

Terminal Evaluation Review Form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3676	
GEF Agency project ID		P091659	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF - 4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Grasslands and Savannas of the Southern Cone of South America: Initiatives for their Conservation in Argentina	
Country/Countries		Argentina	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		BD-4 Strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity BD-5 Fostering Markets for Biodiversity Goods and Services Strategic Objective 2 To mainstream Biodiversity in Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors	
Executing agencies involved		Aves Argentinas, Fundación Vida Silvestre Argentina	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Executing Agency	
Private sector involvement		Yes. Private cattle ranchers engaged in project activities.	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) / Approval date (MSP)		Dec 8, 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		Jun 24, 2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		Sep 30, 2013	
Actual date of project completion		Sep 30, 2013	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.025	0.025
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.925	0.925
Co-financing	IA own	0.52 (IBRD)	
	Government	0.5 (Argentinian Institute)	
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs	1.08 (Aves Arg. & Fund.Vida Silvestre)	
Total GEF funding		0.925	0.925
Total Co-financing		2.1	2.1
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		3.025	3.025
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		May 2, 2014	
TE submission date		May 2, 2014	
Author of TE		Marcelo Acerbi	
TER completion date		January 15, 2015	
TER prepared by		Dania M Trespalacios	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	HS	NR	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	Moderate Risk	NR	NR	MU
M&E Design	NR	NR	NR	HS
M&E Implementation	S	S	NR	S
Quality of Implementation	S	HS	NR	S
Quality of Execution	S	S	NR	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	-	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective is to conserve grassland biodiversity of global and national importance and to protect vital ecosystem services, through the development and implementation of a strategy for sustainable management that combines conservation with production. (PD pg. 6) The Argentine Pampas are one of the richest areas of grassland biodiversity in the world, especially noted for plant species diversity and grassland-dependent birds. The biodiversity of the grasslands is threatened by: the growth and intensification of agricultural crops; cattle overgrazing; excessive use of agrochemicals; frequent burning of grasslands; the replacement of native species by invasive exotic species; and the conversion of grasslands to forestry plantations. (PD pg. 3, 4)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of this project is to assist the Government of Argentina in its efforts to develop, disseminate, and promote biodiversity conservation by mainstreaming it with cattle grazing systems in Argentina's highly valuable grassland areas. (PD pg. 6). The project would also support the development of policy and regulatory frameworks that promote biodiversity-sustainable cattle-ranching.

The expected outcomes of this project as listed in the PD are:

1. New paradigm for grassland conservation through livestock ranching readily available for application in Argentine Pampas.
2. New responsible production model ensures increased biodiversity value of grazed grasslands, and increased income for cattle ranchers.
3. Biodiversity value of 16 properties at four sites increased through adoption of responsible production model
4. Catalyze subsequent establishment of natural grassland beef certification scheme that will subsequently promote higher market value.
5. Replicability of pilot schemes ensured through training of additional producers.
6. Key producers, producers associations and rural communities aware of economic and biodiversity conservation benefits of responsible production.
7. Key public and private agricultural policy and decision makers incorporate responsible production into national, provincial and business plans for the agricultural sector

The PD defines four main components, each associated with particular expected outcomes:

Component 1- Development of a responsible production model for the Argentine Pampas grasslands

Outcome 1 New paradigm for grassland conservation through livestock ranching readily available for application in Argentine Pampas.

New responsible production model ensures increased biodiversity value of grazed grasslands, and increased income for cattle ranchers.

Component 2- Validation and demonstration of responsible production model

Outcome 2 Biodiversity value of 16 properties at four sites increased through adoption of responsible production model

Outcome 3 Catalyze subsequent establishment of natural grassland beef certification scheme that will subsequently promote higher market value.

Component 3- Sharing the responsible production model with a wider audience (nationally and regionally)

Outcome 4 Replicability of pilot schemes ensured through training of additional producers.

Outcome 5 Key producers, producers associations and rural communities aware of economic and biodiversity conservation benefits of responsible production.

Component 4- Building the responsible production model into policy and regulatory frameworks

(PD pg. 6)

Outcome 6 Key public and private agricultural policy and decision makers incorporate responsible production into national, provincial and business plans for the agricultural sector

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

There were **no changes** to Global Environmental or Development objectives.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
---------------	-----------------------------

The project outcomes are consistent with the GEF's Biodiversity focal area. The Argentine Pampas are one of the richest areas of grassland biodiversity in the world, and are threatened by: the growth and intensification of agricultural crops; cattle overgrazing; excessive use of agrochemicals; frequent burning of grasslands; the replacement of native species by invasive exotic species; and the conversion of grasslands to forestry plantations. (PD pg. 3,4) The project

is consistent with the GEF's Strategic Objective 2, 'To Mainstream Biodiversity in Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors', Strategic Program 4, 'Strengthening the Policy and Regulatory Framework for Mainstreaming Biodiversity', and Strategic Program 5, 'Fostering Markets for Biodiversity Goods and Services'. (PD pg. 13,14)

The project is consistent with Argentina's country priorities. Argentina is a signatory to the Convention on Biological Diversity. The objectives, actions and expected outcomes of the project are consistent with the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) of the Argentine Republic, developed by the Secretariat of Natural Resources and Sustainable Development, and help support the Pampas deer *Ozotoceros bezoarticus* national conservation plan being developed by the Secretary of Environment and Sustainable Development of Argentina. The project will help Argentina meet its commitments under the Conservation of Migratory Species, and respond to the IUCN's resolution relating to the Pampas and Cerrados of South America. (PD pg. 13, 14)

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

The TE rates the project's outcomes as highly satisfactory, on account of multiple outcomes that exceeded expectations, and the project's meaningful contribution to the stated development objectives. (TE pg. 12) The TER reviewer acknowledges the projects highly successful achievements, but assesses a slightly lower effectiveness rating based on comparison of expected and actual results measured by the project's indicators. The project, although highly successful, had minor shortcomings, particularly in the partial achievements of outcome 6 (*key public and private agricultural policy and decision makers incorporate responsible production into national, provincial and business plans for the agricultural sector*).

Table one lists the project's 6 outcomes that are defined in the PD, with their respective indicator targets, and the TE's report of results.

Table 1: Project components, expected outcomes and outputs, and results (PD pg. 6-12, TE pg. 8-12)

Objective/Outcomes	Indicator Targets	Achieved?
Objective Assist the Government of Argentina in its efforts to develop, disseminate, and promote biodiversity conservation by mainstreaming it with cattle grazing systems in Argentina's highly valuable grassland areas.	10,000 hectares which apply the responsible production model	Achieved & exceeded
	1,000 hectares under certified cattle-ranching practices that meet biodiversity standards	Achieved & exceeded
	At least one national policy regulating cattle industry include measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity	Partially achieved
	Responsible production model developed and tested with 16 producers. RPM disseminated among more than 400 producers	Achieved & exceeded
	Biodiversity conservation fully integrated into site-specific grassland management regimes	Achieved
Outcome 1 New paradigm for grassland conservation through livestock ranching readily available for application in Argentine Pampas. New responsible production model ensures increased biodiversity value of grazed grasslands, and increased income for cattle ranchers.	Up-to-date assessment of conservation status of Argentine Pampas grasslands	Achieved
	Number of "natural grassland beef" experiences (from within and outside of the region) reviewed and lessons learned made available.	Achieved
	Quantified biodiversity value of different grassland management regimes/practices.	Partially achieved
Outcome 2 Biodiversity value of 16 properties at four sites increased through adoption of responsible production model	16 properties with detailed grassland mgmt. plans following responsible production model	Achieved & exceeded
	At least 16 producers and 32 technical staff trained in best practices for mgmt. plans	Achieved & exceeded
	50% increase of number of hectares of appropriate habitat available for target species	Achieved & exceeded

	Number of hectares of restored natural grasslands (as opposed other uses)	Achieved & exceeded
	Improved condition of grassland habitats.	Achieved
Outcome 3 Catalyze subsequent establishment of natural grassland beef certification scheme that will subsequently promote higher market value.	Number of existing and potential markets identified for "natural grasslands" beef	Achieved
	Internationally recognized minimum standards for certification of "natural grassland beef"	Partially achieved
	Market value of "natural grassland" (including that under certification scheme).	Achieved
Outcome 4 Replicability of pilot schemes ensured through training of additional producers.	4 pilot scheme experiences readily available for consultation	Achieved & exceeded
	1 Training center and training program established and in frequent use	Partially achieved
	60 producers trained in responsible production	Achieved & exceeded
Outcome 5 Key producers, producers associations and rural communities aware of economic and biodiversity conservation benefits of responsible production.	Number of neighboring communities and 500 producers who receive information on activities at pilot sites	Achieved
	4 producers associations promoting responsible production model	Achieved & exceeded
	4 extension agencies promoting responsible production model	Achieved & exceeded
	Education and awareness tools produced and distributed (1000 handbooks, 5000 calendars, 2000 DVDs, 1000 educational packs, etc.	Achieved & exceeded
	6 agricultural fairs at which responsible production model presented (as part of roadshow)	Achieved & exceeded
	Pilot site producers receive specific recognition from local community regarding environmental benefits	Mostly achieved
	40 producers from other countries that learn from pilot experiences.	Mostly achieved
Outcome 6 Key public and private agricultural policy and decision makers incorporate responsible production into national, provincial and business plans for the agricultural sector	Biodiversity conservation integrated within one national policy and at least two provincial sectoral plans	Partially achieved
	40 landowners and rural producers who recognize the benefits of biodiversity conservation in their production plans	Mostly achieved
	Extent of media coverage of responsible production model and pilot site experiences (20 newspaper stories, 20 radio interviews, 10 articles in popular journals, etc.).	Mostly achieved

This project successfully achieved most of the expected targets, and partially achieved the remaining targets. The project exceeded expectations in 5 of the 6 expected outcomes, and in the target indicators for the project's main objective. One example of a highly satisfactory result is the successful dissemination of Responsible Production Models, which in turn resulted in a 484% increase in areas under responsible production, and a 408% increase in areas with certified sustainable cattle ranching. (TE pg. 7)

The Project successfully piloted an approach that integrates biodiversity conservation and livestock production, and demonstrated that "Natural Grasslands" can have positive values for conservation, and for consumers and providers of high-end industries. (TE pg. 12)

It is clear that outcome 6 was only partly achieved, and in this area the performance of the project was moderately satisfactory. The TE reported that no policy regulating the cattle industry was modified, passed, or revoked at the national level. However, at project end, the national authorities were considering several policy proposals that would generate an enabling environment for the mainstreaming of sustainable cattle production. The project also established the technical capacity needed to replicate the project's pilot experiences both in other parts of Argentina, and at other grassland sites in the wider Pampas region. (TE pg. 7)

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

The TE rates project efficiency as satisfactory. It reports that the ratio of operational costs to substantive expenditures was similar to the one originally approved by the donor. The TE states that the design and delivery mechanisms proved appropriate to achieve the project's results. (TE pg. 12) The project was completed in time and on budget, and there were no implementation delays reported by the TE. Considering the high success of the project in general, and the exceeded expectations of many project outcomes, efficiency is rated highly satisfactory.

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

The TE gives various ratings for sustainability, depending on financial, institutional or political risks. These are given below. In general, the TE reports that the knowledge products generated by the project and the results achieved in the field are likely to continue after project completion, but that there are significant risks to the financial and political sustainability of the project. (TE pg. 13). This TER assesses an overall sustainability rating of Moderately Unlikely, based on the financial and political risks identified in the TE.

Risks to the sustainability of project outcomes is further assessed along the following four dimensions:

Financial Risks – (Moderately Unlikely)

Five months after the project closure, the first shipment of certified beef (labeled as “Carne del Pastizal” or “Grasslands Beef”) was exported to a supermarket in The Netherlands, and it was expected that the price of that meat would exceed the regular market reference by, at least, five percent. (TE pg. 7)

The TE notes that, at project completion, the project's executing agencies had not yet secured the financial mechanisms to sustain activities in the long term, nor to scale up the project's results. However, the TE also notes that some of the results of the project are already being replicated by Aves Argentinas in collaboration with the IDB. (TE pg. 13)

The TE notes that the “Grasslands Beef” certification scheme developed by the project is moderately likely to be sustained, because it is still dependent on the fundraising ability of the co-executants, and because the scale of the scheme is not yet large enough for it to self-sustain itself, thus it still needs injection of external funds. (TE pg. 13)

The TE rates the Arrangements for Sustainability as Moderately Unsatisfactory. It notes that it was uncertain whether the proceeds coming from the exports of certified beef can self-sustain the mechanism, or if supplementary resources are needed until the mechanism is up-scaled. (TE pg. 14)

Socio-political Risks – (Moderately Unlikely)

The TE notes that the level of ownership from governmental authorities as well as their formal institutional support was rather limited. Thus the likelihood of influencing national and provincial agricultural policies and plans to incorporate responsible production principles is rated by the TE as “pretty low”. (TE pg. 13)

Environmental Risks - (Unable to Assess)

Neither the TE nor the last PIR discusses environmental risks.

Institutional Risks – (Likely)

Two proposals were developed and are under the scrutiny of the National Agriculture and Livestock Ministry, in order to evaluate the eventual official recognition and support to the scale-up of the sustainable grassland management model promoted by the Project. (TE pg. 11)

The project strengthen and consolidated an existing regional knowledge sharing platform called “Alianza del Pastizal”, which began mobilizing resources and building on some of the outputs and outcomes of this Project. An example of this is an initiative executed by the NGO Aves Argentinas and funded by the Inter American Development Bank, that would build on the responsible livestock production models and beef certification scheme developed by this project to promote the conservation of natural grasslands in Paraguay, Uruguay, three Argentine provinces, and one Brazilian state. (TE pg. 12)

The knowledge products developed by the project are highly likely to be sustained in the long term after the completion of the Project, as they have been widely disseminated and adopted, in different ways, by a wide range of stakeholders. The results achieved in the field, including the implementation of the “Responsible Production Models” and the related improvements in grassland habitats, are significantly likely to be sustained in the midterm, as the related practices have proven beneficial for the current land owners that applied them. (TE pg. 13)

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?

Co-financing constituted almost 70% of the project’s budget. The materialization of co-financing was key to the ability of achieving the project’s outcomes. The exact expected amount of co-financing materialized by project end.

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 no project extensions or delays.

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 reports that many professionals from prestigious institutions participated in the project and contributed important scientific and technical support. Institutions included the Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET), Faculty of Agronomy, University of Buenos Aires (UBA), School of Natural Sciences, UBA, the Faculties of Agricultural Sciences,

National University of Litoral National University of Rosario National University of Lomas de Zamora. (TE pg. 6)

The Project was also consistently supported and/or co-funded by the National Government through the National Institute of Agricultural Technology (INTA), the National Parks Administration (APN) and the Environment and Sustainable Development National Secretariat (SAyDS). The TE reports that the engagement of the technical staff of these institutions was a major success of the project. (TE pg. 6)

However, the TE also states that the level of ownership from governmental authorities as well as their formal institutional support was rather limited, and thus the likelihood of influencing national and provincial policies and plans is low. (TE pg. 13) The TE rates Government commitment as Moderately Satisfactory. (TE pg. 14)

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 Project Document provides a very complete M&E design. (PD pg. 22-25) The M&E plan includes an Inception Report, quarterly operational reports, Annual Progress Reports, and mid-term and final evaluations. A Project Inception Workshop clarified the outputs and respective indicators, and the means of verification for these. It is clear from the PD's Annex 2- Results Framework Matrix- and from the TE's report of project achievements that the indicators for this project were SMART, well designed, with clear timelines and forms of verification. The PD provides a clear budget for M&E activities throughout the life of the project, including reports and monitoring activities. The project provides a particularly exemplary M&E design, and is thus rated highly satisfactory.

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

The TE rates M&E implementation as satisfactory, but does not provide descriptive evidence to support this rating. There were three PIRs completed, all of which document a thorough monitoring of the project's progress towards the original target indicators. There is no evidence of a mid-term report being completed. All three PIRs rate M&E implementation as satisfactory. With no evidence to contrary the TE's rating, M&E implementation is rated satisfactory.

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 implementing agency for this project is the World Bank. The WB was responsible for conducting project supervision, providing financial services and overseeing financial expenditures, and ensuring that the project complied with WB procedures. (PD pg. 33)

The TE rates the performance of the WB as highly satisfactory, but does not provide any supporting evidence. (TE pg. 14) From the project's performance, it is clear that the project was well supervised (PIRs were completed on time and were comprehensive), that there was adequate financial oversight (the project was completed within budget as originally planned), and it seems that the project complied with WB procedures. Without any evidence to suggest the contrary, the quality of project implementation is rated satisfactory.

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

The main executing agency of this project was the NGO Aves Argentinas. It was responsible for the overall implementation of project activities, including the executing of activities, the achievement of project objectives and outcomes. (PD pg. 33)

The project also had an executing partner, the Fundación Vida Silvestre Argentina, that would lead a few specific project activities, including assessing the state of the Argentine grasslands, implementing the activities at Bahía Samborombón site, and developing specific outreach and capacity building materials. (PD pg. 33)

The Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria was a key collaborator in the project. It provided technical support for assessing the relation between habitat types, grassland management regimes and bird abundance, and it contributed to awareness-raising activities and technical training. (PD pg. 33)

The TE notes that all the different aspects of the executing agency's implementation performance (Project management, Financial Management, Counterpart Funding, Procurement and Monitoring and Evaluation) were Satisfactory. The TE further rates the executing agency's public involvement as Highly Satisfactory, and the Safeguards implementation as Satisfactory. (TE pg. 14)

The executing agency complied with the prescribed financial management and M&E activities, including periodic Interim Financial Reports (IFR), and up to date accounting records. Independent audit reports reported “no internal control weaknesses”. The expected outputs of the project were mostly achieved successfully and on time, and many exceeded expectations. Thus there is evidence to suggest that the quality of project execution was satisfactory.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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

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

The project resulted in reduced environmental stress and improved environmental status. The project’s “Responsible production models” were applied in almost 59,000 hectares, and more than 64,000 hectares entered into a sustainable certification program. (TE pg. 7-8) The priorities of biodiversity conservation were fully integrated into the management plans of 21 producers. (TE pg. 8) The number of hectares of appropriate habitat available for target conservation species increased: 1,308 hectares in San Javier site, 30 hectares in Samborombon site, 995 hectares in Gualaguaychu site. The number of restored natural grasslands also increased, and all four project sites have improved their grassland conditions. (TE pg. 9)

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 does not report any direct changes to human well being. But the project did successfully change the markets for sustainably produced beef, which would exceed the price of the regular market reference by at least 5%. (TE pg. 7) This creates economic opportunities for the stakeholders of this project.

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

a) Capacities- The TE reports the following changes in capacity:

- 5 subtypes of a Responsible Production Model developed, piloted and tested with 21 producers. RPM disseminated among more than 889 people. (TE pg. 8)
- Biodiversity conservation fully integrated into the management plans of 21 producers. (TE pg. 8)
- Comprehensive literature review of all formal (documented) experiences made available to Pampas producers. (TE pg. 8)
- 21 properties (4 in Corrientes, 4 in Santa Fe, 4 in Entre Ríos and 9 in Buenos Aires Provinces) now have detailed grassland management plans that follow the responsible production model. (TE pg. 9)
- 85 producers and 32 technical staff were trained in best practices/implementation of management plans, and 190 producers were trained in responsible production. (TE pg. 9, 10)
- Information readily available to producers regarding all existing (international) markets for sustainable beef. (TE pg. 9)
- International market and certification for sustainable beef created and in stages of development. (TE pg. 9-10)
- 5 producer associations and 8 extension agencies now promoting the responsible production model (TE pg. 10, 11)
- 39 producers from other countries learned about RPM (TE pg. 11)

b) Governance - The TE reports the following changes in governance:

- Two proposals to integrate biodiversity conservation in national and provincial policy were developed and are under the scrutiny of the National Agriculture and Livestock Ministry, in order to evaluate the eventual official recognition and support to the scale-up of the sustainable grassland management model promoted by the Project. (TE pg. 11)

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.

There were no unintended impacts of this project.

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-relate and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

- **Replication- Adopted** The project strengthen and consolidated an existing regional knowledge sharing platform called “Alianza del Pastizal”, which began mobilizing resources and building on some of the outputs and outcomes of this Project. An example of this is an initiative executed by the NGO Aves Argentinas and funded by the Inter American Development Bank, that would build on the responsible livestock production models and beef certification scheme developed by this project to promote the conservation of natural grasslands in Paraguay, Uruguay, three Argentine provinces, and one Brazilian state. (TE pg. 12)

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 lists the following lessons learned:

- The success of this kind of interventions is highly dependent on the technical knowledge, as well as the professional capacities locally available (in the field). (TE pg. 14)
- The interventions that are highly dependent on short term external financing (e.g. grant funded projects) face severe limitations when it comes to their ability to influence high level public policies, which requires longer terms. (TE pg. 14)

The TE lists the following recommendations:

- Considering the length of the cattle-ranching business cycle, it would be better to design interventions no shorter than 6 years, in order to be able to thoroughly measure their impacts. (TE pg. 14)

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE explicitly reports on all of the project's outcomes and related target indicators. It gives a complete picture of the results and impacts of the project.	HS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent, but the evidence presented is not complete, and the ratings (particularly for M&E, and the WB's performance) are not well substantiated.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE discusses sustainability sufficiently to convey an understanding of what can be expected. But there is no discussion of project exit strategy, or of environmental risks. More information is needed in this area.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons are supported by the evidence, but they are brief and not comprehensive.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE includes the total project costs, listed by activity, and also includes the expected and actual co-financing used by activity. But it does not include the sources of co-financing.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE rates the implementation of M&E systems in a cursory way, with no supporting evidence, and does not rate M&E design.	U
Overall TE Rating		S

$$0.3 \times (a + b) + 0.1 \times (c + d + e + f) = 0.3(11) + 0.1(16) = 3.3 + 1.6 = 4.9$$

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

No additional sources of information were used in the preparation of this TER, other than PIRs, TE, PD, and Project Review Sheet.