

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		4113	
GEF Agency project ID		CO-X1011	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		Inter-American Development Bank	
Project name		Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Palm Cropping in Colombia with an Ecosystem Approach	
Country/Countries		Colombia	
Region		South America	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		BD-5 – Fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services	
Executing agencies involved		National Federation of African Palm Growers (FEDEPALMA)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		WWF – Northern Amazon & Chocó Darien Regional Office (WWF-NACD) through consultations	
Private sector involvement		Cenipalma through consultation	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) / Approval date (MSP)		March, 2012	
Effectiveness date / project start		April, 2012	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December, 2016	
Actual date of project completion		October, 2018	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	-	-
	Co-financing	-	-
GEF Project Grant		4.25	4.25
Co-financing	IA own	-	-
	Government	7.89	1.21
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	-	-
	Private sector	4.23	7.88
	NGOs/CSOs	0.3	0.44
	Other ¹	1.91	1.57
Total GEF funding		4.25	4.25
Total Co-financing		14.33	11.1
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		18.57	15.35
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December, 2018	
Author of TE		Julio Guzmán	
TER completion date		February, 2020	
TER prepared by		Ritu Kanotra	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts Sohn	

¹ Contribution from National Federation of Oil Palm Growers, Fedepalma, the executing agency

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project was to ‘contribute to the identification, protection and restoration of high conservation value areas and to the sustainable management of oil palm agri systems’ (PD, Pg11).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As per the Project Document, the Development Objective of the project was to ‘contribute to the conservation and mainstreaming of biodiversity in oil palm systems, through enhanced planning and adoption of agro-ecological practices in regions prioritized for the expansion of oil palm cultivation’ (PD, Pg 1). The project had the following 4 components:

Component 1: Integrated planning and management of oil palm agro-ecosystems

Component 2: Conservation and valuation of ecosystem services

Component 3: Alternative agro-biodiversity uses and markets

Component 4: Monitoring, Communication and Impact Assessment

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

Although there were not any changes in the global environmental and development objectives of the project, the TE highlighted the fact that the scope of the some of the activities was reduced during execution for various reasons, such as activities not being ‘feasible’ or ‘viable’ during the timeframe of the project.

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 assessed the relevance of the project as ‘moderately satisfactory’. Based on the evidence in the available reports, this TE, which uses a binary scale for rating relevance, assessed the relevance to ‘satisfactory’. The project was designed to respond to the degradation or depletion of high conservation value areas and degradation of natural ecosystem/ and agro-ecosystems in the areas of direct and indirect influence of oil palm cultivation experiencing rapid growth over the past two decades in Colombia. The design of the project complied with the legal regulation and policies of the Colombia such as National Development Plan (PND) 2010-2014 that identified palm sector as a priority sub-sector to increase productivity and competitiveness and National Policy on Sustainable Production and Consumption (2010), which aimed at changing unsustainable patterns of production and consumption by different sectors of society. It was also in compliance with article 6 of the Convention on Biological Diversity as this project contributes to the incorporation of biodiversity considerations into the sector's plans and programs. Along the same lines, it also contributed to the National Biodiversity Policy (1996) and the Technical Proposal of the National Action Plan for Biodiversity "21st Century Biodiversity." (PD, Pg 15).

The project contributed to objective 2 of the GEF-4 Biodiversity Focal Strategy, which seeks to incorporate biodiversity considerations into productive landscapes through the development of specific tools for planning palm activities with ecosystem criteria, placing emphasis on reducing threats of the productive sector on natural ecosystems and strengthening the national ability to adopt certification standards that promote enhanced environmental and social practices (PD, Pg 16).

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

This TER agrees with the rating assigned to the achievement of project outputs and outcomes as ‘moderately satisfactory’. The project helped in creating awareness amongst the producers, palm guild and the involved institutions - Regional Autonomous Corporation (CAR) and Environmental and Social Technical Assistance and Audit Units (UAATAS) among others, on the benefits of sustainability in the oil palm sector, which was otherwise not a priority or ‘core business’ as only driven by increase in production.

But the project failed to achieve or only partially achieve some of the outputs due to them being, as the TE notes, ‘unviable’; too ‘ambitious’; or due to a lack of clarity on how to achieve these with project partners and government authorities. For instance, design of the incentive schemes or payment of environmental services could not be achieved as it had never been tried in the context of Colombia at the community level; although there were some examples at the private level. The project failed to develop relevant ‘products that could support decision making on the definition of suitable areas for palm cultivation within the territorial order’ due to lack of adequate participation of the related public institutions. Moreover, Aceites Manuelita, one of the selected clusters, which first accepted to

participate and signed an agreement with the executing agency National Federation of Oil Palm Growers (FEDEPALMA), decided not to participate in some project activities, for example, in the cost-benefit quantification studies associated with the provision of ecosystem services. Value chains of green/agrobiodiversity markets could also not be established as the activity was not found financially lucrative by the producers. Similarly, conservation corridors could not be implemented due to lack of project authority to formally declare a corridor but it was successful in identification of the corridors.

Component 1: Integrated planning and management of oil palm agro-ecosystems

As per the TE, most of the activities under this component were completed. However, the information and plans prepared could not be used for the purpose for which these were designed as ‘the products were not worked forcefully in an articulated manner with the government institutions’ (TE, Pg 39). According to the TE, 3 studies each were conducted for ecological structure and palm suitability (one in the north and two in east) but were unified in 2 reports, one for each region, which did not alter the scope of this activity. However, as against the target of 6, only 3 palm beneficiary clusters were trained on the adoption of ecological structures, zoning and planning tools. As per the TE, the executing agency – National Federation of Oil Palm Growers (FEDEPALMA) included the cost of realization of the rest of the three workshops in its budget for next year. The project met the target related to socialization of the proposed methodologies for the generation of the Integral Vision of Conservation in Palm Biodiversity Landscapes with the territorial entities. The project modified the target on ‘two conservation corridors **established** in at a sub-regional scale in oil palm growing areas’ to ‘two conservation corridors **identified** at a sub-regional scale in oil palm growing areas’ stating that it did not have the faculties to formally declare a corridor, but to influence several stakeholders for its implementation.

Component 2: Conservation and valuation of ecosystem services

The project was on target in supporting the High Conservation Value Areas (HCVA) identification studies and management plans for 6 oil palm clusters. As against a target of cost benefit studies on the provision of ecosystem services for 6 prioritized oil palm clusters, the work took place in only 5 clusters due to lack of interest in one of the clusters named Aceites Manuelita, to participate in the study. The project also supported training of the 6 beneficiary palm clusters in the identification, management, protection and restoration of High Conservation Value Areas (HCVA); and training of 5 as against 6 palm clusters in the valuation of their ecosystem services as one of the clusters named Manuella did not participate in the second phase. The project also completed the socialization events of High Conservation Value analysis with environmental and territorial authorities. But the project failed to develop the incentive or compensation schemes for the conservation of HCVAs and ecosystem services due to lack of viability to implement such a system within the duration of the project.

Component 3: Alternative agro-biodiversity uses and markets

As against an original plan of conducting 6 studies, only 1 study (on apiculture) was conducted to analyze opportunities for agrobiodiversity and access to differentiated markets. According to the TE, the baseline study conducted showed that ‘there was no potential to advance in the establishment of chains associated with green markets and agrobiodiversity’ (TE, Pg 41). However, the project subsequently conducted research on the potential of the apiculture chain in one of the clusters in the northern zone. The project was on target in covering 6 Palm clusters with diagnostics and action plans to access social and environmental certifications (Round Table on Sustainable Palm - RSPO). The project exceeded the target on covering farms – 27,715 ha covered as against target of 19,000 ha, on development of

compliance plans to obtain a socio-environmental certification. The target related to ‘60% of beneficiary producers to participate in a program for support for the adoption of green markets and agro-biodiversity tools and practices’ was not accomplished as, according to the TE, ‘in reality, these activities are not with in their core business’ and neither financially attractive to the producers (TE, Pg ix).

Component 4: Monitoring, Communication and Impact Assessment

As per the TE, all the outputs under this component were completed satisfactorily including the completion of baselines and assessment studies with representative samples of project beneficiaries and control group; completion of 10 semiannual performance reports and tours organized for non-beneficiary clusters as part of outreach and training effort. However, the TE or other available reports do not comment on the quality of these reports in terms of the extent to which these helped in monitoring and providing feedback on the degree of progress towards achieving outputs and outcomes.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately unsatisfactory
-----------------------	--

This TER agrees with the rating assigned to the efficiency of the project as ‘moderately unsatisfactory’. The TE notes that the budget allocation from GEF was utilized fully but without achieving the proposed goals under the project. Some of the outputs were declared ‘unviable’ but the budget against these outputs was still spent. Moreover, the counterpart budget also did not materialize fully with very low contribution from the government. Lack of coordination amongst government institutions and other similar initiatives in the country, was described as one of the reasons for low realization of the co-financing, which also points towards lack of cost-effectiveness that could be achieved through institutional collaboration.

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

This TER concurs with the rating assigned by the TE for the likelihood of sustainability of project outputs and outcomes as ‘moderately likely’. The project helped in generating awareness at the local and regional level on developing sustainable palm crops integrating biodiversity conservation. According to the TE, the main actors involved in the project were likely to continue to develop some of the activities initiated through the project. The project designed a series of knowledge products that could also be used for trainings and information/awareness generation in future. The National Sustainable Palm Oil Program, developed through inputs from the current project, could also provide an overall framework where different partner organizations and allies come together to work towards sustainable palm crops in future. However, there were still no committed funds, and the project was not very successful in developing synergies with similar projects and initiatives, essential to provide continuity to the project outputs and outcomes. Moreover, high incidence of diseases/pests, poses an environmental risk that has the potential to deviate attention, time and resources to pest management strategies, rather than to biodiversity conservation or protection promoted under the project.

Financial risk:

As per the TE, some of the activities carried out by the project may continue with funding from various actors involved in the project. For instance, the TE highlighted that UPRA (Rural Agricultural Planning unit) was generating information with its own resources to determine areas of agricultural and palm extension, with criteria of agro-ecological sustainability. The project Executing agency - The National Federation of Oil Palm Growers (FEDEPALMA) and the other collaborating organization – Oil Palm Research Center (CENIPALMA) had also put in their own resources to have environmental and social

agents, which according to the TE, was a result of awareness generated under the project. According to the TE, these organizations were also likely to continue working on some of the other aspects such as developing communication and dissemination processes to promote sustainable palm culture practices and cost-benefit analysis of the implementation of sustainability practices and their benefits. Moreover, some of the beneficiary palm growers were using their own funds to acquire RSPO certification, which was likely to be transmitted to non-beneficiary palm producers in future as well. However, there was still no evidence of a committed or 'likely' funding for carrying forward the initiatives taken under the project.

Institutional risk:

As per the TE, the Executing Agency -The National Federation of Oil Palm Growers (FEDEPALMA) and the Oil Palm Research Center (CENIPALMA), had a tremendous influence on the palm clusters and suppliers and were convinced to act as 'assertive change promoters' to develop sustainable palm crops in balance with biodiversity (TE, Pg). They were also instrumental in launching a sustainable palm production strategy for future use. CENIPALMA had contracted three environmental extension agents to work jointly with the FEDEPALMA, ensuring the sustainability to the initiatives taken under the project. However, the TE also noted that other project partners like Research Institute of Biological Resources (IAVH) and World Wildlife Fund (WWF), did not participate fully as was envisioned during the project design (TE, 25), which brought uncertainty and risk to their level of involvement in future. Also, the project was not quite successful in generating synergies with other institutional actors and initiatives as envisioned during project design, which was critical to provide continuity to project objectives (TE, Pg 54)

But the project generated awareness and also supported development of a series of products, including a pedagogical tool (game) that could be used for training sessions with palm producers in future. The information generated by the project was also included in different pieces of communication to socialize the results to different audiences and generating awareness both amongst public and private sector entities. The project also helped in enhancing capacity of the beneficiary palm growers to develop a sustainable palm crop.

a. Socio-political:

The available reports do not highlight any issues or provide information on the socio-political factors likely to risk the sustainability of the project. The project seemed to have a good support from the producers in the beneficiary clusters at the local level as well as four regional environmental authorities (Regional Autonomous Corporation of Cesar, Magdalena and Orinoquia; Corporation for the Sustainable Development of the Special Management Area La Macarena). The TE did mention about 'the 'problems of signing and complying with cooperation agreements with oil palm beneficiary clusters' as one of the reasons for delay in the project execution but did not elaborate on it. It's difficult to comment on the political support at the national level due to lack of relevant information in the available reports. But it's worth noting that the project failed to mobilize funds from the national government, the reason for which was not explored or explained in any of the available reports.

b. Environmental risk:

The TE noted that the increase in the forest cover and greater vegetation cover promoted in the vicinity and within the palm plantations acted as a safeguard against any ecological risks. Moreover, the RSPO certification program supported through the project would also ensure regular monitoring and

verification of the conservation of the areas covered under the project. However, the project document identified unusually heavy rains that hit Colombia occasionally as one of the risks that could cause a damage to production areas in different regions. The Project Implementation Report, 2016 also highlighted 'high' risk related to emergence and resurgence of pests and diseases in the area of intervention that had the potential to deviate attention, time and resources towards pest management strategies rather than to biodiversity conservation or protection. As per as an interview included the TE, 'the incidence of the diseases -pudricion del cogollo and marchitez letal was higher than expected in the design of the project, which directly affected the use of agrochemicals as diseases with a strong impact on the palm population' (TE, Pg 34).

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?

According to the TE, changes were made in the budget and co-financing contributions by the executing agency during the project implementation. The breakup of co-financing provided in the TE is different from the details in the project document as per the details below:

Items	As per CEO (in USD)	As per TE (in USD)	Disbursed at the Project Closure (as per the TE) (in USD)
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development - National Government	4,470,000	-	0
Institute for the Research of Biological Resources, Alexander von Humboldt (IAvH) - National Government	1,110,000	1,110,000	860,585
Institute of Hydrology, Meteorology and Environmental Studies (IDEAM) - National Government	469,444	470,000	0
Special Unit for the Administration of National Natural Parks - National Government	400,000	400,000	0
WWF – Northern Amazon & Chocó Darien Regional Office (WWF-NACD) - NGO	305,387	310,000	436,884
Regional environmental authorities - Local Government	1,420,000	1,420,000	344,508
Cenipalma - Private Sector	1,654,074	1,660,000	2,339,952
Fedepalma — Exec Agency	1,910,000	1,910,000	1,573,788
Oil Palm Grower Clusters – Private Sector	2,580,000	7,050,000	5,553,842
Total	14,318,905	14,330,000	11,109,559

The TE notes that the government failed to meet its original commitment and did not contribute to the project. Similarly, the contributions from the regional environmental authorities was also not met fully. According to the TE, lack of realization of co-financing from the government was due to 'lack of adequate coordination with the government institutions' (TE, Pg, 43). The project did not achieve some of the outputs but still used all the GEF resources due to lack of realization of full 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?

The project was granted an extension to be completed in 2018 as against the original closing date of 2016. The project was approved in 2012 but it took off only in 2014. As per the PIR (2017), the project's start faced many problems that hindered execution (e.g. lack of planning and institutional commitment, delay in hiring the suitable staff, among others). Subsequent progress implementation reports highlight issues such as 'the current decision making processes with partners for technical and strategic issues', 'problems of signing and complying with cooperation agreements with oil palm beneficiary clusters and other national and regional public institutions', 'delays in administrative processes' and 'lack of internal coordination', that delayed in the project. (PIR, 2015; PIR, 2016). The TE did not discuss the impact of delays on the project outcomes or sustainability.

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:

The project seemed to have a 'moderate' level of support and ownership of the national government. The project was executed by The National Federation of Oil Palm Growers (Fedepalma), an organization constituted by Colombian oil palm growers, in cooperation with other government, non-government and private sector partners. The project had a good cooperation and funding contribution from the local government through the Regional Environmental Authorities. But the TE made a note that national government authorities like the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) and Institute of Hydrology, Meteorology and Environmental Studies (IDEAM), were not involved during the first years of the project, although their participation picked up during the last year. The project could not involve or elicit the level of support from the national government as was probably envisioned in the project document as it also failed to mobilize the co-financing originally committed during the project design.

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: Satisfactory
<p>The TE did not provide a rating but based on the evidence in the available reports, this TER assigned a rating to the M&E design at entry as 'satisfactory'. The project document included a results framework including outcome and output SMART indicators; annual targets; verification means and assumptions. Recommended M&E activities included preparation of baselines, the annual progress reports, financial audits, midterm and performance evaluation as well as impact evaluations considering counterfactual groups. The framework included the budget allocation and also assigned the responsibilities for key M&E activities.</p>	

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

The TE did not provide a rating. But based on the available evidence, this TER has assessed the M&E implementation as ‘satisfactory’. As per the TE, the project successfully met all the M&E requirements in terms of timely completion of the required reports (semiannual and annual operating plans, results and risk matrix updated annually, annual progress reports and tracking tools). Semiannual meetings of the Steering Committee were used to review results, approve annual work plans and adaptive management. However, the TE also highlighted that the project revised some of the indicators during implementation, which were not sent for formal approval of the implementing agency. The TE proposed that ‘changes in the results matrix must be analyzed by the actors and should have been proposed in an assertive and formally approved manner, in order to carry out an adaptive management of the project’ (TE, Pg Xi).

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: Unable to assess
--	---------------------------------

The TE did not assess or assign a rating to the quality of project implementation. There is not enough information in the available reports for this TER to make the assessment.

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

The TE did not assess or assign a rating but based on the narrative in the available reports, this TER assessed the quality of project execution as ‘moderately satisfactory’. According to the TE, overall the executing agency – National Federation of Palm Oil Growers (FEDEPALMA) had the technical and administrative capacity to execute the project. However, the report highlighted certain issues such as ‘slow and cumbersome’ response timing; ‘lack of internal coordination’; ‘high turnover of personnel’ as some of the issues that caused delays in the project implementation. According to the interviews conducted during the TE, ‘the entity fully appropriated the project during 2018, but did not show the same interest since the beginning’ (TE, Pg 25). This project was a learning opportunity for FEDEPALMA that had no prior experience of handling acquisitions, purchases and financial reporting for a GEF/IDB project.

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.

1. Area of palm cultivation under agro-ecological management increased from 4,000 ha to 22,269 ha, against a goal of 25,000 ha.
2. Increase in area under management plans for protection and restoration of HCVs and their ecosystem service – 16,760 ha as against target of 4,000 ha.

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.

As per the TE, the difference in the income change between the control and beneficiary farms exceeded the goal of 5% and reached 29%. The project had a positive impact, greater than expected, on the income of the beneficiary palm growers.

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 project helped in generating awareness among producers and the Colombian palm sector about the need to differentiate the Colombian product with socio-environmental certification such as Round Table on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) or other kinds of similar certifications. Not everything is attributable to the project, but as per the TE, four of the six palm clusters supported by the project were RSPO certified. The activities supported under the project facilitated the obtaining of RSPO certification by the beneficiaries (TE, Pg 36)

b) Governance

As per the TE, the findings and the results of the project helped in developing the mandate of National Sustainable Palm Oil Program. In 2018, the executing agency – the National Federation of Oil Palm

Growers, launched the Colombian Sustainable Palm Oil Program, which aims to strengthen the production, use and recognition of sustainable palm oil from Colombia².

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.

The project did not have any unintended impacts.

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.

As per the TE, the findings and the results of the project helped in developing the mandate of National Sustainable Palm Oil Program. In 2018, the executing agency – National Federation of Oil Palm growers (Fedepalma) launched the Colombian Sustainable Palm Oil Program, which aims to strengthen the production, use and recognition of sustainable palm oil from Colombia³.

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 key lessons are as follows:

1. The project used participatory approach in generating awareness of the producers, the palm guild and other involved institutions. This was evidence with the launch of the National Sustainable Palm Oil Program by the National Federation of Oil Palm growers (Fedepalma) - the executing agency.
2. It is important to align this type of initiative with other similar programs of the government that can provide legitimacy to the process.
3. The partner organizations should be clear about their role, duties and limitations before signing the cooperation agreement
4. It is important to check the compatibility of the project objectives and goals with the methodology suggested for impact evaluation. In this case, the establishment of biological corridors and an impact evaluation with samples selected using randomization were not compatible.

² <https://www.sustainablepalmoilchoice.eu/participant/fedepalma/>

5. It is essential to take formal approval of the implementing agency if changes are made in the results matrix due to change in the context of the country, especially if there is a long-time gap between project design and implementation.
6. The promotion of legume in the beneficiary palm plantations results in a decrease in the use of agro-chemicals.
7. Staff turnover should have been reduced to a minimum.
8. The processes of acquisitions, purchases and financial reports of this type of projects are complex and must have been streamlined to reduce the risks in obtaining the expected results
9. The co-financing contributions negotiated for the implementation of the project should have been monitored and also served as a means to generate synergies with the different institutions involved
10. It is essential that the products produced in projects with GEF resources are public and, therefore, available to society in general
11. Ecological sustainability does not only depend on the identification of High Conservation Value Areas (HCVA). It is equally important to create possibilities for dialogue to promote the conservation of natural resources at the local level
12. The strategy of biodiversity conservation must take into account the participation of and the effect on women and young people of the relevant actors, as in the case of the current project.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The main recommendations are detailed below:

1. Both the implementing and executing agency should have appropriate policies to encourage skilled professional and make changes when the staff did not adapt to the requirements.
2. Training of the administrative officer in charge of the project's financial processes is strongly recommended.
3. The Executing agency should not only keep a track of the GEF resources but also co-finances and use it as an opportunity to achieve synergies with the institutions involved.
4. All types of information products should be published on the web, in order to promote the public use of the information generated.
5. A strategy of generating synergies with other institutional actors, projects and initiatives must be developed, for which it is also essential to have a coordination structure in place, in order to provide continuity to the project objectives.
6. It is necessary to improve communication strategy to reach more efficiently to women and youth in the society.

The

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 TE included a more or less adequate analysis of the relevant outcomes and impacts, except in few places, where more explanation could be provided. For instance, the project faced various delays but the TE did not discuss the impact of these delays on project outcomes. Also, the TE did not provide adequate or convincing explanation of the non-achievement of some of the outputs such as 'incentive or compensation schemes designed for environmental conservation in oil palm clusters' or 'access	MU
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE provided rating to only a few components of the project such as effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. It did not provide rating to the quality of M&E systems; quality of project implementation and execution.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE did not include the assessment of financial sustainability of the project. Also, the evidence presented was not quite adequate and comprehensive to assess the project's sustainability and/or exit strategy.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Except one or two, all the points listed under the 'lessons' section had the relevant evidence or discussion in the main report.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Project included the information but the breakup of the co-financing budget did not match with the budget given in the project document.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE mentioned that all the required reports were completed. However, it did not provide a rating and adequate assessment of the use of the monitoring system or other review mechanisms in the adaptive management of the project as well as on the quality of impact assessment reports.	MS
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).

The TE used information about the National Sustainable Palm Oil Program from the website <https://www.sustainablepalmoilchoice.eu/participant/fedepalma/>