

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2018

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3933	
GEF Agency project ID		GEF-FSP-022_PER	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)	
Project name		Sustainable Management of Protected Areas and Forests of the Northern Highlands of Peru	
Country/Countries		Peru	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity (BD)	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		To ensure the sustainable and participatory management of protected areas and communal forested lands in the Northern highlands of Peru while addressing existing barriers and threats.	
Executing agencies involved		Peruvian Trust Fund for National Parks and Protected Areas (PROFONANPE)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		ONF Andina	
Private sector involvement		N/A	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		June 8, 2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		September 26, 2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		September 30, 2016	
Actual date of project completion		October 30, 2016	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (Million US\$)	At Completion (Millions US\$)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.1	.1
	Co-financing	.1	.1
GEF Project Grant		1.72	1.52
Co-financing	IA own	14.4 (loan)	14.95
	Government	3.35 (grant)	3.35
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	N/A	N/A
	Private sector	.1 (grant)	0
	NGOs/CSOs	N/A	N/A
Total GEF funding		1.82	1.62
Total Co-financing		17.95	18.3
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		19.77	19.92
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		November 10, 2016	
Author of TE		Cesar Sotomayor Calderón, Consultant	
TER completion date		12/10/2018	
TER prepared by		Yuliya Gosnell	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Sohn and Cody Parker	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

To maintain and enhance the economic, social and environmental values of all types of forests, for the benefit of present and future generations, through support to the sustainable management of both natural and plantation forests (Project Document, p. 103).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

To deepen the effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of public investment from central and local governments to improve the welfare of the rural population and increase the value of their natural, physical, human, social and financial assets. (Project Document, p. 11).

With two components, the project intended to i) create a system of protected forests in the country's highlands, and ii) improve the environmental sustainability of economic activities of the population living in the forests' buffer zones.

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

The project did not change its Global Environmental Objectives or Development Objectives. The majority of activities under the project's two components, however, were modified as the project experienced hurdles and delays caused by socio-political tensions in the project's area or limited funding as detailed in Section 4.2. Adjustments in activities allowed project implementors complete the project and realign its outcomes with the project's objectives. The one outcome which was not achieved by the project – 1.4, establishment of a Conservation Endowment Fund – was addressed by returning the seed funds of \$0.2 million back to GEF.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The project is relevant to both national priorities and to GEF strategies and strategic programs.

With regards to the national priorities, the project is aligned with four strategic documents and frameworks:

- **National Rural Development Strategy**, designed to promote sustainable management and conservation of natural resources, and protection of the environment and cultural heritage;
- **National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan** within the framework of the National System for Protected Areas (SINANPE), created to address conservation priorities such as establishment and sound management of protected areas and their buffer zones;
- **The Plan Director for Protected Areas**, identified forests of Cañaris as a priority area to be incorporated into the national system of protected areas;
- **National Policy Framework for Environmental Management**, including the Environmental Code (1990) and the Forest and Fauna Law (Law 1090, 2008; modified by Law 29317, 2009); the latter has legalized decentralized forest management through concessions.

(CEO Endorsement, p. 10).

With regards to GEF strategic objectives, the project is relevant to **GEF's Strategic Objective 1 (BD SO-1): to catalyze sustainability of protected area systems**, as the project's main goal is to increase such sustainability through a series of activities, including capacity-building and support for the regional-national coordination, encouraging participation of the private sector (mining and other sectors, as a major polluter and a source of financing) in the conservation efforts, and through support to the growth of a Conservation Endowment Fund. (CEO Endorsement, p. 10), and **Strategic Objective 2 (BD SO-2): to mainstream biodiversity in production landscapes/seascapes and sectors**, through support of forest certification schemes and by raising awareness of the private sector and consumers on eco-products, and thus, "fostering markets for biodiversity goods and products" (CEO Endorsement, p. 10).

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

The TE rated effectiveness as Satisfactory, and this TER agrees with that rating. The project's design included two components with four subcomponents in each. The TE correctly supported the effectiveness rating with evaluation of effectiveness of activities under each component and subcomponent.

Component 1: Supporting a Regional System of Protected Areas.

Under the first component, the project intended to a) add the Canaris Forest to the network of protected areas of Peruvian highlands; b) strengthen collaboration between local government agencies of two provinces located in geographic proximity of each other - Lambayeque and Cajamarca - in management of protected areas, and strengthen the coordination of the local agencies with national authorities; c) increase participation of the local government in management of protected areas, and d) establish a Conservation Endowment Fund for future management of operating expenses incurred during conservation efforts in the protected areas.

Subcomponent 1.1: Establishment of the Cañaris Protected Area.

The Cañaris Forest did not become a protected area due to conflicts on the grounds of land property rights between local residents and a locally operating mining company Candente Cooper. However, the project implementors extended an existing Laquipampa Wildlife Refuge by 528 ha instead, and the extended area became an equal in size substitute. In addition, the project collected valuable information of the condition of the Cañaris Forest and its biodiversity, and while the Forest did not become a protected area, the collected scientific information on it became available to conservationists. The TE evaluated the rate of completion of this subcomponent at 100 percent.

Subcomponent 1.2: Strengthening the Bi-Regional Conservation Platform and Regional Agencies.

Under this subcomponent, the goals of the project were to create a channel for local government authorities to coordinate their conservation efforts: manage financial and technical resources, share experience, develop joint training programs, and work jointly with the national government on development of relevant policies and strategies.

Based on available information, the TE concluded that during the implementation stage of the project, 12 joint training programs for the local governments of the two provinces took place. A total of 39 professionals attended the training. In addition to the joint training, professionals from the Lambayeque region interned with the technical team from Cajamarca to learn Cajamarca's perspective on the state of regional conservation systems. The project did not evaluate the results of the trainings and the internship. The TE does not provide details on whether a platform for collaborative work was established and if it could effectively accomplish all the set goals under the subcomponent.

Subcomponent 1.3: Strengthening the Participatory Management of Protected Areas.

Among the results under this subcomponent are revitalization of local conservation management committees, which remained largely inactive prior to the project start. During the project implementation, committees began their meetings to determine their capacities, gaps in knowledge, training needs, and to draft their work plans. The committees were able to identify areas of conservation priorities using a tool developed by the National Service of Protected Natural Areas, and the main strategic partners with whom to form alliances in the committees' conservation efforts.

Subcomponent 1.4: Conservation Endowment Fund.

GEF made the first \$200,000 contribution to a fund expected to grow to \$1,200,000 with donations from private, public and non-profit sources, of which \$600,000 were to come from active in the area mining companies. Candente Mining Company made a commitment for the first contribution of \$100,000, but due to the escalating Cañaris Forest conflict, Candente withdrew the offer. No other mining companies or other private sector parties stepped forward with contributions. \$60,000, however, came from local communities and local governments.

Component 2: Sustainable Forest Management of Buffer Zones.

Under the second component, the project planned to a) train local communities to conduct economic activities in a sustainable way to protect forests and land around them; b) develop management plans for forests, which receive a certification from the Forest Stewardship Council; c) create community enterprises to maximize the benefit of the use of protected resources; and d) conduct feasibility studies on collecting payments for use of environmental resources.

Subcomponent 2.1: Integration of land management with sustainable forest use

Subcomponent 2.1 anticipated a chain of activities: a) selection of a set of organized communities for training in economic activities sustainable for forests and land; b) provision of training; c) provision of financing and continued support for the new economic activities.

During the implementation stage, project implementors developed a new tool, which allowed surveying village residents on their economic activities. Collected from 8 villages information was organized into one document, but the TE states that the document was incoherent in presenting results and confusing as to the sources of information in it. Subsequently, project implementors decided to select individual families as training participants rather than entire surveyed villages. The TE states that training was completed, although the total number of participants and the training budget were not known (TE, p. 14).

Subcomponent 2.2: Certification of sustainably managed forest areas

Certification of forests was not completed. However, at mid-term project evaluation, M&E indicator for this subcomponent changed to having a completed technical document to prepare forests for certifications. As a result, a feasibility study was carried out, which determined that forest “certification must result in a binding agreement with the benefitting rural population” (TE, p. 16). A parallel study collected information on forests georeferencing and the environmental condition of the forests.

Subcomponent 2.3: Integration of (Non-Timber Forest Products) NTFP into communal enterprises

The project implementers analyzed the supply and demand on certain NTFPs, and assisted communities of seven villages of Inkahuasi and six villages of Canaris to establish production and marketing of certain native agricultural products, such as Colombian granadilla, organic taro, native cacao, and other fruits. In addition, the project facilitated an establishment of a high-tech nursery producing local seedlings, and a lodging house. The TE states that no information exists on productivity, earnings, and the number of participating people of the established enterprises (TE, pp.19-20).

Subcomponent 2.4: Analysis of Payment Ecosystems Services

The project design anticipated studies conducted in three different areas to identify consumers and payers for environmental services, and the feasibility of scaling of payments for such services.

In the Laquipampa Wildlife Refuge area, local businesses, tour operators and tourists pay fees and taxes for the use of natural resources. In the Udimá Wildlife Refuge, coffee and bamboo producers located in the refuge's special use zone were the primary taxpayers, and payers for environmental services were not identified. The project implementors did not select the third area for the study, and further feasibility analysis in the two identified areas was hindered by lack of stakeholder interest, lack of supporting regulatory system, and general difficulties in valuing environmental resources and services (TE, p. 20).

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

The TE rated efficiency as moderately satisfactory and supports the rating with an argument that all components of the project had changes to its original design as the project incurred implementation challenges, and that the goals of simultaneous rural development and environmental protection set by the project were too ambitious (TER Executive Summary, par. 24). The argument, however, is more applicable to project effectiveness rating rather than efficiency. And in terms of efficiency, the project was completed in time and on budget, with the modified during implementation objectives accomplished.

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

The results of the project are moderately unlikely to be sustainable after the completion of the project's implementation stage. A number of institutional, financial, socio-economic, and environmental risks can affect the sustainability of this project.

Institutional risks are substantial: The project contributed to strengthening of institutions. It set up local management committees of wildlife refuges, created a bi-regional conservation platform, initiated the formation of associations of producers, and improved the capacity of technical teams managing the wildlife of Lambayeque and Cajamarca. The TE mission concluded that local governments had committed to follow up conservation efforts (as a result of the information on the necessity of such actions received during project implementation) but given the challenges with completion of project outcomes where participation of institutions was crucial (establishment of a new protected area and certification of forests), further significant independent progress post project completion is unlikely.

Financial risks are substantial: Given that the Environmental Endowment Fund did not take off during project implementation, future sources of funding for conservation efforts are uncertain. Furthermore, the Analysis of Payment Ecosystems Services was largely inconclusive and unable to determine the types of services and resources for which potential beneficiaries would be willing to pay. The only two identified channels of conservation financing are fees for visiting wildlife refuges and market-based distribution of

sustainable non-timber products. The TE, however, states that producer associations formed by the project will require further technical assistance and resources to develop and market the products.

Socio-political risks are substantial: The project centers its conservation efforts in areas of the country where the local population lives at a near sustenance level. The local residents are the primary beneficiaries of protected forests, and restricting their activities in the forests and in the surrounding areas is likely to imply a cost they may not necessarily be able to bear. Simultaneously, the forests are in close proximity of commercial mines, and assigning a protected status to the areas has the potential to restrict the activities of the mines. The latter considerations were likely the reason in the land ownership debate in protecting the Cañaris Forest, and similar debates are likely to continue.

Environmental risks are low: The natural environment does not present a risk to the sustainability of the project. However, continued commercial activities in the protected areas, such as tourism, mining, and increasing harvesting are likely to deteriorate the environment further, which will make accomplishment of continued conservation efforts with meaningful results more challenging. Thus, if environmental challenges are not proactively addressed at the present moment (through utilization of developed by the project tools, sustainable harvesting methods, knowledge exchange platforms, etc.), increasing environmental deterioration will create further challenges in sustaining the project's accomplishments and will require a new level of interventions.

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 did not play a significant role in the project. While the amount of co-financing appears to be approximately 80 percent of total project costs (with the amounts obtained from final PIR), most of it was used for IFAD's parallel project – Sierra Norte, "Project for Strengthening Assets, Markets and Rural Development Policies in the Northern Highlands", which aimed to protect and enhance the natural and cultural heritage of poor rural households in the northern highlands of Peru. Per the TE, the 3933, or Inkañaris part of the combined project, relied predominately on GEF funds (TE, p. 21). For the implementation phase, GEF provided a grant of \$1.72 million; the only source of co-financing was Agro Rural (Peru's Rural Agricultural Development Program) with a contribution of \$123,000. Such a small amount of co-financing limited the project's ability to accomplish its outcomes and threatened the sustainability of further conservation work post project completion.

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?

The project was completed essentially on time (one month after the expected completion date), without cost overruns. No explanation for the one month extension is available.

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:

While the national government supports biodiversity conservation in the highlands of Peru, it did not have a leading or facilitating role in accomplishment of the project's objectives. The population of the highlands, the primary beneficiary of the area's biodiversity, understood the importance of conservation efforts, but given the state of their welfare and the limited legal claim on the land they occupied, were unable to take rigorous action and ownership of biodiversity conservation. Weak ownership of efforts of both the government and the rural population negatively affected completion of project outcomes and future sustainability of the project's accomplishments.

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

The project did not have an M&E component. "Regarding the supervision and monitoring quality for the execution of the project, there is no monitoring and evaluation system of their own. The design proposed that the monitoring would be in charge of the Sierra Norte Project. The Mission did not have access to project's monitoring records, but it did access the periodic implementation reports (PIRs) that are sent annually to IFAD". Lack of an M&E system led to management teams not having sufficient reliable information to make timely decisions. (TE, par. 21, p. xviii).

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

Despite the fact that the project did not have an M&E system, PROFONANPE took the initiative to inform the Project Management Board and IFAD on the status of the project and challenges it encountered on a regular basis. To do so, PROFONANPE prepared semi-annual reports, annual reports, audit reports, PIR and Tracking Tools. Additionally, IFAD conducted two monitoring visits, upon completion of which, activities were adjusted. Thus, with the background of an absence of a M&E system, monitoring and evaluation efforts stood out. (TER Executive Summary, par. 28, p. 7).

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
--	---------------------------------

The TE states that the goals of the project may have been too ambitious for the amount of financing available for the project (TER Executive Summary, par. 24, p. 7). IFAD made a considerable effort in accomplishing the project's objectives but was limited in its ability to overcome hurdles due to socio-political tensions in the country and the amount of funding it had to work around them. All original project components were modified during the implementation phase to accomplish the most results given the constraints, and IFAD accomplished all except Component 1.4, establishment of a Conservation Endowment Fund. Additionally, IFAD completed M&E activities not required by the project (including two evaluation missions) to create a monitoring track for the project and to make information available for final project evaluation.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Unable to Assess
---	--------------------------

Given the lack of available information on PROFONANPE's performance as executing agency, this TER is unable to assess quality of project execution. PROFONANPE, the project's executing agency, was responsible for planning the project's activities, managing its technical aspects and administering resources. The TE states that IFAD provided no feedback on PROFONANPE's performance (TE, par. 174, p. 35). PROFONANPE's performance is not rated in either of the available project documents. The TE also stated, however, that it did collect some information on PROFONANPE through a direct interview post project completion (TE, par. 215, p. 41). During the interview, the TE authors concluded that PROFONANPE addressed all changes in the project design and followed up on execution of the changes in a timely manner, which is a statement on PROFONANPE's execution performance, but it is not a comprehensive assessment of the performance sufficient to determine an overall performance rating. (TE, par. 154, p. 32).

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.

As a result of the project implementation activities, 528 ha of forest were added to the existing Laquipampa Wildlife Refuge, which would improve conservation of biodiversity in the area. It is challenging, however, to estimate, the extent of improvements to biodiversity of this addition, as the project did not propose measuring it.

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.

Education and Awareness:

The project activities contributed to strengthening of local institutions supporting biodiversity preservation through the creation of bi-regional cooperation platform, training and awareness raising (TE Executive Summary, par. 21, p. 6).

In addition to work on institutional capacity building, the project implementors raised awareness of the local population on the necessity of biodiversity conservation. This occurred through efforts on forest certification, and on identifying commercially viable environmentally sustainable non-timber crops local entrepreneurs could distribute. Increased awareness, improved capacity, and sustainable economic activities have the potential to positively affect the environment and biodiversity of the area in the future.

Income:

While the project identified new environmentally sustainable activities for the local population, the TE did not evaluate the adoption rate of the activities and possible improvements in the population income.

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

As stated in Section 8.2, the project activities contributed to the strengthening of local institutions supporting biodiversity preservation through the creation of a bi-regional cooperation platform, training and awareness raising (TE Executive Summary, par. 21, p. 6).

b) Governance

The project revitalized local conservation management committees, which remained largely inactive prior to the project start. During the project implementation, committees began their meetings to determine their capacities, gaps in knowledge, training needs, and to draft their work plans. The committees were able to identify areas of conservation priorities using a tool developed by the National Service of Protected Natural Areas. Additionally, the project created a bi-regional platform for communication and knowledge exchange of Lambayeque and Cajamarca regional authorities with a mandate to protect biodiversity.

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

The Terminal Evaluation report does not describe unintended impacts, either positive or negative.

- 1.5 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.

Adoption of the project initiatives did not occur at scale as the project activities were limited to two regions and were largely constrained by the lack of supporting regulatory environment, sociopolitical tensions and limited financing. Not only did the project not scale up, all of its activities had to be changed in the process of implementation in order to deliver some results. Still, the main obstacle to scaling up of the project was the inability of the project implementors to establish the Conservation Endowment Fund, the goal of which was to finance continued conservation efforts.

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.

Lesson 1: The National Service of Protected Natural Areas (SERNANP) and regional governments (GORES) were able to establish cooperation while facilitating the project, which should continue in the future. The regional governments were instrumental in allocation of technical assistance funds to families participating in the project (producers of non-timber goods) on a competitive basis.

Lesson 2: Ministries within a national government can successfully cooperate. While implementing activities in the project areas and creating opportunities for the population, the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture worked together successfully.

Lesson 3: Establishment of participatory sustainable management of protected areas should be gradual, with activities to first sensitize and later provide opportunities and responsibilities for citizens.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

Recommendation 1: A project should have an M&E system integrated into its design to enable project implementors collect data and information throughout the implementation phase. This will allow timely adjustment of activities when necessary, and accurate evaluation of the project's results at its completion.

Recommendation 2: In projects addressing both economic development and biodiversity conservation, facilitators should consider involving all stakeholders in the geographical area of interest throughout the project's lifecycle, as doing so will improve sustainability of the project's results.

Recommendation 3: Establishment of participatory sustainable management of protected areas should be gradual, with activities to first sensitize, and later, provide opportunities and responsibilities for citizens. UDIMA had successful experience in establishing and evaluating participatory management.

Recommendation 4: Coordination of local and regional governments post project completion can be improved when new project initiatives (such as management committees, communication platforms) disseminate their goals and agenda, and appoint responsible parties when they are formed.

Recommendation 5: A project design should include contributions to improved institutional capacity in its center to create opportunities for institutions to absorb and systematize lessons learned during the project's implementation.

Recommendation 6: Conservation projects require an intervention model based on local resources that are built through training and follow-up action. These local resources should participate in the project structure as facilitators, animators, and would constitute, at the closure of the project, skilled human capital in the area.

Recommendation 7: The execution of the INKAÑARIS project shows that the management of a project of this type requires that the team of professionals assume greater responsibility and commitment for the integral operation and its results. In this sense, the option of a local team is better than that of a team of consultants who, once finished the product for which they were hired, do not remain or realize the sustainability of the work done.

Recommendation 8: Local institutions – civil society organizations, private organizations, and government agencies at national and regional levels – should gain the capacity to develop further joint conservation work through participation in current project activities.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The assessment of relevant outcomes was moderately satisfactory. Despite the lack of an M&E system in the project's design, TE authors managed to collect relevant information to describe outcomes of each component of the project. Thorough assessment was not possible due to the lack of baseline for evaluation or in availability of activity participants for an interview.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is fairly consistent, although the summary of findings and conclusions in English did not always follow the narrative in Spanish. Evidence was not always complete given the shortage of information caused by limited monitoring of project during its implementation. Statements in English were not always easily understandable.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report does not fully describe risks and consequently, underestimates them. For example, when evaluating institutional risk, the TE relies on verbal commitment of a regional government agency to follow up on one of the achievements of the project, and rates institutional risk as low. The TE does not, however, take into account the current level of capacity of the agency, the history of its weak participation in project activities, nor it consider involvement of other national and regional agencies.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are titled "Conclusions" and are presented as such. Lessons learned can, however, be discerned in the conclusions, along with background information on the lessons. The section on lessons learned could be significantly longer (currently only three lessons are presented), as the project faced multiple hurdles which caused adjustment of project activities.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The project includes actual total project costs, total and per activity. Costs are listed in several sections of the report, and are often combined with Sierra Norte costs.	S

Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report's evaluation of project M&E is rather brief as the project did not have an M&E system. The report, however, makes the best use of available information.	S
Overall TE Rating		MS

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

No additional sources were used in the preparation of this TER.