

## GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
		<b>Review date:</b>		11/04/08
GEF Project ID:	925		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	1321	<b>GEF financing:</b>	4.025	3.443
Project Name:	Conservation of Montane Forest and Paramo in the Colombian Massif – Phase 1	IA/EA own:		
Country:	Colombia	Government:	1.977	UA
		Other*:	11.489	UA
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	13.466	9.448
Operational Program:	4	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	17.491	12.891 (as of July 2006 in TE)
IA	UNDP	<b>Dates</b>		
Partners involved:	Special Administrative Unit for the System of National Natural Parks (UAESPNN)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		01/18/2003
		Closing Date	Proposed: 09/01/2005	Actual: 12/31/2007
		Prepared by: Ines Angulo	Reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 32 months
Author of TE:	Jhon Charles Donato Rondon & Willem Van Wyngaarden	TE completion date:  Sept 2007	TE submission date to GEF EO:  July 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 10 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
<b>2.1a Project outcomes</b>	S	S	-	S
<b>2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes</b>	N/A	-	-	MU
<b>2.1c Monitoring and evaluation</b>	-	U	-	U
<b>2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution</b>	NA	NA	NA	MS
<b>2.1e Quality of the evaluation report</b>	N/A	N/A	MU	MS

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

No. The TE presents an superficial analysis of the project's design, strategy, systems and mechanisms, and is particularly weak in its assessment of M&E. On the other hand, the TE shows a good general knowledge of Colombian biodiversity issues and it includes relevant and useful recommendations for Phase II of the project.

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

No. Although the project financial coordination was weak, there is no indication of mismanagement or corruption.

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

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

According to the Project Document, the Global Environmental Objective was to conserve the global value of biodiversity in the Colombian Massif and protect its role in regulating water.

There were no changes during implementation.

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

Establish a system of protected areas under different regimes of land use, management categories and forms of tenure,  
 (i) retain the full mosaic of ecoregions and ecosystems that are converging in the Colombian Massif,  
 (ii) provide a regional framework for action conservation and  
 (iii) promote the participation and commitment of indigenous groups and other local, regional and national actors related to biodiversity conservation.

Despite suffering substantial changes in the course of its evolution, in technical, administrative and financial coordination, the project kept its original objectives.

**(describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)**

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)		
<b>If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change</b>					
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 outcomes are relevant to Colombia's sustainable development agenda, particularly considering that the area under protection provides 70% of the country's water and is recognized by the government as a priority area. Project outcomes were also complimentary to programmes like the *Voceros del Macizo* agreement which will improve rural electrification, housing, communication and transportation systems, basic sanitation, and rural employment through support to small business.

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

The 1998-2002 National Development Plan (NDP) highlights the country's commitment to sustainable development and the corresponding natural resource management that this requires. It also outlines the current administration's Environmental Plan (Proyecto Colectivo Ambiental) with three main objectives clustered around the central theme of water conservation. One of these objectives is the conservation of priority areas within strategic ecoregions. As the source of four of Colombia's main rivers, providing 70% of the country's water, and housing rich cultural and biological diversity, the Massif was flagged as a strategic ecoregion.

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

Establishment of Protected Areas in high biodiversity ecoregions is relevant to GEF biodiversity focal area Operational Program (OP) 4, and also OP3 and OP12. It is relevant to the GEF operational strategy BD1 - To catalyze sustainability of protected area (PA) systems.

**(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)**

The project is fully consistent with the CBD and contributed directly to Article 8 on *in situ* conservation, particularly items (a) and (b), by establishing a regional system of protected areas under different ownership and management

categories, as a framework for incorporating conservation in the regional planning processes in an area with outstanding biological and cultural biodiversity.	
<b>A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership<sup>1</sup></b>	
N/A	
<b>b. Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
<p>According to the TE, the project became a valid tool for strengthening the importance of buffer zones, the consolidation of three new protected areas of high diversity, the structuring and recognition of networks of private reserves, the capacity to develop educational campaigns and, in particular, it built a social dynamic around biodiversity conservation and natural resource management of the Colombian Massif. Achievement of results from activities implemented outside protected areas was marginally satisfactory, but this will be the focus of Phase II of the project.</p> <p>Specific achievements for each planned component include:</p> <p>Result 1: The project provided an important support for the management of four existing National Natural Parks.</p> <p>Result 2: Two new PAs were consolidated in the BIOMACIZO project. For the Serranía de los Churumbelos, and despite the Academy's endorsement since 2002, the limits have not been defined due to the superposition of the park on priority areas for exploration and exploitation of hydrocarbons.</p> <p>Result 3: Establishment of coordinated and operational networks of private reserves and indigenous and peasant conservation areas, in four zones that link with four existing parks and the main eco-regions of the Massif.</p> <p>Result 4: The project started, participated in and contributed with a large number of experiences associated with sustainable and conservation-friendly production systems (SSC), and in many cases with other entities, projects and institutions.</p> <p>Result 5: Preliminary proposal for a biodiversity monitoring system in the Colombian Massif.</p> <p>Result 6: A communication strategy for the area has been elaborated and several outreach actions have been implemented.</p> <p>Result 7: 28% of municipalities, 33% of departments and 100% of CARs (Regional Environmental Authorities) adopted development plans that include components for biodiversity conservation, such as local and regional reserves.</p>	
<b>c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</b>	<b>Rating: MS</b>
<p>According to the TE, comparing the achievements with the costs per result, it shows that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The high costs for results 1 and 2 coincide with the positive achievements made.</li> <li>• The very positive achievements made in result 3 are more an indication of civil society efforts than the project.</li> <li>• The low performance in results 4, 6 and 7 is reflected in the grading of the results as marginally satisfactory.</li> <li>• Although there was a significant cost for result 5, not all the outcomes were achieved for this result.</li> <li>• There is no satisfactory explanation for the high cost in coordination.</li> </ul> <p>The TE concludes that the project parts that have a direct relation with the mandate of the executing institution (UAESPNN) show good results and a high cost.</p>	
<b>d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated)</b>	
<p>Although the TE states that the project started, participated in and contributed with a large number of experiences associated with sustainable and conservation-friendly production systems (SSC), it does not provide any information on possible (or actual) tradeoffs resulting from these activities.</p>	

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

The project was designed for the conservation of the biodiversity and the environmental resources and services of the Colombian Massif. According to the TE, even though specific local actions supported the project, this did not develop a global vision of the Massif. On the other hand, activities implemented within the newly consolidated Protected Areas under this project are being continued by the UAESPNN. See annexes for details.

**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.

<sup>1</sup> Please consider for regional and global project only

<sup>2</sup> 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)

<b>a. Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
Activities within the parks have a budget from the National Parks Office. On the other hand, the project did not develop a financial and economic strategy, instruments and mechanisms to ensure sustainability of activities that were carried outside the field of the National Parks Office.	
<b>b. Socio-economic / political</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
The project did not manage to establish a direct and clear communication with the indigenous councils; rather efforts were strained due to the lack of fulfillment of understandings, technical and financial agreements. Furthermore, in the case of Cauca they considered that the project infringed on the autonomy of the indigenous councils, as the specific projects with each council runs, politically, against the integrity of the indigenous unit, and there was no equity in the assigning of funds. Although the TER does not mention this, the 2007PIR identifies the resurgence of violence in the area and the expansion of illegal crops as a moderate risk.	
<b>c. Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
According to the TE, activities carried outside the PAs have little sustainability because of the lack of articulation with other state entities and civil society.	
<b>d. Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
The limits for one of the proposed National Natural Parks have not been defined due to the superposition of the park on priority areas for exploration and exploitation of hydrocarbons.	
<b>e. Technological</b>	<b>Rating:</b>
N/A	

#### 4.3 Catalytic role<sup>3</sup>

<b>a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to catalyze changes in stakeholders</b>
No incentives have been introduced yet. The project started pilot projects to promote alternative cattle-farming practices, and productive systems for potato cultivation in buffer zones but failed to institutionalize this support.
<b>b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities changed institutional behaviors</b>
The project started to promote the incorporation of biodiversity conservation principles within social and institutional planning in the Massif and to coordinate activities of the main programs and stakeholders in conservation in the area. This work needs to be reinforced in Phase II of the project to ensure its sustainability.
<b>c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities led to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?</b>
Results from this project strengthened Colombia's recently adopted conservation strategy that seeks to increase and include more stakeholders in the management of PAs and their ownership. The creation of different types of protected areas (owned by indigenous groups, municipalities and private owners) resulted in increased stakeholder participation. The project's role in consolidating the National System of Protected Areas (SINAP) by including the National System of Parks and the regional, local, private and public reserves under different management categories widened the responsibility of stakeholders in the management of protected areas.
<b>d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project led to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing)</b>
Government has allocated a budget to cover administration and management costs of the newly consolidated National Parks. This will enable the Park Staff to implement the Management Plans and will that these newly protected areas are not just "paper parks" but that they
<b>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)?</b>
The TE does not mention any particular individual or institution that played a catalyzing role in this project.

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

<b>a. Co-financing.</b> To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
The TE notes that several of the original important co-funders have still not made payments (Holland, NRF, NRPF, IDB-IICA, CAM-CDM etc), and this corresponds to a total of US\$ 9.5M. Although the TE team did not make a complete follow-up, they were informed that some of the original co-funders were never contacted by the project for payment of their promised funds. The new co-funders mentioned in the last PIR total US\$ 5.5M. The total payment of co-funders to the date of the TE was US\$ 6.0M, or 45% of the amount foreseen in the PRODOC. This lead the TE team to two conclusions:

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

<p>There was no solid follow-up to project execution by the responsible parties. One of the reasons could be the frequent change in persons occupying positions directly linked to the project, in UNDP, in the National Parks Office (UAESPNN) and in project management.</p> <p>That project execution was mainly focused on the use of GEF funds, and there was no effort to formalize the commitments of co-funders.</p> <p>Neither the TE nor the last PIR provide an explanation on how this differences between planned and actual co-financing affected project implementation.</p>
<p><b>b. Delays.</b> 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?</p> <p>The change in administration and the resignation of the Technical Coordinator at the same time caused delays in project implementation and did not allow project supervision to be carried out efficiently.</p>
<p><b>c. Country Ownership.</b> 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.</p> <p>Country ownership of this project has been high. As a result, the UAESPNN has continued the project activities and has a budget from the National Parks Office.</p>

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

<p><b>a. M&amp;E design at Entry</b> <b>Rating (six point scale): S</b></p> <p>According to the ProDoc, the project's Technical Coordinator, with support and information from four sub-regional assistants, would be in charge of monitoring implementation progress on a weekly or monthly basis depending on each activity and work schedule. He/she would be responsible for preparing periodic reports to be reviewed by the National and Regional Project Directors to ensure that implementation is following planned schedules and directions. At least once a year such reports would be shared with the Steering Committee to provide guidance and strategic advice. These reports would also provide the basis for the general UNDP yearly tripartite evaluations of project performance using indicators presented in the Logical Framework matrix, to measure the quality and impact of project implementation, together with a set of more specific parameters to be developed by the Technical Coordinator with each annual Operation Plan.</p> <p>The ProDoc Logical Framework includes appropriate indicators to measure achievement of project outputs and also appropriately specifies means of verification.</p>
<p><b>b. M&amp;E plan Implementation</b> <b>Rating (six point scale): U</b></p> <p>Implementation of the M&amp;E system was unsatisfactory.</p> <p>When the General Director of UAESPNN changed, the new administration found a significant gap regarding project follow-up and evaluation by UNDP (there was no mid-term review which was planned for in the ProjDoc), as well as the lack of the Steering Committee that is mentioned in the ProDoc (at the end of the project there was only 1 meeting of the Steering Committee in the third year). In addition, the Technical Coordinator changed several times during the duration of the project.</p>
<p><b>b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&amp;E in the budget included in the project document?</b> M&amp;E activities were not specifically budgeted in the ProDoc. Project management was budgeted US\$0.775 million.</p>
<p><b>b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&amp;E during project implementation?</b> According to the TE, US\$0.9 million were spent in project coordination (which theoretically includes M&amp;E activities). The TE states that there is no satisfactory explanation for such a high cost, specially considering that a minimum M&amp;E system was not in place.</p>
<p><b>b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system?</b> The TE does not provide enough information on this issue to make an assessment.</p>
<p><b>b.3 Can the project M&amp;E system (or an aspect of the project M&amp;E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why.</b> No, the project implementation team failed to put the M&amp;E in practice. This was due to a combination of poor coordination between the implementing and executing agencies, and lack of leadership regarding M&amp;E activities.</p>

#### 4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

<p><b>a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): MS</b></p>
<p><b>b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): MU</b></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p>The Project Document is a clear document, well structured and with a good logical framework. According to the TE, the participation of UNDP as the IA consolidated institutional support and generated technical and administrative confidence.</p>

On the other hand, there were operational difficulties between UNDP and UAESPNN that lead to the suspension and reduction in previously agreed budgets, imprecise knowledge about existing funds and those already committed, and administrative and financial weakness in general.

**c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies<sup>4</sup> (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 first 2 years of the project, the TE rated project execution as Unsatisfactory. Changes in strategy and general organization impacted on the technical and administrative core of the project and did not allow an operative control to be carried out efficiently, and led to a certain instability and lack of confidence in some structural pillars of the project. This rating was later changed to Satisfactory due to the changes on technical and administrative leadership from a bottom-up control (many consultants without a hierarchical structure) to a top-down structure which enabled the continuity of processes for cooperation and institutional articulation.

The project parts that had a direct relation with the mandate of the executing institution (UAESPNN) show good results, but achieved with a high cost.

**5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

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

The lessons provided in the TE are just a summary of project results, and do not provide any useful information for other GEF projects.

**b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation**

Recommendations given in the TE mainly relate to Phase II of the project. The TE includes recommendations to follow the achievements of each of the project results, and recommendations for each of the project stakeholders. For example, the TE includes a proposed Basic Structure for a Coordination Team during Phase II.

**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.**

N/A

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.

<b>6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<p><b>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b> Achievement of project objectives and results is assessed in general, but some of the key issues are only analyzed in a superficial manner.</p>	MS
<p><b>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?</b> The TE provides evidence to substantiate its ratings, and includes an annex with achievement of results according to the project Logframe. The main information gap in the TE relates to M&amp;E assessment.</p>	S
<p><b>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> The TE section on sustainability does not provide a complete analysis and fails to mention some important risks that are included in the final PIR of the project. On the other hand, other sections of the TE do include information regarding project sustainability.</p>	MU
<p><b>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b></p>	MS

<sup>4</sup> 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.

Lessons included in the TE do not provide any useful analysis, just a summary of project results. On the other hand, recommendations identify issues that should be tackled during Phase II of the project in a very comprehensive manner.	
<b>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> Yes, the TE provides the planned and actual project costs per activity and per year.	S
<b>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&amp;E systems?</b> The TE does not include a comprehensive assessment of the project M&E systems.	U

**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)**

--