

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		4149	
GEF Agency project ID		FSP-028-MX	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		IFAD	
Project name		Mitigating Climate Change through Sustainable Forest Management and Capacity Building in the Southern States of Mexico (Campeche, Chiapas and Oaxaca)	
Country/Countries		Mexico	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SO-7B: to reduce GHG emissions from land use, land use change, and forestry; SP-6: Management of Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry – LULUCF- as a Means to Protect Carbon Stocks and Reduce GHG Emissions.	
Executing agencies involved		National Forestry Commission (CONAFOR)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None	
Private sector involvement		None	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		October 2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		March 27, 2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 2016	
Actual date of project completion		September 2016	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.1	0
	Co-financing	0.14	0
GEF Project Grant		5.0	4.5
Co-financing	IA own	5.0	4.53
	Government	7.04	7.12
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	1.56 (beneficiaries)
	Private sector	0	0
	NGOs/CSOs	0	0
Total GEF funding		5.1	4.497,899
Total Co-financing		12.18	13.21
Total project funding		17.18	17.71

(GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		
Terminal evaluation/review information		
TE completion date	October 23, 2017	
Author of TE	Teresa Bosques	
TER completion date	December 30, 2019	
TER prepared by	Spandana Battula	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Cody Parker	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project was to “contribute to improve living conditions of poor and extremely poor people living in forest areas of the States of Campeche, Chiapas and Oaxaca, through the development of sustainable and sound productive activities. It would also help to improve CONAFOR [the National Forestry Commission]’s expenditure, efficiency and effectiveness, facilitating access of beneficiaries to public resources” (TE pg 1).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project was “(i) to strengthen organizational, management and planning capacities to promote the participation of beneficiaries in activities on natural resource management and conservation and combating climate change; (ii) to promote the creation of sustainable productive businesses that improve beneficiaries' income and living conditions, and supporting projects to prevent and mitigate the impacts of climate change; (iii) support CONAFOR so that its programs reach the most marginalized population and improve its efficiency and impact in the execution of the project; (iv) promote gender mainstreaming in all aspects of the program; (v) Enhance the capacities of the target population, for better access to public resources and greater integration into markets, and to generate local capacities to address climate change impacts, and (vi) forestry projects and initiatives for carbon sequestration, through the creation and strengthening of local capacities, seeking to reduce GHG emissions from deforestation and degradation” (TE pgs 1-2).

The project aimed to achieve this objective through the following two main components:

- a) Strengthening of organizational, planning, local management and climate change mitigation capacities;
- b) Forestry projects and initiatives for carbon sequestration.

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

There is no mention of changes to the objectives or activities 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 project was relevant to GEF's climate change focal area and Strategic Program 6 on management of Land Use, Land-Use Change, and Forestry (LULUCF) as a means to protect carbon stocks and reduce GHG emissions. It was also aligned with GEF's Strategic Objective 7b on reduction in emissions through land use, land-use change and forestry. Moreover, the project was "in line with the obligations of Mexico to various Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs), mainly the UNFCCC, the CBD and the UNCCD and with policies and programmes of the GoM" (TE pg 3). The project was consistent with Mexico's strategy for climate change mitigation and adaptation to increase CO2 sequestration and reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Unable to Assess
-------------------	--------------------------

The TER is unable to assess in detail the two project components due to the limited information available in English in the TE summary report. The two components were a) strengthening of organizational, planning, local management and climate change mitigation capacities, and b) forestry projects and initiatives for carbon sequestration. As per the report, the effectiveness of the project was Moderately Unsatisfactory and stated that "there is insufficient evidence to fully confirm that DECOFOS-GEF had a measurable impact in accordance with its objectives, nor that its whole financing had a significant impact on either rural poverty alleviation or economic growth, by the objectives set out in the project's logical framework" (TE pg 3). The project attempted to develop and improve microenterprises by allocating most of GEF resources towards related activities, however there was no follow-up done to measure the long-term sustainability. The project also promoted comprehensive tools and cases as an "integral process of strengthening *ejidos* or communities with productive chains that allow raising dividends to low costs of sale are not reported in the documents reviewed. Evidence shows that, during the implementation, as a result of the shortcomings in the design of the data collection mechanisms

used by the project, the number of beneficiaries could be overrepresented or not properly registered” (TE pg 4). The TE mentions that there was no systematized follow-up of the impact to attribute any benefits to the project. Given the limited information available, the TER cannot provide a rating to the effectiveness of the project.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

The TE rated efficiency as Moderately Unsatisfactory because the project faced numerous delays due to elections and flow of funds. The TE stated that the presidential election in 2012 slowed the pace of the project implementation while the 2015 state elections affected the closing of the project. The project “was also afflicted by the 3-yr delay[ed] entry of the GEF funds and by the exchange rate fluctuations that lead to adjustments, hence modifying the scope of actions and results” (TE pg 4). In terms of project budget, the TE noted that the budget went through many revisions during project cycle to ensure that necessary budgetary resources were in place but this resulted in implementation slowdown. Therefore, the TER gives also finds the efficiency of the project as Moderately Unsatisfactory.

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

The TE gave a Moderately Likely rating to sustainability of the project but noted that a thorough follow-up of project plans is needed for lasting results. Although the TER assessed sustainability from the TE summary report, it also finds that financial, socio-economic, institutional sustainability was moderately likely while environmental risk seemed low.

Financial: The TE summary report does not provide much information on financial risks but stated that the project’s aim to get an estimate internal rate of return of 23.7% was not good for sustainability in terms of investment (TE pg 4).

Socio-economic: The TE noted that during monitoring “some positive results could be observed in terms of increased income of some of the beneficiaries in rural microenterprises, technology transfer projects, agroforestry modules, nurseries and nature tourism projects, such as natural corridors and a harness-gliding attraction”, indicating a slightly positive outlook for the sustainability of the project’s socioeconomic impacts (TE pg 4).

Institutional: The project design was aligned with National Forestry Commission’s institutional operational mechanism, but it operated with annual calls for projects for which the beneficiaries had to request support on a yearly basis (TE pg 6).

Environmental: The TE stated that “use and conservation of natural resources was promoted through the participation of *ejidos* and communities, in particular at the end of the project, through the 64 community development plans and community action plans, accompanied by mitigation awareness against the effects of climate change” (TE pg 6). No environmental risks to the sustainability of project impacts are noted.

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 actual materialized co-financing amount was \$13,209,446 which was slightly higher than the expected amount of \$12,179,380. The TE summary report does not mention whether the higher materialized amount had any effect on outcomes.

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 faced delays during its implementation because of presidential and state elections which affected the national and institutional authorities. There was also a delay of three years in the disbursement of GEF funds and exchange rate fluctuations that led to adjustments, hence modifying the scope of actions and results.

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:

There is no information on country ownership in the TE summary report.

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 summary report did not provide information or a rating for M&E design at entry but mentioned that the project document showed it was "designed in a thorough and ambitious manner, with a strong component aimed at carrying out CO2 sequestration/GHG emissions reduction activities" (TE pg 2). The project document did provide an M&E plan with provision for progress reports, mid-term review, and terminal evaluation report. However, the TE stated that adjustments needed be made to the logical

framework including the indicators with an emphasis to capacity development component. Therefore, the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating to M&E design.

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

The TE gave a Moderately Unsatisfactory rating to M&E implementation and observed that the project did not “manage to put into practice the sufficient structures to drive a comprehensive and consistent follow-up of the effects generated by the Project in all the municipalities nor a thorough M&E long-term follow-up” (TE pgs 2-3). The TE also noted that the data collected was not consistent and the real impact of the project could not be ascertained in the absence of an impact evaluation and an appropriate M&E System. Therefore the TER also gives a Moderately Unsatisfactory rating to M&E system.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

IFAD was the implementing agency, and according to the TE, it played an important role during monitoring missions and provided supervision and gave recommendations for betterment of the project. It also advised the project to claim the funds and make them effective and provided co-financing for the project implementation. Based on this information from TE summary report, the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating to quality of project implementation.

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

The TE summary report does not provide an evaluation of the National Forestry Commission’s quality of project execution, hence the TER is unable to provide an analysis or rating.

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 TE summary report does not mention any environmental changes.

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.

According to the TE, the project reported a “decrease in the percentage of the population with an income of less than one dollar per day, which fell from 33.6% in 2010 (baseline) to 4% in 2015, exceeding the 50% reduction set by the Millennium Development Goals” (TE pg 5); however, this reduction is not directly attributable to the project.

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 TE mentioned that trainings “provided the people, *ejidos*, communities and associations, with basic elements for the execution of their projects and skills to carry out specific activities, to organize themselves and raise awareness about issues related to climate change. The RIMS states that the project was aimed at training people in the management of natural resources, and implemented actions to disseminate these supports” (TE pg 5).

b) Governance: No governance changes are reported.

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.

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.

No information on the broader adoption or replication of project activities is provided in the TE summary report.

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 provided the following best practices (TE pgs 6-7):

- a) The project contributed in strengthening of capacity of beneficiaries, integrating people without land rights, traditionally not included in the programs of forest use;
- b) The project helped in continuing a previous IFAD project in the country to support public policies on the diversification of deforested and degraded areas through field activities such as agroforestry modules; and
- c) The project carried innovative activities on climate mitigation such as awareness workshops for mitigation and adaptation to CC; establishment of agroforestry modules and community nurseries, and formulation of 64 business plans out of the original goal of 200.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE summary report provided the following recommendations (TE pgs 7-8):

- a) Joint projects with different agencies should start at the same time to avoid coordination issues, and focusing on joint processes would help to better identify opportunities for beneficial cooperation;
- b) In terms of design, projects should have an initial assessment of the needs rather than focusing on results-based contributions. Project design should also pay attention to most vulnerable population, and have a robust M&E system;
- c) There should be an initial pilot project with local actions and then, based on results at the micro-basin levels, scale-up of the project should be done state-wide and then at the national level;
- d) The project should strengthen technical follow-up throughout the cycle - from its formulation to its installation and operation in the two years following start-up; and

- e) In a country like Mexico, “the agrarian organizations must be taken into account, since their situation is different from other countries in the sense that agrarian organizations already exist with rules that restrict the use of resources, but are flexible enough for people without land rights to access to them: It is provided for in the country's agrarian law” (TE pg 8).

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 TER is unable to assess the quality of the Terminal Evaluation report as it is in Spanish and no translation has been provided.	
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?		
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?		
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?		
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?		
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:		
Overall TE Rating		UA

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

The TER used the terminal evaluation summary report. No other sources were consulted.