to build the necessary capacity to transfer these technologies to other Quichua communities of Pastaza.

## 5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

### **a. Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects**

- i. All decisions related to the control and management of the territory and community resources should be taken by consensus through community assemblies with the participation of all members of the community (elderly, men, women and youth).
- ii. It is essential to strengthen and consolidate the capacity of the communities for management and community organization, as good community organization is the basis for the application of the management plans.
- iii. Whenever a complicated institutional framework for implementation is proposed, a careful capacity assessment of all the member organizations should take place. Responsibilities should be assigned according to the expertise and technical and administrative capacity of each organization.
- iv. When formal education is selected as one of the capacity building strategies, it is important to take into account the time necessary to select the students and the time available to complete their professional career.
- v. The implementation of key aspects of the management plans in the form of pilot projects provide the opportunity to demonstrate that such strategies could be developed at the operational level.

### **b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation**

expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

- i) It is important that the process of community territorial organization is founded in ancestral knowledge and techniques regarding the management of the territory, ecosystems and local biodiversity that the Quichua families apply in their daily lives.
- ii) In order to facilitate adequate transmission, consolidation and application of ancestral knowledge, it is important to integrate mixed teams of technicians, including both outsiders and indigenous Quichua technicians, who are responsible for the entire process of territorial planning and natural resource management.
- iii) It is important to link with the *yachacs*, *apamamas* and *apayayas* during all the stages of formulation of the management plans because these individuals have extensive ancestral knowledge related to the sustainable management of the territory, ecosystems and biodiversity.
- iv) The processes of domestication, management and production of flora should be led by the women, taking into account the ancestral knowledge of the useful species of chakra, ushun and purun, as well as all the existing rituals to assure better fertility of the land and greater harvests are transmitted through the apamamas to their daughters over time.
- v) The proposals for territorial zoning of the Quichua territories should consider the existence, management and conservation of the sacred ancestral areas identified by the families as "Supayuc Sacha".
- vi) The experiences of biodiversity management of the territories should be generated at the family level, taking into consideration that the *ayllu* is a social, economic and political unit within the community.
- vii) In the process of design and application of the management plans of the indigenous territories of the Amazon, the conservation of strategic ecosystems, such as the Muriti Turu (flooding forests of palms) and Cucha (remaining lagoons) should be prioritized.
- viii) It is important to secure the sustainability of the operation of the CISA and leverage additional resources to maintain the updating of the databases and the generation of relevant information for territorial planning.

**6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

**6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.**

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 terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

<b>6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<b>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b> The report provides an extensive assessment of the project outcomes and breaks down the project impacts thoroughly by indicator in a separate table.	S (5)
<b>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps?</b> The report is internally consistent to a large extent but does not include any ratings.	MS (4)
<b>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> The report provides an extensive breakdown of project's sustainability.	S (5)
<b>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b>	S (5)

The lessons learned are supported for the most by the evidence presented in the report.	
<b>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> The project provides an extensive breakdown of project costs (but not by activity) and the actual co-financing used.	S (5)
<b>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&amp;E systems?</b> The report provides an adequate evaluation of the project's M&E system.	S (5)

<b>7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUTION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.</b>

**8 Project stakeholders and Key Contacts (Names, addresses, emails etc – mandatory for field visit countries)**

--

**9. Information Gaps (for Field visit countries only)**

--