GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	October 16, 2008
GEF Project ID:	651		at endorsement (Million US$)	at completion (Million US$)
IA/EA Project ID:	P065200	**GEF financing:**	10.00	10.00
Project Name:	Indigenous Management of Protected Areas in the Peruvian Amazon (GEF) Project	IA/EA own:	3.14	1.64
Country:	Peru	Government[1]:		
		Other*:		
		World Bank	5.00	0.95
		Local NGOs	3.60	2.84
		Beneficiaries	1.01	1.37
		Total Cofinancing	12.75	6.80
Operational Program:	3 (Forests Ecosystems) and 2 (Freshwater Ecosystems)	**Total Project Cost:**	22.75	15.80
IA	World Bank	Dates		
Partners involved:	INRENA (National Institute of Natural Resources, Peru) Peru-Canada Counter value Fund	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		11/26/2001
		Closing Date	Proposed: 12/31/2006	Actual: 05/31/2007
Prepared by:	Reviewed by: Alejandro Imbach	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 61	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 66	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 5 months
Author of TE: César Flores		TE completion date: February 2008	TE submission date to GEF EO: April 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 2 months

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

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	**S**	**S**	**S**	**S**
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	**N/A**	**Moderate** (Risk to Development Outcome)	**Moderate**	**MU**
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	**S**	**NA**	**Substantial**	**MS**
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	**S**
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	**N/A**	**N/A**	**Exemplary**	**HS**

[1] INRENA is a Governmental Organization.

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?

Yes. The language is clear and the document is well organized. The lessons learned are well presented, relevant and evidenced based. The analysis on economic and financial aspects (Annex 3) is insightful. The TE could have been richer if an analysis of the budget expenses, activity costs, and sustainability analysis of impacts were included. ToR for TE were not available

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?

No, based on the information provided by the TE follow-up is not necessary.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

The Project Development Objective (PDO) was taken as the GEO in both the Project Appraisal Document (PAD) and the TE.

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

The Project Development Objective (PDO) was "To improve the conservation and sustainable utilization of forest ecosystems in the Peruvian Amazon through the involvement of indigenous communities in the management of Protected Areas" (Annex 1, PAD). It has not changed during the implementation, but the indicators were adjusted at the mid-term review.

PDO indicators at entry were:

- Indigenous people co-manage protected areas in the five target zones through their participation in the corresponding Protected Areas Management Committees.
- Biodiversity loss, as measured by monitoring indicators, is stopped in the five target areas.

As the TE mentions, after the project's mid term review indicators were adjusted to include additional instruments of co-management and to improve the second indicator in terms of measurability and attribution, characteristics that prevented baseline completion as planned initially. Those changes were made to make indicators more precise and, hence, easier to measure. About approval of changes, the TE only mentions that they were approved by the original approving authority.

PDO indicators after the MTR:

1. Five Master Plans including management plans completed for the five NPA; Categorization of three reserved zones completed
2. Indigenous organization participating in NPA Management Committees in the five target areas
3. Sustainable use of natural resources by indigenous communities
4. Enhanced conservation of biodiversity measured by expansion in the SINANPE
5. Positive environmental impacts from sustainable use of natural resources and related activities through bioinvestment projects

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)

a. Relevance **Rating: S**

The TE provides an analysis about the high relevance of the Outcomes of the project in terms of the importance of the protection or the Amazonian ecosystems as a priority objective of Peru's environmental agenda and international commitments. As part or the Context at Appraisal (1.1), the TE provides a similar analysis in terms of the relevance of the project for the Operational Programs 3 (Forest Ecosystems) and 2 (Freshwater Ecosystems).

b. Effectiveness **Rating: S**

According to the TE, three of the five PDO indicators were achieved satisfactorily (100-140%), one reached only to 70% of the target, and one has no baseline. Adequate evidence is provided in the TE to sustain that assertion. All of them where related with relevant issues the project intended to address.

The performance of the Global Environment Objective Indicators was:

- Indicator 1. Five master plans including management plans completed for the five natural protected areas, categorization of three reserves zones completed (achievement 100%)

- Indicator 2. Indigenous organization participating in natural protected areas management committees in the five target areas (achievement 100%, moreover the indigenous organizations directly managed the three communal reserves created under the project)
- Indicator 3. Sustainable use of natural resources by indigenous communities (achievement 140.8%, 200 communities receiving benefits from bioinvestment projects, instead of the initial target value of 142 communities receiving benefits)
- Indicator 4. Enhanced conservation of biodiversity measured by expansion in the SINANPE (achievement 70%, 3.5 million hectares incorporated as two national parks (IUCN II) and three communal reserves (IUCN VI), the original target considered 4.99 million hectares, protected areas covering additional 0.6 million hectares were waiting for approval at the end of the project
- Indicator 5. Positive environmental impacts from sustainable use of natural resources and related activites through bioinvestment projects. (not initial target value, values achieved were: reduction in soil erosion: 34,465 tons; increase in carbon capture: 2,969 tons; 1,273 ha reforested; deforestation prevented in 18,664 ha; sustainable use of 775 ha of surface waters resulted in 100% repopulation of native species)

The performance of the Intermediate Outcome Indicators was:
- Indicator 1. 15 planning documents for the five natural protected areas (achievement 120%, 18 planning documents of six different types were prepared)
- Indicator 2. Establishment of protected area management committees and community surveillance teams (achievement: 129%, the initial target was surveillance contracts signed and facilities in place; 200 indigenous representatives trained, the values achieved were 258 indigenous communities trained for participation in PAMC and five surveillance contracts signed and operating).
- Indicator 3. Preinvestments studies completed and agreed with communities (achievement 107.5%, initial target was 40 bioinvestment projects executed, the value achieved was 43 bioinvestment projects completed)

Other achievements were:
- Poverty alleviation: jobs and incomes directly benefiting 1757 families and 8258 people in five target areas.
- Gender issues: more equitable gender composition within indigenous grassroots organizations and project committees
- Institutional development: New institutional arrangements for participatory biodiversity conservation in Peru has been established (Protected Area Management Committees, Communal Reserves, Natural resources management contracts and community surveillance systems), INRENA and indigenous communities enhanced their capacity to implement co-management of protected areas, planning documents and agreements, and a participatory M&E System was established.

The achieved outcomes, expressed in the intermediate outcome indicators (goods or services provided by the project, complemented with other achievements) are directly related to the good performance of the GEO indicators (empowerment of different stakeholders and environmental benefits) showing the cause -effect design of the project.

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) **Rating: S**

The TE findings indicate that the project has generated positive economic impacts without incurring in high cost on the conservation of natural resources of the target areas and to the lives of the local groups; it also provides an economic analysis that give a good basis to this statement.

The mobilization of cofinancing was 30% lower than expected (US$ 6.95 millions) by reasons detailed at section 4.4a of this TER. This reduction was partially compensated through the contribution of the Peru-Canada Fund to finance bioinvestment projects, and additional resources from the Government of Peru. Also, to face the significant reduction in cofinancing, implementation arrangements were modified at medium term review to reduce costs through

(i) decentralization of the activities to the field teams of INRENA in the target zones, using the resources already installed locally and hiring local services for the assessments and studies,
(ii) the development of productive subprojects to utilize existing experiences, instead of investing in new products that require intense research and special assessments, and
(iii) clustering community subprojects by type of activity and proximity among communities to gain scale economies.

From this standpoint, the initial costs were overestimates because they considered inefficient strategies, but the project was able to choose and implement successful adjustments to achieve its objectives.

Between the key factors that delayed the implementation during the first two years, the TE mentions external factors (disagreements with national indigenous organizations and lack of counterpart funds) and internal factors (institutional capacity and instability, difficulties in institutional coordination), but it doesn't mentions how they affected the cost/effectiveness of the project. The changes caused to face the cofinancing reduction for the investment subprojects didn't

start until the fourth year of the project implementation. If the strategies were earlier implemented, probably the results of those subprojects may have been even better.

4.1.2 Impacts

It is reasonable assumed that the project's outcomes will lead to biodiversity conservation in the long-term because:

- The National System of Protected Areas (SINANPE) has expanded: i) categorization of three reserved areas: Güeppi, Santiago-Comaina, and Purus; (ii) the creation of the two national parks (NP): Alto Purus and Cordillera del Condor, which added 2.6 million hectares under IUCN Category II to SINANPE; and (iii) the creation of three communal reserves (CR): Purus, El Sira, and Tuntanait, which added 0.9 million hectares protected under IUCN Category VI. In Güeppi, one NP and two CRs have been proposed and are awaiting final approval by the Peruvian government. This will expand SINANPE by an additional 0.6 million hectares, 34% under IUCN Category II and 66% to IUCN Category VI. Three biodiversity priority zones in the SINANPE now have full protection: Zone 20–El Sira Mountain Chain, Zone 28–Alto Purus, and Zone 2–Cordillera del Condor including over 400 endemic species and at least 3 species in danger of extinction. The El Sira and Purus CRs and the Alto Purus NP host endemic species of birds, amphibians, reptiles, fish, bears, and mammals. These protected areas also include at least 11 types of forests and hotspots of tropical Andean biodiversity.
- The sustainable use of natural resources has had a positive impact on conservation as proved by preliminary results from the 43 investment interventions in 200 communities comprising 8,258 direct beneficiaries. According to project estimates, the 22 forestry-related projects are having a positive effect with an annual reduction in soil erosion of 34,465 tons and an increasing carbon capture of 2,969 tons; also 1,273 hectares were reforested and the deforestation of 18,664 hectares was prevented. The 20 hydrobiological resource projects have prevented unsustainable extraction of resources from 775 hectares of surface waters and contributed over 100% to repopulation of species; beneficiaries in the communities involved have learned and implemented different conservation practices such as forest management, expansion of hydrobiological resources, and ecofriendly agriculture. Some of these practices are very likely to be replicated due to their positive economic benefits, and would prevent the local population from overexploiting other natural resources.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

a. Financial resources	**Rating: ML**
INRENA succeeded in procuring financial resources from government sources to consolidate the accomplished results. These resources will cover basic staff and recurring costs in the project's five targeted protected areas and will consolidate projects on sustainable-use of natural resources such as forest and hydrobiological management and sustainable agriculture. Several international NGOs are contributing to the continued implementation of community-based subprojects, but it may be difficult for the Peruvian Government to commit the necessary budget to expand the model to other areas.	
b. Socio political	**Rating: MU**
The project has been able to build a wide social base among indigenous communities and their grassroots and regional organizations that support its continuation and expansion. The establishment of Communal Reserves and the signing of their management contracts are concrete outcomes that have gained overall endorsement by indigenous leaders and national and international NGOs. On the other hand, the violence related with illegal logging and illegal extraction of other resources could be a significant threat. The most important challenge is to balance the interest of conservation against the strong economic incentives for mining and oil exploitation in the Amazon including some of the PAs strengthened by the Project (e.g. Pacaya Samiria, Cordillera del Condor, Santiago-Comaina).	
c. Institutional framework and governance	**Rating: ML**
The Peruvian Government has approved the Special Regime for Communal Reserves including institutional arrangements, regulations, and protocols for indigenous communities to manage these Reserves. This model requires further support to be fully institutionalized as INRENA, community organizations and other institutions involved in co-management of PA still require additional institutional strengthening and resources.	

d. Environmental	**Rating: L**
There are no environmental threats other than those traditional productive activities, practiced at small scale by the local indigenous peoples, such as agriculture, hunting and fishing for their subsistence. The projects to enhance the sustainability of natural resources use are very likely to be replicated due to their positive economic benefits, and would prevent the local population from overexploiting other natural resources.	

e. **Technological**	**Rating: L**
There are not technological risks identified	

4.3 Catalytic role

a. Production of a public good The National System of Protected Areas is a public good as it protects biodiversity and provides environmental goods and services at national and global levels. The project contributes to improve the effectiveness, sustainability and extension of this System.
b. Demonstration The dissemination of lessons learned, training and sharing experiences with other governmental organizations, community leaders and social and environmental experts are activities proposed in a Sustainability Program prepared by INRENA (Executing Agency) to be implemented after the end of the Project
c. Replication The sustainability program mentioned above contains a consolidation program that includes the reinforcement of institutional capacity to implement the participatory model for co-managing other Protected Areas belonging to the National System.
d. Scaling up Same as above.

4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
The actual co-financing was around 70% of the expected at the beginning (US$ 6.95 millions less). The TE mentions the following reasons for that:(i) a Bank-financed project, which comprised activities to complement two project components, was closed early in 2004, reducing the planned contribution from this source from US$ 5 million to US$ 0.95 million; (ii) some agencies that participated in project preparation were not allowed under Bank rules to participate in implementation, therefore they withdrew their contributions; (iii) some NGOs reduced their anticipated contributions although they worked in close coordination with project staff; and (iv) the changes in administration of some regional and local governments led to reductions in their contributions to the project. There is no mentions in the TE about the reduction of about US$ 1.5 millions in the committed cofinancing of INRENA (the executing agency), but the ISR of May 2007 mentions that INRENA assumed payment of field staff in the project's natural protected areas and the project staff during the extension period. This reduction was compensated with savings in implementation through changes in implementation arrangements, the contribution of the Peru-Canada Fund to finance bioinvestment projects, and additional resources from the Peruvian government. The reduction of co-financing was addressed at the Mid Term Review, and implementation arrangements were modified to reduce costs, but they couldn't avoid completely the negative effects. The investment subprojects did not start until the fourth year of the project implementation. Therefore, results of the investment could not be sufficiently observed by the end of the project.
b. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
The main reason for delays in project implementation was the lack of counterpart's funding, difficulties in institutional coordination, disagreements with national indigenous organizations, institutional capacity and instability, difficulties in institutional coordination and violence in target sites. According to the achievements of indicators and outputs mentioned in the TE, the delays didn't affect the project's outcomes. The extension of the closing date (five months) given by the Bank, allowed the communities to fulfill activities that, even when they represented a small amount of the grant, were critical for their goals and communities self-esteem and ownership. But a reasonable time was not left for dissemination and demonstration strategies or other activities that could have reinforced the sustainability of the project.
c. 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.
As the project was developed and implemented by a Government Organization and the main institutional beneficiary was the National System of Protected Areas, the country ownership was adequate. Additional efforts were made by national institutions to provide additional funds, to facilitate negotiations between national indigenous organizations and the IA (Peruvian ombudsman), and to help in assigning categories to protected areas located at country's borders (Ministry of External Affairs).

4.5 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

a. M&E design at Entry **Rating (six point scale): MS**
The project developed two M&E Systems, one for the project itself and other for biodiversity conservation issues that measured environmental and social results during the project implementation. Tools for the collection and effective use of data were identified. The project outcome indicators were adjusted during the Mid Term Review in order to allow for a reliable assessment of the Project Development Objective achievement, as the indicators identified in the Project Document where difficult to measure and not sufficient.

b. M&E plan Implementation **Rating (six point scale): MS**
The ICR reports that some internal issues affected the establishment of the Biodiversity M&E System in the five areas. However, the process was completed for two of them. Basic steps were taken in the form of preparation of compendiums of biodiversity conservation and socioeconomic conditions, evaluation protocols and standards and biological databases with GIS layers for the remaining three areas, and INRENA plans to continue working on the development of tools and institutional arrangements to consolidate de co-management of natural protected areas, but not specific mentions about next steps in those three areas were found in the ICR report. The Project M&E System used several mechanisms to monitor progress in activities and outputs and to share information with different parties. At the time of the MTR, these evaluation processes were formalized including the use of the revised indicators. Quarterly reports were produced regularly to track project progress and to update the ISR. An electronic program to support the M&E function was established at institutional level and staff received training to manage its consolidation and expansion.
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? No. The PAD defined a budget of 2.0 US$ million (8.8% of the total initial budget) for both M&E Systems, which is low considering 7-8% as a normal practice for Project M&E Systems without specialized components on biodiversity at the PA System level.
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? Unable to assess. At the end of the Project, the M&E activities received just 56.2% (1.12 US$ million) of the initial budget but the TE doesn't provide any information about the M&E implementation in financial terms. It only mentions that the initial lack of counterpart resources affected the establishment of the Biodiversity M&E System.
b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system? The TE mentions that the Project M&E System was used to complete progress reports that were regularly presented at Steering Committee meetings to monitor performance and at regional meetings with local beneficiaries to check the progress of activities for the promotion of sustainable use of biodiversity. Other outputs were the quarterly reports were produced to track project progress and to update ISR and the evaluation report. The TE didn't mention neither management decisions made on the basis of this information nor about the positive impacts on conservation of the sustainable use of natural resources promoted.
b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why. Yes in some aspects. The design of the Biodiversity M&E System included environmental and social indicators, incorporating traditional knowledge of local communities. The M&E systems performed satisfactorily in general and produced useful information that could have significant use for demonstration, replication, and scaling up strategies in the future.

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S
b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S
Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution. The Bank's overall performance during identification, preparation, and appraisal of the project was moderately satisfactory, according with the TE. Project design and preparation included an intensive consultation process with the indigenous population and other stakeholders and the Bank offered timely support to INRENA to meet minimum institutional arrangements for project execution. However, the lack of an institutional assessment during project preparation, limited mitigation measures to overcome identified risks, and design flaws in M&E arrangements caused difficulties in project implementation and supervision. The Project supervision by the Bank during Project Implemantation is rated as Satisfactory by the TE. Relevant aspects of Bank performance during this stage are: • Specialized support: The Bank accompanied the implementing agency throughout project execution, providing assistance in technical and procedural matters. It also brought international experience to successfully establish the participatory conservation model with the support of an international expert who assisted the PIU in this task. The project team also helped to prepare closing financial reports, project evaluation, and the sustainability program. • Promotion of dialogue: The Bank facilitated dialogue among the major stakeholders, helping to overcome implementation obstacles. All missions included visits to the national indigenous organizations which always received a copy of the Aide-Memoire. Field trips helped to develop trust and partnership with local and regional organizations that were critical actors in project implementation. By being responsive to indigenous organizations'

demands, the Bank gained their respect and helped to maintain dialogue even in difficult moments.

- Flexibility: The project helped the implementing agency to overcome cumbersome administrative processes and to join the team in discussions with other government agencies when necessary. No-objections were granted promptly. At completion, the Bank granted a closing date extension that made it possible to achieve project objectives and fully disburse the grant.

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies[2] (rating on a 6 point scale): S

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.

The scope and complexity of the project has been a real challenge for INRENA, the executing agency. Cumbersome procedures and the lack of enough experience of the staff of the first Project Implementation Unit (PIU) to implement the project, and the weak coordination between field staff and the PIU, and between the PIU and the IANP was deficient, affected project implementation, particularly during the initial years causing delays and difficult the dialogue with indigenous organizations. Therefore, the staff of the PIU was replaced after the MTR.

With a capable new director at the helm of the PIU, a new team in place, and an implementation agreements reached at midterm, project execution gained pace and disbursements that had been lagging in previous years increased. In operational issues, the involvement of the Peruvian Trust Fund for National Parks and Protected Areas (PROFONANPE) was not sufficient to overcome long-established cumbersome public administration procedures. The PIU managed the risks in a positive way, in some cases with support of the Bank, for example engaging in negotiations to respond the national indigenous organizations' claims about categorization, land rights and project management, and involving third parties as mediators or facilitators. The social and institutional endorsement by INRENA and indigenous communities and the legal and institutional tools developed at the project areas provided legal, social and financial bases to ensure the permanence of project benefits.

An analysis of the ratings from the ISRs and the TE (Satisfactory) shows that the candor and realism in reporting by INRENA have been acceptable as they clearly mentioned the INRENA internal constraints and the efforts made to achieve progress and the internal paradigm shifts required to achieve such progress.

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

a. Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects

The ICR report exposes some key lessons about participatory conservation models. There are summarized as:

- **The social approach to conservation**. The bottom-up social approach to conservation built on local capacity promoted community participation and empowerment and established a social network that functioned as a social control mechanism helping to ensure the good use of project resources and distribution of their benefits.

- **The participatory conservation model.** The project demonstrated the feasibility of combining conventional conservation with an indigenous conception of protected areas as their living environment. The participatory conservation model achieved this through:
  a. **An integrated approach to co-management** that promoted project ownership and contributed to the success of the activities and their sustainability. The project designed, tested, and implemented the tools for communities participation in all stages of conservation.
  b. **Bioinvestment projects.** Combining the sustainable use of natural resources with the enhancement of community livelihood generated a positive synergy to conservation that resulted in positive environmental impacts, taking in account local knowledge, adaptation to community's needs, *in situ* technical assistance and training.
  c. **Communal reserves, a breaking point in conservation.** Communal reserves proved to be an alternative acceptable to indigenous peoples and the government to address the conflict between conservation of natural resources and indigenous land rights in protected areas. Indigenous communities manage directly their communal reserves through administration contracts and they implement master plans approved by their community assemblies.

[2] Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

- Co-management required a previous enablement of the indigenous communities that was achieved by strengthening their capacities to implement directly different activities affecting their own livelihoods. **Training** was a key element in the development of the co-management model.
- **Intercultural dialogue** was a positive approach to build a common understanding between indigenous peoples and the project team. The rules of engagement and the way in which this dialogue took place were as important as the matters under discussion.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The document does not have a section on Recommendations. Two main recommendations can be extracted from different chapters:

- The co-management model requires further support to be fully institutionalized. INRENA, community organizations, and other institutions involved in co-management require additional institutional strengthening and resources. It may also be difficult for the government to commit the necessary budget to consolidate, and expand the model. Therefore, additional interventions are needed.
- The difficulties experienced in the first years of project implementation demonstrated the need to address institutional constraints from the beginning (e.g. by preparing and implementing an institutional strengthening program as part of the initial activities). The plan for appropriate institutional arrangements merits major attention during the design phase of the project

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.

The following comments are based on the ICR Review completed on February 2008.

- M&E design, implementation and utilization rating (Substantial).
- ICR rating (Exemplary). '... It fully reported on the project's outcomes and fully canvassed the project's safeguard issues. Annex 3 on the Financial and Economic Analysis is excellent and should serve as a model for other ICRs that report on small grants programs'.
- Recommendation: A PPAR to validate and verify the effectiveness of the Participatory Conservation Model.

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? The TE presents an assessment of all relevant outcomes and impacts of the project in a main chapter, which focuses on the PDO. The assessment of the achievement of the objectives (components) based on the planned and achieved outputs are presented as an Annex. The TE includes a deep economic and financial analysis of the impacts of the project.	6
b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps? The report is consistent, the evidence (including the economic and financial analysis) is convincing and the ratings are well substantiated. No major evidence gaps were found.	6
c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The report has a specific section (2.5) dedicated to this issue, but only resumes the sustainability program prepared by the IA. The 'Assessment of risk to Development Outcome' includes three subjects regarding this issue: legal framework, social endorsement, and financial resources. A detailed and critical assessment for those subjects, as well as for institutional sustainability, knowledge management, exit strategy, and follow-up was needed.	4
d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? The lessons learned are well presented, relevant and evidence-based (beneficiaries' surveys). Future projects design could benefit from them.	6
e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? Yes. The report includes the actual project costs and actual co-financing used, and the costs were presented for each component. However, a more detailed analysis including a) the cost for activities or outputs, and b) how GEF and other agencies funds were distributed in the different components should have been useful.	5

f. Assess the quality of the report evaluation of project M&E systems? The TE describes the Project M&E System briefly and mentions the adjustments made to key indicators at the MRT to better assess achievement of the development objective. A little more space is dedicated to the Participatory M&E component for the project areas and the National System of Protected Areas; the report mentions the factors that affected the establishment of the component and highlights the effort made to complete the process and to involve local communities in the design, and the usefulness of the baseline studies, annual reports on biological and socioeconomic indicators and management effectiveness. A deeper analysis of the quality, consistency and use of the generated information should have been done for both M&E systems.	4

7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUTION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.
None