

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		February 2011
GEF Project ID:	1876 MSP		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	P057026 (WB)	GEF financing:	725,000	725,000
Project Name:	Naya Biological Corridor (NBC) in the Munchique-Pinche Sector	IA/EA own:	0.0	30,000
Country:	Colombia	Government:	0.0	0.0
		Other*:	825,000	380,000
		Total Cofinancing:	825,000	410,000
Operational Program:	OP#3 Forest Ecosystems OP#4 Mountain Ecosystems	Total Project Cost:	1,550,000	1,135,000
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	The Center for Research in Sustainable Agricultural Production Systems (CIPAV Foundation)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		December 2003
		Closing Date	Proposed: December 2006	Actual: June 2007
TER Prepared by:	TER peer reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 36 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 42 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 6 months
Author of TE:	Antonio Solarte	TE completion date: Not provided	TE submission date to GEF EO: August 2010	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): Unable to calculate

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

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

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	MS	N/A	MS
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	Overall risk to development outcome: Significant	N/A	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	S	S	N/A	S
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	N/A	N/A	N/A	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	S

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?

Yes, this Implementation Completion Memorandum (ICM or TE) should be considered a good practice.

- The document provides a consistent and objective analysis of all Project aspects.
- Recommendations could have been clearly delineated instead of fused with lessons learned.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?

No such findings were noted in the TE.

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 TE, the Original (and Revised) Trust Fund Development Objective was displayed as follows:

- The Trust Fund (TF) original objective was to establish an integrated ecosystem management program in the area of the Naya Biological Corridor in the Munchique-Pinche Sector, integrating the use and management of biodiversity while encouraging biodiversity-friendly sustainable agricultural production systems. This main objective remained unchanged throughout the TF implementation.
- The specific objectives were to:
 - a) Adopt a long term strategy that allows the conservation and sustainable management of protected natural ecosystems that contain biodiversity of global importance and are natural areas that are threatened by human intervention;
 - b) Create a biological corridor between core conservation areas;
 - c) Integrate biodiversity conservation with the implementation of sustainable production systems; and
 - d) Develop environmental land use planning within the ethnic and social dynamics of Afro-Colombian groups, the Paeces and Eperara-Siapidaara indigenous communities.

Changes:

- According to the TE, “there was a change regarding TF beneficiaries. During TF execution, the corridor’s borders and area of influence were accurately defined in a participatory process, in response to ongoing regional, municipal and local conservation and environmental plans and projects. Consequently, three sites were targeted for project activities in the municipalities of Morales, El Tambo and Argelia. In this area, no on-going conservation processes led by Afro-Colombian or Eperara-Siapidaara communities were identified, which is why they were excluded from the process. TF beneficiaries consisted mainly of peasant and Paeces indigenous communities.”

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)

According to the TE, the Original (and Revised) Trust Fund Activities/Components were as follows:

- I. Data Collection and Participatory Planning: Original activities included: Compiling existing bibliographical information on biophysical, socioeconomic and cultural aspects of the Munchique-Pinche Corridor; Sharing this information with the communities and complementing the dissemination process with workshops inviting representatives from each site; Collecting missing data using Rapid Ecological Assessment (REA) through expeditions field guided as much as possible by expert scientists, coupled with traditional knowledge and local leaders; Standardizing data in a GIS database; Elaborating 5 thematic maps (vegetal cover, geology and geomorphology, cultural socioeconomic, land use, and key threats); and Supporting a participatory zoning process through workshops with the involved actors. This component and related activities were carried out without changes from the original project design.
- II. Consolidation and Promotion of Protected Areas: This TF component was designed to work in the consolidation of existing protected areas as well as in the promotion of new areas under different IUCN categories for protection. The project brief identified 87.329 hectares legally declared as protected areas (PAs) and set a target of approximately 137.000 additional hectares to be established as protected areas. However, assessments carried out to select conservation areas that would receive technical and financial support from the TF found that the information regarding PAs was not accurate, reason why targets and PA selection were adjusted to fit local conditions taking into consideration: The corridor’s actual borders; Active ongoing conservation community-based PAs initiatives; Legal status of PA declaration, boundaries and correct demarcation; PAs to be supported in the framework of the Regional System of Protected Areas; The presence of illegally armed groups; Budgetary restrictions. The activities planned under this component were developed in coordination with the Administrative Unit of the National Natural Parks System (UAESPNN)

and the Regional Environmental Authority (CRC) in the framework of the Regional System of Protected Areas (SIRAP) for the Cauca Department. These activities included: (i) regional and community-based workshops for the definition, delimitation and constitution of new areas, and (ii) the consolidation of existing protected areas. The underlying condition for both was the provision of adequate resources to establish community-based management programs. The consolidation of an environmental education center in the Munchique National Park was aborted due to the theft of the construction materials by an illegally armed group as well as considerable public unrest in the area. The steering committee, with the participation of the Task Manager, approved the cancellation of the construction of the education center, which partially helped alleviate the budget reduction due to the revaluation of the Colombian peso. As a compensation measure, training activities in sustainable natural resource management and production systems were increased in the buffer zones of the Munchique National Park, resulting in a higher number of pilot farms with sustainable production systems in this area.

- III. Sustainable Production and Natural Resources Management: The original objective of this TF component was to pilot Sustainable Production Systems (SPS) projects and the sustainable use of biodiversity in rural landscapes in 3 pilot areas: Nuclei Paeces, Nuclei Munchique, Nuclei Argelia. The activities carried out in support of this component included: (i) establishing interest groups (adults, young people and students) and training them in biodiversity friendly sustainable systems, and (ii) undertaking culturally differentiated training activities in SPS. Originally, the eastern flank was to implement SPS in at least 15 pilot farms, while the western flank was to undertake forestry certification with support of the Working Group for Forest Certification for Colombia guaranteed by FSC (Forestry Stewardship Council) and supported by the WWF. Activities related to forestry certification were not undertaken during TF execution due to the redefinition of the project area.
- IV. Education and Communication on the Munchique-Pinche Corridor: A communication and education strategy was originally included in the Trust Fund to operate at various levels: a) locally and regionally by means of radio documentaries, videos and programs; b) nationally through a multimedia presentation and a web site; and c) peasant-to-peasant experience and knowledge exchange. The activities were undertaken without modification.
- V. Project Management: This component was defined to promote organizational strengthening of the consortium of NGOs executing the project and to ensure adequate trust fund execution. The consortium was not established following recommendations from the World Bank's Legal Vice- Presidency in the sense that a joint venture between three independent organizations, not having corporate body could not be the grant recipient. Therefore CIPAV acted as project executing agency, setting up subsidiary agreements with ATIZO and PROSELVA to transfer funds for the execution of TF activities in accordance with their experience. Besides this change in the implementation arrangement, activities were executed as established in the original TF design.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)
			TF Beneficiaries, as described above

c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)

Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)
				Afro-Colombian communities, initially expected to compose the spectrum of beneficiaries, were not among the areas designated for project implementation

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	Rating: 5
<p>Satisfactory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the TE, “this TF was consistent with the GEF Strategic Priorities related to Biodiversity in the consolidation of Protected Areas Systems and mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes. At a national level, this TF was relevant to country strategies related to the consolidation of regional and national PA systems. It provides important lessons for work in PA buffer zones, as it put in place a biological corridor that included several aspects of the conservation mosaic figure under implementation by the GEF National Protected Areas Conservation Trust Fund Project. Additionally, the focus on improving livelihoods through execution of sustainable production systems was relevant to CAS economic development objectives and Millennium Development Goals related to the reduction of poverty and the achievement of environmental sustainability.” • The expected project outcomes were fully consistent with the GEF’s forest and mountains ecosystem operational programs, so its relevance is rated as satisfactory. 	
b. Effectiveness	Rating: 4
<p>Moderately Satisfactory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall development objective of the TF was to establish an integrated ecosystem management program in the area of the Naya Biological Corridor in the Munchique-Pinche Sector, integrating the use and management of biodiversity while encouraging biodiversity-friendly sustainable agricultural production systems. Three indicators were established to measure effectiveness: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 60% of the corridor should be under different schemes for conservation and sustainable use: According to the municipal land use planning instruments, 83% of Munchique-Pinche Corridor (equivalent 240,293 ha) is currently under different conservation and sustainable use schemes. However, areas under municipal land-use planning are not officially declared PAs in the Colombian environmental legislation and further regulation is needed in this regard. 2) Land use and management plans for the Munchique-Pinche Corridor should be produced and implemented: Considering the corridor as a dynamic and functional unit of planning, the land-use planning and management strategy undertook comprehensive activities at various scales of intervention. At the farm level, three pilot areas for sustainable production systems and natural resources management were implemented with a total number of 29 pilot farms. Management plans were developed to improve the planning of land uses toward environmental friendly productive systems. Training activities reached 22 villages, 10 rural schools and 150 peasant families, which adopted technologies/techniques such as basic animal production infrastructure, food and fodder security banks, manure and organic wastes recycling through plastic biogas plants and earthworm cultivation, and raising small livestock species. At the watershed level, management plans for 10 micro-watersheds were accomplished. This activity was carried out in the same areas selected for sustainable production systems and protected areas activities. This selection enabled TF activities to focus on three sites and better engage local communities in the overall project execution. At the protected areas and Corridor levels, activities were undertaken in the framework of the Regional System of Protected Areas (SIRAP) of the Cauca Department. Management plans for four protected areas were developed and a management guideline for the corridor area was developed in a participatory process with representatives from municipalities and local organizations. In addition, the municipalities of El Tambo, Argelia and Morales incorporated the Munchique-Pinche Corridor as an integral part of their Local System of PAs through local laws signed by the municipal council, authority that rules land use at this level. 3) At least 60% of the conservation areas should be established: This work was coordinated with the participation of UAESPNN and CRC in the framework of the Regional System of Protected Areas. As far as it was not possible to advance in more municipalities due to budget restrictions caused by the COP revaluation, activities focused on the consolidation of Tambito Natural Reserve and on supporting three new PAs, in the process of official declaration at the end of TF implementation. Actual coverage in terms of hectares of new PAs was lower than expected in the project brief, reaching approximately 12.26% of the proposed conservation areas established, due to reasons explained above. • Considering the minor shortcomings identified in part of the 3 indicators established to measure achievement of the TF Development Objective, especially regarding non-endorsement of PAs by the legislation and low coverage of new PAs, overall effectiveness is rated as moderately satisfactory. 	
c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: 4
<p>Moderately Satisfactory:</p>	

- According to the TE, “the TF was affected by the COP revaluation, from 3,000 to 1,800 pesos per dollar, which meant an important budget reduction. There was also a five-month delay for the first disbursement of funds to the TF special account. In addition, there were security problems in the area due to the presence of illegally armed groups, which hindered fieldwork at certain times.”
- The TE explains that “to overcome these situations, safety measures were taken and most of the TF activities were focused on three sites, with close participation from the local communities. A three-month extension period was approved for the TF closing.”
- Considering that, although the Project demonstrate adequate management, with funds efficiently used to achieve project objectives, even the TE acknowledges that time and resources were spent in adjusting Project area as part of the participatory planning stage under Component 1. Therefore, efficiency is rated as moderately satisfactory.

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.

a. Financial resources	Rating: 3
Moderately likely:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the TE, “this Trust Fund obtained over US\$300,000 in additional grant funds from Conservation International to develop a pilot Payment for Environmental Services scheme, as wells as in-kind contributions from environmental institutions at regional level.” • However, the TE highlights a “significant” risk for the overall Project’s outcome, arguing that “the 3.5-years period for implementation and US \$725,000 budget is considered limited to ensure such process for all municipalities in the area, and financial, technical and political support is required to consolidate TF outcomes.” • Considering potential shortcomings with regard to time constraint for budget implementation, but also pondering that the importance of these factors are highly subjective, risk is either moderate instead of significant, so sustainability is rated as moderately likely. 	
b. Socio political	Rating: 4
Likely:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the TE, “the recognition of the Munchique-Pinche Corridor Area by the environmental authorities at regional and national levels and by 3 municipalities in their land use planning, as well as the corridor’s integration to the National and Regional System of Protected Areas processes are positive factors contributing to maintain this outcome in the following years.” • “The Munchique-Pinche Corridor became known by decision-makers and was promoted at the local, regional and national levels. It has been incorporated into the regional land use planning by the environmental institutions, in the framework of the National and Regional Systems of Protected Areas.” Considering these positive socio-political aspects regarding the recognition of the Corridor, its socio-political sustainability is rated as likely. 	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: 4
Likely:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the TE, “the conceptual and methodological approach followed for the implementation of the conservation corridor, based on institutional and public participation, meant coordinating the efforts, resources and motivations of different participants in order to develop a bottom-up land use planning process, starting at the farm, watershed and municipal levels up to the regional level in the western mountain range of the Cauca Department.” • Regarding the network between protected areas, the TE says that “the TF supported the processes to consolidate and officially declare four protected areas under different management categories with their corresponding management plans.” • Given that these Corridor’s areas were included in the framework of the Regional System of Protected Areas, the Municipalities were committed to supporting these initiatives, there are other organizations supporting these initiatives, and this network is expected to remain in the long term, all these positive expectations regarding framework and governance lead to a likely rating of institutional framework and governance sustainability. 	

d. Environmental	Rating: 4
<p>Likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The TE affirms that “this TF has generated useful lessons to the consolidation of biological corridors, conservation mosaics and other conservation/production land management schemes. Linkages are being sought with related initiatives in Colombia such as the GEF National Protected Areas Conservation Trust Fund Project and the Biocommerce Fund supported by the GEF Conservation and Sustainable use of Biodiversity in the High Andes Region project. Proposals were presented to the Dutch Embassy, Conservation International and the National PA Conservation Trust Fund; however, the team was unable to obtain follow-up financing to further consolidate the Munchique-Pinche Corridor’s management plan nor to continue promoting sustainable production systems generated by the TF.” • The TE also mentions that “three Pilot Areas for sustainable production and natural resources sustainable use were implemented, and producer organizations were strengthened in the three pilot areas. The time to consolidate this process was limited, [but] farmers have incorporated sustainable production schemes in their current agricultural practices.” • Considering the increasing recognition of the Corridor as an environmental area of protection, and no environmental risks were mentioned by or inferred from the TE, environmental sustainability is rated as likely. 	

4.3 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

<p>a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by cofinancing well integrated into the project? 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?</p>
<p>Actual cofinancing was only half of the expected amount:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Original cofinancing estimated for CIPAV Foundation in project brief is included in the <i>Other</i> category (US\$ 825,000), as initially the grant recipient was to be a Consortium of NGOs whose cofinancing commitments were calculated jointly. Actual cofinancing from <i>Other</i> project partners was lower than originally expected (US\$ 380,000). • Regarding the project brief, “cofinancing commitments from environmental institutions and municipalities were lower than expected in the project brief <i>due to the low priority</i> given at the time to these matters and consequently the low allocation of financial resources.” • Therefore, besides the Project’s acknowledged relevance in terms of outcomes, co-financial sources have apparently not fully agreed with the Project’s importance.
<p>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?</p>
<p>Delays had minor impact on the attainment of project outcomes and sustainability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the TE, project execution “suffered minor changes due to external circumstances and institutional dynamics. [...] the presence of illegally armed groups in the corridor area, which meant delays and adjustments in the timing of some field-based activities as far as it was not possible for the project team to visit the area. [...] regarding the schedule of trust fund implementation, the team requested and obtained a three-month extension. This extension was granted for two reasons: (i) conflict in the region due to illicit coca cultivation and territorial battles between various armed groups that led to several delays in the TF implementation, and (ii) a five-month delay in the initial disbursement of resources to the special account.”
<p>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.</p>
<p>Country ownership apparently played a minor role in the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neither country nor local ownership are mentioned in the TE. Although it is highlighted that “financial, technical and political support is required to consolidate TF outcomes”, there was no cofinancing commitment by any governmental authority whatsoever.

4.4 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): 5
<p>Satisfactory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• According to the Project Brief, “monitoring and evaluation of the project will be based on indicators presented in the project summary. The relevant data for the analysis of these indicators will be collected during the different project activities, and in the reports that are made by the CINC on all field activities. These reports will be analyzed each semester, in order to monitor project implementation, and results will be discussed at internal team meetings within the CINC and at meetings with community leaders. The Brief explained that the M&E would be carried out at two different levels: 1) Community Level. On a local scale, monitoring allows the state or other organizations that invest economic resources in the implementation of the project to monitor the compliance with the commitments stated in the inter-corporate agreements. Equally under Colombian law the communities are endowed with rights to supervise their projects. And 2) Project Management. The Project Coordinator (PC) along with the Technical Committee (TC) will develop a project monitoring system. Quarterly revision of the results of the operative plan of the project will also take place in order for the advances and results of the project to be shared between the beneficiaries of the project and the SC. These revisions will be used to form the quarterly information to the WB. The Web Page, multimedia presentation and videos will also provide needed information on which to evaluate the projects progress and as they are updated on a regular basis provide important evaluation data. The activities of the project have been developed into a logical matrix that allows one to establish progress, quality and impact indicators, facilitating precise checking and rapid response adjustments.”• To the Project Brief, “these above noted reports will also include an analysis of some indicators of project impact, both in the field of biodiversity conservation, as in the improvement of quality of life for the communities. Special care will be taken to ensure that information regarding project achievements and impact are fed back to the communities, in an educational form; and in such a way that it can be used as the rationale for making informed and improved decisions regarding social development and environmental conservation at the local level. Results of all these activities relating to project monitoring and evaluation will serve as a basis for the recommendation and implementation of change in the operative development of the project; and it is hoped that they will prove useful as a reference point for the implementation of other similar projects. In addition, the Bank will undertake normal periodic supervision such as annual, half term and final performance evaluation.”• Considering that the plan paid substantial attention to all aspects of M&E, with sound tracking scheme through SMART indicators of results and progress towards achieving project objectives, all considered practicable and sufficient, M&E at entry is rated as satisfactory.	
b. M&E plan Implementation	Rating (six point scale): 5
<p>Satisfactory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• As had been explained in the Project Brief, “Monitoring and evaluation of the project will be based on indicators presented in the project summary.” These indicators are explained in detail, per component, in the TE’s section <i>Outcome Indicators</i>, and are described below:• Component 1: Data Collection and Participatory Planning: Existing information about biodiversity, land use, and socio-economic and cultural aspects of the corridor will be compiled and presented in thematic maps as an input into the delimitation and zoning. 1.1. Two desk-studies about biophysical, socio-economic and cultural aspects of the Munchique. 1.2 Eleven fieldtrips to verify and Pinche Corridor share the biophysical, socio-economic and cultural information with representatives from social groups in each region. 1.2 Eleven fieldtrips to verify and share the biophysical, socio-economic and cultural information with representatives from social groups in each region. 1.3 Three field trips to collect the additional primary level biophysical, socio-economic and cultural information. 1.4. Six thematic maps as inputs for the preliminary zoning. 1.5. Eleven workshops to analyze and define the final zoning of the Munchique-Pinche Corridor. 1.6. Design of monitoring program for the Munchique-Pinche Corridor based on the baseline and annual land use changes• Component 2: Consolidation and Promotion of Protected Areas. Biophysical and sociological studies of the potential for the delineation and establishment of protected areas with input from local communities will be carried out. Four new conservation areas in the Regional Protected Areas System will be included. Implementation of management and monitoring plans will be approved by local communities. 2.1. Eleven workshops to identify applicable criteria in defining the new protected areas system which will be comprised of existing protected areas and three new areas. 2.2 Six events (touring workshops), for the delimitation, selection and participatory creation of new protected areas. 2.3 Two workshops to organize and integrate the protected areas. 2.4. The design and execution of a management plan for the Tambito Reserve. 2.5. The strengthening of three training centers in the Munchique National Park. Capacity at these centers will be improved to provide specialized training in the management of protected areas and biodiversity conservation.	

- Component 3: Sustainable Production and Natural Resources Management. Management Plan for 10 Micro-watersheds in the 3 pilot areas will be designed. A monitoring system for land use change in the three pilot areas will be developed. 3.1 Four courses on Sustainable Production Systems, Forest Management, and Certification. 3.2 Four training events and four mobile courses for: (a) participatory planning and environmental management, for biological diversity, systems of production, and environmental monitoring; (b) forest sector planning. 3.3. Four training events for young people from Afrocolombian, indigenous and farming communities on the following themes: (a) Recognition of the value of traditional systems of production and sustainable use; (b) development and application of technologies of sustainable agriculture; (c) environmental monitoring; and (d) methods for participatory research. 3.4. Implementation of Sustainable Production Systems on at least 15 farms, and of Forestry Management Plans in at least 3 forest areas.
- Component 4: Education and Communication on the Munchique-Pinche Corridor: Munchique-Pinche Corridor present in the Local, Regional, National Development Plans. Local, Regional, National organization actively promoting the Munchique-Pinche Corridor. 4.1. Eight training events for 30 community leaders in organizational processes, environmental land use planning and GIS. 4.2. An educational training module on conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use of biological resources for rural schools in the area of the Munchique-Pinche Corridor. 4.3. *[Unable to be read, visual problems in the TE soft version]*.
- Component 5: Project Management: CIPAV Foundation successful in administrative and organizational processes and local organizations PROSELVA and ATIZO strengthened Presentation of proposal to different institutions for further funding of the Munchique-Pinche Corridor. 5.1. *[Unable to be read, visual problems in the TE soft version]* 5.2. Two (2) meetings per year of the Steering Committee, 50% ñ meetings were held once a year. 5.3. Four (4) meetings per year of the Technical Committee and meeting with other local institutions and organizations working in the Munchique-Pinche Corridor. 3 Technical Committee meetings were held per year, while 6 meetings were held with local institutions and organizations. 5.4. One (1) workshop per year to socialize the Trust Fund development
- Considering that M&E implementation carried thorough and SMART procedures to fulfill M&E requirements, all in a timely manner, M&E implementation is rated as satisfactory.

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): 5

b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): 5

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.

Satisfactory:

- According to the TE, “the Bank has carried out its responsibilities to support all the TF related-activities. Technical and administrative matters were solved efficiently, on time and at least two missions were undertaken yearly by the Bank Staff to follow-up on field activities.”
- With regard to Project Management, the TE mentions that “the consortium was not established following recommendations from the World Bank’s Legal Vice- Presidency in the sense that a joint venture between three independent organizations, not having corporate body could not be the grant recipient. Therefore CIPAV acted as project executing agency, setting up subsidiary agreements with ATIZO and PROSELVA to transfer funds for the execution of TF activities in accordance with their experience. Besides this change in the implementation arrangement, activities were executed as established in the original TF design.”
- Considering that no major shortcoming was identified in the Bank’s performance, implementation with regard to project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision, and so on, is rated as satisfactory.

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies¹ (rating on a 6 point scale): 5

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.

Satisfactory:

- According to the TE, “CIPAV was able to undertake project activities and achieve expected outcomes despite adverse public order situations and budget deficit to COP revaluation.”
- As noted above, with regard to Project Management, the TE mentions that “the consortium was not

¹ 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 expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

established following recommendations from the World Bank’s Legal Vice- Presidency in the sense that a joint venture between three independent organizations, not having corporate body could not be the grant recipient. Therefore CIPAV acted as project executing agency, setting up subsidiary agreements with ATIZO and PROSELVA to transfer funds for the execution of TF activities in accordance with their experience. Besides this change in the implementation arrangement, activities were executed as established in the original TF design.”

- Considering that no major shortcoming was identified in the recipient’s performance, CIPAV’s execution through its subsidiary agreements with local partners and, overall, its focus on results is rated as satisfactory.

5. PROGRESS TOWARDS IMPACT

a. What is the outlined outcomes-to-impact pathway?
 Briefly describe the logical sequence of means-to-end linkages underlying a project (Outcome to impact pathways are the means-ends relationships between project outcomes and the intended impacts – i.e. the logical results chain of activity, output, outcome and impact)

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Intermediary States	Impacts
To Collect data and Promote participatory planning To Consolidate and Promote protected areas by increasing awareness of NBC's importance To Promote sustainable production and natural resources' management To Ensure an efficient project management	Knowledge exchange in training sessions regarding sustainable production on a peasant-to-peasant basis Development of pilot initiatives to serve as learning experiences: Training on environmental and PA-related issues	Adoption of long-term strategy that allows the conservation and sustainable management of protected natural ecosystems that contain biodiversity of global importance and are natural areas that are threatened by human intervention Protected Areas were consolidated in the region as buffer zones, improving livelihoods through economic development, poverty reduction and the achievement of environmental sustainability A Payment for Environmental Services scheme was developed for the protection of watersheds supplying rural aqueducts in the indigenous zone of Morales	Inclusion of the Munchique-Pinche Corridor as a regional initiative to conserve biodiversity	An integrated ecosystem management program in the NBC established, integrating the use and management of biodiversity

b. What are the actual (intended or unintended) impacts of the project?
 Based on the assessment of outcomes [4.1.1] explain to what extent the project contributed to or detracted from the path to project impacts and to impact drivers (Impact drivers are the **significant factors** that, if present, are expected to contribute to the ultimate realization of project impacts and that are within the ability of the project to influence

Considering the assessed outcomes and presented impacts, impact drivers were:

- **Efficient coordination:** The coordination of activities with UAESPNN and CRC for the promotion of PAs and the Munchique-Pinche corridor are reported to have helped strengthened Cauca’s Regional System of Protected Areas. It allowed for training activities on environmental and PA-related issues to benefit local communities beyond the Munchique-Pinche corridor borders, reaching 15 municipalities of the Cauca Department and around 60 community leaders who were qualified on the subject. Institutional coordination also helped ensure training and technical support for the consolidation of Tambito Private Reserve and for the implementation of management plans for three new PAs: Santa Clara-Naranjal Municipal Reserve, Pico de Aguila Indigenous PA, and a network of 11 nature reserves owned by peasant farmers.
- **Pilot initiatives as learning experiences:** The pilot farms are reported to have demonstrated to be a valid strategy to exchange knowledge regarding sustainable production systems on a peasant-to-peasant basis. This learning process has enabled improved food security, natural resources management and productivity at farm

- level.
- **Training sessions:** The work undertaken to train members of Municipal Councils is reported to have been an additional impact that helped establish Municipal Systems of PAs in Morales, El Tambo and Argelia and allowed for the inclusion of the Munchique-Pinche Corridor as a regional initiative to conserve biodiversity, in municipal laws ruled by the Municipal Councils.
- **Financial security:** The project team was successful at leveraging co-financing funds and in-kind contributions from external donors other than public authorities (for almost 50% of the total amount of the TF budget). These funds were invested simultaneously during TF implementation period. Three new projects were financed that served to some extent to balance the budget deficit resulting from the COP revaluation and to support operational expenses and training activities on PAs and land use planning. Additional funding leveraged from Conservation International expanded project impact, as far as it was possible to develop a Payment for Environmental Services scheme for the protection of watersheds supplying rural aqueducts in the indigenous zone of Morales.

c. Drawing on the assessment of the likelihood of outcome sustainability[4.2], what are the apparent risks to achieved impacts being sustained and likely impacts being achieved?

Considering the assessed likelihood of outcome sustainability, it is inferable from this project that the apparent risks to impacts were:

- **Existence of social conflicts:** According to the TE, “international experience related to the establishment of biological corridors is limited which makes the successful project implementation a challenging task. At the same time, during project preparation a systematic effort was made to identify project risks and to examine what actions could be taken to mitigate those risks. [...] The project area in the NBC has been chosen because of the relative absence of security problems and social conflicts and the fact that more than 60% of the nucleus areas of the NBC are uninhabited. In order to further diminish these risks, the project has adopted a flexible strategy for identifying pilot project areas and will have in place a decision-making apparatus which will allow pilot projects to be scaled back or closed in case problems arise. This strategy also permits activities to resume in these critical areas when the intensity of the conflict is diminished. In areas that have been under the threat of conflict, it is worth mentioning the efforts made by the communities to ensure autonomy, particularly in the zones of the Paeces and Eperara Siapidaara. The position of the indigenous communities stated in the Extraordinary Congress of the Regional Indigenous Council of Cauca (RICC) held in the municipality of Caloto, Department of Cauca, in April of 2001 is to demand the immediate withdrawal of any armed groups. Civil supervisions were constituted to safeguard the order in these indigenous territories, under the supervision of the People’s Counsel for the Defense which help communities to develop and implement their projects. In cases where armed groups entered these communities, the community has faced them without arms. This is a very value precedent in term of autonomy.”
- **Increased pressure on biodiversity from the advance of the agricultural frontier and mining expansion:** According to the TE, “the project area is under increasing external pressure from the advance of the agricultural frontier, mining and establishment of mega development projects. These activities often have a negative impact on indigenous efforts to manage and conserve natural resources and can result in fragmented ecosystems and reduced levels of biodiversity. Nevertheless, communities are becoming increasingly more aware of these threats and recognize the potential economic and environmental benefits of establishing the NBC. In order to address the risks associated with these activities, the NBC project will work closely with communities to design appropriate activities including sustainable productive systems, organizational strengthening and environmental education. Most of the area of the proposed NBC is unlikely to be affected by mining related problems except in the Municipalities of Timbiqui and El Tambo where gold and coal are prevalent and where dredging is causing adverse environmental and social impacts. The Afrocolombian community has taken action to remove the mining company from the area. With the NBC established, Colombian law requires that proposed mining activities be evaluated during a open and participatory process and approval be provided by the Private Natural Reserves Network. The community directly affected evaluates proposed and indicates their support or opposition to the project. The NBC project will work to reinforce these processes and at the same time provide opportunities for communities to develop alternative income generating activities based on environmentally sustainable criteria. At the same time, participation by the CRC and the Ministry of Environment through their participation in the project’s technical committee will help to mitigate the risk.”

d. Evidence of Impact

Question	Yes	No	UA
i. Did the evaluation report on <i>stress reduction</i> ² at the <u>local level</u> (i.e. at the demonstration-pilot level, etc)?	X		
ii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope ³ of such reductions given the range of concerns targeted by the project. Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to the TE, “at the farm level, three pilot areas for sustainable production systems and natural resources management were implemented with a total number of 29 pilot farms. Management plans were developed to improve the planning of land uses toward environmental friendly productive systems. Training activities reached 22 villages, 10 rural schools and 150 peasant families, which adopted technologies/techniques such as basic animal production infrastructure, food and fodder security banks, manure and organic wastes recycling through plastic biogas plants and earthworm cultivation, and raising small livestock species. At the watershed level, management plans for 10 micro-watersheds were accomplished. This activity was carried out in the same areas selected for sustainable production systems and protected areas activities. This selection enabled TF activities to focus on three sites and better engage local communities in the overall project execution.” 			
iii. Did the evaluation report stress reduction at the broader <u>systemic level</u> ?		X	
iv. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of such reductions given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
v. Did the evaluation report change in the <i>environmental status</i> at the local level (i.e. at the demonstration - pilot level, etc)		X	
vi. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
vii. Did the evaluation report change in the environmental status at the broader systemic level?	X		
viii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of such change given the range of concerns targeted by the project. Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to the TE, “at the national level, this TF was relevant to country strategies related to the consolidation of regional and national PA systems. It provides important lessons for work in PA buffer zones, as it put in place a biological corridor that included several aspects of the conservation mosaic figure under implementation by the GEF National Protected Areas Conservation Trust Fund Project. Additionally, the focus on improving livelihoods through execution of sustainable production systems was relevant to CAS economic development objectives and Millennium Development Goals related to the reduction of poverty and the achievement of environmental sustainability.” 			
ix. Did the evaluation report change in the socioeconomic status at the local level?		X	
x. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
xi. Did the evaluation report change in the socio-economic status at the systemic level?		X	
xii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
xiii. Did the evaluation provide evidence of any negative impacts (on drivers toward the projects intended impact, environmental status, socioeconomic status)? Describe the impacts that were documented and how severe were these impacts? No negative impacts were reported in the TE.			
e. Monitoring of impacts			
i. Are arrangements/institutions in place to monitor stress reduction/improvement in the environment and/or socio-economic conditions at the local level after project completion?		X	
ii. Are arrangements/institutions in place to monitor stress reduction/improvement in		X	

² Stress = Pressure on the environment caused by human activities; Reduction=decrease of this pressure

³ Scope refers to the broadness of results against original objectives,

the environment and/or socio-economic conditions at the systemic level after project completion?			

6. 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
<p>The key lessons, good practices and approaches provided by the TE are fused with is recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conceptual and methodological approach developed in the TF implementation is useful for future projects in the consolidation of biological corridors, conservation mosaics and other conservation/production schemes. • During project formulation and before its implementation, agreements should be signed with key stakeholders (municipalities, environmental authorities, national parks, private reserve associations and especially local communities), clearly stating their commitment to the project and their willingness to participate. These agreements should also define the applicable approach to determine boundaries of the PAs to be established. • Without accurate, verified information on the area of potential project sites, data on ha or km2 should not be included in project brief, but only their location identified. If project preparation resources are sufficient, land surveys could be financed to determine exact coverage. In addition, secondary sources of information on site boundaries should be clearly identified in project brief, along with their level of reliability and margin of error, if they are not to be thoroughly verified during project formulation. • An implementation period of three years is considered insufficient to reach the sustainability of the different processes undertaken in the TF development. • TF design and implementation should focus from the start on supporting linkages with existing institutions and designing a strategy for financial sustainability. • Greater results-dissemination efforts are needed in other areas not intervened by project. • Activities for TF implementation should take into consideration the opportunities provided by ongoing community-based conservation initiatives as well as the institutional context, to allow for outcome sustainability and larger-scale impacts. • Focusing TF activities on a limited number of sites for different levels of land use planning (farm, watersheds, PAs) and capacity building was a key strategy to achieve expected outcomes and overcome problems encountered during implementation. However, targeting TF activities in few project sites may result in having certain actors and potential beneficiaries' feeling excluded from project activities. • An adequate selection of project beneficiaries and community leaders for field activities is an important matter to ensure project success: beneficiaries must demonstrate the level of commitment required to make use of the knowledge imparted and the willingness to share it. • Administrative capacities of the executing agencies and other partners affect project implementation. Human and financial resources must be allocated to strengthen grass-root organizations in this type of community-based projects, as successfully demonstrated by this TF. • Strategies are needed to bridge the gap between grass-root work and national/regional policy developments and programs. TF lacked a strategic approach to guarantee that its positive results were integrated into ongoing national work.
b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation
<p>The recommendations were fused with key lessons, good practices and approaches provided by the TE. See section above.</p>

7. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

7.1 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.

No other sources were used.

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.

7.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	5
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?	5
c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?	5
d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Lessons are supported by the evidence presented very comprehensive. However, although recommendations (aimed at replicating some aspects and avoiding others) might be inferred from lessons learned, the document does not clearly provide them.	4
e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	5
f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems?	5

8. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUTION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.

No other sources were used.