GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	
GEF Project ID:	774		at endorsement (Million US$)	at completion (Million US$)
IA/EA Project ID:		**GEF financing:**	$15.00	$15.01
Project Name:	Andean Region Conservation and Use of Biodiversity	IA/EA own:		
Countries:	Colombia	Government:	8.00	12.27
		Other*:	7.00	10.40
		Total Cofinancing	15.00	22.67
Operational Program:	# 4, Mountain Ecosystems and # 3, Forest Ecosystems; Focal Area: Biological Diversity	**Total Project Cost:**	$30.00	$37.68
IA	World Bank	Dates		
Partners involved:	Alexander von Humboldt Institute on Biological Research (IAvH) The Netherlands; Local Governments (CARS)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		Dec. 2001
		Closing Date	Proposed: Dec. 2007	Actual: Dec. 2007
Prepared by: Pallavi Nuka	Reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 72 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 72 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 72 months
Author of TE: World Bank – Colombia & Mexico Country Mgmt. Unit		TE completion date: ???	TE submission date to GEF EO: June 30 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in 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	**MS**	**MS**	**MU**	**MU**
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	**N/A**	**U**	**Significant**	**U**
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	**S**	**MU**	**Negligible**	**MU**
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	**S**	**MS**	**MS**	**MS**
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	**N/A**	**N/A**	**S**	**S**

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why? Yes, the terminal evaluation report provides a comprehensive assessment of project design, implementation, and outcomes. The report is detailed and well organized.
2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funs, mismanagement, etc.?

No such findings are mentioned in the terminal evaluation report.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

The global environmental objective of this project was to support conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use of mountain and forest ecosystems in the Andean region. Additionally, the project sought to combat land degradation in target areas.

There were no changes in global environmental objectives during project implementation.

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)

As stated in the appraisal document, this project's development objective is to "increase conservation, knowledge and sustainable use of globally important biodiversity of the Colombian Andes." Specifically, the project aimed to:

1. Support the development of a more representative, effective, and viable Andean protected area system;
2. Identify conservation opportunities in rural landscapes, develop and promote management tools for biodiversity conservation;
3. Expand, organize, and disseminate the knowledge base on biodiversity in the Andes to a wide audience of stakeholders and policy makers, and implement monitoring tools; and,
4. Promote inter-sectoral coordination to address some root causes of biodiversity loss in the Andes.

There were no changes in the development objectives during project implementation.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)

c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)

Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, causing a change in objectives	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)

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 (of outcomes to focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities) Rating: S

A.1. What is the relevance of the project outcomes/results to:

(i) the national sustainable development agenda and development needs and challenges?

The project is linked to Colombia's 2006-2010 National Development Plan, which contains three environmental management themes which are closely related to the project objectives: (i) biodiversity knowledge, conservation and sustainable use; (ii) sustainable productive processes; and (iii) land management. According to the World Bank's Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) document for Colombia, "inadequate management of natural resources… has led to a growing deterioration as seen by the loss of biodiversity, deforestation… endangered strategic ecosystems, soil degradation, highly polluted rivers, canals and wetlands." This project also contributes to the CAS's strategic focus on sustainable development/protection and conservation of strategic ecosystems; improving the effectiveness of the recently introduced decentralized system for environmental management; and promoting employment opportunities for the poor through environmentally sustainable projects.

(ii) the national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?

The Colombian Andes are acknowledged as global priority areas for conservation of flora and fauna. This project launched Colombia's 25-year National Biodiversity Policy and Proposed Action Plan (1998) and addressed the need to consolidate disparate national protected areas into a single system with a variety of protection categories at regional and local levels.

(iii) the achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?

This project supports key elements of the GEF Operational Strategy regarding conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use in mountain and forest ecosystems (Operational Programs 4 and 3) as well as the cross-sectoral area of land degradation. The project is fully consistent with the principles of the Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity as it takes an ecosystem approach to maximizing biodiversity conservation under a variety of management regimes and involving a range of stakeholders including local communities, indigenous peoples, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), the private sector, and local, regional and central government agencies. Finally, the project also addresses issues of agro-biodiversity, which were endorsed as a GEF Priority by the III Conference of the Parties in Buenos Aires (1996).

(iv) the implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives)

This project fits the priorities of the COP of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) on the sustainable use and conservation of semi-arid zone ecosystems. Colombia ratified the CBD on November 28, 1994. This project is consistent with Colombia's commitments to the CBD, with emphasis on Articles 6 (integration of biodiversity across sectors), 7 (biodiversity identification and monitoring), 8 (*in situ* conservation), 10 (sustainable use) and 13 (education and public awareness).

A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership[1]

This project had no formal international or regional linkages.

b. Effectiveness **Rating: MU**

The project has achieved most of its targeted outputs and, according to the terminal evaluation report, there is evidence of its contribution to the conservation of biodiversity in the Colombian Andes. However, the project's long-term effectiveness in conserving biodiversity is doubtful. The terminal evaluation rates overall outcomes and effectiveness as moderately satisfactory and an independent evaluation group (IEG) report rates effectiveness as modest.

All of the targets under the protected areas component have been met. This was the single largest project component, and the most important for consolidating the management of protected areas in Colombia. The executing agency, the Alexander von Humboldt Institute for Biological Research (IAvH), was successful in developing enhanced management tools for the system of National Protected Areas. Key elements of this new strategy were tested in seven WWF/World Bank targeted ecoregions. Technical studies by the IAvH have also provided some evidence to strengthen the legal framework for the National Protected Areas System. But, the IEG notes that despite improvement in the representation of threatened species in protected areas, there is no evidence that the ground management and operation of protected areas is any more effective or viable as a result of the project.

Pilot efforts to promote conservation in rural landscapes have been moderately effective. Land management techniques, including hedgerows, agro-forestry systems, multi-purpose forests, and forest corridors, have been applied at 10 pilot sites and have directly affected 332 hectares of cultivable land on 274 farms. The result has been the enhanced ecological connectivity of over 4000 hectares of remnant forest patches. Several pilot incentive programs were also launched, including a biotrade program and property tax exemptions for the use of biodiversity friendly land management practices. The bio-trade program has spun off and become a self-sustaining Fund operating nationally. Yet, despite their potential, these pilot programs have had little influence on regional and national government policy. The terminal evaluation notes that the biotrade program and tax exemptions are now being promoted in three other small projects, but there is no plan for broader replication.

The project has been most successful in expanding and organizing the biodiversity knowledge base and disseminating the information to stakeholders. Outputs from this component included books, software programs, technical papers, audio and video records, and maps. A decentralized Biodiversity Information System (BIS) setup by the project and linking data from various partner institutions, is now being widely used by scientists, advocacy NGOs, teachers and the general public. The impact on government agencies has been less pronounced. The terminal evaluation report mentions that "the lack of a marketing strategy for project results has weakened the widespread adoption of quality

[1] Please consider for regional and global project only

knowledge-based products by decision makers, and more needs to be done with a view to compiling a portfolio that can easily be "sold" to different potential users."

Effectiveness in improving inter-sectoral coordination on biodiversity conservation is poor. While the sector policies for Environment, Transportation, and Mining have been amended to include biodiversity, only the Environment sector has adopted specific legislation to consider biodiversity impacts for all programs. According to the terminal evaluation, "the project has failed to engage key decision makers at the local, regional and national levels, including the Ministry for the Environment" because the IAvH, an independent scientific institution, had limited leverage with government bodies.

Both the terminal evaluation report and the IEG report mention two serious flaws in the project design, which have hampered effectiveness. First, the project had diffuse objectives, with 18 subcomponents under 5 components. This design created difficulties with execution given the six-year timeline and the limited capacity of the executing agency. The ICR notes that "too many components contributed to the segmentation of project implementation, reinforced by the M&E focus on products/outputs by component rather than on outcomes contributing to the achievement of global environmental objectives." Second, insufficient consideration was given to the long-term sustainability of the project. During the project implementation, a large part of IAvH's budget came from GEF funding, and minimal follow-on funding was secured by project closing. As a result, IAvH has experienced severe staff cuts and project activities have been curtailed.

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

The project has strengthened management of 464,539 hectares of existing protected areas under the National Park System. An additional 88,134 hectares of new protected area was brought under management through the creation of a new national park. This is a total of 552,673 ha of public land under conservation through this project. Representation of species in protected areas has improved. 96.4% of the unprotected species in the region are now represented through the declaration of 85 new protected areas. An undetermined amount of private land has been brought under management through the 81 new private reserves (40 expected) created. Also, a regional protected area network was created comprising a total area of 9,881,084 hectares.

Total project cost was $37.68 M, 25% more than budgeted in the project document, but there was no significant increase in project activities to account for added costs. Moreover, the amount of new area brought under protection, through creation of a new 88,134 ha National Park, is not substantial.

d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated) – this could happen both during the designing of the project where some choices are made that lead to preference for one priority over the other, and during implementation of the project when resources are transferred from addressing environmental priorities to development priorities and vice versa. If possible explain the reasons for such tradeoffs.

There is no specific mention of such trade-offs in the terminal evaluation report or in the progress reports for this project. The project design balances environmental and development priorities with components addressing each set of issues. The choice of the IAvH, a biological research institution, as the executing agency for the project has tilted implementation toward robust environmental and scientific outputs. The development outputs, including activities designed to improve rural livelihoods while preserving biodiversity and improved inter-sectoral coordination, have not been as robust.

4.1.2 Results / Impacts[2] (Describe Impacts) (please fill in annex 1 – results scoresheet and annex 2 – focal area impacts (against GEF Strategic Priority indicators, where appropriate and possible)

A National Protected Areas System has been established with different categories of protected areas, permitting protection of a more representative collection of ecosystems. The project has assisted private reserves in developing and managing protected areas. Conservation opportunities identified in rural landscapes through the biodiversity and socioeconomic assessments were translated into management tools and incentives were applied in pilot sites, including a national biotrade program. Widespread promotion and sectoral adoption, including by environmental authorities, is still pending, but pilot program operation continues due to the commitment of the beneficiaries. Enhanced biodiversity knowledge and monitoring has been achieved through: i) an Andean biodiversity baseline completed with data from 9 biodiversity assessments and 2 land cover map updates; ii) fieldwork training in indicator system piloted to prioritize

[2] Please consider direct and indirect global environmental results; any unexpected results; local development benefits (including results relevant to communities, gender issues, indigenous peoples, NGOs and CBOs)

conservation areas in 3 project zones; and iv) a decentralized Biodiversity Information System (BIS). The project has increased inter-sectoral coordination by inserting biodiversity concerns into the sector policies of several government departments, but the project has not had sufficient impact on high-level government decision makers or on national legislation .

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: U (1)**
There is no guaranteed long-term funding from either government or outside donors to support continuation of project achievements. The National Parks Administrative Unit (UAESPNN) has committed $0.3 M for short-term continuation of project activities. Several partners of the Biodiversity Information System have pledged their support for its continued operation through financial and in-kind contributions.	
b. Socio-economic / political	**Rating: MU (2)**
Stakeholder support, in particular from rural communities, was a key factor contributing to successful implementation of pilot programs. However, the pilot program interventions were too small to promote national or even regional adoption beyond project completion. The private reserves are strongly supported by the National Network of Agrotourism and Ecotourism Services, *Agroecotur*, and are likely to remain protected areas. High-level political support for the project is low.	
c. Institutional framework and governance	**Rating: MU (2)**
The UAESPNN has taken over some protected areas management activities from the IAvH, but ineffective management of protected areas remains a risk. There is no institutional support for the rural landscapes component. The sectoral policy-screening tools are at risk of falling into disuse without a stronger legal and regulatory framework.	
d. Environmental	**Rating: ML (3)**
Invasive flora species and the spread of domestic animals are real environmental risks, but these risks can be mitigated through active management of protected areas by the UAESPNN.	
e. Technological	**Rating: N/A**
This project does face technological risk.	

4.3 Catalytic role[3]

a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholders
The project piloted three innovative incentive programs to promote conservation efforts. These were (i) property tax exemptions and water payments to farmers in exchange for conserving forest area; (ii) a Biotrade Fund; and (iii) green market initiatives with 10 municipalities. The Biotrade Fund has become self-sustaining and the payments to farmers continue, but replication of these incentive programs has been limited to three small-scale projects.
b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors
Project activities have not impacted institutional behaviors.
c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?
Project activities under the inter-sectoral coordination component have introduced biodiversity into the policies of three government sectors. The Environment Ministry has incorporated biodiversity considerations into environmental impact assessments and has established an Early Warning System for biodiversity impacts from large-scale development projects. Forty three biodiversity oriented policy adjustments have been made in the agriculture, mining, energy and transport sectors. Project activities have provided input for 8 national regulations, including 6 bills passed to Congress.
d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project contributed to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing)
The project has no guaranteed follow-on funding from Government or other donors.

[3] Please review the 'Catalytic Role of GEF: How is it measured and evaluated – A conceptual framework' prior to addressing this section.

e. PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?
No such champions were mentioned.

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?
Co-financing provided 60% of the total project cost and was essential to the protected areas component of the project. Local governments provided $12.27 M and the Govt. of the Netherlands provided $6.78M. This financing supported creation of the national protected areas system and the development of participatory management plans with local communities.
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?
Personnel changes in government agencies, particularly in municipal governments, hindered project implementation in several areas as the targets agreed upon with previous delegates were not prioritized by subsequent decision-makers and agreements had to be rebuilt.
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.
Country ownership has had a positive impact on ensuring the participation of local communities and stakeholders in protected areas management. However, the selection of a scientific institution as executing agency compromised the achievement of some outcomes as high-level government decision makers were not involved in project due to which there was little political support for the project.

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 M&E plan included in the project appraisal document compared planned versus executed activities and outputs using measures of effectiveness, efficiency and timing. However, the terminal evaluation notes that the 40 framework indicators were not comprehensive measures of progress towards the objectives. Following the mid-term review, the M&E system was revised to focus on 15 indicators deemed most representative of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, and 6 outcome indicators.
b. M&E plan Implementation **Rating (six point scale): MU**
The 6 outcome indicators agreed upon were measured only on project closing. Meetings with regional and component coordinators were held annually. Progress reports were based on information from contractors and grant recipients working on different components and were of poor quality. A mid-term evaluation and a terminal evaluation were conducted. There was little focus on the project's impacts throughout the implementation process.
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? Yes, a project management budget was included in the project document.
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? Yes, IAvH set up a planning and M&E system administered by its planning office.
b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Project monitoring provided feedback during implementation. The mid-term evaluation recommendation to revise the M&E system was adopted. Recommendations that the project develop a stronger communications strategy were never implemented.
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. No, the original M&E design was overly focused on outputs and did not measure impacts on global environmental objectives.

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): MS
b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): MU *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 implementing agency for this project was the World Bank. The project design had an ineffective M&E system, and it underestimated key financial and political risks to sustainability. The terminal evaluation notes that the budgets for disseminating and consolidating project results and for inter-sectoral coordination were small relative to the potential impacts of these components for biodiversity conservation in Colombia.

The choice of IAvH as executing agency was appropriate given the Insitute's scientific authority, but the IAvH's weak points could have been mitigated by staffing the project team with experts in public outreach and green business. Despite the attempts at mid-term to overhaul the project, the original design failings were not overcome through IA supervision. The IA could have pushed the project team towards stronger dissemination efforts and helped cultivate links at the Ministry level.

Supervision was carried out through in-house and outside consultant visits twice a year. The IA did provide specialized technical support during implementation. Financial oversight was sound and a comprehensive midterm review took place in May 2005. Tripartite meetings with the Government of the Netherlands were conducted once a year or as needed and the Bank played an important role in facilitating agreements to help ensure Dutch contributions.

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies[4] (rating on a 6 point scale) MS
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 executing agency, the IAvH, was able to carry out project until completion with committed and quality staff, despite changing national coordinators three times. The IAvH provided high quality technical information to support the different project activities. It complied with Bank procedures, maintained strong financial and procurement management, adopted suggestions for improvement and supervised progress to guarantee output quality. Its failure to adequately involve key decision-makers to support project outcomes, including within the Environment ministry, and its failure to transfer outputs to the National Environmental System for their broad adoption is related to its nature as a research institute and to project design shortcomings mentioned above.

Significant turnover in the Ministry of Environment, including its merger with the Ministry of Economic Development, negatively affected its involvement with the project, as fewer human resources were available to devote to active participation and feedback for project implementation. However, the UAESPNN as head of the National Protected Area System remained actively involved and committed throughout implementation to apply project methodologies and approaches, although not without hesitation regarding management of productive areas in National Park buffer zones. It overcame administrative inefficiencies and obstacles in its relation with IAvH that hindered project execution particularly under component 1, and thus contributed to enhance biodiversity conservation and sustainable use through improved PA management.

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.

1. **Balancing participatory approaches and the need for focused objectives** requires building stakeholder understanding of the issue, so as to adequately channel expectations into focused agreements. Focused objectives are crucial for the effectiveness and sustainability of project outcomes but they imply the exclusion certain topics and certain interests. Seeking to implement a national biodiversity policy framework in this six-year project is geographically too ambitious and undermines the achievement of outcomes.

2. **Trade-offs between administrative efficiency and institutional adoption of outcomes** – IAvH's designation by the MMA as implementing agency enhanced administrative efficiency given the Institute's legal status and its strong financial management skills. Where possible, these arrangements whereby resource execution is governed by private law but their use is decided upon with public authorities should be employed. However, in seeking efficiency,

[4] 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.

correspondence between project objectives and institutional functions should be ensured. IAvH s role within the SINA is to provide knowledge-based outputs to inform decision making, especially by the MMA as head of the SINA and responsible for defining the country's environmental policy. The research-oriented nature of the IAvH may have influenced a project design favoring outputs, segmenting implementation and overlooking political marketing of results to key institutional stakeholders to focus instead on comprehensive, quality assessments of study objects. However, Bank teams and project designs must ensure that policy makers are held accountable for interventions which seek to mainstream biodiversity considerations in productive landscapes and sectors. UAESPNN's adoption and regular use of methodologies developed under component one, including its budget allocations to continue activities in the 6 National Natural Parks targeted by the project, illustrate how in spite of administrative inefficiencies and slow learning curves inherent to most public authorities, investing in their direct execution of project activities can result in long-term adoption of project outcomes.

3. **A results-framework and M&E schemes critically affect output-outcome and component linkages** – few and synthetic indicators focusing on how outputs lead up to desired outcomes help overcome segmented approaches to project implementation. As a first generation GEF project seeking to promote public and private conservation and sustainable use efforts in the Colombian Andes, including mainstreaming biodiversity considerations in sectoral practices and policies, the design of a useful M&E framework proved to be a challenge that was not surmounted.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

1. **Donor coordination** – coordinated donor investments and actions, in particular under a programmatic approach, should be actively sought to help strengthen the impact of single interventions.

2. Adequate risk assessment and sustainability mechanisms – the risks identified during preparation should be closely screened and candidly evaluated, so as to ensure that project implementation focuses on developing adequate mitigation measures and sustainability mechanisms from the start, if deficient. Midterm review provides an excellent opportunity to evaluate strengths and weaknesses of the project's sustainability strategy, which should include:

(i) *Building community-based ownership* –This strategy proved successful in turning local actors into advocates of land management tools and conservation incentives, once their benefits were evident. Therefore, project design should allocate sufficient resources for this type of support-building strategies. It is in this manner that civil society can be empowered to press for the continuity of successful institutional actions.
(ii) *Developing institutional alliances and engagement* – Institutional commitment to project objectives and results is critical for sustainability. Enough time should be invested in building alliances with management and technical staff in key partner institutions, through their active involvement in preparation **and** execution and the provision of sufficient training given slow learning curves. This is successfully illustrated by UAESPNN's incorporation of project results, compared to other authorities less involved in activity implementation and now less committed to their continuation.

3. Linking biodiversity knowledge production with conservation and sustainable use practices requires a different phased approach – a more effective phased approach to increase biodiversity knowledge, conservation and sustainable use implies separating stages and even operations for the implementation of activities aimed at each. In this manner, initial stages should focus on generating knowledge to design and pilot tools to enhance public and private conservation and sustainable use practices. Knowledge gained in such a first phase would provide solid M&E evidence for a second phase scaling-up. Implementing these activities in parallel, as was the case for the project under review, scatters efforts with little impact; opportunities for sustainability such as allowing more/separate time and resources for results marketing and adoption by key actors are missed.

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.

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	S

the project and the achievement of the objectives? A comprehensive assessment of outputs, impacts, and progress towards environmental objectives is included in the terminal evaluation report.	
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? No evidence gaps were noted and the evidence presented is internally consistent.	S
c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The report provides a realistic assessment of sustainability. No exit strategy is outlined.	S
d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? The lessons learned are supported by the evidence presented, but little mention is made of the project's successful outcomes.	MS
e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The report includes actual project costs and actual co-financing used.	S
f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The report provides a fair and detailed evaluation of the project's M&E systems.	S

7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUTION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.

8 Project stakeholders and Key Contacts (Names, addresses, emails etc – mandatory for field visit countries)

9. Information Gaps (for Field visit countries only)
