

***Terminal Evaluation for UNDP - GEF Project
Promoting Integrated Ecosystem and Natural Resource
Management in Honduras***

No. 00036832

GEFSEC ID: 1047

PIMS 2223

***GEF Focal Area: Multi-focal (Biodiversity, Climate Change, Soil
Degradation)***

GEF Program: OP 12: Integrated Ecosystem Management

Evaluator: María Onestini

Evaluation Period: August – November 2013

January 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
ii. Executive summary.....	5
• Project summary table.....	5
• Project description.....	6
• Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons.....	7
• Evaluation rating table.....	10
1. Introduction.....	13
• Purpose of the evaluation.....	13
Scope and methodology.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
• Scope of the evaluation.....	14
• Methodology of the evaluation.....	14
• Structure of the evaluation report.....	17
2. Project description and development context.....	18
• Project start and duration.....	18
• Problems that the project sought to address.....	18
• Immediate and development project objectives.....	19
• Main stakeholders.....	21
• Expected results.....	21
3. Findings.....	24
3.1 Project design/formulation.....	24
• Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic / strategy; Indicators)...	24
• Assumptions and Risks.....	26
• Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design.....	27
• Planned stakeholder participation.....	27

•	Replication approach.....	28
•	UNDP comparative advantage	29
•	Management arrangements.....	30
3.2	Project Implementation	31
•	Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation).....	31
•	Partnership arrangements.....	31
•	Project finance.....	32
•	Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation)	33
•	UNDP and implementing partner implementation / execution coordination, and operational issues	35
3.3	Project results.....	36
•	Overall results (attainment of objectives).....	36
•	Relevance.....	38
•	Effectiveness & Efficiency.....	40
•	Contributions to effect level results: Summary	42
•	Country ownership	43
•	Sustainability	44
4.	Conclusions, Recommendations & lessons	47
	Conclusions	47
	Best Practices and Lessons Learned	Error! Bookmark not defined.
	Recommendations	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5.	Anexes	Error! Bookmark not defined.
•	Terms of reference.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
•	Itinerary and Agenda	Error! Bookmark not defined.
•	List of persons interviewed.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
•	List of documents reviewed.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
•	Evaluation Question Matrix	Error! Bookmark not defined.
•	Focus group guide.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
•	Code of Conduct	Error! Bookmark not defined.

- Logical framework, project document.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**
- Logical Framework with changes Reformulated ..**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Acknowledgements

The evaluator would like to thank all those who generously gave their time and provided information during the evaluation. I want to thank Carla Lecaros, Inka Mattila and the UNDP Regional Centre Evaluation Unit as well as Nelson Ulloa, Juan Ferrando and UNDP-Honduras office for their guidance and support to the evaluation process.

ii. Executive summary

- **Project Overview**

Project Title:	Promoting Integrated Ecosystem and Natural Resource Management in Honduras			
GEF Project ID:	1047		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00036832	GEF financing:	4.206.536,00	4 206 536,00
Country:	Honduras	IA/EA own:		
Region:	Sico Paulaya and Texiguat	Government:		
Focal Area:	Multifocal	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	39,364,468.00¹	
Executing Agency:	Secretaria de Agricultura y Ganadería	Total Project Cost:		4 206 536,00
Other Partners involved:	UICN CATIE Fundación Yuscarán Fundación Pantera Fundación Madera Verde Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras Centro de Biodiversidad el Zamorano	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		July 2004
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: February 2010	Actual: June 2013

¹ Please note that there is a large discrepancy between the data overview of the project in terms of planned and final co - financing given under the project. This data is updated in the co-financing table included in section 3.2 Implementation of the draft report.

- **Project description**

Because Honduras has an exceptionally high biodiversity for its size still remain significant carbon stocks in forest areas. At the same time, the country has a highly dependent on the use of natural resources population, directly and indirectly. Therefore, natural resources are under extreme pressure due to deforestation, especially in border areas of wetland agriculture, as a result of extensive livestock farming, speculative land debris clearance, and agriculture (large-scale colonizing small producers). In the arid zone, the resilience of natural resources and ecosystems, as well as its ability to sustain rural livelihoods are threatened by improper management practices for land and water. Reversing these processes is limited by several factors including the highly centralized and sectorial policies; ineffective regulation and inadequate conditions of governance; inadequate consideration of environmental issues in rural development initiatives; and lack of access to information and technical capacity among local stakeholders.

Overall, the project aimed to address various aspects of the problems associated with the lack of integrated management of natural resources in several areas of Honduras. Issues such as existing barriers related to issues of information, technical and organizational issues that impede the effective implementation of integrated ecosystem in the context of rural development management.

- Immediate and development Project objectives

The GEF Project - UNDP Demonstrating Integrated Management of Ecosystems and Watersheds in Honduras (Project No. 00036832) had the goal to promote the generation of global environmental benefits (in the areas of Biodiversity, Land Degradation and Carbon Sequestration) through channeling early ecosystem management in the operations of rural development projects in the country.

The project was originally designed to strengthen the capacity of (funded by the International Fund for Agricultural Development -FIDA--) to incorporate and adopt integrated approaches to management nationwide, National Programme for Local Development (PRONADEL) using lessons practices to be learned through activities in two selected pilot areas. The pilot areas were chosen based on maximizing uptake global environmental values and ensuring the highest potential for replicability, national and sub-regional.

Finally, for reasons unrelated to the project, linking with PRONADEL program was not feasible, therefore responded to this reality with several adaptations. The main reason he froze as IFAD financing for PRONADEL. This freezing of funds had the effect had the effect of stopping all activities PRONADEL and, in turn, not only stop the expected co IFAD financing activities but also what was expected would actually implementing agency. This forced a must and essential to the

project and the expected results reformulation, as explained in the relevant sections in this report.

The intervention areas were the area Sico-Paulaya (APSP) and the area Texíguat (APT). The first was selected in order to reduce threats to the western boundary of the globally important Biosphere Reserve Rio Platano (RBRP) which is World Heritage. The second, located in an arid area of the country is characterized by a migration of the population due to soil degradation.

- **Summary of conclusions, lessons learned, best practices and recommendations**

In general terms, it may indicate that the project has reached a certain extent to meet their goals to achieve multiple environmental benefits by incorporating principles of Integrated Ecosystem and Watershed (MIEC) Management initiatives for productive rural development in Honduras and Central America. It has generated deployment tools whose effects are being collected. It has implemented pilot experiments where effects win - win (win-win) are evident through the provision of basic needs for isolated populations where conditions while conservation and sustainable use of natural resources are generated. Have arisen productive experiences that improve farmers' incomes while at the same time practice for conservation and sustainable use in the forestry sector are generated. Some key points are listed below.

The Ecosystem Project underwent a series of rigorous formulations re-cycle implementation, therefore, from the Project and from the UNDP has made a great effort in adaptive management. Reformulations and revisions have been essential in order to implement the project despite that ninety percent of expected funding was not received, the focus shifted substantially. Capacity building and institutional strengthening have been a good strategy to find effects and / or long-lasting results and strengthen areas of the State seeking the same goals as the Ecosystem Project. The project had a very good liaison between pilot areas - central government

The project generated a number of materials, guidelines and tools for use in the country (and some to Central America) generating capacity in state institutions in municipalities as well as with civil society and beneficiaries. This shows that the project has been effective to a certain level. Overall, the project makes Honduras a number of instruments that have been used in some levels to generate effects and even positive impacts and that have a high potential to replicate and create lasting and sustainable future effects.

Adaptive management is one of the best practices in operational terms Ecosystem Project that has been collected in this evaluation. One lesson learned is that the reformulation and reviews

are essential in reply to monitor projects, and more useful if carried out early in the implementation process, especially when interventions have disabilities and complications. It is recommended that interventions how are you develop early in the implementation process, evaluation and self-evaluation leading to sane reformulations, especially when circumstances indicate that the objectives and results as were indicated in the design stage not being making effective are presented

One of the best practices identified has been the establishment of micro hydropower plants in rural areas. These two pilot projects have multiple benefits (win - win) with the generation of clean energy for isolated and in vulnerable communities. But at the same time creating incentives for maintaining forest cover in the catchment areas of the hydropower plants. This case is an excellent example that when achievements are evident in local interventions and pilot areas, efforts should be to replicate or scale up to a higher successful initiatives and best practices (replication, increased and repeat at different levels and scales).

Another best practice identified was the relationship between the pilot areas and other levels (local, national). Although such projects typically call a broad subject and experience collaboration between the pilot areas and other levels of intervention, this does not occur in all circumstances. This project turned out to be good practice, in part due to the constant intervention at the local level and constant technical support to the pilot areas. Pilot experiences have fueled national processes, for example by generating inputs for biological corridors and demonstrative generating situations that improve the quality of life for residents while effectively apply concepts of integrated ecosystem management.

As for recommendations stress that such projects are best processes, effects, and sustainable multiple benefits to development impacts. It should strengthen this aspect of the draft integrated management of natural resources to include conservation and sustainable use of natural resources with improvements in the living conditions of vulnerable populations.

Despite the achievements and accomplishments of objectives at certain levels, it is evident that the project in its implementation phase has had a myriad of activities that often do not appear to be programmatic. However, considering that the gaps between topics were high and that there was a robust nucleation or thematic axis defined and focused. It would be more fruitful in the future to achieve overall goals and outcomes, the projects are more programmatic in generating products and processes, focusing perhaps in some lines, themes and processes, and not overextend.

In this case, as elsewhere in the country, plans and actions should be taken to promote sustainability of project outcomes at the institutional level, especially considering the institutional weakness and lack of continuity in public policy present in Honduras. It is recommended that

various levels of training , training, and awareness with new leaders and new managers to generate continuity and consolidation processes initiated are applied , generating sustainability, supporting the transfer of public policies , knowledge and training among political transitions .

It is recommended that projects should have fluid exchanges and accompaniments from the regional and global to capture, enhance, and / or enhance opportunities for addressing technical projects. It would be highly desirable for future or present are sharing mechanisms between GEF projects and between projects implemented UNDP field with other relevant interventions cooperation. This beneficiary assimilation of lessons learned and at the same time encourages the exchange and synergies between projects and interventions, enhancing the effect of cooperation in general. The generation of appropriate capabilities and operational and technical support to the implementing agency and the project team would be very useful to avoid learning "on the fly." This would help greatly not only in the implementation of operational aspects but also, and recalling that this is the ultimate utility of projects, improving their outcomes and impacts.

The methodical systematization of knowledge should be an integral part of such projects, in order to generate greater and more lasting results might have been the systematization of knowledge. Processes should be installed early in knowledge management projects to socialize and systematize information practices and tools generated by the Project, rescuing experiences and tools in full, and enable the generation of results and impact on the medium and long term, even after completion of the project as such also by communicating and giving visibility to the achievements of the projects.

When interventions have disabilities and difficult complications should be generated (early in the implementation process) systems and mechanisms for monitoring, evaluation and self- evaluation leading to reformulations senses , especially when circumstances occur that indicate that the objectives and results as they were are indicated in the design stage are not making effective . It also recommends that in the future these aspects of capacity building , institutional strengthening, and implementation of management tools will be strengthened in the GEF / UNDP projects and the institutions and capacity building promotes obtaining long-term results the sustainability of the effects and impacts and replicability .

- **Evaluation Ratings Table**

Table 1 Honduras Rated Ecosystem Project²

Evaluation Ratings	
Monitoring and Evaluation	
Overall quality of M&E	MS
<i>M&E design at entry</i>	MS
<i>M&E Plan Implementation</i>	MU
IA& EA Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	MS
<i>Quality of UNDP Implementation</i>	MS
<i>Quality of Execution - Executing Agency</i>	MS
Assessment of Outcomes	
Overall Project Outcome Rating	S
<i>Relevance</i>	R
<i>Effectiveness</i>	MS
<i>Efficiency</i>	MS
Sustainability	
Overall likelihood of sustainability	ML
<i>Financial resources:</i>	ML
<i>Socio-political</i>	ML
<i>Institutional framework and governance:</i>	ML
<i>Environmental</i>	ML

²² The project name has been abbreviated Ecosystem Project through its development. In this report, this name and the full name are used.

Table 2 Rating scales

<p><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i></p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p>	<p><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p><i>Relevance ratings</i></p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><i>Impact Ratings:</i></p> <p>3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations

SPPA	Sico Paulaya Pilot Area
TPA	Texiguat Pilot Area
CATIE	Centro Agronómico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñanza
CPAP	Country Programme and Action Plan
CPD	Country Programme Document
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
ICF	Forestry Conservation Institute
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IME	Integrated Management of Ecosystems
IMEW	Integrated Management of Ecosystems and Watersheds
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
PRONADEL	Programa Nacional para el Desarrollo Local
PRONADERS	Programa Nacional de Desarrollo Rural Sostenible
SAG	Secretaría de Agricultura y Ganadería
SERNA	Secretaría de Recursos Naturales y Ambiente
UICN	Unión Internacional para la Conservación de la Naturaleza
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework

1. Introduction

• Purpose of the evaluation

Evaluations of UNDP projects funded by GEF have multiple purposes, often complementary, such as:

- promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose the scope of the project achievements,
- synthesize lessons that may help improve the selection, design and implementation of future activities funded by UNDP GEF,
- provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the portfolio of UNDP and in need of care , and provide input on possible improvements regarding previously identified issues
- contribute to the overall evaluation of the results in achieving the GEF strategic objectives aimed toward a global environmental benefit,
- measuring the convergence project with other priorities within the UNDP country program , including poverty alleviation , reduction of disaster risk and vulnerability, as cross-cutting issues such as women's empowerment and support human rights.

The key issues addressed in this project include evaluation of its design; the process and implementation approach and its implementation, products and their potential impact to date; the quality of products produced; used indicators of various kinds; financing; lessons learned, and current results of the project. For the latter, roughly following criteria of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency. The evaluation also looked at issues related to national ownership of the project, project communication, participation of key stakeholders, financial, monitoring and sustainability.

More specifically relevant to the project key issues addressed Demonstrating Integrated Management of Ecosystems and Watersheds in Honduras (whose name is abbreviated as Ecosystem Project) were the changes in institutional contexts that occurred during implementation and how those affected the opportunity to achieve the objectives the project and its results. The objectives of this evaluation process are several. First, it is understood that this exercise serves a mandate to have an independent external evaluation of the project results. The overall objective is that ensures an independent evaluation appreciate and document the impacts (positive and negative, intended or unintended) results of products developed as part of this project.

Also, it is considered as an additional objective assessment has to be a significant other evaluation exercises planned in the near future input. Especially considering that this exercise can

be helpful to identify the contribution of the Project Assessment Area Effect Environment UNDP planned to take place in the near future, as well as a useful model for other areas of exercise and UNDP System of the United Nations (at national, regional and global levels) involved in the projects of the Department of Environment.

This final evaluation was performed according to the models, standards and procedures established by UNDP and GEF, especially as set forth in the Guide for the Evaluation of UNDP GEF-Financed Projects, and additional documents. Finally, this review of the project, like others, must be an integral part of policy monitoring and evaluation of UNDP / GEF projects. As such, it includes explicit goals, monitor and evaluate results, such as products, and impacts; provide a basis for future improvements and changes, feedback and disseminate information on lessons learned in developing the project, among others.

Evaluation Approach

The perspective of this evaluation followed the general approach and method developed for the final evaluations of projects supported by UNDP and funded by the GEF. The evaluation, therefore, be framed using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact, as defined and explained in the guide for final evaluations of the projects supported by UNDP and funded by the GEF.

Additionally, according to the instruction in the Terms of Reference of this process, a brief report will be held Annex valuing the contributions of the results of this project to Outcome 5 Country Program of the Office of UNDP Honduras (CPAP) 2007-2011 and Effect 3 Country Programme (CPD) 2012-2016. Specifically, it is expected to assess the contribution of UNDP to changes in behaviors, practices and / or institutional performance of actors responding to that effect.

- **Scope of Assessment**

The scope of this evaluation follow the guidelines defined for terminal evaluations of the projects supported by UNDP and the GEF. Will be evaluated according to the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact. The project implementation period was from June 2004 to September 2013 Geographical coverage regarding pilot areas have been the Sico Paulaya Pilot Area (SPPA) and Area Texiguat (TPA). This evaluation comprehends the entire period of project implementation.

- **Evaluation Methodology**

Following the above perspectives, several data collection tools for analyzing information from the principles and guidelines established in the Guide for final evaluations of the projects

supported by UNDP and GEF-funded and surrounding documents were used . Also, the evaluation exercise was addressed participatory, with a broad involvement of different actors in Honduras UNDP and other relevant project (governmental and nongovernmental) actors. Different actors have been members of the areas of State directly and indirectly involved in the project, project staff, direct beneficiaries, and academics. Located in annexes listing of persons interviewed.

Searched the methodologies implemented through specific tools feed into each other. Also, through the combination of methods used feedback between the various tools and validation between different levels and types of data collection was sought. This aggregation method also allows triangulate information, and thus ensure the validity of the data that will lead to the evaluation process. First, an evaluation matrix was developed (see Table 1). This tool allowed, from the pre - established criteria, grouped and displayed the evaluation questions, specific sub - questions, and information data sources and methods and tools for data collection. This tool was used to collect and systematize information (including fieldwork and visits to the pilot areas of the project).

On specific methodologies for collecting evaluation evidence, the following tools were used (included in appendices the various tools used):

- *Document analysis. Analysis of project documents and publications that originated in the project (research publications, media, etc.). Also, country program documents for contribution purposes are discussed. The list of documents reviewed is attached in annexes.*
- *Key informant interviews: series of open and semi open made to key people involved directly and indirectly with the project to implement in-depth interviews questions. The key players (stakeholders) are spelled as Honduras and UNDP staff , strategic partners of civil society / NGOs / beneficiaries , government actors , local actors groups , among others. The interviews were face during the mission in Tegucigalpa and in the two pilot areas of intervention. The list of people interviewed is annexed, including key partners and key stakeholders contacted.³*
- *Focus groups: a focus group was implemented with project beneficiaries where a series of open and semi-open questions related directly and indirectly to the GEF Project keys were made - UNDP Demonstrating Integrated Ecosystem and Watershed Management in*

Honduras, to implement in-depth interviews, but unlike the previous point with group methodologies. The Focus Group Guide is annexed.

- *Direct Observation / Field Visit: Field visits were developed to areas of implementation of pilot project was conducted where direct observation undertaken by the project intervention areas in the territory. Sico - Paulaya Pilot Area (SPPA) and the Texíguat pilot area (TPA): a two intervention areas visits were made.*
- *Limitations: The limitations are the features provided in this type of evaluation exercise (such as limited time). Also, because of the long process that led the design and implementation of the project, this delay introduced some methodological limitations (such as difficulties in accessing information, or access to interviewees who contributed to the project in its early stages). The project has no explicit theory of change before the project formulation. Therefore, this limitation was overcome by analyzing inputs inductively understood that logic was cup. In general, in addition, this set of constraints is largely franquearon triangulation of information and analysis of documents relating to the early stages of the Project.⁴*

Within assessments GEF (GEF) projects a number of qualifications are promoted (in relation to issues such as monitoring and evaluation, implementation, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, etc.). This assessment, therefore, assigned ratings to the criteria designated by the GEF. It is also required that the evaluation assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the scope of financing planned and performed, which is located in a scheme in relation to finance.

Conducted a mission in Honduras between 16 and 26 September, where the methodologies listed above were implemented to collect information. The mission took place in

⁴ The problem analysis is stated in the Project Document as "i) the problem to be solved. Honduras has an exceptionally high biodiversity for its size, significant carbon stocks in forest areas that still exist and a population that is highly dependent on the use of natural resources. Biodiversity and carbon stocks are under extreme pressure due to deforestation, especially in border areas of wetland agriculture, as a result of extensive livestock, speculative land debris clearance and colonialist smallholder agriculture. The flexibility of natural resources and ecosystems and their ability to sustain rural livelihoods are threatened by inappropriate management of land and water, especially in the arid zone. Reverse these processes is hampered by several factors including sector-based policies and centralized policies; the ineffective regulation and inadequate conditions of governance; inadequate consideration of environmental issues in rural development initiatives; and lack of access to information and the technical capacity among local stakeholders. "

Tegucigalpa as well as in Sico Paulaya Pilot Area (SPPA) and Texiguat Pilot Area (TPA). The mission concluded with a meeting where the first findings of this evaluation are presented.

- **Structure of the evaluation report**

This evaluation report is structured primarily with introductions and exposed (aims, methodology, etc.). Then the concept and design of the project aiming to establish the problems and strengths of these stages and as a basis for evaluating the lessons learned. Then assess, among other things, the type of project implementation, including relevant aspects of the involvement of implementing institutions, financial planning and routing. This report continues with a review of the project's success in achieving goals and results. Finally after these findings, the report goes into a purposeful future treatment in relation to Ecosystem Project, including an analysis of lessons learned and corrective action proposals and strengthening future similar project. Valuations are included as indicated scales. Moreover, an appreciation of contributions to the results at the outcome level is included.

2. Project Description and development context

- **Onset and duration of project**

The signing of the project document (i.e., the starting date) was in July 2004. The period of execution and project duration was from July 2004 to September 2013.⁵

- **Problems that the project sought to address**

Problems that the project sought to address were multiple. Because Honduras has an exceptionally high biodiversity for its size still remain significant carbon stocks in forest areas. At the same time, the country has a highly dependent on the use of natural resources population, directly and indirectly. Therefore, natural resources are under extreme pressure due to deforestation, especially in border areas of wetland agriculture, as a result of extensive livestock farming, speculative land debris clearance, and agriculture (large-scale colonizing small producers). In the arid zone, the resilience of natural resources and ecosystems, as well as its ability to sustain rural livelihoods are threatened by improper management practices for land and water.

Reversing these processes is limited by several factors including the highly centralized and sectorial policies ; ineffective regulation and inadequate conditions of governance; inadequate consideration of environmental issues in rural development initiatives ; and lack of access to information and technical capacity among local stakeholders.⁶

Other specific problems and their causes that the project sought to address the analysis down to the territories where he worked local level interventions are identified. Identified for example in the Sico - Paulaya Pilot Area (SPPA) was crucial to reduce the threats to the western boundary of Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (RPBR), declared a UNESCO World Heritage. The second area of local intervention, Texíguat Pilot Area (TPA) which is located in the arid area south of the country is characterized by a dynamic emigration of the population largely associable to the degradation and a high level of repeated failures due livelihood programs. In this area it sought the Ecosystem Project would generate learning through demonstration on how interventions which can address the degradation in a productive area where thousands of poor farmers seek a livelihood. This area also has endemic species in agro ecosystems area and therefore provides a

⁵ Originally it was planned for the project to last until 2012; an extension of one year was necessary. The revisions that took place are described in the text of this report.

⁶ www.pnud.hn

space where demonstratively important processes could be addressed by incorporating issues of sustainable use of biodiversity in agro ecosystems.

Overall, therefore, the project aimed to address various aspects of the problems associated with the lack of integrated management of natural resources in several areas of Honduras. Issues such as existing barriers related to issues of information, technical and organizational issues that impede the effective implementation of integrated ecosystem in the context of rural development management.

- **Immediate and development objectives of the project**

The GEF Project - UNDP Demonstrating Integrated Management of Ecosystems and Watersheds in Honduras (Project No. 00036832) had the goal to promote the generation of global environmental benefits (in the areas of Biodiversity, Land Degradation and Carbon Sequestration) through channeling early ecosystem management in the operations of rural development projects in the country.

The project was originally designed to strengthen the capacity of (funded by the International Fund for Agricultural Development -IFAD-) to incorporate and adopt integrated approaches to management nationwide, National Programme for Local Development (PRONADEL) using lessons practices to be learned through activities in two selected pilot areas. The pilot areas were chosen based on maximizing uptake global environmental values and ensuring the highest potential for replicability, national and sub -regional.

Finally, for reasons unrelated to the project, linking with PRONADEL program was not feasible, therefore responded to this reality with several adaptations. The main reason he froze as IFAD financing for PRONADEL. This freezing of funds had the effect had the effect of stopping all activities PRONADEL and , in turn , not only stop the expected co IFAD financing activities but also what was expected would actually implementing agency . This forced a must and essential to the project and the expected results reformulation, as explained in the relevant sections in this report.

The intervention areas were the Sico - Paulaya Pilot Area (SPPA) and the Texíguat Pilot Area (TPA). The first was selected in order to reduce threats to the western boundary of the globally important Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (RPBR) which is a World Heritage. The second, located in an arid area of the country is characterized by a migration of the population due to soil degradation. It is considered that the selection of these areas allow learning and establishment of demonstration in order to address issues related to land degradation in productive areas and subsistence areas. Therefore, it would have greater importance in the context of the Project.

The project, in its design, proposed various levels of intervention related. These were,

1. A level 1 pilot areas where it was intended to generate activities and products whose effect would be to remove barriers to information, technical and organizational issues that impede the effective implementation of integrated ecosystem management (IEM), providing demonstrations validated IEM and also achieving significant benefits in global environmental conservation values;
2. PRONADEL project level, providing general advice and training to ensure the adoption and use of the principles of integrated ecosystem nationwide operations management ;
3. At program level, promoting the replication of lessons learned and incorporating environmental considerations into rural development projects through the National Program for Sustainable Development (PRONADERS);
4. A national Ministerial level, supporting lobbying for the creation of a favorable policy environment and the incorporation of integrated management and national conservation standards, and ;
5. Central regional level, providing capacity building and disseminating lessons learned from this project to governments, donors and rural development projects in the region.

Also, you realize that the project is in the framework of UNDP, specifically based on the effect on the working area of Environment and Energy. That is, specifically , the intervention is part of the portfolio of the Environment Unit , UNDP Energy and Honduras are expected to contribute to Outcome 3.2 Country Programme 2012-2016 "The Government of Honduras , private sector and communities in the target areas , adopt good management practices ecosystems, solid waste management , mitigation and adaptation to climate change that allow the preservation of natural capital , reducing economic losses and income generation opportunities for the sectors vulnerable " and UNDAF Outcome 5 " the Honduran government has the capacity to reduce vulnerability of the population through the implementation of policies for the environment and risk management . "

According to project documents, it consisted in the design of the main strategies listed below:

1. Considerations for multiple global benefits achieved using principles of Integrated Ecosystem Management (IEM) successfully introduced in national

procedures and operations PRONADEL and effectively producing the expected results.

2. Approach to integrate the principles of IEM in PRONADEL operations, successfully demonstrated and validated to yield multiple global environmental benefits in two pilot areas.
3. Experiences learned in pilot areas and captured, documented and successfully disseminated to a wide audience of funding agencies involved in development and conservation in Honduras and throughout Central America project.

However, it should be noted early in this report since its inception to its final implementation phase this project suffered various alterations. In this sense we can outline that there were three reformulations of the logical framework, changes in indicators, reduction in pilot intervention, changes in deployment strategies, ups and downs in that administrative areas of government would implement the project, changes in agency areas and implementing institutions, and a significant reduction of ninety percent of funding expected at design time and project approval. Although the project is set out in several documents in the manner indicated above, the realities of their restatements and their implementation were others. These changes had various causes, which we will deal in the relevant parts of this report.

- **Key Stakeholders**

Key stakeholders of Ecosystem Research those directly involved have been several. Mainly, various agencies of the National Government of Honduras relevant issues involved in the project, essentially the Forest Conservation Institute (ICF) and to some extent the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (SERNA). Organizations including civil society in various aspects have been international non - governmental organizations with activities in the country (e.g., IUCN, Panthera Foundation, Green Wood Foundation); organizations Honduran civil society (such as the Foundation they will look), and academia (e.g., Zamorano University). Other government agencies involved were the municipalities in the pilot areas. Also, the project has involved temporary or partial to various other actors in various types of activities (consulting, etc.), such as academics, private consultants, among other forms. Finally, several communities and actors have been direct beneficiaries of project interventions.

- **Expected Results**

The project's expected results, records of inception and design thereof, results were as follows:

Output 1.1: Environmental considerations, including mechanisms for environmental evaluation, monitoring and mitigation, mainstreamed into PRONADEL financed rural development operations, and fine-tuned over time with lessons learnt from pilot studies. As a result of support by the Project in training, technical advice, the development and application of environmental mechanisms and the dissemination of lessons learnt in the pilot areas, PRONADEL will have modified its activities in such a way as to reduce the risk of negative impacts on global environmental values across the whole of its area of influence.

Output 2.1: Application of cross-sectorial and participatory planning for IEM in the two pilot areas. Through the support of participatory processes of context analysis and of the participatory development of natural resource management plans, the Project will help to ensure that natural resources in the pilot areas are managed in a durable and equitable manner which takes into account both local needs and global environmental values.

Output 2.2: Inclusion of considerations of IEM in the policy formulation and lobbying processes of key national institutions, with mandates in resource management and rural development, has led to modifications in legislation, policies, regulations and economic incentives which promote global environmental benefits in the pilot areas. The Project will provide training and information support to key institutions and also facilitate and support processes of analysis and advocacy at local level.

Output 2.3: Demonstration projects in alternative productive and land-use practices established in the pilot areas providing critical information for the application of IEM. The Project will set up a fund to support projects which will contribute to global environmental benefits in the pilot areas and at the same time have demonstration value at a wider level.

Output 2.4: Key institutions in pilot areas have increased awareness in, and capacity for applying and enforcing IEM. The Project will provide training, information and equipment support to key institutions active in the provision of technical support to local communities and in the enforcement of environmental regulations, and will support applied research.

Output 2.5: Local stakeholders in the pilot areas have increased awareness in, and capacity for applying IEM and alternative land use practices. The Project will provide technical, organizational and marketing assistance to local stakeholders and their organizations to help them undertake sustainable management of natural resources.

Output 3.1: Lessons learnt at pilot area and project level recorded and disseminated to stakeholders in conservation and rural development throughout Central America. The Project will support forums, seminars, bulletins, email listings, website postings and reciprocal exchange visits involving key players at national and regional levels.

Output 3.2: Key government institutions (SAG -UPEG and DINADERS- and SERNA) have increased awareness and capacity for applying integrated approaches to conservation and rural development. The Project will provide advice, training and information support to these key institutions. During part of the Project Coordinator will be based in DINADERS to ensure the effectiveness of this support.

Yet here also highlighted that since its inception to its final implementation phase this project endured various alterations. Although the project is set out in several documents in the manner indicated above, the realities of their restatements and their implementation were others. These changes had various causes and subsequent effects, including products and processes generated, which will deal with the relevant parts of this report.

3. Findings

3.1 Project design and formulation

- **Logical Framework Analysis and Results Framework (logic and strategy of the project; indicators)**

The Logical Framework is a key tool of projects. Not only usable to guide the implementation according to the intervention logic, indicators and assumptions / risks, but also to guide the monitoring and evaluation and adaptive management through the project cycle.

In the context of this project is understood to have been several logical frameworks according to the various stages that the project suffered. First, there was the logical framework as part of the project design, that is, as is reflected in the Project Document. A second logical framework was the result of a detailed review conducted at the beginning of the implementation phase. The purpose of this exercise was to examine reformulation how the project might best contend with the lack of the lead partner of the project provided the PRONADEL. As understood, also, at this stage of review, we decided that was not necessary a substantive modification of the expected outputs and outcomes, as well as other factors contained in the logical framework and so only had to identify another (s) partner (s) that could save the ill-fated relationship with PRONADEL.⁷

Finally, a new review of the logical framework took place following the recommendations submitted by the midterm evaluation. This is in annexes (Logical Framework Recommendation Restated by MTE).

This new revision adjusts its premises to be more in tune with reality after the project could not be implemented with the proposed principal partner. It also adopts some of the adaptations suggested in the evolution of average. Briefly, in terms of objectives / expected results, the logical framework in its third version for this project is outlined below.

⁷ These and other valuations of the early stages of Ecosystems Project was largely based on the report of the mid-term, "Independent Mid-Term Evaluation of the UNDP / GEF Project Promoting integrated ecosystem and natural resource management in Honduras (Promoting Integrated Ecosystem and Natural Resource Management in Honduras) HON / 03 / G31 (PIMS 2223) - Mid-Term Evaluation Prepared for the Global Environment Facility (GEF) thru the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), "author Virginia Ravndal.

Since the project underwent several stages whose information is not readily available, and because the midterm evaluation if covered these early stages, has decided to follow and reflect here the conclusions of this assessment when relevant, spiked by findings this assessment if any.

Development Objective: Multiple global environmental benefits are achieved through mainstreaming of Integrated Ecosystem Management (IEM) principles into productive rural development projects in Honduras and Central America

Objective: Multiple global environmental benefits have been achieved in the area of influence of PRONADEL following the successful demonstration, validation and dissemination of experiences of this approach attained in two pilots areas

Output 1: Considerations to achieve multiple global environmental benefits using IEM principles have been successfully mainstreamed into national procedures and operations and are effectively producing the expected results.

Output 2. The approach to integrate IEM principles has been successfully demonstrated and validated to yield multiple global environmental benefits in two pilot areas

Output 3: The experiences learned at pilot area and project level have been captured and documented and have been successfully disseminated to a wide audience of funding agencies involved in development and conservation activities, both in Honduras and throughout Central America.

Regarding indicated above, and other similar topics incorporated into the Third Ecosystem Project logical framework, one can evaluate the latter version represents a marked improvement in the original logical framework. The revised with changes highlighted in the Logical Framework is a matrix in annexes. This version is more suited to the prevailing realities, mainly because the project was not within the sphere of work PRONADEL, and further emphasize activities, outputs and outcomes that engage the conservation and use of natural resources rural development.

Despite this, the logical framework structured re still presents some problems. As was indicated in the midterm evaluation, this does not this per logical framework should I be but as it is stated that this type of tool for GEF projects must have certain concepts embodied by mandate, but in practice are difficult or impossible to implement. For example, the use of broad language and not clearly defined, such phrases as "integrated ecosystem and watershed management", "global environmental benefits" are very broad, not exhaustive concepts, not operationalized. Therefore, projects should try to interpret and apply these broad concepts without an adequate set of guidelines to operational or notions.

Within the frame of the logical framework, performance and impact indicators for project implementation are introduced, together with the corresponding means of verification. With regard to indicators, these improved substantially since its conceptualization in the first to the third logical framework. In the annexes are amended log frame indicators reformulated. Adhering

to the notion that the indicators used in GEF projects should be SMART (for its acronym in English). This is that indicators should be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound.⁸

- **Assumptions and risks**

Risk analysis and assumptions on an assessment of this kind is an appreciation of the factors (called assumptions in the logical framework) that affect or may affect the achievement of the objectives of an intervention. It seeks to develop an assessment of the assumptions and risks identified in the project design, whether logical and coherent, and have helped to identify activities and planned results or not.

In giving a brief look at the first inception and the first logical frameworks are considered to assumptions, assumptions and risks in the design stage is underestimated. Even during the early reformulation processes after the start of the project, continuity PRONADEL as institutional counterpart is supposed as already recognized not only that this assumption was sub estimated but also other nearby, assumptions such as the commitment of the institution to the concepts of conservation, sustainable use of natural resources and environmental management; financing and resource allocation - or adequate levels of co would be provided.⁹

The third reformulation of the logical framework presents more consistent with the reality of the political and administrative contexts assumptions, as well as co - financing. For example, as indicated course maintaining levels of engagement between agencies and local government funding, or keeping commitments with key project partners.

⁸ Smart:

S Specific: the results must use the language of change: they must describe a specific future condition.

M Measurable: Results, whether quantitative or qualitative, must have measurable indicators to make it possible to assess whether they are met or not.

A Affordable: the results should be available model can achieve partners.

R Relevant: The results should contribute to selected priorities of the national development framework.

T time restraint: the results are never permanent. There must be provided to achieve the results date.

⁹ It is necessary to recall that a funding of US \$ 40 million expected with a strong component by IFAD never happened.

Future projects would benefit from a review of the logical framework of projects funded by the GEF and implemented by UNDP. This review could review issues relevant to definitions of principles, indicators and means of verification, among others.

- **Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into the project design and linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector**

Little assimilation of lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into the project design is very evident. They also many synergistic dynamics between the Ecosystem Project and other GEF projects in Honduras or in the region in similar topics and / or areas of overlapping or similar intervention occurred. Only some very specific matches are relieved. Although some previous and contemporaneous to Ecosystem Project interventions mentioned in the Project Document, synergies with these did not materialize in punctuated form there.

- **Planned stakeholder participation**

The involvement of stakeholders was dissimilar in what can be considered the design stage and the two stages of implementation of this project. As stated in the assessment report average, as it was found in the current year, the participation of stakeholders and potential stakeholders in the design stage was very slight, almost nil. For example, neither the strategic partners (including academia or civil society organizations and producer associations) participated in the design. The design and subsequent implementation of the project would have benefited if only there had been consultations with key stakeholders (e.g. academics, producers).

With regard to the two stages of implementation (ie, before and after the redesign of the project that took place in large part because of the management response to the evaluation of the average), participation was dissimilar. In the first stage there is not really a broad and planned participation by different actors, special non-governmental actors. The players invited to the second stage of the project was actually stage where most processes were implemented and generated most products, did not participate in the first stage of it.¹⁰ Those who somehow had a hand in the first stage considered frustrating because at this stage no significant generation of products or processes are evident.

In the second stage, post midterm evaluation, it has been shown that was carried out a process of stakeholder involvement in the Ecosystem Project, an interaction at different levels. There was interaction with academia, NGOs (at national and municipal level) and also direct beneficiaries of the project.

¹⁰ View midterm evaluation of the project.

- **Repeat approach**

In the context of GEF projects / GEF approach repeat or catalytic effect is defined as lessons and experiences resulting from the project and that are repeated or applied in the design and implementation of other projects. This concept is understood, the extent to which the project stated:

1. *production of a public good: the lowest level of the catalytic results, including, for example, the development of new technologies and approaches;*
2. *manifestation / demonstration: measures were taken to promote the public good, for example, through the development of demonstration sites, successful dissemination of information and training;*
3. *repetition activities, demonstrations and techniques are repeated within or outside the project, nationally or internationally, and;*
4. *Increase: approaches developed through the project are used in a regional / national level and are widely accepted and perhaps required by law.*¹¹

The project has had some catalytic effects due to the focus that has been given to some activities, products and processes. For example, there was knowledge transfer and exchange of information at regional and global level through the dissemination of the National Conservation Plan Jaguar (*Panthera onca*) and the National Conservation Plan Danto (tapir).¹² That is, through the dissemination of tools and lessons through project result documents, and exchange of information on national and regional, and international levels, with this example and the like. Some of these presentations have been the framework for agreements with civil society organizations for the management of target species.¹³

Notwithstanding the above, it is worth noting that the project has a high potential catalytic effect if it should occur follow the activities, achievements, and impacts already generated. For example, through the expansion of demonstration projects, such as those carried out by the establishment of micro hydropower plants in rural areas.

¹¹ Definitions given in the manual "GUIDE TO MAKE FINAL PROJECT SUPPORTED AND FUNDED UNDP GEF EVALUATIONS" UNDP Evaluation Office.

¹² The latter being presented at the V International Symposium on Tapir in Malaysia.

¹³ For example, during the presentation mentioned in Malaysia, the Government of Honduras signed an agreement for the conservation of danto with IUCN organization.

The project generated a number of tools of great importance for the country in terms of the integrated management of natural resources. However, these are scattered in a number of documents without clear nucleation. For example, the generated tools treated with themes ranging from bird monitoring to power generation in micro hydroelectric projects. This assessment is not intended to indicate which of the many issues under discussion is more valuable or more important than another. However, considering that the dispersion between topics was high and that there was a robust nucleation or thematic area well defined.

Also, the project lacked a process of systematization of knowledge I generated more durable impacts or effects as obtained and replicable. Especially considering all the various topics covered tools.

- **Comparative advantage of UNDP**

Occurring on the comparative advantage of UNDP projects funded by the GEF is its specificity as an agency. For the GEF, UNDP's comparative advantage lies explicitly in its global network of country offices, experience in integrated development policies, human resource development, institutional strengthening, and their aspiration for community participation and sectors not -governmental in its projects and programs. Since GEF is understood that the comparative advantage also lies in UNDP promotes activities compatible with its own mandate and national sustainable development plans.

It is also understood that the main strength of the association UNDP - GEF should be at various levels. First, a country office level, providing direct support to projects at local and national level support. Second, at the regional level, with the support of specialized technical advisors to prop up the country offices with thematic expertise and capabilities. Finally, global technical advisors capable of providing advanced technical knowledge, anticipating emerging trends. Therefore, the emphasis is not only on programmatic aspects but also in technical and comprehensive vision of development with environmental aspects subject.

Indeed, in the Ecosystem Project has had some comparative advantage of UNDP, particularly in relation to the thematic accompaniment nationwide. Furthermore, with the ongoing effort to implement the project with the main objective look¹⁴, a comparative advantage is evident over other environmental provisions in the context of development that could have prevailed without the impetus of UNDP. Also, from the UNDP connections were generated out of Honduras to generate capacity issues in the country did not have capabilities. Although the

¹⁴ Recalling that the aim of the project was "to promote the generation of global environmental benefits . . . through channeling early integrated ecosystem management in operations of rural development projects in the country."

intervention suffered several changes of project officers from UNDP comparative advantage from a technical point of view and theme persisted and remained beyond the high turnover.

From the regional level, the project received support in its infancy in the theme and program implementation in the various formulations re bore the Project. This support is instrumented through technical guidance and specific recommendations for reformulation and refinement of indicators, based lines and goals, as well as the reformulation and adjustment of various products of the logical framework. In addition, the GEF's regional office for Latin America has made specific recommendations provided as part of the annual project progress reports (PIRS) and review of annual operating plans.

However, from the various stakeholders in the country directly involved in the project, indicates that the intervention might have received fluid exchanges and accompaniments from the regional and global to capture, enhance, and / or enhance opportunities for addressing technical projects. This would include instances generate and strengthen exchange and training for project coordinators.

- **Administrative Provisions**

The management arrangements varied widely through the project cycle. First, the project was of nationally implementation having as implementing agency the Secretary of Agriculture and Livestock (SAG) of Honduras. Then, the organizational structure changed to also include the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (SERNA) as the focal point and the project came to be attached to the Forest Conservation Institute (ICF).

These changes in some way reflect the changing orientation of the project going from a purely rural focus - Agricultural incorporate other themes to promote integrated ecosystem and natural resource management. However, these changes infringe on the continuity and effectiveness of the project. These alterations were largely justified by the radical change that took the project once it was determined that neither the IFAD funded the same and that neither the PRONADEL be involved (as stated in other relevant sections of the draft). These changes are detailed in the logical framework matrix reformulated in annexes. This obviously slowed the project continues until the new formulations were not fully incorporated into the implementation process.

There were also several administrative changes. For example, staff turnover three project coordinators, project officer's rotation, changes in management, etc., which somehow also affected continuity processes implementation.

3.2 Project Implementation

- **Adaptive management and feedback from M & E activities used for adaptive management**

Adaptive management refers to changes in project design and results of the project during implementation. The evaluation was realized that substantive changes in this project in many aspects, objectives and mode of execution.

Adaptive management shown by the project has been high, and the project stands as a good example of adaptive management, particularly in its later stages. This is in large part to follow and consider the analysis of the midterm evaluation and recommendations. Had there not been a reformulation after the midterm evaluation, and if there is no following her adaptive management, the project would probably not achieve the objectives, outputs and outcomes it has achieved to date. As one of the axes of adaptation of Ecosystem Management Project, you can highlight the second reformulation of the logical framework matrix, which behaved greater focus and understanding vis-a-vis the project.

As mentioned in the report of the mid-term evaluation, however, despite the profound reformulation project documents after that, websites where relevant information is housed, and other materials that give visibility to the project continued, referring to the objectives, partners, etc., which were no longer valid. For example, without going any further, the PIR 2013 still refers to members who should have been part of the project and related issues more or less as a fait accompli. Project documents and products that arise as part of the project Ecosystem did not reflect fully the new contexts in his final implementation stage, and indeed where the most work was carried out. Therefore, not only multiple documents do not reflect the real situation of the project, they also reported and neither gave visibility to the facts and realistically achievements.

Also, note that adaptive management is said to strengthening field activities in both the pilot and the adaptation to changing conditions external to the project (such as changes in government or changes in the administrative structure of the state areas Honduran government regarding national structures for the sustainable management of natural resources).

- **Partnership Agreements**

The project, particularly in its last stage, established and implemented effective implementation with stakeholders involved in the country and in Central America and effective partnerships. Agreements and collaboration with relevant stakeholders were established.

For example, with the Foundation in the Texiguat Pilot Area (TPA) was worked in several municipalities in order to facilitate the project for the proposed Biological Corridor La Union and

establish a mechanism for local involvement Biological Corridor called the Union Committee. In the Sico - Paulaya Pilot Area (SPPA) collaborated with the Green Wood Foundation in the processes of forest management with local groups on topics related to the use and management of broadleaf forests, and related topics to better positioning of small producers in the markets for wood products. Also in this area pilot partnership agreements with the Municipality of Iriona and direct beneficiaries of various communities were established.

With the Pantera / IUCN Foundation works monitoring protocols target species such as tapir, jaguar, etc. coordinated Collaborations with organizations dedicated to the research and (national, regional, and international) training such as the National University of Honduras (UNAH), the Tropical Agricultural Research and Higher Education (CATIE) were also surveyed, the Pan-American Agricultural School / Zamorano Foundation .

Also, collaborations with various international aid agencies are evident. These were specific collaborations, for example with GIZ on some issues in the territory; and the Forest Service of the Government of the United States (US Forest Service). With the latter agency collaborated with the production / publishing certain guidelines and project plans.

In general, therefore, one can say that the various associativity's Ecosystem Project generated with government agencies as well as civil society. It is desirable that these associations in the last stage of implementation of the project worked well, not only generating timely association (i.e. association for a specific job or product generating specific benefits), but, perhaps more importantly, generating joint activities and benefits Shortcuts to some communities.

- **Project Funding**

This evaluation assesses the project's key financial issues, including the scope of co-planned and actual funding. As noted in the table below there is a large discrepancy between actual and planned expenditures. This is due almost exclusively as the co - financing planned \$ 39,364,468 (which should have come IFAD / PRONADEL of majority) never became effective. This is basically the project was implemented with only 10 percent of the funds going to achieve planned. Funding / co-funding effectively took place indicated in the chart below (Table 3 Financing / Co - Financing Project).

Table 3 Project Financing / Co - Financing

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own Financing (millions USD)		Government (millions USD)		Partner Agency (millions USD)		Total (millones de USD)
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Real
Grants	4 206 536	4 206 536	0	0	39 364 468	0	4 206 536
Loans/Concessions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
• In – kind support	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
• Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	4 206 536	4 206 536	0	0	0	0	4 206 536

- **Monitoring and Evaluation: starting design and implementation**

Final evaluations consider all aspects of monitoring and evaluation (M & E) as a whole, from design to the final considerations. The objectives of the monitoring plan and evaluation of the projects are continually monitoring the achievement of results and objectives of the project. Therefore, all valuations of the project cycle exist where information will be included.

Regarding assessments, the monitoring plan at the beginning of the project (i.e., the plan outlined in the design stage) indicated fairly standard methodologies and procedures for such projects. Included assessments at the beginning of the project, a mid-term review and a final evaluation. The assessment of project start was not implemented (scheduled to take place at the end of the first two years of implementation), therefore the monitoring plan implemented in the design was not followed.

According to the report of midterm review (and thus this assessment is agreed) would have been helpful to have had an assessment at the beginning of the project since the difficulties manifested itself at the beginning of it. By not having carried out an assessment in the early years of implementation, it was not available early rerouting of the project and the process of adapting the project needed was delayed. The midterm evaluation was conducted five years after the project started. This exercise, along with adaptive management itself addressed the recommendations and implemented a variety of thematic and administrative adjustments (mostly in line with recommendations from the midterm evaluation and suggestions of the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor provided during a mission in October 2010 in response to the Mid-Term evaluation), it paid off in an adaptation that safeguarded the implementation of the project in its final stage.

In terms of indicators, this theme was developed in the section on the logical framework. As indicated therein, the indicators in the logical framework are indicators of performance and impact indicators for project implementation and also indicated above, these improved substantially since its conceptualization in the first to the third logical framework. Adhering to the notion that the indicators used in GEF projects should be SMART (for its acronym in English). This is that indicators should be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound.

However, it is notable that the shortcomings identified in this area are not due solely to whether the evaluation and monitoring exercises took place or not as originally planned or following the outline of the logical framework. Are due in large part to the low utilization that were given in the adaptation and monitoring the project in a special way in the first years of implementation. For example, although several methods for monitoring indicated that there was no alliance with PRONADEL -consequently- and 90 percent of funding predicted would not happen, there were no adjustments of the project until 2010, therefore, the great failure part not due to monitoring but it is ignored as indicated in the monitoring and evaluation tools, and therefore they did not have the desired effectiveness. Project management should account for the findings from these exercises and use them to adapt the projects based on the constant valuations carried out through continuous monitoring. Especially when they reveal serious problems or deep disagreement with the phases of the projects already implemented.

Table 4 Rate of Assessment and Monitoring ¹⁵

Monitoring and Evaluation	
General Quality of M&E	MS
<i>M&E design at entry</i>	MS
<i>M&E Plan Implementation</i>	MU

¹⁵ The rating scale overall quality of the implementation and execution is as follows, 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS) showed no deficiencies; 5: Satisfactory (S): minor deficiencies; 4: Moderately satisfactory (MS); 3: Moderately unsatisfactory (MU): significant deficiencies; 2: Unsatisfactory (U): significant deficiencies; 1: Highly unsatisfactory (HU): serious deficiencies.

- **Coordination of the implementation and execution of UNDP and partner for the implementation and operational issues**

Despite being a repetitive aspect in this report, must realize that the testing and rating of the quality of project implementation should be made explicit reference to the two stages. For brevity, refer to the application and pre implementation and post 2010.

As for the pre-stage 2010, may indicate that this was not satisfactory because of significant deficiencies. These deficiencies were in approach (i.e. the focus on agricultural issues with partners in the area of the Honduran state which in fact participated in the project, for example). The deficiency in the responsiveness of managers to significant parts application problems that existed in the early stages of Ecosystems Project. Finally, and perhaps emblematic example and key indicator is the lack of products and subsequent results and effects in the first stage.

The second stage (post 2010, so to speak) shows a definite improvement in enforcement matters, and operational application. This is in approach, in terms of responsiveness of parts managers, and as for implementation of activities, products and processes as conclusive indicator that actually was running and implementing the project.

Regarding the implementation of the implementing partner of Ecosystems Project, again one must differentiate between the two stages. Although it was logical to include the first member of the Project, the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (SAG) and associated organism due to the thematic trend at the time and because the PRONADEL was part of SAG, as stated in the assessment of middle term and as has been noted in this evaluation exercise was not an appropriate association. Although the SAG was a partner through the various stages, the organization NEX not much active participation in the project is found in these stages.

Passing enforcement agency to orbit the Forest Conservation Institute (ICF) and the focal point SERNA (which, along with the SAG, joined the project steering committee) a better thematic and operational balance was found. Also, due to the insertion of the ICF in the field, this facilitated implementation at pilot areas and the connection between the level and the national level. In this second stage of a broader national project ownership process also occurred in part because of the national implementation (NEX) in part because the goals, objectives and desired effects through the implementation of the project are in line with plans and objectives of the ICF that of other agencies.

The stakeholders also indicated that these projects benefited greatly through proper support to partners (in particular as regards implementation guidelines, administrative, operational but also techniques). It is envisaged that the project did not have adequate generation capacity and appropriate operational and technical support to the implementing agency and the project team, who had to learn "on the fly" without generating capabilities in this regard.

Table 5 AI & AE Execution Rate ¹⁶

IA& EA Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	MS
<i>Quality of Implementation Agency</i>	MS
<i>Quality of Execution - Executing Agency</i>	MS

3.3 Project results

- **Overall results (achievement of objectives)**

As for the overall results, due to the aforementioned reformulation should assess these in terms of the objectives reformulated in the second stage of the project and not present in the Project Document as these cannot be classified as outcomes. In general, the objectives are obtained reformulated somewhat. Are discussed below and a valuation is generated at the end of this section, in addition to the criteria to be evaluated in subsequent sections.

The objectives reformulated in 2010 were:

<i>General Objective: multiple environmental benefits are achieved by incorporating principles of Integrated Ecosystem and Watershed (IEWM) Management in productive rural development initiatives in Honduras and Central America</i>
Specific Objective: multiple environmental benefits are achieved in the total area of influence of the partners, by integrating principles of IMCS in its procedures, after the demonstration, validation and dissemination of successful experience with this approach in two pilot areas.

The specific objective of achieving multiple environmental benefits was generated in some level. As in many such projects, the level of achievement of the objectives that is attributable to the project or other factors cannot be fully evaluated. However, for example-it is stated that in the pilot areas were obtained deforestation data (despite continuing) their rates have declined. For example, in the Sico Paulaya Pilot Area deforestation rates have decreased by 3.5 percent annually between 1999 and 2005, to 1.48 percent between 2006 and 2011, however, attributed

¹⁶ The rating scale overall quality of the implementation and execution is as follows, 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS) showed no deficiencies; 5: Satisfactory (S): minor deficiencies; 4: Moderately satisfactory (MS); 3. Moderately unsatisfactory (MU): significant deficiencies; 2. Unsatisfactory (U): significant deficiencies; 1. Highly unsatisfactory (HU): serious deficiencies.

to project or the overall decline in the rate of deforestation, when multiple factors are at play is difficult if not impossible with the available data. The rate of deforestation in the area has multiple factors, such as regulations, market forces, migration, changes in prevailing productive sectors in the area, and to other interventions in the area of influence of the pilot area. Therefore, one can only indicate that the project may have helped but he cannot be reliably attributed this dynamic to the project.

There have been pilot projects, such as the experience of establishing power plants micro in rural areas, which have generated positive externalities of conservation and sustainable use of natural resources while creating conditions for improving the quality of life for residents, while reducing emissions. Forestry cooperatives have been trained and accompanied him in the process of incorporating sustainable techniques that create value for their products.

A key component of the overall performance has been in the field of capacity building, among which some have been achieved to date and others are in nascent stages of implementation processes with a degree of expected results in the medium and long term. For example, the generation of institutionalized methodological proposals for criteria and indicators for the identification and recognition of Biological Corridors nationally; protocols and monitoring strategies target fauna; land use plans at the municipal level; methodological guide for the development of micro hydropower plants in rural areas; and cluster development in clusters of tables and productivity environment locally.

Despite the achievements and accomplishments of objectives at certain levels, it is evident that the project in its implementation phase has had a myriad of activities that often do not appear to be programmatic. The project starts generating products and processes very dissimilar subjects (from watershed management to the planned installation of a corridor to protect big cats, from coffee production to the production of wood two highly dissimilar ecosystems in the country, from micro watershed studies to research on cactus, from the generation of clean energy to the zoning). Although as stated elsewhere in this report, they compete indicate which of these processes and products are more valuable than others, is displayed to the generation of products and processes was not focused enough to generate a programming process with a clear nucleation. More varieties of actions as management activities as a project with a clear programmatic focus are displayed. The results of Ecosystems Project, and obviously the achievement of objectives and overall performance was not entirely programmatic in generating products and processes, and devolved into multiple topics, subtopics, and processes to overextend.

Another process that would have benefited the project and generate greater and more lasting results might have been the systematization of knowledge. The systematization of knowledge generated was not made within the context of the project methodically. There was not a process of knowledge management and systematization of practices and tools generated by the

Project and, therefore, a complete rescue experience was not given. Therefore, there are much more thorough knowledge of the processes, products that were part of the project and not the results and effects in the medium and long term are enhanced, even after completion of the project as such.

If he gets to the general objective of this intervention "multiple environmental benefits are achieved by incorporating principles of Integrated Ecosystem and Watershed (MIEC) Management initiatives for productive rural development in Honduras and Central America" must realize the last point where it is indicated that regional goals were pursued in Central America. This has happened with some products, for example by generating national plans for conservation of wildlife (e.g. jaguar and tapir), where the findings and plans have been shared in Central America. This is important not only to meet the objectives of the project per se, but also (as has been stressed by various stakeholders) for insertion of Honduras as a supplier of tools for the conservation of species of concern in the sub ecosystems - region.

In summary, in terms of overall product quality of Ecosystems Project, it can be indicated to be satisfactory. The following sections of this section the general results and achievements of objectives are analyzed according to several criteria. The criteria to analyze about getting results are relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, national ownership, and impact, scoring when they are ready.

Table 6 Results Rating ¹⁷

Products/results	
Overall quality of Project results	S

- **Relevance**

The relevance of a project is the extent to which the objectives of an intervention are consistent to the needs of the country, the requirements and needs of the beneficiaries, and the priorities and policies of partners and donors. That is, the extent to which an activity is suited to the priorities of local and national development and organizational policies, including changes over time. The relevance within the context of projects funded by GEF and implemented by UNDP

¹⁷ The rating scale overall quality of the implementation and execution is as follows, 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS) showed no deficiencies; 5: Satisfactory (S): minor deficiencies; 4: Moderately satisfactory (MS); 3. Moderately unsatisfactory (MU): significant deficiencies; 2. Unsatisfactory (U): significant deficiencies; 1. Highly unsatisfactory (HU): serious deficiencies.

often becomes a question of whether the objectives of an intervention or its design are still appropriate given changes in circumstances.

The project is relevant to the needs and priorities of Honduras. As stated in the UNDAF 2007 - 2011, Honduras is exposed to acute environmental vulnerability combined with the lack of institutional and environmental policies that promote equitable access to and sustainable use of natural resources. The same document indicates that it is a priority that political and technological and production systems, concepts and incorporate environmentally friendly practices.

Also, as indicated in the Project Document this importance is reflected in policies, plans, and programs set forth by the Government of Honduras. For example, as stated herein, the inclusion of issues related to sustainable use and conservation of biological diversity, soil degradation, resource management at the basin level, and the preservation of sinks and reservoirs of emissions of greenhouse gases, in development planning priorities are evidenced in various planning instruments, policies and legislation. These instruments include, among others, the National Biodiversity Strategy and Modernization Act and the Agricultural Sector Development.

Despite changes in the context and circumstances surrounding the project and the changes that the project experienced, it is as relevant now as when it was designed and approved, as well as relevant at the stage of reformulation.

It is also considered that a project is relevant or not to the extent to which the project is consistent with GEF operational programs and strategic priorities on which the project was financed. In this case, it also relieved that the project meets the strategic priorities and operational programs, and therefore is relevant in this context. It is considered that the reformulation of the project after 2010 has made the most significant project in this context, since in the early stages of implementing some of the strategic priorities of the GEF were not adequately covered.

Table 1 Relevance Rating¹⁸

Relevance	
Qualification of relevance	R

¹⁸ The ratings of importance are: 2. Relevant (R); 1. Not Relevant (NR).

- **Effectiveness and efficiency**

The effectiveness and efficiency are two criteria intrinsically linked with evaluations of projects funded by the GEF and implemented by UNDP. Is considered to be effective to the extent in which they are able (or is expected to be achieved) the development intervention targets. Efficiency is a measure of how economically resources / inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) economically into results translate.

In regard to efficiency and effectiveness of Ecosystems Project has shown that the project did reach objectives and expected results somewhat successful when an overall assessment is made. A third of the (monetary) resources and more than half of the deployment time (almost five of the nine years of the project in its early stages) does not show much effectiveness or efficiency. The last three years largely regained momentum, generating a somewhat satisfactory overall efficiency.

The project has been somewhat effective in building institutional capacity. For example, the Forest Conservation Institute (ICF), a relatively new area with Nobel Laureates approaches in the Honduran state benefited from the development of instruments and tools generated by the project. Tools such as management plans, guidelines varied themes and similar products, are forward-looking and may have high potential to generate institutional capacity for integrated ecosystem management.

The project has been effective in some interventions in pilot areas (eg, implementation of pilot micro hydro projects) and supporting local processes such as support to forest producers in quality improvement and certification of their products. Therefore, taking into account the activities and products generated throughout the implementation process considers the effectiveness and efficiency have been somewhat successful.

Table 2 Effectiveness and Efficiency¹⁹

Products/results	
<i>Effectiveness</i>	MS
<i>Efficiency</i>	MS

¹⁹ The rating scale overall quality of the implementation and execution is as follows, 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS) showed no deficiencies; 5: Satisfactory (S): minor deficiencies; 4: Moderately satisfactory (MS); 3. Moderately unsatisfactory (MU): significant deficiencies; 2. Unsatisfactory (U): significant deficiencies; 1. Highly unsatisfactory (HU): serious deficiencies.

- **Contributions to effect level results: Summary**

As part of its efforts to boost the Results Based Management (RBM), UNDP has promoted impact assessments according to each country program framework. The effects are defined as the actual changes in development conditions to be achieved from the products generated by the projects. To nurture this process outcome evaluation program framework, some contributions are made in this report. Understanding that this assessment only program framework vis-a-vis the Ecosystem Project Honduras, some statements can be made with this look is referring.

The evaluation of the results obtained are related to the UNDAF Effect 5 ("The Honduran government has the capacity to reduce vulnerability of the population through the implementation of environmental policies and risk management") expressed in the Plan Country Programme Action between the Government of Honduras and UNDP (period 2007-2011). They also relate to the Outcome 3.2 Country Programme 2012-2016: "The Government of Honduras, private sector and communities in intervention areas, adopt best practices in ecosystem management, solid waste management, mitigation and adaptation climate change that allow the preservation of natural capital, reducing economic losses and income generation opportunities for vulnerable sectors. "

It follows, in general terms, which the expected results within the Ecosystem Project are being made at the level of effect according to the program framework. The following contributions of the project being evaluated in relation to the analysis of the effect of area emerge. It is understood through this assessment that the Ecosystem Project has helped introduce in Honduras tools that can lead to good practice in the management of ecosystems, not only at government level but also at the level of the private sector and communities in areas intervention, such as in the pilot areas. For example, tools developed within the framework of the project (such as wildlife monitoring strategies or action plans for handling micro basins, and similar developed within the framework of the project) have skills inward state Honduras; capabilities if or when it was applied- can reduce vulnerability of the population through the implementation of integrated management and sustainable use of natural resources policies. Recall that in this way the effect is defined, as reflected in the first paragraph of this section of the report: "The Honduran government has the capacity to reduce vulnerability of the population through the implementation of environmental policies. . . ". Some tools are already leading to good practice, such as the implementation of micro hydro basins in remote areas of the country, which not only generates clean energy for people who did not have a non-polluting source of energy through behavior change and practices but it is also having an impact on improved management of natural resources associated with the area where the facility.

Also within the framework of the Ecosystem Project, where processes generating revenue for sectors vulnerable enhanced within the context of sustainable use of natural resources were

generated. For example, in terms of logging and forestry, tables of dialogue that encouraged the project and collaboration with civil society and direct beneficiaries have had the effect of improving the position of producers in relation to the timber resource. This in turn has created impact in terms of better niche and increased revenue generation through the implementation of practices for sustainable use of timber.

One of the key issues regarding the contributions of area-level effect is similar relationship with stakeholders in Honduras. Although this project is of national implementation and the direct relationship of UNDP has been mainly with government actors, however certain dynamics that contribute to effects on different stakeholders is evident. As explicitly pointed out by several actors, the list of members is generated, the area of equality and national institutions, helps not only to the implementation of the projects themselves, but also to generate effects. The relationship with the Government of Honduras is fluid (most of the time it took place Ecosystem Project implementation, i.e. before and after the interruption of the democratic order in the country), and the Area of Environment and Energy maintains close relationships with the thematic environmental sector counterparts in the national administration. Government stakeholders contacted as part of this process realize that Area and UNDP creates a relationship of partnership in the process of project implementation. This helps to implementation, not only in terms of relevance since this association, and according to the same partners indicate the adaptability of the area is a key dynamic to work together as well as the perception that effects are generated intrinsically related to the needs of the country, not exogenous to what Honduras needs.

- **National ownership and integration**

National ownership of a UNDP / GEF project relates to the importance of the project to national development and environmental programs, the recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements, where this is. In the case of Ecosystems Project, this dimension is clear. The project falls clearly in the national plans that formulate the need for ecosystem management helping to improve the conditions of vulnerability and equitable access to natural resources from the most vulnerable sectors of Honduras. Also, this project is part of the fulfillment of the international commitments undertaken by the country to become a State Party to the Convention on Biological Diversity, for example.

Also, the projects implemented by UNDP and funded by the GEF are key components in the national programming of UNDP, as well as regional and global programs. This evaluation assesses the extent to which the project will be integrated with other UNDP priorities, including poverty reduction, improved governance.

Projects supported by UNDP and funded by the GEF are key elements in the UNDP country programming. As such, the objectives and results of the project should be aligned with strategies

of UNDP country program as well as with global environmental benefits required by the GEF as stated in conventions on the global environment (e.g., the Convention on Biological Diversity).

In the case of Honduras, this project is part of Outcome 3.2 Country Programme 2012-2016 "The Government of Honduras, private sector and communities in intervention areas, adopt best practices in ecosystem management, solid waste management of mitigation and adaptation to climate change that allow the preservation of natural capital, reducing economic losses and income generation opportunities for vulnerable sectors "and UNDAF Outcome 5" the Honduran government has the capacity to reduce population vulnerability by implementing environmental policy and risk management. "Therefore, the objectives of the project meet the agreed priorities in the program document for the country and the plan of action for the country program of UNDP. In specific terms of governance, the project contributed to building capacity in the ICF, integrating principles of conservation and sustainable use of natural resources as, for example, clearly it was part of the effect mentioned.

In this case, the Ecosystem Project integrates several of the priorities of UNDP. In addition to the objectives strict environmental benefits, the project faced aspects of poverty reduction through practical pilot's communities (such as the aforementioned experiences generating clean energy or improving productivity in forestry while incorporate dimensions of ecosystem management). The project did not incorporate a gender dimension as axis of products or processes.²⁰

- **Sustainability**

Among the projects funded by the GEF and UNDP-supported sustainability stipulated as the probability that the project results are maintained over time when the project ends. Therefore, we are evaluating the possibility that the results are sustainable over time or not. The Ecosystem Project has certain aspects that induce conceive that the results can last over time, while other aspects could have been strengthened to ensure the durability of the gains and minimize risks of non-sustainability. In short, sustainability is somewhat likely, presenting moderate risks.

Sustainability is based on various nuances of a project and as above, an assessment can only indicate if given the possible conditions for sustaining effects in the short, medium and long term. Some of the conditions that must exist to allow for the possibility of holding future project

²⁰ Some stoves were installed called eco - efficient with the intent to benefit women of pilot communities, with varying successes and problems, but this does not imply that the project incorporates the gender dimension as such.

effects are installed institutional capacity to 'leave' a project in the country. In this case, these conditions are in place to some extent.

For example, between positive and possibly leading to the sustainability aspects, one can delineate the Project supported the capacity building of national partners, particularly in the ICF. The project worked with ICF in the sense of strengthening a new institution within the Honduran state, promoting the expansion of its mission in an almost strictly forestry organization to an institution expanded its incorporated dimensions related to the productive landscape approach, biological corridors, etc. This way chances of sustainability and institutional capacity (including entities in it, but also people and systems) is installed to begin to address issues in an integrated productivity and management of natural resources in the country.

Also, another feature that can ensure sustainability in terms of national ownership of a project and its relationship to various stakeholders. The project generated a good national ownership, the actors have repeatedly indicated that the products and processes generated "were what the country needed and proposed" indicating a feedback appropriation reasoning - country needs - likelihood of sustainability. Government - also organizational arrangements within the context of the project by the public sector and the productive sector, local communities and organizations are not generated. Having been concrete results in many events (benefiting the actors) considers that many this can help create conditions for sustainability in the medium and long term, particularly interventions in the pilot areas.

Some of the interventions in the pilot areas were not empowered to activities or processes that can nurture sustainability. For example, installing energy efficient stoves was not accompanied by a monitoring process that promotes sustainability in the medium and long term. In fact, several of the experimental micro-efficient stoves were already abandoned a few months to complete the project. Another intervention (key and best practice Ecosystem Project as discussed in that section) was installing micro hydro. However, in this case the micro plants had some mechanical problems after installing them and the beneficiaries had no instruments (materials, documentation, and training) to maintain the plants and generate sustainable profits in the medium and long term, even after the project completion.

Like any such intervention, sustainability (or rather, the lack of likelihood of sustainability in some respects) is directly related risks. Project achievements face risks, partly attributable to the project and the socio - political context and Honduras. As for risk governance, can emphasize the degree of institutional weakness and lack of continuity in public policy in some areas, especially when government changes occur, or same parties or leaders. The fragility of governance in terms of integrated ecosystem management to equate conservation with productive rural development is high and this may hamper the continuity of achievements. On the issue of governance, poor quality of national government presence in remote and isolated areas within the country is also

evidence, therefore the sustainability of achievements in the pilot projects is difficult in this context.

Table 9 Sustainability Rating ²¹

Sustainability	
Overall likelihood of sustainability	ML
Financial resources	ML
Socio-political	ML
Institutional framework and governance	ML
Environmental	ML

²¹ The sustainability rating scale is as follows: 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability; 3. moderately likely (ML): moderate risks; 2. moderately unlikely (MU): Significant risks. 1. Unlikely (U): Serious risks.

4. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons

As conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations, this section focuses on summarizing the actions globally to continue or reinforce initial benefits and proactive recommendations for future projects (covering corrective measures for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation projects). Also, best and worst practices in addressing issues related to the various criteria evaluated included.

Conclusions

In general terms, it may indicate that the project has reached a certain extent to meet their goals to achieve multiple environmental benefits by incorporating principles of Integrated Ecosystem and Watershed (MIEC) Management initiatives for productive rural development in Honduras and Central America. It has generated deployment tools whose effects are being collected. It has implemented pilot experiments where effects win - win are evident through the provision of basic needs for isolated populations where both conditions of conservation and sustainable use of natural resources are generated. They have raised productive experiences that improve farmers' incomes while at the same time practice of conservation and sustainable use in the forestry sector are generated. Some key points are listed below.

The Ecosystem Project underwent a series of rigorous formulations re-cycle implementation, therefore, from the Project and from the UNDP has made a great effort in adaptive management. Reformulations and revisions have been essential in order to implement the project despite that ninety percent of the expected funding was not received, the focus shifted substantially.

Capacity building and institutional strengthening have been a good strategy to look for effects and / or long-lasting results and strengthen areas of the state seeking the same goals as the Ecosystem Project. The project had a very good liaison between pilot areas - central government

However, the project had a few exchanges with similar interventions (not just in the country, either in the region). It would be highly desirable for future or present are sharing mechanisms between and among GEF projects implemented by UNDP projects in the field with other relevant interventions and cooperation with other GEF / UNDP projects in other countries dealing with similar issues. This would benefit the assimilation of lessons learned and also encourages the exchange and synergies between projects and interventions, enhancing the effect of cooperation in general.

The project generated a number of materials, guidelines and tools for use in the country (and some to Central America) generating capacity in state institutions, in municipalities, as well as with civil society and beneficiaries. This shows that the project has been effective to a certain level. Overall, the project makes Honduras a number of instruments that have been used in some levels to generate effects and even positive impacts and that have a high potential to replicate and create lasting and sustainable future effects.

Best Practices and Lessons Learned

- • Adaptive management is one of the best practices in operational terms Ecosystem Project that have been collected in this evaluation. One lesson learned is that the reformulation and reviews are essential in reply to monitor projects, and more useful if carried out early in the implementation process, particularly when interventions have disabilities and complications. It is recommended that interventions how are you develop early in the implementation process, evaluation and self-evaluation leading to sane reformulations, especially when circumstances indicate that the objectives and results as were indicated in the design stage not being making effective are presented
- • One of the best practices identified was the establishment of micro hydropower plants in rural areas. These two pilot projects have multiple benefits (win - win) with the generation of clean energy to remote and in vulnerable communities. But at the same time creating incentives for maintaining forest cover in the catchment areas of hydropower. This case is an excellent example that when achievements are evident in local interventions and pilot areas, efforts should be replicated on a larger scale and bring successful initiatives and best practices (replication, increased and repeat at different levels and scales)
- • Another best practice identified was the relationship between the pilot areas and other levels (local, national). Although such projects typically call a broad subject and experience collaboration between the pilot areas and the other levels of intervention, this does not happen in all circumstances. This project turned out to be good practice, in part due to the constant intervention at the local level and constant technical support to the pilot areas. Pilot experiences have fueled national processes, for example by generating inputs for biological corridors and demonstrative generating situations that improve the quality of life for residents while effectively apply concepts of integrated ecosystem management. It is recommended that the relationship to be strengthened in the future, perhaps using this experience as a model.

Recommendations

- Projects of this type are best processes, effects and multiple benefits to sustainable development impacts. It should strengthen this aspect of the draft integrated management of natural resources to include conservation and sustainable use of natural resources with improvements in the living conditions of vulnerable populations.
- • Despite the achievements and accomplishments of goals at certain levels, it is evident that the project in its implementation phase has a myriad of activities that often do not appear to be programmatic. However, it is considered that the gaps between topics was high and that there was a robust nucleation or thematic axis defined and focused. It would be more fruitful in the future to achieve overall goals and outcomes, the projects are more programmatic in generating products and processes, focusing perhaps in some lines, themes and processes, and not overextend.
- • Here, as elsewhere in the country, plans and actions should be taken to promote sustainability of project impact at the institutional level, especially considering the institutional weakness and lack of continuity in public policy present in Honduras. It is recommended that various levels of training, training, and awareness with new leaders and new managers to generate continuity and consolidation processes initiated are applied, generating sustainability, supporting the transfer of public policies, knowledge and training among political transitions.
- • It is recommended that the project should have exchanges fluid and sides from the regional and global levels in order to capture, enhance, and / or enhance opportunities for addressing technical projects. This would include instances generate and strengthen exchange and training for the project coordinators and the generation of exchanges with other projects of similar issues in the region.
- • It would be highly desirable for future or present are sharing mechanisms between and among GEF projects implemented by UNDP projects in the field with other relevant interventions for cooperation. This beneficiary assimilation of lessons learned and at the same time encourages the exchange and synergies between projects and interventions, enhancing the effect of cooperation in general. The generation of appropriate capabilities and operational and technical support to the implementing agency and the project team would be very useful to avoid learning "on the fly." This would help greatly not only in the implementation

of operational aspects but also, and recalling that this is the ultimate utility of projects, improving their outcomes and impacts.

- The methodical systematization of knowledge should be an integral part of such projects in order to generate greater and more lasting results might have been the systematization of knowledge. Processes should be installed early in knowledge management projects to socialize and organize information practices and tools generated by the project, capturing experiences and tools in full, and enable the generation of results and impact on the medium and long term, even after completion of the project as such also communicating and giving visibility to the achievements of the projects.
- When interventions have disabilities and difficult complications should arise (early in the implementation process) systems and mechanisms for monitoring, evaluation and self-evaluation leading to reformulations sane, especially when circumstances arise that indicate that the objectives and results as were indicated in the design stage are not making effective.
- It is recommended that in the future these aspects of capacity building, institutional strengthening, and implementation of management tools will be strengthened in the GEF / UNDP projects and the institutional and capacity building promotes outcome in the long term, sustainability of outcomes and impact and replicability.
- The tools, methodologies, and guidelines generated by the project must be accompanied by training and education, particularly with beneficiary communities and local governments in these products can be assimilated by local communities and governments, helping not only to improve management knowledge but also to create sustainability and replicability of the intended positive impacts. Also, this type of generation capacities based on the pilot or the instruments should incorporate concepts generated training for the gains are sustainable and endure over time.