

## Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

### 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		500	
GEF Agency project ID		1424	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-2	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		In-Situ Conservation of Native Cultivars and Their Wild Relatives	
Country/Countries		Peru	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		1-Arid and Semi-Arid Zone Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		INIA (Instituto Nacional de Investigacion Agraria)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Secondary executing agency	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		11/6/2000	
Effectiveness date / project start		11/17/2000	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		07/1/2003	
Actual date of project completion		11/2006	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.17	0.17
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		5.05	5.05
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	0.5	0
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		1.0
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		5.22	5.22
Total Co-financing		0.5	1.0
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		5.72	6.22
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		10/2006	
TE submission date		01/2007	
Author of TE		Gustavo Gutiérrez, Manuel Tejada, Teobaldo Pinzás	
TER completion date		11/23/2014	
TER prepared by		Nelly Bourlion	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objectives of the project is the conservation of agrobiodiversity in Peru, one of the world’s most important centers of crop and plant genetic diversity (PD, pg.19). According to the PD, “the Peruvian Andes comprise a significant part of one of the world’s most important Vavilov Centers of Diversity and rival the indo-Malayan and Mediterranean regions in terms of crop genetic diversity” (PD, pg.21). The total number of native plant species in Peru is around 4,500. The global significance of the germplasm embodied in these native crops and varieties is already acknowledged by the worldwide spread of Andean crops such as potatoes, lima beans, peppers, tomatoes etc.

This project is focused on preserving the diversity of varieties of native crops and their wild relatives that are of potential use to global agriculture and food security. This project targets 11 important crop species, including several local varieties and wild relatives, for conservation of their genetic diversity within functioning agroecosystems (PD, pg.21). These crops have been selected according to their actual or potential importance to long-term global food security, variability within each of the species, extent of genetic erosion, endemism, and social and cultural importance. (PD, pg.19)

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development objective is “to preserve in situ the native species and its wild relatives (of targeted species) inside and around the farm” (PD, pg.21).

The project focuses activities in eight key geographic areas and implements a series of strategic measures aimed at developing a comprehensive model or package of interventions designed to counteract threats to long-term conservation of genetic diversity from a variety of economic and cultural trends (PD, pg.21). The strategic measures include: providing specific standing to these areas as Special Management Areas; targeted incentives to participating farmer communities and organizations to conserve crop genetic diversity; increasing the market acceptability of a broader range of native cultivars both within the target areas and outside; maintaining gene flows through traditional practices within and between the target areas; and developing a sound information base and monitoring system to document genetic diversity, the traditional knowledge systems which sustain it, and experiences with marketing of traditional crops, as well as to provide a mechanism from which to feed lessons learned

and best practices back to the stakeholder organizations and institutions of the key areas (PD, pg.21). Eleven major crops are chosen to be worked with: camu-camu, passion, amaranth, corn, quinoa, lima beans, parsnips, maca, cassava, yams and potatoes.

To reach the development objective, the project defines six outcomes:

- Outcome 1: Farmers have strengthened in-situ conservation capabilities for native crops and their related wild species.
- Outcome 2: Relevant organizations capacities are enhanced to promote in farm conservation and the effective participation of conservation oriented farmers and communities in the distribution of benefits
- Outcome 3: Awareness with regard to the ecological , cultural and nutrition value of native crops and its related wild species is increased at local and national level and expressed in education programs, research, public policies and investment programs.
- Outcome 4: Enabling policies, laws and tools implemented at local level to encourage farmers in the production and conservation of native crops and its wild related species.
- Outcome 5: The market of goods and services related to native crops operates consistently with conservation objectives, crop diversity and variability, as well as the equitable sharing of benefits at local levels.
- Outcome 6: An information and monitoring system is functioning as an important tool for the management, planning and coordination of Agrobiodiversity initiatives in Peru and the quantitative assessment of Information regarding the biological, ecological, social, cultural, political and economic impact of the project.

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

The logframe was modified in October 2004. The main change was a wording change; the objectives were changed into outcomes. The Outcome 2 was modified and the outcome 5 was modified accordingly.

Outcome 2 went from “Continue and intensify efforts on farm conservation, and effective participation of farmers and conservation communities in the distribution of benefits” to “Strengthening the organizations in the market organization, and focus actions on local and regional level” (TE, pg.35).

Outcome 5 was completely changed to make it compatible with the modified outcome 2. In outcome 5, the work of strengthening the emerging markets of native crops and their derivatives was abandoned.

In both cases the explicit reference to marketing organization and explicit actions of the project to market access for conservationist producers was removed. These changes were due to the difference of opinion between the executing institutions on the relationship between support for conservation and marketing or market access (TE, pg.21).

#### 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.

<b>4.1 Relevance</b>	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	----------------------

The project is relevant to national and international strategy, as well as to GEF strategies.

Peru has made commitments towards the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, at international and national levels. Peru ratified the CBD, adopted the Agenda 21, and subscribed to the FAO Global Plan of Action for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. At the national level, the 1993 Constitution and the Environment and Natural Resources Code set out provisions relating to the conservation of biological diversity and genetic diversity.

The project approach is consistent with GEF OP-1 on arid and semi-arid zone an ecosystem that calls for special attention to the demonstration and application of techniques, tools, and methods to conserve traditional crops in their original habitats. The OP specifically calls for “demonstrating and applying techniques to conserve biodiversity important to agriculture” and “supporting capacity building efforts that promote the preservation and maintenance of indigenous and local communities’ knowledge, innovation, and practices relevant to conservation of biological diversity, with their prior informed consent and participation” (PD, pg.40).

<b>4.2 Effectiveness</b>	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The TE rates overall project effectiveness as Moderately Satisfactory. This TER however rates project effectiveness as Moderately Unsatisfactory since progress towards expected achievements under 3 of 6 defined outcomes is assessed as moderately unsatisfactory or unsatisfactory. In particular, progress in terms of changes in policies, laws, market access, and monitoring (Outcomes 4-6) was far below expected targets.

Progress towards achievement of expected outcomes is assessed along each defined outcome below:

**Outcome 1:** *Farmers have strengthened in-situ conservation capabilities for native crops and their related wild species - Satisfactory*

According to the TE, the main achievement of the project was the contribution to improving farmers' ability to identify threats to agrobiodiversity and implement mitigation measures on their own. A significant effort was also made to record traditional practices, and to incorporate appropriate new technologies, this helped improve agronomic conditions of the crop areas targeted by the project. Some regions also have developed plans to mitigate threats to in situ conservation (TE, pg.25).

**Outcome 2:** *Relevant organizations capacities are enhanced to promote in farm conservation and the effective participation of conservation oriented farmers and communities in the distribution of benefits – Satisfactory.*

The organizations focused their activities on farm conservation tasks, primarily for the collection and systematization of information, among other issues, diversity, variability and breeding of native varieties, knowledge and directions in agricultural production and recovery of traditional authorities (TE, pg.31). In the local areas in which the project actions were implemented, the recognition and reevaluation of Andean crops have increased.

**Outcome 3:** *Awareness with regard to the ecological , cultural and nutrition value of native crops and its related wild species is increased at local and national level and expressed in education programs, research, public policies and investment programs - Moderately Satisfactory*

Regionally and nationally project impact is not significant, beyond professional and academic circles and institutions dedicated to promoting rural development (TE, pg.35).

**Outcome 4:** *Enabling policies, laws and tools implemented at local level to encourage farmers in the production and conservation of native crops and its wild related species - Unsatisfactory*

The project did not have the expected progress in terms of sectoral policies, legal frameworks and incentives in direct support of the in-situ conservation of agricultural biodiversity. The progress of the project in terms of influencing the public agenda for the incorporation of quotas to promote in-situ conservation investments has been limited (TE, pg.39). Nationally, only the INCAGRO project of the Ministry of Agriculture has incorporated this theme. The Ministry of Finance has not been persuaded to commit resources.

**Outcome 5:** *The market of goods and services related to native crops operates consistently with conservation objectives, crop diversity and variability, as well as the equitable sharing of benefits at local levels – Moderately Unsatisfactory*

One of the results that should have been reached referred to the issue of market access as one of the mechanisms for sustainable conservation of agricultural biodiversity and to redistribute its benefits to the people directly involved and their communities. This subject and marketing activities to be undertaken were one of the most controversial subjects between central and local implementing institutions. They had differing positions and it negatively impacted the project's achievements. Another

shortcoming was the failure to have budget allocations by the Peruvian state, as a counterpart to the contribution of the GEF. The lack of resources contributed to magnify the conceptual differences about marketing (TE, p.41).

**Outcome 6:** *An information and monitoring system is functioning as an important tool for the management, planning and coordination of Agrobiodiversity initiatives in Peru and the quantitative assessment of Information regarding the biological, ecological, social, cultural, political and economic impact of the project – Unsatisfactory*

According to the TE, it was not possible to have the information system in operation in the fourth year of the project. That was one of the main activities in which a significant delay that affected project completion was recorded (TE, pg.46).

4.3 <b>Efficiency</b>	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------	---------------------------------

To ensure cost-effectiveness the PD called for project activities to be targeted on sites where participating institutions had institutional presence so as to take advantage of existing relationships to implement the project more efficiently (PD, pg.20). According to the TE, tracking of expenditures in the first two years seem inadequate. However, there was no issue with disbursements that affected the implementation (TE, pg.24). Financial planning was adjusted to the requirements of the annual planning of activities. More than 44% of the budget was allocated to the Outcome 1, to strengthen in situ conservation in farms. The lack of agreement between the executing institutions on the link between conservation and market (Outcome 5) is reflected in the small amount allocated to this subject. The outcome 4, focused on policy advocacy, received a fairly small budget allocation of 3.5% of total actual budget (TE, pg.24).

The Project had to be extended 1 additional year, because of the delay in the Italian Government’s transfer of Funds (PIR, pg.1). The funds from the cooperation of the Italian Government were disbursed with a delay, thus demanding an implementation plan to continue with the project implementation during the period from November 2005 to July 2006. The implementation of this continuity plan was delayed and gave way to have the project closed on December 2006 (PIR, pg.32).

Therefore, the overall efficiency of the project is Moderately Satisfactory.

4.4 <b>Sustainability</b>	Rating: Moderately Unlikely
---------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates sustainability of project outcomes as Moderately Likely. This TER however finds greater risks to sustainability of outcomes, rating overall sustainability as moderately unlikely, principally because of financial and socio-political risks to sustainability. (TE, p.25).

Risks to the sustainability of project outcomes are further assessed along the following four dimensions:

**Financial Sustainability: Moderately Unlikely**

The availability of resources seems limited. For this project the Peruvian government failed to meet its commitment and did not provide as much financing as expected. Therefore it is highly doubtful that it will commit more funds to sustain the project. Moreover, there is no information in the TE about any additional source of financing that could ensure project's sustainability.

**Sociopolitical Sustainability: Moderately Unlikely**

According to the TE, the sustainability of the project achievements on the issue of in situ conservation of Andean crops, organizing farmers and conservationists initial marketing experiences is not guaranteed. The number of farm families that carried out in situ conservation in their fields, crop varieties and production volumes has increased. However, the dedication demanded by the conservation of agrobiodiversity is much larger and interferes with the livelihoods of rural families in terms of dedication of time and effort. During the project period, the benefits provided (support, seed exchange, visits or internships, training, attendance at events on the subject) offset this dedication, but once the project finished the sustainability of conservation achievements in site is not ensured

**Institutional Sustainability: Likely**

At National Government Level, the National Environmental Council (CONAM) started the implementation of the National Plan of Agro biodiversity and has put in action the National Agro-biodiversity Group. The Project has helped in the preparation of the Regional Agrobiodiversity Agendas in six regions of the country. Therefore the institutional context seems appropriate to ensure project's sustainability.

**Environmental Sustainability: Moderately Unlikely.**

The environmental risks remain the same after the project. The three main causes of the loss of agrobiodiversity are a) the replacement of native varieties by modern varieties; b) loss of traditional knowledge about growing native varieties; and c) overgrazing. The project tackles some of these aspects but did not solve all of them. Therefore, the environmental sustainability remains moderately unlikely.

## **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?

In the PD, the Peruvian Government funds were expected to finance part of the Project Implementation Unit, and part of the cost of activities associated with Outcome 5 (Strengthen incipient local, national

and international markets for native crops). Those funds were also expected to finance activities related to improvement of agronomic practices.

However, the Peruvian government did not give the expected funds and this reduced the availability of resources. But, a contribution of one million dollars from the Italian government offset the lack of state contribution (TE, pg.23). And therefore their contribution financed field-oriented activities of Outcomes 1, 2, and 3. GEF funds were expected to finance all other project activities (PD, pg.43).

Overall, the lower than expected Peruvian government contribution led to a delay, and therefore impacted implementation. It also impacted project's sustainability, since it is highly doubtful than the government will provide with additional funds to ensure project's sustainability while it did not provide for project's implementation.

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 funds from the Italian Government werer disbursed with a delay, thus demanding an implementation plan to continue with the project implementation during the period from November 2005 to July 2006. Therefore, the project closing date was delayed by 1 year to November 2006 (PIR, pg.32).

This delay impacted some of the project activities. The information system could not be in operation in a 4 years' timeframe. This was one of the main activities in which a significant delay that affected project completion was recorded. The monitoring system for in situ conservation of agricultural biodiversity, was also delayed.

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 had a high degree of country ownership. The idea for the project came within the National Commission on Biodiversity, to the extent that was inserted into the country's priorities concerning biodiversity. The project successfully responded to the interests and concerns of the country for the protection of natural resources and biodiversity. Moreover, much of the project strategy developed during the formulation was based on the experience gained by national organizations, mainly non-governmental, in the field of protection of resources, knowledge, practices and traditions of Andean peasants. Among the state agencies involved in the conservation of the environment and biodiversity, the level of ownership of the project was relatively high in the case of INIA and CONAM, and reduced in the case of INRENA. On the other hand, the Peruvian government did not commit the expected funds, and therefore the country ownership was impacted (TE, pg.20).

## **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.

<b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b>	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
------------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE rates M&E Design at entry as Satisfactory, but this TER rates M&E Design at entry as Moderately Satisfactory, principally because the logframe is unclear with regard to expected outcomes, and had to be modified during the project's course.

The project steering committee has a precise role defined in the PD to oversee the M&E of project activities and to commission independent evaluations (PD, pg.36). The Project Implementation Unit was expected to monitor the progress of project implementation and impact in the middle, at the end, and after completion of the project. Moreover a logical framework with indicators is designed in the PD to monitor the impact of the project (PD, p.43).

However, the intervention strategy for the conservation of species is poorly defined. The conservation of wild species is included in the objectives and supported throughout the project. But no specific measures for this purpose are indicated in the description of expected results and / or activities (TE, pg.14). Moreover, the six outcomes of the project were appropriate to respond to the six themes to achieve the overall objective of the project. However, the expected outcomes and outputs were unclearly defined in the logframe, and were subsequently modified in October 2004 during project implementation (TE, p.15). The initial logframe was used until October 2004, when it was redesigned to suit the structure and terminology of the UNDP Planning Matrix. This reformulation included a redefinition of outcomes, especially outcomes 2 and 5. In both cases the explicit reference to marketing organization and explicit actions of the project to market access for producer conservationists was removed. These changes were due to the difference of opinion between the executing institutions on the relationship between support for conservation and marketing or market access. (TE, pg.21).

A budget was allocated in the PD, for the M&E implementation (PD, pg.45).

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

Monitoring such a project (with diverse executing institutions acting with different approaches in 12 regions of the country) was a challenge to the PIU. Each executing agency fulfilled its role in the M&E implementation, and scored an acceptable degree of success. However, the Mid-Term Evaluation was omitted and it deprived the set of institutions of a reflection on their work. Nevertheless, they found a way to adjust activities under the Planning Matrix and to maintain an internal discussion throughout the project. The project regularly conducted baseline studies and annual operating plans. The executing

agencies were based in the regions, and therefore their constant presence in the field facilitated the monitoring of progress of the project (TE, pg.23).

## 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.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: Unable to Assess
--	--------------------------

There is no information in the TE and/or in the PIR to allow an assessment of quality of project implementation.

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: Satisfactory
---	----------------------

The project brief of this project was designed several years before the project actually started to be implemented. Therefore, the institutional arrangements changed. INIA (the Institution Nacional de Investigacion Agraria) was originally proposed as the main executing agency of the project. But because of important staff reductions in the government institution, it was decided that IIAP would be the new executing agency. Although INIA was no longer the executing agency, it remained an important partner with other secondary executing agencies in implementing field-based activities in the target project sites (PD, g.35). Overall, six institutions participated in the project' execution, both governmental and non-governmental, each responsible for specific target areas.

Having 6 executing agencies impacted project execution. The executing agencies had different positions on key issues of conceptualization and promotion of in situ conservation, which made it difficult to manage a project already complex in itself. The first manager resigned after about two years, having strong disagreements with executing institutions, and its replacement only stayed a few months in office. Finally it was decided to replace the management and coordination position by a professional hired for this specific work to the end of the project. In this period, the coordinator managed to give fluidity to the execution of activities. The Executive Unit developed extensive work relations with other public and private cooperation entities and executed tasks effectively. A key to the coordinator success was to prioritize the execution of activities on the search for agreements on issues in which the executing institutions would not harmonize their positions (TE, pg.21).

## 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 below that this is indeed the case. 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.

No environmental impact are reported in the TE and/or the PIR.

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.

Meetings have been held with Quechua communities of Laria (Huancavelica) to discuss the possibilities and effects of the creation of one AMECA, to feedback the active participation process of the local communities (PIR, pg.36).

In the agricultural sector, thanks to the suggestion of the National Environmental Council (CONAM), a member of the Project Board, the creation of the National Potato Day has been supported. This measure has had great impact among farmers and that was seen during the celebrations and in the expressions of pride in the production sites, thus creating favorable conditions for sustainability of the in situ conservation of native agro-biodiversity (PIR, pg.37).

The project interacted with 892 farmers in 177 communities, in twelve political regions of Peru (TE, pg.13).

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

Several publications, a communication plan and several radio programs have been developed (PIR pg.37).

Many progress and achievements of the project were documented in reports, publications and other media for professionals (TE, pg.23)

#### b) Governance

Due the activities of the In Situ Project, INRENA has included the management of agro-biodiversity as part of its policy for conservation. (PIR, pg.36)

In situ conservation has been included in the regional environmental action plans of the ABD National Plan (PIR, pg.37).

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 were reported in the TE and/or the PIR.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The Monastery Hotel in Cusco, member of a five-star hotel chain, has established a commercial partnership with APROCULTIVOS, a traditional farmer organization, to include the variety of native potatoes in the gastronomy of restaurants in the five-fork category. The replication of this experience in Cusco has increased the commercial partnership of APROCULTIVOS with NOVOTEL and the SABOR DE LA CASA Restaurant (PIR, p.37).

There is a potential project to replicate the in-situ Project in the Apurimac Region, with the financing of a mining company (PIR, p.39). The replication of the Project in the Apurimac Region with the financing of the private enterprise (Xstrata) with the purpose of creating adequate conditions for the generation of income and family and community well-being coming from the conservation of native crops. Upon project completion there should be an agreement with the XSTRATA Enterprise and the executing

organizations of the Project working in Cusco to prepare the Project document that makes feasible the replication of the experience. Finally, the in-situ Project experience should be submitted to the IV International Congress of Mining Women, on the “Rural Development Conference”, and included in the theme “Mining and Human Rights” that was held in Ica (Peru) from 27 to 29 September (PIR, pg.39).

## **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 following lessons are given in the TE (pg.4):

1. In the course of implementation, training facilitation committees (national and regional) were created, a strategy not considered in the design of the project, it was a success as a space for dialogue, coordination, overcoming differences, external supervision, and sustainability. These committees were mainly composed of regional facilitators (local experts hired by the project to fulfill this role) and representatives of the executing agencies.  
The internships or exchange visits between conservation farmers proved to be one of the best intervention strategies for achieving project involvement, interest and long-term commitment of local farmers with the project objectives.
2. The elements that have contributed most to the success of the project are the interdisciplinary approach, inter-execution, innovative and native character of the proposal, and adaptive management.
3. In terms of limitations, one of the factors that influenced the lower growth in some of the results was the significant delay in the onset of activities, which in some cases was extended until the last years of implementation. Leaving aside the issues of budget limitations and the need for prerequisite check, this was a weakness of the UEP, possibly explained by the search for consensus decision making, along with the complexity of the project and the large number of studies and consultancies that took place.
4. One of the major weaknesses of the project was its inability to proceed with the activities and expected results of the joint objective linked to the market and conceptual differences between implementing institutions, despite already having a course of action established during the project formulation.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The following recommendations are given in the TE (Pg.4):

1. In the formulation of a new project, it is important to consider risks from internal conflicts (institutional or personal) affecting implementation, and therefore incorporate measures aimed

at preventing or facilitate or resolve conflicts.

Part of the conflicts experienced by the project during the first years of its implementation stemmed from the lack of clarity or lack of policies on risks or incompatibilities.

2. At the level of the donor organization is necessary to specify policies that prevent the participation of the same actor in the tasks of formulation, implementation and monitoring. It is important that project formulation clearly resolves all problems or uncertainties related to the conceptual framework and project strategy.
3. At the same time it is important that the execution of a project is flexible enough to incorporate the necessary changes in both management and the definition of goals and activities.
4. The process of negotiation and signing cooperation agreements between UNDP and countries should incorporate effective mechanisms to ensure compliance with financial commitments from countries established in the design and approval of projects.
5. During the evaluation, there should be a planned and structured effort to systematize and share the results and lessons learned from the project, in view of their innovative aspects and the importance of its objectives for influencing national policy and institutional approaches.
6. The design or the start of project implementation should set out clearly the rules or criteria for standardization of information that all executing agencies must follow.
7. It is important that the progress of the project are shared with officials of the National Agrobiodiversity Program, so that it strengthens proposals of in situ conservation of agrobiodiversity Technical Groups.

## 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?	The report assesses the relevant outcomes. However the impacts of the project are not really given, and the changes in outcomes/objectives/outputs is not enough described. The quality of project implementation is also not assessed.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent, evidences are presented and ratings for all categories are given.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report assesses project sustainability in a limited way. There is no description and/or assessment of financial sustainability, institutional sustainability, environmental etc. Only an overview is given and more details would have been useful.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence	The lessons and recommendations are described and very detailed. They are based on evidences given in the report.	S

presented and are they comprehensive?		
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes tables and descriptive text on project costs (actual vs. planned) per activity, and actual cofinancing is given.	<b>S</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The M&E system is described, and the M&E implementation assessed. However, there were changes in the project logframe, in the outcomes and objectives. The TE mentions these changes but not enough details are given, on the reasons for these changes and on the actual changes.	<b>MU</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MS</b>

$$0.3*(9) + 0.1*(16) = 2.7 + 1.6 = 4.3$$

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