

GEF IEO Terminal Evaluation Review form (retrofitting of APR2004 cohort)

This form is for retrofitting of the TERs prepared for APR2004. While several topics covered in this form had already been covered in the earlier form, this revised form adds several other performance and impact related concerns.

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		496	
GEF Agency project ID		P057045	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF - 2	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Northern Belize Biological Corridors Project	
Country/Countries		Belize	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP 3 – Forest Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Programme for Belize (PfB) - Belizian NGO	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Lead executing agency	
Private sector involvement		Through consultations (private land-owners)	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		November 1998	
Effectiveness date / project start		April 1999	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		March 2002	
Actual date of project completion		June 2002	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.025	0.025
	Co-financing	0.010	0.010
GEF Project Grant		0.724	0.724
Co-financing	IA/EA own	3.155	2.916
	Government		
	Other*		
Total GEF funding		0.748	0.748
Total Co-financing		3.165	2.926
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		3.913	3.674
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		June 2003	
TE submission date			
Author of TE			
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) preparer		Baastel	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) reviewer		Josh Brann	
Revised TER (2014) completion date		June 2014	
Revised TER (2014) prepared by		Joshua Schneck	
TER GEF IEO peer review (2014)		Neeraj Negi	

*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	N/R	N/R	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/R	N/R	N/R	ML
M&E Design	N/R	N/R	N/R	U
M&E Implementation	N/R	N/R	N/R	S
Quality of Implementation	N/R	N/R	N/R	U/A
Quality of Execution	N/R	N/R	N/R	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/R	MU

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As stated in the Project Brief (PB), the global environmental objectives of the project are to secure the long-term conservation of globally significant biodiversity in the “Maya Lowlands” of north-eastern Central America by maintaining ecological linkages between protected areas across northern Belize. The connectivity of this natural landscape, which is important for species movement and long-term viability, faces a number of threats including human population increases and land conversion, small-scale slash and burn agricultural practices, wildfires, unsustainable hunting, inadequate enforcement of environmental laws and regulations, and introduction of exotic species (PB, pg 7).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As stated in the PB, the development objectives of the project are to contribute to the long-term conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in Belize through interventions that reduce pressure on biological resources and conserve the natural landscapes of the Northern Belize Biological Corridors. An overall indicator of project success is provided in the PB:

by the end of the project, deforestation rates within the Northern Belize Biological Corridors, adjusted for their area, should be 25% or less of the current deforestation rate for northern Belize (estimated at 13,400 ha/yr in 1994 study) (PB, pg 2).

To achieve this overall objective, the project expects to produce the following four outcomes:

1. Refinement and application of mechanisms for corridor creation and management, appropriate to the northern Belize context;
2. Consolidation of the Rio Bravo Management Conservation and Management Area (RBCMA – an area through which a portion of the targeted corridors extend) through a series of investments in the conservation area and with surrounding local communities;
3. Consolidation of the network of corridors across the Northern Coastal Plain, from the RBCMA north-eastward, primarily through investments at the community level;

4. Enhanced awareness of the larger Mesoamerican Biological Corridor system and conservation issues in general, on the part of the student population, general public, and decision makers, translating into support for the Corridor concept.

Three performance indicators are provided in the PB for the four outcomes defined above:

- Six communities or major landowners (representing about 50% of those targeted by the project) are successfully implementing new land management approaches compatible with Corridor objectives.
- Change in the formal conservation status of lands on a minimum of four sites located in corridors such that their biodiversity comes under stricter protection.
- At least 50% of the secondary school student body exposed to the Corridor concept; and ten media presentations concerning corridors are given to the general public.

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

No changes to the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or activities are reported in the TE to have occurred during implementation.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The project is relevant to Belize and to the GEF. For Belize, PB states that the project is consistent with the National Biodiversity Strategy and with the National Biological Corridors study. In addition, the National Protected Areas Systems Plan (1995) explicitly promoted the conservation approach of using corridors in Northern Belize. Lastly, the National Environmental Action Plan of Belize includes as priority actions strengthening land-use management, reducing deforestation and unsustainable agricultural practices, and expanding the use of financial mechanisms for environmental and natural resources management – all of which are consistent with this project’s goals and approach. For the GEF, the project is consistent with Operational Program 3 – Forest Ecosystems, which seeks to conserve the long-term viability of globally significant forest ecosystems and the ecosystem services they provide.

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

The project had moderate shortcomings in some key areas, but on balance, was able to achieve many of the expected results. In terms of the overall performance indicator (reduction of deforestation rate of Northern Belize Biological Corridors), the TE reports that the deforestation rate in Northern Belize – an area that includes the Northern Belize Biological Corridors – is likely to have decreased over the study period. However, differing assessment methodologies as well as significant uncertainty in the estimates provided (both pre- and post-project), limit the usefulness of this indicator. TE also states that any changes in deforestation rates are more likely the result of larger economic forces (principally changes in agricultural prices leading farmers to leave additional land fallow), rather than the result of project activities (TE, pg 9).

Project effectiveness, as measured by the three performance sub-indicators, is detailed below:

- *Six communities or major landowners (representing about 50% of those targeted by the project) are successfully implementing new land management approaches compatible with Corridor objectives.* While the TE is unclear about the degree to which community activities overlap one another in terms of the number of communities participating, TE states that 4 community-based ecotourism activities supported by the project are still operational and generating revenue; 1 community-based agroforestry project is operational and generating revenue; and 2 community-based honey production ventures are operational and generating revenue. This would appear to have surpassed the indicator target of 6 successful ventures. At the same time, expenditures on activities linked to this indicator were some 35% less than expected, due to a number of factors cited in the TE including: (a) lack of political support from the Ministry of Natural Resources for a wildlife rearing project and lack of support from local political representatives in San Felipe for conservation project at one targeted site; (b) Hurricane Keith in 2000 and subsequent flooding which damaged several project sites and caused extensive delays; (c) limited capacity of some community groups to implement projects, particularly with the Belize Old Northern Highway Communities Association (BONCA). It's also not clear from the TE the extent to which these successful ventures have led, or will lead, to positive changes in land management practices by participating communities (so for example, how much of an impact will small-scale honey production have on land management practices in the two communities where the venture is operational?).
- *Change in the formal conservation status of lands on a minimum of four sites located in corridors such that their biodiversity comes under stricter protection.* TE states that the project supported the increased conservation status of 3 sites and enhanced the protection and sustainability of another. The targeted sites and protections include: (a) 250 acres of forested land for which tenure was “ensured” under management of Rio Hondo Environmental Conservation Organization (RHECO); (b) 5,985 acres that were declared wildlife sanctuary – the Spanish Creek Wildlife Sanctuary – by the Ministry of Natural Resources; (c) 2,400 acres of forest in the Fireburn area for which the project provided support for surveying; and (d) funding to improve

the “protection capacity and increase sustainability, through ecotourism, of the Shipstern Nature Reserve. It’s not clear from the TE what the legal status/degree of enhanced protection that was achieved through the support of the project, how sustainable these achievements are, what the mechanism was that brought it about, and how significant these sites are in relation to the entire Northern Belize Biological Corridors.

- *At least 50% of the secondary school student body exposed to the Corridor concept; and ten media presentations concerning corridors are given to the general public.* Efforts linked to this indicator appear to have been successful overall. TE states that an environmental education program was developed and implemented in 20 high schools, representing 90% of high schools in Orange Walk and Corozal districts, and that the program reached around 2000 students. In addition, 25 primary schools in the area were exposed to the northern biological corridors through school presentations, field trips, and support for environmental projects. TE also states that educational outreach to the general public was achieved through development of educational materials including press articles, brochures, displays, posters and corridor maps distributed among the general public in forums, shows and fairs organized by Governmental authorities, NGOs, and communities. A documentary video was developed and aired on the local television stations. TE state that these educational efforts have resulted in support for the biological corridors from the communities and student population (TE, pg 27). TE also finds that while the biological corridors have not been officially accepted by the GoB, officials involved in land use planning are “considering it in their planning exercises” (TE, pg 27).

Important achievements that are not captured by the three performance indicators, but that are stated in the TE are:

- Under Objective 1 (see Development Objectives section above), a feasibility study was undertaken, the results of which were used to identify the most suitable parcels of land for conservation efforts going forward. However, these corridors have not been recognized by the Ministry of Natural Resources. This goal of formal recognition is not found in the PB, but is mentioned in the TE (see shortcomings below).

Important shortcomings that are not captured by the three performance indicators, but that are stated in the TE are:

- *Development of incentives for private lands conservation* – TE states that initial steps in developing a framework for incentives, through a land tenure study of lands within and adjacent to the corridors, was undertaken. However, the actual development of incentives was not completed due to difficulties in finding a suitable consultant within budget (project could not come up with additional \$20,000 which seems difficult to reconcile in a \$4 million dollar project) (TE, pg 13). PB states that development of incentives is an activity “of central importance” (PB, pg 12). PB also envisages facilitating access to new funding sources for conservation of the Corridors, which does not appear to have taken place.

- *Official recognition by GoB of the Northern Belize Biological Corridors* – TE states that the Corridors are not officially recognized by the government, but that planning officers are considering them in their planning (TE, pg 8).

On balance, project is rated as moderately satisfactory, based largely on project’s achievement in meeting the three performance indicators.

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

TE does not adequately assess project efficiency. The following is based on TE narrative and PIRs. Most project activities were successfully implemented using budgeted resources, with variations in expenditures attributed to difficulties in securing support from the Conservation Division of the Ministry of Natural Resources (TE, pg 6), as well as flooding from Hurricane Keith. TE states that the mid-term project evaluation served to strengthen the engagement of community stakeholders and was used for adaptive management, particularly in steering the community activities component of the project (TE, pg 27). In addition, TE states that the Technical Advisory Committee established under the project, and comprising of representatives from other NGOs, community representatives, and government workers was effective in providing guidance during project implementation. Lastly, project monitoring appears to have been robust throughout the project, with detailed financial reporting, and monitoring of each project activity. Shortcomings that are noted in evaluative reports include delays in implementing subprojects (final PIR). In addition, the project failed to undertake a study leading to the development of incentives for conservation, and the reason given by project management - difficulties in finding a suitable consultant within budget (project could not come up with additional \$20,000) - seems difficult to reconcile in a \$4 million dollar project) (TE, pg 13).

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

While risks to sustainability of project outcomes remain, on balance, prospects for project sustainability appear moderately likely. Project sustainability is assessed along the following four dimensions:

- *Environmental sustainability (ML)*– As noted above, the deforestation rate in the in Northern Belize – an area that includes the Northern Belize Biological Corridors – is likely to have decreased over the study period. However, changes in deforestation rates are more likely the result of larger economic forces (principally changes in agricultural prices leading farmers to leave additional land fallow), rather than the result of project activities (TE, pg 9). As such, threats to the viability of biodiversity within the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor system are likely to be more or less at the level of pre-project conditions, which, while relatively low in Belize compared to other central American countries, is still significant (PB, pg 7).
- *Financial sustainability (ML)* – TE notes several positive developments regarding the likelihood of sustained financing for the conservation of the Corridors. Seven revenue-generating

community-based activities compatible with conservation are reported to have been established through the project and are still operational. TE states that the executing agency, Programme for Belize, has secured ten years of annual funds for the protection of the RBCMA as well as an endowment fund for its management (TE, pg 15). In addition, TE reports that the technical and financial training provided by the MSP to community groups has enabled some of them to get further financial assistance from local funding agencies to enhance their alternative land use management projects and continue to generate benefits “long after the project has been completed” (TE, pg 22). Despite these positive developments, incentive mechanisms for private landowners were not developed by project completion, as called for in the PB, and it is not clear that the short-term financial benefits of conservation will be sufficiently larger than those of land conversion and other unsustainable land management practices.

- *Socio-Political sustainability (ML)* – As stated in the TE, the project supported increased conservation status of three sites within the Corridor system, and enhanced the protection and sustainability of another. In addition, TE states that the awareness-raising components of the project, including environmental education campaigns, have resulted in support for the biological corridors from the communities and student population (TE, pg 27). At the same time, the Corridors are not officially recognized by the GoB, although TE states that officials involved in land use planning are “considering” these corridors in their planning exercises (TE, pg 27).
- *Institutional sustainability (ML)* – Technical capacity was cited as a factor limiting the progress of some community interventions, where only 7 of 17 activities supported by the project are reported to be operational and generating revenue at project closure. At the same time, the TE finds that the many CBOs involved in the conservation of the Corridors, as well as the executing agency, remain committed to the work of the project, and in many cases have been strengthened through project activities and outputs (i.e., through capacity development, study outputs, access to finance). TE states that the formation of the Association of Northern Conservation Organizations (ASONCO) will enable communities in northern Belize to access funding and training from other organizations and continue to generate benefits for, and support from, stakeholder communities (TE, pg 22).

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?

Realized co-financing (\$2.9 million) was close to expected co-financing (\$3.2 million). TE does not discuss reasons for difference, nor the degree to which co-financing was key to achievement of project outcomes of sustainability. Co-financing was however, well-integrated into 2 of the 4 project components – activities 2 and 3 – as well as project management, and there does not seem to be any difference in the quality of components implemented with or without 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?

PIR does report that there were delays in implementation of community activities. Some delays were attributed to Hurricane Keith and subsequent flooding, and others to lower than expected capacity of communities to implement some of the community-based activities. TE does not make the extent to which delays affected project outcomes and sustainability clear.

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:

TE offers some conflicting assessments of country ownership. On the one hand, support for the Corridors from local communities and CBOs appears to be strong – an assessment provided in the PB and that was born out over the course of the project (PB pg 15, and TE pg 27). At the same time, official recognition from the GoB for the Corridors is yet to be realized, and this, coupled with the establishment of effective incentive mechanisms for private landowners, will be essential for the long-term conservation of the Corridors (TE, pg 8).

6. Assessment of project’s Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Unsatisfactory
-------------------------	-------------------------------

Project M&E design at entry had major shortcomings. Most project activities and outcomes lack appropriate indicators. The overall indicator of project success – a targeted reduction in the deforestation rate in the Northern Belize Biological Corridors – is not clearly linked to project activities, and at the same time, M&E design did not ensure that systems for measuring deforestation in project areas were viable.. PB states that the Executing Agency is “currently measuring deforestation rates for all of northern Belize and will have access to such (deforestation) data” (PB, pg 2). However, this proved to be false as the Executing agency did not in fact have access to data (TE, pg 9). Moreover, many confounding factors such as commodity prices can be expected to have a much greater impact on deforestation rates than project activities from this MSP, and therefore, this indicator is of little value. In addition, only three performance indicators are provided for the four project activities, and these indicators fail to capture anything about the quality or sustainability of outputs (ex., quality of educational programs or community programs). This is particularly true for the community-based

activities that were intended to lesson pressures on forested resources. A SMART indicator would have measured outcomes of interest that are clearly linked to project activities (so for example, changes in land-management practices in communities where interventions have taken place). Other shortcomings include failure to provide a dedicated budget for M&E activities, failure to provide a timetable for M&E activities, and failure to clearly define responsibilities for project M&E. PB simply states that progress assessments will be conducted annually, and project reporting will follow WB procedures for MSPs.

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

While TE does not provide a rating for M&E implementation, M&E implementation appears to have been satisfactorily done, with some minor shortcomings. TE states that a Technical Advisory Committee was established with responsibilities that included monitoring and evaluating project progress, and that this committee functioned well in that capacity (TE, pg 25). TE also states that annual monitoring visits by the WB included field visits to monitor community initiatives and meetings with project stakeholders – all of which fed into adaptive management. Project management monitored all project indicators, although weaknesses in the design of these indicators (discussed above) limited their effectiveness as an evaluative tool. Mid-term project evaluation was carried out, along with PIRs, and was seen as being effective in steering the project activities (TE, pg 27). Shortcomings include failure to improve upon project M&E indicators when it should have been clear to the project management and the WB that these indicators did not capture impacts of project activities sufficiently.

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

There is insufficient information provided in the TE to assess the Quality of Project Implementation and provide a rating.

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

While the TE does not provide a rating for Quality of Project Execution, it can be assessed from the TE narrative and PIRs that Quality of Project Execution was satisfactory, with some moderate shortcomings. TE states that a Technical Advisory Committee was established to provide guidance to the project coordinator and to monitor and evaluate project progress, and that this committee functioned well in that capacity (TE, pg 25). All project activities called for in the PB, with the notable exception of developing incentives for land conservation, were completed. All monitoring and reporting activities called for in PB were completed, including mid-term evaluation. Final PIR notes that several of the community-based project activities were experiencing delays, although it appears that much of this was due to lower than anticipated capacity on the part of community-based groups to implement project activities, as well as effects from Hurricane Keith.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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.

TE does not provide a clear assessment of any environmental change that occurred as a result of the project. TE reports that the deforestation rate in Northern Belize – an area that includes the Northern Belize Biological Corridors – is likely to have decreased over the study period. However, differing assessment methodologies as well as significant uncertainty in the estimates provided (both pre- and post-project), limit the usefulness of this indicator. TE also states that any changes in deforestation rates are more likely the result of larger economic forces (principally changes in agricultural prices leading farmers to leave additional land fallow), rather than the result of project activities (TE, pg 9). Similarly, project supported several community-based activities that were intended to lower pressures on forested resources. However, assessment is offered on whether and how the status of forested resources was changed due to any project activities.

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.

Project supported several community-based activities, 7 of which are still operational and generating revenue: 4 community-based ecotourism activities supported by the project; 1 community-based agroforestry project; and 2 community-based honey production ventures. The extent of community benefits/revenue from these ventures is not stated.

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 – Project also supported development of protocols for monitoring biodiversity in some the Corridors, although what these protocols are, and how novel they are is not stated in the TE. Project included an environmental education program that was implemented in 20 high schools, representing 90% of high schools in Orange Walk and Corozal districts, and that reached around 2000 students. In addition, 25 primary schools in the area were exposed to the northern biological corridors through school presentations, field trips, and support for environmental projects. TE also states that educational outreach to the general public was achieved through development of educational materials including press articles, brochures, displays, posters and corridor maps distributed among the general public in forums, shows and fairs organized by Governmental authorities, NGOs, and communities. A documentary video was developed and aired on the local television stations. TE state that these educational efforts have resulted in support for the biological corridors from the communities and student population (TE, pg 27).

b) Governance - TE states that the project supported the increased conservation status of 3 sites and enhanced the protection and sustainability of another. The targeted sites and protections include: (a) 250 acres of forested land for which tenure was “ensured” under management of Rio Hondo Environmental Conservation Organization (RHECO); (b) 5,985 acres that were declared wildlife sanctuary – the Spanish Creek Wildlife Sanctuary – by the Ministry of Natural Resources; (c) 2,400 acres of forest in the Fireburn area for which the project provided support for surveying; and (d) funding to improve the “protection capacity and increase sustainability, through ecotourism, of the Shipstern Nature Reserve. It’s not clear from the TE what the legal status/degree of enhanced protection that was achieved through the support of the project, how sustainable these achievements are, what the mechanism was that brought it about, and how significant these sites are in relation to the entire Northern Belize Biological Corridors.

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 to have occurred as a result of the project.

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 adoption of GEF initiatives at scale occurred by project's end. Most of the project activities appear to have been narrowly targeted, with little possibility of broader adoption.

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 offers the following lessons:

- A pre-project community consultation assists in the formulation of the project, increases the awareness and sense of ownership of the communities, and increases support from the communities and project success.
- Addressing the interest of communities through community-based alternative land use activities increases community support.
- Involvement of Government authorities and other relevant stakeholders increases project benefits beyond project completion.
- The involvement of community representatives at the coordination level, through the technical advisory committee, improves the capacity of the organization for solving complex problems involving community organizations.
- Land tenure remains a critical factor for communities to engage in alternative land-use management approaches. The lack of legal tenure prevents long-term investments on alternative land use approaches by the communities and funding agencies.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

TE offers the following recommendations:

- It is important to provide conservation incentives for private land owners to implement land use management strategies that are compatible with conservation of the Northern Belize Biological Corridors.

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 EO 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 provides an assessment of performance along each of the four project indicators, and an overall assessment of project outcomes. However, TE provides little information on the quality of interventions, particularly community-based activities, and their impact on land management practices. TE also fails to adequately discuss reasons behind project shortcomings, particularly the failure to develop incentive schemes for private landowners, and why only 7 of the 17 community-based activities were successful.	MU
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Performance ratings are not provided in the TE as these were not a requirement of GEF projects at the time. TE does not discuss delays that are mentioned in PIR regarding community-based activities, nor adequately discuss the quality of project supervision from the WB, and why only 7 of the 17 community-based activities were successful. Moreover, TE does not provide evidence to back up claims that project's educational component has helped bring about support for Corridors among targeted stakeholders. Explanation for not undertaking private incentive study are difficult to reconcile given this activity was identified in PD as being of central importance to the project.	MU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	TE provides some discussion of factors that may be expected to impact project sustainability, such as the environmental education component, and capacity building provided to community groups. However, the change in conservation status achieved at 4 sites due to project interventions is not adequately assessed, and it's unclear what the legal status/degree of enhanced protection that was achieved through the support of the project, how sustainable these achievements are, what the mechanism was that brought it about, and how significant these sites are in relation to the entire Northern Belize Biological Corridors	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons provided are not insightful and are of little value. Nothing is said about the community-based activities and educational component, and little is said about project shortcomings.	U
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	TE does provide actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	TE does not assess project's M&E system other than provided some general comments about effectiveness of MTR and Technical Advisory Committee. Design of M&E system is not discussed at all.	MU
Overall TE Rating		MU

Overall TE rating = (0.3 * (3+3)) + (0.1 * (3+2+5+3)) = 1.8 + 1.3 = 3.1 = MU

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