

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

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3996	
GEF Agency project ID		4210	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		SFM: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into the Management of Pine-Oak Forests	
Country/Countries		Honduras	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity (BD)	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		MFS-PE4; BD-SP4 Policy; Markets MFS-SP5; Markets BD-SP5	
Executing agencies involved		The Nature Conservancy, Institute for Forest Conservation, SERNA, AMO, CATIE, Fundación PROLANCHO, UNAG, ESNACIFOR	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NGOs as lead executing agencies	
Private sector involvement		Owners of private forests as beneficiaries	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		October 20, 2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		May 26, 2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		April 30, 2015	
Actual date of project completion		April 30, 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.08	0.08
	Co-financing	N/A	N/A
GEF Project Grant		0.829	N/A
Co-financing	IA own	0.20	N/A
	Government	2.105	N/A
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.99	N/A
	Private sector	0	N/A
	NGOs/CSOs	0	N/A
Total GEF funding		0.909	N/A
Total Co-financing		3.299	N/A
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		4.128	NA
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		February 15, 2016	
Author of TE		Guido Fernández de Velasco	
TER completion date		January 27, 2017	
TER prepared by		Matteo Borzoni	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	N/R	Highly satisfactory	N/A	Moderately satisfactory
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/R	Likely	N/A	Moderately likely
M&E Design	N/R	Moderately satisfactory	N/A	Moderately satisfactory
M&E Implementation	N/R	Satisfactory	N/A	Moderately satisfactory
Quality of Implementation	N/R	Highly satisfactory	N/A	Highly satisfactory
Quality of Execution	N/R	Highly satisfactory	N/A	Highly satisfactory
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	.	-	N/A	Unsatisfactory

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The ProDoc does not include a formal definition of the global environmental objective.

The global significance of the ecoregion where the project was implemented stems from its high levels of biodiversity (BD) and endemism, and its importance as a migration route for neotropical migrant birds. The North Central American Highlands Endemic Bird Area, of which the pine-oak forests of Honduras form a part, contains 20 extant restricted range species. The most outstanding characteristic of the pine-oak forests is the richness of the genus *Pinus*: Honduras has a total of 9 pine species, most of which are confined to this ecoregion. (ProDoc. p.18)

The main threats to this ecoregion arise within the forestry sector. *Pinus oocarpa* forests are the mainstay of the country's forestry industry. Although they are capable of being managed sustainably for timber in a manner that is compatible with biodiversity (BD) conservation, large areas are subject to inadequate methods of harvesting, timber extraction and forestry. The extraction of more than the permissible annual yield, the removal and poor selection of seed trees and the failure to protect and promote natural regeneration leads to progressive thinning out of the forest canopy and in some cases eventual complete forest loss. Even when sustainable, in terms of regeneration capacity of the forest, timber harvesting also modifies the vertical structure of the canopy and its plant species composition. These changes reduce the habitat value of the forest for mammals, birds and plant species that are sensitive to disturbance and changes in light and moisture regimes.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project is "To mainstream biodiversity conservation into sustainable forest management in the pine-oak ecoregion, in conformity with the livelihood support needs of the local population" (ProDoc. p.54)

This objective was to be achieved through the following three expected outcomes:

- Outcome 1: managers and users and forestry authorities have access to forest management prescriptions that maximize the habitat value of pine/oak forests for globally important flora and fauna.
- Outcome 2: Forest owners, managers and users have the capacities required for the application of forms of forest use and management that are compatible with biodiversity conservation.
- Outcome 3: Forest management practices are subject to regulation and enforcement that permit the conservation of globally important biodiversity.

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

No

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 TE rated Relevance as “Relevant” and this TER, which uses a different scale, rates relevance as “Satisfactory”.

The project is consistent with national priorities and policies. The country’s Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper recognizes the importance of sustainable forest management for poverty reduction. The approval of the new Forestry Law in 2007 reflects the priority accorded by the Government to sustainable forest management as a means of achieving the combined goals of poverty reduction, protection of environmental services and BD conservation. The National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan promotes the conservation of biological diversity through the sustainable use of its components, including the strengthening of the social forestry system through the participation of municipal authorities and local communities and review, adjustment, discussion and approval of the new Forestry Law with the objective of achieving sustainable exploitation of forest resources.

The project is also consistent with the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area. More specifically, the project contributes to Strategic Objective 2 “To Mainstream Biodiversity in Production Landscapes/Seascapes

and Sectors”. Its main emphasis is on Strategic Priority 4 “Strengthening the Policy and Regulatory Framework for Mainstreaming Biodiversity” as it focuses on mainstreaming BD into the management prescriptions and plans which are legal prerequisites for the approval of forest management activities, and on strengthening local capacities for planning and regulation of forestry activities. The project also includes elements of Strategic Priority 5 “Fostering Markets for Biodiversity Goods and Services” as it supports marketing of non-timber forest products, which are produced coherently with BD principles. The project also contributes to Strategic Objective 2 of the SFM framework strategy “Sustainable management and use of forest resources” as it focusses on the sustainable management of forests.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately satisfactory
--------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE rated effectiveness as “satisfactory”. This TER revises that rating to “Moderately Satisfactory”. This is because the first expected outcome was achieved, however the achievement of the second expected result is partially incomplete since no concrete income diversification activity took place. Moreover, the information included in the TE and in the PIRs do not clarify whether the third expected result has been achieved.

For the first outcome the project planned to update norms on fire and pest management, thinning, wood extraction, and road construction in forest areas and on management of non-timber forest products (NTFPs). In addition, the project envisaged that the percentage of the area included in the forest management plan and excluded from extraction activities would have increased from 35% to 40%. In this regards a gap analysis was conducted to assess how biodiversity aspects are included in forest management plans. Simplified guides for forest management plans in mixed forests were developed on the basis of the results of the gap analysis (PIR 2015, p.17). The simplified guides were approved by ministerial resolution (PIR 2015, p. 48). Also, 66 fire protection plans were developed, which planned fire control patrols, controlled fires, and employment of guards (PIR 2014, p.11). The increase in the forest area legally excluded from extraction activities increased from 35% to 38% after the approval of the new regulation on forestry plans and community forests. The project also supported issuing usufruct rights to three agroforestry cooperatives to manage 7,000 ha of forest under management plans that promote biodiversity considerations. This is supposed to improve forestry management practices of 22 communities (PIR 2015, p. 48). For the first expected outcome the project also planned to improve institutional capacities to share information and knowledge on forestry. In this regard the project developed a strategic plan for the Honduras Pine Oak Alliance, its communication plan and the internal rules of the alliance. The Honduras Pine Oak Alliance brings together a wide range of actors involved by the project.

For the second outcome the project planned to improve knowledge on biodiversity conversation principles in forest management practices among forest users, managers and owners. In this regards the project trained about 250 people from 10 different agro-forestry cooperatives on community forestry management. Standards for monitoring community forestry activities were developed. Also about 30 municipal officers (from the 10 target municipalities) were trained in environmental management.

Various practical and theoretical workshops were organized about the inclusion of biodiversity concepts in forestry management. In addition, an association of private forest owners was established with the support of the project (PIR 2015, p. 27). The project also planned to support economic diversification forestry activities. However activities in this field were extremely limited with very little results (TE, p. 14-15 and 22).

For the third outcome the project planned to build capacities for an effective regulation and monitoring of biodiversity and forest management practices. In this regard, the project supported a memorandum of understanding between the Association of Municipalities of Olancho and the General Direction of the Environment (under the Ministry of Environment) to strengthen the environmental management capacities of the municipalities included in the pine-oak eco-region of the Olancho department. Capacity building activities were organized and 16 environmental units were certified on environmental management (TE, p. 23). In addition, the project supported the development of nine environmental municipal action plans, which were approved by the municipality councils and by the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (PIR, p. 34). The project also supported the development of the Municipal Forestry Protection Strategy (TE, p. 24). The third outcome envisaged that the extraction level of wood and NTFPs would not exceed their natural regeneration capacities. A baseline study was conducted on wood and NTFP extraction. An oak extraction plan was developed along with a proposal for a model of pine resin production (PIR 2014, p. 32). However, neither the TE nor the PIRs include an assessment of whether the project actually contributed to keeping the extraction of forest products within the natural regeneration capacity of the forest.

An analysis of the contribution of the project to the development objective is not possible since no considerations are included in the TE on this specific topic. Indicators of the development objective are only partially substantiated with data in the project PIRs. However, the 2015 PIR reports that the project area affected by fires was reduced by 50% from 2013 to 2014 (p. 12). The PIR suggests that this reduction should be attributed to the project and that it was due to the trainings and the equipment delivered by the project (p. 48).

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Highly satisfactory
-----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rated efficiency as “Highly Satisfactory” and this TER agrees with that rating.

At March 2015 the project expenses amounted to 93% of the GEF contribution (TE, p. 25).

The project was planned to be implemented through an NGO execution modality. Changes in the implementation modality were introduced after the project start at the partners’ requests and consisted in leaving the project management under UNDP. In addition, the original project design included the use of national and international consultants, who eventually were not employed. According to the TE these changes allowed the project to use a greater amount of financial resources for the implementation of activities and to involve more partners, who were not initially planned to be part of the project. Such partners include AMO (an association of municipality of Olancho), CATIE (a regional center dedicated to research and graduate education in agriculture, and the management, conservation and sustainable use of natural resources), Fundación PROLANCHO (a local private foundation dealing with the integrated

development of Olancho), and UNAG (the National University of Agriculture). The TE also reports that The Nature Conservancy (TNC) did not use project resources to cover overhead and operative costs (p. 11).

The project was implemented without requiring time extension and the TE does no mention delays.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately likely
---------------------------	---------------------------

The TE rated Sustainability as “Likely”, while this TER revises that rating to “Moderately likely”. This is because financial sustainability and environmental sustainability are both considered “Moderately likely”.

The financial sustainability is rated as “Moderately Likely” by the TE and this TER agrees with that rating. According to the 2015 PIR (p. 32) financial resources are available for the continuation of activities from the Meso-American Pine-Oak Alliance and will be managed by the Fundación Prolancho. The PIR also reports that CATIE designed a re-investment proposal for these financial resources to be used by agro-forestry cooperatives to promote community forestry initiatives. This funding mechanism contributes to the financial sustainability of the project and it was already used to fund three small regional projects implemented by the same co-executors of this GEF-funded project (TE, p. 26). However, the TE also stresses that the main financial mechanisms that was included in the project design relied on a EU-funded Forest Sector Modernization Project and on next phase of the GTZ-funded Natural Resources Program (PRORENA). However no coordination took place with these initiatives, thus suggesting that the use of the funds from these projects to sustain the services of the GEF-funded project is not credible (TE, p. 26). In addition, the TE stresses that the project did not implement substantial activities to build the capacities of the forestry cooperatives to produce and market NTFPs (p. 14). This obviously limits the financial sustainability of the project.

The TE rated the sustainability of the institutional framework and governance as “Likely” and this TER agrees with that rating. The Honduran Pine Oak Alliance brings together 15 institutions, covering all the actors involved in the project. In this regards, the project supported the development of the Strategic Plan of the Honduran Pine Oak Alliance. In addition, three regional platforms were set-up with the aim of sharing learning and promoting coordination. An association of private forest owners (40 owners) was established and strengthened. Regarding forest management practices, sixteen (16) Municipal Environmental Units were certificated. Nine municipalities have Environmental Action Plans. At municipal level a Forest Protection Strategy was developed and included the establishment of three Municipal Forest Protection Committees. Also a plan for fuelwood extraction was drafted (PIR 2015, p. 47-50)

The TE rated environmental sustainability as “Moderately Likely” and this TER agrees with that rating. There are important threats that have affected the project area and that may cause further damages in the future. These include insect pests, forest fires and land use changes (TE, p. 27).

Socio-political sustainability was rated as “Likely” in the TE. However, this TER is unable to assess socio-political sustainability since no relevant information is included in TE. One of the initiatives supported by the project does not seem to be sustainable. This is the case of the Pine-Oak Biological Corridor and its conservation plan. The TE reports that the proposal for the corridor is in the hands of General Direction of Biodiversity (under the Ministry of Energy, Natural Resources and the Environment). The staff of the General Direction of Biodiversity interviewed during the TE complained that they were not consulted during the design of the corridor (TE, p. 24) consequently the initiative does not seem to have political ownership.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The data included in the TE on co-financing is not clear. The TE mentions that the a total of \$US 3,134,091 was contributed as co-financing in cash, and \$US 993,568 in kind from ESNACIFOR for a total of \$US 4,127,659. This is the same amount included by the author of the TE in the project summary table for the co-financing budgeted at endorsement (and not at the terminal evaluation). Also, the summary table for the co-financing budgeted of the TE reports only zeros as co-financing values at terminal evaluation. So it is not clear whether the co-financing data reported in the TE refer to planned co-financing or to spent co-financing. The author emphasizes that documentation of co-financing was not provided though this was specifically requested (TE, p. 19).

In conclusion, even though the TE mentions that in-kind co-financing was provided, the available information does not make it possible to provide considerations on the extent to which co-financing was essential for the achievement of GEF objectives or on differences between expected and planned co-financing.

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 have been no extensions or delays.

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

A lack of ownership on the part of the General Direction of Biodiversity (which is part of the Ministry of the Environment) affected the approval of the pine-oak biological corridor. The staff of the General Direction of Biodiversity was not consulted during the project implementation on the design of the

corridor though this is an issue under their responsibility. As consequence, the General Direction of Biodiversity will not probably back the initiative.

The simplified guides for forest management guides in mixed forests were approved by ministerial resolution, which suggests a positive ownership of this initiative by the government. Also the municipal environmental action plans are characterized by a good level of ownership since they were approved by the nine municipality councils and by the relevant ministry.

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

The TE rated M&E Design at entry as “Moderately satisfactory” and this TER agrees with that rating.

Eight indicators of the strategic results framework required a baseline study to be quantified, however for five indicators the project did not set baseline figures when the TE was conducted (TE, p. 21). This problem was also recognized in PIRs (PIR 2015, p. 51).

Following the template for GEF-funded project documents a monitoring and evaluation plan was developed in the original project document (with its budget). The monitoring and evaluation plan included annual project reports, project implementation reviews, quarterly progress reports, periodic thematic reports, terminal report, a mid-term evaluation and a final evaluation.

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

The TE rates M&E Implementation as “Satisfactory” and this TER revises that rating to “Moderately satisfactory” no actions were taken by the project to set a baseline value for five indicators (see Section 6.1).

Two indicators of the development objective consist in the frequency of sightings of a bird (Golden-cheeked warbler *Dendroica chrysoparia*) and of a salamanders during transects. However data to inform these indicators were not collected. The rest of the indicators of the strategic results framework were monitored.

The TE mentions that the project developed two important monitoring tools, which consist in the “Follow-up and monitoring mechanisms for the planned activities of the management and operative forestry plans” and the “Standards for the monitoring and evaluation of community forestry” (p. 23).

A mid-term evaluation was conducted but the TE does not report any considerations on the capacity of the project to addresses the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation. The mid-term evaluation was not available for this TER so no other considerations are possible on the capacity of the project use of the mid-term evaluation as an adaptive management tool.

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: Highly satisfactory
--	-----------------------------

The TE rated the Quality of Project Implementation as “Highly satisfactory”. This TER agrees with that rating.

UNDP was the implementing agency. According to initial agreements, the role of UNDP should have consisted in a supervision and monitoring, since NGO execution was the modality for the implementation of the project. After the project started the project steering committee introduced important changes in the implementation modality, thus leaving the complete management of the project in the hands of UNDP. According to the TE (p. 11) this made it possible to save substantial financial resources. The resources so saved were used for more field activities and more grant agreements with new organizations (see Section 3.3)

The TE also mentions that UNDP did not only provide administrative support (as specified in the project document), but also qualified technical assistance (p. 11).

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Highly satisfactory
---	-----------------------------

The TE rated the Quality of Project Execution as “Highly Satisfactory”. This TER agrees with that rating.

The TE mentions that relationships between The Nature Conservancy and the Institute for Forest Conservation (the two main executing agencies) were very collaborative and this facilitated the overall implementation of the project (p. 17). In addition the TE reports that the Nature Conservancy did not use project resources to cover overhead and operative costs, which contributed to the overall efficiency of the use of GEF funds. (p. 11).

A project steering committee was in place and brought together all involved actors.

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 PIR reports that 66 forest fires were reported in 2013 in the Olancho department, thus affecting an area of 3,546.70 ha. The following year the number of fires increased to 73 but the total affected area was about 50% lower than the area burnt in 2013 and amounted to 1,749.6 ha (PIR 2014, p. 10). The PIRs attributes the reduction in the area affected by fires forest to the improved capacities of project beneficiaries to address fire problems. However without further details on the rational for this attribution, concluding that the reduction in the extension of burnt forest area is caused by the project is questionable, since there may be many other influencing factors.

TE (p. 22) also emphasizes that, given the reduced scale of the project it, is unlikely that the project has generated an improvement in the ecological status of the area and adds that there are no objective data to assess whether the project caused environmental improvements.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The project planned to support income diversification activities. However initiatives in this regards were minimal. Consequently it can be assumed that no significant socio-economic changes took place.

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

Numerous capacity building initiatives were organized. More specifically about 250 people, from 10 different agro-forestry cooperatives, were trained on community forestry management. In addition, about 30 municipal officers (from the 10 target municipalities) were trained in environmental management. Members of the municipal committees for forest protection were also trained.

Studies were conducted on wood and NTFP extraction. An oak extraction plan was developed by the Prolancho Fundación. Also a proposal for a model of pine resin production was drafted by ESNACIFOR.

The project developed guidelines for municipal environmental management. Simplified guides for forest management plans in mixed forests were also developed.

Finally, in collaboration with UNAG, the project supported a publication on the Biodiversity of the Olancho Pine-Oak Ecosystem

b) Governance

At municipal level the project supported the development and implementation of the Municipal Forest Protection Plan and included the establishment of three Municipal Forest Protection Committees. Nine Municipal Environmental Action Plans were drafted and approved by municipal councils. The project also spearheaded the process of certification of 16 municipal management units. Procedures for municipal environmental units were developed along with standards for monitoring community forestry activities.

The project supported the development of the Strategic Plan of the Honduran Pine Oak Alliance, which brings together 15 institutes that were involved in project activities.

Three regional platforms were established to promote coordination and learning among their members. An association of private forest owners (40 owners) was also established.

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 in the TE or in the PIRs/

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.

The TE reports that the General Direction for the Environmental (under the Ministry of Energy, Natural Resources and Environment) intends to replicate the Olancho Network of Municipal Environmental Units developed by the project in other departments of the country (p. 24).

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 includes one single lesson, which is here reported.

Coordination and collaboration among national and local initiatives are essential to build capacities in the implementation of norms and regulations for environmental conservation.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

Most important recommendations are the following:

- In future UNDP projects environmental management and conservation should be mainstreamed in all UNDP initiatives.
- Alliances and agreements with universities and educational institutions should be promoted with the purpose of strengthening the use and development of biodiversity monitoring tools.

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?	An analysis of each outcome is included but a clear assessment of the achievements of the outcomes based on the target and indicators of the strategic result framework is missing. An analysis of the achievement of the development objective is missing. A clear analysis of impacts is also missing.	MU
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The analysis reported lacks evidence. The report includes very general statements with few references to facts. There are clear inconsistencies in the analysis of indicators (they are considered inadequate in one part of the report and adequate in other parts). A good part of ratings are not substantiated or not coherent with the shortcomings reported.	U
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The analysis of financial, institutional and environmental sustainability is acceptable, while the analysis of socio-cultural sustainability is not relevant. Considerations on the exit strategy are poor.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	There is only one lesson learned, which is very obvious and has no real learning value.	HU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Only the total expenditure of GEF-funded component is included.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Considerations on the quality of the M&E at design are relevant and comprehensive. The report does not provide any assessment on the capacity of the project to address the recommendations included in the mid-term evaluation (and on the use of monitoring system as an adaptive management tool). This make the analysis of the M&E implementation very poor.	U
Overall TE Rating		U

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