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		644	
GEF Agency project ID		60558	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-2	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		El Triunfo Biosphere Reserve: Habitat Enhancement in Productive Landscapes	
Country/Countries		Mexico	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program		OP-3: Forest Ecosystems, OP-4: Mountain Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Instituto para el Desarrollo Sustentable en Mesoamérica (IDESMAC)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		IDESMAC: lead executing agency; Instituto de Historia Natural: executing partner; Instituto Nacional de Ecologia: executing partner	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		June 17, 1999	
Effectiveness date / project start		July 13, 1999	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		September 30, 2002	
Actual date of project completion		September 30, 2002	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.25	.25
	Co-financing	.35	.35
GEF Project Grant		.73	.73
Co-financing	IA/EA own	.88	
	Government	.65	
	Other*	.66	
Total GEF funding		.75	.75
Total Co-financing		1.43	1.48(total co-financing; was not disaggregated by source)
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.18	2.23
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		March 26, 2003	
TE submission date		March 26, 2003	
Author of TE		TTL: Ina Ruthenberg and Theresa Bradley	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) preparer		Robert C. G. Varley	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) reviewer		Joshua Brann	
Revised TER (2014) completion date		July 2014	
Revised TER (2014) prepared by		Shanna Edberg	
TER GEF IEO peer review (2014)		Joshua Schneck	

*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/a	n/a	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	L	n/a	n/a	ML
M&E Design	n/a	n/a	n/a	MS
M&E Implementation	S	n/a	n/a	MU
Quality of Implementation	S	n/a	n/a	MS
Quality of Execution	S	n/a	n/a	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	n/a	n/a	n/a	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

According the project document, this project would conserve biodiversity in the biosphere reserve of El Triunfo in the Mexican state of Chiapas. El Triunfo Biosphere reserve has a large amount of intact cloud forests and a high diversity of native species unique to the area, though deforestation causes the loss of 8,500 hectares per year. According to the TE, "The goal was to conserve biodiversity in the El Triunfo Biosphere Reserve buffer zones by supporting local efforts to adopt sustainable agricultural practices, including shade-grown coffee, that reduced fragmentation of forest habitats, promoted the conservation of biodiversity, and increased local participation in the benefits of conservation" (TE, page 3).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

According to the project document, the three outcomes envisioned for the project are as follows:

1. Local communities are actively involved in biodiversity conservation, as measured by the results of village meetings, community activities, the status of contributions and benefits, and participatory evaluation.
2. Sustainable agriculture with respect to biodiversity and economic viability, as measured by income increases in small producers through biodiversity-friendly production.
3. Conservation and recuperation of native species, as measured by the stabilization and increased presence of 8 threatened species that were selected as indicators.

The project aimed to stabilize about 4,000 hectares of the reserve threatened by deforestation, with an increase in biodiversity-friendly shade coffee production from 700 to 1500 hectares. Project activities included:

1. Community participation of around 1,500 farmers in 20 communities, with workshops to organize participatory action plans, implementation, and monitoring and self-evaluation.
2. Sustainable agricultural production through diversification of income sources, adding value to existing products through processing, and promotion and certification of biodiversity-friendly products (especially coffee).

3. Species conservation through developing communities' local environmental plans and developing a platform for information exchange.

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

There were no changes in objectives or activities. Some of the project's indicators were revised after the midterm evaluation in order to strengthen the relationship between the three project components and intensify stakeholder engagement.

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 conforms to GEF Operational Program 3: Forest Ecosystems, and GEF Operational Program 4: Mountain Ecosystems. The project area covers both types of ecosystems, and project activities are in line with the operational programs' suggested conservation activities, such as "developing socio-economic activities to reconcile biodiversity conservation with human needs," "participatory management of natural resources," "sustainable production and use of natural products," and so on (Operational Program Number 3, page 8, and Operational Program Number 4, page 7).

The project is also in line with Mexican national and state-level priorities. The Chiapas Program of Ecology, Natural Resources, and Fisheries 1995-2000 assigned the highest protection to the bioregion that includes El Triunfo Biosphere Reserve. Mexico's National Development Plan and National Environment Program 1995-2000 "emphasize the importance of conserving natural protected areas," and the National System of Natural Protected Areas seeks to protect "the most representative natural ecosystems in the country," including the El Triunfo site (Project Brief, page 3). Lastly, the Mexican Natural Protected Areas Program 1995-2000 was issued to develop a strategy for protecting Mexico's natural resources.

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

In most cases, the project met its targets for sustainable agriculture and biodiversity conservation, as described by each intended outcome below:

1. Local communities are actively involved in biodiversity conservation, as measured by the results of village meetings, community activities, the status of contributions and benefits, and participatory evaluation.

Participation of agriculture producers in the project rose from 156 to 872 during the project's duration, with representatives of five out of seven of the participating cooperatives involved in the final evaluation. More workshops than planned were held (39 instead of 27 workshops), with a 95% attendance rate for producers. 95% of producers also participated in the establishment of quality control systems for production. A system of biodiversity monitoring was put into place for all the communities, and five out of seven of the cooperatives have access to a biodiversity database. In addition, "Two communities have reached agreements on land-use for biodiversity important areas. Four other communities have proposed agreements designed, with discussions for implementation underway," although the original target was 15 communities (TE, page 8). Packages of educational material on the environment were disseminated to 113 schools, and 80% of the cooperatives engaged in education activities out of a target of 100%. It is not clear whether the objective of completing environmental education workshops in 20 communities was completed.

2. Sustainable agriculture with respect to biodiversity and economic viability, as measured by income increases in small producers through biodiversity-friendly production.

1,740 hectares were converted into certified organic coffee producers, and 910 hectares were converted into shaded coffee producers, out of a targeted increase of 800 new hectares of shade coffee production. The target of a 25% increase in income was exceeded, with an actual increase of 50-125% depending on the cooperative. Seven projects for alternative, non-extractive production were identified and three were being implemented by project closure. A certification system was created for biodiversity-friendly shade grown coffee, and the volume of certified coffee that was sold grew by six times between 1999 and 2002. The Universidad Autonoma de Chiapas created a diploma for Sustainable Coffee.

3. Conservation and recuperation of native species, as measured by the stabilization and increased presence of 8 threatened species that were selected as indicators.

1,000 hectares of forest area became newly protected through the certification program, while 1,050 hectares are now protected under biodiversity agreements with the resident communities. Three other communities were developing similar agreements at the time of the writing of the TE, bringing the total of newly protected forest area to around 3,550 hectares out of a target of around 4,000 hectares. The entire monitoring area of 150,000 hectares was surveyed by GIS and a forest cover study was

completed. Changes in native species populations and deforestation rates could not be evaluated because the community monitoring system was not implemented until the third and final year of the project.

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

There was a delay in starting the biodiversity monitoring system which prevented tracking the impact of the project on local species, but overall the project was completed without any additional time needed.

The project ended up focusing and spending more money on sustainable livelihoods and less on biodiversity than originally planned in the project document, for reasons that are unclear in the TE. Lastly, the TE noted discrepancies in the project's financial statements versus the amount disbursed; the World Bank auditors referred to the situation as low-risk and related to weak financial management.

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

Financial: **Moderately likely**; in a positive signal for sustainability, each of the seven cooperatives reached in the project has government financing and technical assistant services that will continue for the short run after project closure. In addition, "Seven cooperatives designed and are implementing strategic plans for external technical assistance with financing from FIRA and BANAMEX" (TE, page 8). On the other hand, it is possible that a drop in the price of coffee could occur in the future. During implementation, international coffee prices fell by 50%, which caused "about half of the local leaders in coffee production" to leave the project area (TE, page 15). It also caused farmers to become more risk-averse and more wary of diversifying into alternative products. If such a price drop were to occur again, the project's benefits would be severely eroded if beneficiaries move out of the project area and into more extractive production. This risk is somewhat mitigated by the increase in organically-certified coffee production, due to the price premium for organic coffee. Also, biodiversity-certified production does not command its own price premium and relies on the organic certification for its market power, so there is no economic incentive to continue to pursue biodiversity-friendly certification on its own.

Sociopolitical: **Moderately likely**; the Universidad Autonoma de Chiapas created a diploma in Sustainable Coffee with the aim of providing long-term technical assistance to the cooperatives in the region. This program will continue to train people in the field of sustainable agriculture. There are some political concerns for project sustainability; the historic change in government in 2001 caused the Ministry for Agriculture and Livestock to withdraw its support from the Mesa El Triunfo, a roundtable created to coordinate the project with other initiatives in the region. Despite this loss of government support, a network of organizations was built during the project, including "governmental organizations

at the federal and state level [1], the private sector[2], non-governmental institutions[3], academia and research institutions[4], financial intermediaries[5], certification agencies[6], local private agricultural extension services[7] and international organizations including bilateral donors[8]," which will provide "a powerful foundation for promoting the concept of biodiversity friendly coffee" (TE, pages 11-12).

Institutional: **Moderately likely**; five out of the seven cooperatives have access to the biodiversity database that was created, although none of them have the capacity to use the GIS information. The TE and PIRs do not discuss the sustainability of the biodiversity monitoring system that was adopted by the communities, so the reviewer is unable to assess that component of the project. A certification program was created for biodiversity-friendly coffee, but the certification "is not yet established in the marketplace and by itself does not draw a premium" (TE, page 13). Therefore the mechanism for biodiversity-friendly certification exists, but the market conditions do not provide an incentive for its expansion.

Environmental: **Moderately likely**; during the project's implementation, a drought occurred that lowered coffee production by 40%. The TE does not discuss the impact of the drought on the project's outcomes, but it is likely that droughts will continue to occur in the future. They could have a similar effect as the drop in the price of coffee, causing migrations and risk-aversion that disturb the project's outcomes.

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?

Actual co-financing exceeded planned co-financing by about $50,000. The cofinancing allowed some of the project's outputs to be expanded, for example the increase in participating cooperatives from five to seven and the implementation of 39 workshops rather than the 27 as planned in the original design. This in turn expanded the project's area of impact. The government and BANAMEX's financing and technical assistance will continue after project closure, which enhances the likelihood of financial sustainability in the short-run.

[1] Government: SAGARPA, SEMARNAT, SDR (Secretaria de la Desarollo Rural), Consejo Mexicana de Café, Consejo Estatal de Café.
[2] Starbucks and Sustainable Harvest provided early-on support; other private companies roles were limited to purchasing the coffee.
[3] NGOs: Vientes Culturales, PRONATURA, Conservation International, The Nature Conservancy, Smithsonian Migratory Bird Center
[4] Academia: UEA, UACH, INIFAP, UNICACH, ECOSUR, UNACH.
[5] Financial intermediaries: BANAMEX, FIRA, BANCOMEX, PACKARD.
[6] Certification Agencies: CERTIMEX, OCIA.
[7] Private agricultural extension services: DAISA, PAISA.
[8] International organizations and bilateral donors: IICA, World Bank, GEF, German and Swiss Government.

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?

Not applicable; there was no overall delay or extension. There was a delay in starting the biodiversity monitoring system which prevented tracking the impact of the project on local species and hence on biodiversity. The reason for the late start of this component was not recorded in the TE or PIRs.

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:

Country ownership was high for the project, judging by the involvement of a number of government organizations, NGOs, academic institutions, and private sector banks, businesses, and trade associations. The TE reports that "The Federal Ministry of Agriculture (SAGAR) was particularly responsive and keen to support this effort. With their backing, the project initiated an inter-institutional forum that brought together governmental (federal and state) and non-governmental organizations that work in the project region" (TE, page 12). However, with the historic election that took place in 2000, the change in government the following year caused the ministry to withdraw its active support, signaling a decline in country ownership by the end of the project.

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 project's indicators focus more on socio-economic than environmental benefits. For example, biodiversity impact is measured using an indicator of increases in income, which does not seem appropriate. The M&E design could also have used a plan to measure deforestation at the end of the project. Since the monitoring system was implemented too late to measure the project's impact on biodiversity, an indicator of the impact on deforestation would have been useful for measuring at least one aspect of the project's environmental effects. There was a study undertaken on forest cover, but the results were not presented in the TE.

The logistical and organizational plan as presented in the project document is well conceived, with regular intervals to evaluate progress in a participatory manner with the project stakeholders and

beneficiaries. There is baseline information on deforestation and the socioeconomic status of the communities involved, but no baseline was collected for biodiversity and native species presence.

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

The M&E system was effective in facilitating participation of the beneficiary communities; five out of seven of the cooperatives participated in the final evaluation, although the other two were prevented by distance.

Environmental monitoring was a serious shortcoming. As noted above, the indicators focused on socioeconomic measures rather than environmental ones, a flaw which was never addressed in the project. In fact, during implementation "there was less emphasis placed on biodiversity issues…than originally planned," an occurrence that was never explained or remedied (TE, page 16). The community monitoring system was not put into place until the project's final year, preventing any assessment of biodiversity impacts of the project as was intended in the project design. There are no apparent incentives for the cooperatives to continue biodiversity monitoring or to use the database that most of them now have access to. M&E implementation is thus rated moderately unsatisfactory for the failure to measure or incentivize biodiversity impacts.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

Project design should have considered the need for capacity-building in the executing agency prior to project implementation. The TE attributes the delay in setting up the monitoring system to a lack of funds in the PDF-A period. Other than those issues, project design was sound in its approach to conservation by promoting sustainable livelihoods, setting up a participatory monitoring system, facilitating conservation agreements, and spreading environmental education. The focus of the project shifted away from biodiversity to socioeconomic improvement, but the reasons for this are unknown and it may have been an implementation issue rather than a design or supervision issue.

The TE reported delays and difficulties with disbursements because the disbursement protocols were not yet developed for MSPs; MSPs at the time "were a new instrument for the Bank" (TE, page 18). The World Bank also lacked "an overall systematic approach…to ensure that the MSP from the beginning was closely aligned with its related on-going and planned operations in the country" and did not have an explicit strategy for sustainability (TE, page 18). Furthermore, the TE states that more intensive support was necessary for strengthening stakeholder relationships, and tighter supervision with an increase in supervision funding would have increased the project's benefits.

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

IDESMAC, the project's executing agency, was a young organization without experience of managing a project of this scale. It required some capacity-building that had not been planned for in the project design. Other issues with IDESMAC emerged during project implementation, such as "inadequate financial management capacity" and "sub-optimal relations with its two major partners," the Instituto de Historia Natural and the Instituto Nacional de Ecologia (TE, page 16). According to the TE, the components under IDESMAC's supervision (technical assistance and stakeholder participation) were more successful than the components under the supervision of the two institutes (environmental education and biodiversity monitoring). It is not clear whether the weakness of the environmental components of the project was a fault on the part of the executing agencies, or whether it was the result of the general shift away from biodiversity and toward socioeconomic impact. The TE states that the Instituto de Historia Natural's "level of effort was less than expected" and the weakness of the partnership prevented all the project's components from being implemented fully (TE, page 16). But despite these issues, the project met most of its targets and exceeded some.

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.

Unable to assess. The lack of a baseline and delay in setting up the biodiversity monitoring system resulted in an inability to assess the project's biodiversity impacts. There also was no measurement for the rate of deforestation following the project's closure, and the TE and PIRs did not report the results of the forest cover survey so there is no way to determine the impact of the project on deforestation. Progress was made in protecting 3,550 hectares of forest area through community agreements and the certification program.

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.

The project activities in certification of coffee and commercial training in the cooperatives resulted in an average 50-125% increase in income, depending on the cooperative. Environmental education was distributed to 113 schools and 80% of the cooperatives.

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

A biodiversity monitoring system was set up in all of the cooperatives, but it is not known to what degree they were adopted and will be used in the future. A biodiversity database was also compiled and distributed to five out of the seven cooperatives. The cooperatives now have greater access to international markets and technical and credit assistance from Mexican institutions.

b) Governance

A roundtable was established and dialogue was facilitated between several NGOs, government agencies, banks, academic institutions, international donors, and trade associations. The roundtable suffered from the change in government and loss of support from a key government ministry, but the TE implies that the network that was created will continue to collaborate on sustainable agriculture issues.

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.

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.

According to the TE, the project's results caused "keen interest by the sustainable development policy community as well as academics," and it was presented in a multitude of forums and publications (TE, page 13). The Consejo de Civil de Café Sustentable was created with the participation of 30,000 coffee producers, and it "is the likely vehicle to replicate the project's impacts nation-wide" (TE, page 14). The accredited course on sustainable coffee production will also facilitate replication. The World Bank and IDESMAC used the lessons learned in this project to prepare another GEF project in Central America, and the commercialization strategy was used for two projects in Colombia.

While the creation of a biodiversity-friendly standard for coffee certification put the structure in place for other coffee producers to follow suit in transitioning to more eco-friendly production, economic conditions must be favorable to incentivize the adoption of the biodiversity standard (i.e. it must gather a price premium similar to organic coffee.)

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 states that the project's effort to link biodiversity conservation to economic benefits was a motivator for change among the beneficiaries. The practical learning of entrepreneurial and commercial skills allowed the cooperatives to sell their coffee at a premium to an international market that was more appreciative of the biodiversity and organic certifications than the local coffee market.

The TE also mentions the difficulty of building stakeholder participation in a region with "a legacy of conflict and mistrust," and that the sustainability of partnerships is easily threatened in a politicized environment (TE, page 17). However, it did not include suggestions for overcoming these obstacles or what the project did to handle the situation.

The project impacts would have been stronger and more sustained if more resources had been available for project preparation and a higher supervision budget.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE recommends that, if using a local NGO as the project's executing agency, "specific activities should be designed and project funds should be allocated for strengthening that organization during implementation, and additional budget for Bank support in project design and supervision are required" (TE, page 17).

The World Bank should consider its role in project sustainability during both the design and implementation phase of the project.

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?	Assessment of outcomes could be clearer. For example, the TE only states that 7 projects for alternative livelihoods were designed and 3 implemented, but without any explanation regarding what those projects were. Also, the level of adoption of the community biodiversity monitoring system was not stated, making it difficult to assess that component's level of success or likelihood of sustainability. The results of the study on forest cover were not presented, so there is no way to assess the project's impact on deforestation.	**MS**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE does not contain ratings. It is internally consistent, but lacks details and figures such as the increase in income are not well supported. No methodology is explained for determining the cause of the income increase. The TE does not effectively make the case that the changes in livelihoods were responsible for improving biodiversity.	**MU**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The sustainability section leaves out the potential effects of another drought occurring or lowering coffee prices and the mass migration that could follow (as occurred during the project's duration). It also focuses exclusively on sustainable livelihoods rather than biodiversity benefits, the monitoring system, or educational efforts.	**MU**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned emphasized that biodiversity conservation can bring socioeconomic benefits, but not the approaches that can bring biodiversity benefits. Some of the lessons learned are just descriptions of the project's local context, without actual lessons, approaches, or recommendations.	**MS**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The per-component costs are reported. However, the TE does not disaggregate the sources of cofinancing except in a few cases. It is largely unknown which organization contributed what.	**MS**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The paragraph on M&E is shallow and does not include any mention of adaptive management or the lack of environmental indicators.	**MS**
Overall TE Rating		**MS**

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

No additional information was used.