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		62	
GEF Agency project ID		7493; P052209	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Protected Areas Program: Proposed Restructuring Project	
Country/Countries		Mexico	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		STRM-Short Term Response Measures	
Executing agencies involved		Fondo Mexicano para la Conservacion de la Naturaleza (FMCN) National Ecology Institute (INE)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		through consultation	
Private sector involvement		through consultations	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		5/1/1991	
Effectiveness date / project start		4/15/1993	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		4/30/1996	
Actual date of project completion		12/31/1997	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		25.2	24.7 (trustee dataset)
Co-financing	IA/EA own		
	Government		23.4
	Other*		Pvt foundation: 6.8 m NGOs: 5.1 m
Total GEF funding		25.2	24.7
Total Co-financing		17.2	35.3
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		42.2	60
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		10/30/2003	
TE submission date		11/06/2003	
Author of TE		Adriana Moreira	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) preparer		Robert C G Varley	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) reviewer		Antonio del Monaco	
Revised TER (2014) completion date		04/02/2014	
Revised TER (2014) prepared by		Nelly Bourlion	
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	HS	MS	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	ML	HL	HL	L
M&E Design	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS
M&E Implementation	S	N/A	N/A	MS
Quality of Implementation	S	S	S	S
Quality of Execution	HS	HS	HS	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	S	MU

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project is "to implement protection/ conservation programs in ten biosphere reserves in high priority ecosystems containing endemic and/or endangered species of global importance."

Mexico is ranked fourth among the thirteen megadiversity countries, containing 10% of the world's biodiversity. Besides being biologically important, Mexico's forests and wildlands have national and global significance for environmental, social, and economic reasons. The Government of Mexico (GOM) has developed various strategies for protecting critical natural areas over the past two decades, including the creation of a National System of Protected Natural Areas (SINAP).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objectives as mentioned in the previous TER are:

(1) to strengthen the management of protected areas at the reserve level;
(2) to promote local participation, including indigenous communities, in the implementation, operating and management plans for protected areas; and
(3) to ensure long-term recurrent cost financing for core protection and conservation activities.

The components of the project are as follow:

(1) Reserve Conservation Program - protection, community outreach, and training activities in 10 protected areas, including Technical Advisory Councils and income generating activities.
(2) Central Coordination Programs - support activities at the national level.
Permanent Endowment for Protected Areas - establishment and operation of a permanent endowment fund
(3) (FANP), the income from which would fund operating costs at the 10 reserves.

The project reserves, encompassing about one-half the total area of Mexico's biosphere and special biosphere reserves at the time, were: (1) Calakmul Biosphere Reserve; (2) El Triunfo Biosphere Reserve; (3) Isla Contoy National Park; (4) Wildlife Protection Area Islas del Golfo de California; (5) Sierra de Manantlán Biosphere Reserve; (6) Mariposa Monarca Biosphere Reserve; (7) Montes Azules Biosphere

Reserve; (8) Ría Lagartos Biosphere Reserve; (9) Sian Ka'an Biosphere Reserve; and (10) Vizcaíno Biosphere Reserve.

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

Due to slow progress during the initial stages of implementation, the project was restructured, and the objectives were narrowed. The narrower focus on institutional and financial outcomes reduced the weight given to demonstrating biodiversity impact for what was considered a relatively short implementation period of 5 years. The new indicators for measuring progress on the conservation objective and the biodiversity impacts, were agreed at entry.

The objectives of the restructured project were to : (a) to implement protection/conservation programs in ten biosphere reserves (instead of 17) in high priority ecosystems containing endemic and/or endangered species of global importance; (b) to strengthen the management of protected areas at the reserve level; (c) to promote local participation, including indigenous communities, in the implementation, operating and management plans for protected areas; and (d) to ensure long-term recurrent cost financing for core protection and conservation activities.

According to the TE, additional co-financing from NGOs and private foundations during the restructuring of the project led to an increased scale of activities in the protected areas system. During the course of the project implementation, the Government of Mexico substantially increased its annual financial commitment to protected areas, and elevated the protected areas agency to a significantly more visible and powerful position within SEMARNA (a ministry for environment, natural resources, and fisheries). The partnership between SEMARNAT and FMCN (Mexican Nature Conservation Fund) created incentives and mechanisms to develop management plans and improve management systems.

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**

No information on relevance is available in the previous TER, or in the TE. Therefore the information comes from the PD.

The project is relevant to the objectives and priorities of the biodiversity focal area of the GEF. The project was approved as a short term response measure. Its objectives, at the time of its approval, were consistent with the

forest ecosystem related operational program (OP-3) of GEF. The project was also relevant to the respective national legislation, in particular with Article 27 of the Mexican Constitution, which establishes the obligation of the federal government to conserve the nation's natural resources ad to preserve and restore ecological equilibrium in the public interest. (PD, pg. 7) Additionally, the project is also relevant with the government's priorities for environmental policies and actions that are summarized in the 1989-94 National Development Plan.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The outcomes in terms of effectiveness are rated satisfactory. At project completion following results had been achieved.

Component 1: Reserve Conservation Program - protection, community outreach, and training activities in 10 protected areas, including Technical Advisory Councils and income generating activities.

(1) 72 of the 149 protected areas in the system had core staff (in 1990, no protected areas had permanent official staff) and basic operations budgets paid by the Mexican government. Twenty seven protected areas had a published Management Program.
(2) The core staff of competent and trained staff had been established for the 10 protected areas, management plans had been published, and the annual operating plans were in use.
(3) Technical Advisory Councils operated in all the reserves. These Councils included indigenous people, and were participating in review of plans and implementation of social strategies.
(4) More than 60 community-based sustainable development projects had been supported.

Component 2: Central Coordination Programs - support activities at the national level.

The Government substantially increased its annual financial commitment, and consolidated the position of a new institution (CNAMP), absorbing SEMARNAT's Regional Sustainable Development Program (PRODERS.).

Component 3: Permanent Endowment for Protected Areas - establishment and operation of a permanent endowment fund (FANP), the income from which would fund operating costs at the 10 reserves

(1) FANP has been established and is operating with financial results exceeding appraisal projections, and annual administration below the 12% benchmark. The target investment performance was also achieved in 2001 and 2002, despite the economic downturn.
(2) The FANP endowment has not been depleted and the balance of $41.5 million now also includes SINAP II project co-financing. Other donor support of FANP was greater than expected and GEF funds were well leveraged.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

According to the TE, due to slow progress in disbursements (less than $4 million out of a total grant of $25 million), attributed to institutional instability and economic crisis, the Agency intended to close the project. However, it was extended to facilitate restructuring of the project. The restructured project was designed primarily based on a review prepared by Pronatura, a Mexican NGO. The restructured project corresponded more closely with the implementation concerns of the Bank and the Recipient and also those of the GEF.

The project was completed and closed on December 31, 2002. At that time, all of the planned activities of the restructured project had been completed. The project activities were completed in accordance with planned budgets with respect to the GEF funds.

Because of the success of the permanent financing mechanism, protected areas now have a reliable source of annual funding that is not dependent on annual budget appropriations (but creates an incentive to keep appropriations at an adequate level). As a result of the project activities, the national protected areas system has begun to develop systems for long term planning and monitoring of field activities, appropriate to the field of conservation where the objectives are for the long term. Finally, the effectiveness of the financing mechanism has created opportunities for significant additional external funding from bilateral, corporate, and nonprofit sources, nationally and internationally.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Likely**

The sustainability of this project is rated as Likely.

Financial sustainability: FANP is a powerful, permanent funding mechanism and the focus on financing and institutional mechanisms, the main concern at appraisal, has created a high likelihood of sustainability. Additionally, proposals for revenue generation mechanisms, including entry fees at some sites, have been tested in some locations, and should generate regular revenue streams in future.

Socio-political sustainability: During the project Government has elevated the agency responsible for administering protected areas, renamed it CONANP and given it a higher position in the hierarchy of SEMARNAT (The Ministry for Environment and Natural Resources.) The sustainability and strength of the agency are good indicators of budgetary stability too.

Institutional sustainability: Project successes have spilled over into other protected areas with the follow-up project (SINAP II), which not only extends the scale replication of the management structures set up for the reserves, but increases overall national capacity and central support resources. However, CONANP (UCANP) at the beginning of the project, although growing rapidly and making progress, is still not consolidated in terms of well-regulated civil service career paths, and internal processes of planning, monitoring, and management; and although management plans and programs were developed for all areas, there is a lack of clearly stated norms for good protected area management, according to the ICR.

Technical Sustainability: Infrastructure to support field work in the protected areas is still inadequate.

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 restructured project relied on GOM financial support, FANP investment income, and NGO co-financing to provide financing for all project activities from 1998 onwards. Co-financing from NGOs and private foundations was raised during the restructuring of the project. At the time, the main source of co-financing was assumed to be FMCN's existing small grants program, established with funding from GOM, USAID, and other sources, to support conservation and sustainable use projects, local community capacity building, publications, and scholarships. All of the reserves supported by the SINAP project fell within the priorities already established for the small grants program, and FMCN agreed to carry out promotion and dissemination activities to assure that reserve staff and local residents were aware of the opportunities presented by the small grants program. The increased availability of cofinancing led to increased scale of some of the project activities, and has lowered the risked to financial sustainability.

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?

According to the TE, the governmental reorganization and budgetary problems related to an economic crisis and peso devaluation resulted in budget austerity measures and severe spending controls on publicly funded projects. At the end of 1994, there was another agency reorganization. INE was placed under the jurisdiction of a new ministry for environment, natural resources, and fisheries (SEMARNAP, name changed to SEMARNAT in 2000). By the end of 1995, the project's original closing date, only $US3.96 million had been disbursed. Management plans had been completed for 6 reserves, emergency plans for another 3. Technical advisory councils (CTAs) were established in 6 reserves, and on-site protection activities initiated at 10. However, within these technical accomplishments there was tremendous variation from site to site, both in the scope and the quality of management plans and in the degree of involvement of CTAs. In an effort to reach a common understanding about the constraints to effective implementation, the GOM and the World Bank agreed to commission an independent analysis and recommendations for improving project implementation and justifying an extension of the project closing date. The Mexican non-governmental organization Pronatura conducted this exercise. The assessment report recommended changes including increased training and technical assistance, streamlining of World Bank procurement review requirements, introduction of third-party reserve management programs where appropriate, and measures to address long-term financial sustainability.

Negotiations for the restructured project concluded in May 1996, permitting resumption of project activities with a new completion date of 2002.

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 restructuring decentralized implementation arrangements, strengthened local participation, and promoted coordination between national governmental and nongovernmental institutions to ensure management activities

consistent with national protected area legislation and policies. The two institutions responsible for project implementation after restructuring were FMCN and the National Institute of Ecology (INE), a semi-autonomous agency of the Secretariat of Environment, Natural Resources, and Fisheries (SEMARNAP). SEMARNAP retained overall responsibility for the policy and institutional framework of the National System of Protected Areas (SINAP), oversight of INE's implementation of protected area management, and responsibility to provide additional technical and financial support to the implementation of Indigenous Peoples Development Plans through PRODERS, the Regional Sustainable Development Program within CONANP. During the course of project implementation the government has contributed greater than anticipated funds to the project. This allowed the project to undertake some activities at a greater scale and also reduced the risks to financial sustainability.

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 PD does not mention any M&E plan per se. However, it states that detailed M&E indicators would be developed during project implementation, for each protected area. Additionally, a Technical Advisory Council would be established to periodically monitor the project, each of those Council would include representatives from local communities, scientific groups, governments, NGOs, and the private sector. Their annual meetings would review the progress in reaching the project's targets. There is no budget specifically designed for the M&E plan.

Therefore, the M&E design at Entry is moderately satisfactory, due to the lack of details in the M&E plan.

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

The M&E implementation is rated satisfactory.

In order to examine the relationship of project activities to achievement of objectives, CONANP and FMCN have collaborated in developing a monitoring and evaluation system designed to provide feedback oriented toward adaptive management of the protected areas. It emphasizes periodic field-level evaluation of management activities and their impacts. In addition, the Central Coordination and FANP administration units have developed logical frameworks and indicators to monitor their performance. However, the protected areas agency (UCANP at the beginning of the project, now CONANP), although growing rapidly and making progress, is still not consolidated in terms of well-regulated civil service career paths, and internal processes of planning, monitoring, and management. There is, furthermore, a lack of clearly stated norms for good protected area management and an inadequate infrastructure to support field work in the protected areas.

The majority of the financial and process indicators were produced by the project management system and were not particularly innovative, according to the TER, but the development of standardized biodiversity and sustainability indicators, using periodic field-level evaluation of management activities and their impacts and GIS instruments was a notable achievement. The project developed a relatively simple system, replacing one that in the earlier design involved collecting data on 1300 variables.

The formal target of establishing technical Advisory Councils, including indigenous people and other stakeholders was achieved at each reserve, as measured by project outputs, but it is not clear how effective the outcomes have been in addressing the social problems of encroachment, deforestation etc. The ICR cites 60 community-based social development projects have been supported (presumably the "income generating activities" foreseen at appraisal), at a cost of more than $4 million, but the results are not reported, either in social or economic terms. The numerical results of what monitoring is cited does not provide a time series or dis-aggregation by each of the 10 reserves

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

No information on the quality of project implementation is given in the previous TER, therefore the information comes from the TE.

The Mexican Protected Areas Project (Sistema Nacional de Areas Naturales Protegidas, or SINAP), derives from the restructured Mexico Environmental Project originally approved in 1992. As a result, its lending phase was simultaneous to the restructuring of the previous project and SINAP did not acquire separate status until 1998, when supervision was already under way.

During the life of the project, supervision missions required staff of the recipient to spend more than 1.7 person/years in planning, logistical coordination, and documentation, and accompanying World Bank staff and consultants on mission. The project did benefit in several instances from the guidance of technical experts participating in missions. However, given the consistent high quality of technical and financial reports submitted throughout the project, and clear evidence of the competence of the managers at both central and protected area levels, the supervision in the middle years was excessive. It reflected the World Bank's need to acquaint new personnel with the project as much as the requirements of supervision.

Overall, the World Bank contributed significantly to the restructuring of the project to its current form and provided close, extensive supervision in the initial years of implementation to ensure a successful turnaround. In

so doing, the Bank drew on extensive institutional, financial, and technical expertise related to designing, launching, and managing trust funds with similar objectives around the world.

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

According to the information provided in the TE, in late 1992 the GOM agency responsible for implementing the project was reorganized leading to establishment of two semiautonomous institute – the National Ecology Institute (INE) and the Attorney General for Environmental Protection (PROFEPA). INE had responsibility for managing protected areas and PROFEPA for enforcing environmental regulations. There was high staff turnover, including significant turnover in directors and administrative staff at the protected area level, and major changes at the CONANP central level as a result of the change in administration.

The protected areas agency, CONANP, significantly increased government support to the protected areas system, kept the core personnel in place at all of the reserves included in the project, and strengthened its institutional capacity considerably during the course of the project. In particular, the competence and dedication of the protected area managers contributed to the success of the project. At the time of the TE, 72 of the 149 protected areas in the system had core staff and basic operations budgets The Mexican government had instituted six-year, coherent programs for protecting biodiversity in consultation with scientists, conservationists, and local people. Inter-institutional bodies had been established to identify common goals and rationalize investments in and around protected areas.

However, CONANP still faced considerable challenges. It must develop a management structure adequate to support and supervise the growing number of staffed protected areas, consolidate human resources and career paths, and build on the current rudimentary monitoring and evaluation system to develop benchmarks and indicators of excellent protected area management as well as conservation status.

Overall, project operations were successful in large part due to the commitment of the people who participated in the project, including reserve personnel, members of CTFANP, CONANP, and FMCN. In particular, the protected area directors demonstrated vision, creativity, and technical capacity to overcome significant challenges. Their attitude of solidarity toward the communities within and around the reserves, searching together for long-term solutions to basic needs that have yet to be satisfied, formed the basis for well-founded social strategies and good possibilities in many areas for community involvement and leadership in vigilance and other conservation activities. Finally, the project benefited from excellent systems for use and control of the project budget.

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.

According to the previous TER, some of the preliminary data show upward trends - habitat conversion rates have decreased in some areas. Project successes have spilled over into other protected areas and a follow-up project (SINAP II) was begun before this project was evaluated. One reserve, Sian Ka'an, actually showed an increase in

vegetative area due to restoration projects. The formal target of establishing technical Advisory Councils, including indigenous people and stakeholders was achieved at each reserve.

On the other hand, indicators for the primary biodiversity objective are negative for some areas with habitat conversion rates increasing, and it is not clear how effective the implementation of the new activities have been in addressing the social problems of encroachment and deforestation.

The objective of conserving unique biodiversity in the selected reserves must be considered over a time period longer than the five years that the project has been operating; however, there are both early indicators of success and a system in place for continuous monitoring of the biodiversity resource in a timely manner, such that management systems can adapt to address new and recurring threats.

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.

No information is reported in the previous TER or TE.

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

According to the previous TER, all of the protected areas included in the project have functioning Advisory Councils (CAs) composed of representatives of communities and other stakeholders, including indigenous people. The CAs participate in the review of annual operating plans and play other roles in the implementation of social strategies in the respective areas. The experience of the CAs has generated considerable learning about social participation, resulting in the development of new models with considerable interaction with local populations, more so than the originally envisioned Technical Advisory Committees (CTAs). These include the establishment of sub-councils for distinct regions or thematic focus areas. Additionally, the CAs functioned as one element in a comprehensive social strategy for each protected area. These strategies also included indigenous people development plans where appropriate, sustainable development action plans, strategies for social "co-responsibility" for conservation, and for outreach and communications. Each protected area includes specific activities and outcome indicators for these 4 components of the social strategy in its operating plan and monitoring program. At the time of the TE, more than 60 community-based sustainable development projects in buffer zones had been supported with project funds, and more than US$4 million in complementary funding for sustainable development projects had been channeled to the 10 reserves through development agencies, NGOs, and others. Over the period 2000-2002, achievement of the identified outputs and outcomes was generally very good, in the range of 80-100% overall.

The project succeeded in installing a functioning unit for coordination of planning, monitoring, and reporting; establishment of a comprehensive monitoring system for the protected areas, and compliance with other terms of the grant agreement, including application of fiscal counterpart funds. The central coordination consistently prepared and submitted consolidated reports, and participated in consultations, within agreed timeframes. Independent external evaluations were conducted at midterm (2000) and at the end of the project (2003). The project succeeded to a large extent in coordinating projects of multiple external donors to avoid duplication of program activities and incompatible efforts.

The strategic objectives to strengthen reserve management, promote local participation, including indigenous communities, and ensure long-term recurrent cost financing for core protection and conservation activities were achieved, in several instances with results exceeding the expectations of the project design team.

b) Governance

According to the TE, a team of dedicated and professional protected area managers has been built, constituting a new generation of leadership for the system. The Mexican government has instituted six-year, coherent programs for protecting biodiversity in consultation with scientists, conservationists, and local people. Inter-institutional bodies have been established to identify common goals and rationalize investments in and around protected areas. National regulations for protected areas have been published and CONANP is working on turning these regulations into law.

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.

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

The TE states that a second phase is already in progress, this is a significant achievement of this project in terms of protected areas management in Mexico. However, no other details are given.

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 were given in the TE:

(1) Projects like these, which successfully took an integrated approach to protected area management plans, institutional strengthening, sustainable funding and the inclusion of local communities, are important vehicles for protecting globally valuable and threatened ecosystems.

(2) This project confirms the finding of several other projects that building a stable, diverse base of funding sources sufficient to support a protected area over time is a long and complex process.
(3) This project confirms findings from diverse sources indicating that long-term conservation is possible only with the involvement and cooperation of stakeholders at the local and national levels, and that methods to achieve this involvement must be adapted to the unique circumstances of each area
(4) Very clear, tangible and quantifiable development objectives and indicators are needed to avoid dispersing the project into activities with little overall impact on the status of the environment.
(5) A lesson identified in GEF's global portfolio of trust funds was that trust funds can promote decreases in government funding of protected areas by substituting trust fund financing for regular appropriations. This project did not have that experience, and in fact became a premier example of a government/fund partnership that actually leveraged increased government funding to protected areas.
(6) This project demonstrated that investments in variable-return instruments are not appropriate to programs with fixed income requirements, except in the unusual (and unpredictable) case of an equity market that provides sufficient excess revenues in the early years to provide a cushion for a sustained downturn.
(7) This project demonstrates the need for long-term financing mechanisms to have adequate reserves for emergencies and unforeseen costs, and raises interesting questions about proper use of contingency funds.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

No recommendations are given in the TE, and therefore no information is reported in the previous TER.

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 long-term cause and effect relationships are complex and more time may be needed to establish the longer-term project outcomes. The omission of quantitative analysis of biodiversity achievements was understandable, although a discussion of whether or how the project design needed adjusting, would have been relevant.	**MU**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE has only one descriptive paragraph on biodiversity outcomes and little information on the outcome of the community development activities. Tables of monitoring data, together with deeper analysis, would have been preferable, even if they were not paramount objectives. 60 community-based social development projects have been supported (the "income generating activities" foreseen at appraisal), at a cost of more than $4 million, but there is no evaluation of results - either in social or economic terms. Nonetheless the report is consistent and the evidence convincing enough.	**MU**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Beyond the institutional and financial factors, which have been properly assessed as highly likely to be sustained, there is only the residual doubts about the effectiveness of the project outcomes on achievement of the Global Environment Objective. The continuation with SINAP II is the exit strategy and no details of further steps to achieve sustainability or replication are discussed	**MU**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported by the evidence however, there is no recommendation for further development, the project SINAP II could have surely benefitted from recommendations.	**MS**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The costs of the project are given with details in the text and later in the Annex. The actual costs, as well as cofinancing are detailed and the changes in cofinancing and funding are well explained.	**S**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The M&E system is very lightly described. Very little information is given. This section should have been more developed with description of the M&E system as well as analysis of the quality of this system.	**MU**
Overall TE Rating		**MU**

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