

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		1732	
GEF Agency project ID		1653	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		In-Situ Conservation of Andean Crops and Their Wild Relatives in the Humahuaca Valley, the Southernmost Extension of the Central Andes	
Country/Countries		Argentina	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP13: Agrobiodiversity	
Executing agencies involved		FUCEMA	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		As lead executing agency	
Private sector involvement		As project partners (local producers)	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		March 8 th , 2005	
Effectiveness date / project start		November 2005	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		Dec 31, 2010	
Actual date of project completion		Dec 31, 2009	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.03	.03
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		.94	.92
Co-financing	IA own		NA
	Government	.2	NA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	.5 ¹	NA
	Private sector		NA
	NGOs/CSOs	.21	NA
Total GEF funding		.97	.95
Total Co-financing		.91	1.06
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.88	2.01
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December 2013	
Author of TE		Sandra Cesilini, Marisa Diaz. And Ana Maria Miente Alzogaray	
TER completion date		2/25/2016	
TER prepared by		Molly Watts	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Caroline Laroche	

¹ .5 listed in project document as "other", cannot discern what sector they belong to.

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	Satisfactory to Highly Satisfactory	NR	S
Sustainability of Outcomes		Highly Likely to Likely	NR	L
M&E Design		NR	NR	S
M&E Implementation		NR	NR	S
Quality of Implementation		NR	NR	UA
Quality of Execution		NR	NR	UA
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	NR	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's global environmental objective was "the long-term in situ conservation and continued evolution of globally significant agrobiodiversity in the productive landscape of the southernmost extension of the Central Andes." (PD p.40) During the past several decades, cultural, social, policy and economic factors have led to a decline in traditional agricultural knowledge and practices in the region, and production systems have changed with introduced crops replacing traditional crops. These changes have led to the loss of Andean plant genetic resources of global significance.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's immediate development objective was that "Indigenous farmers in the Humahuaca Valley of Argentina adopt improved on-farm conservation and management, based on traditional production practices that contribute to in situ conservation of selected globally significant Andean crop varieties and their wild relatives." (PD. P.40) The project would aim to achieve this objective through three main outcomes:

- 1) Communities, indigenous farmers and local authorities have increased information on native crop varieties and wild relatives and on traditional knowledge and practices relevant to their cultivation, processing and improvement.
- 2) Indigenous farmers are motivated to participate in production of traditional crop varieties through improved production factors and supportive market structures.
- 3) A strengthened enabling environment exists for the conservation of traditional crop varieties and their wild relatives in the Humahuaca Valley.

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

There were no changes to the project’s global environmental objectives, development objectives, or other activities during implementation.

4. GEF IEO 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 TE does not rate relevance. This TER rates relevance as satisfactory. This project is relevant to GEF operational program 13: Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity Important to Agriculture, specifically program element 3 – Capacity Building- as the program seeks to enhance the capacity of indigenous communities to conserve and sustainably manage agricultural biodiversity. The project is also relevant to the objectives of GEF Strategic Priority 2-Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes and Sectors.

In terms of relevance at a national level, the project follows national priorities thematically as well as geographically. The target crops, corn and potatoes, are of significant value to the national economy, resulting in increased governmental interest in Andean crops. The Humahuaca Valley is the most important area of Argentina for traditional crop varieties, as well as related wild crops. In 2000 a state law was passed declaring the Humahuaca Valley as a “Protected Landscape”, and in 2003 the Humahuaca Valley was added to the list of UNESCO World Heritage Sites. This project identified the areas that are most important for conservation of wild relatives within the valley, and also promoted increased production of traditional crop varieties across the broader landscape. (Project document p.6)

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

The TE rates achievement of all three of the project’s outcomes as very satisfactory, and notes that there is evidence to support the fact that there has been commercial growth of Andean Crops in the project area during execution. This TER rates effectiveness as satisfactory, as there is evidence that the project has largely been successful in achieving its goals, achieving most targets and exceeding some targets.

1) **Communities, indigenous farmers and local authorities have increased information on native crop varieties and wild relatives and on traditional knowledge and practices relevant to their cultivation,**

processing and improvement. The two main outputs under this outcome, that project core areas have inventories of native varieties, landraces and their wild relatives completed as well as conservation oriented farmers and priority agrobiodiversity conservation zones for native varieties and wild relatives are identified, and that traditional knowledge and practices related to native varieties and landraces of the target crop varieties are documented and disseminated within local farmer communities, have been achieved and all targets were met or surpassed. (PIR 2011) The project has established and published a methodology to identify conservation oriented farmers, and identified niches for Andean provincial and national products. By project end, at least 30% of farmers living in project areas have received formal training through workshops organized by the project. Knowledge transfer and capacity building for the preparation of traditional varieties was achieved through a highly successful program of cooking fairs which included the participation of 450 women during the life of the project (against an original target of 100) and currently with more than 3,000 participants (according to data from the Ministry of Culture of the Nation and the Ministry of Social Development) (TE p.50)

2) Indigenous farmers are motivated to participate in production of traditional crop varieties through improved production factors and supportive market structures. The two planned outputs for this outcome were that there is enhanced on-farm production of targeted native crop varieties and landraces in core project areas, and strengthened capacities of indigenous farmers and communities for processing, distributing and marketing native varieties and landraces of target crops. The project supported the organization of Producer's Associations for Conservation Oriented Farmers (COFs) in project core areas. Targets for this were largely reached, with participation of at least on average 70% of COFs in each area. Producers associations have continued with their activities even after the Project's closure. Prices of some products are rising, for example, prices of yacon have increased by 75% and local varieties of potatoes by 76%. There has been a 10% increase in the number of farmers in the area devoted to cultivating local varieties project. The project provided support for seed exchange fairs that have been highly successful with a large number of the farmers attending. The final PIR notes that a high proportion of these farmers exchange Andean crops seeds at these fairs, meaning that the expected target of 10% increase in the number of Andean crops species seeds exchange is likely to have been exceeded. Since project closure seed fairs have continued through the support of local municipalities.

3) A strengthened enabling environment exists for the conservation of traditional crop varieties and their wild relatives in the Humahuaca Valley. The two main outputs planned under this outcome were an awareness raising program within targeted sectors of the Argentine public on the importance and potential uses of traditional varieties of Andean crops, and conservation and sustainable use of traditional varieties of Andean crops and their wild relatives is mainstreamed into local institutional policy, legal, and regulatory frameworks, and experiences are shared at the national level. The project implemented a successful communication strategy that identified target audiences and included local radio stations, TV channels and newspaper. Based on the registry record of relevant workshops the project reached the target of 50% of farmers in 15 targeted communities that participated in awareness building on the importance of wild relatives. The project has worked with municipalities to include support actions for varieties of traditional Andean crops in rural development, and land use. The Municipal Government of Jujuy is supporting three Andean crop programs, creating a record of Andean

crops farmers, supporting the continuation of seed exchange fairs and the designating two sites for the conservation of agro-biodiversity. Mixed Municipalities and communities' forums were established in Volcan, Huamhuaca and Saspala. In order to promote the use of Andean crops in meals, the project published a school book of Andean crops, which was delivered to 25 schools.

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

The TE found as a result of a cost-effectiveness analysis that the project was efficiently implemented. (TE p.36) An analysis of budget spent shows that spending was spread fairly evenly over the course of project implementation, an indicator of efficient budget execution. (TE p.37) The Final PIR notes that there were minor initial delays related with project start up, (PIR 2011) but otherwise the project was executed in a timely fashion, with the only significant delay being in implementation of the terminal evaluation, due to factors outside the project's control. The project successfully mobilized co-financing from local and global actors, including co-financing for new projects which would continue after project completion. (TE p.47) The TE estimates the project's positive economic impact on the value of local crop production is around \$200,000 per year, indicating a good return on investment. Considering the overall effectiveness of the project in achieving its outcomes on a fairly small budget this TER considers efficiency to be Satisfactory.

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

The TE rates sustainability as highly likely to likely. This TE rates sustainability as likely, as no major threats to sustainability of project outcomes are noted in the TE, and as some project activities have been institutionalized within the project areas, such as the producers associations which have continued their activities after the project's closure. (PIR 2011)

Financial Resources: The TE rates sustainability of financial resources as likely, and this TER agrees, based on the funding achieved from private and local actors at the local, provincial and national level. (TE p.55) The TE notes that the search for permanent funding should be deepened further, because it is not clear that national, provincial, and local budgets will continue providing resources for project activities. However, some activities are already being supported by various projects which have been mobilized. Additionally the co-financing raised by the project from producers and municipal budgets is a positive indicator of financial sustainability, and local actors have demonstrated their willingness to support activities.

Socio-political: The TE rates socio-political sustainability as likely, and this TER agrees, based on the strong participation and ownership of project activities at a local level. The project has recruited a small number of farmers aimed at preserving indigenous intangible cultural heritage as facilitators for training and dissemination events. This has proved a great success and these facilitators have become local leaders and advocates of conservation of agricultural biodiversity which increases the odds of a continuing interest in the traditional culture that is perceptible long after project completion. (TE p.50) 5 producers associations for conservation oriented farmers were established in each of the 5 project core areas, and these have continued activities even after project closure.

Institutional framework and governance: The TE rates sustainability in this aspect as likely, however this TER is unable to assess risks based on legal frameworks, policies, or governance structures, as little information is provided on this subject. The project has generated guides and manuals to permit the continuation of the project's work, both for provincial and local governments. The TE states that much of the sustainability of the project will depend on how the government absorbs these products. (TE p.56) A good indicator of sustainability in terms of institutional framework and governance is that the municipalities in project areas have taken on the seed fairs introduced by the project as regular activities. (TE p.7)

Environmental: The TE rates environmental sustainability to be likely, however information to support this rating is not provided. This TER is unable to assess environmental sustainability of the project, as not enough information is provided.

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?

The project generated total co-financing of 1.05 USD, exceeding the original amount forecast by the project. 426,000 in co-financing came from local actors specifically producers, and municipal governments. This is a very positive indicator for sustainability, especially as 223,195\$ of this is dedicated to work which will continue the project's activities. (TE p.46) The TE does not contain information on which activities the co-financing supported, but it can be seen as beneficial in achieving project outcomes and sustainability.

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?

The only significant delay in the project came in the implementation of the TE, which occurred a few years after project activities ended in 2009 (The TE does not provide dates for data collection, however it was finalized in December 2013.) The reason for this delay based on the final PIR seems to have been the political situation. The final PIR notes some minor delays in project start up, but these do not seem to have affected the project's outcomes or sustainability.

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 for this project appears to be very high. A good indicator of this is that the municipalities in project areas have taken on the seed fairs introduced by the project as regular activities. (TE p.7) The co-financing provided by local actors is another strong indicator of country ownership.

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: Satisfactory
------------------------------------	----------------------

The TE does not rate M&E Design at entry, but gives a score of very satisfactory to M&E overall. This TER rates M&E Design at Entry as satisfactory. The project document lays out a complete M&E plan, which includes provisions for an inception report, as well as a mid-term and final evaluation. The M&E budget noted in the project document is US\$99,000. (Project document p.34) Log frame indicators are for the most part SMART.

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

The TE does not rate M&E implementation, but gives a score of very satisfactory to M&E overall.

Project Implementation Reviews were produced every year, and they track progress on indicators. There is no indication of whether or not the mid-term evaluation was carried out, and based on the lack of discussion of one in the PIRs it would appear that it was not. Considering that this was a relatively modest mid-sized project the omission of a mid-term evaluation is understandable, however considering it was included in the original M&E design at entry, the reason for the omission should have been explained. Other than this the M&E plan seems to have been carried out efficiently, and the collection of M&E data has fed into the terminal evaluation report, including indicators on participation of women in project activities. No information on adaptive management is provided. In general M&E implementation appears to have been adequate and appropriate for a project of this size.

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: Unable to Assess
--	--------------------------

The implementing agency for this project was UNDP. This TER is unable to assess quality of project implementation as no information is provided on their performance in the TE or other project reporting documents.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Unable to Assess
---	--------------------------

The project’s executing agency was the NGO FUCEMA. This TER is unable to assess quality of project execution as no discussion is provided on their performance in the TE or other project reporting documents.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

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.

There is no information available on the environmental impact of the project.

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.

Economic evaluations show that farmers who participated in the project have received higher profits than before the project, as the price of potatoes and yacon have increased by 76% and 75% respectively. (TE p.51) The TE estimates the project’s positive economic impact on the value of local crop production is around \$200,000 per year.

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

The project has generated guides and manuals to permit the continuation of the project's work, both for provincial and local governments. By project end, at least 30% of farmers living in project areas have received formal training through workshops organized by the project. Knowledge transfer and capacity building for the preparation of traditional varieties was achieved through a highly successful program of cooking fairs which included the participation of 450 women during the life of the project (against an original target of 100) and currently with more than 3,000 participants (according to data from the Ministry of Culture of the Nation and the Ministry of Social Development) (TE p.50)

b) Governance

Not applicable

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 of the project are noted in the TE or other documents.

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.

As noted above, some project activities, such as seed fairs, have been institutionalized by municipalities. Producers associations have continued activities after the project's end.

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.

Identifying social leaders in populations or people (Men, women and youth) with leadership potential who could become key allies of the implementation process of the project, can generate social mobilization and revitalization with other actors.

The active participation of indigenous leaders throughout the project cycle has a high impact on the sustainability of the project. This also applies to the participation of women in the preservation of cultural identity.

Achieving greater legitimacy and social support for the proposal, thus creating better conditions for further implementation, generates stakeholder engagement in the implementation of the project. In this strengthens not only the intervention but also community organization.

The decision-making spaces of organizational forms of community should not be undermined by economic enterprises, but strengthened as the only spaces for planning and implementation of plans.

Pilot areas should be selected on the basis of the existence of the communal ownership of land, but also on the basis of the existence of leadership and cultural identity that can reinforce an intervention.

The experience of the knowledge of indigenous peoples on soils, climate, vegetation, animals and ecosystems translates their actions into multidimensional production strategies (eg diverse ecosystems multiple species). These strategies generate (within certain limitations technical and ecological) the strengthening of food self-sufficiency in families in a region, this self-sufficiency to integrated quality nutritious products to benefit the health of children, youth, elders and family.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

Seek to ensure the continuity of the technical teams of each field organization, linking them to other ongoing projects in the region so as to strengthen the relationships built between all parties, both at the national and regional level.

Promote activities and joint sessions between different areas and units of the national government and regional and local governments, including new areas of territorial intervention and other ethnic groups in order to strengthen the integrated approach of projects.

Continue exploring mechanisms work with universities in different regions, since it would help execute complex projects in the different regions and specific studies to develop in new areas where propose projects without requiring additional technical resources mobilization.

Deepen the mechanism of joint action and learning using all information, tools and ready-made products.

Continue planning training activities, taking into account the needs of the institutions or areas.

Promote firm commitments of the different levels of government in technical-support teams since the development of strategies innovative not enough to generate the desired impact in terms of changes organizational and cultural.

Strengthen joint work with the private sector in both broadcast and in monitoring strategies inclusion of communities in a perspective of respect for cultural diversity.

Continue to work with the various stakeholders in the region to avoid that they introduce foods for their settlers and tourists that could largely be replaced by local crops and foods produced in the region.

Involve advocacy, to engage the national, provincial, and local government, in creating food and nutrition policies based on these Andean crops, to include local foods of high nutritional value, as part of Food Programs.

The Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Development, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education, universities, and municipalities should be involved in the processes.

Integrate into the food chain the added value of producing Andean food crops with the food industry from feeding programs social.

Analyze how other projects can retrieve local varieties and other repricing and rehabilitation of genes in areas where these crops were important.

The renovation and utilization of local resources and knowledge can be replicated in other regions where in order to modernize, integrate and leverage the market for the benefit of small farmers, peasants and indigenous different regions.

Include the agro-industrialization on a small scale, as a way of adding value to these products.

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 IEO 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?	The report contains a detailed assessment of achievement of relevant outcomes and impacts.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent, with evidence complete and for the most part well substantiated. More information could have been given on performance of implementing and executing agencies however.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The sustainability section lacks discussion of sustainability in terms of institutional frameworks and governance, and environmental aspects.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported by the evidence and are comprehensive.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Project total costs and costs per activity are provided, as well as total final co-financing. However it is not possible to discern what activities co-financing was used for.	S

Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The description of the project's M&E system is somewhat superficial.	MS
Overall TE Rating		S

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

No additional sources of information were used in the preparation of this TER.