GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

* 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	ML	ML	N/A	MU
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	MS	N/A	N/A	U
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	MS	MS	N/A	MS
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?
No, the terminal evaluation does not adequately evaluate the project's monitoring & evaluation system. The assessment does not adequately cover actual environmental results.

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 Implementation Completion Report (TE).

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

As noted in the Project Document, the overall objective of the project was to "establish the basis for biodiversity conservation through community driven natural resource management in indigenous Dekhuana lands and co-management of protected areas."

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

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)?)

As stated in the Project Document, the goal of the project was to promote biodiversity conservation through "participatory planning, co-management arrangements, piloting of innovative natural resource management practices, and establishing durable equitable benefits sharing in the traditional lands of the Dhekuana People."

The specific objectives of the project as listed in the Pro Doc were:
1. Development and implementation of consensus-based natural resource management plans for Dhekuana lands;
2. Co-management of parts of the Duida-Marahuaca National Park and Alto Orinoco-Casiquiare Biosphere Reserve, under agreement with INPARQUES,
3. Development of complementary alternative food production and eco-tourism strategies ;
4. Strengthening of the institutional capacity of implementing organization

The expected outcomes of the project were:
- Improved community natural resource management, data collection, and planning for Dhekuana communities.
- Improved co-management for eco-tourism, wildlife distribution and park management.
- Improved sustainable development for Dhekuana indigenous communities.
- Improved institutional capacity and management

There were several approved revisions that reduced the scope of project objectives and activities during implementation. Approval was given by the Country Director in the Amended Grant Agreement (9/16/2008).
1. Instead of working with 4 communities as planned, the project concentrated activities in 3 communities.
2. The eco-tourism activity was dropped for logistical reasons (geographical remoteness, access to clean water, etc.) and because of objections from the Dhekuana. Instead of the proposed eco-tourism center, funds were used to construct a community center to house ongoing project related activities.
3. Co-management of the National Park was not feasible due to obstacles presented by INPARQUES, and the associated activities switched to focus on monitoring biodiversity in the Dhekuana lands.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)
	X	X	

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)
	X	X		

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: S

Project outcomes have improved the protection, monitoring, and management of areas of high biodiversity and major natural habitats, communities and ecosystems in the Guiana Shield eco-region. These outcomes support the aims of the GEF Operational Strategy for Biodiversity and the OP's for Forest and Mountain Ecosystems.

Likewise, project outcomes are consistent with COP guidance, as they promote conservation of vulnerable ecosystems and species; build capacity at local levels; strengthen the involvement of indigenous communities; promote environmental and economic sustainability; and assist with identification and monitoring of ecosystems and species under threat. Outcomes are also consistent with the two primary objectives of conservation and sustainable use of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

Project outcomes are relevant to the national aims of sustainable management of biodiversity and conservation of indigenous communities. The outcomes support national efforts to protect critical habitats in the Guiana Shield eco-region, namely the Canaima National Park and Duida-Marahuaca National Park, which lies in Dhekuana lands. In 1992 the Govt. of Venezuela established the Alto Orinoco-Casiquiare Biosphere Reserve, to secure the ancestral homelands and traditional lifestyles of the Yanomami and Dhekuana indigenous peoples. The project has supported this policy through promotion, preservation, and maintenance of indigenous knowledge, innovation and practices as are consistent with the goal of conservation of biological diversity.

b. Effectiveness	Rating: MU

This project has laid the groundwork for biodiversity conservation in the project area and built local capacity so that the Dhekuana can, in the future, better direct sustainability initiatives. The project has developed inventories of flora and fauna, maps of species distribution, hunting and fishing zones, a database of demographic and cultural information, and pre-investment studies of sustainable subprojects. These are all important inputs for creating a future sustainable use plan appropriate for the Dhekuana culture. Some of the project's original objectives were recognized as inappropriate or too ambitious given the 3yr implementation period and limited resources. Despite the revisions to objectives/outcomes, the project still has not been able to successfully complete all the expected activities. Notably, the project was unable to prepare consensus-based natural resource management (NRM) plans, to establish baselines for biodiversity monitoring, and to implement the sustainable development sub-projects. **Therefore effectiveness is rated Moderately Unsatisfactory.**

Project activities were grouped into four components, community NRM planning, co-management of protected areas, and pilot projects for sustainable food production and ecotourism, and project management. Effectiveness in these four component areas is discussed below.

Component 1: Community Natural Resource Management Planning.
The activities under this component have been very effective in enhancing capacity and building a strong foundation for the development of NRM plans. Eleven youth (expected 10) were trained as "bioprospectors." This included training in GPS/GIS, mapping, data collection, and biodiversity monitoring. By the project's close, only six remained in the communities to continue biodiversity monitoring and mapping activities. Demographic, historical, and cultural data was collected creating the first written record of Dhekuana customs, history and territory. Hunting, fishing, and cultivation areas have been mapped (about 162,000 ha in total) based on satellite images and validated by on-the ground surveys. Flora and fauna inventories have been developed for 71 species (325 sightings) and species sighting information incorporated into the maps. These products will be used to develop natural resource management plans for the participating communities. The NRM plans, remain a goal that as the TE report notes, "the Dhekuana are prepared and motivated to pursue, with the help of Otro Futuro."

Component 2: Biodiversity Monitoring (originally Co-management of Protected Areas)
This component has only partially achieved the revised objective of biodiversity monitoring. The original objective of a permanent co-management team, comprised of Dhekuana rangers, was abandoned as the Parks Office (INPARQUES) did not have the financial resources. Following the revision, this component was expected to develop a system for monitoring biodiversity and establish clear baselines for species distribution and population. It's not clear from the TE report that any such system has been developed and implemented, or that solid baselines were established. The project did succeed in constructing three different trails (four expected) for agricultural purposes, for biodiversity observation and for general community use. The eleven bioprospectors were trained in biodiversity monitoring and sample of hunting and fishing yields was cataloged and used to update the species inventories. However, based on the TE report, it's not clear if this sample was representative of total hunting/fishing activity and thus it may not be useful as a measure of species increase or decrease. The TE report also notes that the species inventory developed under

Component 1 is "not sufficient" to form a baseline against which to measure changes in species populations.

Component 3: Sustainable Development Sub-projects
There were significant changes to the objectives of this component. The Dhekuana community objected to eco-tourism, as well as to a sub-project focusing on cultivation of medicinal plants. The sustainable development pilot projects focused on family based food production for local consumption and small scale export to outside markets. Four subprojects identified under component 1 were developed to the pre-investment stage with support from SACAICET, a project partner. Subproject implementation was only partially achieved as significant challenges remain. The geographic isolation of the Dhekuana means that finding a market and getting goods to market is very difficult. It will be necessary to continue working with SACAICET to define necessary and concrete steps to put the subprojects into practice on a broad scale.

The facilities constructed using resources from this component included housing for the resident project biologists during implementation, a plaza for Dhekuana gatherings (assemblies, meetings and social events), and an *Aula Aramare* functioning as a cultural, knowledge and technology center. The Dhekuana and their partners intend to continue using these facilities as a center for training (i.e. technology and methods) where all documents, maps, cultural information and biodiversity data will be kept and managed by a Dhekuana *maestro*, and to provide a space for continued cultural revitalization.

Component 4: Project Management
The TE report notes that the project has taken a "learning by doing" approach to implementation. Based on information in the TE report, this approach has been effective in enhancing the capacity of the executing agency, Otro Futuro, to manage future projects. Otro Futuro was able to develop strategic alliances and leverage resources despite unforeseen obstacles. Overall, the organization has become a stronger and more capable agent for the Dhekuana.

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: MS

The project timeline was affected by initial disbursement delays, which delayed the start of activities. As a result the project was granted a 9-month extension in 2008. As described above, project objectives were also revised, reducing the scope of activities under some components.

Total project costs were $1.430 M, about 30% higher than the $1.1 M budgeted in the Project Document. The actual GEF grant amount was $0.684 M, about 9% less than the $0.750 M originally planned. Considering the project extension and the 30% higher than expected costs, some important outcomes remain unachieved.
The TE report does not breakdown actual project costs by component or activity, however it does cite the geographic remoteness of the area as major factor. This factor, though, clearly should have been a consideration at the project design phase. Transport and access to the site was further complicated by the Govt. of Venezuela's declaration of a "military area" in the Amazonas State (after the project's start). The project was successful in leveraging additional co-financing and support from existing project partners and in attracting support from additional partners, enabling project activities to continue in as timely a manner as possible.
.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes 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: MU (2)

IVIC and government officials have promised to provide technical and financial support for Otro Futuro's team, so that biodiversity monitoring and NRM plans can be implemented. The project has also attracted the involvement of the other NGOs, so that the sub-projects can be implemented. However, the loss of INPARQUES, the Government Parks Agency, as a partner poses an important risk to sustainability of other outcomes. It was not possible for the trained bioprospectors to be integrated into INPARQUES as part-time rangers.Five of the eleven Dhekuana trained as bioprospectors have left their communities. If there is no funding for the remaining, there is a risk they may leave the area to find work.

b. Socio political	Rating: L (4)

This project was part of the Dhekuana's larger goal to demarcate and sustainably manage their ancestral territories. This project has given them the tools and skills to effectively communicate their goals and negotiate with state authorities. They will continue to work with national NGOs to develop a NRM plan, and implement the income/food generating sub-projects. They have also expressed a commitment to sharing the knowledge and technology gained from

this project with other communities. The center constructed as part of this project will serve as a communal repository for all the natural and cultural information collected.	
c. Institutional framework and governance	**Rating: ML (3)**
The Defense Ministry currently controls the area and has thus far supported project activities. Although INPARQUES has not been able to financially support the project, it is still managing the national parks areas and working with the Dhekuana. If the political or military situation changes, this would change the risk rating.	
d. Environmental	**Rating: L**
There is negligible risk of environmental factors impeding the sustainability of project outcomes. The site is located in a remote protected area and access by outsiders is highly restricted.	

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

a. Co-financing. *To what extent was the reported co-financing (or proposed co-financing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by co-financing 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?*

Co-financing--all in-kind, in the form donated equipment, staff hours, software licenses, and aerial transport provided by the military--was critical to achievement of project objectives. The estimated value of this co-financing was $745,000, more than double the $350,000 listed in the Project Document. The co-financing is largely attributable to the aerial transport provided by the Defense Ministry, the estimated cost of overhead (office space, software licenses, etc) donated by the IVIC, additional staff hours donated by the executing agency, and some time dedicated by the Ministry of Health personnel. The aerial transport in particular was critical for achieving project outcomes as the project team Dhekuana would otherwise have been cut-off from. The participation and financial support of two in-country partners (INPARQUES and Simón Bolivar Geographic Institute) was discontinued due to changes in project scope and subsequent amendments to the grant agreement.

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?*

Due to unexpected delays in disbursement of project funds, which delayed initiation and continuous execution of project activities, a 9-month extension was approved. As a result of the initial disbursement delays combined with the geographic above conditions, several activities were delayed.

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

The Govt. of Venezuela has been committed to the achievement of project activities and objectives despite the declaration of a military zone in the area. The Defense Ministry provided help in getting access to the site and contributed aerial transport, critical to getting project staff and equipment to and from the project area. Without Defense Ministry support, the project would not have been able to continue. Other Ministries and IVIC (a government institutions) have co-financed the project and also expressed support for continuing financing so that Otro Futuro can remain operative.

The parks agency, INPARQUES, was supposed to be a major partner, but due to budgetary reasons could not hire the trained Dhekuana bioprospectors as part-time forest rangers. This meant that one of the project's main components had to be revised and a major objective, co-management of protected areas, could not be realized.

At the local level, the project has been highly community driven and as such certain activities have taken longer to implement. Aspects of the project that were clearly and unequivocally supported by the community (such as training, construction of the community center, biodiversity inventories) were quickly implemented. The natural resource management plans have not yet been implemented and sustainable hunting activities have not been defined because of the time required to explain and negotiate the details of the plans. Some project activities (eco-tourism, marketing of medicinal plants) were changed or dropped due to objections from the community. The concerns about NRM plans, eco-tourism, marketing of traditional medicinal plants, were not understood and incorporated into project design before the project began. As noted in the TE report, the Bank could have provided more input on the choice of outcomes as well as on stakeholder participation during the project design phase.

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): S**
The Project Document included a project timeline and a log-frame with expected outcomes and indicators for each outcome. While the indicators were relevant to outcomes, in some cases there were no clear baselines against which to	

measure progress. The Project Document also specifies that a progress report should be prepared every 6 months by the project team, and that annual reports should be submitted to the World Bank after consultation with the project partners including the Dhekuana.

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

The TE report only briefly mentions the M&E plan implementation, noting that "M&E was not implemented systematically according to agreed upon outcome measures (in the Project Document)." Based on evidence from the 2007 and 2008 PIRs, the implementing agency appears to have made an effort to put a project M&E system in place. The executing agency, Otro Futuro is reported to have monitored activities. There is no indication in the TE report that the project team collected data relevant to project inputs, progress, results, or impacts. The TE report does notes in several times that attempts to implement the M&E system and evaluate the project according to the revised log-frame were "inconsistent."

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

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

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 IA for this project was the in-country World Bank team. With regard to project design, the TE report notes that the "original outcome indicators were relatively ambitious" given the grant size, and factors such as the geographic remoteness of the project site, and linguistic and cultural obstacles. Based on information in the TE report, stakeholder consultation during the project design phase was limited. The TE report notes that "the Bank could have provided more guidance regarding choice of appropriate targets." The selection of Otro Futuro as executing agency was appropriate given its technical expertise, but more attention should have been given to it's lack of relevant administrative capacity.

In light of the fact that the executing agency, Otro Futuro had no experience with GEF funded projects, support and guidance from the World Bank team was critical. The TE report notes that IA provided "close supervision to ensure compliance" with GEF and Bank procedures. Unexpected staff turnover in Otro Futuro after the project began meant that the Bank team spent much time rebuilding capacity. In addition, the GEF and CMU provided the technical and financial support needed to fulfill some supervision activities (i.e. advice on technical, financial and procurement matters via a Bank specialist in each area). Based on the evidence in the PIRs (2006-2008) the IA did try to keep the project focused on results, but extensive resources were directed towards developing the administrative capacity of the executing agency. Evidence from the TE report supports this assessment. The TE report notes that the Bank team did "try to push the project along," but guidance to the executing agencies and the Dhekuana "could have more consistently referred to the project brief and design in order to facilitate greater consistency in monitoring and reporting according to original (and modified) indicators."

The Bank team ably managed several unexpected events, including the loss of the National Institute for Parks (INPARQUES) as a project partner and the declaration of the Amazonas State as a military area. The Bank built links with the Defense Ministry that allowed the project to continue, and fostered working relationships with the Food, Health, and Environment ministries that helped accomplish some project activities.

Project supervision was managed from Caracas. Two field supervision missions were conducted during implementation. The Bank conducted a site visit in 2007, and in 2009 met with Dhekuana representatives in a town outside the project area. The Bank repeatedly brought stakeholders together to share knowledge and concerns and sought to advance the project implementation. However, evidence from the 2008 PIR indicates that Bank supervision and monitoring inputs were not adequate for the scope of the project. The missions did not include environmental specialists and the number of missions fell short of what the project team thought was required. Supervision reporting was realistic. Requests for extensions were dealt with efficiently.

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies[1] (rating on a 6 point scale) MU

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.

This executing agency for this project was Otro Futuro, an NGO based in Caracas and largely staffed by researchers

---

[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.

from the Instituto Venezolano de Investigaciones Cientificas (IVIC). The on-site partner was Kyujani Originario, an indigenous people's organization in the Amazonas State.

Throughout implementation Otro Futuro has made consistent efforts to enhance capacities among the Dhekuana and ensure project continuity. The organization has maintained a focus on the project's long-term impacts and supported greater empowerment of the Dhekuana. Otro Futuro was able to cultivate alliances with the government, military, and other partners that allowed project activities to continue even after the declaration of a military zone in the Amazonas. These alliances are also important for the sustainability of project activities.

As noted above, Otro Futuro had no experience with GEF grants and little project management experience. In this regard, there was a learning curve for the organization, which was compounded by unexpected delays in the initial disbursement of funds and staff turnover. Despite significant support and supervision from the bank team, project execution got off to a slow start and implementation was also slow. According to the TE report, Otro Futuro's focus on stated project objectives, outcomes and indicators was weak. No efforts were made to implement the M&E system or measure progress according to the project's log-frame. And, most importantly, communication and dialogue with project stakeholders was inconsistent. Results and findings were not presented to the Dhekuana in a timely manner so as to maintain the project's momentum.

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	Impacts
Data collection and technology transfer to build a modern framework for community based natural resource management planning. Support and training for co-management of protected areas Identification and implementation of sustainable food production and economic development pilot projects. Support to develop capacities of executing agencies and community members.	Natural resource management plans and establishment of hunting blocks for four settlements. Dhekuana youth trained in GIS use for resource management. Dhekuana trained in biodiversity monitoring and participating in park patrols. Sustainable livelihoods sub-projects operational. One conservation and sustainable use long-term plan for the Dhekuana Organization "Kuyujani Originario"	Adoption and enforcement of consensus-based natural resource management plans. Co-management of Protected Areas by indigenous communities and INPARQUES. Increased support for conservation. Sustainable food production/cultivation strategies adopted at the community/household level. Community wide diversification of income sources. Strengthening of institutional capacity	Reduced hunting; no decrease in baseline species levels or in forest cover. Increased land area under sustainable management. Improved health and material status of community members. Reduced human pressure on natural resources in the project area.

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).

Given the nature of the project, environmental results cannot be expected in the short term. The project's focus was on building person and institutional capacities of the local community which would facilitate achievement of environmental impacts in the future. As intended, the project has greatly enhanced the capacities of the Dhekuana to apply modern tools and techniques in improving their traditional resource management practices. This allows them to better interact with

authorities and outsiders in order to promote the conservation of their ancestral lands. Project activities have pushed the Dhekuana to combine modern conservation and information gathering tools with their traditional resource management practices. Youth training has revitalized interest in the traditional Dhekuana culture and it has given them greater authority in their elder-dominated communities. Youth are now teaching their elders about how to apply the new knowledge and technology. Along with this shift in inter-generational relationships, the project has fostered "more self-motivated engagement on the part of the Dhekuana" and strengthened their ability to actively participate in future projects.

Although not intended, the project has strengthened the project management capacities of the executing agency, Otro Futuro. From this experience, Otro Futuro has not only increased its capacity to manage similar projects, but to better visualize and communicate realistic goals for such projects and to work with external donors and other counterparts according to their requirements. They now have increased flexibility and capacity when it comes to grant management and they have become better intermediaries to advocate for the Dhekuana people. Another unintended impact has been the significant amount of interest this project has generated among national NGOs. Several organizations contributed to the project through in-kind co-financing. The project has forged strong links between the Dhekuana and the Center for Investigation and Control of Tropical Diseases (SACAICET), as well the Foundation for the Development of Science and Technology (FUNDACITE). These links are critical for continuing and building upon project activities.

Impact Drivers: Two factors will strongly influence whether project impacts are likely to be realized. One is the level of buy-in from the Dheukana leaders to enforce the NRM plans and limit hunting activities. The second is the success of the sustainable livelihoods sub-projects. These projects must reliably provide alternative food/protein sources for the community in order to reduce dependence on natural resources.

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?**

There are significant financial risks to the sustainability of project impacts. Financially, there is no funding to support the Dhekuana trained as bioprospectors. 5 out of the 11 trained have already left the community, and there is no incentive for those who remain to continue to do monitoring work. Other risks to impacts are difficult to assess. Environmental impacts depend on the sustainability of the NRM plans. As noted above, the level of support from the community for enforcing these plans is unclear. The sustainable livelihoods sub-projects have garnered outside interest and support. It is likely that these projects will be implemented and if successful they will provide the nutritional and income stability required to reduce dependence on natural resources.

d. Evidence of Impact

Question	Yes	No	UA
i. Did the evaluation report on *stress reduction*[2] at the local level (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.			
iii. Did the evaluation report stress reduction at the broader systemic level?		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 *environmental status* 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.			
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			

[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.

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

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

1. Presentation of collected information via consistent dissemination and workshops with community members contributes to more meaningful and sustainable project outcomes. Such consultation and discussion can help identify weaknesses in the project with enough time to address them before project closure.

2. The Dhekuana focus much of their attention on concrete results and tangible products. It is the information about these results and products that they share with their own and other communities, spreading word of project successes and failures and thus affecting participation.

3. The Dhekuana see this project as another phase of the work that they had begun with the original territorial demarcation of the Dhekuana territory in 1993. As such, they have much older antecedents and more far reaching goals beyond the WB/GEF project. It is important for a project to have a good sense of these long-term goals and social context as they constitute an additional force that directs project execution.

4. A Natural Resource Management Plan as conceptualized in western scientific and natural resource management communities does not exist within the Dhekuana culture. Rather, it is considered as a communication tool that would be for those persons who are not part of the Dhekuana community. The Dhekuana believe they already manage their surroundings sufficiently and according to their traditional and ancestral customs and rules. Therefore, the project focused on education and the use of modern tools to generate scientific data that, communicated through the young bioprospectors, could influence the natural resource decision-making patterns and customs of the Dhekuana. However, there is no one figure or group that can impose a management plan on the many different Dhekuana communities, which may have differing goals and preferences for the use of their lands.

5. Strategic cultivation of alliances with other organizations can provide important back-ups and supplements for a project not only in terms of donations of equipment and funds, but also with knowledge-building and other support. In the face of increasing uncertainty and restrictions presented by changing political climates in Venezuela, as well as difficulties associated with accessing the site, such alliances proved extremely useful to help the project advance.

6. It is helpful to conduct an up-front needs assessment to identify an executing agency's potential weaknesses in order to address them adequately and expeditiously so as not to hinder project advancement; as a result, capacity-building for executing agencies can begin during project preparation, during which project objectives (and well-defined activities to achieve them) are elaborated in close consultation with project staff, keeping in mind the capacities and weaknesses of the executing agency itself. In general, it is important that expectations for project achievements be realistic.

7. It should also be noted that close and constant supervision is essential to ensure the success of a complex project dealing with such external challenges as those faced by this one (i.e. distance to project site, political context, etc.).

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

1. When working with local communities and indigenous groups, future projects should focus on demonstrating tangible outcomes in as many stages of the project as possible, in order to encourage positive word-of-mouth communication of project accomplishments and activities. Strategies for promoting project activities along these local communication pathways includes the creation of visual tools and records that can be easily shown and clearly demonstrate project advances, and which can invite continued discussion and collaboration (i.e. species registry and territorial maps). Initiating such a process with such products could also help to counter occasional individual or community tendencies to become relatively closed (or non-communicative) when faced with potential conflicts or information that is not understood.

2. Periodic re-assessment of how project activities are contributing not only to project goals, but also to local community development goals is important to ensure that there is no diversion between the two as the project progresses, since the community will continually shape the project in order to simultaneously achieve their longer-term goals. Continual dialogue during project preparation and implementation will help to align and re-align, when necessary, the long-term objectives with shorter-term activities.

3. Future efforts to work with the Dhekuana and IP in general should strive to approach influencing resource management decisions via the daily resource use activities already practiced. At the same time that a project gives IP tools to make better management decisions, it should not attempt to impose such ends on them if they are clearly resisting, but instead should brainstorm alternative options.

4. Considering the potential challenges to project implementation (i.e. remote location, necessity of permissions to enter the area, need for executing agency capacity-building, etc), and the fact that GEF project activities fall within ongoing efforts by Otro Futuro and the Dhekuana, substantive targets and timelines for achieving them should have been scaled down (if not at project beginning, then at MTR). Training of executing agency staff regarding development of realistically achievable project activities and indicators during the project lifetime could have helped. In addition, when working with weaker executing agencies that have their own specific agendas (either community development/empowerment of indigenous peoples, or biodiversity protection) there may be a tendency for that organization to focus on its thematic strengths during project implementation at the expense of agreed upon project targets. In this sense, it is necessary to provide ample guidance to that executing agency to balance its thematic strength(s) with the multiple foci of the project.

5. In the future, linking GEF projects (especially MSPs) to the Bank's operational work in the area can allow projects to take advantage of shared financial, technical and knowledge support for adequate supervision.

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 consulted.

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? The report contains a thorough discussion of outcomes and impacts relative to objectives.	S
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? **The report is internally consistent; no evidence gaps were noted.**	S
c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The report assesses overall risks using a SWOT analysis and it also assesses the replicibility of the project.	S
d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? The lessons learned are comprehensive and adequately supported by the evidence presented on project implementation.	S
e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The report does not contain actual project costs per activity; a table of in-kind co-financing is included as are the final expenses for the GEF grant	MS

f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems?	U
The report does not evaluate the project's M&E system.	

8. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUTION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.
No other sources were consulted.