

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

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3604	
GEF Agency project ID		3883	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Mainstreaming traditional knowledge associated with agrobiodiversity in Colombian agro-ecosystems	
Country/Countries		Colombia	
Region		Latin America	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SO-2: Strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for the integration of biodiversity (SP 4). Fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services (SP 5).	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MADS) (formally the Ministry of Environment Ministry of Environment, Housing and Territorial Development (MAVDT))	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Association for Rural Development – secondary executing agency Local community associations in all five project sites – through consultation	
Private sector involvement		Natural Heritage Fund for Biodiversity and Protected Areas and Bio-Commerce Fund – through consultation	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		December 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		July 2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		March 2015	
Actual date of project completion		July 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	\$0.350	\$0.350
	Co-financing	\$0.100	\$0.100
GEF Project Grant		\$2.500	\$2.382
Co-financing	IA own	N/A	N/A
	Government	\$4.818	\$1.43
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	N/A	N/A
	Private sector	N/A	\$0.237
	NGOs/CSOs	\$1.896	\$0.285
Total GEF funding		\$2.500	\$2.382
Total Co-financing		\$7.031	\$2.012
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		\$9.531	\$4.394
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		February 2015	
Author of TE		Edwin Yalit Mendoza Parada	
TER completion date		January 17, 2017	
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	S	HS		HS
Sustainability of Outcomes		L		L
M&E Design		S		HS
M&E Implementation		S		S
Quality of Implementation		S		S
Quality of Execution		S		S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		--		MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project objective is to conserve sustainable agro-ecosystems in Colombia through the protection and management of agrobiodiversity and associated traditional knowledge (ProDoc, p.1)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The focus of the project is two-fold (a) to strengthen national policies and regulations in order to mainstream agrobiodiversity associated with traditional knowledge in the agricultural sector (supportive of SP4), and (B) to promote marketing chains for agrobiodiversity products (supportive of SP5).

The four main outcomes of the project are:

1. Agricultural biodiversity (AB) and associated traditional knowledge (TK) will be integrated into national priorities and policies.
2. Agrobiodiversity of global, regional, and local importance will be protected through strengthening traditional practices and access to markets.
3. Local capacity for management of agro-ecosystems and traditional knowledge associated with agrobiodiversity will be strengthened.
4. Decision makers, communities, and organizations will be aware of the value of Agricultural biodiversity and Traditional Knowledge.

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

There were no changes noted to the objectives or activities of the project.

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 project is relevant to the GEF-4 Biodiversity Strategic Objectives, local beneficiaries, and the national conservation strategies of Colombia.

GEF-4 relevance: The project is consistent with the GEF-4 BD-SO2: *Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors*. It supports SP4 ‘Strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity’ since the project focuses on strengthening national policies and regulations to mainstream agrobiodiversity associated with traditional knowledge in the agricultural sector in Colombia. It also supports Strategic Program 5 ‘Fostering markets for Biodiversity goods and services’ because it works to promote marketing chains for agrobiodiversity products. Specifically with SP5, the project has developed activities to promote sustainable practices and market development (such as demonstration activities and certification mechanisms).

Colombia national strategy relevance: The Colombian government has recognized the importance of traditional knowledge and the protection of agrobiodiversity and specific policy recommendations and strategies have been integrated in national plans such as the National 2006-2010 Development Plan, called “Colombia State: Development for All” and the National Policy on Biodiversity. The National Policy on Biodiversity specifically works to incorporate and support the right of indigenous communities in the production and commercialization of local markets, respecting their cultural and traditional rights (ProDoc, p.9).

Beneficiary needs/relevance: Within the Colombian Andean, Pacific, and Amazonian regions many communities recognize the importance of managing traditional knowledge that can preserve biological and cultural diversity. However, these communities have been working to expand these practices under uncertain conditions, operating with few resources and capacity, and little institutional support within the context of a growing competitive market. This project is relevant to their needs as those communities find new ways to adapt to these new markets and growing changes to the landscape from monocrop agriculture and loss of knowledge concerning agrobiodiversity (ProDoc, p.9-12).

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

Overall, the project operated in a highly satisfactory way. Even though it wasn't able to meet all of its targets, it often surpassed many initially defined Outcome targets ahead of schedule. Below is a description of effectiveness according to Outcome:

- *Outcome 1: Agricultural biodiversity (AB) and associated traditional knowledge (TK) will be integrated into national priorities and policies*
 - The project was able to meet all indicator targets indicators that were defined for this outcome, and ahead of schedule (PIR, p.26). These targets concerned policies and regulation instruments that have been adopted by the government. For example, the project was able to meet its target of developing: *1 public policy for protection of traditional knowledge that incorporates knowledge associated with agrobiodiversity and traditional alimentation*. As well, it was able to develop *4 methodologies for Special Safeguard Plans (PES) for traditional knowledge associated with AB for at least one of the pilot areas*.
- *Outcome 2: Agrobiodiversity of global, regional, and local importance will be protected through strengthening traditional practices and access to markets.*
 - The project met almost all of its targets for this outcome. In some cases the project surpassed the initial targets. For example, in 2013 (two years before project completion) it already identified 359,077 hectares in indigenous reserves, civil society reserves, biological corridors and watershed protection areas such as the Community Conservation Areas. The initial target for all the pilot sites was 269,127 hectares. And it exceeded the target of *Number of families that incorporate traditional practices in the demonstration projects*, from 325 to 398 families (TE, p.39).

After the mid-term evaluation, the project changed the indicator *Number of products certified or in the process of certification* (p.3, PIR 2014) to *Increase in revenues from products of AB (organic) certificates that incorporate traditional knowledge (CT)* and had a target of an "increase between 5% and 10% in the income derived from two products". The project recorded an increase of 53% of revenues, thus exceeding its modified target (TE, p.39).

The project also developed targets for each of the pilot sites for the *number of hectares under management systems that contribute to increased AB and associated knowledge in the Amazon, Andes and Chocó through demonstration projects with indigenous, afro, and farmer communities*. Although it wasn't able to meet the targets for each pilot site, it achieved 95% of the initial target, and managed to put 437 ha of land under sustainable management systems instead of 460 ha (PIR, p.9).

- *Outcome 3: Local capacity for management of agro-ecosystems and traditional knowledge associated with agrobiodiversity will be strengthened.*
 - The project met all of its six targets for Outcome 6, and in many instances where capacity building activities involved communities and families, it surpassed the initial goals. For

example, one of its largest achievements was the *Number of families strengthened with traditional practices associated with the handling of the AB*. Initially it had a target of >40 families that integrate traditional practices. At project completion, a total of 429 families were integrating traditional practices. As well, the project set out to train 30 people in the *development and implementation of marketing plans for products associated with the AB and the CT*. It also achieved over this rate, by training 118 members of the pilot communities, achieving a success rate of almost 4 times the initial target (TE, p.48).

- *Outcome 4*: Decision makers, communities, and organizations will be aware of the value of AB and TK.
 - The project also successfully achieved all of the targets for Outcome 4, and surpassed the targets for many of the indicators. Some examples of this are: *Number of staff from partner organizations informed and aware of the importance of the CT/AB* (from a target of 150, to a result of 4,162); and *Number of communication products to inform the public opinion and to mobilize the citizens for the protection of the CT and the AB* (from a target of 15, to a result of 59) (TE, p.42).

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

The project received a *satisfactory* rating in the terminal evaluation, and this evaluation rates it the same. (TE, p.12).

Overall the project was efficiently executed and due to an adaptive management approach was able to adjust indicators and targets when necessary, allowing the project to achieve its targets. In many instances (as reported in the *effectiveness* section) the project was able to achieve those targets ahead of schedule. Most of the outcome targets were met in 2014, one year before the completion of the project (PIR 2014). It did not go over budget and operated within the projected timeframe.

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

This TE rates the sustainability of the project as likely and assesses each sustainability dimension below:

- *Financial sustainability* - The TE notes that financial sustainability is *likely* considering the project has been able to demonstrate the financial value of production systems (TE, p.48). However, it presents a general statement and is unable to illustrate an example of families or pilot sites saying that they will continue the project after completion. Therefore, this assessment in this section, looks to evidence in the MTR for the final rating. The MTR states that because financial resources have not been secured by the project, that generates a financial risk to the project. It states that the financial sustainability of the project can increase to *likely* if the national

government appropriates funds for the project, and at the final evaluation there was no evidence that showed that they were going to do that (MTR, p.12). Therefore, financial sustainability is moderately likely.

- *Socioeconomic sustainability* - The MTR rates this as *likely* due to the capacity building (knowledge on how to manage and ensure the conservation of traditional agriculture and certification) that was raised in the project communities (MTR, p.12). The project achieved many results in building the capacity and knowledge of the families and communities in the pilot sites. The number of community members trained in traditional practices (handling of biodiversity approaches, marketing biodiversity and traditional knowledge products) illustrate that the project was scaling locally to families that it didn't originally intend to work with. This shows that socially it has the opportunity to be replicated and sustained (TE, p. 40).
- *Institutional sustainability* - Institutionally, the project was able to garner support from the various Ministries, local governments and research institutes in the country. Much of the activities that were successfully achieved were related to building the legal, regulatory and policy frameworks necessary to see that the project continues sustainably. An example of this is the realization of 2 Regional Development Plans for the municipalities of Túquerres and Nuquí, and also the formulation of the normative law *Res. 970* in the 'National Policy for Integrated Management of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services' which worked to protect the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

Beyond the specific instances of institutional mainstreaming, the project also developed a rapport between parties that did not have a high degree of interaction before – such as those between public sectors (Ministry of Environment) and local organizations and communities (i.e. the local indigenous associations) (MTR). For these reasons, this TER rates this factor as *likely*.

- *Environmental sustainability* – The MTR and the TE did not note specific environmental risks to project sustainability except for potentially those that are the result climate change.

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 CEO Endorsement had confirmed co-financing from government agencies, ministries, scientific institutions, and private sector organizations in the amount of USD \$7,031,339 (CEO Endorsement, p. 5). However, the project was only able to raise USD \$2,012,894.28, or 28.6% of the total co-financing envisioned. The TE notes that the causes of not meeting co-financing commitments were that several partners executed their activities before the start of the project (so the project could not include their commitment as co-financing), and that others chose to

withdraw from the project. The largest sources that were not fulfilled were from government agencies and ministries (TE, p.26). Neither the TE, PIRs, nor the MTR draw linkages between the lack of co-financing materialized and the achievement of outcomes.

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 was a 7 month delay at the start of the project due to the restructuring of two government Ministries involved in the project (MAVDT + MADS). The activities that were delayed because of this was recruitment of staff and formalizing Letters of Agreement and grants.

In the early stages of implementation there were also delays because of logistical problems posed at some pilot sites. This delayed the achievement of some results and yearly targets, but the project was able to overcome those delays in the last years of the project, from 2013-2014 (TE, p.29). The project documents do not draw the causal link between the project delays and the achievement of the outcomes or sustainability.

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 highlights the efforts undertaken by the Ministry of the Environment to achieve the project results, however it does not reflect on country ownership and the way ownership has affected project results. Likewise, the TE makes general comments about the beneficiaries of the project and their sense of ownership in the project so it is difficult to illustrate evidence about the degree of ownership in 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: Highly Satisfactory
-------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates M&E Design at entry as satisfactory, while this TER rates it as highly satisfactory. The M&E design in the Project Document is robust and well-defined. It has time-bound targets that allow project teams to track and monitor results, sources for verification, and adequate baselines (ProDoc, p.66). The

assumptions and risks that were tied to each outcome indicator were also realistic. For example, for the indicator “Number of families incorporating traditional practices into the demonstration projects” the risks to meeting the target of number of families are that there is an ‘increase in practices that promote monocultures among local communities and relevant actors’, and that ‘climate change alters the agricultural calendar so much that traditional knowledge cannot provide adaptive measures’ (ProDoc, p.68).

The M&E plan is also clearly defined, and the Project Document explains the various M&E roles and responsibilities of specific persons throughout the duration of the project (i.e. Quarterly Progress Reports, ATLAS, PIR, Specific Thematic Reports, etc.) with a corresponding budget (ProDoc, p.46). The M&E workplan was budgeted for USD 81,000.

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

The TE rates M&E implementation as satisfactory, and this TER agrees with that rating. The M&E plan during implementation experienced some drawbacks, albeit minor. It was noted in the MTR that some of the organizations executing the project, such as research institutes, were not made aware of the M&E workplan and therefore could not be involved in the implementation of the plan as specified in the Project Document. It was also noted that the EMT was performed later than scheduled. (MTR, p. 9).

The project documents also state that the total budget for the M&E activities would have been more. It was noted in the MTR that: “While the resources for monitoring and evaluation are considered to be sufficient, greater availability of these resources would have been preferable for the validation of indicators in the project pilot sites” (MTR, p.26). It was not stated if the budget affected the overall delivery of the M&E activities.

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 and this TER rate the Quality of Project Implementation as satisfactory. UNDP Colombia was able to properly administer the project within the respected timeframe, and facilitated the project successfully with the Ministry of Environment (TE, p.10). The TE states that UNDP was able to “properly

administer the UNDP GEF funding, and maintained strict controls on the procurement of goods and services from suppliers and on the recruitment of project staff' (TE, p.23). The project documents do not indicate any major shortcomings in the performance of UNDP in implementing the project. Minor shortcomings were that at the beginning of the project there were some delays in financial disbursement which led to project activity delays, but did not affect the achievement of the outcomes.

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

The Executing Agency for this project was the Colombian Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MADS) (formally the Ministry of Environment Ministry of Environment, Housing and Territorial Development (MAVDT)). The TE and this TER rate the Quality of Project Execution as *satisfactory*.

From 2010-2012 the agency experienced some internal changes as it went through a political restructuring. This ended up in delayed decision making on project activities, hiring of staff on the national team, and formalizing Agreement Letters and Grants (MTR, p.21). However, the TE notes that there was a lot of effort on the part of MADS from the mid-point of the project (2012-2015) to achieve the results and outcomes which it was able to accomplish.

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 environmental impact of the project is that it was able to conserve 354,667 hectares of forests and 437 hectares of agroecosystems of global importance. This was through the management of agrobiodiversity and traditional knowledge (TE, p.34).

The project activities that contributed to this impact were the capacity building, demonstration and uptake of management/ production practices by families and communities. Also, the integration of several associations and partnerships with UAESPNN, Natural Heritage (who have worked on defining zoning areas), and ASOINTAM was able to increase the total number of hectares under protection. (TE, p. 34). The MTR states that: "The project shows verifiable reductions in diversity loss and gain of genetic variability in agro ecosystems. It has generated

positive impacts by improving living conditions through the implemented demonstration systems, and has led to its replication by applying the traditional mechanisms of seed exchange and transfer of knowledge” (MTR, p. 41).

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.

In terms of economic impact and well-being, the project resulted in 53% increased incomes for families that marketed traditional knowledge and agrobiodiversity products (TE, p.39). At least 118 members of organizations in Tarapaca, Nuquí and Nariño were specifically trained on how to increase income derived from production practices associated with traditional knowledge (PIR 2014, p.25). The last PIR also notes that because of the changes in agro-production, there was also improved food sovereignty, and better life quality due to improved nourishment (PIR 2014, p. 13).

The project documents also note that the project was able to strengthen the role of women in the family unit and the overall agricultural production system. The project gave women the opportunity to be leaders in various ways and participate in activities that strengthened also their economic capabilities. These activities were: promoting and recovering traditional seeds, organizing ceremonies, thought gatherings and exchanges on traditional knowledge (PIR 2014, p. 32).

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*: There has been some notable impacts with regard to capacity and the increased capacity of local indigenous communities to partake and replicate traditional knowledge practices. One example of this is that 118 people were trained in developing business plans, which was much more than the initial target of 25 people. This is an indication of the interest and potential replicability this activity has within the same communities and outside (PIR 2014, p.25).

b) *Governance*: This project developed many governance instruments (policies, guidance, regulation, etc.) that can lead to larger impact. Some examples of these are: a policy proposal for the protection of TK associated with AB in Colombia, a legal amendment to a pre-existing law

on the enforcement of CBD, and 3 regional development plans (PIR 2014, p.6-8). The activities in the project that supported these advancements were focused on developing participatory policies with the beneficiaries.

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 project documents do 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.

As mentioned previously, the project was able to reach and train significantly more families than initially targeted which could be illustrative of the scaling of the project within the local communities. However, the project TE does not specifically reference that causal link. Therefore, it is difficult to assess if the project has led to broader adoption.

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.

There are several good practices/ approaches that have been outlined in the project documents. These are listed below (PIR 2014, p.29)

- It is vital to have a permanent technical support team that can work in the pilot sites and also monitor and oversee agreements with local entities and organizations
- Local focal points in the pilot sites can facilitate the flow of information between the project coordination and families/communities
- Standardizing procedures for soliciting advances, disbursements, and legalizations can speed up processes and maintain consistency
- Where no banking exists, there should be ways to adapt processing resources with trustees guaranteed by community organizations
- Establish longer timeframes if the work is being carried out with organizations in remote locations (such as Tarapacá or Nuquí) that only have one weekly flight
- Each entity and institution has their own procedures for hiring and procurement, which is essential to take into account when calculating project timeframes

- It is essential that agreements with community organizations are made through building trust and mutual understanding, in order to understand local conditions of the project
- Projects that seek to influence the adoption of rules and policies at the national, regional or local, must take into account within their assumptions the potential changes in national governments that may affect the achievement of the objectives (TE, p.52)
- The GEF cycle is long and does not necessarily coincide with the administrative cycles of governments which can lead to difficulty obtaining intentions of co-financing
- The community or social organizations that may be more efficient in the management of grants, are those that have the capacity to absorb, subsidize or maintain for themselves the operating and administrative costs of a project

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The brief descriptions below are the most important recommendations that were provided:

**it should be noted that many of the recommendations that the TE provided were very general or the English translation made it difficult to understand the author.*

On shaping the project:

- The M&E plan should include ways to track and verify the compensatory measures provided by the partners of the project
- Projects should take into account a period of at least 6 months at the beginning of the project to dedicate to finalizing administrative details (staff hiring, legal agreements between partners, etc.) or else delays might occur
- Projects that seek to influence the adoption policies must take into account the potential changes in governments that may affect the achievement of the objectives
- M&E plans should be shared with all participating entities and include a sustainability plan (and a way to monitor if sustainability can or will occur)
- The EA should lead processes for tracking and monitoring sustainability and impact (in this case it was MADS)
- The IA (UNDP) should develop a Guide to Procedures that can be shared with all institutions involved, presenting the administrative structures of the project

On financial planning:

- The Implementing Agencies should aim to harmonize the cycle of the GEF projects with administrative cycles of the national and local governments
- The UNDP Country Office must have a more active role in demanding financial information for the institutions and organizations associated with GEF projects
- There should be more investment in human capital and awareness of the logistics needed to operate in isolated regions

On sustainability:

- Some ways to foster sustainability for grassroots projects are to link it to financial mechanisms such as the Small Grants Programme or have communities contribute small donations so the impact of interventions are continued
- In local communities, there should also be an emphasis on building alliances and community relations and maintain the rapport between public and private institutions at all levels to achieve results

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 good overview of the achievement of the targets and indicators, however, it does not go into detail about the achievement of the objectives in a qualitative format, nor offer an in-depth description of why the project was able to meet its targets. Overall, the report was difficult to understand since the English translation was poor, so this TER relied on other sources of documentation	MU
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent with the project documents and particularly the last PIR, which occurred a few months prior to the TE. The evidence presented and ratings correspond with the data/information throughout the project documentation.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE discusses sustainability in broad language and does present a thorough analysis of the sustainability context.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported by evidence and consistent with the narrative from the project documents (PIR, MTR, etc.), however, they could have been better formulated as they were either too general (boiler plate)	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report details the final budget + association with each outcome as well as actual co-financing used	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Again, the TE presented an analysis of the M&E system that was broad and in general terms and could have been more specific	MS
Overall TE Rating		MS

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

MTR 2014