

GEF IEO Terminal Evaluation Review form (retrofitting of APR2004 cohort)

This form is for retrofitting of the TERs prepared for APR2004. While several topics covered in this form had already been covered in the earlier form, this revised form adds several other performance and impact related concerns.

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		16	
GEF Agency project ID		57031	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-2	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Management and Protection of Laguna del Tigre National Park	
Country/Countries		Guatemala	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP2 (Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems), and OP3 (Forest Ecosystems)	
Executing agencies involved		Conservation International/Guatemala	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Lead executing agency	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		July 1999	
Effectiveness date / project start		September 1999	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		November 2001	
Actual date of project completion		March 2002	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.025	0.025
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.723	0.723
Co-financing	IA/EA own		
	Government		
	Other*		
Total GEF funding		0.748	0.748
Total Co-financing		0.940	1.087
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.688	1.835
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		September 16, 2002	
TE submission date			
Author of TE			
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) preparer		Baastel	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) reviewer		Josh Brann	
Revised TER (2014) completion date		June 2014	
Revised TER (2014) prepared by		Joshua Schneck	
TER GEF IEO peer review (2014)		Neeraj Negi	

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

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	N/R	N/R	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	ML	N/R	N/R	ML
M&E Design	N/R	N/R	N/R	MS
M&E Implementation	N/R	N/R	N/R	S
Quality of Implementation	N/R	N/R	N/R	S
Quality of Execution	N/R	N/R	N/R	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/R	MU

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objectives of the project, as stated in the Project Brief (PB), are to conserve the biodiversity and natural habitats of Laguna del Tigre National Park and Biotop Peten¹, which together, at 338,002 hectares, form the largest contiguous area in Guatemala's protected areas system. The Laguna del Tigre is the largest freshwater wetland in Central America, and has been recognized as a wetland harboring globally-significant biodiversity. The area supports large populations of resident and migratory birds and protects a number of endangered species. It also serves as an important spawning ground for marine and freshwater fish species. According to the PB, the area is threatened by road construction, land conversion, oil exploration, illegal logging and wildlife poaching.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

To achieve the conservation of Laguna del Tigre, the project seeks to help government, NGOs, communities, and other stakeholders improve their management of Laguna del Tigre, and of the community management units within its boundaries. An indicator of overall success defined in the PB is to reduce the annual rate of habitat loss within Laguna del Tigre (not including the Community Management Units, which are concessions established in 1997-98 for settlers living in the park at that time) to a level at or below that of the Maya Biosphere Reserve as a whole (0.36%). The current annual rate of habitat loss for Laguna del Tigre is estimated at 0.57% (PB, pg ii).

As stated in the PB, to achieve the overall goal of the project, the following six results are expected from this two-year project:

1. Environmentally sound economic and agricultural alternatives are introduced to Laguna del Tigre communities.
2. Community and municipal organizations within Laguna del Tigre are strengthened.
3. Environmental education and conservation awareness programs are established and operating.
4. NGO capacities for core zone co-management are strengthened.

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, all references to Laguna del Tigre cover the combined area (338,002 hectares).

5. CONAP’s core zone management system is reinforced (CONAP is the Guatemalan Government’s office for protected areas management).
6. Changes in ecosystem health and socioeconomic conditions in Laguna del Tigre documented and findings disseminated to managers.

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

No. No changes were noted in the TE or PIRs.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The project is relevant to both Guatemala and the GEF. For Guatemala, the project’s goal of conserving the biodiversity and natural habitats of Laguna del Tigre is identical to that articulated in the Government’s 1999-2003 Master Plan for the Laguna del Tigre Management Unit (PB, pg ii). Moreover, the project’s strategy of engaging with local communities to develop sustainable co-management regimes for the park and surrounding areas is one that the Guatemalan government has been pursuing since early 1990s, with help from Conservation International among others (PB, pg 1). For the GEF, Laguna del Tigre is an area known to harbor globally-significant biodiversity, faces a number of threats, and its conservation is thus well-aligned with GEF goals articulated under Operational Programs 2 (Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems), and 3 (Forest Ecosystems).

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

As assessed in the TE, the project has been successful at achieving most of its stated objectives, including the overall goal of reducing the rate of habitat loss within Laguna del Tigre. Some minor shortcomings are noted, including the withdrawal of an NGO that had been formed with the express intention of co-administering the park, and less than expected piloting of sustainable land management practices in Laguna del Tigre communities. However, in general, the project appears to have been well conceived, and the strategy employed has thus far proven successful at producing a large majority of the

desired outcomes. TE states that the rate of habitat loss (deforestation used as a proxy) in Laguna del Tigre fell more than 50% from 0.57% in 1997, to 0.25% in 2001, citing a study done by CONAP and CARE-Guatemala.

Progress is further detailed along each of the six expected results (note that TE reports on PB logframe “effectiveness indicators” rather than on performance indicators for the 6 expected results, which makes assessing progress under expected results difficult):

1. *Environmentally sound economic and agricultural alternatives are introduced to Laguna del Tigre communities.* TE states that the project has worked with two communities within Laguna del Tigre – Paso Caballos and Buen Samaritano - compared with three expected in the PB logframe. All of the families in both communities are reported to have prepared land management plans that include adoption of agroforestry techniques and that have been accepted by CONAP, and 25 families within one of the communities are implementing agroforestry techniques. The TE does not report on the status of implementation of agroforestry in the other engaged community. PIR states that piloting of demonstration activities in third community was not feasible according to CONAP due to “community unrest” (final PIR, pg 1). At the same time, TE states that the Environmental and Natural Resource Commission of the Municipality of San Andres reached formal agreements with all 13 communities in the Laguna del Tigre, compared with a target of at least 4 (TE, pg 11). The agreements commit communities to aid in park management and conservation, though the precise legal status and extent of these commitments is not discussed in the TE or PB.
2. *Community and municipal organizations within Laguna del Tigre are strengthened.* Under this activity grouping the municipality of San Andres has been “strengthened”, with its environmental department now coordinating a program for the prevention of forest fires in Laguna del Tigre, in conjunction with communities (TE, pg 6). This is generally inline with performance indicators found in the PB (detail on specific performance indicators is not provided in TE).
3. *Environmental education and conservation awareness programs are established and operating.* Project activities under this result appear to have been very successful, with the project responsible for creation of educational materials that have been incorporated by all Laguna del Tigre schools. TE also states that these Laguna del Tigre schools have been included in an environmental education pilot project being conducted by schools throughout the larger Peten region, offering the potential for scaling up of this project component. TE also states that the project created a non-formal program of environmental education directed at the entire population of the park (TE, pg 12). TE does not assess the overall quality of these education efforts however.
4. *NGO capacities for core zone co-management are strengthened.* Progress under this result grouping is mixed. TE states that the local NGO that was formed in 1998 (Canan Kaax) with the express mission of assuming a role in co-managing the Laguna del Tigre protected area (and towards which this activity was targeted in the PB) dropped out of the project due to “complexities.” The reason for this withdrawal is not clarified or discussed in either the PIRs or

TE. The TE goes on to say that CONAP subsequently assumed control over this part of the park management and project, and that a “Support Committee for the Laguna del Tigre National Park,” consisting of some local NGOs and TNC Guatemala have been recognized as an advisory group. The outcome suggests that the reasons for the change in management may have been political, although this is purely speculative and not discussed in the TE. In any case, the end result is clearly not one of a local NGO sharing co-management responsibilities for the park, as envisioned in the PB. There were also several performance indicators under this result grouping covering the establishment of long-term financial support for Canan Kaxx that don’t appear to have been met, nor transferred over to any of the other NGOs on the advisory committee.

5. *CONAP’s core zone management system is reinforced.* Project was successful at delivering expected outputs under this result grouping. Laguna del Tigre park now has a functioning administrative system, with physical headquarters in the park, a director, rangers, and equipment, and the Government of Guatemala has dedicated funds for management activities through CONAP. Infrastructure developed includes 8 control and vigilance posts, and 3 “well-equipped” biological monitoring posts, and there are 40 forest rangers on staff (TE, pg 7). This is in addition to other technical personnel on staff.
6. *Changes in ecosystem health and socioeconomic conditions in Laguna del Tigre documented and findings disseminated to managers.* According to the TE, activities under this grouping were very successful in producing desired outputs. A 2001 social monitoring study found that while migration into the park continues, the rate of migration has been reduced by around 60% (baseline date or level not stated). In addition, relations between park communities and CONAP are reportedly greatly improved from prior (pre-project) status. There have also been 4 ecological studies done with the support of the project. These studies “have made it possible to adopt management methods for the largest fresh water wetlands in Central America” (TE, pg 8). Results from the studies have also been incorporated into the project’s educational material under result grouping 3 (see above).

Also noteworthy, the TE states that the sustainable land management activities engaging with Laguna del Tigre communities were recognized by an international organization – the English Whitley Foundation. The organization awarded \$37,000, and TE states that this funding has permitted the consolidation of community work that is being carried out by a local NGO, ProPeten, as a follow-up to this project (TE, pg 10).

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

TE does not directly assess project efficiency. The TER rating on efficiency is based on several lines of evidence: (1) TE’s documented project expenditures, which are generally in-line with those given in the PB; (2) TE states that the project was effective in securing and supporting the participation of “all” stakeholders in Laguna de Tigre, despite a history of strained relations between stakeholders – particularly CONAP and the communities in the park; (3) project’s strategy of working at the beginning of the project to establish formal links with CONAP and the Municipality of San Andres was effective in

“opening the doors for coordination of activities among the communities of the Laguna del Tigre, all of which fall within the municipal jurisdiction of San Andres” (TE, pg 14). Thus the project was able to leverage the resources of the local municipality to the benefit of the project; (4) TE praises the flexibility of the WB in efficiently reconfiguring some project activities following the withdrawal of Canan Kaxx (TE, pg 15); and (5) all M&E, including PIRs, tracking of project financials, and monitoring of project metrics appears to have been done well, although PIRs lack detailed information on some key issues (reasons for withdrawal of Canan Kaxx for example).

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

TE does not adequately assess sustainability of project outcomes. TER rating on sustainability comes from a reading of the TE narrative and reference back to risk assessment in PB (PB, pg 11).

- *Environmental sustainability (ML)* – project outcomes still face a number of environmental threats. These include continuing interest from private companies in developing petroleum resources inside the park. As noted in the PB, this has historically been a source of ongoing conflict between stakeholders with opposing interests. TE states that as a result of the project, the government of Guatemala has established a policy of not authorizing any concession for petroleum activities in protected areas, but the threat remains nonetheless (TE, pg 20). Migration into the park continues, albeit at a reduced rate. Thus the likelihood of further land clearing, degradation, and poaching remains.
- *Financial sustainability (ML)* – TE states that more work needs to be done to secure long-term financing for Laguna del Tigre (TE, pg 7). At the same time, TE notes that for the first time, the Government of Guatemala has dedicated funds for the management of Laguna del Tigre, through CONAP. In addition, TE states that a small amount of award money has facilitated the consolidation of community work that is being carried out by a local NGO, ProPeten, as a follow-up to this project (TE, pg 10).
- *Institutional sustainability (ML)* – TE states that CONAP has been strengthened as a result of the project, and there is also substantial engagement from the Municipality of San Andres with park community and in conserving Laguna del Tigre. Questions remain about the sustainability of local NGOs which are also important to the overall sustainability of conservation efforts.
- *Socio-Political sustainability (ML)* – By all accounts in the TE, the project has made substantial success in raising awareness of key stakeholders on the importance and benefits of conserving Laguna del Tigre, and in introducing more sustainable land management practices to park communities. At the same time, migration into the park continues, albeit at a reduced rate, and the interests of community members in adopting and maintaining sustainable land management practices will depend in part on whether benefits from conservation – which include tourism potential and greater land tenure rights – can be sufficiently realized.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

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

TE does not discuss co-financing at all, except to report the extent to which expected co-financing was realized. No explanation or discussion is provided at all on why expected co-financing was a bit higher than expected. That said, co-financing does appear to be well integrated into the project, with each project component funding by a mixture of GEF funding and co-financing.

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

TE does not discuss why project was completed 4 months later than planned. TE notes that the withdrawal of Canan Kaax from the project necessitated some reconfiguring of project activities, but no significant delays are reported to have resulted from this development.

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

Country ownership of the project appears to be strong, judging by: the decision by the Government of Guatemala to fund management of Laguna del Tigre through CONAP; the willingness of the local Municipality of San Andres to work with park community and in conserving Laguna del Tigre; the decision by the government of Guatemala to subsequently refuse to authorize any concession for petroleum activities in protected areas; and the interest on the part of several local NGOs in working of various aspects of Laguna del Tigre conservation. As assessed in the TE, the support of key agencies in Guatemala was important in coordinating stakeholders and in supporting many of the project's efforts at improving park management. Their continued support will be important for project sustainability, as the park will require continual investments in funding and resources to realize long-term conservation goals.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
------------------------------------	--

TE does not assess project’s M&E design. Following is based on a reading of the PB and TE narrative. Project was designed with a detailed implementation plan and logframe with performance indicators and in some cases, means of verification. Indicators are provided for each of the six results groupings, as well as for a larger “effectiveness indicators.” Because these effectiveness indicators overlap to varying degrees with indicators for the outcomes, the logframe matrix appears overly complex. In addition, the logframe does not identify a means of verification for many of the performance indicators. For example, performance indicator 1.1 “Laguna del Tigre Administrative System fully functional by end of 1999” does not specify what is meant by “fully functional” nor how this is to be assessed. Similarly, the economically sound livelihoods component is not defined clearly. PB states generally that the information collected through monitoring activities, along with additional evaluations, will be reviewed on an annual basis and that changes, if necessary, will be made to second year activities. However, PB does not define who has responsibility for conducting M&E activities, which is an important oversight given the many groups working on this project (State and local agencies, local NGOs and CI/Guatemala, project management, community members). PB does provide dedicated funding to M&E in project cost matrix (PB, pg 14). Overall, project’s M&E design appears extensive, but indicators and processes should have been streamlined and more focused so as to allow for collection of information on not just the extent of key project outputs, but their quality and effectiveness.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------

TE does not assess M&E implementation. Following is based on TE narrative and PIRs. All of the monitoring studies called for in project’s logframe – including the socio-economic survey of park communities, forest cover change assessment, and ecological monitoring – appear to have been done and provided useful information in assessing the overall efficacy of the project. PIRs are lacking in detail in some areas, particularly why Canan Kaxx withdrew from the project, and why pilot sustainable agriculture project was only feasible in 2 of the 3 communities targeted in the PB. Project appears to have tracked finances well, as detailed costs tables are provided in TE.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

TE provides limited information on the extent or quality of oversight provided by the World Bank. Project design appears to have been well conceived, with a strategy that has proved effective, and that built upon activities that had been tested and refined to some degree by Conservation International (PB, pg 11). Shortcomings in M&E design are noted above. TE states that the WB was flexible in dealing with the issue of the NGO withdrawal for the project (Canan Kaxx), and that this flexibility made it possible to reconfigure the project adequately (TE, pg 15). No issues with procurement delays or funds flow are noted in the TE or PIRs. TE also notes the expertise provided by WB staff and constant communication and coordination were effective in addressing the “many and varied challenges that constantly came up, and at the same time, permitted us to develop and institute local capacity for dealing with those challenges” (TE, pg 15).

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

Conservation International/Guatemala (locally known as ProPeten) served as the lead executing agency. TE does not directly assess quality of project execution and barely mentions CI/Guatemala. Following is based on TE narrative and PIRs. Project was effective in establishing good working relations with local communities and securing their interest in participating in project activities. TE states that this work in the early stages of the project cleared the way for participation of the local San Andres municipality to engage in the project, together with CONAP. Project management appear to have done a good job in managing project finances, and in conducting project activities on schedule, including M&E. Overall, a strong performance by CI/Guatemala, with no significant execution issues raised in either the PIRs or TE.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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

TE states that the rate of habitat loss (deforestation used as a proxy) in Laguna del Tigre fell more than 50% from 0.57% in 1997, to 0.25% in 2001, citing a study done by CONAP and CARE-Guatemala. Rate of migration into park is also reported to have declined by 60% (baseline date or level not stated). Project was focused on piloting of activities (ex., sustainable agricultural practices) and awareness raising, and strengthening of park management in effort to conserve Laguna del Tigre. Not clear the extent of

causality in the reduced deforestation rates, or this metric's link to ecosystem health and species conservation, or how sustainable this is.

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

TE states that piloting of sustainable agricultural techniques occurred in 2 park communities, and that some efforts at developing tourism potential of the park were made. All of the families in both communities are reported to have prepared land management plans that include adoption of agroforestry techniques and that have been accepted by CONAP, and 25 families within one of the communities are implementing agroforestry techniques. The TE does not report on the status of implementation of agroforestry in the other engaged community. In addition, the extent to which these activities have had an impact on community well being is not discussed in the TE.

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

a) Capacities – As a result of the project, piloting of sustainable agricultural methods has taken place in two communities living inside Laguna del Tigre. Awareness raising activities including educational outreach to all park communities and select number of schools in larger Peten area may have contributed to knowledge and interest of stakeholders in adopting more sustainable land management practices.

b) Governance - the municipality of San Andres is now coordinating a program for the prevention of forest fires in Laguna del Tigre, in conjunction with communities (TE, pg 6). Laguna del Tigre park now has a functioning administrative system, with physical headquarters in the park, a director, rangers, and equipment, and the Government of Guatemala has dedicated funds for management activities through CONAP. Infrastructure developed includes 8 control and vigilance posts, and 3 "well-equipped" biological monitoring posts, and there are 40 forest rangers on staff (TE, pg 7). This is in addition to other technical personnel on staff. "Support Committee for the Laguna del Tigre National Park," consisting of some local NGOs and TNC Guatemala have been recognized by CONAP as an advisory group on Laguna del Tigre management.

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

No unintended impacts are reported to have occurred as a result of the project.

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

TE states that that environmental education program developed in part with inputs from this project has been included in an environmental education pilot project being conducted by schools throughout the larger Peten region, offering the potential for scaling up of this awareness-raising activity. TE does not describe how this partnership and sharing of information came about, or what materials from this project have or haven't been included in the environmental education instructional program.

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

TE provides the following key lessons:

- Management and conservation of protected areas is enhanced by participation of local government.
- Local government is more capable of mobilizing local efforts for conservation than central government agencies.
- Prior to making any decisions, no matter how wise the decisions themselves may be, local authorities and communities must be informed about and persuaded that the decisions are wise and benefit them.
- Before trying to introduce changes in a settlement, it is necessary to achieve community integration so that the residents have a shared vision. Thereafter changes may be introduced.
- The rules of interaction and the roles assigned each actor must be agreed upon and made clear to everybody before co-management activities can be initiated.
- Involving the communities in the research process, not only as a source of information but also in collecting data, analyzing results, and communicating results to the community has generated in the settlements an awareness of the importance of scientific knowledge for management of the areas in which they live.

- Involving the communities in the research process gives them access to knowledge that permits them to adjust their activities in order to minimize their negative impact on the ecosystem, and the potential to make rational use of natural resources and link them with economic activities and ecological viability.
- In Guatemala there is an intense struggle between activist groups and petroleum companies. For organizations based in the field, they should not be on one side or the other, but rather develop proposals that seek to conciliate development and conservation activities.
- Building a constituency for environmental education is an iterative process.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

TE offers the following recommendation:

- Parengo, the oil company operating in the park, has begun to show interest in conservation and the protection of the park. The next step would be to integrate the company into the support committee for Laguna del Tigre.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	TE does an adequate job of assessing principle outcomes of the project. However, little detail is provided on project shortcomings, or the quality of outputs. Moreover, insufficient detail is provided on how educational programs were taken up by larger Peten schools in pilot project – a potentially significant opportunity for scaling up and lessons learned that is lost.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	TE appears does not appear balanced or sufficiently critical in its assessment. No details are provided on any of the project’s shortcomings (piloting of agriculture, withdrawal of NGO, etc.). No detail is provided on the quality of outputs. Ratings are not provided, although this was not a requirement at the time. Overall, the TE offers little insight on what made the project successful, and provides insufficient evidence to back up its claims of success.	U
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Sustainability of project outcomes is not assessed adequately in the TE. Within the narrative of the TE are factors that clearly will affect sustainability, such as continued funding for Laguna del Tigre park management, efforts to increase revenues from tourism, etc. However, no assessment is ever provided on how all these components come together to affect the likelihood of sustainability – a key weakness of the TE. A fund set up for the Laguna del Tigre park, the Fondo Jaguar, that is mentioned in the PIR is not discussed at all in the TE. The issue of petroleum exploration and new policy of the Government of Guatemala to halt concessions in the park is not assessed sufficiently – particularly from the standpoint of park communities who have historically supported oil exploration as it provides income opportunities (as stated in the PB).	U
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons are very general and too simplistic to be of much value (example – “management of protected areas is enhanced by participation of local government”). What would have been more helpful were lessons derived from the piloting and educational awareness components, the community partnership efforts, and challenges with the local NGO that dropped out of the project – all of which are absent from the TE lessons (and narrative as well).	U
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	While report does include the actual project costs and co-financing used, there is no discussion on why realized co-financing was higher than expected or indeed where the additional funding came from (“other funding” is used in table 3)	MS
Assess the quality of the report’s evaluation of project M&E systems:	TE does not assess M&E systems except to mention some reporting outputs that were done by the project, and	U

oversight missions from the WB.	
Overall TE Rating	MU

Overall TE rating: $(0.3 * (4+2)) + (0.1 * (2+2+4+2)) = 1.8 + 1 = 2.8 = \text{MU}$

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