

## GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		
GEF Project ID:	243		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	1434	<b>GEF financing:</b>	10.6	10.6
Project Name:	Establishment of a Programme for the Consolidation of the Meso-American Biological Corridor	IA/EA own:	-	-
Country:	Regional (Central America)	Government:	4	4
		Other*:	7.72	6.6 (does not include \$11.5 of the GEF/WB/IADB project)
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	11.72	10.6
Operational Program:	3	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	22.32	21.2
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	UNEP, Comisión Centroamericana de Ambiente y Desarrollo (CCAD)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		11/10/1999
		Closing Date	Proposed: 11/29/2006	Actual: 06/30/2007
Prepared by: Ines Angulo	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 84	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 91	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 7
Author of TE: Allen D. Putney, Clemencia Vela		TE completion date: 07/2007	TE submission date to GEF EO: 04/02/2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 7

\* 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	-	MS
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	-	-	MU
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	-	S	-	MS
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	NA	NA	NA	MS
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	MS	MS

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

The TE should be considered a good practice in some aspects. Taking into consideration the complexity of the project, the evaluation succeeded reasonably well in assessing the key features and drawing relevant lessons learnt. On the other hand, specific information on use of resources, tangible achievements and impact of the project was incomplete.

#### **2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds,**

**mismanagement, etc.?**

No

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

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

According to the ProDoc the GEO is *“the establishment of a Programme for the Consolidation of the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor (The CCAD and countries in the Mesoamerican Region put a system into operation that consolidates the MBC, to conserve and manage biodiversity in a sustainable manner)”*.

There were no changes to the global environmental objectives during implementation.

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

According to the ProDoc the Development Objectives were

1. *“PROGRAM COORDINATION AND STRATEGIC PLANNING”*: Consolidation of a fully functional MBC is a long term process which will require a technical Regional Operations Coordinating Unit (ROCU) representative of the principal themes and stakeholder concerns on which the success and sustainability of this initiative will depend.
2. *“RESOURCE MOBILIZATION FOR THE CONSOLIDATION OF THE MBC”*: This will require training of the ROCU and the CCAD-ES, the Central American Council on Protected Areas, the Central American Council on Forests, and the Ministries of Environment and Natural Resources of the eight countries participating in this project as well as of those institutions and stakeholder groups which have or will have responsibility for the establishment of the MBC
3. *“INFORMATION AND MONITORING”*: The MBC information system – Corre-net - will be designed specifically for the MBC to allow efficient access to the large amount of existing data and information about the MBC, its biodiversity, conservation and development programs, and technologies, institutions and organizations involved.
4. *“CAPACITY BUILDING AND INTRA-REGIONAL EXCHANGES”*: the project will develop a capacity building sub-programme aimed at the principal regional stakeholder groups such as the Central American Federation of Municipalities (FEMICA), Indigenous Council of Central America (CICA), Association of Central American Peasant Organizations for Cooperation and Development (ASOCODE), Committee of Mesoamerican Members of IUCN (COMIUCN), Federation of Private Sector Entities of Central America and Panama (FEDEPRICAP), the Central American Councils on Forests and Protected Areas (CCAB and CCAP), etc.
5. *“PARTICIPATION, PUBLIC AWARENESS, AND EXPANSION”*: the project will a) establish a sub-programme aimed at raising the awareness of the general public and the principal stakeholder groups regarding the scope, objectives and potential benefits of the MBC to sustainable development, and b) establish or strengthen mechanisms for stakeholder participation at the national and regional levels in the planning and monitoring of the Programme's objectives and activities.
6. *“POLICY HARMONIZATION”*: Activities under this component will feed the ongoing, established regional policy formulation and integration process by identifying the key issues and sectoral activities affecting biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, as well as providing viable recommendations for policy reforms and adoptions by SICA.

The TE explains that while the main objectives of the project remained unchanged throughout implementation, there were changes in the project components listed in the logical framework of the project. This resulted in substantial changes in the approach of the implementation strategy, in some activities; which to some extent affected the expected accomplishments at the start of the project.

The 4 final components were i) strengthening the management capabilities of the MBC; ii) strengthening the economic viability of MBC; iii) ownership of the MBC from the Meso-American society, and iv) to guide decision-makers with better information management.

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

<b>Overall Environmental Objectives</b>	<b>Project Development Objectives</b>	<b>Project Components</b>	<b>Any other (specify)</b>
	In the latest Logical Framework, produced in 2004, the project components were		

	reduced. This included the expected development of a strategic plan for the project, the generation of regional scenarios, and the scope of training and information systems. These changes were approved by UNDP.			
<b>c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)</b>				
<b>Original objectives not sufficiently articulated</b>	<b>Exogenous conditions changed, causing a change in objectives</b>	<b>Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious</b>	<b>Project was restructured because of lack of progress</b>	<b>Any other (specify)</b>
	The TE notes that changes in the project were mainly caused by changes in political priorities in the participating countries.			

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

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

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

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

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

In October of 1994, the governments of Central America formed the *Alliance for Sustainable Development (ALIDES)* to coordinate short, medium- and long-term actions aimed at modifying conventional development approaches in order to ensure environmental, economic, social and cultural sustainability. ALIDES specifically advocates the creation of a regional "biological corridor to strengthen the respective national systems of protected areas."

**(ii) the national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?**

The creation and consolidation of the MBC has been identified as a priority by all the participating countries. Over the past decade, the countries of the region have increasingly worked together to build consensus around common environmental goals. All involved countries signed the Central American Environmental Protection Agreement and established the Central American Commission on Environment and Development (CCAD), which is one of the project implementing institutions.

**(iii) the achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?**

The results of the Project coincide with the objectives of the GEF operational programme on Biodiversity which aims at the conservation of biodiversity within and outside protected areas.

**(iv) the implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives)**

The project is within the priorities set by the CBD under Article 8, and particularly under Annex 1.

**A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership<sup>1</sup>**

The project supported the establishment of programs and projects within the MBC at all levels, and was a catalytic factor in the region. It also supported the development of plans, strategies and tools for other corridors in the region.

**b. Effectiveness**

**Rating: MS**

According to the TE, confusion regarding the changes in logframe and the lack of baselines and clear targets made it a challenge to properly assess the effectiveness of the project. Based on information obtained from interviews, and analysis of the financial records, among other methodologies, the TE concluded that the project "*has successfully created strategies, structures, machinery, tools and skills to continue the consolidation of the MBC and is a great contribution to the achievement of ecological connectivity and the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in Mesoamerica*".

The project was very successful at assuring coordination and complementarity with other projects and interventions

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

<p>related to regional and national MBC, which increased its effectiveness. Indeed, one of the strategies that enabled the project to achieve a large quantity of goods was the relationship or alliance with a number of national and regional initiatives with which it shared the achievement of certain goals. Similarly, the harmonization of policies such as the protocols for trans-frontier areas for applying the CITES convention and for the bi-and tri national management of protected areas were significant.</p> <p>The TE concludes that when compared to the original ProDoc logframe, the project failed to achieve some important objectives such as the failure to generate the biological/ecological information needed to establish baselines (there was no field component, and all information used for the publications was second-hand), and the fact that some strategic programmes that were conceived under the project did not reach the implementation phase.</p>
<p><b>c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) <span style="float: right;">Rating: UA</span></b></p> <p>The Project's period for implementation was 6 years, but there was an extension of 1 additional year without a budget increase. This delay was due to a difficult and slow start of project implementation. Due to the complex nature of the project (highly political), there was a need to rely on an adaptive management style. As a result, there were several changes to the project intervention strategy. Although these changes were necessary to achieve the overall project objectives, it is clear that they imply costs that were not originally budgeted for. These changes also make it hard to assess the overall efficiency of the project. In addition, the TE specifies that it is not easy to establish the cost-effectiveness of the project since it was almost impossible to distinguish which of the contributions were of the project and which were those provided by other sources.</p>
<p><b>d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated) – this could happen both during the designing of the project where some choices are made that lead to preference for one priority over the other, and during implementation of the project when resources are transferred from addressing environmental priorities to development priorities and vice versa. If possible explain the reasons for such tradeoffs.</b></p> <p>The TE does not mention any trade offs between environmental and development priorities. The analysis presented in the TE does not include an evaluation of the effects of creating protected areas (or corridor areas) on local people. This project did not have a “field” component directed at dealing with the social/economic dimension of protected areas, since this was originally to be funded by DANIDA who backed out off the project before implementation.</p>

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

Upon completion it is clear that the project has achieved the objective of putting a system to consolidate the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor and to conserve and manage biodiversity in a sustainable manner in place and has improved the harmonization of related policies in Central America.

**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.

<p><b>a. Financial resources <span style="float: right;">Rating: MU</span></b></p> <p>In many cases, there are a set of second-generation projects that will complement the progress of the MBC project. In any case, funding sources for the continuation of activities vary greatly among countries and specific areas. According to the TE, even though the prospects for external financing for most of the actions generated by the project are relatively good, it is very clear that there are risks to financial sustainability of the environmental initiatives of the Mesoamerican Region since most of these efforts depend on donations and loans from international agencies and bi-laterals.</p>
<p><b>b. Socio-economic / political <span style="float: right;">Rating: ML</span></b></p> <p>The project has been successful at achieving the internalization of the “MBC concept” and the basic elements such as coordination, harmonization and regional connectivity that it represents. For example the TE mentions that institutional and political plans have included actions related to the concept of MBC.</p> <p>Due to the lack of DANIDA funding, the project experienced a serious gap in the social aspects related to the consolidation of the MBC.</p>
<p><b>c. Institutional framework and governance <span style="float: right;">Rating: ML</span></b></p> <p>According to the TE, the basic components of the project have been absorbed by the CCAD, other regional institutions, countries, civil society and individuals.</p>

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

The level at which the project was able to strengthen governmental institutions in charge of promoting the MBC in each country vary, being strong in some countries like El Salvador, but weak in many others. Strengthening of the institutional framework for the management of Conservation Areas was almost zero.	
<b>d. Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
The TE does not provide a specific analysis on this criterion. It does mention the expansion of agriculture areas (for maize and sugar cane) to produce biogas and ethanol as a possible risk to the biodiversity in the protected areas.	
<b>e. Technological</b>	<b>Rating: NA</b>
Not applicable.	

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

<b>a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholders</b>
No incentives mentioned
<b>b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors</b>
The TE mentions that institutions directly involved in the implementation of the project were successful in incorporating it to their internal functions. On the other hand, the project did not reach out to other institutions that are important to the sustainability of the project such as those related to the agriculture sector.
<b>c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?</b>
The project successfully achieved the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Harmonization of concepts, agendas, policies and methodologies in the region.</li> <li>• Promotion of the concept of corridors looking for voluntary participation in private land.</li> <li>• Played an important role in the formation of Associations of Private Reserves.</li> <li>• Promoted and supported the inclusion of environmental issues in the countries agriculture agenda.</li> </ul>
<b>d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project contributed to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing)</b>
Some of the implementing countries have been following the issue of MBC by supporting follow up projects. In addition, the project played a catalytic role in the creation of new related projects and initiatives in the region.
<b>e. PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?</b>
No mention of project champions.

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

<b>a. Co-financing.</b> To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
The exit of DANIDA from the project resulted in a reduction of budget of \$6 million, which were originally planned to be spent on (i) promotion of farmer and indigenous participation in the planning and management of MBC consolidation, especially those communities or groups living in protected areas or in prospective corridor "interareas" (US\$ 3.4 million); (ii) local level sustainable development demonstration projects i.e., principally projects aimed at generating income to offset those activities deemed detrimental to biodiversity and consolidation of the MBC (US\$ 1.8 million); and (iii) analysis and strengthening of the role of women in MBC consolidation (US\$0.4 million). Without this contribution, the project had a significant gap in the social issue that was never possible to meet with other sources.
<b>b. Delays.</b> 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?
The project had a 1-year extension. In general, activities that required consensus and approval from the different governments that participated in the project took longer time than expected. An example was the elaboration of regional strategies for the management of the MesoAmerican Biological Corridor. The TE does not mention how delays affected project outcomes or sustainability.
<b>c. Country Ownership.</b> 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.
According to the TE, the country ownership at project conception was very high. Thereafter, it varied from country to country, as a result of the various changes in governments throughout the 7 years of project duration. In addition, as a

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

result of the project's administrative structure, the countries and actors had only indirect access to decision-making. This lack of access caused some discomfort to many of the local and national stakeholders who felt that the draft they had adequate space for discussion on technical issues, but little space to participate in project decisions. For example, the Mid-term review was never analyzed by local stakeholders (who perceived it as a top-down process), and was never addressed as a topic of discussion and decision by the Interagency Committee. According to the TE, the countries and project staff felt that they did not have sufficient opportunity to participate in the discussion and influence the decision. As a result, the acceptance of recommendation by the mid-term evaluation of non-supporting field activities in the corridors caused much turbulence in the project that might have been diminished if he had enough discussion among stakeholders.

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

##### a. M&E design at Entry Rating (six point scale): U

The ProDoc does not distinguish implementation indicators and indicators of achievement, not differentiating between achievement of objectives and activities. Many of the project outcomes identified in the ProjDoc have no targets related to them, as for example: "Improved conservation status of Mesoamerican biodiversity through support to the consolidation of protected areas"; "Increased knowledge and data collected about the species and ecosystems of the Region"; and "Increase in the level of public awareness of the value of goods and services provided by forests and protected areas".

Furthermore, the TE indicates that this lack of clarity between objectives, outcomes and related indicators was one of the most serious flaws of the project design.

On the other hand, the ProDoc clearly defines the roles and frequency of M&E activities, including a M&E plan and a schedule for reviews, reporting and evaluation of project activities. It states that the project complexity will be managed by the drafting and approving of annual operational plans and periodic technical backstopping missions and reports. For example it would be subject to annual tripartite review involving the CCAD President and one representative of UNDP, UNEP and WB. The Project Steering Committee, with the support of the Technical Advisory Team, would prepare a Project Performance Evaluation Report (PPER) and submit it to the Tripartite Review parties one month before the tripartite meetings. Monitoring the progress of project implementation would be carried out internally and permanently by the Regional Operations Coordinating Unit (ROCU).

##### b. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): MS

The TE concludes that the lack of clarity of the project's logical framework had a negative effect on the implementation of the M&E plan.

Annual Operation Plans (POA) were made for each of the years of project implementation. Quarterly and annual progress reports were also submitted to the GEF. The TE highlights the quality of information found in the progress reports and that there was no information available on whether there was a more detailed M&E plan from the ROCU towards countries. The TE evaluators note that they had no information about monitoring missions by UNDP / GEF. According to the TE, the Mid-term evaluation played a pivotal role in the implementation of the project: it geared again towards regional activities and towards achieving greater participation in the process of coordination and oversight.

##### b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document?

The ProjDoc does include a detailed budget for M&E activities, as well as information on costs and staff requirements for the different M&E requirements, including supervision missions.

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

There is no mention of lack of funding for project M&E activities.

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

The TE mentions that the project is a good example of adaptive management. In this case, the time that passed from project concept to project implementation was 5 years and almost 10 years from concept to completion. Changes in the political, financial, social, etc, background in the region and in each one of the participating countries required changes and adjustments to be made in the project as well. For example the midterm was the bases of the project refocus.

##### b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why.

No. Although the project was successfully supervised the M&E system had some weaknesses that affected project implementation and the final assessment of project achievements (for example the lack of appropriate indicators at entry).

#### 4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

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

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

*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.*

The UNDP was the IA of the project. UNDP had the comparative advantage of having offices in all participating countries that allowed closer monitoring and support to the executors. The TE highlights that the UNDP office in Nicaragua showed a superior organizational capacity and efficiency to other similar offices in other countries, noting that this country office was chosen as the project headquarters.

The TE also notes that the UNDP project supervision was constant and positive, and that its role as administrator of the project was also good. On the other hand, the TE includes a comprehensive analysis of the limitations and lack of clarity of the project logframe (both in the original version and also after modifications during implementation), and the negative effects this had on project implementation.

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

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.

Such a complex project required a very complex executing/administrative system, which included a technical Regional Operations Coordinating Unit, a ETN office (Enlaces Tecnicos Nacionales) in each participating country, an Interagency Steering Committee, and a National Office of the Regional Project in each country. Although the TE does not include a specific analysis of the quality of execution, it does mention that roles between all these different stakeholders was not very clear, and also that changes in personnel had a negative effect on project implementation (for example the project had 3 different Regional Project Coordinators). The TE also mentions that UNEP's role as an executing role during the duration of the project was limited to the education outreach component.

**5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

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

In specific terms, lessons were grouped into three categories:

**1. Concepts**

- The power of a good concept
- Recognition of diversity within and between countries
- Necessity of presenting the project again as it is started
- Feasibility of regional projects in the Mesoamerican region

**2. Processes**

- It is possible to harmonize inputs from different donors when the Project concept is powerful
- Balance between the active participation of countries and political interference in the project
- Negotiation with countries to find a way to minimize confusions and conflicts among the national project staff and the permanent personnel at the ministries (definitions of communication lines with regional coordination, relations with high-level Ministry officials, government representation, training for permanent personnel and information management are important)
- Good use of the Logical Framework is essential to facilitate the start and the implementation of the project, as well as monitoring and evaluation. Consequently, main project actors must be trained to ensure adequate understanding and use of this tool.
- In every project, and especially in one of longer duration, it is essential to programme a calendar of performance landmarks to give visibility to the execution phases and the form in which partial inputs or products support the achievement of planned outputs
- For an adequate project assessment, it is important to measure not only inputs, but also impacts of the project on biodiversity itself from its beginning

**3. Management**

- The role of the Regional Facilitator should be very clear: advisor or facilitator?
- The regional staff should be selected jointly with national authorities.
- Project activities should be incorporated into institutional agendas
- Foreign Ministries should be included from the beginning of bi- and tri-national activities
- Frequent changes in national authorities should be expected
- There can be no recipes; all countries and regions have different contexts

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

<sup>4</sup> Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

- Link the concept of MBC with major projects for the region. For example, explore the use of MBC mark of origin as an element of distinguishing the goods of the region in international markets; seize activities of the Puebla-Panama Plan financed by the WB and IADB to continue with the initiative of the MBC, and include the issue of MBC in discussions on free trade treaties.
- Conduct a feasibility study for the establishment of an independent regional fund for the MBC.
- Link climate change programs with programs of biodiversity, especially in the use of carbon credits for reforestation and for avoided deforestation in protected areas, and the rationalization of alternative energy sources such as biodiesel and ethanol.
- Increased awareness on the status of protected areas and the impact of activities in the corridors for connectivity populations of species is essential to reinforce positive actions and mitigate negative ones.
- A deeper institutional analysis is required to respond to the needs of interaction among environmental sectors responsible for PAs and the protection of biodiversity with those who work in productive sectors of the areas involved corridors. The dynamics of ecosystems do not respond to simple territorial divisions and the best option to achieve connectivity of the sustainable processes depends on the specific characteristics of each corridor and the PAs it connects.

## 6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

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

-

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p><b>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b> The evaluation does not make use of the ProDoc indicators because it deems them poorly conceived. Despite that, the TE manages to present a fair picture of achievements and outcomes. Important aspects beyond the formal logframe are identified and assessed (such as policy factors, unintended regional processes and management issues).</p>	MS
<p><b>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps?</b> In spite of much effort and several tools used to establish the project's achievements, the evaluation does not manage to present entirely coherent conclusions in this area.</p>	MS
<p><b>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> The TE includes a section on sustainability, but no rating. It describes the catalytic effect of the project and the sustainability of new structures created by the project. It also makes suggestions on how to arrange financial sustainability after the donor funding is discontinued.</p>	S
<p><b>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> Lessons learnt provide valuable examples that can be taken into account in other circumstances. Most recommendations are more like conclusions.</p>	MS
<p><b>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> The TE includes information on actual total project costs, but cost analysis is very basic and leaves many questions unanswered in a project of sizeable financial resources. For example, there is no information why one of the main sponsors (DANIDA) pulled out from the project. An audit report is in the bibliography but in the text there is no reference to it.</p>	MU
<p><b>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&amp;E systems?</b> The section on M&amp;E systems is brief and limited to assessing the fulfillment of formal requirements of operational planning and progress reporting. Partly this is justified by the fact that apparently the project did not have a functional M&amp;E system.</p>	MU

## 7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.



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

-

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

-