

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		348	
GEF Agency project ID		550	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Biodiversity Conservation in the Darien Region	
Country/Countries		Panama	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP-3: Forest Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Autoridad Nacional del Medio Ambiente (ANAM)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Not involved.	
Private sector involvement		Not involved.	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) / Approval date (MSP)		5/1/1991	
Effectiveness date / project start		5/22/1994	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		12/1/1999	
Actual date of project completion		1/1/2001	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0	0
	Co-financing	0	0
GEF Project Grant		2	2
Co-financing	IA own	0	UA
	Government	0.5	UA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	UA
	Private sector	0	UA
	NGOs/CSOs	0	UA
Total GEF funding		2	2
Total Co-financing		0.5	0.63
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.5	2.63
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		5/2001	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Rosario Arias Peña and Peter R. Wilshusen	
TER completion date		September 2014	
TER prepared by		Shanna Edberg	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	HS	n/a	n/a	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes	n/a	n/a	n/a	U
M&E Design	n/a	n/a	n/a	U
M&E Implementation	n/a	n/a	n/a	U
Quality of Implementation	n/a	n/a	n/a	U
Quality of Execution	n/a	n/a	n/a	U
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	n/a	n/a	n/a	MU

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's global environmental objective according to the Project Document (PD) was to protect and conserve the biodiversity of Darien National Park. The forest, which was declared a Biosphere Reserve and a World Heritage Site, is threatened primarily by conversion to pasture and farmland. The project would protect the remaining forest cover through sustainable management and capacity building of park management.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

Note - the original PD was not available at the time of TER review. The development objectives that follow were taken from UNDP's 1996 Project Implementation Review document:

1. To systematically increment existing knowledge regarding the distribution and abundance of flora and fauna in two areas within the Darien National Park and in one adjacent to it.
2. To identify, catalog, and evaluate the different uses of forest resources by the various indigenous communities inhabiting the Darien National Park and its adjacent areas, as well as determining the actual and/or potential degree of impact by productive activities, both small scale and large, on existing biological reserves.
3. To increase existing knowledge regarding the different ethnic groups living in the Darien, particularly their use of resources and productive methods, through the coordination of activities between communities participating in biodiversity conservation programs.
4. To develop the tools and methodologies for an alternative economic valuation of the Darien National Park, based on an inventory of its goods and services, thereby facilitating a review of its management plans to include the management categories and preservation priorities for its most delicate ecosystems.
5. To determine the feasibility of strategies and innovative economic programs, aimed at supporting alternative production practices in selected pilot indigenous communities, including Afro-Panamanian communities settled within the Darien National Park and its critical areas of influence.

6. To increase the knowledge of local Darien population, particularly non-indigenous groups, with regards to biodiversity conservation, its sustainable uses, and the means by which to make equitable the distribution of its potential benefits.
7. To consolidate on-going conservation efforts aimed at protection of biodiversity and the cultural patrimony of the Darien National Park and of the Reserva Forrestal de Canglon-Filo del Tallo, and to implement monitoring, supervision, and enforcement required for conservation.
8. To modernize, update, and render efficient the management and protection of the Darien National Park's resources.

The following are the project's revised development objectives after the project had been reformulated in 1998:

1. To identify, develop and implement participatory planning activities for the protection and sustainable use of the natural resources of the Darien region.
2. To strengthen conservation and sustainable development operations in the Darien National Park and in the Filo de Tallo and Canglón Reserves.
3. To demonstrate the feasibility of sustainable uses for forests and other wild resources.
4. To raise awareness in local communities and promote knowledge on the value of natural resources in the project area.
5. To increase and diversify the basis of financial resources for the conservation of Darien's biodiversity.
6. To increase the local population's knowledge of Darien (particularly among non-indigenous groups), regarding the natural resources of the Darien National Park and its influence zone and its current conservation status.

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

Yes. The project was reformulated in 1998 after four years of implementation. The aforementioned objectives are the new ones that followed the project's redesign.

4. GEF EO 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
----------------------	-----------------------------

This project falls under GEF Operational Program 3, Forest Ecosystems. The Operational Program prioritizes conservation and sustainable use of forest ecosystems, which the project intends to accomplish by demonstrating the feasibility of sustainable forest use, strengthening sustainable development operations, raising awareness of the value of natural resources, and increasing the financial resources put toward the conservation of biodiversity in Darien.

The project also aligns with Panamanian priorities. The project itself derives from the government’s National Environmental Plan, which was formulated in 1990 with the help of UNDP. In the early 1990s, Panama passed legislation such as reforestation incentives, protected area management, and a forestry law. Panama also participated in regional initiatives, including the creation of the Central American Commission for the Environment and Development.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
--------------------------	--

According to the terminal evaluation, the project “has satisfactorily fulfilled the objectives established in the [1998] project document,” although “it did not complete certain activities” (TE, page 13). However, it is clear that the overall objective of protecting Darien National Park was not accomplished and project activities had a minimal impact in this regard.

On an objective-by-objective basis, the first objective on implementing participatory planning activities for the sustainable use of natural resources was considered to be satisfactory by the TE. The project created a database on Darien, organized a workshop on management of the Darien National Park, and coordinated research activities with other organizations. However, the workshop did not have a follow-up plan for implementation of its findings, the database has not been updated or made publicly available, and the research studies were not integrated into the management process of the Darien National Park. The project’s activities were thus “isolated contributions, and are not a part of the park’s action plan” (TE, page 14). The project also did not update the management plan of the park, as the 1998 project document had stipulated. The terminal evaluation states that this component of the project “was not realistic” considering the limited time and resources available after the project’s reformulation (TE, page 15). The project also intended to create “local management support committees of protected areas,” but this did not occur. Instead, the project began an environmental sanitation program, which was not in the 1998 project document. The TE implies that the sanitation techniques were not fully adequate; for example, one of the communities contains an open landfill that was not addressed. The project succeeded in making “different projects and organizations coordinate their activities” in Darien, but “there is still no inter-institutional program to direct support to protected areas in a coordinated and efficient way” (TE, page 15). The TE does not describe the coordination efforts or the effects of linking the various projects operating in the area, and no evidence is provided to support the TE’s assessment on coordination.

Objective 2 intended to strengthen conservation and sustainable development operations in Darien. The project created signs to indicate entry points to vulnerable areas, but the borders of the Filo del Tallo Reserve were not established as indicated in the project document. The TE reports that the signage “had a negative impact...since the local people perceived it as an imposition from the government” and the project had major disagreements with a local conservation organization (TE, page 16). The project organized seven training workshops on environmental interpretation, cartography, databases, participatory evaluation, meteorology, and park ranging. However, the Darien park staff does not have the necessary equipment (e.g. a compass) to apply the training or generate new data. Infrastructure at one park station was improved and the project created a new office for the General Embera-Wounaan Indigenous Council, but the TE reported that operation costs were high.

Objective 3 was to demonstrate the sustainable use of forest resources. The project implemented a microcredit program in four communities, of which three communities were successful in achieving legal status and sustainable processes. However, the project document provides a target of twenty microcredit programs rather than four, and the TE does not state whether these programs fostered improved resource management. The project created organic plantain and yam plantations in three communities, but “there has been a lack of technical follow-up” and the project document stated that programs for five species would be established rather than just two (TE, page 19). Two-hundred and fifty farmers were trained in organic production techniques, and a rice husker and sugar mill were purchased by the project.

Objective 4 intended to raise awareness of the value of natural resources in the project area. The project produced radio programs and translated them into two indigenous languages and implemented an art exhibition on Darien. However, there was no baseline information on public awareness or opinions regarding Darien, and it is therefore not possible to tell whether the awareness programs had the intended effect, although the TE states that “the project has contributed in raising awareness in the communities of the region, government and non-government stakeholders, and to some degree in Panama City residents” (TE, page 21). The project implemented environmental education guidelines and organized a workshop for school teachers on the use of the guidelines. The Ministry of Education intended to update the guidelines and implement them nationwide, but this was not carried out and no schools have received the guidelines. The number of visitors to the Darien National Park increased by 10% between 1998 and 2000, which may indicate the success of awareness raising and improved park infrastructure.

Objective 5 was to increase and diversify financial resources for biodiversity conservation. The TE rates this objective as 100% complete due to the implementation of the microcredit model described in Objective 3, and due to the cofinancing obtained from “the British Embassy, Canadian Cooperation Agency, and Natura, including joint activities with the MIDA-ProDarien Project (FIDA), IDB Darien Sustainable Development Program, the Spanish Cooperation Agency, and the International Cooperative Institute (ICI)” (TE, page 22). The TE does not indicate the purpose or sustainability of the cofinancing, or what the joint activities accomplished.

Objective 6 intended to increase the knowledge of local populations on natural resources and conservation. Reports were published and disseminated on the status of the animal and plant populations in Darien National Park and a database was created, as stated in Objective 1. But “it has not been determined whether these activities have promoted awareness-raising in the local population of Darien” (TE, page 23).

Project effectiveness is rated moderately unsatisfactory due to the lack of completion of multiple project activities, such as the Darien National Park management plan. Many activities that were completed, such as the training workshops and research studies, were not effective because there was no mechanism to ensure that the information and skills would be utilized in the management of Darien.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Unsatisfactory
-----------------------	-------------------------------

Project efficiency is low due to the ineffective first four years of the project prior to its revision (1994-1998). The TE contains very little information on these initial years, and there is no indication if any activities were accomplished. It is clear from the TE that as a result of the project’s first four years, communities strongly mistrusted project staff even after the reformulation of the project in 1998. From 1994 to 1998, “the technical team was unable to establish a reliable relationship with local communities during the project initial stage, resulting in lack of communication with community members and few follow-up activities” (TE, page 25). The TE reports that after 1998, project staff were able to regain credibility in some of the communities, but “non-compliance by the first technical unit had an important impact on the various activities included in the second 1998 project document,” including the shrinking of the scope of the project (TE, page 25). The project end date was extended from 1999 to 2001, but by the end of 2001 many activities remained incomplete or ineffective, as described above. It appears as though four years of the project were lost altogether due to poor management, and much of the remaining time was spent attempting to rebuild trust with the project communities.

The TE also reported abnormalities in the project’s financial management. For the first four years of the project, “proof of expenses was unavailable” in some cases (TE, page 31). The TE also implied that the proportion of resources allocated to field activities was too low (43% went to field activities and 57% to personnel and operational expenses).

Some project components could be considered a waste of time and effort. For example, the seven training workshops that were implemented will have little to no effect because the Darien park personnel do not have the equipment to apply the training. Similarly, the database on Darien has not been updated or used in the park management plan, and park personnel are unable to update it with their current equipment.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Unlikely
---------------------------	-------------------------

Financial: Unlikely; there is no plan for financing protected areas in Darien. The microcredit program that the project facilitated in three communities is neither comprehensive nor sufficient to ensure financial support for the conservation of Darien. The TE cites other ongoing projects in Darien, such as the Inter-American Development Bank's Darien Sustainable Development Program, as sources of financial sustainability, but these claims are dubious without more detailed information on the other projects.

Sociopolitical: Moderately unlikely; one sociopolitical risk is the presence of Colombian paramilitary troops, which pose a public safety threat to local communities and project staff. The project design did not address this risk, and there is no evidence that it was taken into account during project implementation. The high levels of community mistrust reported by the TE pose another threat to sociopolitical sustainability. Although the TE reports that the project team was able to regain credibility in some communities, in other communities the project had to be abandoned entirely. The negative reaction that communities had to the posting of signposts indicating vulnerable areas is another signal of low stakeholder ownership. In addition, the TE also reported "deep differences" between the project team and a local NGO, Organización Salvemos el Filo del Tallo (TE, page 16). The disagreement is not elaborated, but the TE implies that it caused the failure of one of the project components (defining the borders of the Filo del Tallo Reserve). There is no evidence for stakeholder buy-in of the project, and the TE reports a lack of institutional coordination for the support of Darien.

Institutional: Unlikely; stakeholder institutions remain weak. The TE states that "there is no skilled technical team to manage the protected areas," and there is a history of institutional changes and frequent staff rotation in the government's environmental authority (TE, page 26). This weakens the effect of training programs, as skilled personnel are rotated out of protected area management. Although the project created a database on Darien, it is not being updated with more recent information and is therefore a snapshot of the past. The project had some capacity-building components such as workshops, but there was insufficient equipment for Darien park staff to make use of the training. Hence the effects of the training will not be sustained. A new management plan for Darien National Park was not created as planned, so much of the research and training conducted by the project will not be put into use. Lastly, 250 farmers were trained in organic agriculture and organic plantations were initiated in three communities, but "there has been a lack of technical follow-up by specialized agronomists" which puts the results at risk (TE, page 19).

Environmental: Moderately likely; the TE cites the risk of the improvement of the Pan American Highway, which could lead to increased migration and use of ecologically-sensitive areas. No other environmental risks are apparent or mentioned in the TE.

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?

Unable to assess. According to the TE, significant cofinancing was obtained from "the British Embassy, Canadian Cooperation Agency, and Natura, including joint activities with the MIDA-ProDarien Project (FIDA), IDB Darien Sustainable Development Program, the Spanish Cooperation Agency, and the International Cooperative Institute (ICI)" (TE, page 22). The TE does not state the purpose or activities financed by cofinancing. The PIR states that \$630,000 was raised for cofinancing, but does not break down the total into individual donors or financed activities.

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 by two years on a no-cost basis. As described above, the extension was the result of poor performance during the first four years of the project that led to the project's revision in 1998. The two-year extension allowed the project to make some progress in the reformulated activities, but many activities remained incomplete or ineffective at the end of the project. At project start, there was a delay in forming the project's technical unit and in final project approval by an indigenous group (the Embera Wounaan General Congress) that lasted until 1995. The effect of the delay is unknown.

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:

Country ownership appears to be low. The project's executing agency was Panama's national environmental authority (Autoridad Nacional del Medio Ambiente or ANAM), but the TE reports that ANAM staff visits to the project area were less frequent than the project document had stipulated. Also, "ANAM's regional office has dedicated most of its resources to the administration of forest permits" (TE, page 17). The TE does not explain how the lack of visits and attention paid to the project affected project outcomes, but it signals a lack of commitment to the project.

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: Unsatisfactory
------------------------------------	-------------------------------

There is no information available on the original (pre-1998) M&E design for the project. The 1998 project document states that the technical team will design a monitoring program, but does not give any specifics such as a time frame for monitoring activities and outputs. The TE states that there was a “lack of indicators or clearly defined assessment mechanisms” in project design (TE, page 34). The lack of indicators and M&E mechanisms indicates serious deficiencies in M&E design.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Unsatisfactory
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------

The deficiencies evident in M&E design were not addressed during implementation. The TE states that project activities were not subject to regular assessment. Regular meetings and reports took place, but they had “a limited purpose” and became solely information updates or entries in management reports rather than vehicles for monitoring or adaptive management (TE, page 34). Two PIRs are available for 2000 and 2001, but the information contained in them often contrasts with the information presented in the TE. For example, the final PIR reported that all four microcredit programs were functioning successfully, while the TE states that only three were successful.

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: Unsatisfactory
--	-------------------------------

Project design after the 1998 revision was weak, and there is no information available on the original project design. The project design after 1998 did not take into account the lack of equipment available for Darien park staff, which rendered the project’s training efforts unusable. The design also did not adequately plan for project sustainability or follow-up activities, such as a way to integrate the park management workshop and the research conducted into Darien’s management plan.

Project supervision was also inadequate. There was no apparent action taken by UNDP in response to the project’s failures post-1998, such as the incomplete project activities. The financial irregularities and

over-spending on personnel rather than project activities should have merited more attention. There is no evidence to suggest that UNDP took any corrective action after the project was redesigned in 1998.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Unsatisfactory
---	-------------------------------

The project’s executing agency, ANAM, did not demonstrate commitment to the project. ANAM’s visits to the project were infrequent, and the TE reports that most of its resources were committed to forest permits rather than the project’s goals. In addition, poor performance prior to the 1998 project revision caused the communities in the project area to mistrust the project team, which forced the team to spend effort on rebuilding relationships after 1998. Project execution is thus rated unsatisfactory, considering the lack of completion of multiple project activities and the minimal effect of the activities that were completed.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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.

No environmental impacts were 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.

The microcredit program that was implemented in three communities may allow the residents to become more financially independent (TE, page 27). The creation of organic plantations and the provision of a rice husker and sugar mill could also increase community incomes. However, there is no hard data on the impacts of these activities.

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

The project had several activities on capacity-building, but with limited effectiveness. 250 farmers were trained in organic farming techniques. A workshop on national park management was organized, although there was no follow-up to implement the findings into Darien's management plan. The project organized seven training workshops on environmental interpretation, cartography, databases, participatory evaluation, meteorology, and park ranging. However, the Darien park staff did not have the equipment to apply the training to its operations. Infrastructure at one park station was improved and the project created a new office for the General Embera-Wounaan Indigenous Council. The project also implemented environmental education guidelines and organized a workshop for school teachers on the use of the guidelines, but the guidelines were not distributed to schools due to a lack of action by the Ministry of Education.

b) Governance

The only governance change effected by the project was the creation of a database on Darien. However, the database has not been updated or made publicly available, nor has it fed into the management systems of Darien National Park. Therefore its impact is limited.

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 were 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.

No replication or broader adoption was planned or realized.

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 contains the following lessons learned:

Project design must incorporate plans for participation, follow-up, decision-making, assessment, and coordination. Participatory analysis is fundamental for planning, and follow-up must be established.

Early consultation is a first step and democratic processes should be established to ensure respect for communities.

Small projects can have important short-term results. A stable and capable team is essential for carrying out project activities. Implementing agencies should allow some level of autonomy, but a clearly defined technical approach must be followed.

Processes need clearly defined indicators to assess project impact, and monitoring systems should include socio-economic, cultural, and ecological factors.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE recommends the development of a regional action plan for the conservation of Darien, which will extend the microcredit program and coordinate environmental education programs. The project's community programs should be participatory in terms of project design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. The project should develop a technical training program, appoint technical specialists to manage the protected areas, update data on Darien, and strengthen coordination with other related projects. The project should follow good management practices such as conflict resolution processes, regular technical audits, and ensuring resources to field activities.

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 EO 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?	There is almost no information reported on the project's performance in the years prior to the project's reformulation (i.e. 1994-1998). This hindered understanding of the project's effects and performance. Other than the lack of information on the 1994-1998 period, the TE's description of outcomes from the 1998-2001 phase of the project was adequate.	MU
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The tone and ratings of the evaluation do not match the evidence for actual project results; for example, the TE considers several components to be satisfactory even when it simultaneously rates the components as only 50% complete. It also rated the microcredit program as satisfactory, even though it only targeted 4 communities rather than the 20 specified in the project document. Therefore the ratings are not substantiated and seem contradictory.	U
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE places its hopes for project sustainability in other non-GEF projects operating in Darien, without any evidence to support this assessment. Despite this, there is sufficient information throughout the TE to rate project sustainability, even if the TE's section on sustainability was inadequate.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The project's recommendations and lessons learned focus on the creation of a new project for Darien's conservation. The recommendations for a new Darien plan are all things that should have been accomplished during this project (e.g. the TE recommends a capable technical team, strengthened coordination with other projects, and good project management.) Therefore the recommendations and lessons are not very useful and are another indicator of the project's flaws.	MU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	There is some financial information and budget breakdowns, but no information on cofinancing except a list of organizations from which cofinancing was received (but no dollar amounts). The explanation of GEF financing was unclear and contradictory; for example, if 36% of the budget was spent in 1998-2000, that conflicts with the statement that \$1.16 million was utilized in 1998-2000.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Adequate; there was essentially no functioning M&E system.	S
Overall TE Rating		MU

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