

# 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		672	
GEF Agency project ID		1469	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-2	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Conservation of Biodiversity in the Talamanca-Caribbean Biological Corridor	
Country/Countries		Costa Rica	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP3 – Forest Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Corredor Biologico Talamanca Caribe (CBTC)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Lead executing agency	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		September 1999	
Effectiveness date / project start		March 2000	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		May 2003	
Actual date of project completion		May 31, 2003	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.75	0.746
Co-financing	IA/EA own		
	Government		
	Other*	0.52 (TNC)	N/A
Total GEF funding		0.75	0.746
Total Co-financing		0.52	N/A
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.27	N/A
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		July 29, 2003	
TE submission date			
Author of TE			
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) preparer		Siham Mohamedahmed	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) reviewer		Aaron Zazueta	
Revised TER (2014) completion date		May 29, 2014	
Revised TER (2014) prepared by		Joshua Schneck	
TER GEF IEO peer review (2014)		Neeraj Negi	

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

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As stated in the Project Document (PD), the global environmental objective (GEO) of the project is the conservation, protection, and sustainable use of the globally significant biodiversity of the Talamanca Caribbean Biological Corridor in Costa Rica. The project was approved under, and is consistent with, the framework of the GEF operational program on forest ecosystems (OP-3). The Talamanca region contains the largest single block of primary forest left in Costa Rica and was declared a Biosphere Reserve and later a World Patrimony Site by UNESCO in 1992 due to its natural and cultural diversity. Among the many threatened endemic species for which the area is home to, the PD also states that the area is an important stopping point for hundreds of thousands of migratory birds that can be observed during the Fall migration. The area is under serious threat from logging (principally legal but also illegal logging) as well as poorly-planned development (PD, pg 10). While the PD does not state the exact size of the area, the TE states that the project focused activities on the most heavily populated and threatened part of the Corridor, mostly in the lower reaches, and covering an area of 46,560 Ha, or 15% of the total ecological corridor (TE, pg 6).

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As stated in the PD, the project had 4 development objectives:

1. Protect, preserve and restore the ecologically and globally significant forest, marine and freshwater ecotypes present in the Corridor;
2. Adopt and apply improved biodiversity friendly sustainable forest management practices;
3. Protect biodiversity through the development, management and marketing of local and regional sustainable ecotourism products while increasing tourism-based incomes;
4. Strengthen the local grassroots organizations and the state run ALCAC (La Amistad Caribe Conservation Area) office, through the development of a co-management model for the protected areas and Corridor project.

The expected project results corresponding to each of the 4 development objectives above are:

- Ecologically and globally significant forest, marine and freshwater ecotypes are identified and purchased when necessary, or restricted through environmental easements, and local organizations and communities are trained and educated to protect them;
- A sustainable forest management model is developed and extended to forest resource managers, users and communities;
- Regional and local ecotourism development strategies are designed and implemented in collaboration with local communities; and
- The capacity of local organizations, communities and government to participate in co-management of biodiversity in the CBTC is strengthened.

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

**Yes.** Two of the development objectives were modified in 2001 by the Project Executing Unit, and approved by the country office of UNDP. For objective 2, the “biodiversity friendly sustainable forest management practices” was changed to just “sustainable forest management practices. The TE states that while this was a purposeful change, the effect was minimal as the activities undertaken were inline with the objectives as originally stated (TE, pg 17). However the second change was more substantive. Objective 4 was changed from “strengthen local grassroots organizations and the ALCAC office,” to “strengthen local organizations and the ALCAC office.” According to the TE, the change effectively meant that the project was free to focus primarily on strengthening just one agricultural organization focused on cacao production: the APPTA (TE, pg 17). As the TE states, this took focus away from other, potentially more worthwhile organizations whose mission is more in keeping with the project’s overall goals. In addition, the change was not made in a transparent way, and while one could read the change as increasing the scope of project activities, in effect it provided coverage to limit activities (by focusing on just one agricultural organization), and thus in some ways the change in wording is misleading.

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

The project is highly relevant to both national priorities and those of the GEF. Costa Rica ratified the CBD in 1994. Furthermore, protection and sustainable management of biodiversity are national priorities, as

evidenced by a number of national laws that are supportive of the CBD’s objectives, including the Organic Environmental Act, the Forestry Act, and the Wildlife Conservation Act (PG, pg 1). For the GEF, the project’s goals are directly in line with GEF BD objectives for the preservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity. As stated above, the project’s target area has been found to contain an abundance of globally significant biodiversity, and is threatened by rapidly progressing land conversion and degradation.

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

From the evidence presented in the terminal evaluation, the project experienced major shortcomings and was largely ineffective at achieving its expected outcomes. While the project is faulted for having poorly designed indicators and M&E implementation from which to assess progress to date, as well as inadequate resources and time to achieve its stated objectives, it is clear that the project achieved only a small portion of what it set out to. Progress under each of the four development objectives is detailed below:

1. *Protect, preserve and restore the ecologically and globally significant forest, marine and freshwater ecotypes present in the Corridor* – Under this objective, ecologically and globally significant forest, marine and freshwater ecotypes were to first be identified. Following this, conservation was to be achieved by purchasing land when necessary, or restricting use through environmental easements. In addition, local organizations and communities were to be trained and educated in biodiversity protection. According to the TE, only 26% of funding originally budgeted for activities under this objective were spent, although the TE does not elaborate on the reasons, except to say that TNC had a change in priorities midway through the project, and pulled out some of its funding. Additional detail on this objective’s sub-components:
  - The surveying exercise was partially completed and yielded little new information about the area’s globally significant biodiversity to what was already known by CBTC which had been working in the area for nearly a decade (TE, pg 20). However, the TE reports that the exercise was helpful in arriving at a consensus amongst a variety of stakeholders of actions that should be pursued to conserve biodiversity in the Corridor.
  - Just over half of the expected co-funding from TNC was used to purchase 202 ha of forest. The TE states that “due to legal questions pertaining to land ownership of the lands originally slated for acquisition, TNC was not able to proceed with the purchase of some of the area originally intended for purchase. Moreover, during the project period, TNC’s priorities shifted, and the organization decided it should focus its activities in another area” in Costa Rica (TE, pg 21).
  - TE states that the project has done well in promoting the Costa Rican government’s PES program, and that “mostly as a result of this promotion by the project” participation in the program has significantly increased since the project began (TE, pg 22). However, there TE provides no quantitative measures to back up any of these claims, and the project apparently did not monitor this output as called for in the PD logframe (i.e.,

number of hectares committed; number of program beneficiaries; number of conservation easements; establishment of a land trust).

- Restoration of degraded areas was minimal, and limited to around 4 ha (TE, pg 22). While the TE does not indicate to what extent the area in the CBTC is degraded, we can assume that that it covers an area far larger than 4 ha, given that the total project area covered around 46,000 ha.
  - The goal of establishing a network of community natural resource guards was largely unrealized, with just 22 people from 11 communities initially engaged (out of a target of 15 communities), and participation that decreased over the 3 years of the project.
  - Biological monitoring was poorly executed, according to the TE, with little value gained from monitoring activities (TE, pg 23). Some success was achieved in the area of aquatic biomonitoring, which involved secondary schools and volunteers, however, results were not distributed widely, no useable baseline was established, and the effort does not appear to have been integrated into the rest of the project in any meaningful way.
  - TE makes no mention of any implementation of an environmental education program in communities that includes wildlife and forestry control techniques, as called for in the PD logframe under this objective.
  - The one macro indicator provided in the logframe to gauge overall success under this project output – “increase in the % forest cover in CBTC” - does not appear to have been achieved, although the logframe does not state at what timeframe increases in forest cover can be expected to be detected. TE states that CBTC finds that the rate of deforestation in the area has slowed from 11% per annum at the project’s onset, to 7.15% per annum at project closure. However, TE states that the reviewer does not have any confidence in the data presented by the CBTC as the methods are different for each assessment and the data upon which the findings are based is limited (TE, pg 7).
2. *Adopt and apply improved biodiversity friendly sustainable forest management practices* – Under this objective, a sustainable forest management model was to be developed and extended to forest resource managers, users and communities. However, no working model was ever fully developed. TE states that a comparative economic analysis was done on the benefits from non-sustainable and sustainable timber extraction. The sustainable approach results in a reduction of 40% profits to the logger and reduction of 30% proceeds to the landowner. The project did not identify any ways to substitute lost income, and thus it’s unlikely that this current analysis will develop into any model for adoption and replication.
3. *Protect biodiversity through the development, management and marketing of local and regional sustainable ecotourism products while increasing tourism-based incomes* – Under this objective, regional and local ecotourism development strategies were to be designed and detailed in a document, and other activities were to be implemented. No mention of any strategy document is provided in the TE. TE does state that the project established an ecotourism network and that twenty communities are now involved, and that the project has helped to enhance the capacity of the various community associations involved in ecotourism initiatives – though no mention of how this is being accomplished. The project developed an accreditation system for local guides,

although the extent to which this has been effective in improving ecotourism, from the standpoint of visitors or local communities, is not discussed. In all, activities appear to have been unfocused and too wide ranging to have made much of an impact.

4. *Strengthen the local grassroots organizations and the state-run ALCAC office, through the development of a co-management model for the protected areas and Corridor project* – Under this objective, the project was to assess the training needs of local organizations and ACLAC, develop training models, and elaborate on self-sustaining financial strategies. TE states that limited support was provided to those entities involved in co-management of the PAs with ACLAC, with some modest success (not detailed further). TE states that project support to ACLAC was very effective and represents one of the biggest success stories of the project. However, nothing further on this is provided in the TE. Finally, the project did provide support to a group charged with enhancing cacao production, but, in the assessment of the TE, this effort was not strategic as it was not aligned with the project’s overall mission of biodiversity protection. TE notes that project failed to strengthen local CBOs, particularly those involved with PA management, as called for in the PD.

In summary, project effectiveness is rated as unsatisfactory because the project largely failed to achieve what it set out to do.

<b>4.3 Efficiency</b>	Rating: <b>Unsatisfactory</b>
-----------------------	-------------------------------

Project efficiency is rated as unsatisfactory. The project failed to set up a Project Steering Committee as called for in the PD. Several activities called for in the project’s logframe appear to have been dropped or simply ignored. Many of the project’s activities that were undertaken, such as bio monitoring and establishment of community rangers, were done sporadically and poorly. As noted in the TE, the project scope was far too broad, and the time frame and budget were inadequate – all of which likely hampered project efficiency as the project appears to have only partially executed many project activities, and ignored others. TE states that a disproportionate amount of GEF funding was used to cover personnel costs of CBTC that were being provided for by outside means prior to the project (TE, pg 9). Moreover, the project lacked effecting monitoring and oversight, with poorly designed indicators that did not lend themselves to adaptive management (see M&E below). Finally, TE states that project reporting demands were overwhelming, with project personnel spending 15 days out of every 3 months preparing detailed and comprehensive trimester reports. UNDP ‘s country office recommended that the reporting be abbreviated and reduced, however CBTC continued to use the same format (TE, pg 12).

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

The project appears to have made little headway in reducing threats to the sustainability of project outcomes, with the sole exception being the small amount of acreage (202 Ha) purchased by the Nature Conservancy as part of the project. Risks to project sustainability are assessed further along these four dimensions:

- Environmental threats – **(U)**. The area’s biodiversity still faces significant threats from hunting and unsustainable logging – both legal and illegal. As noted above, little progress was made in developing and advancing any sustainable model of timber production in the area, and no laws or protections for the area’s threatened forests were advanced during the course of the project.
- Financial – **(U)**. None of the ecotourism initiatives supported by the project are self-sustaining at project closure. No co-financing or any other substantive commitment on the part of the Costa Rican government was obtained, and just over half of the funding from TNC expected at the project signing materialized. There are also insufficient funding of the CR’s PES program to support demand and needed protections of biodiversity.
- Socio-political – **(MU)**. TE states that the project helped to enhance the capacity of several community associations involved in eco-tourism, and that there appears to be interest in local communities in conserving the local forest. Moreover, the staff of the CBTC is reported to be highly committed, and there is good collaboration between this organization and key government entities responsible for shaping policy on the forest resources. However, the community ranger program started by the project is already withering in terms of participation and the project failed to establish links with other NGOs and institutions that could potentially aid in project sustainability.
- Institutional **(MU)**. TE reports that ACLAC is severely understaffed and ill equipped, although the project’s efforts (not detailed in the TE) at strengthening the capacity of ACLAC is seen as one of its biggest successes.

## 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?

Just over half of the expected co-funding from TNC materialized. This limited the extent to which the project was able to pursue land acquisition and conservation easements. However, the project document (PD) does not provide a detailed budget for project funding, including co-funding (TNC funds are primarily to be spend on “miscellaneous” components). As for a reason for the limited materialization of co-financing, the TE states that “due to legal questions pertaining to land ownership of the lands originally slated for acquisition, TNC was not able to proceed with the purchase of some of the area originally intended for purchase. Moreover, during the project period, TNC’s priorities shifted, and the organization decided it should focus its activities in another area” in Costa Rica (TE, pg 21). The failure to achieve more in the way of land purchases and conservation easements, for which co-financing would have likely contributed to, did limit project’s success in establishing the basis for

conservation of the CBTC, as most of the land is no more protected at project closure than when the project began.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project did not receive any extension or experience any delays.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The project was not financed with any co-funding from the CR government, nor did it benefit from any commitment in terms of relevant agency support. TE does report that relations and collaboration between the ACLAC office and the CBTC were good, and the project does appear to be well aligned with national priorities. However, it seems reasonable to conclude that the project would have achieved more, particularly in regards to the forestry and capacity building components, if the project had been integrated with a country office, and received more country ownership. At project closure, there is nothing legally binding that will reduce the principle threats to the areas biodiversity (logging practices, development, hunting), other than the small amount of land purchased by TNC with the help 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: <b>Unsatisfactory</b>
-------------------------	-------------------------------

The project's M&E system was poorly and incompletely designed in nearly all dimensions. Shortcomings include poorly chosen indicators that do not capture relevant outcomes (ex, Activity 2 under Output 1, *Biological monitoring methodology designed* – indicator is “Results of monitoring program”), lack targets, lack a timeframe for when results can be expected to manifest and appear, lack a dedicated and detailed budget, lack baselines, and lack a clear explication of how results from the M&E systems are expected to feed into RBM. This was a complex project that could have greatly benefited from a strong M&E system, and the poor M&E design likely contributed to the project's limited success as many activities were dropped or ignored, and many that were done were poorly executed (particularly the



monitoring program, ranger program, environmental education program, and sustainable forestry management program.)

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

The project failed to establish an effective M&E system, although it did make an attempt to reconfigure some of the logframe indicators, which were clearly unworkable. However, the revised indicators did not improve upon the original ones in any substantive way (TE, pg 10). Much of the intended biological monitoring appears to have not taken place, or was done haphazardly and sporadically. Moreover, TE reports that the project management spent an inordinate amount of time preparing detailed and comprehensive trimester reports that apparently were of little use. UNDP ‘s country office recommended that the reporting be abbreviated and reduced, however CBTC continued to use the same format (TE, pg 12). The failure of the project to establish effective M&E systems likely contributed to the project’s limited success, as coordination and control of the many project activities was severely lacking.

## **7. Assessment of project implementation and execution**

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Unsatisfactory</b>
--	-------------------------------

Project implementation was unsatisfactory along a number of lines, from poor project design to poor supervision. On the design front, the project was far too broad in scope for an MSP, and both the time frame and budget were inadequate to achieve its stated objectives (TE, pg 8). The project’s M&E system, as detailed above, was poorly designed and did not lend itself to RBM. The project could have benefitted from a commitment of resources and collaboration from a government counterpart, or at least a more detailed description of the kinds of capacity developing initiatives that were to be expected to take place – both in ACLAC and in local organizations. The commitment of co-financing from TNC does not appear to have been clearly delineated, with no breakdown of what TNC resources were expected to be used for. The same extends to use of GEF resources, which, as the TE notes, were used to fund existing CBTC salaries that were funded prior to the project, and not additional project-specific components, as intended. Moreover, the project never established a project steering committee, as called for in the PD,

and UNDP should have ensured that this took place (TE, pg 9). The principle barriers to conservation – logging and hunting – were not defined in the project’s design and were never given the attention they deserved (TE, pg 7). Finally, TE notes that numerous changes in personnel within the UNDP country office resulted in four different UNDP programme officers being responsible for the project during the three years that it was under implementation. This made it difficult to effectively monitor the project (TE, pg 11). TE also notes that UNDP took a “hands off” approach to project monitoring, with most of the program officers having never visited the project.

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

Project execution was poor. Weaknesses include failure to execute many project activities as called for in the PD; poor execution of many project activities (monitoring, environmental education, creation of sustainable forestry plan, etc.); failure to set up a Project Steering Committee; failure to adjust its reporting approach as suggested by UNDP; failure to set up effective RBM systems. While TE notes that the project executing agency (CBTC) is highly motivated and has been working in the area for a long time, they were apparently unable to manage a project as complex as this one, and could have benefited from a closer collaboration with a government counterpart and UNDP itself.

## **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.

A small amount of land, 202 ha, was purchased by TNC as part of this project. It can be assumed that this land was threatened and contained globally significant biodiversity. However, no further information is provided in the TE. Moreover, this is a small fraction of the 46,000 ha of threatened land that is the focus of the project. Other conservation measures, such as participation of local landowners in Costa Rica’s PES program is suggested in the TE, but the extent to which this has occurred, and the degree to which the project facilitated this is unclear. The corridor remains under threat from unsustainable logging (both legal and illegal), as well as hunting and land conversion. All of the factors that are detailed in this TER, from poor design to poor supervision and execution, contributed to the project’s shortcomings in the area of environmental change.

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 TE lists several initiatives that were supported or started under the project, though quantification of any changes in human-well being is not provided. TE states that “communities living in the corridor are benefiting in a real and concrete sense from ecotourism initiatives supported by the project,” before going on to say that most of these initiatives began long before this project (TE, pg 28). Twenty communities are involved in an ecotourism network established by the project, though what this means is unclear. TE also states that the project developed an accreditation system for local guides and the eighty local guides from the participating communities in the network are now accredited by MINEA.

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 – TE states that the project was successful in strengthening the capacity of ACLAC office, as well as on agricultural organization focused on cacao production (APPTA), however, no further information is provided on what kinds of capacities were strengthened, or how this might translate into improved conservation outcomes for the areas biodiversity.

b) Governance – as stated above, the project helped establish an ecotourism network that twenty communities are participating in. However, what this actually means, or how sustainable this network is is unclear. No other changes that would relate to governance are reported in the TE.

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 from the project are reported in the TE.

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 project did not result in any adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. This was a small MSP, with many far reaching goals, that had very limited success. A report on a sustainable forestry model was expected to

be produced but never materialized, due in part to poor project design and execution and insufficient funding.

## **9. Lessons and recommendations**

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

The TE offers the following key lessons from the project experience:

- A functional Project Steering Committee is indispensable
- Good indicators greatly facilitate project evaluation. Lack of such indicators makes it difficult to monitor and evaluate a project.
- Although project staff may sometimes accompany the evaluation mission on field sites and interviews, their participation must be very carefully considered so as not to affect interviews in undesirable ways.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE offers the following recommendations from the project experience:

- Project objectives should be impact-oriented rather than task-oriented to ensure that the project works towards having an impact, and not merely towards undertaking project activities.
- Impact-oriented indicators and time-bound benchmarks for monitoring their progress throughout the project life should be defined in the project document. Clear consequences for not achieving these benchmarks, including reallocation of resources, should also be outlined.
- GEF funds are made available in part based on the amount of co-financing secured for a proposed project. The project budget should include both the GEF funds as well as the co-financing, indicating specifically how all funds will be used. In addition, a letter of commitment of co-financing should be secured before GEF funds are released.
- Evaluation mission length should depend on the complexity of a project and not on the funding amount. Evaluations that focus on impact and not merely on delivery of goods and services usually require more time.
- Mid-term and final evaluation reports of all UNDP/GEF projects should be distributed by email to all other relevant ongoing projects in UNDP's portfolio. This is a simple way of sharing lessons and avoiding repeat of mistakes.

## 10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	TE does not adequately report on many relevant project activities (ex., educational component; development of sustainable forestry model; monitoring) nor provide adequate detail on those it mentions as having occurred (ex., capacity building efforts with ACLAC and others).	<b>MU</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Report provides no ratings. Evidence is not complete regarding many of the project activities including capacity building, educational outreach, and SFM program.	<b>MU</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	TE does an adequate job in pointing out the limited prospects for sustainability of project outcomes, although more detail on the threats, particularly financial ones, as well as strength of the ecotourism network established by the project would have been helpful.	<b>MS</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons are fairly basic and could have been expanded to a discussion of how weaknesses in the project's design and lack of commitments from the GOGR, along with limited capacity of CBTC, contributed to limited outcomes	<b>MU</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	No. TE reports cost of each of the four development outcomes, but does not provide any breakdown of GEF funding vs co-financing. Moreover, there is a discrepancy between the amounts presented in the TE and those in the final PIR which is never discussed in the TE.	<b>U</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	TE does a fair job of pointing out the inadequacies of the project's M&E systems, but more could have been said about how the lack of an effective M&E system hindered achievement of project outcomes.	<b>MS</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MU</b>

Overall TE rating:  $(0.3 * (3+3)) + (0.1 * (4+3+2+4)) = 1.8 + 1.3 = 3.1 = \text{MU}$

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