Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2020

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3266	
GEF Agency project ID		609364	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		FAO	
Project name		Management of Chimborazo's Natural Resources	
Country/Countries		Ecuador	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		BD SP-4, BD SP-5	
Executing agencies involved		Provincial Government of Chimborazo	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		EcoCiencia (as partner, co-financier)	
Private sector involvement		None	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		1/11/2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		3/2/2012	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		1/1/2017	
Actual date of project completion		5/1/2018	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.10	0.10
	Co-financing	0.20	0.20
GEF Project Grant		3.87	3.87
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	2.89	4.55
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	3.20	3.06
	Beneficiaries	0.10	0.28
	NGOs/CSOs	0.25	0.15
Total GEF funding		3.97	3.97
Total Co-financing		6.64	8.08
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		10.61	12.25
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		October 2018	
Author of TE		Clemencia Vela, Warren Olding, Lavinia Monforte, Carlos Tarazona (FAO Evaluation Office)	
TER completion date		6/5/2019	
TER prepared by		Cody Parker	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Neeraj Negi	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	MS		MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML		MU
M&E Design		MU		MS
M&E Implementation		MU		MU
Quality of Implementation		MS		MU
Quality of Execution		MS		MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report				S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The global environmental objective of the project was "to conserve and sustainably manage Chimborazo's *paramos* and the biodiversity of the mountain ecosystems and to improve local livelihoods through strengthening of policy, legal and institutional frameworks and local awareness, capacities and incentives for participation in planning and sustainable natural resource management" (PD, ii).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's development objective was "to re-establish and sustainably use the agrobiodiversity and ecosystems of the *paramos,* and to improve food sovereignty of the local indigenous population dependent on Chimborazo's mountain ecosystems by applying modern watershed management approaches" (PD, ii).

This was to be achieved through three "specific objectives" which form the project components:

1. Conserving the *paramos* and related highland ecosystems
2. Strengthening of the management and conservation of the Chimborazo Fauna Production Reserve
3. Capacity building of the Chimborazo Provincial Council for sustainable natural resource management.

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

No changes are reported.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 **Relevance**	Rating: Satisfactory

The TE rates relevance as Satisfactory. This TER also rates relevance as Satisfactory.

The project's objectives are in line with national and local strategies and policies, especially the National System of Protected Areas and the provincial Land Use Development Plan. The project addresses a high-priority issue for local communities, namely the preservation of high micro-basins where environmental services are decreasing (TE, 23). Given its focus on *paramo* ecosystem conservation and integration of biodiversity into natural resource management, the project is also consistent with GEF's biodiversity focus on "conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the maintenance of ecosystem services". The project's capacity building- and policy strengthening-focused approach was sensible considering the threat posed to the ecosystem by small-scale unsustainable agriculture practices, especially given the project's synergy with existing provincial initiatives in a supportive local political environment.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The TE rates effectiveness as Moderately Satisfactory. This TER also rates effectiveness as Moderately Satisfactory, considering its achievements in improving land and water management and strengthening the legal framework despite unsatisfactory outcomes in agrobiodiversity promotion and unsatisfactory economic benefits.

Component 1: Conservation of *paramos* and associated ecosystems. Activities under this component were implemented as planned: planning of water basins in the community; organizational and institutional strengthening; pilot interventions (sub-projects identified in the micro-basin plans); compensation mechanisms for environmental services; and optimization and rationalization of water usage in the province. The organizational/institutional strengthening activity involved the creation of Co-management Committees, which were integral to the execution of the other four activities through the implementation of 226 subprojects across 5 river micro-basins (TE, 29). The Co-management Committees also served as the platform for land/water management trainings reaching 1,093 participants across 111 communities. In total, 40,000 ha of land were reported as protected/under improved management, yet the TE found that this was an over-reporting as much of it was either already protected before project start or was due to other projects; even if accurate, it falls far short of the target of 113,000 ha (TE, 36-37).

A significant output of Component 1 was the pilot implementation of a compensation scheme for environmental services: an inter-institutional agreement between irrigation boards, the electric

company, and irrigation users has enabled the mobilization of compensation funding for environmental subprojects in one micro-basin, and 79 compensation agreements for *paramo* conservation were signed with landowners. Both of these activities were supported by a "massive" awareness campaign, which nonetheless failed to instill an integrated understanding of the landscape. The agroecology subprojects, for instance, were not focused on agrobiodiversity using native seeds and conservation as a strategy for climate change adaptation, as envisioned in project design (TE, 29). This was attributed to a lack of capacity within the execution unit and a failure to synergize sufficiently with another GEF agrobiodiversity project in the area. Furthermore, socioeconomic benefits from many subprojects were lost due to a lack of follow-up support for commercialization, etc. (TE, 38).

Component 2: Strengthening of the management and conservation of the Chimborazo Fauna Production Reserve. The component contained five actions towards this end: i) elaboration and negotiation of a national plan for the management of Vicuña [a native livestock species recently re-introduced] in Ecuador; ii) development of local capacities and supply of equipment to capture and shear vicuña; iii) building of priority infrastructure and its equipment; iv) study of the Reserve and its buffer zone; and v) development and implementation of the co-management plans for natural resources in the Reserve and its buffer zone. These activities were achieved, and the project overall had a strong impact on improving conditions and capacities for the raising of vicuña, which is less environmentally stressful than other types of livestock. The establishment of a Working Group composed of local and international experts was particularly helpful in updating strategies and regulations for vicuña management as well as training and study tours. The study carried out by the project was crucial to the development of a new management plan for the Reserve which was being implemented at the time of TE, although ownership is reportedly low on the part of managers of the Reserve who were insufficiently involved in the development of the plan (TE, 35). This component also strengthened the Reserve through the construction of an environmentally friendly cafeteria and an upgrade to the visitors' center to promote flora and fauna conservation within the Reserve, although one "control house" built along a rehabilitated trail reportedly caused environmental damage as it was being built, suggesting inadequate planning (TE, 31). In addition, these activities received no follow-up and it is unclear whether the cafeteria is financially sustainable or the visitors center is actually impacting conservation of flora/fauna.

Component 3: Capacity building of the Chimborazo Provincial Council. This component focused on three activities: training to develop policies and regulations on natural resources management that consider biodiversity conservation; training programs on methodologies and tools for natural resources management; and monitoring of natural resources management to assess the state of biodiversity and natural resources. The project successfully contributed to the development of province-level regulations on: accreditation in all processes related to prevention, control, and monitoring of environmental pollution; sustainable management and conservation of paramos and other fragile ecosystems; and compensation mechanism for environmental services (expected to be approved shortly after TE). This nonetheless falls short of the four regulations/policies targeted in project design, and their approval was delayed due to a national mandate for local governments to update their land use development plans, which had to be completed before regulations could be included (TE, 33). In addition, for unspecified reasons, the local university had difficulty developing five planned training modules, which were not

ready until the end of the project. This component met its target of establishing monitoring systems for water and land quality across the province, which as a result now features the largest hydrometeorological network in Ecuador. However, monitoring of biological natural resources was not included in the monitoring network as envisioned in the project design (TE, 93).

Overall, the project managed to execute most of its activities, and generated positive impacts particularly with regard to sustainable use of water resources, strengthening of the legal framework for conservation, a new management plan for the Reserve, and mechanisms and networks facilitating participatory dialogue on environmental information and conservation among a broad range of stakeholders, including local communities. However, agrobiodiversity and biodiversity monitoring were not supported as strongly as envisioned in project design, subprojects did not provide sustainable economic benefits, and the project's overall impact on *paramo* conservation is uncertain, especially as some of the area reported as protected was likely the result of prior initiatives or different projects, and no information was able to be gathered on the efficacy of the isolated patches of *paramo* that were protected by the project (TE, 36-37).

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory

The TE rates efficiency as Moderately Unsatisfactory. This TER also rates efficiency as Moderately Unsatisfactory due to significant delays and slow execution of project funding which negatively impacted various activities including training and approval of regulations.

The first funding disbursement was made 5 months later than expected, leading to a delayed start (TE, 39). The project activities subsequently experienced delay of more than a year due to problems with contracting and national purchasing processes. Despite this, there was still $530,000 of GEF grant unspent at the the end of the project (TE, 41). Delays in contracting, including contracting for building of infrastructure and economic activities for vicuna, meant that a large amount of funding was spent only at the very end of the project -- 20% of GEF funds were executed in the final 6 months -- leaving no possibility for technical support or follow-up (TE 4, 39). Insufficient risk analysis and mitigation measures during project design are faulted in part for the delays, as is the monitoring system which did was not adequate to guide implementation based on the situation on the ground and made it more difficult to remedy the project's slow execution (TE, 93). The OPIM modality was complex and difficult to operationalize due to inadequate staff training. Consequently, use of this modality was also a cause of inefficiency.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: Moderately Unlikely

The TE rates sustainability overall as Moderately Likely. This TER rates the sustainability to be Moderately Unlikely considering the fragility of political support, lack of steady economic benefits from subprojects, and overall low acceptance of agrobiodiversity promotion among beneficiaries.

Institutional: The project received strong support from the provincial leader (Prefect), who is taking measures to institutionalize and continue some of the project's achievements, including the environmental services compensation scheme and the water resources management measures, through

the post-project hiring of three staff for follow up. However, elections in 2019 could jeopardize this support. In fact, elections are held annually and this high turnover in general may lead to an erosion of commitment at the provincial government level. Furthermore, there is a risk that the continuation of project activities will follow a sectoral rather than multisectoral approach due to the close links developed with the provincial Environmental Coordination rather than the Planning Coordination (as expected in the project document), leading to insufficient integration of biodiversity and socioeconomic needs. However, this may be mitigated by the positive collaborations that have developed between various government bodies and other organizations (TE, 52).

Financial: Despite the currently strong political support, dwindling state resources resulting from economic recession since 2016 may threaten the continuity of community subprojects, with some provincial and local authorities affirming that budget cuts will limit their capacity for continued support. (TE, 53).

Sociopolitical: Beneficiary communities received training and support for environmental protection in production processes, but not in commercialization of products or compensation mechanisms for environmental services (as envisioned). There was a lack of business partnership development in several of the business projects developed. As a result, the sustainability of many of these socioeconomic achievements is in question as beneficiaries are unlikely to be able to cover the cost of operations and maintenance through the early years without continuing support (TE, 53). The agroecology projects did not adequately integrate agrobiodiversity, e.g. the use of native seeds, as targeted in project design; as a result, an understanding of agrobiodiversity and its role in food security was not instilled among beneficiaries. Extreme poverty, not significantly mitigated by the project, continues to threaten the conservation of the *paramo* ecosystem. Nonetheless, the project was well received by beneficiaries, especially with regard to its water management aspects which are of great concern locally (TE, 56).

Environmental: The project enhanced the environmental sustainability of the RPFCH through the development of new management plans and measures to reduce impact from visitors. However, the grave threats posed by climate change and extreme poverty were not adequately considered in the management plans (TE, 53).

Overall, the continuation of project benefits rests on continued high ownership by the provincial government which cannot be relied on, especially given its increasingly limited budget and the unpredictable nature of the political system. Long-term benefits from agroecology subprojects are unlikely, meaning the increase in food security and re-establishment of agrobiodiversity is in doubt. Therefore, sustainability is rated as Moderately Unlikely.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Mobilized co-financing of $8.1 million exceeded the anticipated total of $6.4 million. This mostly reflects higher than expected contributions from the local and national government. No clear reason is given for the increased co-financing, although the TE mentions that the OPIM modality facilitated it through strong coordination with the government (TE, 4). No specific impact of the increased co-financing on the project is reported.

The TE expresses concern regarding beneficiary co-financing. All beneficiary communities had to contribute co-financing in order to participate in the project, which could mean that those most in need of the project's achievements were excluded (TE, 44).

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project was extended twice, first to September 2017 and then to April 2018. Delays were primarily caused by slow contracting of technical staff and overall slow execution of resources due to national purchasing processes (TE, 39). Because of the delays as a large portion of funding for some of the economic and policy activities was only used at the end of the project. As a result, the affected activities did not receive the expected follow-up support during the project implementation duration.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

Little is reported about country ownership at the national level. At the provincial level, the government showed strong support, especially as the project was in line with the Prefect's regional development plan. A higher-than-planned local government co-financing contribution also demonstrates the high level of provincial ownership. In some respects, it could have been better; it is reported that managers of the Chimborazo Fauna Reserve demonstrated weak ownership of the management plans developed, although it is unclear whether this is their fault or the project's for not including them fully in the process. Overall, country ownership was strong, although high political turnover due to elections may threaten it in the long term.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately

Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 **M&E Design at entry**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The TE rates M&E design as Moderately Unsatisfactory. This TER upgrades the rating to Moderately Satisfactory due to the overall adequate M&E plan despite some issues with indicators and the lack of a detailed budget.

The M&E plan in the project document lays out a detailed schedule for production of various monitoring reports and independent evaluations (MTR and TE), as well as technical and co-financing reports. Institutional responsibilities for monitoring are clearly defined. Indigenous communities are to be included in the M&E process, although the mechanism for this inclusion is not explained. Key indicators and intermediate indicators are defined and are mostly SMART and include means of verification and responsible monitoring parties. An exception is the two key indicators for the development objective, whose targets refer to income benefits and community involvement in conservation practices 3 years after project end; no provision to monitor these targets is specified. The M&E plan also includes no detailed breakdown of its $189,000 budget, although the midterm and terminal evaluations are budgeted alongside other project activities (due to lack of breakdown, it is unclear whether their cost is included as part of the $189,000) (PD, 61). Despite these issues, the project's M&E plan was overall detailed and coherent with the logic of the project. Therefore, M&E design is rated as Moderately Satisfactory.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory

The TE rates M&E implementation as Moderately Unsatisfactory. This TER concurs with the rating.

Planned reports were submitted and the PIRs are detailed. However, the TE concludes that the quality of information gathering to track progress towards targets was poor, which contributed to insufficient adaptive management. Following the midterm evaluation the project should have established new indicators for certain aspects of the project to ensure adequate focus on the objectives, especially regarding agrobiodiversity, as the agroecology projects supported did not end up promoting agrobiodiversity and the use of native seeds, leading to concerns that the importance of agrobiodiversity in food security was lost on many beneficiaries. Some midterm recommendations were accepted while others, e.g. update of the logframe, were not, apparently due to lack of qualified M&E staff; no management response was made to clarify which recommendations were accepted and why (TE, 45). A consultant was hired to determine the level of achievement of the project's indicators, but this took place towards the end of the project and could not contribute to adaptive management or learning during implementation (TE, 45). Considering these shortcomings, M&E implementation is rated as Moderately Unsatisfactory.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 **Quality of Project Implementation**	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory

The TE rates quality of project implementation as Moderately Satisfactory. This TER revises the rating to Moderately Unsatisfactory, due mainly to insufficient follow-up and adaptive management.

The project's implementing agency was FAO. In terms of project design, the TE criticized the broadness of the project's objectives and lack of a "clear final objective", which led to varied understanding of the project objectives by different actors. Project design did not include a sufficient examination of pertinent national/provincial norms and regulations, nor the functions of different administrative levels or GEF/FAO's rules, procedures and roles in the project. Along with the lack of training provided by FAO Ecuador to local executors regarding the OPIM management modality, this made it difficult for OPIM to manage the demands and procedures of all project stakeholders. Risk analysis was insufficient, causing the project to be unprepared for the administrative problems that caused delays, and these administrative problems were themselves exacerbated by insufficient attention to inter-institutional arrangements in project design (TE, 8).

While the OPIM was initially planned to be under the authority of the provincial Planning Coordination, for unexplained reasons it ended up being established under the authority of the Environmental Management Coordinator instead. This led to missed opportunities for broader and more integrated implementation of the project, especially with regard to synergy with the provincial Land Use Development Policy (TE, 46). On the other hand, execution through OPIM provided some advantages, notably more effective participation of local communities and facilitation of political and economic support within the government (which led, for example, to higher-than-expected co-financing) (TE, 48).

While FAO provided some support and follow-up throughout the project, it should have been stronger. Although follow-up was discussed at the Inception Workshop with OPIM and the government, such follow-up was not updated to include new staff who joined the project later. Moreover, FAO follow-up was mostly focused at the administrative level (monitoring TORs and PIRs) and in an advisory role, rather than a more active role which could have ensured a more integrated focus of the project. FAO missed some opportunities in this regard; for example, the development of Ecuador's National Strategy for Biodiversity 2015-2020 could have been taken as an opportunity to refocus the project on conservation and the use of native crops and encouraged the Ministry of Environment to adopt a more active role (TE, 47). Overall, the lack of implementation support was a primary cause of project delays and the failure of the project to maintain an adequate focus on biodiversity.

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The TE rates quality of project execution as Moderately Satisfactory. This TER also rates execution as Moderately Satisfactory.

The project was executed by the Chimborazo provincial government through the Operational Partner Implementation Modality (OPIM). While the national Ministry of Environment is indicated as another executing agency in project documents, it does not appear to have been involved directly in the execution of project activities and is listed as a "partner" rather than co-executor in the TE.

The TE does not provide detailed information on the performance of the Chimborazo provincial government in project execution, instead focusing on the advantages and disadvantages of execution through the OPIM modality outlined in the previous section.

Management of risks identified in the project document was neglected by executing staff during project execution, hindered the project's ability to mitigate operational problems during implementation (TE, 47). High turnover of government staff also contributed to delays and slow budget execution (TE, 4). Nonetheless, the Environmental Management Coordinator did a satisfactory and timely job of executing his administrative and supervisory responsibilities including approving contracts, supervising implementation of work plans and leading direct management in the field. Furthermore, the main execution problems (especially the delays and decreased focus on biodiversity) could have been remedied with more active follow-up from FAO, and the TE assesses that the OPIM overall proved to be a "viable mechanism" for project implementation (TE, 57). Considering this and the fact that government staff showed commitment to and ownership of the project despite limited capacity and resources, execution is rated as Moderately Satisfactory.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

Although the project contributed to the legal and regulatory framework for conservation and agrobiodiversity, concrete impacts on environmental stress and status are not reported in the TE. Although the building of water reservoirs and preservation of patches of *paramo* under Component 1 is a "contribution to the *paramo* ecosystem", its impact on biodiversity conservation specifically could not be assessed (TE, 29-30). In total, 21,900 hectares of land are reported by the project as having been

"protected" through various interventions, but some of these may in fact be attributable to other related projects, and no measurable impact on biodiversity conservation due to this protection is reported.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

No significant progress was reported with respect to poverty alleviation, and poverty continues to threaten the conservation of the *paramo* ecosystem. Agroecology subprojects did not result in economic benefits and no follow-up was provided on their long-term effects. Largely due to a lack of marketing support and follow-up, benefits from other economic subprojects (tourism, handicrafts, vicuña wool) were not sustained, even though participants expressed satisfaction with them during the project (TE, 38). The only positive socioeconomic results reported were that some beneficiaries confirmed improved quality of life in terms of health due to an increase in the variety of foods consumed.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

Training for sustainable land and water management was carried out in 111 communities reaching 1,093 participants (739 men and 354 women). Activities for training in the management of vicuna were also carried out including the production of manuals, setup of groups, and a study tour to Peru (where vicuna industry is better established). Due to insufficient monitoring and follow-up, little information is available on the details of these trainings, and it is unclear what sustained impacts they may have (TE, 51). The project also implemented management training, for example for managers of the Chimborazo Fauna Reserve, but the impact of these trainings was limited by high staff turnover (TE, 48). The hydrometeorological monitoring system has improved environmental monitoring capacities, and an inter-institutional agreement led by the provincial government has enabled it to continue for at least two years after project end (TE, 34, 52).

b) Governance

The project's contribution to Chimborazo's legal framework was valuable, strengthening the Chimborazo Environmental Council and regulations governing prevention and monitoring of

environmental pollution, sustainable management of *paramo* and other fragile ecosystems, and compensation mechanisms for environmental services (TE, 33).

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts are reported.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The TE states that replication of the subprojects is "highly unlikely" due to cost (TE, 54). Beneficiaries lack the financial resources for replication and are hopeful that the authorities will provide further support for local non-beneficiaries who were "left behind" by the project. The only project actions identified as being adopted or expanded were the hydrometeorological monitoring system, which the government is sustaining for at least a 2-year period after project end, and potentially compensation mechanisms for environmental services in other provinces (although this regulation was not yet approved even in Chimborazo province by time of TE, it was expected shortly thereafter in 2018).

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The TE does not highlight any key good practices to be applied in other GEF projects, or provide key lessons apart from its recommendations (below).

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

Recommendations for GEF (TE, 58-59):

1. Identify, document and disseminate key positive and negative lessons, and systematize them so that GEF and FAO can apply them in future projects and in the policy dialogue with the Government of Ecuador.

2. The design of future projects should define a clear intervention logic based on a final objective and observing the vertical as well as horizontal relationship between specific objectives (components) to achieve a comprehensive vision.

3. Environmental indicators must be geo-referenced where relevant (to understand the interaction between the local and global dimensions) and have a dedicated budget to be able to report the contribution of each project to the most relevant international, national and subnational environment objectives.

4. Due to the complexity of the requirements and/or of the options that the GEF projects implemented with the "OPIM" modality present during project design, it is important to have an operating manual that clarifies responsibilities regarding the local authorities so that at the start of project operations GEF and FAO procedures and policies are correctly applied in planning, implementation and monitoring.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	**GEF IEO comments**	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report thoroughly assesses project outcomes and impacts as well as achievement of objectives.	**S**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent and ratings are generally well justified. More information could have been given regarding the performance of government as EA.	**S**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report gives an adequate assessment of sustainability along the four dimensions.	**S**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	While the project does not include a "lessons learned" section, the conclusions and recommendations presented are comprehensive and supported by evidence.	**S**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes actual project costs and co-financing in detail.	**S**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report adequately assesses the M&E system, although sometimes conflates M&E design with M&E implementation.	**S**
Overall TE Rating		**S**

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

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