

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2016

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3592	
GEF Agency project ID		3989	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Conservation of biodiversity in the indigenous productive landscapes of the Moskitia	
Country/Countries		Honduras	
Region		Central America	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SO2 of Biodiversity Focal Area; SP4 and SP5	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (SERNA)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Beneficiaries: Miskito organizations: MASTA, FINZMOS and communal governments (Territorial Councils and Councils of Elders)	
Private sector involvement		N/A	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		July 15, 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		December 8, 2009	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		November 30 th , 2013	
Actual date of project completion		July 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	\$0.141	\$0.141
	Co-financing	\$0.145	\$0.145
GEF Project Grant		\$2.0183	\$2.0183
Co-financing	IA own	\$0.080	\$0.223051
	Government	\$4.762	\$4.762
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	\$0.025	\$0.025
	Private sector	N/A	N/A
	NGOs/CSOs	\$0.648	\$0.648
Total GEF funding		\$2.1593	\$2.0183
Total Co-financing		\$5.885,000	\$5.883051
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		\$8.0443	\$7.901351
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		July 2016	
Author of TE		Joe Ryan (Team Leader); Rafael Sambula (National Consultant)	
TER completion date		12/21/2016	
TER prepared by		Punji Leagnavar	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's global environmental goal is "to conserve globally important biodiversity in the Moskitia region of Honduras" (Prodoc p.24). It sought to achieve this by developing the capacities of indigenous communities and cooperatives to carry out sustainable management practices, and create production landscapes that reduce deforestation and rates of lost for endemic fauna and flora species. It also worked to develop structures to regulate and enforce conservation-friendly resource use and effective enforcement of conservation laws that reduce the threat of illegal encroachment and harvesting.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective was: "Biodiversity conservation in production landscapes managed by indigenous people in the Moskitia" (CEO Endorsement, p. 1).

The project had listed three project outcomes (ProDoc, p. 24-27):

- **Outcome 1:** Local people have the capacities to apply modified and alternative production systems (subsistence, artisanal and community-based commercial) which favor biodiversity (BD).
- **Outcome 2:** BD-friendly forms of production are supported by an enabling environment of policies and investments
- **Outcome 3:** BD-friendly forms of management in the target sectors are subject to effective planning, monitoring, and regulation in accordance with local norms and national legislation.

The project listed Global Environmental Benefits to be generated by the project, which includes maintaining coverage of the Pine Savanna and Tropical Broadleaved Forest, improving the population status of several species (Green Macaw, *Dicotyles pecari* peccary,

Roystonea dunlapiana palm, and improving the ecological integrity of the lagoon ecosystem and local fish populations (ProDoc, p.30).

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

No; however, the project did change outcome indicators during the mid-term evaluation and APR 2011 and also there was a change to the phrasing of the Outcome #2, whereby from the CEO Endorsement to the PIR 2015 it was 'Outcome 2: BD-friendly forms of production are supported by an enabling environment of policies and investments', and then at the TE it changed to 'Outcome 2: Legal and political environment created for allowing development activities that are compatible with BD conservation'.

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 states that the project was *highly relevant* to the Miskito Region and to conservation efforts to protect this Central American biodiversity hotspot (TE, p.xii).

The project was relevant to National Priorities as well as GEF strategic objectives. As the TE notes: "The project was not only Highly Relevant to the needs of the Miskito people and for protecting the region's rich, but threatened biodiversity, it was also consistent with Government Plans and Strategies, particularly the Plan Nación and the Strategy for Conserving Biodiversity, fit well with UNDP's Strategy and Vision for Honduras and GEF-4's Strategic Program (SP4 and SP5)" (TE, p.1).

For GEF-4 Strategic Programs, the project is relevant to the BD-SP4 and BD-SP5. For BD-SP4 the project clearly supports the 'Strengthening Policy and Regulatory Frameworks for Mainstreaming Biodiversity' because it works with the indigenous community to develop regulations and policy to ensure that biodiversity friendly resource management is supported. The project also focused on fostering markets for biodiversity goods/services by working with cooperatives on alternative income generating activities and improving their market access. This is relevant to BD-SP5, 'Fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services'.

4.2 Effectiveness

Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The project was given a *satisfactory* (S) effectiveness rating by the TE. This overall rating was due to the fact that the project team was able to deliver on some objectives despite the insurmountable challenges and pressures it was faced related to weak government systems, security concerns, administrative pitfalls and logistical challenges. Project accomplishments under each outcome are described below: (TE, p.32-43)

1. Outcome 1: Local people have the capacities to apply modified and alternative production systems that conserve BD
 - The TE rates this as *moderately satisfactory* (MS) as only 2 of the 5 indicators were achieved. However, the TER rates this as *moderately unsatisfactory* (MU) as it finds that only 1 of the 5 indicators was achieved.
 - The project failed to achieve a tax savings plan that would save the cooperatives \$3000 and also be reinvested back into the sustainable forest activities. It also failed to provide any evidence that cooperatives were commercializing alternative timber species.
 - Although the TE states that the project achieved the goal of reducing uncontrolled fires, the evidence points to the contrary. In 2012 it was observed that 14,824 ha of forest was burnt, and in 2014 (towards the end of the project cycle) 64,945.08 ha of forest were burnt, which is an increase of a factor of five (TE, p.34).
 - The project did however, achieve the goal of 10 productive units implementing management plans. By the end of the project, there were 6 cooperatives and 5 in the fisheries sector implementing management plans.
2. Outcome 2: Legal and political environment created for allowing development activities that are compatible with BD conservation.
 - Rated in TE as *moderately satisfactory* (MS) because not all of the results were achieved.
 - One of the results that was achieved is related to supporting local entities with investments. The project originally had a target of supporting 3 institutions/programs/projects with biodiversity-friendly investments. By the end of the project it successfully mobilized funding for 11 biodiversity-friendly productive projects (TE, p.37). As well, the project originally planned to establish 68,000 ha of land use contracts for indigenous organizations, but surpassed that figure for 200,000 ha (tripling the initial target) (TE, p.38).
 - However, other results were not achieved. The project was supposed to increase the number of staff (12 in total) in local forestry, fishery and environmental offices but failed to do so because local agencies backed away from their agreements.
3. Outcome 3: BD-friendly forms of management in forestry and fisheries sectors are subject to effective planning, monitoring, regulation and enforcement in accordance with local norms and national legislation

- TE rates this as *highly satisfactory* as it achieved 4 out of 6 of the indicators. The project was able to increase both the number of people trained in forest/ecosystem management (local forest users, fishers, etc.) and also the conservation areas which were designated by local people.
- The project was able to exceed the original targets for this component; for example, at the end of the project there were 29 designated no-take areas (triple the original target); there were 69 local forest users trained in conservation techniques (twice the original target); and the project increased integrated resource management plans in Auka by more than 136% from the target indicator (TE, p.41).

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

The TE rates the project efficiency as *moderately unsatisfactory* (MU). This was a large part due to the inefficiencies in administration. At the mid-term period, the project administrator resigned and it took over a year to fill the position, which affected the delivery of the project and funds.

Another compounding factor in the delivery of the project, that affected cost effectiveness, was that the UNDP Country Office was inefficient in releasing funding for the project to begin (causing a delay in the start of the project), and this was experienced throughout the duration of the project to the point where it affected the personal finances of the project staff and the activities. “The team went long periods without receiving funds and frequently had to borrow money to make ends meet (TE, p.x)”. There were also political problems (a coup d’etat) that affected the project and caused the project to experience delays.

The project however, was able to raise more co-financing than what was originally stated in the ProDoc.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately likely
--------------------	---------------------------

The TE rates the project *likely* for the overall likelihood of risks to sustainability. It states that the newly formed Alliance for Development of the Moskitia has two important components that will support the sustainability of the project, which is (1) financial resources from at least two key donors which are the Swiss and German Development Cooperation (plus the fact that the national government has committed to raising funds), and (2) it will have a strong focus on governance. (TE, p.xiii). The sustainability of project outcomes hinges on the success of Alliance, and not on the evidence that communities are going to continue the project activities independent of the Alliance (i.e. acknowledgement from the communities that they would continue with alternative income generating activities, there would be enforcement of no-take zones, etc.). The Alliance has also yet to define its specific activities, and donors have only committed funding, not disbursed funding. Because of these reasons the TER rates the sustainability of outcomes as *moderately likely*.

The following are the rating for each dimension provided by the TE reviewer:

- **Financial resources** – *likely*; bilateral development donors have committed to financing the new Alliance which continues the objective of the GEF project
- **Socio-economic** – *likely*; the local shareholders who have been trained in income generating conservation techniques (e.g. alternative fishing gear, protecting macaw, etc.) will most likely continue to engage in these activities and the communities will be protected under new schemes such as the Inter-Governmental Commission
- **Institutional framework and governance** – *moderately unlikely*; although the TE rated this as moderately likely, there is no indication that the governance issues related to better local enforcement of Mosquito areas has been resolved; nor is there evidence to show that the various local governments that hindered the success of the project have shown greater interest in seeing it continue. These two pieces are essential institutional framework and governance pieces that effect sustainability.
- **Environmental** – *unable to assess*; the TE does not mention any environmental risks that could pose a threat to the sustainability of the project

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?

The project met its co-financing obligations of US\$ 4,384,190 million. In the end, \$143,051 in additional co-financing was mobilized by the UNDP TRAC to finance the project. There were however some challenges to meeting the co-financing amounts initially. The ProDoc initially had the beneficiaries providing a matching requirement, but then the project team realized that would be a challenge considering the high poverty rate in the community. Therefore, the PRONEGOCIOS project had to readjust its disbursement requirements in order to provide their financial support.

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?

There were a few project delays that affected the efficiency of the project delivery. First, the country experienced a 2009 coup d'état which delayed the start of project implementation (an unforeseen political risk). The TE notes that this caused a delay in project activities due to the difficulties in getting the local Miskito communities and the government to come to an agreement on how to continue with the project. The Miskito leaders did not accept that the SERNA (Honduras Department of Biodiversity) would take a lead role in the project implementation (TE, p. 25).

The project was scheduled to close on 1 November 2013 but an extension was granted through the end of March 2015 due to this relatively poor implementation rate (it was only 72% at the PIR in 2013).

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:

Lack of country ownership was one of the major challenges affecting the outcomes and sustainability of the project. The TE identified weak governance systems as a hindrance to obtaining the project objectives. Throughout the project there were critical times when the government needed to exercise its authority in protecting local laws (overfishing, illegal land seizures), however it did not. "Despite repeated calls for government assistance to reduce pressures on biodiversity, the government provided little support and it failed to take action until the end of the project.... the lack of government intervention to confront these problems created an unlevel playing field from the start and the ET rates the government ownership in the project as being *Unsatisfactory* (U)." (TE, p.1)

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 Unsatisfactory
-------------------------	-----------------------------------

The TE determines the project M&E design at project startup to be *satisfactory*. However this TER rates it as *moderately unsatisfactory*.

There were many shortcomings in the M&E design. The TE states: "The log frame was in place, although few of the indicators were SMART and assumptions were superficial, thereby making it difficult to conduct a results-based M&E" (TE, p. xii). The TE also states the inherent weaknesses in the M&E design that most of the expected outcome indicators were weak and most were formulated as *outputs*. There were only 5 that could be considered outcome and they did not meet SMART criteria (they were not time-bound). For example, *Increase in the number of permanent technical staff in local offices of forestry, fisheries and environment authorities*, was an outcome indicator to measure Outcome 2: 'BD-friendly forms of production are supported by an enabling environment of policies and investment'. Another example is: *Increase in the number of forestry cooperatives that maintain up to date and accurate financial records* as an outcome indicator for Outcome 1: 'Local people have the capacities to apply modified and alternative production systems (subsistence, artisanal and community-based commercial) which favor biodiversity (BD)'.

The MTE exposed these weaknesses in the M&E system, and the project reformed and eliminated several indicators after that point. One of the other shortcomings were the absence of indicators for gender for the project, one of the key GEF corporate objectives.

The total budget for M&E was \$118,777 and there was no indication that this was not sufficiently funded (ProDoc, p. 39).

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

The TE determines the M&E plan implementation to be *moderately satisfactory*, “M&E documents were in place, although the reporting on PIRs was sporadic, but there was no results-based M&E as generally practiced by other UN agencies” (TE, p. xii). This lack of a results-based M&E framework prevented best practices and lessons to be captured and there was a general consensus that it generally led to less flexibility throughout the project to adjust and refine its framework as circumstances changed. (TE, p. 26).

The quality of the M&E process, particularly the PIR, was also in question in the TE. The PIR was based on interviews in English which limited the review to only a few people. The monitoring approach was sometimes met with delays due to technical difficulties (such as getting cameras to record wildlife) or administrative delays (in one case a technical partner was not able to submit a report on time, which led to a one year delay in monitoring a specific indicator) (PIR 2015, p.7).

The M&E design at the time of the project document also included a list of impact indicators and global environmental benefits that were not monitored throughout the duration of the project.

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 an overall *satisfactory* (S) rating for Quality of Project Implementation. This TER rates it as *satisfactory* as well. This rating has to do with both the quality of the project design and the quality and oversight of the Implementing Agency, UNDP.

With regard to the oversight of UNDP, although the project was able to accomplish many of its goals and targets, the administrative inefficiencies of UNDP created delays in project delivery and

implementation. “Inefficient project administration and financial disbursement by the executing agency during the last year of project implementation further compromised the technical team’s effectiveness to operate in the field” (TE, p. vi). The TE however, states that the project was still able to maintain a satisfactory rating because the project was still able to function under such extreme conditions and political instability.

In regards to the project design - The TE spoke about the inherent weaknesses and assumptions that were placed in the logical framework, which affected the implementation of the project. “Although the ProDoc was developed using excellent background information and good baselines for several species, its logical framework was flawed as it places great emphasis on timber products and a source of income by supporting the cooperative model... Considerable emphasis was placed (on marketing and selling timber that was centered on a model built around cooperatives, reflected in the disproportionate number of indicators for outcomes #1 and #2 indicators)” (TE, p. vii). The major considerations that affected the project meeting its potential were not flagged in the original project design, for example “...incongruent sectorial policies, clouded transparency and poor information sharing were not considered, even though they are at the root of the problems facing the Moskitia” (TE, p.9).

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

*This rating and description is for UNDP.

The original Executing Agency was SERNA, the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment in Honduras. However this changed in 2009, when UNDP was forced into a Direct Implementation Modality mode, whereby it played the function of both IA and EA. IA through a Direct Implementation Modality (TE, p.19). The project moved into this modality because the MASTA (the organization that represents the Mostikia) took a political position against the Government of Honduras and SERNA after the coup; the government also had weak ownership of the project and failed to confront the illegal landscape grabbing and destruction, one of the major obstacles to achieving project outcomes. It was also decided that UNDP assume this position to maintain neutrality in the project and mediate conflicts between the Mostikia and the government (PIR 2013).

Although the technical staff was highly competent and effective, weak administrative support from UNDP Country Office during the last year resulted in inefficient financial disbursement that affected the overall effectiveness of field-related activities. The project staff “survived by taking out loans and continuing their work despite these difficult conditions that the very executing agency imposed on them” (TE, p.20). Despite this however, the active involvement of the Country Office’s Resident Representative in the last year and a half of the project helped overcome this weakness and the project was able to become justifiably more effective with their involvement (TE, p.viii).

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.

The TE states that there was *significant* impact with regard to 'Environmental status improvement', and that the project has generally reduced pressures on biodiversity and other ecosystem services, and have improved planning and management which have led to better protection (TE, p.53). Specifically, the project has: (a) put 5,000 hectares of pine forest under management; (b) created the environment where red macaw populations are steady in and around Mábita, and (c) developed a management plan for the Karatasca Lagoon, where management interventions (i.e. sustainable fishing) are leading to direct impacts (TE, p. 45). The Karatasca Lagoon management plan was a significant environmental change, whereby at the start of the project there were no aquatic areas under management, and at the end the Karatasca Lagoon system, encompassing 104,000 ha., had a management plan (TE, p.29). The plan was based on local norms and regulations, and provided alternatives to unsustainable fishing, establishing quotas for different species, developed zoning and 29 no-take areas (TE, p.40)

Environmental stress reduction was rated as *minimally significant* by the TE (p.53). The TE concludes: "The level of environmental stress is still high, mainly due to the presence of terceros, the lack of jobs, poor education and health services. Until these are addressed, the problem will continue to be volatile" (TE, p.40).

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 TE explains that the project introduced income generating activities which were biodiversity-friendly. These activities such as scientific tourism and alternative fisheries both reduced pressure from stressed fish species and also created more than 6000 seasonal jobs each year (TE, p. 46). One of the income generating activities used biodiversity-friendly "suriperas nets" to catch shrimp. This generated income and reduced pressures from overfishing (PIR 2013, p.32,34,43).

Although initially not included in the project design, the project was able to incorporate women and capacity building activities for women through training and workshops. These workshops have strengthened the capacity of women in the Miskito and has led to more women being in territorial and communal assemblies (TE, p. 17). The project trained more than 2x the number of shareholders than originally targeted, and half of these were women (TE, p. 42).

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:

One impact that was reported in the TE was that the project was able to translate the International Labor Organization Agreement 169 into Miskito, which gave the Miskito a legal tool for which to negotiate issues related to indigenous rights to their territories (TE, p. 36). The TE states: “...the entire process helped inform and empower the Miskito community about their land rights and that any titles that the government gave to *Terceros* were invalid. As a result, this agreement became a tool that empowered the Miskito community to be duly informed about any concessions affecting their territory...” (TE, p.38).

b) Governance:

The TE describes one of the “greatest achievements” of the project to be the issuance of land titles to the Territorial Councils. This has paved the way for the Miskito communities and cooperatives to be formal owners of the forests; and can be used to legally defend their territories, something that had previously been at risk and was one of the impetus for the project in the first place. Another impact was the 2016 institutionalization of the Alliance for the Development of the Moskitia which was an agreement between the President of Honduras, the Representative of the UN, and Representatives of the Swiss and German Development Cooperation to improve the well-being of the Moskitia. (TE, p.46).

Another significant governance impact arose when the largest of all territorial council (FINZMOS) formulated a community-based norm/regulation that protected over 300 000 hectares of land (TE, p. 38).

And yet another impact is considered to be the institutionalization of the Alliance for the Development of the Moskitia. The organization that provides the opportunity to continue the mission of the project beyond its lifespan, and that has guaranteed funding for the next ten years (TE, p.46).

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 mention any unintended impacts.

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 does not mention adoption of GEF initiatives at scale.

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 provides some critical learned lessons for the GEF in relation to local biodiversity projects, one of the major lessons, repeated throughout the document is that the “one-size fits all” model for remote, community-based biodiversity projects can only be successful if there is a strong governance system. Other learned lessons are:

- The TE suggests that potentially GEF agreements need to be made on conditions to the government agencies that are involved. “Future donor-funded projects should develop both incentives and penalties for engaging partner countries to assume greater ownership and they must insist that projects are designed in a way that will help overturn the general lack of political will that is common in these kinds of projects” (TE, p.x).
- Future work in remote areas with weak traditions of governance run the risk of failure unless issues related to governance, enforcement and rule of law are addressed; when governance issues arise, new partnership models should be explored; projects in similar remote areas with similar contexts may take much longer to achieve than the GEF funding period
- Adaptive management approaches can be better at collecting lessons and can potentially improve the efficiency of projects; unless there is a robust M&E system in place from the project design, it can be difficult to course correct and revise decisions and actions in a timely manner
- Transparent and open communication with beneficiaries was fundamental for this project to succeed; complementing that is also that supporting culture-specific

- knowledge can empower communities, especially when women and marginalized communities are integrated
- Administrative delays (disbursements, appointments, hiring, etc.) can have a significant impact on effectiveness

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provided several recommendations based on the findings of the project. The TE recommends that:

- On project design and implementation:
 - Projects should develop a responsive, results-based M&E system that is capable of detecting failures early; not waiting until the mid or terminal evaluation to correct course; exit strategies should also be built into the project design
 - The administrative capabilities of the UNDP Country Office has to be improved so that financial payments can happen in a timely manner
- For future GEF projects:
 - The project gives a model for projects facing logistical challenges (e.g. projects in remote areas, lack of accessibility to funds, weak government, etc.)
 - Future projects located in remote areas need additional financing, time and human resources to meet objectives
- Specific to future projects in the Moskitia region:
 - Better governance (national, regional and local levels) need to be thoroughly integrated into the project design.
 - Incentives should be made to engage government shareholders and foster greater ownership specifically in the Moskitia
 - Income-generating projects should focus on working at the family or kinship level using the Community Forestry Development model (not the forestry cooperative modality)
 - Future projects in the Moskitia should further strengthen opportunities for women to play an even greater role in building resilient ecosystems.

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 contained a detailed analysis of the outcomes, impacts and achievement of objectives. For example, the TE walked through each indicator and whether or not it was achieved. It provided data points and evidence for most of the indicators.	HS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and	The report was mostly consistent, providing evidence that supported the ratings. However, there could have	S

convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	been more data points provided in the justification of ratings.	
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Project sustainability was overwhelmingly assessed using only one factor which was the creation of the Alliance that would continue project objectives even though it has yet to begin or be defined; the TE could have discussed or considered more at length other factors that affect sustainability of outcomes.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The TE did a good job of describing lessons learned and supporting them through evidence.	HS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Although the TE included a breakdown of the final budget, it did not disaggregate according to project activity and final donor. Nor did it include co-financing budget breakdown per activity.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Overall the quality of the TE concerning project M&E systems was robust and good	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).

The additional resources used were:

The project's Mid-term review.