1. Project Data

GEF Project ID	886
IA/EA Project ID	GF/1010-01-
Focal Area	International Waters
Project Name	Implementation of Strategic Action Program for the Bermejo River Binational Basin: Phase II
Country/Countries	Argentina, Bolivia
Geographic Scope	Regional
Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects	UNEP
Executing Agencies involved	General Secretariat of the Organization of the American States (GS/OAS), Binational Commission - Upper Bermejo
Involvement of NGO and CBO	Not involved
Involvement of Private Sector	No- Not Involved
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	1 - Arid and semi-Arid Zone Ecosystems 9 - Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area Operational Program
TER Prepared by	Sunpreet Kaur
TER Peer Review by	Neeraj Negi
Author of TE	Hugo Navajas and Mario Schreider
Review Completion Date	
CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	4/30/2001
Project Implementation Start Date	5/1/2001
Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation)	10/31/2005
Actual Date of Project Completion	3/1/2010
TE Completion Date	10/1/2011
IA Review Date	NA
TE Submission Date	8/30/2012

2. Project Financing

Financing Source	At Endorsement (millions USD)	At Completion (millions USD)
GEF Project Preparation Grant	-	-
Co-financing for Project Preparation	-	-
Total Project Prep Financing	-	-
GEF Financing	11.04	11.04
IA/EA own	3.00	3.00
Government	8.43	8.43
Other*	-	-
Total Project Financing	22.47	22.47
Total Financing including Prep	22.47	22.47

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

3. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF Evaluation Office TE Review
Project Outcomes		MS	MS	Unsatisfactory
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	MU	MU	Moderately Unlikely
Monitoring and Evaluation		MU	MU	Moderately Unsatisfactory
Quality of Implementation and Execution	N/A	MU	MU	Moderately Unsatisfactory
Quality of the Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A	Not mentioned	Moderately Unsatisfactory

4. Project Objectives

4.1. *Global Environmental Objectives of the project:*

The primary objective of this GEF IW project was: "to assist the governments of Argentina and Bolivia in addressing the root causes of the principal environmental problems affecting the Bermejo River Basin, with a focus on their main trans-boundary manifestations - namely, sediment erosion, transport, and deposition." It encompassed activities for the control of land degradation due to agricultural activities, prevention of erosion, and sediment control – including the creation, restoration and protection of natural vegetated areas, conservation of aquatic and terrestrial habitat, and support to popular participation in the management of natural resources through improved access to information and enhancement of public awareness, control of water-borne contaminants, and related measures. No change is noted in the Global Environmental Objective of this project.

4.2. *Development Objectives of the project:*

The development objective of the project was "to promote the sustainable development of the Bermejo River Binational Basin (BRBB)". No change is noted in the Global Environmental Objective of this project.

4.3. *Changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities:*

Criteria	Change?	Reason for Change
Global Environmental Objectives	No	
Development Objectives	No	
Project Components	No	
Other activities	No	

5. GEF EO Assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

5.1. *Relevance* – **Unsatisfactory**

Although the project was approved under the operational programmes of "Arid and semi-arid ecosystems" and "Integrated and water multiple focal", there are serious concerns about relevance of the project in generating GEBs and being relevant to GEF mandate. The Trans-boundary Diagnostic Analysis of Binational Basin of R. Bermejo conducted in May 2000 had clearly noted that "there are no identifiable management measures in the Upper Bemejo Basin

that would substantially affect the quantity of sediments generated by the Basin as a whole, and the most productive sediment zones in the Upper Bermejo Basin are not significantly affected by human activity at this time".

The TE has assessed relevance of the project on issues focused at the basin level, which are more localized in nature. However, it lacks an adequate assessment of relevance of the project in terms of the GEBs. It is in this context that the raring of the project is down-graded to Unsatisfactory.

5.2. *Effectiveness* – **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The TE notes that most of the sub-projects executed under the Bermejo SAP II achieved their planned outputs. They contributed to local and institutional outcomes. The Bermejo SAP II overall had little impact basin-wide. No progress was made in standardizing institutional and regulatory frameworks to encourage integrated management of the binational basin. This was due to overly ambitious objectives for the period of time given to Project execution.

However, the Project linked actors and initiatives, supported the recognition of several initiatives and enabled the sourcing of additional resources. It had a catalytic effect on the creation of networks and other binational initiatives, which generated Basin-wide collaborative dynamics.

The TE also states that important progress was made towards the overall objective and the objectives of the strategic areas which must still be consolidated. There is evidence of results attributable to the Project. There are water zoning and land use studies that are consulted by the governments of the Argentine provinces and the Tarija Department in Bolivia. An example of this is the Tarija Land Management Plan (POTT), which is an important reference for evaluating the environmental feasibility of public investments. Production models were developed that are undergoing validation and demonstration. These include goat production and pasture management models in Formosa, and the organization of agricultural producers in the Chaco Province. The Argentine environmental education component featured an innovative design and successful execution, with a strong potential for replication. The combination of infrastructural measures to control erosion and sedimentation with micro-irrigation and agroforestry works generated transversal benefits in several rural communities in the Upper Basin.

5.3. *Efficiency* – **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

There was limited monitoring of the execution processes “on the ground” on the part of the implementing agencies of the Project, there were delays in disbursements, and there was a slow pace in execution. The execution of the Project was slow and took almost double the time initially planned. External factors (political changes and the Argentine financial crisis) strongly influenced the performance of the Project, affecting both countries in different ways and at different stages.

The Program Study on IW also noted that there is a need for adopting a system-wide approach for maintaining sediment balances, and a piece-meal approach (as in case of this project) will not work.

5.4. *Sustainability* – **Medium / Significant Risks**

The TE notes four aspects of risks to the project's sustainability and continuity - Financial, Socio-political, Institutional and Environmental. Generally, it was deemed that a little more than a third of the actions supported by the Project achieved continuity. The hasty closing strategy was necessary from an administrative perspective, but affected the consolidation and transfer of several sub-projects in progress. There was no exit strategy which could have given more attention to the consolidation and sustainability of sub-projects already underway, and the sharing of results and experience with the parties involved.

1. Financial Sustainability: Most of the sub-projects executed within the framework of the Bermejo SAP II lack financial sustainability. A proposal (PROBER) was prepared to mobilize funds on a larger scale. COBINABE receives annual allocations from both governments.
2. Socio-political Sustainability: About a third of the actions supported by the SAP achieved continuity. Insufficient attention was given to consolidation and transfer of processes.
3. Institutional Sustainability: Progress was made in consolidating COBINABE as a binational entity of the Basin. An institutional framework was never articulated for Basin-wide integrated management.
4. Environmental Sustainability: The infrastructural works for sediment and erosion control demonstrate good performance. Several of the non-structural measures lack sustainability. The first management plan for a Protected Area in Jujuy was created. The creation of the Upper Bermejo Biosphere Reserve has yet to be approved.

6. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

6.1. *Co-financing*

6.1.1. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by co-financing well integrated into the project?

With co-financing contributing almost 45% the project's overall costs, it was reportedly essential to the achievement of GEF objectives. Within the project design, the estimated co-financing from different sources was distributed across the four components of the project, thus ascertaining the integration of components supported by co-financing into the project.

6.1.2. 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?

Although the TE does not provide accurate figures of the actual co-financing materialized, it roughly mentions $8.78m co-financing generated from the member countries and $30m from the Tarija Perfecture. These figures are much higher than the expected levels of co-financing. Although the impact of higher co-financing is not clearly noted in the TE, it does state that the fundraising successes of the OTNPB is note-worthy, given that it mobilized more than US$ 30 million in co-financing from the Tarija Prefecture, enabling the execution of several sub-projects.

6.2. Delays

6.2.1. 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 TE attributes delays in project implementation to the complex administrative system, with highly intricate disbursement and financial control procedures, requiring actions performed at various levels. The OAS and UNEP used different accounting systems. In addition, the scale of the Bermejo SAP II and the lack of experience on the part of national implementers with the required procedures and forms, contributed to delays in disbursement of funds that affected the Project. Due to payment delays, activities had to be rescheduled for the Biological Corridor sub-project without considering production cycles and seasonal changes.

6.3. Country ownership

6.3.1. 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 TE notes that the countries played an essential role in the design, execution, and management of the Bermejo SAP II.

7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

7.1. *M&E design at entry* – **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

For the project, a Logical Framework was prepared with indicators, and the required reports were specified (QER, QQR, PIRs, final reports). However, the project design did not involve any budgetary allocations for monitoring of projects in progress.

7.2. *M&E implementation* – **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The reporting requirements were met and the annual implementation plans were reviewed. There was also occasional monitoring on the part of the Technical Unit, the OAS, and UNEP, which contributed to the scheduling of activities and budgetary adjustments. However, there was little monitoring of the SAP sub-projects. Also, in most cases there was no evaluation of specific sub-projects. These factors limited the capacity for adaptive management, early

detection of problems, and adjustment of processes, as well as the potential for learning and experience on the part of local actors. Several people involved were unaware of the Mid-Term Evaluation reports, in particular a report (Bewers, 2005) that was never distributed. There was little participation on the part of the Basin actors in M&E activities. This affected the performance of several sub-projects and the Project overall.

8. Assessment of project's Quality of Implementation and Execution

8.1. *Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution* – **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

8.2. *Overall Quality of Implementation* – **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The implementation strategy for the project was properly focused on tackling the root causes of the environmental problems that affect the Basin. The design of the objectives and strategic areas began with a Trans-boundary Environmental Assessment (DAT) and was clearly aimed at the main problems that were identified. There was an attempt at cross-sectional approach between project and components that was innovative. Had it been applied, this would have strengthened the demonstrative value of the Project.

The integrated nature of the SAP was weakened by a Project strategy focused on dispersed sub-projects with few links and little intersectional relevance. As regards the results achieved by the project, most of the sub-projects executed under the Bermejo SAP II achieved their planned outputs. They contributed to local and institutional outcomes. The Bermejo SAP II overall had little impact basin-wide. No progress was made in standardizing institutional and regulatory frameworks to encourage integrated management of the binational basin. This was due to overly ambitious objectives for the period of time given to Project execution. The support from the OAS was important in supporting the execution of the Project during political changes and the financial crisis experienced in Argentina.

The TE notes that the project management capacity was lacking for an initiative of this scale and complexity. There was also felt a need for design of a more proactive monitoring and evaluation system, that would have enabled in improving the project's design and effectiveness. Insufficient resources were allocated to M&E of the sub-projects executed within the framework of the SAP other than the external evaluations.

8.3. *Overall Quality of Execution* - **Moderately unsatisfactory**

The execution strategy for the project was multidimensional, combining interventions at different levels (systemic, institutional, local), and if it had been achieved in full, it would have resulted in a transversal impact with significant demonstrative value.

The financial management of project execution was also marred with several concerns, viz. a complex system requiring coordination of actions on several levels. Administrative delays affected the disbursement of funds to several sub-projects and the overall performance of the Project. In part, this was due to deficiencies in the documentation submitted to request funds,

in addition to the complexity inherent to the management of 29 decentralized sub-projects in two different countries. Some sub-projects did not receive all approved funds.

Given its scale and complexity, execution of the Bermejo SAP II implied a series of administrative and logistical challenges. The Project encountered start-up problems in Argentina, where national capacity for execution was weakened by political changes and a serious financial crisis. The support from the OAS was important in supporting the execution of the Project during political changes and the financial crisis experienced in Argentina.

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1. *Key lessons*

9.2. *Key recommendations*

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

Criteria	Rating	GEF EO Comments
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	**MS**	Although the TE does give a detailed account of the achievement of objectives and results by the project, it falls shy of providing reasons/evidences for failure in achieving some of the project objectives.
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	**MU**	The IA ratings provided for some of the parameters (such as effectiveness, etc.) are inconsistent with the narrative account of the achievements by the project and the evidences provided therein.
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	**MS**	The TE assesses the project's sustainability in detail, along with giving an account of the reasons for short-fall as well. However, as the project lacked any exit strategy, the TE also refrains from making any comments on it.
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	**MU**	The TE makes a note of only one lesson learned from the project's implementation, along with providing the evidence to support its case as well. Providing a more comprehensive account of the lessons learned on various aspects of the project's implementation may have been more useful for referral in the future.
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	**U**	The TE provides no indication of the actual project costs incurred (total and per activity), nor the actual co-financing utilised. At places, it just gives approximate estimates of co-financing materialized for a couple of sources.
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	**MS**	An adequate assessment of the M&E system design and implementation is provided in the TE, with an account of the related evidences as well.

11. Other issues to follow up on

No

12. Sources of information

Field Visit by the Evaluation Office	**By Mr. Aaron Zazuetta**
Telephone Interviews	
Past documents done by the EO	
Other (specify)	

Annex I – Project Impacts as assessed by the GEF Evaluation Office

Did the project have outputs contributing to knowledge being generated or improved?	No

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE BEING GENERATED OR IMPROVED?

The formulation process of the SAP was highly participative. The Regional Advisory Committee could not be created, despite Project attempts. The participation of Basin actors in the execution of the Bermejo SAP II was more concrete in individual sub-projects, but the Project was unable to translate this into a program-wide participatory mechanism.

Is there evidence that the knowledge was used for management/ governance?	NA

HOW WAS THIS KNOWLEDGE USED AND WHAT RESULTED FROM THAT USE?

NA

Did the project have outputs contributing to the development of databases and information-sharing arrangements?

	No

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO INFORMATION BEING COMPILED AND MADE ACCESSIBLE TO MANY?

The TE points out a number of aspects for formulation into a database by the project - the monitoring system, measuring public awareness levels, successful practices, etc. These would have helped in maintaining the continuity of project's activities or results.

Is there evidence that these outputs were used?	NA

TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THESE OUTPUTS BEEN USED?
WHAT HAS RESULTED FROM INFORMATION BEING MADE ACCESSIBLE TO OTHERS?

NA

Did the project have activities that contributed to awareness and knowledge being raised?	Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

One of the four components of the project (Area IV) dealt with "Public Awareness and Participation and Replication of activities". The activities within this component were deemed essential for the project as the Transboundary Environmental Assessment identified the lack of community awareness, commitment, and participation in the management of natural resources, and the lack of mechanisms to support community involvement in management processes as one of the root causes of the environmental problems in the Bermejo River Basin.

Was any ***positive*** change in behavior reported as a result of these activities?	Yes

WHAT BEHAVIOR (POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE) HAS CHANGED AS A RESULT?

The greatest impact in Area IV was in the environmental education programs, especially in the Argentine provinces, where the methodology and execution processes offered successful practices that can be replicated. It is noted in the TE that the perceptions of the individuals interviewed regarding the Argentine environmental education component were highly positive, both in terms of the process and the achieved results.

Did the project activities contribute to building technical/ environmental management skills?	No

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO ***TECHNICAL/ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS*** BEING BUILT OR IMPROVED?

NA

Is there evidence of these skills being applied by people trained?	NA

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

NA

Did the project contribute to the development of legal / policy / regulatory frameworks?	No
Were these adopted?	NA

WHAT LAWS/ POLICIES/ RULES WERE ADOPTED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

The Bermejo SAP II did not manage to standardize the legal and regulatory framework of the Basin due to external factors that were out of the program's scope. Although the project intended to do so, a regulatory framework was not created for Basin-wide use and conservation of natural resources.

Did the project contribute to the development of institutional and administrative systems and structures?	Yes
Were these institutional and administrative systems and structures integrated as permanent structures?	Yes

WHAT OFFICES/ GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES WERE CREATED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

Through the SAP project, the institutional growth and expansion of COBINABE are notable. The Binational Commission was the main beneficiary of the Project, and is now in a stronger position to influence the development of the Basin. The Project contributed to developing the strategic vision of COBINABE, which developed from a "utilitarian" approach centered on the multiple uses of water resources, to a more ecosystem-based approach promoting sustainable development and greater environmental sensitivity. The Project also served as a vehicle for the regional recognition of COBINABE, which grew from an entity associated exclusively with the Upper Basin to a binational entity recognized throughout the entire Basin.

Did the project contribute to structures/ mechanisms/ processes that allowed more stakeholder participation in environmental governance?

Yes

Were improved arrangements for stakeholder engagement integrated as permanent structures?

No

WHAT STRUCTURES/ MECHANISMS/ PROCESSES WERE SUPPORTED BY THE PROJECT THAT ALLOWED MORE STAKEHOLDERS/ SECTORS TO PARTICIPATE IN ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE/ MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES?

The formulation process of the SAP was highly participative. The Regional Advisory Committee could not be created, despite Project attempts. The participation of Basin actors in the execution of the Bermejo SAP II was more concrete in individual sub-projects, but the Project was unable to translate this into a program-wide participatory mechanism.

Did the project contribute to informal processes facilitating trust-building or conflict resolution?

No

WHAT PROCESSES OR MECHANISMS FACILITATED TRUST-BUILDING AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION?
WHAT RESULTED FROM THESE?

In fact, the project suffered from differences between the institutional and regulatory framework of the two countries (and the Argentine provinces), which affected the process of convergence and standardization for development plans.

Did the project contribute to any of the following:		Please specify what was contributed:
Technologies & Approaches	No	
Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies	No	
Financial Mechanisms	No	

Did r**eplication** of the promoted technologies, and economic and financial instruments take place?

UA

SPECIFY WHICH PLACES IMPLEMENTED WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH.
WHAT WAS THE RESULT IN THOSE PLACES (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

The TE states that the Project linked actors and initiatives, supported the recognition of several initiatives and enabled the sourcing of additional resources. It had a catalytic effect on the creation of networks and other binational initiatives, which generated Basin-wide collaborative dynamics. However, no concrete evidence is provided to support the statement.

Did **scaling-up** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place? No

SPECIFY AT WHAT ADMINISTRATIVE & ECOLOGICAL SCALE AND WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS ADOPTED.

HOW WAS IT MODIFIED TO FIT THE NEW SCALE? WHAT WAS THE RESULT AT THE NEW SCALE/S (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

NA

Did **mainstreaming** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place? No

SPECIFY HOW (MEANS/ INSTRUMENT) AND WHICH ASPECTS OF THE TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS INCORPORATED INTO THE EXISTING SYSTEM. WHAT WAS THE RESULT OR STATUS (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

NA

Did r**emoval of market barriers** and sustainable market change take place? No

SPECIFY HOW DEMAND HAS BEEN CREATED FOR WHICH PRODUCTS/ SERVICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO GEBs.

NA

Based on most of the project's components and/or what it generally intended to do, what type of project would you say this is?

Combination *<--dropdown menu*

If "combination", then of which types?

Implementation Strategies & Institutional Capacity (governance) *<--dropdown menu*

*QUANTITATIVE OR ANECDOTAL DETAILS ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **PRESSURE HAS BEEN REDUCED/PREVENTED** OR ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **STATUS HAS CHANGED** AT THE DEMONSTRATION SITES AS A CONTRIBUTION/RESULT OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES. FOR SYSTEM LEVEL CHANGES, SPECIFY THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR ECOLOGICAL SCALES.*

Was stress reduction achieved?					Yes
If so, at what scales?	Please mark 'x' for all that apply				
	x	Local	x	Intended (local)	Unintended (local)
		Systemic		Intended (systemic)	Unintended (systemic)
How was the information obtained?		Measured	x	Anecdotal	

Was there a change in environmental status?					UA
If so, at what scales?	Please mark 'x' for all that apply				
		Local		Intended (local)	Unintended (local)
		Systemic		Intended (systemic)	Unintended (systemic)
How was the information obtained?		Measured		Anecdotal	

Evidence of intended stress reduction achieved at the **local level**

It is noted in the TE that the Bermejo SAP II fully upheld the immediate objective of containing soil degradation and erosion in critical areas of the Basin. This was achieved primarily through infrastructural measures, which were accompanied by non-structural measures, generally of lesser impact. The infrastructural measures implemented in the Upper Basin demonstrated strong performance, with visible and geographically specific effects on sediment transport. However, the limited information available and the difficulties in evaluating erosion processes and sedimentation throughout the Basin make it impossible to quantify the level of reduction in environmental stress and changes in the state of the environment. It is important to mention that the infrastructural measures, although effective, are temporary, and do not offer a permanent solution. These useful investments require maintenance plans and support from non-structural measures, such as appropriate agricultural and forestry practices and community awareness and participation.

Evidence of intended stress reduction at a **systemic level**

NA

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at the **local level**

NA

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at a **systemic level**

NA

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **local level**

NA

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **systemic level**

NA

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place during the project?

Environmental No

Socioeconomic No

To what extent were arrangements in place and being implemented during the project? Briefly describe arrangements.

NA

To what extent did these arrangements use parameters/ indicators to measure changes that are actually related to what the project was trying to achieve?

NA

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place to function after the project?

No

To what extent were arrangements put into place to function after GEF support had ended? Briefly describe arrangements.

In fact, the project lacked any exit strategy which could have given more attention to the consolidation and sustainability of sub-projects already underway, and the sharing of results and experiences with the parties involved.

Was there a government body/ other permanent organization with a clear mandate and budget to monitor environmental and/or socioeconomic status?

No

Has the monitoring data been used for management? NA

How has the data been used for management? Describe mechanisms and actual instances.

NA

Has the data been made accessible to the public? NA

How has the data been made accessible to the public? Describe reporting systems or methods.

NA

"SOCIOECONOMIC" REFERS TO ACCESS TO & USE OF RESOURCES (DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS), LIVELIHOOD, INCOME, FOOD SECURITY, HOME, HEALTH, SAFETY, RELATIONSHIPS, AND OTHER ASPECTS OF HUMAN WELL-BEING .AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, INCLUDE "BEFORE" AND "AFTER" NUMBERS, YEARS WHEN DATA WAS COLLECTED, AND DATA SOURCES.

Did the project contribute to **positive** socioeconomic impacts? UA

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply

☐	Local	☐	Intended (local)	☐	Unintended (local)
☐	Systemic	☐	Intended (systemic)	☐	Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

☐	Measured	☐	Anecdotal

Did the project contribute to **negative** socioeconomic impacts? UA

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply

☐	Local	☐	Intended (local)	☐	Unintended (local)
☐	Systemic	☐	Intended (systemic)	☐	Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

☐	Measured	☐	Anecdotal

Evidence on intended socio-economic impacts at the **local level**

NA

Evidence on intended socio-economic impacts at **systemic level**

NA

Evidence on unintended socio-economic impacts at the **local level**

NA

Evidence on unintended socio-economic impacts at **systemic level**

NA

Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report

With respect to the lessons learned from this project, the TE notes that it is important to provide adequate time for programs of this magnitude. A determining factor limiting performance of the Bermejo SAP II was the disconnect between the time scheduled and the actual time needed for bringing institutional, social and economic processes to fruition. The Project began activities with an unrealistic schedule, and had to deal with successive political changes, financial crises, and other external factors that affected the implementation process. The combination of these factors (plus the hasty closing strategy) resulted in rather superficial implementation and often premature closing of sub-projects. But more importantly, because the initial duration of the Project was relatively short, with many consecutive, short extensions, a longer-term implementation strategy was never developed. The Project kept focusing on the delivery of a large number of dispersed and disconnected sub-projects, rather than on its longer-term, basin-wide integrated management objectives.

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The TE provides a number of recommendations from the project, particularly directed towards the partners of the upcoming PROBER project:
1. It is recommended to schedule a preparatory phase of reflection and strategic planning, before beginning implementation of the PROBER.
2. COBINABE must plan for its institutional recognition within the Basin, in order to consolidate its role as a center for the emerging system of integrated management.
3. UNEP and the OAS can take advantage of this and similar experiences to review the mechanisms and procedures for resource coordination, administration, and disbursement.