

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

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3886	
GEF Agency project ID		P112106	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		National Protected Areas Conservation Trust Fund-Additional Financing for the Sustainability of the Macizo Regional Protected Area System	
Country/Countries		Colombia	
Region		Latin America	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SP1 (Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas)	
Executing agencies involved		Patrimonio Natural-Fund for Biodiversity and Protected Areas (FUNBAP), SIRAPM	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		--	
Private sector involvement		--	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		May 2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		June 2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		October 2014 <sup>[1]</sup>	
Actual date of project completion		October 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0	0
	Co-financing	25,000	N/A
GEF Project Grant		4.0	4.0
Co-financing	IA own	0	N/A
	Government	11.25	N/A
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	N/A
	Private sector	0	N/A
	NGOs/CSOs	0	N/A
Total GEF funding		4.0	4.0
Total Co-financing		11.25	N/A
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		15.25	N/A
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		April 18, 2015	
Author of TE		Abdelaziz Lagnaoui	
TER completion date		December 8, 2015	
TER prepared by		Caroline Laroche	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Molly Watts	

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

\*The IA Evaluation Office assessed M&E Quality as Moderate, with no distinction between M&E Design and M&E Implementation

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project

This project took the form of additional financing to the project “National Protected Areas (NPAs) Conservation Trust Fund”. The aim was to supplement the project by scaling it up to five new regions, including the Macizo Regional Protected Area System (SIRAPM), an area of global and national environmental significance. For this reason, the GEO for this project builds upon that of the original project and reads as follows: “to support the conservation of globally significant biodiversity in and the financial sustainability of the Macizo Regional Protected Area System (SIRAPM) by integrating it into the conservation mosaic approach promoted under the National Protected Area Conservation Trust Fund for the consolidation of the Colombian National Protected Area System. “ (PD p.22)

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Project Development Objective remains the same as for the original project, namely “to launch a conservation trust fund that will support the consolidation of Colombia’s NPAS and contribute to arresting and reversing trends in biodiversity loss” (PD p.22).

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

There were no changes in objectives during implementation.

## 4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 <b>Relevance</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates the relevance of this project as High (TE p.10). This TER assesses relevance to be satisfactory as the objectives of this project were closely aligned with those of the GEF, the World Bank and the Colombian Government.

Since this project entailed additional funding to a pre-existing project, the relevance of the proposed activities had already been proven. The Government of Colombia (GoC) was keen to see the project extended to new areas, and to ensure the sustainability of the existing protected areas going forward. Given the perceived importance of the project, the GoC was also willing to provide the co-financing necessary to the execution of this new project phase.

The project contributed to the GEF's Biodiversity focal area under Strategic Priority 1 – Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas. Indeed, the project aims to conserve Colombia's protected areas and to ensure their sustainability by effectively integrating them into the conservation Mosaics Approach. The project was also in line with the World Bank's Country Assistance Strategy for Colombia, which "supports the country's development goals in promoting environmental sustainability, including biodiversity conservation, knowledge, and sustainable use as one of five strategies established in the National Development Plan" (PD p.15). Finally, the project was also consistent with the Colombian government's policy, which actively "seeks to widen the application of the mosaics approach across the country" (PD p.7). Indeed, "Colombia's National Development Plan for 2011-2014, articulated in the *Prosperidad para todas* (Prosperity for All), identified the need for sustainable development, biodiversity conservation, management of protected areas, and sustainable land management, in areas directly affected by the Colombian conflict" (ICR Review, p.3).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
-------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates the effectiveness of this project as Substantial. We assess effectiveness as satisfactory due to the achievement of all revised project targets.

During the first phase of the National Protected Areas Conservation Trust Fund, for which this project provided additional financing, from 2006 to 2011, the project was very successful. The GEF highlighted this project as part of the International Year of Biodiversity celebrations, noting that it was employing an effective and new approach to strengthen the management of protected areas (PD p.12). The additional funding provided to the project appears to have supported the continued achievement of successful outcomes.

The project objective set after the project revision to incorporate the Additional Funding were all met (TE p.iv). As this TER is only concerned with the Additional Funding component of the project, only revised targets (the project areas that the Additional Funding was supposed to contribute to) will be reported against below.

First, the project contributed to conserving 2,638,018 hectares of conservation land. This represents 108% of the target value for the additional funding project. Second, the project contributed to conserving 1,444,246 hectares of the surrounding territories, or 50% of the conservation land. This greatly surpasses the target value for additional funding of 20%. Third, eleven Conservation Mosaic Work Plans were prepared as a result of an integrated planning process linking national park objectives and surrounding landscapes' development plans, five of which were a result of this project's additional financing. This achievement meets the project's objective for the additional funding, which was to have work plans for ten conservation mosaics (TE pp. iv). Fourth, 97% of the baseline natural vegetation coverage remains in each core conservation area at the project end; this is higher than the target of 90%. Fifth, Ecological connectivity has been improved in 8 conservation mosaics, surpassing the target of 5. Finally, species richness has been observed to improve in four mosaics, more than the target of 3. All the revised global environmental objectives set for this project (including additional funding) have been achieved, demonstrating that the additional funding effectively contributed to project outcomes. (TE pp.iv-v)

In addition, the project reached the targets for all of its revised intermediate outcome indicators, including the achievement of investment returns of 7.72% per year, an improvement in the management effectiveness scores of 6 national parks, 10 mosaics having adopted landscape management strategies, and more than 90% of the baseline families adopting sustainable production systems and improved management systems. (TE pp.vi-ix)

Threats to biodiversity have been significantly reduced as an outcome of the project, and the initiative is now seen as having been so successful that the mosaic approach to conservation is now being incorporated in the country's 2014-18 National Development Plan (TE p.10). The project appears to have been effective in meeting all its objectives.

<b>4.3 Efficiency</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rated the project's efficiency as substantial. This TER rates efficiency as satisfactory due to the high benefit-cost ratio for the project.

A cost-benefit analysis was conducted for the overall project (initial funding and additional funding phases), using an opportunity cost approach established by the World Bank's WAVES (Wealth Accounting and the Valuation of Ecosystem Services). The benefits calculated were from the lower deforestation rates due to the project (assuming 0.6% deforestation without the project, and between 0.2% and 0.3% with the project). The Net Present Value was estimated to be \$8 million, with a benefit-cost ratio of 1.5 (TE p.12). While only cursory information is provided about the methodology, the values appear realistic and conservative as economics benefits from the project are likely to be underestimated; some project benefits, for example additional carbon sequestration and storage, are not accounted for.

The project appears to have been well managed, with the TE (p.9) reporting that the executing agency Patrimonio natural had a "well-staffed project team with the necessary experience and qualifications for adequate project management". No implementation delays took place during the Additional Funding phase of the project, and financial management appears to have been sound. The Additional Funding phase of the project successfully built upon the lessons and management structure built during the first phase to efficiently scale up the program.

<b>4.4 Sustainability</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Likely</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

The TE does not rate the sustainability of this project. This TER assesses a rating of Moderately Likely, finding there to be some important financial and political-risks, but overall assessing that the likelihood of the outcomes being sustained going forward remained high given the extent of government ownership and the initiatives already set up to maintain conservation effort after project completion.

#### **Financial Risks – Moderately Likely** <sup>[1]</sup><sub>SEP</sub>

The GoC appears committed to supporting the continuation of the mosaic approach to conservation going forward. As part of the project, the Biodiversity Conservation Fund Trust was set up with the intention of continuing to provide financial resources for conservation in the foreseeable future. However, the endowment fund has grown less rapidly than expected,

averaging a return of 7.72% between 2007 and 2014 (TE p.14). The TE “concluded that the fund would benefit from a stronger commitment and enhanced fundraising strategies by Patrimonio Natural to locate this capital. (TE p.14)

### **Socio-political Risks – Moderately Likely**

The peace process has still not been completed in Colombia, and political issues therefore remain a concern. While there remain some risks of conflict in some of the project areas, the project has not so far been impeded by the conflict, and the expectation is that this would remain the case, especially given the advances made in the peace process.

### **Environmental Risks**

Not applicable

### **Institutional Risks – Likely**

Institutional risks to the project appear very low as the GoC is now supporting several initiatives ensuring the sustainability of the conservation work initiated by the project. Among other things, the GoC is “promoting sustainable land use practices and better governance through the Forest Conservation and Sustainability in the Heart of the Colombian Amazon Project. (...) The heart of the Amazon project applies the mosaic approach introduced by this project, supports an *Integrated Management Approach* that integrates sustainable development plans with conservation goals, and includes in its target areas the newly expanded *Parque Nacional Natural Cerranía de Chiribiquete* (PNNSCH), which is the biggest national park in Colombia with 2.7 million ha” (TE p.9). Finally, in 2013, the GoC has set a goal to achieve zero net deforestation by 2020, a goal it plans to achieve through the ‘Amazon Vision’ project, which was developed in partnership with the Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development.

The sustainability of the project appears to be ensured due to project continuation through the Forest Conservation and Sustainability in the Heart of the Colombian Amazon Project, the Amazon Vision project as well as the high country ownership from the Colombian government.

## **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?

Given that co-financing made up most of the project budget, it was absolutely essential to the project, which would not have been possible without it. The planned co-financing was to be provided by the UAESPNN (US\$3.85M), Patrimonio Natural (US\$1.8M), Cortolima (US\$2.28M) and the CARs (Regional Autonomous Environmental Authorities) (US\$2.69M —in kind and US\$.63M in cash).

As the TE does not provide detailed final budget tables, it is unclear whether all co-financing partners made their planned contributions. However, given the TE does not mention lower than expected co-financing, this TER presumes co-financing amounts disbursed were close to the amounts expected.

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 extensions or delays in the Additional Funding phase of the project.

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 overall project (initial project and Additional Funding phase) was very high. The GoC demonstrated commitment by providing high counterpart funding and by setting up various environmental policies and initiatives supporting or building upon the conservation efforts made as part of this project. For example, in 2013, the GoC has set a goal to achieve zero net deforestation by 2020, a goal it plans to achieve through the 'Amazon Vision' project, which was developed in partnership with the Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development.

## 6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
-------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE gives overall M&E for this project a rating of High. This TER assesses M&E design to be satisfactory due to the apparent care with which the M&E system was developed, and the attention put on establishing a results framework that would be straightforward and easily measurable.

Patrimonio Natural was in charge of undertaking the M&E for this project (PD p.57). Their responsibilities included submitting to the World Bank biannual year reports, detailed financial administration statements and procurement statements. In addition, PN was required to "supply all necessary information to assess project progress to the World Bank and AF Steering Committee" (PD p.57). A clear project results framework was included in the PD, with results indicators including baseline

information, data sources and responsibility for data collection. However, this TER remains unclear as to how impact attribution issues were being taken into consideration at the design stage of the M&E systems. Following GEF guidelines for projects in protected areas, PN also implemented the GEF Tracking Tools as a parallel monitoring mechanism. (TE p.8)

The Project Document did not include any more specific information regarding M&E timelines, responsibilities or budget; this is partially explained by the fact an M&E system was already in place for this first phase of the project, prior to the commitment of the additional funding. While the PD is scarce in M&E information, the GEF Review Sheet (p.9) states that adequate clarifications regarding M&E were provided prior to the start of the project.

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------------------	--

The TE rates M&E Implementation as High. Overall, this TER agrees with the TE that M&E implementation was well conducted. However, due to the shortcomings of the final evaluation and the lack of information on the new M&E methodologies developed, a rating of Moderately Satisfactory is assigned.

M&E activities for this project appear to have been implemented as planned, and M&E data appears to have contributed to project decisions, including the better design of the Additional Funding phase of the project. In this regard, and as stated in the TE (p.8), “M&E was key for successful implementation and provided lessons and an enabling environment for future use.”

In addition to implementing the M&E strategy as planned, the staff in charge of M&E proactively developed a new monitoring strategy (AEMAPPS) after realizing that the GEF Tracking Tools were not sufficient or well adapted to effectively monitor the project. Indeed, they “developed, with the support of Wildlife Conservation Society, an innovative monitoring system for the Mazico area that included structural, functional (biodiversity and ecosystem services) and social (skills, actors and relationships) monitoring ‘networks’” (TE p.8). No additional information is provided on this new monitoring strategy, or on how it was used to better evaluate project outcomes.

Evaluation activities (mid-term, final) for this project have taken place as planned. However, the final evaluation has severe gaps. Among others, the report is very light on methodological issues, fails to define key indicators, does not provide the necessary data to support its claims on the achievement of project outcomes, and fails to go beyond a discussion of outputs in the “achievement of outcomes” section of the report.

## **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.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
--	-----------------------------

This TER focuses on the performance of the World Bank as the main implementation partner for this project. The TE rates the WB's performance as Satisfactory. This TER also rates project implementation as satisfactory, due to the extensive and productive supervision provided by the World Bank, and the overall smooth project implementation.

Project design was largely established keeping in mind the lessons from previous World Bank-GEF projects, and ensured that the "outline of the project was practical, adaptable to the conditions and context of each protected area mosaic" (TE p.29). As seen above, the M&E design was satisfactory and the additional funding phase was adequately integrated into the main project.

Over the course of the project (including the Additional Funding phase), there were several supervision missions during which the World Bank team effectively flagged potential issues and took corrective action. For example, the TE reports that the WB team was actively engaged with PN in 2012 when PN faced difficulties raising funding crucial for the capitalization of the endowment fund. The WB Team was also "extensively involved in the design and subsequent approval of the project's AF, and worked closely with the client to ensure that the additional project targets were indeed achieved. During the ICR preparation mission, the client acknowledged that the Bank teams always maintained their role as a cooperation partner while at the same time refraining from intervening excessively in the actual project's implementation." (TE p.15) Despite there having been three different team leaders over the years, there is no evidence this affected project continuity.

According to the TE (p.6), "implementation reflected the care and due diligence put into the project's preparation and design by the Bank and client's teams. The PDO and GEO addressed actual needs filled by the project and contributed to the country's national priorities. Project components, having been designed to target actual problems in conservation and landscape management, provided effective vehicles to channel project resources to local partners and stakeholders." <sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub>

Overall, the WB seems to have collaborated extensively and productively with PN in order to ensure the successful implementation of this project.

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
---	-----------------------------

This TER focuses on the performance of Patrimonio Natural (PN) as the main execution partner for this project. The TE rates PN's performance as Satisfactory. This TER also rates project execution as satisfactory, due to the ability of PN to execute the project to plan and to develop a strong collaboration with the WB for the implementation of this project.

The TE largely describes the PN's as an effective and skilled body, and as the right partner for this project. "Once the project became effective, Patrimonio Natural setup the necessary management structures with efficiency and in accordance with the plan. Strong support by the Colombian government, the UAESPNN and the various CARs involved in the project provided an adequate environment to start project activities on schedule" (TE p.6). Indeed, the TE describes PN in overall laudatory terms:

"During project implementation, Patrimonio Natural was able to develop strong administrative, technical, financial, and procurement capacities, and managed to maintain good coordination and leadership qualities throughout. Patrimonio Natural's technical and administrative teams were flexible and responsive, which allowed them to adapt to the diverse implementation challenges encountered at the local level. They also managed to allocate approximately US\$ 68 million in sinking funds between 2006 and EOP in 2014 through the implementation of 214 projects to an additional number of protected areas that were not even part of the original project." (TE p.16)

The extent of the collaboration between the WB and PN also "went a long way in ensuring a successful implementation (TE p.7). Overall, everything appears to have worked to plan, and there is no evidence of there having been issues in the control of PN that have negatively impacted outcomes.

## **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 overall project allegedly contributed to the protection of 2,638,018 hectares of conservation land, 1,444,246 hectares of the surrounding territories, and to improving the ecological connectivity in 8 conservation mosaics. However, the supporting evidence for those numbers in the TE is weak, and the TE provides no indication that the methodology used to calculate these numbers robustly attributes conservation outcomes to the project itself. More specifically, the additional financing enabled the project to create five additional conservation mosaics, thereby expanding project benefits to a larger area than originally intended. (TE p.11)

More broadly and more relevant to the global environment, the project “introduced a novel approach for sustainable management of PA and surrounding rural landscapes through the ‘mosaic’ concept.” (TE p.11)

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 only mention of socioeconomic change in the TE is the following, which summarizes the project’s contribution rather well: “Although the project was not specifically designed to alleviate poverty, the mosaic approach had intrinsic effects on poverty reduction. Through the implementation of agro-ecological and sustainable cattle ranching activities, the project generated an increase of agricultural productivity that helped beneficiary families and local indigenous and Afro-Colombian communities improve their food security, as well as, in some cases, generate additional income from selling and marketing their products.” (TE p.13)

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

According to the TE, the main capacity built was within the institutions that took part of the project (Patrimonio Natural, UAESPNN, CARs), which all benefited from the project (TE p.13).

b) Governance

Not applicable

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 outcomes and/or impacts were registered.

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.

This project itself represented the scale up of the mosaic approach to conservation in Colombia in the form of additional funding to an existing project. At project end, the GoC had established the *Forest Conservation and Sustainability in the Heart of the Colombian Amazon Project*, which uses the mosaic approach developed as part of the GEF project. (TE p.9)

## 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 (pp.16-17) mentions the following lessons (shortened here):

1. The main lesson obtained from the project is that the mosaic conservation concept can produce significant conservation benefits. While the concept of Biosphere Reserves does not necessarily work, mosaics have shown that the idea of approaching conservation, landscape management and local participation with the same priority level does work. The concept also demonstrated that protected area networks need to include benefit sharing and promote agreements with local communities in order to reduce the trade-offs between biodiversity conservation and economic well-being. The team suggests that the Bank consider testing the mosaic concept in other countries with similar conservation challenges.
2. Due diligence and a project design that reflected a thorough understanding of the country's and project sites' current and realistic context were the keys for successful completion. Strict adherence to timelines and quick reactions to contingencies by the client, as well as a high level of proactivity by the Bank teams created a perfect combination of factors that resulted in a successful project. The team considers that this project could serve as a platform for case studies in efficient Bank-Client relations and project implementation.
3. Local participation and a solid strategy for continuous communication and dissemination were the key to promote local buy-in and appropriation of project activities. The project made a point of not relying exclusively on 'vertical teaching' mechanism and strongly encouraged horizontal knowledge exchanges between stakeholders. For example, 'farmer to farmer' exchanges practiced during the project to share learning experiences increased the understanding of project processes and facilitated the adoption of project- promoted good practices.
4. Best practices and lessons learned from other World Bank/GEF-supported trust funds contributed to paving the way for the successful establishment and growth of Patrimonio

Natural. By the end of the project, Patrimonio Natural was examining the validity of using GEF funds to establish a relatively small endowment fund as opposed to spending them directly to support conservation activities. Although this could generate a larger impact on a cost-benefit-time basis than waiting for variable annual returns, the overall concept of setting up Conservation Trust Funds through a project was demonstrated to be a valid approach, and the project experience should be replicated in similar country and region contexts.

## 9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE does not specifically provide any recommendation outside of those implied in the key lessons proposed.

## 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
<b>To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b>	The discussion of outcomes in section 3.2 of the report is very output-oriented, and there is not a good discussion of the way in which the project activities contributed to the outcomes described. Issues of attribution are not tackled.	<b>MU</b>
<b>To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?</b>	The report is consistent, but ratings are not always well substantiated due to significant evidence gaps -- it is not always clear that there is evidence for the success claims made in the TE, or where this evidence comes from.	<b>U</b>
<b>To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?</b>	The project does discuss issues of sustainability, but stops at describing the potential project risks rather than providing a real assessment of the potential for sustainability.	<b>MS</b>
<b>To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b>	Lessons learned are provided, but they do not always build upon the evidence presented in the report.	<b>MS</b>
<b>Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b>	No, and the figures provided do not distinguish between initial project and additional financing.	<b>HU</b>
<b>Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&amp;E systems:</b>	The report very briefly describes some of the monitoring that took place during the project, but does not assess the project's M&E systems as a whole and fail to properly describe the monitoring systems in place.	<b>MU</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MU</b>

**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, and PD.*