

(Including final supervision)

**Project Information:** [By clicking on (i) you will get additional information for associated section/field. Some information in this document is populated from iDESK, TAAS PDS Approval & TAAS - Supervisions.]

Data populated
Data Entry

<i>Region:</i> LAC	<i>Country:</i> Peru	<i>Sector:</i> X - Other (For Non-Investment Projects)	
<i>Business Line:</i> Environment and Social Sustainability	<i>Business Line sub-area(s):</i> Biodiversity and Sustainable Natural Resource Management: Nature-based products and services: (100%);		
<i>Primary (Originating) Dept/Division:</i> CESBD - Environment & Social Development/Bio-diversity	<i>Implementing Dept/Division:</i>		
<i>Client Name:</i> Inka Terra Peru (54112)	<i>Project/Transaction Leader:</i> Juan Jose Dada		
<i>Project ID:</i> 506050	<i>Project Short Name:</i> BDGEF Inka Terra	<i>Project Long Name:</i> BDGEF Inka Terra:An Innovative Partnership for Self-Financing Biodiversity Conservation & Community	
<i>Original Approval Date:</i> Mar. 6, 2007	<i>Total Funding:</i> 480,000	<i>Actual Project Duration:</i> 58 months	
	Original (i)	Revised (i)	Actual (i)
Project Implementation Start	Mar. 30, 2004	Feb. 10, 2001	Mar. 30, 2004
Project Completion	Mar. 30, 2008	Jun. 30, 2011	Dec. 31, 2008

<i>Relationship to IFC Project(s)</i>	<i>Relationship Type</i>	<i>Project ID</i>	<i>Project Long Name</i>
IFC TAAS Project	None		
IFC Investment Project	Link to an existing IFC investment	10651	Inka Terra Peru. S.A.C
<i>Recipients</i> SME Company	<i>Beneficiaries</i> Other Intermediary; SME Company; Government National		

<b>Objective</b>	<p>Original (Mar 06, 2007) - To catalyse self-financing uses of the 10,000 hectare Inka Terra Ecological Reserve (IER) that achieve biodiversity conservation and sustainable development for local communities.</p> <p>To provide a replicable model for engaging the private sector in achieving financial sustainability for protected areas.</p> <p>Most recent update (Jan 29, 2009) - The objective of this project is to catalyse self-financing uses of the 10,000 hectare Inka Terra Ecological Reserve (IER) that achieve biodiversity conservation and sustainable development for local communities. By the end of this project ITA will have a reliable source of income to durably manage and protect the Reserve.</p> <p>A broader goal of this project is to provide a replicable model for engaging more private sector companies in achieving financial sustainability for protected areas.</p>
------------------	---

<p><b>Key Highlights (i)</b> Summarize key project highlights</p>	<p>Entire Project: The purpose of this project was to catalyze self-financing activities within and around the 10,000 hectare Inka Terra Ecological Reserve to fund biodiversity conservation and sustainable development for the four local communities. This project was expected to provide a replicable model for engaging the private sector in achieving financial sustainability for protected areas and conservation work.</p> <p>The project's strategy involved the establishment of an NGO called the Inka Terra Association (ITA). IFC disbursed \$363,000 as a loan to ITA in order to construct four eco-tourism attractions that will serve as income generation assets for ITA to be financially self-sustainable in the long term, and \$362,000 as grant to ITA in order to carry out community development activities and develop alternative livelihoods.</p> <p>Inka Terra Asociacion (ITA) is an operational, self financing, conservation organization that runs four eco-tourism attractions in partnership with a private eco-lodge in the Peruvian Amazon.</p> <p>The four eco-tourism attractions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Canopy walk,</li> <li>- Elevated walkway over a wetland,</li> <li>- Wildlife rescue center, and</li> <li>- Wildlife observation platform</li> </ul> <p>These attractions generate enough funding for ITA to (i) manage and maintain the tourism services, (ii) monitor and protect the entire reserve, and (iii) repay the loan provided by the project to build the infrastructure.</p> <p>Reporting period since last supervision: IFC received the first repayment installment of the loan as scheduled. Inka Terra Asociacion (ITA) redesigned its workplan prioritizing the maintenance of the tourism infrastructure and the monitoring and protection of the protected area. It is still uncertain whether ITA will be able to continue its community support program as it has become clear that this program will have to be reduced considerably.</p>
---	--

**Lessons Learned:**

Delete Row (i)	Lesson Area (i)	Comments and Suggestions (e.g. What worked well? What would you have done differently?) <input type="checkbox"/> Add Additional Lessons Learned Row
	Design/planning	<p>The design of this project was well conceptualized since the beginning and proved to be an interesting model for companies whose business model depends on natural habitat to leverage their activities partnering with conservation organizations.</p> <p>This project proved that sustainable sources of funding can come from eco-tourism demand through alliances with in alliance with professional tourism operators and entrepreneurs; and that having a partnership with a non-for-profit institution does leverage the direct investment in natural habitat and biodiversity conservation of a company.</p> <p>The financial structuring of the project (half non-reimbursable and half loan) also proved to be beneficial. The discipline necessary to project a loan repayment and maintain the infrastructure that generates the income forced a responsible business management culture in the NGO. At the same time, having non-reimbursable funds to work with and support the communities leveraged the existence of the protected area, and paid for a public good and benefit.</p>

Delete Row (i)	Lesson Area (i)	Comments and Suggestions (e.g. What worked well? What would you have done differently?) <input type="checkbox"/> Add Additional Lessons Learned Row
		<p>The main flaw identified by IFC in the design of this project is the lack of a transition plan (or sustainability strategy) for the community development activities that were funded by the non-reimbursable funding. Once these funds were consumed, it was uncertain the level of investment in community development that ITA is going to be able to maintain remain uncertain. The project design did not address this issue at all.</p>
	Pricing	<p>This project allowed a non-for-profit NGO to create a sustainable source of funding to protect a private reserve and work with the neighboring communities. These conservation and development impacts are complemented by the innovative conservation and partnership models tested by the project.</p> <p>From a strict "advisory services" perspective, the pricing in this project was adequate.</p>
	Implementation/delivery	<p>Overall, the implementation of the project was satisfactory. ITA met most of the expectations set at project design and managed to implement and execute most of the activities proposed. At the end, ITA achieved its main objective of developing a sustainable source of funding enough to monitor and protect the reserve and pay the loan used to build the attractions.</p> <p>Unfortunately, ITA was not able to adapt plans and change strategy to deliver the community development results as expected. Most activities were executed and outputs achieved (trainings, capacity building events, promotion of alternative sustainable livelihood systems, etc.), but the outcomes and impacts of this activities are limited and not as expected. IFC noted on several occasions that the type of training and capacity building approach was not influencing the community as intended, but ITA failed to implement an alternative approach. The timing is also important as changes and learning do take time.</p> <p>The conservation activities have produced the expected results, and the tourism attractions were built and are being operated successfully. There was a one year delay in the construction of the last two tourism attractions that was justified by a delay in the governmental permits required to build and run a wildlife rescue center and the seasonal dry/rain weather that forced construction plans to wait until the rains stop.</p> <p>Due to the above mentioned delay, the grant agreement completion date was extended for one year (ending July, 2009 instead of July, 2008). Nevertheless, the loan agreement repayment period was not modified (the date of the last payment is June 15, 2011).</p>
	Development Results	<p>A total of 8,840 ha of land are being protected in the Peruvian Amazon. The difference between the amount of hectares conserved and the original target of 10,000 he is due to a land tenure dispute by two communities. This land dispute and the need to adjust the official size of conservation areas (public and private alike) is common in Latin America. The fact, however, that two communities were able to strengthen their land title has a positive social impact as well.</p> <p>The model of a conservation concession funded by tourism fees that cover all monitoring, protection, and maintenance costs, contributes to the biodiversity conservation needs of developing countries while achieving its economic goal. This project also proved that for-profit tourism operators can successfully partner with non-for-profit conservation organizations finding common synergy.</p>

Delete Row (i)	Lesson Area (i)	Comments and Suggestions (e.g. What worked well? What would you have done differently?) <input type="checkbox"/> Add Additional Lessons Learned Row
		<p>The social development impact did not fully achieve the scale originally expected. Three communities received financial and technical support. Nine families established alternative livelihood options with the financial support from the project and as a result of the training events done by ITA. Two business models proved attractive to the communities (agro-forestry and apiculture).</p>
	Project team	<p>ITA had a good balance of staff with conservation and ecology background and staff with deep understanding of the tourism sector and its needs. This was key to deliver on the conservation intended results and provide a quality service to a professionally ran lodge nearby.</p>
	Consultant work	N/A
	Client commitment/satisfaction	<p>ITA proved to be committed to the project and the area. Throughout the life of the project, IFC kept a good working relationship with ITA to supervise the implementation of the planned activities and provide technical assistance on the issues that required a different approach.</p>
	Funding leverage	<p>ITA was able to generate enough funding from the tourism attractions to cover the monitoring and protection of the reserve, and very likely to repay the loan as scheduled.</p> <p>ITA was not successful in raising additional donor's funding for the community development activities. It is IFC opinion that this was partially because the NGO was perceived as a "company foundation", and partially because ITA was never forced to fundraise due to our grant. When funds were scarce, ITA was able to reduced the level of investment without altering the workplan enough to fail on its obligations.</p>
	Experience with replicating	<p>Even though the model is considered highly replicable and potentially beneficial to many conservation organizations and tourism companies, the project did not invest in dissemination and replication sufficiently. ESS business line will include this project in a planned subsequent knowledge management effort in FY09 or FY10. This will be especially important to document a possible future course of action for the "nature-based products and services" product of the business line which is to be exited.</p>
	Link with IFC Investment	<p>Since its origins, this project was designed to support an IFC client (the for-profit lodge Inka Terra) by facilitating the establishment of a parallel non-for-profit conservation organization (Inka Terra Asociacion). This allowed the company to leverage their interest and resources committed to biodiversity conservation and community development without putting extra pressure on their cash-flow and capital invested. Strategically, the conservation of the reserve done by the association strengthens the business case for the lodge to invest in a business model that depends on healthy habitat and wildlife.</p> <p>This model is ready to be applied to any IFC client that with the need to manage a protected area while deriving incremental revenues from it.</p>

**Follow up opportunities:**

Are there new business development or replication opportunities?	TAAS	Investment
	Yes	Yes
<i>If yes,</i> 1. Describe opportunity	Eco-standards and sustainable supply chains: standards contribute to increase the bottom line in cases where a protected area is involved.	Investments in sectors that require companies to manage natural protected areas. Like biodiversity offsets in oil, gas, mining, and infrastructure projects.
2. Recommended follow up action	Knowledge management activity to document lesson learned.	Share lessons with Biodiversity Offsets Program and potential projects in COC and CIN.

**Summary of Supervision Performance Ratings:**

Performance Category (i)				
Supervision Reporting Period	Development Results	Financial	Timeline	Overall
#1[As of Jun. 30, 2007]	A - On or Above Targets	A - On or Under Budget	B - Slightly Delayed	B - Some Areas of Underperformance
Rationale for overall performance rating assigned Inka Terra Asociacion has followed the original plan of implementation, its outputs and activities, thoroughly. The construction of the other eco-tourism attractions has been delayed by unforeseen environmental conditions, but remains within an acceptable timeframe. The support (training and financial) to the communities has been delivered also as planned, unfortunately, the community bio-business have not been as successful as initially anticipated and it is still uncertain if their intended impact will be achieved.				
#2[As of Dec. 31, 2007]	B - Slightly Below Targets	A - On or Under Budget	B - Slightly Delayed	B - Some Areas of Underperformance
Rationale for overall performance rating assigned ITA has not been as successful as planned on its work with local villagers and the development of new biodiversity-based business models. they have not been able to interest enough villagers and the agro-forestry and bee-farming efforts remain at pilot stage. This development result will be challenged more if ITA's level of investment has to be reduced to pay for the loan.				
#3[As of Jun. 30, 2008]	B - Slightly Below Targets	A - On or Under Budget	A - On or Ahead of Plan	B - Some Areas of Underperformance
Rationale for overall performance rating assigned Overall this project is implemented as planned and is delivering planned outputs. Unfortunately, these outputs (workshops, training events, etc.) are still not influencing as many community members as originally planned. As explained in previous PSRs, the Asociacion tried to adjust their trainings and outreach practices, but it is not likely that they will be able to increase their development impact now that their grant funds have been used completely.				
#4 [As of Dec. 31, 2008]	B - Slightly Below Current Targets	A - On or Under Budget	A - On or Ahead of Plan	B - Some Areas of Underperformance
Rationale for overall performance rating assigned The main objective of this project was achieved and the environmental benefits are clear and very likely to continue over the long term. Both involved institutions, the NGO and the lodge, were benefited by the project. Nevertheless, the social objective have not been met, the outcome and impact of the activities implemented to support the communities are not significant.				

**Development Effectiveness:** [Click on respective (i) for guidance on rating.]

	Highly Unsuccessful	Unsuccessful	Mostly Unsuccessful	Mostly Successful	Successful	Highly Successful	Not Applicable
<b>Development Effectiveness- Synthesis Rating (Based on criterion 1-5) (i)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Rationale	The project would have had higher development effectiveness if the sponsor adapted to the challenges and limitations in the development of alternative sustainable livelihoods in a remote area.
-----------	--

	Unsatisfactory	Partly Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent	Not Yet Achieved	Meets Exclusion Criteria (i)
1. Strategic Relevance (i)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Rationale	<p>This project provided a new model of partnership between for-profit ventures and non-for-profit entities that share the same natural and social asset as basis for their activities.</p> <p>The project also managed the sustainable conservation of a considerable amount of land in the Peruvian Amazon. This strengthens the case for conservation concessions to be used by the government of Peru as alternative uses for forested areas without restricting the development options of the nearby communities.</p> <p>The project was also very strategic in testing a new business model based on nature conservation and providing excellent lessons that will be captured in a subsequent knowledge management exercise and put to use for future IFC clients that need advisory services in protected areas management.</p>					
2. Output Achievement (i)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Rationale	<p>Key deliverables were met: 1) construction of ecotourism attractions, 2) establishment of the conservation concession as a private protected reserve, and 3) training, capacity building events, and financial support to promote sustainable livelihood alternatives in the area.</p> <p>IFC provided active supervision and technical advice to the sponsor throughout the implementation of the project.</p>					
3. Outcome Achievement (i)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rationale	<p>Short and medium-term effects were achieved: 1) the ecotourism infrastructure was built and is being used by tourists who pay the use fee, 2) Three alternative sustainable livelihood models were introduced to the communities and several community members invested their own time and resources, even though the number of members involved is less than originally expected.</p> <p>From the point of view of testing a new business model, the project was Satisfactory.</p>					
4. Impact Achievement (i)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rationale	<p>The reserve is being actively managed and protected by ITA. As opposed as before when the for-profit lodge owned the concession but was not actively protecting or monitoring its biodiversity.</p> <p>The social development impacts are limited and its long term viability is not secure. Due to the small scale of these impacts no post-project completion monitoring is justified.</p>					
5. Efficiency (i)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Rationale	<p>The cost of setting up the reserve and the tourism attractions that now produce enough income to manage the area and repay the loan was low compared to similar projects. On the other hand, the cost of the community development activities was high, especially considering the limited impact and an assessment of the costs involved will be done as part of</p>					

	the subsequent knowledge management activity.					
6. IFC Role and Contribution ( i )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<p>IFC's unique experience in biodiversity based business models allowed for the balanced integration of both conservation goals and for-profit tourism activities. If IFC had not been part of the project design and its active supervision, it is likely that one of these would have disproportionately received more attention than the other, thus jeopardizing the success of the overall project.</p> <p>IFC was able to leverage the relationship with a tourism client company, and this can happen as well with a company in another sector with a similar need.</p>					
Rationale						

<b>Post completion monitoring recommendation</b> [Based on outcome and impact indicator level recommendation within Development Results section that follows]	
Recommended	No
Recommended duration for annual post completion monitoring	
Approach for post project completion monitoring (including estimated level of effort, resources and funding source)	No specific post project completion monitoring required, but there will be a contribution to a knowledge management activity in which the lessons of this project will be captured.



### Development Results

Outputs (i) <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Add Outputs Row</span>								
Delete Row (i)	Component /Activities (i)	Discontinued (i)	Indicators (i)	Targets (i)			Results (i)	
				Cumulative		Changes during prior periods	Change during this Period	Cumulative
				Original	Revised			
<input type="checkbox"/>	New eco-tourism attractions that generate long-term revenues for forest conservation	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of new biodiversity-based business models or financial products	4.00		4.00	0.00	4.00
<input type="checkbox"/>	Community members investing in sustainable business (agro-forestry, apiculture, aquaculture, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of new biodiversity-based business models or financial products	3.00		3.00	-1.00	2.00
<input type="checkbox"/>	Support to community members in sustainable business	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of entities receiving advisory services	12.00		9.00	0.00	9.00

Outcome (i) <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Add Outcome Row</span>													
Delete Row (i)	Component /Activities (i)	Discontinued (i)	Indicators (i)	Baseline (i)		Targets (i)			Results (i)			Is post project completion monitoring by unit outstanding?	If yes, annually for how many years?
				Original A	Revised B	Cumulative		Changes during prior periods	Change during this Period	Cumulative			
						Original	Revised				Expect to achieve by		
<input type="checkbox"/>	New eco-tourism attractions that generate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	(US\$) Income generated by new biodiversity-based business models or financial products	363,000.00		0.00		>5 yrs post c	283,638.00	0.00	646,638.00	Select one	Select one



Outcome (i) <input type="checkbox"/> Add Outcome Row													
Delete Row (i)	Component /Activities (i)	Discontinued (i)	Indicators (i)	Baseline (i)		Targets (i)			Results (i)			Is post project completion monitoring by unit outstanding?	If yes, annually for how many years?
						Cumulative			Changes during prior periods	Change during this Period	Cumulat-ive		
	long-term revenues for forest conservation												
<input type="checkbox"/>	Community members investing in sustainable business (agro-forestry, apiculture, aquaculture, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of entities receiving advisory services	16.00		0.00		Project comp	9.00	0.00	25.00	No	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Community members investing in sustainable business (agro-forestry, apiculture, aquaculture, etc.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	Number of SMEs providing economic benefits and livelihood security for local communities	16.00		0.00		Project comp	12.00	0.00	28.00	Select one	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Community members investing in sustainable business (agro-forestry, apiculture, aquaculture, etc.)1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	Number of entities receiving advisory services	16.00		0.00		Project comp	9.00	0.00	25.00	Select one	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	New eco-tourism attractions	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Total incremental sales revenue (US\$)	0.00		363,000.00		Project comp	358,048.00	167,991.00	526,039.00	No	Select one

Outcome (i) <input type="checkbox"/> Add Outcome Row												
Delete Row (i)	Component /Activities (i)	Discontinued (i)	Indicators (i)	Targets (i)			Results (i)			Is post project completion monitoring by unit outstanding?	If yes, annually for how many years?	
				Cumulative			Changes during prior periods	Change during this Period	Cumulat-ive			
	that generate long-term revenues											

Impacts (i) <input type="checkbox"/> Add Impacts Row												
Delete Row (i)	Component /Activities (i)	Discontinued (i)	Indicators (i)	Targets (i)			Results (i)			Is post project completion monitoring by unit outstanding?	If yes, annually for how many years?	
				Original A	Revised B	Expect to achieve by	C	D	E=(A,B)+C+D			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conservation Concession	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	Hectares of sustainably managed land	10,000.00		8,840.00	Project completion	8,840.00	0.00	18,840.00	Select one	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Support to community members in sustainable business	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of people positively affected (direct)	0.00		16.00	Project completion	9.00	0.00	9.00	No	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conservation Concession	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Hectares of land managed sustainably	0.00		10,000.00	Project completion	8,840.00	0.00	8,840.00	No	Select one

**Comments on development results achieved**

Entire Project (including additional relevant results (positive and negative) other than those planned)	No additional development results were achieved and no unforeseen negative impacts were observed. The main expectations on the sustainable funding for the conservation of the reserve and a successful partnership between a lodge and an NGO were successfully met. The positive social impact of the project was below target, and the sustainability and long-term resilience of these results is difficult to evaluate.
Reporting period since last supervision	In this last period, aquaculture was one of the alternative sustainable livelihood options promoted in the communities and for which technical assistance and financial support was given. Unfortunately, by the end of the fourth year of implementation all community

	members that had invested on aquaculture farms had discontinued them. The income projected (limited by the local price) did not justify more costly and modern infrastructure, therefore the facilities demanded excessive labor and did not protect the fish from excessive rains or occasional floods in the region.
--	--

**Financial (USD):**

<b>Funding</b>									
Original (i) Mar. 6, 2007	Revised (i)	Actual Expenses (i)			Outstanding Purchase Order Commitments (i)	Total Expenses + Commitments		Funding Balance	
		As of Jun. 30, 2008	From Jun. 30, 2008 to Dec. 31, 2008	Total Dec. 31, 2008		Amt	%	Amt	%
A	B	C	D	E = C + D	F	G = E + F	H = G/(A,B)	I = (A,B)-G	J = I/(A,B)
476,757	480,000	448,713.61	3,860.90	452,574.51	0.00	452,574.51	94.00%	27,425.49	6.00%
<i>Explanation for significant variances between (1) original and revised funding (A vs. B) and (2) approved/revised funding and total expenses + commitments (A/B vs. G)</i>									

<b>Pricing Goals (i)</b>									
Charging for Products/Services (Yes/No)					No				
Charging details					N/A				
Comments <i>Describe the key factors in setting the charging structure. If No selected above, specify reason.</i>					In pursuing these objectives, Inka Terra will go above-and-beyond IFC's minimum environmental and social requirements. Doing so will involve incremental costs that the GEF is asked to cover in the form of a grant and concessional loan.				
<b>Fees/Contributions</b>									
	Original (i) Mar. 6, 2007	Revised (i)	Receipts (i)				Fees/Contributions Balance		
			As of Jun. 30, 2008	From Jun. 30, 2008 to Dec. 31, 2008	Total Dec. 31, 2008 Amt %		Amt	%	
	A	B	C	D	E = C + D	F = E/(A,B)	G=(A,B)-E	H=G/( A,B)	
Cash Fees from Recipients	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00		
In-Kind Contributions	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00		
Other	11,728,827	11,728,827	10,600,317.00	167,991.00	10,768,308.00	92.00%	960,519.00	8.00%	
<i>Explanation for significant variances between (1) original and revised fees/contributions (A vs. B) and (2) approved/revised fees/contributions and related total receipts (A/B vs. E)</i>									

<b>WBS Status</b>								<input type="checkbox"/> Add WBS Row	
Delete Row (i)	Discontinued (i)	WBS element	Name	Closed	Expected/Actual close date	Outstanding commitments	Outstanding Fees	Comments	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	IFC-00506050-TF053713	GEF Inka Terra - TF053173	Yes	Feb. 12, 2009	0.00	0.00		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	IFC-00506050-	GEF Inka	No	Jun. 30, 2011	0.00	0.00		

WBS Status								<input type="checkbox"/> Add WBS Row
Delete Row (i)	Discontinued (i)	WBS element	Name	Closed	Expected/Actual close date	Outstanding commitments	Outstanding Fees	Comments
		TF053713-LN	Terra - Loan					
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	IFC-00506050-TF093297-M7	GEF Inka Terra - TF093297-M7	Yes	Feb. 12, 2009	0.00	0.00	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	IFC-00506050-BF000107-M7	GEF Inka Terra - BF000107-M7	Yes	Feb. 12, 2009	0.00	0.00	

**Timeline:**

Delete Row (i)	Key Activities for Reporting Period	Activity Status	Timeline	<input type="checkbox"/> Add Timeline Row

*Explanation for delays in start and/or completion of key activities and resulting impact on overall project timeframe.*

**Consultants:** [This information should be entered manually]

Delete Row (i)	Consultant Name/Firm	Expertise/Comments	<input type="checkbox"/> Add Consultant Row
		[In line with IFC Legal requirements, consultant performance information should NOT be provided]	

**Project Team:** [This information should be automatically populated from iDESK]

Core Team Members	Primary	Proxies
Transaction Leader	Juan Jose Dada	Thanh Thuy T. Nguyen, Vinitha R. Jayalal, Margaret Peters-Fawcett, Diana Mirzakarimova, Nazira Abdukhalilova, Maria del Rosario Rojas
Monitoring and Evaluations Officer	Baljit Wadhwa	Thanh Thuy T. Nguyen, Shir Ashar Naveh
Finance Officer	Nazira Abdukhalilova	CES Finance and Budget Team
Team Assistant	Maria Christina S. Javier	Vinitha R. Jayalal
Other Team Members	Cecilia Lim, Ekaterina Pankratova, David Martz, Jacinta Cheen Sim Au Yong, iDesk - CPRFO Data Editors, OEG Monitoring	
Management Team	Primary	Proxies
Unit Line Manager	Catherine Cruveillier Cassagne	Houria Sammari, Zouera Youssoufou
Unit Manager	Monika M. Weber-Fahr	Thanh Thuy T. Nguyen, Fayana A. Willie, Lisa Da Silva

**Additional Comment(s):**

A relatively successful project in a difficult environment with many valid lessons learned.

**Review and Approval Status:** [This information should be automatically populated from iDESK]



TL/M&E/FinO Initiate Completion - Initiate Completion by Juan Jose Dada at 02/13/2009 05:03:07 PM

Comment :

Unit Line Manager Clear - Cleared to Unit Manager by Catherine Cassagne at 02/13/2009 05:11:08 PM

Comment : Well done - I am looking forward to the knowledge management exercise that is planned for FY09/10 on eco-tourism models and lessons learned. It is interesting to see that this project has fundamental lessons for the eco-standards product.

Unit Manager Approve - Approved by Monika M. Weber-Fahr at 02/13/2009 06:12:06 PM

Comment : It is good to see the project closing and the learning taking place.