

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, Feb 2017

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		4111	
GEF Agency project ID		4208	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Institutional and policy strengthening to increase biodiversity conservation on production lands (PL) in Colombia	
Country/Countries		Colombia	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		BD-SP4-Policy and BD-SP5-Markets	
Executing agencies involved		The Nature Conservancy (TNC)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Natural Reserves Network of the Civil Society (RESNATUR) as one of the main beneficiary. Others include: WWF, Fundación Natura and Parques Nacionales Naturales	
Private sector involvement		Vichada's agroforestry trade association (AGAV in Spanish) acting as secondary executing agency	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) / Approval date (MSP)		February 18 th , 2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		28 July 2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		27 July 2014	
Actual date of project completion		30 March 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.02	-
	Co-financing	0.04	-
GEF Project Grant		0.97	0.97
Co-financing	IA own	-	-
	Government	0.44	0.07
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	-	-
	Private sector	0.05	0.29
	NGOs/CSOs	1.68	1.72
Total GEF funding		1.00	0.97
Total Co-financing		2.20	2.09
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		3.19	3.06
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		January 2015	
Author of TE		Clemencia Vela	
TER completion date		X February 2016	
TER prepared by		Mireia Duran	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Sohn	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environment Objective, as stated in the Project Document (p. 28), is “is to promote conservation of biodiversity on PL [production lands] in Colombia.”

The long-term impact expected is “to contribute to the conservation of biodiversity of global importance, including mammals, resident and migratory birds, and reptiles whose habitats will also be protected through this project” (Project Document Brief).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective, as stated in the Project Document (p. 28), is “is to promote voluntary biodiversity conservation practices on cattle ranching and forestry production lands (PL) through a revised legal/policy framework and institutional strengthening, and with the application of a pilot program in the Llanos region of Colombia.” The main UNDAF outcome is “to consolidate national and regional capacity for the knowledge, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and for the preservation, management and recovery of the ecosystems in order to guarantee the maintenance of environmental assets and services” (Project Document Brief).

The expected components of this project are:

Outcome 1. Adjustments in policies and laws regarding production practices promote conservation on production lands (PL).

Outcome 2. Strengthened management capacity for conservation practices on PL in the Llanos region.

Outcome 3. Pilot projects designed improve biodiversity conservation and income of farmers in the region of the Llanos.

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

The main changes, as recorded in the 2014 PIR, were made around the goals of outcome 1 “adjustments in policy”. These goals were redirected with the change of some indicators in the Logic Framework and in the risk matrix, specifically the project reduced the scope of indicators aimed at changing laws at the

national level. The project designed specific instruments for conservation at regional and local level. The reason for these changes was that the strengthening or "adjusting" of policies appeared to be more strategic and effective at regional levels. The beneficiaries, due to their weakness in some technical and policy areas, also requested these adjustments. In addition, the previous economic instruments were ineffective and thus, the design of new instruments for conservation was considered more appropriate than adjusting existing ones, which would have high transaction costs.

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 rates this project as relevant. This TER, which uses a different scale, rates relevance as satisfactory. The project is highly relevant due to the urgent need for conservation of an ecoregion rich in biodiversity that is facing serious threats. In Colombia the Llanos region contains biodiversity of global and regional importance: 2,126 species of plants, 119 species of reptiles, 644 species of birds, 28 species of amphibians, and 190 known species of mammals have been reported.

The project is relevant and pertinent at the national level. First, it is consistent with the Colombian Constitution of 1991 which provides the basis for civil society participation in the conservation of nature; second it is consistent with the environmental legal framework that recognizes the category of Natural Reserves of the Civil Society (RNSC) and assigns the registration of these areas to the National Parks Unit of Colombia (UAESPNN); and third it is aligned with the incentives for conservation and / or production that the Government of Colombia (GC) delivers. In addition, the project is considered pertinent and timely as it was implemented in a political moment in which the government was aggressively promoting development policies for the Llanos area.

Finally, this project is also consistent with GEF Strategic Objective Biodiversity: Incorporation of biodiversity in productive landscapes and sectors. It is relevant to GEF strategic priorities through Strategic Program 4: Strengthening of policy and regulatory framework to integrate biodiversity and Strategic Program 5: Fostering for markets biodiversity goods and services (Project Document, p.26).

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

The TE rates effectiveness as moderately satisfactory, and this TER agrees with that rating. Overall, the project achieved most of the goals stated within Outcome 2 and 3, and even exceeded some of the targets

set in the Results Frameworks of the PD. However, some targets were not met, especially within Outcome 1: Adjustments in policies and laws related to production practices that would promote conservation on private land. The TE emphasizes the great efforts made by the working groups involved in the project during execution and implementation (TE p.42). Nonetheless, there were some weaknesses in the design and strategic direction during execution that limited achievement of global benefits. Details on the progress of each outcome and goals are presented below:

Outcome 1: Adjustments in policies and laws related to production practices that would promote conservation on private land. Some targets under this outcome were not met and initial expected outcomes were not successfully achieved. The initial target stated in the Results Framework was to reform 7 policies or laws intended to promote conservation in the PL (PD, p.49). However during the project's life there was no reported legislation enacted that was consistent with the results sought by the project (TE, p.42).

Nonetheless, the project reached some accomplishments in legal and political grounds (TE, p.42-43):

- 1) It developed draft legal reforms for the implementation of environmental incentives as proposed in the Results Framework, but due to lack of political support to implement them, the project changed the scope of the goals and instead focused on the local level. This generated significant results at regional and local level. The new strategy reached greater achievements than insisting in complying with national indicators that would have exceeded the real possibilities of this project.
- 2) It generated support guides for local entities such as the property tax exemption for municipalities in Hato Corozal and Yopal.
- 3) The project took part in open consultations promoted by CORPORINOQUIA for its process to issue a resolution for the establishment of the Environmental Determinants. It successfully influenced the approval for the official consideration of RNSC as protected areas within the category of environmental protection.

Outcome 2: Strengthened management capacity for conservation practices on production lands in the Llanos region. Most goals were achieved. The project supported the local governments in the application of the resolution on Environmental Determinants in their territorial planning processes. This support was important to strengthen capacities for conservation practices at local level since local authorities find difficult to apply the law at regional level due to the large number of regulations coming from different sectors. Meanwhile, the information provided to understand the farm size (UAFs) in the Llanos region was useful but should be larger than originally proposed according to government officials that were interviewed as part of the final evaluation of this project.

The project also reported success in local capacity building (one of the focus areas after modifying some of the project objectives), particularly in: a) RESANTUR, where financial capacities were strengthened and private NGOs induced to register as OARNSC¹, and b) the promotion of The Forest Producers Association (AGAF).

¹ Organización Articuladora de Reservas Naturales de la Sociedad Civil.

Training workshops and meetings implemented in this project provided a platform for actors and authorities to promote future joint actions or resolve problem regarding land legalization and land use (TE, p.44).

Outcome 3: Pilot program to improve biodiversity conservation and producers' income in the Llanos region. Most targets under this outcome were achieved. According to the TE (p. 43) “the results of the pilot projects have enriched the understanding of sustainable management alternatives for flooded savannas where few studies had been done before.” The products generated of the pilot projects (guidelines for implementing environmental incentives in the Llanos that at the same time generate higher returns) were reported to be useful to officials of the subject.

Regarding the change in the landowners' perception about the benefits generated by the incentives of the pilot program (one of the indicators to evaluate output 3 stated in the Results Framework of the PD, p. 52), the TE explains that farmers had the perception of having obtained highest productivity thanks to the technical assistance provided in the pilot project and management practices learnt (p. 44).

Finally, one of the main targets of the project, “area with conservation-production management plans,” exceeded the initial target set in the Results Framework. The Project Document (p. 48) and the PIR 2014 proposed goal was 85,969 ha, while the TE reported that the project had achieved 114,013 ha. Similarly, the project exceeded some of the targets under “land cover of terrestrial ecosystem”, while others fell short:

Change in land cover of terrestrial ecosystems	Target proposed in the Results Framework	Target achieved (TE)
Flooded savannas	39,994 ha	15,803ha
High plains/savannas	18,731 ha	28,017 ha
Forests	9,619 ha	8,641 ha
Scrubland	1,688 ha	2,298 ha

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

The TE rated efficiency as satisfactory, while this TER gives a rating of Moderately Satisfactory. There were many institutions involved in the design, management and execution of the project, which resulted in high coordination costs compared to similar projects. Including inputs from various institutions enriched the project and facilitated the achievement of outcomes. However and despite efforts made by all parties, there were several organizational weaknesses that affected execution. For instance, the TE emphasizes the weak role of the Steering Committee to review the logical path of the project to achieve results, to comply with overall objectives of conservation and to undertake a comprehensive analysis of the results (p. 31). The TE also detected weak government involvement² and weak leadership of the TNC, the executing agency of project³. In addition, delays in the implementation of some activities had a chain

² The project involved local government institutions but these entities were not included in the evaluation of capacity building needs for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies as expected in the outcome 2 (TE, p. 35).

³ According to the TE, TNC officer's participation was intermittent or via Skype, which was not ideal for a project, especially when the TNC assumed leadership of the project. The project coordinator was logistically located within the TNC but its participation cannot be considered as representing the TNC.

reaction, as they were linked to other planned activities. For instance, delays of the TNC to produce the pilot project maps and the BD base line within those projects delayed the production of management plans, which were responsibility of Fundacion Natura considered within Outcome 3 (TE, p. 33). The TE also points out delays in the availability of funds and the wearing out of the participating institutions because of the constant re-planning of process and of the financial reporting (p. 38). This also increased the costs of the project, although these were not high enough to alter the budget.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that by the date of the TE, most of the expected outcomes were met and the costs associated with delays and organizational issues were not significant enough for the project to exceed the initial planned budget, which is why efficiency is rated as moderately satisfactory.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
--------------------	---------------------------

The Terminal Evaluation rates overall sustainability as moderately likely, and stresses the likely sustainability of most of the results of the project and the uncertainty and possible risk of other aspects. This TER agrees with that rating. The following four risk factors are assessed:

- 1) **Financial resources (ML).** The project does not include a specific mechanism to ensure financial continuity once it finished. However, the TE states that the main institutions involved in the project will continue working in the area and replicate the project's benefits by providing technical information and resources (p. 53). There is uncertainty related to the future resources that might be invested to continue practices learned in livestock and forestry.
- 2) **Sociopolitical (L)**
 - Landowners are likely to continue with the activities promoted in the pilot project due to increased productivity and revenues produced. NGOs (FHV and RESNATUR) are also incentivized to continue working on this issue since they have been promoting the subject prior to the project.
 - The future maintenance of forest patch registered as RNSC is also likely due to the incentives of landowners to maintain these agreements as it gives them more rights over their land.
 - Landowners are also likely to continue sustainable management practices taught by the project due to the perception that these practices will help them to increase production.
 - The sustainability of the knowledge provided is uncertain, as only those who attended training sessions gained access to the information provided by the project..
 - Articulating NGOs as part of the RNSC is likely sustainable given that some of them (RESNATUR) have been acting as such even before the project.
 - Vichada and Casanares have the political risk of llaneros deciding to sell their land to foreign investors who might change the use of land with negative consequences for the environment of the area.
- 3) **Institutional framework and governance (ML).**
 - The sustainability of conservation incentives is unpredictable due to the high turnover of staff in local governments.
 - The continuity of the implementation of the conservation incentives guidelines is uncertain since no information was available to determine the feasibility of applying them. It is also unknown

the degree of interest and ownership that the institutions may have to disburse money for this category.

- There are also significant political risks related to the participation of other sectors to promote development processes that might be incompatible with conservation.
- Local ownership (local authorities in the municipalities and departmental councils) guarantees the likely continuity of the land management processes supported with the inclusion of the Environmental Determinants.

4) Environmental (ML)

- Landowners are likely to conserve forest remnants in the RNSC of the pilot projects due to the benefits they received as RNSC.
- There is no information available to assess whether landowners have sufficient environmental awareness and knowledge about the importance of conserving all species in the food chain within their land. Therefore the sustainability of conservation of species of global significance is uncertain.
- Main environment risk to the project include rivers or groundwater pollution caused by industrial projects, intensive farming of rice or hydrocarbon activities.

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 appears to be important to achieve project's outcomes and objectives, although the TE does not provide detailed information about it. Funds from The Nature Conservancy (TNC) financed office support costs and complementary salaries to cover additional time once the relevant GEF funds were used. Co-financing also included indirect project expenses (TE, p.41). The actual co-financing was 75,199 USD lower than expected. The TE does not provide the reasons for this difference, nor does it provide further details on the relation between co-financing and the sustainability and/or outcomes of the project.

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 beginning date of the project was June 28, 2011 (date the project document was signed) but actual execution of funds did not begin until nine months later, in March 2012. The original project's Closing Date was March 1, 2014 but with the Mid Term Evaluation delay, it was extended to December 2014 (TE, p.39). This extension was largely caused by delays in hiring staff, and delays in establishing links with co-financiers. These delays led to substitution of the coordinator of the project management after the second year of implementation. In addition, the fact that contracts depended on a TNC (The Nature Conservancy) official headquartered in Costa Rica, rather than in Colombia, generated additional delays

in TNC duties that conditioned the timely execution of project activities (TE, p.33). As a result of the time between design and implementation, not all officials involved in the design were involved in the implementation.

In addition the actual disbursements to institutions were slow and late, which negatively affected Outcomes 2 and 3 since the dates for the working meetings on farms and training workshops in the towns had to be rescheduled. It also implied shorter actual time for the execution of activities planned for a given quarter (TE, p.39). The PIR 2014 also reported that sometimes, by the end the quarter, the total execution did not exceed 80% of the resources, which meant delays in requesting the next payment and, therefore, delays in implementing the activities in each region (PIR, p.22). The delays involved a continuous re-planning of expenditures and activate dates, increasing operational costs 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:

National ownership was limited and weak during execution. In contrast, local ownership was high and crucial to achieve the main targets of the project. One of the strengths of this project was that it was promoted by the Colombian Interagency Panel for Private Conservation Tools (G5). This Panel had been working since 2002 on the subject, and, according to Project Documents, its members selected areas of project intervention from previous studies. G5 was also highly involved during implementation of the project, which was helpful to achieve project's results and promote environmental sustainability. The large number of agencies involved in this project was beneficial to achieve set targets and promote local ownership. In addition, beneficiaries participated in monitoring processes, which generated ownership and social awareness towards conservation and environmental management (TE, p. 59).

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: Moderately Satisfactory
-------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE regarded the M&E design at entry as successful claiming that "proposed indicators were clear and allowed monitoring of the products." However, there were some weaknesses in the design that hindered the evaluation of the project, particularly the lack of proper indicators to monitor global objectives and long-term impacts. The project propely included within its budget expenditures to follow up tasks done by the coordinator such as, gathering information for the baseline, pilot project implementation, participation of training workshops, and the project Mid Term and Final evaluation (TE, p.35-36).

Some of the problems of the M&E design includes (TE, p.25-26):

- Lack of indicators for globally important species, which makes difficult the evaluation of project's contribution to achieve global benefits.
- The indicators of Outcome 1 were slightly unrealistic and difficult to obtain.
- Numerical data was not included for Outcome 2.1 at baseline.
- Some performance indicators and indicators of intermediate impact presented certain weaknesses.
- Indicators of the document conservation outcome at the farm level had different targets and the text is not sufficiently clear to allow the identification of potential local / global benefits at the different levels of intervention.
- Some indicators presented inconsistencies (for example, within the text and in table 3 of the Project Document it is proposed as a goal the establishment of 14 pilot farms, whereas in the Logical Framework matrix it shows 24 as the target number).

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

The TE rates the M&E implementation as moderately satisfactory. The project used most of the M&E tools proposed in the design and produce quarterly and annual reports (PIR), and a mid-term evaluation (that was delayed due to the difficulties in obtaining candidates for this task). However, the mid-term evaluation (MTE) reported some inconsistencies in the figures of the reports presented (p.31). The MTE also pointed out the absence of financial and technical consolidated reports, which should have been delivered by March 2013. UNDP undertook in-field visits and used internal meetings and technical committees as part of the M&E plan. However, the annual evaluations and the in-field visit reports were not delivered for the mid-term evaluation.

The project team and the UNDP officer in Colombia held a successful and close monitoring of the risk matrix, reviewing it regularly at quarterly meetings to confirm whether the risks were still present and whether the measures taken were adequate (TE, p. 35). Also, the baseline of several indicators served as a reference for changes in the project. For some indicators, the baseline was updated during implementation but this was not performed in a timely manner (TE, p.36).

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
--	----------------------

The implementing agency for this project was UNDP. Overall, the TE rated UNDP coordination and project implementation as satisfactory although there were a few weaknesses in their approach (weaknesses that were later resolved during execution). This TER agrees with that rating. As positive aspects, the TE points out the close monitoring of UNDP through quarterly meeting with the project coordinator and the close financial monitoring. It also highlights the significant support provided by UNDP to guide the project for reporting, budget management procedures and to clarify adaptations options of indicators. However, the TE stresses the weak guidance of UNDP for the institutions capacities assessment (TE, p.36-37).

In addition the TE qualifies as satisfactory the quality of the meetings/workshops/discussion forums, data analysis and preparation proposals of Outcome 1. Furthermore, project implementation was flexible as some adjustments were made to increase the effectiveness of the project. The scope and goals of Outcome 1 were modified following UNDP's suggestion and its justification and better results were appropriately reported in the PIR 2014, the MTE and the TE. The main adjustments were consistent with budgetary changes, and shifting budget lines between different categories to facilitate the management. UNDP corroborated that these allocations did not exceed 10% of the approved budget (TE, p.37).

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

This project's executing agency was the Nature Conservancy. The TE rates the Execution Agency coordination and project implementation as satisfactory, while this TER rates the quality of project execution as moderately satisfactory. The execution of the project was assigned to various institutions and thus, it required strong monitoring on individual results of each institution. The TE reported "weak monitoring of the results coming from their interaction" (p. 35) and even when the executers made an effort to improve the coordination among the components, the TE found no evidence that they have managed to develop a logical path for the project (p.37). In addition, the project coordinator was replaced as a response of the coordination problems previously identified. The TE reported that most of the coordination problems were corrected except for the delaying of the TNC products.

AS UNDP, TNC provided a close and accurate financial monitoring with its own accounting system. This discrepancy between UNDP and TNC systems created some delays and increased administrative costs (an administrative had to be hired to consolidate the financial accounts). Furthermore, because the TNC had process the funds through its internal system, which is done by the administrative office located in Bolivia, funding for the participating institutions took at least a week to arrive and sometimes even longer (TE, p.38).

Finally, it is worth noting that the project was executed on budget.

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.

Overall, the TE stresses the weaknesses of generating / reporting global environmental change. The expected environmental impact of this project is biodiversity conservation, which results will be observable in the future, and thus it is not feasible to expect a large impact by the end of project. The TE could not identify a clear path towards achieving the expected impact following the GEF "Results to Impact" methodology (TE, p. 44). Regarding short-term impact, the project was highly successful in promoting the traditional cattle ranching and partially successful in promoting raising intensive livestock. Nonetheless, the TE emphasizes the difficulty to identify the actual contribution of the project to the conservation of biodiversity due to the weaknesses of the indicators defined in the project design, the implementation modality used and the limitations related to spread information in the area (p.44). Finally, the TE found no evidence to attribute conservation incentives as promoters of conservation (p.46).

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 TE points out that participation of women, which could have contributed to increase gender equality in the area, was limited. Despite most professionals and technicians involved in the coordination, administration and technical assistance were women, at farm level, most participants / beneficiaries were men. The project focused primarily on training the owners of the estates (who were mostly men) and thus, missed the opportunity to involve workers and their wives and to promote the participation of women on farms. In addition, the project missed the opportunity to promote a balanced perception of farmers / foresters towards women who believe hiring women "causes problems" (TE, p. 49).

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

a) Capacities

The only reference in the TE related to possible improved capacities as a result of the project is the prevention of natural disasters. The project addressed the issue of draughts during the field work. Llaneros still practice traditional cattle management, which have been greatly affected by more acute droughts periods in the area. The technical assistance offered in Casanares included a production sustainable alternative providing nutritional supplements to livestock in the dry season, which was reported to have effectively increased reproduction of livestock (p.49). Even though the TE does not assess the possible long-term impact of this measure, it can be inferred that the effectiveness of the new techniques will incentivize farmers to maintain them, bringing about positive environmental change in terms of reducing livestock mortality. Additionally, the project included the Unit of Risks and Threats in the training processes of land planning in Casanares, whose main topic was floods (TE, p. 49). Again, no assessment of long-term impact is made in the TE but positive environmental change to prevent natural disasters might occur as a result of this initiative.

b) Governance

The TE states that “training in regional land use, planning processes and use of environmental determinant could be considered as a contribution to governance processes if it is taken into account that a sustainable community development gets easier when the development is based on clear rules and long-term community benefit.” (p.49). The report also points out that the project worked in an area subject to the influence of armed groups (FARC and paramilitary), but it is inferred from the TE that the project did not have any impact on the conflict dynamics of the area (p.49).

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.

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 reported that owners of neighboring farms expressed interest in replicating some of the activities of the project, but there was no information on the projection of potential stakeholders in surrounded areas (p.50). However, Fundacion Natura Colombia (FNC) appears to have replicated some of the activities of the project. The TE reported that FNC was providing pilot projects similar to those implemented in this project in 40 additional cattle farms in Casanares (City of Peace Ariporo). This has

taken place as a result of FNC involvement in the project. As stated in the TE, “the FNC elaborated a proposal including the required elements in addition to land planning and complementary conservation strategies” (p.50). This has provided FNC with the knowledge and expertise necessary to replicate the project. It is worth noting that by the time of the elaboration of the TE, the new project was in its preliminary phase and thus, there is no information on the implementation / results of the new activities. Finally, the creation of new RNSCs have been mainstreamed through the creation and institutionalization of Trustees of Earth, which are NGOs responsible for supporting private owners to become certified and be established as an RNSC (TE, p. 51).

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 identifies the following key lessons learned from this project:

- The proper focus and planning tools (including indicators) relevant to the current context at the beginning of the Project are essential to achieve proposed goals
- The correct understanding of “commonly used terminology” is crucial for achieving proposed goals, especially final desired impact.
- Political lobbying requires support from IA and EA authorities at the highest levels
- Generating greater awareness and understanding for the need of biodiversity conservation is a fundamental task in many projects.
- An efficient management is crucial for achieving good coordination among stakeholders and for the timely delivery of products to comply with the expected results.
- A coherent management structure is essential in project monitoring and execution, especially if the project’s management depends on different executers and the components required for the interlink of different products
- An inefficient financial management that delays access to funds can affect the quality of the products, an unnecessary wearing out of the executers, and even hinder the motivation of stakeholders’ participation.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations to ensure the sustainability of the project’s results:

- Ensuring that the farm owners of pilot projects receive all the information provided in the training sessions or that they know where to find it.
- Ensuring that all pertinent documents are accessible, easily recognized and organized in a way that facilitates the understanding of the reader. Thus, products generated by the project could guide other llaneros and public officials that were not involved in the training activities of the project.

- Since the G5 organizations will continue working in the area, with an effort to ensure sustainability of results and continuity towards achieving the overall objectives pursued, it would be advisable to establish a Leaving Strategy for the project so it can serve as a guide for future actions.

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?	TE covers achievements at the macro level but does not provide sufficient detail on many components. Along those lines, the TE does not include the result or progress made in most of the indicators proposed in the Results Framework (e.g. the Area (ha) of PRSC established, the Area (ha) of land under conservation agreements administrated by the Land Trust, the number of farms implementing biodiversity conservation actions, and so on). Besides, the assessment is not well structured as some of the evidence / arguments overlap with different outcomes.	MU
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Overall the TE is comprehensive and thorough, although significant spelling errors make difficult the understanding of some parts. There are also a few inconsistencies related to ratings and arguments to support the project's sustainability and the high levels of uncertainty described in the long-term/global impacts section. The ratings are also comprehensive and overall, well sustained (except for M&E design), but quantitative and sometimes qualitative evidence is missing.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The sustainability of the project is assessed in a comprehensive manner, including not only risks and obstacles but also a detailed list of recommendations to ensure it and strengthen it.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are comprehensive and supported by the main arguments and evidence presented in the TE.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE includes the actual project costs (total, per outcome and per year) and the actual co-financing used.	HS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Overall, the M&E assessment of the TE was brief and focused on explaining who was doing it instead of describing its effectiveness in detail. The rating of the M&E design is not well sustained and is inflated considering the difficulties to monitor and evaluate long-term impact (a point greatly emphasized during the report). The TE does not mention how M&E tools tracked progress, collected data or how reliable findings were to assess real outcomes.	MU
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).