

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3590	
GEF Agency project ID		3882	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Colombia's Coffee Sector	
Country/Countries		Colombia	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Biodiversity SO-2; SP-5	
Executing agencies involved		National Federation of Coffee Growers of Colombia (FNC)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Humboldt Institute; Colombian Institute of Technical Standards (ICONTEC)	
Private sector involvement			
CEO Endorsement (FSP) / Approval date (MSP)		October 30, 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		February 22, 2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 2014	
Actual date of project completion		December 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.23	.23
	Co-financing	.12	Not given ¹
GEF Project Grant		2	2
Co-financing	IA own	.3	.3
	Government	2.44	2.87
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	.27	1
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs ²	3.08	3.38
Total GEF funding		2.23	2.23
Total Co-financing		6.21	7.55
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		8.44	9.78
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		June 2014	
Author of TE		Rodrigo Martinez	
TER completion date		1/15/2016	
TER prepared by		Laura Nissley	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

¹ It is unclear if co-financing from the PPG materialized from the TE and project documents

² National Federation of Coffee Growers of Colombia is a non-profit business association.

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project (stated as the “goal” in the project document) was to “conserve biodiversity in Colombian coffee landscapes” (PD pg. 24).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project was to “create an enabling environment for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in coffee production landscapes that contributes to both the livelihood of the local populations and global environmental benefits” (PD pg. 24).

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

There were no changes to the Global Environmental Objective or the Development Objective during implementation.

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 provides a rating of “relevant” for this component of project outcomes. This TER, which uses a different scale, provides a rating of **Satisfactory**. The project’s outcomes were consistent with GEF- 4 Strategic Objective 2 under the Biodiversity Focal Area, which seeks *to mainstream biodiversity in productive landscapes/seascapes and sectors*. More specifically, the project is consistent with Strategic Program 5, *fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services* (PD pg. 24).

The project is also in line with Colombia’s National Biodiversity and Action Plan (NBSAP), which promotes the sustainable use of biodiversity through (1) sustainable management of natural resources, (2) development of economic potential of biodiversity, and (3) assessment of the economic value of biodiversity and its ecosystem services. Additionally, Colombia’s National Development Plan for 2006-2010 identified (1) conservation and sustainable use of environmental goods and services, and (2) generation of income and green employment, as strategic priorities for environmental sustainability. The project’s outcomes are also in line with Colombia’s obligations as a signatory to the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (PD pg. 37).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Satisfactory
-------------------	-----------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for project effectiveness, which this TER downgrades to **Satisfactory**. The project met, and in some cases exceeded, expected results in key areas. Payment for ecosystem services (PES) projects were successfully implemented and the production of certified and verified coffee increased significantly. These efforts directly contributed to an increase in participants’ income. Additionally, human capacity for implementing PES schemes and certifying coffee increased significantly.

It should be noted here that the TE provides a poor assessment of project outcomes and therefore this TER relied largely on the final 2014 Project Implementation Review (PIR) for evidence to support its assessment.

A summary of the project’s achievements, by outcome, is provided below:

- Outcome 1: Increased economic incentives generated by catalyzing payments for ecosystem services to attract and keep farmers committed to growing biodiversity-friendly coffee**
 Expected results under this outcome included the implementation of pilot PES projects for carbon sequestration and hydrological services. Additionally, the project expected to see an increase in participants’ net income as a result of participating in the pilot projects (PD pgs. 24-26). By June 2014, a carbon sequestration project covering three pilot areas (Nariño, Valle del Cauca, and Quindio) was established and certified by the Colombian Institute of Technical

Standards. On average, each beneficiary netted \$87.50 from participating in the pilot project (2014 PIR pgs. 9-11). Additionally, two pilot PES projects for hydrological services were established in the Sanchez-Las Palmas and Toro Basins for controlling sediments and reducing water pollution, respectively. Participants in the Sanchez-Las Palmas pilot received \$13.11/month for establishing landscape management tools on their properties. Participants in the Toro pilot received \$21.32/month for installing technological improvement to their farms (i.e. methods for washing coffee) (2014 PIR pgs. 11-14).

- **Outcome 2: Increased and stable income from certified and non-certified products grown in coffee farms that protect biodiversity of global importance**

Expected results under this outcome included (1) trained extension workers and coffee producers in certification and verification standards, (2) increase in the number of hectares of certified and verified coffee, (3) increase in the total volume of certified and verified coffee traded in the pilot areas, (4) development of market strategies for certified and non-certified non-timber and agroforestry products, (5) establishment of nurseries to facilitate access to plant species that promote conservation on coffee farms, and (6) increase in coffee growers' income (PD pgs. 26-30). By June 2014, 17,879 extension workers had been trained on certification standards in the three pilot areas, 156% of the target. Additionally, 31,130 hectares of certified and verified coffee were developed, 115% of the target. This yielded an 89% increase in the volume of certified and verified coffee traded in the pilot areas. By June 2014, participating coffee growers' income had increased an average of 12%. Additionally, the project assisted in the development of five market strategies for banana, guadua, flowers and foliage, aromatic and medicinal herbs, and citrus and avocado. Six nurseries were also developed, with 580,000 plants of 264 native species (2014 PIR pgs. 15-27).

- **Outcome 3: Strengthened capacities of municipalities to advance landscape-based planning in the coffee producing region to support the economic and ecological long-term viability of biodiversity-friendly coffee farms**

Expected results under this outcome included (1) design and implementation of an information system for biodiversity monitoring, (2) establishment of municipal "conservation corridors,³" (3) trained decision-makers and community leaders in PES for carbon and water conservation, and (4) endemic and threatened species (plants, birds, and ants) remain stable or increase (PD pgs. 30-31). By June 2014, the project had produced a database with biological information on each flora, bird, and ant species at the sites. The 2014 PIR notes that the participating municipalities were aware of the information system, however it's unclear if the municipalities have utilized the system. By June 2014, 1,022 hectares of conservation corridors had also been established, connecting 10,304 hectares of native forests, 168% of the target. Additionally, 50 decision-makers were trained in PES schemes, achieving 100% of the target. By 2014, 26 species of

³ A "conservation corridor" is a conservation area that enables connectivity between coffee landscapes and native forest areas or core conservation areas. Conservation corridors increase the available habitat for biodiversity (TE pg. 30).

endangered plant species; 50 bird species; and 33 ant species were accounted for in project areas (2014 PIR pgs. 28-35).

- **Outcome 4: Successful project outcomes are replicated in other municipalities through strategic partnerships with key stakeholders**

By project end, it was expected that successful PES models would be replicated in up to three additional municipalities in the coffee growing region. Additionally, the project would document successful PES models to serve as a reference for famers and decision-makers on PES project implementation (PD pg. 31). By June 2014, PES models were replicated in nine municipalities, totaling 229.4 hectares utilizing land management tools (2014 PIR pg. 35). It is not evident from the project documents whether a resource on PES project implementation was developed and disseminated.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for project efficiency, which this TER downgrades to **Satisfactory**. The project was completed within the expected timeframe, managing resources and implementing activities efficiently. The TE notes that the project utilized the National Federation of Coffee Growers of Colombia's (FNC) existing network of extension workers which expedited project activities. The extension workers were familiar with the municipalities and had existing relationships with farmers which accelerated negotiations and commitments (TE pgs. 40-41). The TE does note that there were delays in approving the transfer of resources from UNDP and FNC to the project beneficiaries, however this process was streamlined over time (pg. 30).

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
---------------------------	----------------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Likely** for sustainability, and this TER concurs.

Financial Resources

This TER finds the sustainability of financial resources to be **Moderately Likely**. Autonomous Regional Corporations⁴ (CARs) have committed resources for continuing the implementation of land management tools (LMT). In particular, the Valle del Cauca Regional Corporation has allocated \$2.67 million for implementing LMT in their Tri-Annual Plan of Action (TE pg. 27). Additionally, the FNC has

⁴ Autonomous Regional Corporations are responsible for the implementation of policies, plans, programs, and projects related to the environment and natural resources at the regional level (PD pg. 13).

received \$10 million from the KfW Development Bank to expand project methodologies to 59 municipalities (TE pg. 27). At the local level, some of the economic incentives (i.e. LMT and Emission Reduction Certificates) are not sustainable, however the conversion of land use to sustainable ecosystem management should contribute to sustained income growth over time. There is a risk that the market for specialty and sustainable coffee could fluctuate threatening the financial sustainability of the project outcomes (TE pg. 44).

Sociopolitical

This TER rates sociopolitical sustainability as **Moderately Likely**. Key project stakeholders, such as the FNC and CARs, have demonstrated a commitment to the long-term objectives of the project. The TE notes that there appears to be a shift in the CARs' perception of coffee farmers, who were seen less as polluters and agents of deforestation, and more as contributors to the restoration of biodiversity (TE pg. 27). The TE does note however, that some of the coffee farmers were not invested in certification and verification. The farmers agreed that the procedures and tracking tools they learned helped them to improve the overall running of their farms, but viewed the certification process as much more labor intensive than traditional coffee (TE pg. 44).

Institutional Framework and Governance

This TER rates the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance as **Likely**. The institutional capacity of the FNC to incorporate biodiversity into the coffee sector was significantly strengthened as a result of the intervention. Additionally, three municipalities have adopted property tax exemptions which had benefitted 155 farms by June 2014 (2014 PIR pgs. 30-31).

Environmental

This TER rates environmental sustainability as **Moderately Likely**. The TE does not cite any significant and imminent threats to environmental sustainability. However, the TE does note that climate variability can induce coffee production crises, as happened in 2009.

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?

Actual co-financing exceeded expected co-financing by approximately \$1.3 million. Additional co-financing was provided by regional and municipal governments, as well as the Patrimonio Natural Foundation. The TE notes that co-financing was essential for financing project activities, as FNC resources had been decreasing over the last decade (TE pg. 25).

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 experienced minor delays in the transfer of resources from the UNDP and FNC to project beneficiaries. Overall, this did not affect the project's timeline.

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:

The TE does not directly assess the degree of country ownership over the project. The project was implemented at the regional level, and the significant involvement of Autonomous Regional Corporations and municipal governments in the facilitation of project activities reflects that (Midterm Review pg. 67). The national government provided financial support through the Ministry of Agriculture and Sustainable Development and the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development.

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 provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for M&E design at entry, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The results framework outlined in the project document is logically sound, and includes outcome indicators, baseline values, targets, verification mechanisms, and risks and assumptions. The indicators were largely SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and timely), however the Midterm Review noted that some of the indicators were not sufficient for measuring the intended outcomes of the project. For example, change in the number of endemic and threatened species in the conservation corridors was not sufficient for measuring the intervention effects on biodiversity (Midterm Review pg. 26). The M&E plan outlines general M&E activities, such as day to day monitoring, periodic monitoring by UNDP, annual reviews, and a midterm and final evaluation. The M&E plan also indicates the responsible parties, budget, and timeframe for each M&E activity. In total, \$129,000 was allocated for M&E at the design phase of the project. Although there were moderate shortcomings in the M&E plan, it was largely appropriate for the project.

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

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for “M&E plan execution,” which this TER downgrades to **Satisfactory** for M&E implementation. A review of the annual PIRs indicates that the M&E system was operational and data was collected regularly and consistently for most of the performance indicators. This data was used to track progress toward outcomes and substantiate ratings in the annual reports. Additionally, a Midterm Review was conducted in 2012 which provided a number of recommendations to improve the project intervention, including changes to the project’s results framework. For example, the Midterm Review noted that the indicator for capturing changes in biodiversity (i.e. change in the number of endemic and threatened species by biological group in the conservation corridors) needed to be adjusted and data needed to be collected at the farm level as well (pg. 50). It does not appear that the project adjusted the indicator to better capture changes in biodiversity, but the project did begin collecting data at the farm level, establishing baseline values in 2012 and collecting comparative data in 2014. Additionally, on the recommendation of the Midterm Review, the project incorporated an additional indicator to capture changes in economic incentives (i.e. number of municipalities that adapt policy instruments that promote biodiversity conservation in coffee farms, through economic incentives). Overall, M&E implementation was satisfactory, despite minor shortcomings.

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: Satisfactory
---------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for “quality of application of UNDP.” This TER downgrades the rating to **Satisfactory** for quality of project implementation. Overall, the project design was sound and supported by a diverse group of stakeholders from the coffee sector. The TE notes that UNDP and FNC coordinated well over the life of the project and UNDP responded to issues that came up during project implementation in a timely manner (pg. 19; 35). UNDP also provided supervision over the

financial management of the project. The TE does note that there were some delays with the transfer of funds between UNDP, FNC, and project beneficiaries due to tensions between the “demands of a rural economy” and the procurement procedures of both UNDP and FNC. For example, small disbursements to extension workers required the same disbursement procedures as transactions of higher values which led to delays and higher transaction costs (TE pg. 35). However, these delays did not affect the timeline of the project or the achievement of project outcomes by the completion date.

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

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for quality of project execution, which this TER downgrades to **Satisfactory**. The project management team was embedded in the existing structure of the National Federation of Coffee Growers of Colombia (FNC), and consisted of a national coordinator and support staff; three regional coordinators; and three extension leaders. The Midterm Review noted that the FNC had an extensive and credible network in Colombia, which positioned the project to effectively reach beneficiaries in a cost-efficient manner (pg. 24). The FNC was also proactive in establishing new partnerships to facilitate project activities and seeking additional co-financing. As noted above, the project experienced some inefficiencies in the transfer of funds due to the procurement procedures of both UNDP and FNC. This did not however affect the achievement of project outcomes in the long term, and the project was completed on time.

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.

By June 2014, 31,130 hectares of certified and verified coffee were developed (Quindio: 9,521 hectares; Valle del Cauca: 9,998 hectares; Nariño: 11, 614 hectares) and conservation corridors covering 1,022 hectares had also been established, connecting 10,304 hectares of native forests. Additionally, 26 species of endangered plant species; 50 bird species; and 33 ant species were

accounted for in project areas (TE pgs. 22-23). Six nurseries were also developed, with 580,000 plants of 264 native species (2014 PIR pg. 27).

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 project provided a number of economic incentives (certified and verified coffee; payment for ecosystem services projects; market strategies for non-timber and agroforestry products) which resulted in an average net income increase of 8% (TE pg.22).

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

By June 2014, 17,879 extension workers had been trained on certification standards in the three pilot areas—Quindio, Valle del Cauca, and Nariño (2014 PIR pg. 20). Additionally, 50 decision-makers were trained in payment for ecosystem schemes. Moreover, the capacity of the National Federation of Coffee Growers of Colombia (FNC) to incorporate biodiversity in the coffee sector was strengthened (TE pg. 37). The FNC has now integrated the concepts of biodiversity and use of land management tools into their environmental guidance for coffee (TE pg. 40). The FNC also has the capacity to measure changes in native species, which contribute to improving the environmental quality of the farm, reducing production costs and diversify revenue (TE pg. 49).

b) Governance

By June 2014, three additional municipalities (Filandia, Arboleda and Ansermanuevo) adopted property tax exemptions for areas under conservation (2014 PIR pgs. 30-31).

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.

The TE does not cite any unintended impacts that occurred by project end.

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.

Replication of payment for ecological services (PES) models was a key outcome of the project. By June 2014, PES models were replicated in nine municipalities, totaling 229.4 hectares utilizing land management tools (2014 PIR pg. 35). Additionally, Autonomous Regional Corporations (CARs) have committed resources for continuing the implementation of land management tools. For example, the Valle del Cauca Regional Corporation has allocated \$2.67 million for implementing LMT in their Tri-Annual Plan of Action (TE pg. 27). Additionally, the FNC has received \$10 million from the KfW Development Bank to expand project methodologies to 59 municipalities (TE pg. 27).

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 states the following lessons learned (pgs. 53-54):

- The project lies within the conceptual framework of sustainable livelihoods used internationally to describe different aspects of vulnerability of people, [in particular the social, political and economic processes that influence vulnerability]. The assets that minimize vulnerability include financial, physical, human, natural and social capital. Social capital was strengthened with this project and is an element that could be valued with the same methodologies as another contribution of the project to reduce the vulnerability of the participating populations. This also ultimately contributes to poverty alleviation. The recognition by farmers and ranchers that their activities affect populations in the lower basin, and their attachment to the land and pride in their work, are sources of social capital strength that could be properly valued in future projects.
- When considering potential for replication of projects and scalability, project designers should consider the conditions and circumstances of the municipalities and should think of making an assessment of institutional capacity to indicate the feasibility of the Mayor's involvement. This should be done prior to the investment of human and financial resources. To pursue strengthening Mayors on spatial planning can be expensive and yield undesired results for any project with these characteristics, as evidenced as well during the implementation of GEF-Andes

project in the 2000s and again in this project. However, this should be seen as a call to look for different forms of engagement with mayors.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE states the following recommendations for “future work that accentuates the main objectives” (TE pgs. 52-53). For other recommendations regarding the “design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project,” as well as recommendations for “further strengthening the project benefits” please refer to pages 49-52 of the TE.

- The generated knowledge and human resource capacity that was built for five years of the project must be preserved. Having a group of extension workers who have provided a comprehensive service, e.g. in assisting the farmers with conservation of biodiversity and environmental management of the farm in addition to the usual advice given to improve productivity, varieties, fertilization, pest and coffee quality, is of great value for the FNC. There are very few models of integrated extensionism in Latin America and the Caribbean and FNC include this in its sustainability coffee policies.⁵
- The development of a program for mainstreaming biodiversity in the coffee sector that transcends the vision of pilot project to a line of work with and annual budget would be an important gain towards the sustainability. This could be articulated under the umbrella of the Climate-Smart strategy for the coffee sector of the FNC.
- The methodologies built on this project could be incorporated into the Command Control and Guidelines of the FNC, which are the basis for technical assistance activities used with farmers. These guidelines should promote comprehensive extensionism where the farmer can benefit from not only production but also an environmental technical assistance.⁶
- For a replica project or program the Technical Management (Gerencia Tecnica) of the FNC should evaluate the need for conserving part of the staff that worked for the project. Much of the knowledge of the project is in the human resources who worked here.
- This project would have been a good opportunity to have a ministerial agenda with a permanent task force coordinated by MADS [Ministry of Agriculture and Sustainable Development] and MARD [Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development]. This task force will help advance the dialogue about the importance of biodiversity in productive sectors. UNDP could lead and perform as a facilitator of a dialogue and development of plans, programs and projects with an

⁵ This recommendation was originally designated as a “lesson learned” in the TE. As it reads more like a recommendation, the TER moved it to this section.

⁶ This TER interprets this recommendation to suggest that the FNC should incorporate or mainstream the methodologies used by this project (i.e. certification and verification standards) into their guidelines.

inter-sectoral vision. It would have been beneficial if early on the project both the MADS and MARD, had had more interaction and field experience with the activities implemented.

- Despite the fact that there was no conceptual approach in the formulation of the project to adaptation to climate change; it is wise that the project can highlight its contribution to adaptation and climate variability of the LMT [land management tools], for example in terms of improvement of water quality and quantity, biocontrol, diversification of income sources, and strengthening of social capital among others. This information could be also attractive to certain donors. This analysis could be led by MARD in its agenda for low carbon agriculture. Meanwhile MARD should bring to the attention of the Colombian Agricultural Institute (ICA) lessons learned from the project.
- It is important that the MADS adopt the results of this project, and divulge the good practices in the country in initiatives such as Amazon Vision and internationally, to help channel funds that may strengthen the results achieved in the project area or extend the impact to more municipalities. For example by approaching the Colombo British Chamber of Commerce or other funders that are interested in encouraging private sector to invest in such initiatives. The international offices of International Affairs of FNC and MADS could lead this initiative together.
- It is recommended that at the Interagency Committee meetings of the project, other productive sectors such as palm, cocoa and cattle ranching are considered under a jurisdictional level plan.
- On the international stage it is suggested that UNDP and MADS include lessons learned and good practices of this project in REDD + project proposals.
- The MADS noted that the concept of the project can be deployed to support the actions of Biosphere Reserves in the Andean belt and Sierra Nevada. UNDP, MARD, MADS and National Parks could follow up on this topic.
- In order to have a better participation of mayors the FNC suggests working with larger development packages that are not just environmentally related but include housing, health and education. On this point there is a role to play from the MARD and other relevant ministries.
- Another way to raise the interest of Mayors is through contests or public recognition for Mayors for incorporating LMT.

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 provides a poor assessment of the project's outcomes and impacts. The effectiveness section provides a handful of observations without any supporting evidence.	U
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report provides very little evidence except for four impact-level indicators. Most of the evidence presented in this TER was gathered from the 2014 PIR and Midterm Review.	U
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report provides an adequate assessment of project sustainability, except in terms of environmental risks. The information presented is also poorly organized.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned and recommendations presented are extensive. However, many of them are not tied to the evidence (or lack thereof) presented in the report.	MU
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, except for the PPG stage.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report provides no assessment of the M&E design and very little information on implementation.	MU
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).

Midterm Review (August 2012)