

## 1. Project Data

GEF Project ID	2686
IA/EA Project ID	RS-X1016
Focal Area	Biodiversity
Project Name	Integrated Management of the Montecristo Trinational Protected Area Project
Country/Countries	El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras
Geographic Scope	Regional
Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects	IADB
Executing Agencies involved	Trinational Executive Secretariat of the Trinational Commission for the Trifinio Plan
Involvement of NGO and CBO	Not involved
Involvement of Private Sector	Yes- Beneficiary
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	1- Arid and Semi-Arid Zone Ecosystems 2- Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems 4- Mountain Ecosystems
TER Prepared by	Anoop Agarwal
TER Peer Review by	Neeraj Negi
Author of TE	Evan Green, Alexandre Daoust
Review Completion Date	12/21/2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	7/6/2006
Project Implementation Start Date	8/16/2006
Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation)	8/16/2010
Actual Date of Project Completion	12/14/2011
TE Completion Date	4/1/2012
IA Review Date	
TE Submission Date	9/6/2012

## 2. Project Financing

Financing Source	At Endorsement (millions USD)	At Completion (millions USD)
GEF Project Preparation Grant	0.15	0.15
Co-financing for Project Preparation	0.28	0.28
Total Project Prep Financing	0.43	0.43
GEF Financing	3.50	3.50
IA/EA own	2.18	3.47
Government	1.64	0.04
Other*	1.67	0.64
Total Project Financing	8.99	7.64
Total Financing including Prep	9.42	8.07

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

### 3. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF Evaluation Office TE Review
Project Outcomes	S	MS	Not Reviewed	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	MU	Not Reviewed	MU
Monitoring and Evaluation	HS	MU	Not Reviewed	U
Quality of Implementation and Execution	N/A		Not Reviewed	MU
Quality of the Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A	Not Reviewed	S

### 4. Project Objectives

#### 4.1. Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

"The global objective (or goal) of the project is to contribute to the protection and conservation of globally important biodiversity, natural processes, and environmental services of the MTPA in the Trifinio Region in Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras, and to contribute to the implementation of the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor (MBC) in benefit of population of the MTPA and its buffer zone." (pg. 1, TE)

No changes were made to the Global Environmental Objectives.

#### 4.2. Development Objectives of the project:

"The development objective (or purpose) is to support the initial implementation of the Integrated Management Plan of the MTPA in the Trifinio Region of El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras, through a trinational institutional framework operating in a participatory, integrated and effective manner." (pg. 1, TE)

The project's objective was considered too ambitious. Additionally, there was "factual misunderstanding" in the information during the project design stage; the geographic size of the core zone of the MTPA was thought to be 13,923.86ha but is currently 5,996.3ha. Seven indicators were modified and 4 were deleted. The timing of the change is not specified, but the TE does note that the first time the new set of indicators were presented was in the 2011 PIR, indicating that the change was in the later part of the project.

#### 4.3. Changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities:

Criteria	Change?	Reason for Change
Global Environmental Objectives	No	
Development Objectives	Yes	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious
Project Components	No	
Other activities	Yes	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious

*After the MTE, seven indicators were modified and four deleted*

## 5. GEF EO Assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

### 5.1. *Relevance* – **Satisfactory**

The project is relevant as it addresses OP #1, #2, and #4 (Arid and Semi-Arid Zone Ecosystems, Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems, and Mountain Ecosystems, respectively) under the Biodiversity focal area. According to the TE, "The project is considered quite relevant and aligned with the countries' environmental and biodiversity conservation policies and priorities and both the GEF's and the IDB's policies and priorities in the region. The project sought to address an issue of concern and importance to all countries involved, and their partners." However, according to the TE, project planning was weak as it did not include local stakeholders.

### 5.2. *Effectiveness* – **Moderately Satisfactory**

The effectiveness results are mixed, based on the components of the project, but overall seems to be mostly satisfactory. More detail is provided below, but in summary Objectives 2 and 3 performed well while Objectives 1 and 4 seem to have struggled to meet the expectations.

Objective 1: Legal, territorial, and institutional consolidation of the MTPA

--The objective of having legal, territorial, and institutional consolidation of the MTPA faced challenges and expected results were considered "overambitious". This assessment seems to have happened quite late in the project and therefore seems like an adjustment for a lack of progress. However, the fact that 3 countries are working together trinationally is "considered among the key successes achieved by the project". A potential success would have been the establishment of a Special Trust Fund, but only the outline was developed by the end of the project.

--There is a possibility for increased future collaboration as UNESCO recently renamed the region "Trifinio Fraternidad Biosphere Reserve" and added it as a Biosphere Reserve in UNESCO's Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Program. This was not included as part of the expectations and therefore is considered an unexpected success.

Objective 2: Integrated management of the MTPA for the conservation of biodiversity

--Visitor centers and bridges have been built on the Honduran and Guatemalan sides of the MTPA and roads were improved on all three sides. This objective met expectations.

--Management plans for private natural reserves have been developed, but no management program has.

--According to the TE, "Data suggests that the project supported the implementation of the Association of Private Natural Reserves (the Association), and the institutionalization of the Alianza, a cluster of Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOs) from the three countries, the Trinational Mancomunidad (Manco), regrouping municipalities from the three countries, and

the Cámara de Turismo Sostenible, a trinational tourism institution." This seems to indicate a decent level of effectiveness to the objective, especially as more local stakeholders were being involved.

Objective 3: Sustainable use of natural resources and environmental management in buffer zone and biological corridors

--The partnership with PROTCAFE indicates some positive socio-economic benefit, as explained in the respective section below. There were also several small-scale sanitation projects that were successful. There were about 24 sanitation projects in all three countries, several even led to infrastructure development of latrines, though with some push back from the locals. Additionally, the TE says that 4 workshops for technical assistance for the corridors were organized and 10ha. of reforestation per country were designated, but this is only mentioned once. There was uncertainty as to the area of the core zone at the beginning of the project, which led to confusion among some of the indicators. This objective exceeded expectations as the partnership with PROTCAFE was not initially planned, but led to key results.

Objective 4: Monitoring and investigation of ecological and socioeconomic conditions in the MTPA and its buffer zone

--This objective seems to have failed. There is no monitoring system in place, and baselines were only developed in 2011 (the year the project ended) and are yet to be approved. A research program was started, and 3 of the 15 proposals submitted are being financed. Some data on the project has been made available to the public, but the extent to which it is used is uncertain.

### 5.3. *Efficiency* – **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The efficiency greatly varied during the 4-year duration of the project. Progress was slow during the early years, but staff changes and management improvements in resource management did accelerate the project in the later years. One strength was the project coordinated and created synergies with other projects in the region. However, for the most part, it seems that the project had trouble getting much accomplished in terms of objectives until the management overhaul in the last year and a half of the project.

### 5.4. *Sustainability* – **Medium/Significant Risks**

The TE rates the project's risk to sustainability as 'Moderately Satisfactory'. The foundation of the MTPA is in place, but its sustenance is still based on external stimulus, such as donor projects, as opposed to countries themselves. The likelihood of the external funding is not certain. The outsourcing of core project work to an external private international firm also influenced sustainability as no one national institution or any trinationally-based institution was being directly strengthened. Even though regional institutions have begun working more cooperatively, roles and responsibilities are not clearly defined. The TE also draws attention to

the fact that "although the UMT has renewed its co-management agreements with the ICF in Honduras and CONAP in Guatemala in 2011, it may not have adequate capacity."

## **6. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes**

### *6.1. Co-financing*

- 6.1.1. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by co-financing well integrated into the project?

The activities supported by the co-financing were well-linked and were a significant part of the project; by the end all funds had been spent. Each of the project objectives had a direct co-financing amount associated with it. The initial disbursements were low amounts, but as the project gained traction towards the end, disbursements began to increase. Only the GEF financing and the \$1.16M of IDB financing were well accounted for, but the co-financing coming from other projects and national institutions were less so.

There are some discrepancies within the TE, and between the TE and the information in the PMIS system. The total amount in the bottom of Annex 4 in the TE does not sum properly.

- 6.1.2. 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?

It is hard to accurately assess as the co-financing data is poorly documented.

### *6.2. Delays*

- 6.2.1. 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 was initially a 4-year project, but was extended for 1-year. Much of the success and progress of the project seems to have come during the last year and a half, so it seems to have strengthened the project's outcomes and sustainability by putting the proper management in place.

### *6.3. Country ownership*

- 6.3.1. 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, country ownership was critical to the success of the project's outcomes and sustainability. Three countries were involved: Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador. It is unclear how the project was received initially in these three countries. The trinational cooperation seems to have increased from the beginning of the project, but not without some bumps in the road. One major one was the 2009 Honduran political crisis that threatened the success of this project. Going forward, political stability and good management is going to be key for the sustainability of the MTPA.

## **7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system**

### **7.1. M&E design at entry – Moderately Satisfactory**

According to the project appraisal document that was submitted for CEO approval, setting up the monitoring and research of ecological and socioeconomic conditions in the MTPA, buffer zone and biological corridors system was a major objective. An M&E design was included in the project document, with a conscious effort to select SMART indicators, however, according to the TE, the indicators were not regarded as SMART (Simple, Manageable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely). Implementation of M&E was expected to happen within the first 12 months following the operational establishment of the TMU and use baseline of indicators linked to the Logical Framework.

### **7.2. M&E implementation – Moderately Unsatisfactory**

Part of the project's objective was to set-up an M&E system to allow the trinational governments to track and manage data on the Montecristo Trinational Protected Area (MTPA). Over the 4 years of the project, the agencies have failed to do this. They have come only as far as to set baselines for the monitoring, but no system has been agreed on or put in place. A comprehensive information system, including a GIS, was to be established to consolidate all relevant information products generated by and used for project execution, but this was not executed. Additionally, according to the TE, the indicators were not regarded as SMART (Simple, Manageable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely). Therefore, the M&E system was not used to improve or adapt project performance.

## **8. Assessment of project's Quality of Implementation and Execution**

### **8.1. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution – Moderately Satisfactory**

### **8.2. Overall Quality of Implementation - Moderately Satisfactory**

The project design used a structured logframe framework with 4 objectives specifically defined, 12 activities listed, and 40 indicators created, which indicates that it was well thought out. However, 7 indicators were modified and 4 deleted, suggesting that either the design was overambitious, or progress was lacking and needed to be readjusted. The progress of the project was imbalanced, with a very slow start, but showing quite noticeable progress in its last year (that was the extension). This was primarily due to the change in management; had this been addressed earlier, it seems that a lot more impact could have been made. The TE does not specify whether the slow start was due to poor supervision by the implementing agency or for

other reasons. While disbursement was slow in the beginning, it is unclear whether the slow disbursement was a reason for a slow start to the project, or because a slow start to the project led to a slow disbursement.

The Montecristo Trinational Protected Area (MTPA) was able to bring together representatives from 3 countries to the table, which was one of its primary objectives. The project also showed positive socio-economic impact through its partnership with PROTCAFE. In this sense, the quality of implementation and execution and quality of implementation for the implementing agency is rated as Mostly Satisfactory.

### 8.3. Overall Quality of Execution - **Moderately Satisfactory**

Based on information provided in the TE, several executing agencies were involved, and adequately represented the interests of their respective regions. The lead project executing agency was Trinational Executive Secretariat of the Trinational Commission for the Trifinio Plan (Comisión Trinacional del Plan Trifinio CTPT/ Secretaría Ejecutiva Trinacional (SET)) and was tasked with implementing the key project objective of supporting the "initial implementation of the Integrated Management Plan (IMP) of the Montecristo Trinational Protected Area (MTPA) in the Trifinio Region of El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras". According to the project document, specifically, the tasks were outlined as:

- (i) supervising the execution of the IMP and other activities related to this Project;
- (ii) signing on behalf of the CTPT, agreements with each of the national protected areas authorities delegating the management of the MTPA;
- (iii) administering Project funds based on procedures to be established in the Project Operating Regulations; and
- (iv) coordination with the CTAP

The Trinational Management Unit (UMT), which was created within the CTPT to manage the MTPA, was to be strengthened by the project as a technical advisory body to the CTPT, and there is evidence in the TE to show that it was.

The Technical Assistance Management (EAT), a private firm hired specifically for the project, was to support the UMT. Its role in this project was an area for debate among political representatives, according to the TE, and EAT faced significant pushback from other regional organizations.

## 9. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

Criteria	Rating	GEF EO Comments
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	The TE does a good job of using the Logframe applied in the project creation in its analysis. This allowed for a section by section analysis.
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>	There were some variation between the ratings given and the qualitative assessment in the terminal evaluation. M&E, for example, is one area where the reviewer feels that the TE was generous in its rating based on the evidence provided. No M&E system was put in place even though it was a major objective of the project-- it was rated MU, overall, but the reviewer feels that since this was such a critical component of the project, it should be rated U. The rating for risk to sustainability is another section that the reviewer differed in opinion to the TE.
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	<b>Satisfactory</b>	The TE adequately addresses risks, and gives a reasonable overall assessment.
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	<b>Satisfactory</b>	The TE provides a good summary the lessons learned. These lessons are supported by the findings and conclusions in the TE.
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	<b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>	It does, but it acknowledges that some of the co-financing costs from organizations other than the IDB were not well monitored. Additionally, the numbers in Annex 4 do not add up. The information is mis-aligned with that in PMIS and it is hard to understand what exactly the co-financing amount that actually came in was.
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	<b>Satisfactory</b>	The assessment is thorough.

## 10. Other issues to follow up on

### 11. Sources of information



## Annex I – Project Impacts as assessed by the GEF Evaluation Office

Did the project have outputs contributing to knowledge being generated or improved?

UA

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE BEING GENERATED OR IMPROVED?

According to the TE, while the project seems to have outputs contributing to knowledge being generated and improved, it was through a third-party organization (EAT) that was contracted. The TE does not specify the outputs but the project document notes expectations of knowledge gain in areas of ecology, visitor/tourist communication, conflicts resolution, and knowledge of the biodiversity, best uses of the natural resources, and the economic valuation of its environmental services as a goal. This knowledge and expertise development was lost once the private firm's contract ended because it was the representatives who gained much of the knowledge and developed much of the key products, not the trinational stakeholders. The involvement of a private company was suggested to counter-balance the trinational political context, despite the threat of losing the expertise after the contract.

Is there evidence that the knowledge was used for management/ governance?

No

HOW WAS THIS KNOWLEDGE USED AND WHAT RESULTED FROM THAT USE?

Did the project have outputs contributing to the development of databases and information-sharing arrangements?

Yes

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO INFORMATION BEING COMPILED AND MADE ACCESSIBLE TO MANY?

Information about the project was made available and used publicly at the local, national, trinational and international levels (through websites, bulletins etc.) The web site [www.aguasinfronteras.net](http://www.aguasinfronteras.net) includes some key information about the MTPA that internet users can access. Relevant information is being shared; however, it is not known to what extent it is being used.

Using the GEF PMIS system for data management was also considered, but there is little evidence that data is being used and there is some resistance to sharing information at the technical level among key stakeholders.

Is there evidence that these outputs were used?

No

TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THESE OUTPUTS BEEN USED?

WHAT HAS RESULTED FROM INFORMATION BEING MADE ACCESSIBLE TO OTHERS?

According to the TE, evidence suggests that "there is little awareness of this information and no use in decision making and implementation."

Did the project have activities that contributed to awareness and knowledge being raised?

Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

Part of the project's documented successes is an environmental educational promotion program. The program operated in the MTPA and its buffer zone, and disseminated educational and promotional information about the management and protection of the area. The program involved schools and local ecological advocacy groups. According to the TE, at least 500 families have received environmental education in the MTPA and its buffer zone. "The environmental awareness promotion program was developed and material – including 750 documents produced and printed – is complementary to the regular school curriculum. Activities – including congresses and workshops – were carried out to sensitize school teachers, students and parents in 67 educational institutions."

Environmental sanitation campaigns in 24 communities (6 in Guatemala, 4 in Honduras and 14 in El Salvador), including cleanups and solid waste recycling processes, were also implemented.

Was any **positive** change in behavior reported as a result of these activities?

Yes

WHAT BEHAVIOR (POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE) HAS CHANGED AS A RESULT?

Under the partnership with PROTCAFE, the program under Objective 3 led to latrines and water tanks to be built for the municipality in Metapan, El Salvador. The community was not initially satisfied with the infrastructure and conflicts between the municipality and project representatives caused by communication deficiencies have affected the infrastructure building process negatively. However, there was a adoption of sanitation methods.

Did the project activities contribute to building technical/environmental management skills?

No

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO **TECHNICAL/ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS** BEING BUILT OR IMPROVED?

Is there evidence of these skills being applied by people trained?

No

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

Did the project contribute to the development of legal / policy / regulatory frameworks?

Yes

Were these adopted?

No

WHAT LAWS/ POLICIES/ RULES WERE ADOPTED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

Specific Objective 1 of the project was legal, territorial and institutional consolidation of the Montecristo Trinational Protected Area (MTPA). Under this objective, several activities were mentioned, the main results of which are listed below, but all are still pending:

a) The public and private land ownership in the MTPA has been mapped and the Technical Assistance Management (EAT) final report specifies that the proposal for the MTPA core zone legal perimeter and zoning, achieved through a land census of the area and not a cadastre, and that a consensus was reached concerning the document among the territorial coordinators. However, the document still needs to be approved by the Trinational Committee for Protected Areas (CTAP) and the legal version of the document is still pending.

b) A trinational institutional framework for the MTPA has been agreed by the appropriate national authorities and the CTPT/SET. Regional agreements and national legal instruments supporting the IMP have struggled to pass and have not been legalized.

c) At the end of the project, a Special Trust Fund has been designed, but not yet agreed upon by the stakeholders

Did the project contribute to the development of institutional and administrative systems and structures?

Were these institutional and administrative systems and structures integrated as permanent structures?

**WHAT OFFICES/ GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES WERE CREATED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?**

None were created, but Montecristo Trinational Protected Area (MTPA) was strengthened by building partnerships with the trinational regional organizations.

Did the project contribute to structures/ mechanisms/ processes that allowed more stakeholder participation in environmental governance?

Were improved arrangements for stakeholder engagement integrated as permanent structures?

**WHAT STRUCTURES/ MECHANISMS/ PROCESSES WERE SUPPORTED BY THE PROJECT THAT ALLOWED MORE STAKEHOLDERS/ SECTORS TO PARTICIPATE IN ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE/ MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES?**

Montecristo Trinational Protected Area (MTPA) was strengthened through additional financing and the convening of trinational coordinators. Bringing in a third party, Technical Assistance Management (EAT), to the table allowed for non-government actors to be involved, however, this private international firm was not involved in the project once its contract was over.

Did the project contribute to informal processes facilitating trust-building or conflict resolution?

**WHAT PROCESSES OR MECHANISMS FACILITATED TRUST-BUILDING AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION?  
WHAT RESULTED FROM THESE?**

The strengthening of the Montecristo Trinational Protected Area (MTPA) led to greater cooperation among the trinational countries, Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador. One unexpected output was UNESCO's declaration of the area as "Trifinio Fraternidad Biosphere Reserve" which encourages cooperation to continue.

Did the project contribute to any of the following:		Please specify what was contributed:
Technologies & Approaches	<input type="text" value="No"/>	<input type="text"/>
Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies	<input type="text" value="No"/>	<input type="text"/>
Financial Mechanisms	<input type="text" value="No"/>	<input type="text"/>

Did **replication** of the promoted technologies, and economic and financial instruments take place?

SPECIFY WHICH PLACES IMPLEMENTED WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH.

WHAT WAS THE RESULT IN THOSE PLACES (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did **scaling-up** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?

SPECIFY AT WHAT ADMINISTRATIVE & ECOLOGICAL SCALE AND WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS ADOPTED.

HOW WAS IT MODIFIED TO FIT THE NEW SCALE? WHAT WAS THE RESULT AT THE NEW SCALE/S (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did **mainstreaming** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?

SPECIFY HOW (MEANS/ INSTRUMENT) AND WHICH ASPECTS OF THE TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS INCORPORATED INTO THE EXISTING SYSTEM. WHAT WAS THE RESULT OR STATUS (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did **removal of market barriers** and sustainable market change take place?

SPECIFY HOW DEMAND HAS BEEN CREATED FOR WHICH PRODUCTS/ SERVICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO GEBs.

Based on most of the project's components and/or what it generally intended to do, what type of project would you say this is?

<--dropdown menu

If "combination", then of which types?

&  <--dropdown menu

*QUANTITATIVE OR ANECDOTAL DETAILS ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **PRESSURE HAS BEEN REDUCED/PREVENTED** OR ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **STATUS HAS CHANGED** AT THE DEMONSTRATION SITES AS A CONTRIBUTION/RESULT OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES. FOR SYSTEM LEVEL CHANGES, SPECIFY THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR ECOLOGICAL SCALES.*

Was stress reduction achieved?

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local     Intended (local)     Unintended (local)  
 Systemic     Intended (systemic)     Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

Measured     Anecdotal

Was there a change in environmental status?

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local     Intended (local)     Unintended (local)  
 Systemic     Intended (systemic)     Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

Measured     Anecdotal

Evidence of intended stress reduction achieved at the **local level**

Evidence of intended stress reduction at a **systemic level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at a **systemic level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **systemic level**

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place during the project?

Environmental  No

Socioeconomic  No

To what extent were arrangements in place and being implemented during the project? Briefly describe arrangements.

M&E for impact monitoring was poor during the course of project implementation. The baseline required for project monitoring was only developed in 2011, near the project's end. Its contents have not yet been fully approved, however, the baseline does comprise a significant amount of data to potentially be used and build upon in the future.

To what extent did these arrangements use parameters/ indicators to measure changes that are actually related to what the project was trying to achieve?

A monitoring system has not been put in place, even though a baseline established, to monitor project progress and impacts based on the indicators established in the logical framework. There were close to 40 indicators, some of which changed during the project has some were considered too ambitious.

This was part of Specific Objective 4 and is directly relevant to what the project was trying to achieve, but did not.

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place to function after the project?

No

To what extent were arrangements put into place to function after GEF support had ended? Briefly describe arrangements.

As mentioned above, a M&E system had not been agreed upon or approved by the end of the project. "There are also varying understandings of what a monitoring system should be and who should take care of it."

Montecristo Trinational Protected Area's (MTPA's) research program has been formulated. For example, in May and June 2011, there was a sampling of flora and fauna in the MTPA in coordination with University of Puebla. Additionally, "a research program for the MTPA designed and in implementation and at least three trinational research projects have been carried out". Fifteen research proposals were submitted, and 3 are being financed.

Was there a government body/ other permanent organization with a clear mandate and budget to monitor environmental and/or socioeconomic status?

No

Has the monitoring data been used for management? No

How has the data been used for management? Describe mechanisms and actual instances.

Has the data been made accessible to the public? UA

How has the data been made accessible to the public? Describe reporting systems or methods.

Some information about the Montecristo Trinational Protected Area (MTPA) has been made available to the public, but since little data has been collected, it is not possible to make it available to the public.

"SOCIOECONOMIC" REFERS TO ACCESS TO & USE OF RESOURCES (DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS), LIVELIHOOD, INCOME, FOOD SECURITY, HOME, HEALTH, SAFETY, RELATIONSHIPS, AND OTHER ASPECTS OF HUMAN WELL-BEING .AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, INCLUDE "BEFORE" AND "AFTER" NUMBERS, YEARS WHEN DATA WAS COLLECTED, AND DATA SOURCES.

Did the project contribute to positive socioeconomic impacts? Yes

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply
[x] Local [ ] Intended (local) [x] Unintended (local)
[ ] Systemic [ ] Intended (systemic) [ ] Unintended (systemic)
How was the information obtained? [ ] Measured [x] Anecdotal

Did the project contribute to negative socioeconomic impacts? No

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply
[ ] Local [ ] Intended (local) [ ] Unintended (local)
[ ] Systemic [ ] Intended (systemic) [ ] Unintended (systemic)
How was the information obtained? [ ] Measured [ ] Anecdotal

Evidence on intended socio-economic impacts at the local level

Evidence on intended socio-economic impacts at systemic level

## Evidence on unintended socio-economic impacts at the **local level**

The TE does not provide any evidence of direct socio-economic impact of the components funded by the GEF, but there seems to be some positive impact through PROTCAFE, a project integrated in the Montecristo Trinational Protected Area (MTPA) project as co-financing. The impact was in the region of the Lempa River in Honduras, and came about through the "promotion of sustainable high quality coffee production and marketing linked to environmentally responsible practices, social equity and economic efficiency". According to the case study in the terminal evaluation, 180 beneficiary families and 10 coffee production organizations have been affected by the project since execution started on July 1st 2008. The project helped to establish and commercialize a coffee brand owned by the Trifinio SERTINSA Company. Also, in Guatemala, as noted in the MTE, promotion and regulation of coffee production lowered water contamination through coffee processing for 100 beneficiaries in the buffer zone. Further detail is not provided.

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

- \*The Honduran political crisis showed the importance of strong risk planning and management.
- \*There was a lack of local participation in the design phase of the project, but in the last 2 years, when progress was actually made, local institutions played an increasingly important role in MTPA project implementation.
- \*The project had a highly complex logframe, however, it had to make adjustments to the indicators because they were "overambitious". It seems that the project was more successful when it became more focused and targeted.
- \*Flexibility in management and project design was very important.
- \*Decentralization, by sharing responsibilities with local stakeholders, can yield significant results.
- \*Develop and M&E framework and system early in the project, unlike this case.
- \*Ensure that the main institutions responsible for continuing the project results are directly targeted by capacity building activities. In this case, bringing in the third party firm EAT caused tension with UMT and led to a loss of knowledge building with the stakeholders.
- \*Balanced participation, or at least the perception of balanced participation, is important when working across a region.



Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

In terms of project design, it is recommended that project design include an extensive risk management analysis process, steps be taken to ensure that local actors are strongly involved in the project design process, and future projects concentrate on fewer objectives, focusing on building on successes and a feasible set of expected results.

In terms of project management and monitoring, it is recommended that it become a firm requirement of all GEF and IDB projects to establish a full M&E system and a completed baseline within the first year of project implementation, all project funds, including co-financing and in-kind contributions be required to be tracked throughout project implementation, procedures take place to identify areas for improvement in terms of management flexibility, communication become a greater focus.

In terms of Montecristo Trinational Protected Area (MTPA) management, it is recommended that the roles and responsibilities of involved institutions clearly defined and circulated in a detailed document, discussions on the developed options for the Trust Fund be re-started and that the involvement of the private sector be considered, and the GEF and IDB consider another project in the MTPA region, in order to further trinational coordination and management of the MTPA.