Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2013

1. Project Data

Summary project data	
GEF project ID	368
GEF Agency project ID	535
GEF Replenishment Phase	Pilot Phase
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)	UNDP
Project name	Programme for Sustainable Forestry (Iwokrama Rain Forest Programme)
Country/Countries	Guyana
Region	LAC
Focal area	Biodiversity
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	OP 3: Forest Ecosystems
Executing agencies involved	The Department for International Economic Cooperation (DIEC)
NGOs/CBOs involvement	Not involved
Private sector involvement	Not involved
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)	U/A
Effectiveness date / project start	February 1993
Expected date of project completion (at start)	May 1997
Actual date of project completion	U/A. Likely May 1999

Project Financing		At Endorsement (US $M)	At Completion (US $M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		3.0	3.0
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	1.0	U/A
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.78	U/A
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		3.0	3.0
Total Co-financing		1.78	U/A
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		4.78	U/A

Terminal evaluation/review information	
TE completion date	October 2000
TE submission date	
Author of TE	Graham Baines, Richard Warner
TER completion date	August 2014
TER prepared by	Joshua Schneck
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)	Neeraj Negi

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	N/A	N/R	N/R	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	N/R	N/R	ML
M&E Design	N/A	N/R	N/R	U
M&E Implementation	N/A	N/R	N/R	U
Quality of Implementation	N/A	N/R	N/R	MS
Quality of Execution	N/A	N/R	N/R	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/R	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objectives of the project, as stated in the Project Document (PD), are to develop approaches for the sustainable management and use of tropical forest resources, both within Guyana, and internationally. According to the PD, approaches to the sustainable use and protection of tropical forests are not known nor well developed, and the absence of this information and techniques is in part responsible for the loss of globally significant tropical forest ecosystems (PD, pg 10). Moreover, the PD states that threats to tropical forests are expected to grow in the long term, and thus it is expected that the knowledge gained from this project will be of value in future efforts to conserve bio-diverse tropical forests, including those that are not currently being degraded.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objectives of the project, as stated in the PD, are "*to demonstrate that the tropical rain forest can maintain desired levels of biological diversity while supporting economic activity*." At the end of the project, the Government of Guyana and other countries "...*will be in a more advantageous position to examine and take strategic- level decisions on investments and support for a variety of national and international initiatives on sustainable utilization and management of tropical rain forests*..." (PD, pg 12).

The project is expected to achieve its Development and Global Environmental Objective by achieving the following Immediate Objective and 7 associated outputs:

Immediate Objective – "To establish an International Board of Trustees for the Iwokrama Rain Forest Program that is capable and enabled to undertake total management of the international program for the sustainable utilization of the resources from tropical forests and the conservation of biodiversity."

Associated outputs:

1. Establish the legal entity and institutional framework for the long-term development of the Iwokrama Program.
2. Establish a GIS containing natural and physical resource data pertaining to the program site.
3. Establish a base camp, supporting field and related stations.

4. Compile a detailed inventory of species and site characteristics
5. Draft a biodiversity research strategy, indicative program, and options for implementation.
6. Identify sustainability parameters for the Iwokrama Program and articulate a long-term financing and resource mobilization strategy.
7. Provide a training program in fields related to the sustainable utilization of natural resources.

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

No.

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 was relevant to Guyana and to the GEF. Relevance to Guyana is seen in the genesis of the project, which was an offer by the Government of Guyana to the Commonwealth and international community, of 360,000 hectares of its Amazonian rain forest for an international pilot project to develop and demonstrate methods for sustainable management and use of tropical forests while conserving biodiversisty (PD, pg 4). From this offering, the Iwograma Rain Forest Program was designed. This project is designed to support the launching of the Iwograma Rain Forest Program. PD envisioned that target beneficiaries would include local Guyana communities living near the preserve, and that the outputs of the program would be relevant for Guyana's development goals moving forward. For the GEF, the project is in line with the objectives of Operational Program 3: Forest Ecosystems, which seeks to preserve globally significant biodiversity residing in forest ecosystems. As stated in the PD, the Iwokrana rain forest, as well as tropical forests ecosystems worldwide, are some of the most biodiverse places on the planet. Moreover, the project also provided a test case for a potentially new way of managing globally significant landscapes – one in which an international organization is charged with some of the responsibilities for managing national lands (TE, pg 3).

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The project was effective in achieving most of its short-term objectives, as well as establishing the basis from which the long-term global environmental objective may be realized. Shortcomings primarily concern a failure to conduct a more extensive training program and set of associated activities, as

envisioned in the PD, that potentially would have made an impact in upgrading the capacity of environmental staff in the Guyana government, and provide for greater integration between the Iwokrama Rain Forest Program and National agencies (TE, pg 12).

Progress is detailed further along each of the seven outputs.

1. *Establish the legal entity and institutional framework for the long-term development of the Iwokrama Program.* Under this output, the Government of Guyana passed the "Iwokrama International Centre for Rain Forest Conservation and Development Act of 1996," that provides the legal basis through with the Iwokrama Program (continuing post project) is managed. The Act provides for management authority over a 360,000 hectare rain forest, and also makes provision for a research and training center at the University of Guyana in Georgetown. Both are under the custodianship of an international Board of Trustees. One weakness of the Act that is identified in the TE is the lack of law enforcement provisions, with the Guyanese government currently lacking the resources to patrol the reserve and enforce laws. There is also ambiguity over whether mining near rivers in the reserve is allowed under Guyana law, and TE notes that some are exploiting this uncertainty to dredge for alluvial gold.

2. *Establish a GIS containing natural and physical resource data pertaining to the program site.* Activities under this output were fully completed and successful, with the unit housed at the Iwokrama Center.

3. *Establish a base camp, supporting field and related stations.* TE states that the base camp and other stations were completed and to a higher standard than anticipated by the PD (TE, pg 14).

4. *Compile a detailed inventory of species and site characteristics.* TE states this activity grouping was completed as expected. Of note, botanists from the Smithsonian Institution made some 4,000 collections from the Reserve, and faunal surveys have found the highest recorded diversity of bats for a comparable area anywhere in the world (TE, pg 17).

5. *Draft a biodiversity research strategy, indicative program, and options for implementation.* TE finds that this activity grouping was completed as anticipated and that there is now a small but growing portfolio of research projects which target issues and areas of knowledge consistent with PD intentions. Research projects completed or underway at time of TE include (a) Joint IEE, TROPENBPS, GFC trial on the cost effectiveness of reduced impact logging; (b) study on the economics of non-timber forest products ; and (c) ethno-biology of Amerindian tribe living adjacent to the reserve, describing their use of plants and animals.

6. *Identify sustainability parameters for the Iwokrama Program and articulate a long-term financing and resource mobilization strategy.* Efforts under this activity have been largely successful, although long-term funding of core operations for the center remains a concern. A financing and operations plan though 2007 was completed and thus far, the project has been able to raise more than $10 million (USD) in funding for ongoing projects (TE, pg 20).

7. *Provide a training program in fields related to the sustainable utilization of natural resources.* Activities under this output were only partially completed, and TE finds this to be the project's most significant shortcoming. TE is not clear as to why actual expenditures for training was far below expectations (~$20,000 spent compared with over $350,000 budgeted), stating that the

decision to hold off on training early in the project was made at the instance of the Government (TE, pg 20). TE's finds however that, though funds were underspent, staff at the Guyana Forestry Commission, the Guyana Natural Resources Agency, and the University of Guyana benefited from participation in research projects and short training programs sponsored by Iwokrama.

Overall, the project achieved most of what it set out to do, and set the groundwork to achieve the long-term environmental objective stated in the PD. Effectiveness is therefore rated as Satisfactory, with the shortcomings related to training (1 of 7 outputs), being the only real failure of the project.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

TE notes that project efficiency was affected by a delay in appointing the interim Director General of the Iwokrama Program, and in resolving the administrative confusion associated with this delay. TE states that "better coordination with national agencies would almost certainly exist today had the national agency counterpart team been established and sustained as required by the Project design and had the budgeted funds for training been allocated at an earlier stage" (TE, pg 23). According to the TE, the first Director General of the Program was not recruited until 2 years after commencement of project activities, and no acting Director was named in the interim. The consequent lack of clear direction during the early years of the project "seriously constrained project implementation" (TE, pg 9). In addition, parts of the institutional framework that were provided for in the PD, including the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, were not established. On the other hand, TE finds that overall, project efficiency was satisfactory. Examples of well-run project activities are found in the delivery of most project outputs, including some to a higher degree of quality than anticipated in the PD (ex., construction of the Iwokrama Center), as well as strong independent accounting systems set up by the project (TE, pg 22). A listing of project expenditures and co-financing realized by project activity is, however, not provided in the TE. Project efficiency is rated as Moderately Satisfactory on balance, given above shortcomings and management assessment.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Moderately Likely**

TE finds that the project has established a firm foundation for a sustainable Iwokrama Program (TE, pg 28). To date, the project has generated nearly $10 million in international funding for projects supportive of the programs objectives. There are some ongoing concerns in securing funding for core operations, but TE finds it is likely that this funding gap will be addressed from business activities that will soon commence at the Center (principally tourism and sustainable timber production).

Sustainability is assessed further along the following four dimensions:

- *Environmental sustainability* (**ML**) – TE notes that law enforcement in the Iwokrama reserve – which is critical to the sustainability of the center over the long-term – needs to be addressed, as the law is currently ambiguous as to what kinds of activities are allowed, and provisions for effective enforcement are deemed inadequate. On the other hand, the passage of the Iwokrama International Centre for Rain Forest Conservation and Development Act of 1996, that

established the reserve and the governing body, should help to mitigate/address environmental risks to the sustainability of project outcomes.

- *Financial sustainability* (**ML**) – as noted above, financial sustainability of the program and center is likely, though not assured, as some funding gaps remain for core project activities.
- *Socio-political sustainability* (**L**) – TE finds that community support for Iwokrama is strong, as the effects of the project on indigenous communities in the vicinity of Iworkrama forest have been "outstandingly beneficial" (TE, pg 29). Political support can be seen in the passage of the Act establishing the Center and reserve. Moreover, TE finds that the research and scientific community of Guyana is well linked with the program.
- *Institutional sustainability* (**L**) – The project has succeeded in establishing a center with legal backing, a solid presence, and control by an international body with a high profile international board (the head of the IPCC is one of the members). Institutional sustainability is likely.

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?

TE states that it is not possible to quantify the total contribution from co-financing, but that it was likely less than budgeted. However, TE notes that the contribution of Guyana in terms of the assistance and financial support for the construction of the project's Base camp, was "completed and to a higher standard than anticipated by the PD. This has been a major contribution of the Government" (TE, pg 14). Other aspects of co-financing and their possible contribution on project outcomes and sustainability are not discussed in the TE.

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?

TE does not provide a date for project closure As per the trustee record the project was financially closed on December 31st 2006. However, it is often the case that a project's operational completion may precede its financial closure by substantial time. It appears that the project was operationally completed a year or more after its expected date of closure. TE does note presence of delays, particularly in appointing the interim Director General of the Iwokrama Program, and in resolving the administrative confusion associated with this delay. TE states that "better coordination with national agencies would almost certainly exist today had the national agency counterpart team been established and sustained as required by the Project design and had the budgeted funds for training been allocated at an earlier stage" (TE, pg 23). According to the TE, the first Director General of the Program was not recruited until 2 years after commencement of project activities, and no acting Director was named in the interim. The consequent lack of clear direction during the early years of the project "seriously constrained project implementation" (TE, pg 9). Sustainability of project outcomes would appear to be only marginally affected by the delays, in that greater integration with national agencies – an outcome hindered by

project delays – might have provided a stronger basis for socio-political support. However, as noted in the sustainability section, socio-political support for the project going forward appears to be strong.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

Country ownership for the project is strong, and can be seen as critical to project success and sustainability. The project was made possible by the decision by the Government of Guyana to set aside 360,000 hectares of its tropical rainforest for a program, of which the project is one foundational piece. Country support is further evidenced by the passage of the "Iwokrama International Centre for Rain Forest Conservation and Development Act of 1996," that provides the legal basis through with the Iwokrama Program (continuing post project) is managed. Had these two developments failed to happen, the project could not have gone forward.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 **M&E Design at entry**	Rating: **Unsatisfactory**

Project design lacked a logical framework, indicators, or targets. PD calls for regular reporting, a formal mid-term review, and terminal evaluation. PD also stipulates that a Project Monitoring Unit will be established within the Guyanese Natural Resources Agency to ensure smooth operations of the project (PD, pg 20). However, beyond these basic provisions, nothing is provided in the PD that would constitute a well-conceived and tailored M&E system. The absence of a well-defined M&E system is noted in the TE as having negatively impacted project implementation. "Had success criteria been identified in the PD, internal monitoring would have been much easier to undertake. It would also have simplified the preparation of Project Performance Evaluation Reports (and their subsequent analysis) and so eased the burden of project management, and assisted terminal evaluation" TE, pg 22).

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

Project management did not move to address any of the deficiencies in M&E design noted above, and in some cases, failed to do M&E activities that were called for in the PD. TE finds that no formal Mid-Term Review report was undertaken, nor was a terminal report prepared (TE, pg 22). Financial accounting systems were apparently managed by UNDP and GOG, and these were found by the TE to have been adequate.

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: **Moderately Satisfactory**

Quality of project implementation was strong in some respects, particularly during implementation, but had some notable shortcomings with respect to project design. TE finds deficiencies in the PD, including lack of a logical framework, and unrealistic expectations for a three-year project implemented in a country with poorly developed infrastructure and limited capacity for conservation and management of resources (TE, pg 5). The development objective is not presented as a clear and unambiguous statement. Moreover, PD does not adequately provide for establishment of an effective M&E system, lacking both indicators and targets, as noted above. Some of the design weaknesses are also indicative of weaknesses in the appraisal process. During implementation, TE notes that oversight and assistance from UNDP was strong. Adequate accounting systems were managed by UNDP and the GOG and regularly reconciled (TE, pg 22). Changes to the budget were documented. TE states that UNDP played a "critical role" in the successful implementation of the project – undertaking almost all of the local procurement of goods and services, and reportedly went to "extraordinary lengths" to source experts and consultants (TE, pg 23). TE also finds that UNDP was a key mover in terms of working to ensure the participation of indigenous populations in the project, and remained "an integral partner with Government and Management throughout all phases of implementation" (TE, pg 23).

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

Project execution was hindered by delay in appointing the interim Director General of the Iwokrama Program, and in resolving the administrative confusion associated with this delay. TE states that "better coordination with national agencies would almost certainly exist today had the national agency counterpart team been established and sustained as required by the Project design and had the budgeted funds for training been allocated at an earlier stage" (TE, pg 23). According to the TE, the first Director General of the Program was not recruited until 2 years after commencement of project activities, and no acting Director was named in the interim. The consequent lack of clear direction during the early years of the project "seriously constrained project implementation" (TE, pg 9). In addition, project management failed to establish an effective M&E system, and did not undertake several of the M&E activities called for in the PD, including preparation of a Mid-Term Review and final report. Other aspects of project execution appear to have been strong, with all activities except for the training activities executed well. TE is not clear as to why actual expenditures for training was far below expectations (~$20,000 spent compared with over $350,000 budgeted), stating that the decision to hold

off on training early in the project was made at the instance of the Government (TE, pg 20). Overall, project execution is rated as Moderately Satisfactory.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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

No changes in environmental stress or environmental status are documented in the TE.

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.

TE states that "the neighboring communities (indigenous Amerindian) did become familiar with the techniques and approaches that helped improve their economic and social development through sensitive use of natural resources. Indeed, the success with which this set of beneficiaries was targeted and became actively involved was outstanding. It is among this group of beneficiaries that employment benefits from the project were marked. The success of local community participation is highlighted by the fact that, at the outset, there was considerable skepticism and suspicion about the Iwokrama concept. Much credit is due to the Government of Guyana, UNDP and project representative who undertook the demanding task of engaging the communities in participatory exercises at the stage of project formulation and, subsequently, at another critical stage – finalization of the Iwokrama legislation" (TE, pg 7).

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 – participating scientists have benefitted from the project, both by direct participation and through informant ion and understanding generated on techniques for the sustainable use of tropical forests, and preservation of biological diversity. TE states that some of this information is making its way into peer-reviewed literature, and is available on the internet. However, TE finds that the project's impact on the capacity of Guyanese government agencies has been small (TE, pg 1). TE's does note that staff at the Guyana Forestry Commission, the Guyana Natural Resources Agency, and the

University of Guyana benefited from participation in research projects and short training programs sponsored by Iwokrama. Benefits are not detailed however in the TE.

b) Governance - the Government of Guyana passed the "Iwokrama International Centre for Rain Forest Conservation and Development Act of 1996," that provides the legal basis through with the Iwokrama Program (continuing post project) is managed. The Act provides for management authority over a 360,000 hectare rain forest, and also makes provision for a research and training center at the University of Guyana in Georgetown. Both are under the custodianship of an international Board of Trustees. One weakness of the Act that is identified in the TE is the lack of law enforcement provisions, with the Guyanese government currently lacking the resources to patrol the reserve and enforce laws. There is also ambiguity over whether mining near rivers in the reserve is allowed under Guyana law, and TE notes that some are exploiting this uncertainty to dredge for alluvial gold. Overall, the governance structure set up for management of Iwokrama would appear to a significant positive step in ensuring that this area is sustainably managed in perpetuity, and that it may be used as a laboratory to develop sustainable management techniques for tropical forests.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts are reported to have occurred as a result of the 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-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

No adoption of GEF initiatives at scale are reported to have taken place. Any impacts of this nature, if they are to occur at all, will only take place after sufficient time (many years of research) to demonstrate how tropical forest resources may be managed and utilized in a sustainable manner.

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.

TE describes the following key lessons:

- The innovative concept of an international management regime within a national context is yet to be fully understood or implemented.

- Good results can emerge from a PD with weaknesses of logic in the definition of Outputs and Activities (PD for example, lists a 'zoning/management plan' as an activity when this should have been an output (TE, pg 5) – but only with innovative leadership on the part of project management.
- A logical framework in the PD would have greatly assisted evaluation.
- There is a need to act quickly to make alternative leadership arrangements, or even to suspend implementation, if there is to be a delay in the appointment of a Project leader.
- The matter of capacity building needs, if not identified or identifiable at the time of project formulation, should be covered in the PD by provision for a training needs assessment accompanied by an appropriate budget items. A particular concern with this project has been that despite the preparation of administrative procedures and manuals, administrative staff did not effectively use these.
- The effective communication of results to non-technical audiences requires that documentation be prepared with the specific needs of the particular audience in mind, and in a simple form of English.
- Even though the NGO community in Guyana is weak, its potential to contribute to this project may not have been adequately tapped. The lesson is that even where an NGO community is not strong, specific provision for NGP involvement should still be considered and , if rejected, this decision fully justified. Particular attention should be paid to any need for capacity building for NGPs to engage in a project, for they are a key element in Project sustainability.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

TE provides the following recommendations:

- With the development of the program, greater attention should now be given to strengthening interactive linkages between Iwokrama and agencies of the Government of Guyana with a view to facilitating the transfer to those agencies of skills, knowledge and understanding about rainforest and wildlife management and community participation in these areas.
- Joint action is recommended to address issues regarding enforcement of laws within the reserve.
- Noting the exceptional achievements of Iwokrama in engaging neighboring Amerindian communities in a range of resource management and cultural strengthening activities, it is recommended that this experience be offered as a basis for training for community development elsewhere in Guyana.
- The Iwokrama approach and experience has widespread relevance. Its impact would be greater if it were written up and presented in a form to inspire and inform others. An excellent model exists in the documentation of the experience of a GEF funded project in Papua New Guinea's tropical rainforests.

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?	Report does a good job of assessing relevant project outcomes, detailing all the project activities that took place. More detail should have been provided on when training activities did not take place however.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Report is internally consistent, although no ratings were provided as they were not a requirement at the time. More detail should have been provided on how the research program put in place by the project is expected to inform the sustainable use of tropical forests, and what provisions there are for the testing of various resource exploitation methods, particularly reduced impact logging.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Report does a good job of assessing key factors/risks affecting sustainability of project outcomes.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons are well supported by the evidence presented in the TE, and are comprehensive.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	TE includes no reporting on actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used, except to say that actual co-financing was probably less than expected, and expenditures on training (output 7) were far below expectations.	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Report does a good job of describing problems with M&E design and implementation.	S
Overall TE Rating		S

Overall TE rating: (0.3 * (5+5)) + (0.1 * (5+5+2+5)) = 3+ 1.7 = 4.7 = S

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