

**Central American Markets for Biodiversity (CAMBio):
Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable
use within micro, small, and medium-sized enterprise
development and financing**

FINAL EXTERNAL EVALUATION

FINAL REPORT

UNDP-GEF PROJECT (Project 3368)

**DESIREE ELIZONDO External Consultant
NICARAGUA, July 22, 2016**

VERSIONS OF THE REPORT

Draft (V1): Delivered on May 5, 2016

Final: Delivered on June 30, 2016

Final with Revisions: Delivered on July 22, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	V
1.1. PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE	V
1.2. A BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION	V
1.3. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS	V
1.6. EVALUATION RATING TABLE	IX
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION	1
1.2. SCOPE OF THE ASSESMENT AND METHODOLOGY	1
1.3. STRUCTURE OF THE EVALUATION REPORT	2
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT	2
2.1. ONSET AND DURATION OF PROJECT	2
2.2. PROBLEMS THAT THE PROJECT SOUGHT TO ADDRESS	3
2.3. IMMEDIATE AND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT	3
2.4. EXPECTED RESULTS	4
2.5. KEY REFERENCE INDICATORS	5
2.6. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	5
3. FINDINGS	6
3.1. PROJECT DESIGN AND FORMULATION	6
• Logical Framework Analysis and Results Framework (logic and strategy of the project; indicators)	6
• Project Indicators, Assumptions and Risks	7
• Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into the project design and linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector	8
• Repeat approach	9
• Comparative advantage of UNDP	10
• Project links with other sector interventions	10
• Administrative Provisions	11
3.2. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION	11
• Adaptive management (changes in project design and project results during implementation)	11
• Partnership Agreements	12
• Feedback from M & E activities used for adaptive management	13
• Project Funding	13
• Monitoring and Evaluation: starting design and implementation	14
• Coordination of the implementation and execution of UNDP and partner for the implementation and operational issues	15
3.3. PROJECT RESULTS	15
• Overall results (achievement of objectives)	15
3.4. EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY	26
3.5. RELEVANCE	27
3.6. INTEGRATION AND NATIONAL IMPLICATION	28
3.7. SUSTAINABILITY	28
3.8. IMPACT	29
4. CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS	33
4.1. RECOMMENDATIONS	35

4.2. LESSONS LEARNED.....	37
ANNEXES.....	38
ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	38
ANNEX 2. ITINERARY	51
ANNEX 3. LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED	57
ANNEX 4. SUMMARY OF FIELD VISITS	58
ANNEX 5. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	59
ANNEX 6. EVALUATION QUESTION MATRIX.....	60
ANNEX 7. QUESTIONNAIRE USED AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS.....	65
ANNEX 8. EVALUATION CONSULTANT AGREEMENT FORM	67
ANNEX 9. EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM	67
ANNEX 10. PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK.....	68
ANNEX 11. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	75
ANNEX 12. INFORMATION GENERATED BY THE PROJECT.....	79

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ADICLA	Integral Development Association of Atitlán Lake Basin
APR	Annual Project Review
ARECA	Accelerating Renewable Energy Investment in Central America and Panama
ASADAS	Rural Aqueduct Associations
AWP	Annual Work Plan
AYNLA	Association <i>Help yourself and we will help you</i>
BANDESAL	Development Bank of El Salvador
BF	Biodiversity Friendly
BF-CHM	Biodiversity Friendly Clearing House Mechanism
BF-MSME	Biodiversity Friendly Micro-Small-Medium Enterprises
BIE	Biodiversity Impact Evaluation
BMP	Best Management Practices
CABEI	Central America Bank of Economic Integration
CAMBio	Central American Markets for Biodiversity Conservation
CAPAS	Central America Protected Areas System
CATIE	Tropical Agricultural Research and Higher Education Center
CCAD	Central America Commission for Environment and Development
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
COOCIQUE	Credit Union of the community of Ciudad Quesada
COOPEALIANZA	Credit Union and Multiple Services Perez Zeledon Alliance
EA	Executing Agency
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of United Nations
FDL	Local Development Fund
FIs	Financial Institutions
FINAM	Financing for the Majorities
FONAFIFO	National Forestry Financing Fund of Costa Rica
FONDESOL	Fund for Solidarity Development
FUNCAFOR	Forest Coffee Foundation
GBA	Global Business Advisors
GE	Génesis Empresarial
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IA	Implementing Agency
IFC	International Finance Corporation
INCAE	Central American Institute of Business Administration
KFW	German Development Bank
LFA	Logical Framework Analysis
LGC	Global Credit Line
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MAP	Agro-Environmental Program

MBC	Mesoamerican Biological Corridor
MFI	Micro-finance Institution
MSME	Micro-Small-Medium Enterprises
MSP	Medium Size Project
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NGO	Non-Government Organization
NITLAPAN	The Research and Development Institute of the Nicaraguan Central American University
PACE	Business Skills Support Program
PACT	Technical Skills Support Program
PARCA	Environmental Plan for the Central American Region
PDF	Project Development Facility
PES	Payments for Environmental Services
PIR	Project Implementation Report
PIT	Project Implementation Team
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
PLF	Project Logical Framework
POA	Yearly Operation Plan
PROARCA	Regional Environmental Program for Central America
PD	Project Document
PSC	Project Steering Committee
SGP	Small Grants Program
SIGMA	PROARCA Environmental Management and Finance Program
TA	Technical Assistance
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
ZONAF	Central American Border Zone Development Program

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1.PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	<i>Central American Markets for Biodiversity (CAMBio): Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within micro-, small, and medium-sized enterprise development and financing</i>			
GEF project ID:	2670		At endorsement (million USD)	At completion (million USD)
PNUD project ID:	3368	GEF Financing	10.225	
Country:	Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica	IA and EA own:		
Region:	Latin America and Caribbean	Government:		
Focal Area:	MSMES	Other:		
FA objectives, (OP/SP):	2,3,4	Total co-financing		0.78 (0.23 MSMEs, 0.55 FIs)
Executing Agency	Central America Bank of Integration (CABEI)	Total Project Cost:	17	58
Other Involved Partners:	Central America Environmental Commission (CCAD)	ProDoc Signature (date project began): 18 July, 2006		
		(Operational) Closing Date	Proposed: June 2012	Actual: December 2015

1.2.A BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The CAMBio project sought to develop financial mechanisms, delivered through national financial institutions, to encourage adoption of biodiversity-friendly practices by farmers, livestock producers, tourism operators, and other small and medium-sized enterprises. The project's specific objective was to remove barriers in banking, business, and enabling environments to catalyze biodiversity-friendly investments in micro-, small-, and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs) in Central America.

1.3.SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

Financing BF-MSME

- CABEI was very successful in providing US\$ 55 million (a threefold increase in pledged funds) to financial institutions lending to BF-MSMEs, through existing credit lines.
- CAMBio involved more than 27 FIs, including a group of four banks specializing in agricultural commodities, which allocated more than half of the credit funds. Most of the funds accessed were used as working capital.

- This evaluation confirms that most CAMbio beneficiaries were already clients of *FIs*. To reach greater financial inclusion in lending operations, banking policies must consider focalization strategies to reach new clients.

Project Incentives – The non-refundable components

- The project employed three non-reimbursable financial facilities (technical assistance, bio-awards and partial risk guarantees) to support the emergence of biodiversity- friendly enterprises. According to written procedures, all the MSMEs eligible for a BF loan were also eligible to receive project incentives.
- The technical assistance strategy changed during project implementation, from a facility targeting the provision of assistance based on a modality of cost recovery principles, to a fund operated as small, short-term grants used for consultancies and subcontracts.
- Around 20% of the US\$10 million provided by GEF was disbursed as technical assistance to *FIs* or sectorial recipient organizations in 155 payments. Microfinance institutions used the funds to improve skills on productive farms, using their own technical or promoter networks. Banks, on the other hand, paid for coffee certification processes, training events and outreach activities. Sectorial organizations sponsored training courses, regional workshops, and other activities aimed at building institutional capacities.
- The facility to provide partial credit guarantees was scaled down, and practically became non-operational in 2012. The fund disbursed 7.5%, of the allocated US\$2.9 million, in 12 contracts.
- The use of the bio-award, a cash incentive to reward the enhancement of biodiversity friendly practices, reached 26% of loan recipients and 22 financial intermediaries, using 14.5% of the GEF allocation. According to the rules, the amount of the award was set at 20% of the total loan, up to a maximum of US\$10,000 (70% of the award resources went to MSMEs and 30% to *FIs*).
- The operationalization of this cash award was overwhelmingly complicated, expensive, and required specialized personnel and a field technical structure seldom found in financial institutions.

Project Management, Evaluation and Monitoring

- The project was very successful in achieving approved targets, and according to POAs and the internal monitoring system, has significantly exceeded expected output indicators. However, there is still a significant distance between these accomplishments and the project's expected outcomes and immediate objective. Indicators to measure results and impacts were not used as part of the project monitoring system.

Project Impact

The main project objective was to remove barriers in banking and business, and to achieve biodiversity benefits with these investments, while being able to generate increased earnings. Evidence collected during this evaluation confirms that the delivery of cash incentives provided additional cash flow to MSMEs. Nonetheless, these benefits reached beneficiaries in differentiated forms, and no data is available to assess the impacts produced from these contributions.

The CAMBio Project Biodiversity Impact Evaluation confirms that data to assess results was available for only 20% of all loans. Within this group, almost all investments were allocated to eco-regions where tropical forests are considered the dominant ecosystem. Additionally, selection criteria for loan placement required that recipients were implementing some form of biodiversity-friendly productive practice. No comprehensive impact analysis can be carried out due to a lack of more robust databases.

1.4. RECOMMENDATIONS

The alliance between UNDP/GEF and CABEL makes use of an already established financial intermediation network, using the global credit mechanism, and presently offers 14 financial products to MSMEs. The evaluator strongly recommends that CABEL, hopefully with GEF technical cooperation, expands credit schemes to produce ecosystem services in productive landscapes with development goals.

The following recommendations to UNDP/GEF/CABEL for a post-CAMbio initiative build upon the findings of this evaluation, in order to consolidate financial inclusion and biodiversity benefits.

FI target groups:

- Financial institutions have very well defined strategies for financial markets and credit infiltration. Lending to agriculture continues to be seen as a very risky business. With the exception of microfinance institutions, *FIs* do not target small farmers, and this sector continues to face severe barriers to financial inclusion. A new UNDP/CABEL initiative must openly address these limitations, and define potential project beneficiaries.
- This evaluation shows that microfinance institutions and agricultural lending cooperatives are better prepared to provide financial services to smaller production sectors and achieve greater financial inclusion in their networks.
- Ideally, the bracket of potentially profitable farmers would be identified. With support in the form of loans, technical assistance and chain markets, these farmers would be able to overcome barriers and become competitive, and exit the productive stagnation that keeps them in poverty.
- The CAMbio lending portfolio concentrated on two very extreme groups of farmers. A new initiative should avoid such polarized clientele to be effective and produce impact. In Guatemala, the microfinance organization invested considerable effort in trying to reach subsistence agriculture clients. In the case of very small credits, the CAMbio loan approval and follow-up processes posed a severe limitation to the scalability and effectiveness of its model. On the other hand, the environmental requirements for the large loans made by private banks were too lenient.

Productive Sectors:

- Agricultural commodities play a major role in the livelihood strategies of farmers in Central America. However, there are major differences in the degree of modernization and market integration within the CABEL defined MSME sector. A new initiative must clearly define a typology of farmers and productive systems as target groups. A clear target group will allow lending to be effectively integrated with technical assistance and anchor market chains.
- CAMbio demand was in the coffee sector. But within this sector, there are substantial differences in production technologies, and in levels of vulnerability faced by farmers for sustaining livelihoods. To insure consistency with UNDP development strategies, a new initiative must be firmly anchored among small-scale farmers. As many researchers have demonstrated, small-scale family farms produce over 70% of the world's coffee, giving this sector tremendous potential for a vertical and horizontal integration in value chains.
- However, before embarking on a new initiative, a more profound assessment is required to better understand sector niches and opportunities.

Value Chain Approach:

- Commercial sectors and sustainable food chains are increasingly adopting inclusive models, pulling small farmers into the value chain approach. The FDL-Nitlapan institutional model is a

very effective approach for providing financing to small producers. In the CAMbio model, they provided support to farmers in the form of credit and technical assistance. However, they also have an excellent record bringing the extension model one step further: integrating markets. Using anchor firms in dairy processing, they have linked farmers receiving credit and technical assistance with these businesses, demonstrating a very successful development model.

- A new initiative must avoid the small grant model of technical assistance, and should fine-tune a more strategic and sustainable methodology.

Definition of sustainable practices:

- To obtain positive biodiversity externalities, a much more comprehensive ecosystem approach is needed. The CAMbio model is based on sector good practices. This approach is reasonable for improving production practices, and for mitigating bad practices. But to reduce deforestation, land degradation, climate change adaptation and biodiversity losses, additions at the farm and landscape levels must be carefully assessed with an agro-ecology perspective. Conservation management strategies must also be part of the picture.
- As a cautionary note, not all certification seals for coffee require ecological considerations. It is possible that a coffee farmer in the specialty market, with several certifications, might be deforesting very important biodiversity spots to increase the coffee production area.
- In any case, the causalities and additions achieved with the introduction of best management practices in regard to biodiversity require careful assessment.

Use of Incentives and cash awards:

- If requirements are not clearly defined and if the selection processes are not competitive and transparent, a new initiative should steer clear of this type of award. Better loan rates might, in fact, be an easier alternative to providing incentives.

1.5. LESSONS LEARNED

- Agricultural commodity production plays a very important role in the economy of rural populations in Central America. CAMBio defines coffee, cacao and cardamom as biodiversity-friendly crops. However, depending on management practices and technologies, these crops can also be the source of losses in biodiversity and ecosystem services. The tradeoffs that may occur must be acknowledged and integrated into the project intervention models.
- CAMBio promoted the afforestation of farming systems in many respects through improved agroforestry, but was not found to provide sufficient mechanisms to enhance the protection of existing forests on farms.
- A project of the scale and complexity of CAMbio requires better institutional anchoring and active stakeholders very embedded in project implementation, such as farmer organizations and commercial anchor firms.
- It is not reasonable to employ bank loan procedures for the delivery of incentives, if these are intended to reach an ample clientele. A good lesson is provided in the section on bio-awards.
- The cost effectiveness and the roles of a PIU, including technical experts, must be carefully determined.
- Future programs following similar purposes should invest more time in acquiring baseline information and developing more robust databases for impact assessments.

1.6.EVALUATION RATING TABLE

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	<i>rating</i>	2. IA& EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry	MS	Quality of UNDP Implementation	MS
M&E Plan Implementation	MU	Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	MS
Overall quality of M&E	MS	Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	MS
3. Assessment of Outcomes	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
Relevance	R	Financial resources:	L
Effectiveness	MS	Socio-political:	NA
Efficiency	MU	Institutional framework and governance:	NA
Overall Project Outcome Rating	MS	Environmental :	NA
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	L

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1.PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

This document presents the results of the independent and final evaluation of the project “The Central American Markets for Biodiversity (CAMBio): Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within micro, small, and medium-sized enterprise development and financing.” The project, implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), was financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) as a Full Size Project, and the Central American Bank for Economic Integration (CABEI), which was also the direct executor.

The main purpose of the evaluation is to determine the performance of the project in reference to the expected outputs, and the impact and sustainability of its results. In addition, the following multiple purposes of the UNDP-GEF external review were considered:

- promote accountability and transparency, and assess and specify the scope of project achievements,
- draw lessons that may help improve the selection, design and implementation of future activities funded by GEF,
- contribute to the overall evaluation of the results in achieving the GEF strategic objectives aimed toward a global environmental benefit,
- measure the project convergence with other UNDP priorities within the country program, including poverty alleviation, gender, reduction of disaster risk and vulnerability.

1.2.SCOPE OF THE ASSESMENT AND METHODOLOGY

The review follows the UNDP and GEF guidelines for terminal evaluations. The project results and its performance have been assessed using the five major criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact. Project success was measured based on the Revised Logical Framework which provided performance and result indicators for project implementation. The GEF rating system was applied to assess project relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, as well as the quality of the M&E systems.

The assessment has been conducted in a participatory manner through a combination of:

1. The review of project documentation and outsource information gathering.
2. An opening meeting and work session with CABEI and main project staff in Tegucigalpa.
3. Site visits and interviews with key stakeholders from the five participating countries.
4. Follow up conferences and debriefing with UNDP and CABEI.

CABEI project staff and the consultant handled all logistical and organizational matters, with support from the UNDP Tegucigalpa office. The fieldwork was conducted during the months of January and February 2016, with the exception of Nicaragua, with field visits carried out in late March.

The evaluation process comprised three phases. The first consisted of data collection and the design of methodological tools and the fieldwork schedule (Annex 1). This phase finalized with the presentation of the inception report to UNDP, CABEI and project officials on December 17. UNDP criteria for selection of field visits were based on the concentration of lending operations in each country. Sites to visit and organizations to interview were specified to the evaluator in the Term of Reference (ToR).

After the Christmas holidays, a second phase followed that consisted of country visits to the project sites and stakeholder interviews. All the interviews with *FIs* were scheduled by CABEI. The aim was to obtain firsthand opinions from participating financial institutions and their clients, as well as to

visit sites of intervention, to verify sustainable practices in situ. Due to the remote characteristics of site locations, and the high dispersion of clients, 10 more days were allocated to this phase (see work plan in Annex 1).

The third and final phase consisted of information analysis and report writing. The draft report was written in March in the consultant's home country. This phase concluded with the incorporation of comments from UNDP and CABEL into the draft report and the submission of the final evaluation report on June 30.

1.3. STRUCTURE OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

According to the ToR and "Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations" (2012), the report emphasizes the following aspects:

Project design and its relevance in relation to: a) logic and strategy of the project, with respect to development priorities at the regional and national levels; b) stakeholders – assessment of participation in correspondence with the specific needs; c) lessons from other relevant projects and linkages with other sector interventions; d) UNDP comparative advantage and mission to promote sustainable human development.

Implementation and Performance: management arrangements focused on project implementation: general implementation and management; financial accountability; monitoring and evaluation at the project level.

Results –Effectiveness: the extent to which the project has achieved its objectives and the desired outcomes, and the overall contribution of the project to national strategic objectives; efficiency - assess efficiency with respect to overall impact of the project and better projection of achievements and benefits resulting from project resources, and the cost-effectiveness of the utilization of GEF resources and actual co-financing to achieve project results; sustainability; contribution to capacity development; replication – analysis of replication potential of the project's positive results in country and in the region, outlining possible funding sources; replication to date without direct intervention of the project; synergies with other similar projects.

Conclusion and Recommendations: changes in stakeholder behavior to improve biodiversity and productive practices; financial barriers and enabling conditions for MSMEs; actions needed to improve impacts and best practices.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

2.1. ONSET AND DURATION OF PROJECT

The project implementation period was from January 2007 to December 2015, with a geographical coverage of the five Central American countries that are members of CABEL (Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua and Costa Rica). This evaluation covers the entire period of project implementation.

Table 1: Project Timeline

Milestone	Expected Date	Actual Date
PDF – A Approval Date		
Pipeline Entry Date		01-16-2005
CEO Endorsement		03-20-2006
Agency approval date UNDP		07-18-2006
Implementation	05-1-2005	2007
Midterm Review	06-2008	03-2011
Project completion	December 2011	2014
Project closing	December 2013	2015
Terminal Evaluation		2016

This project was first conceived in early 2002, as part of the regional efforts to implement the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor (MBC)¹. The CAMBio project was fully developed and approved in 2006 with CABEL as the executing agency. Initially, a two-year inception phase was foreseen starting January 2007, but in practice, the project had a slow start. This situation was not resolved until 2010. In November 2010, the Project Steering Committee (PSC) approved an extension of the project, scheduled to end in December 2013. However, the high point of its operations was in 2012 and 2013, and the project finally ended operations in December 2015.

2.2.PROBLEMS THAT THE PROJECT SOUGHT TO ADDRESS

It is widely recognized that Mesoamerica represents one of the most biodiversity-rich spots on earth. Accounting for only 0.5% of the earth's land, it supports 7% of known species to date (PD)². In spite of the relevant conservation efforts, the region still has one of the highest deforestation rates on the continent. With only 2.1% of the Mesoamerica forests, it contributes to 5.4% of the earth's deforestation (FAO 2010)³. The utmost consequence of deforestation is the loss of biodiversity associated with the change of habitat and land degradation. Additionally, cattle ranching and traditional subsistence crop production dominate the landscape after forest removal, with very low levels of yields. The most acute rural poverty in Central America occurs precisely in these agricultural frontier areas. Generally, there is little presence of public and financial institutions, minimal social infrastructure and a lack of governance in these isolated regions. Precarious property and indigenous rights and high levels of violence also characterize these territories. Access to credit, when available, is channeled through non-banking institutions, NGOs and donor driven projects.

By providing innovative financial mechanisms and technical assistance to farmers, cattle ranchers, tourism and forestry entrepreneurs in target areas close to conservation areas, new opportunities can emerge, favoring the adoption of biodiversity-friendly practices and green markets. Ultimately, the project aims to expand the area adopting such practices, leading to improved biodiversity conservation at farm and landscape level. According to the project analysis, a major constraint limiting the growth of any small business is the availability of capital. It is generally accepted that conservative banking practices have left the agricultural sector with limited financing, due to the high risks associated with its operations.

According to the project document, the key tools available for supporting the emergence of biodiversity-friendly small and micro enterprises are (i) financing, (ii) business development and marketing support, and (iii) creation of an effective enabling environment. Incremental support from GEF to address the removal of barriers preventing the effective application of these tools constitutes the guiding principle of the present project.

2.3.IMMEDIATE AND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

The purpose of the project is to mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of production landscapes in five Central American countries (Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Costa Rica, and Nicaragua).

The **project goal** is to ensure that micro, small- and medium-sized enterprises in Central America increasingly contribute to sustainable development and environmental protection by incorporating biodiversity concerns in their products and services.

¹ Initiative launched by the Central America Commission on Environment (CCAD) and Mexico in 1997 and endorsed by GEF few years later.

² Project Document page 5

³ FAO 2010. Statistical Reports.

The **project objective** is to remove barriers in banking and business, and create an enabling environment that catalyzes biodiversity-friendly investments in micro, small-, and medium-sized enterprises in Central America.

2.4.EXPECTED RESULTS

The project outcomes and outputs are described below. It should be noted that each output is specifically designed to address a barrier identified in the project document. The project log frame was adjusted after the Mid Term Evaluation (MTE), conducted in May 2010.

Table 2: Project outcomes and outputs

Outcome 1: The Central American Bank for Economic Integration (CABEI) and its Financial Intermediaries are providing loan financing to MSMEs for development of biodiversity-friendly business activities		
	At Project design	After MTE
Output 1.1	Increased awareness among financial institutions of potential market opportunities for lending to BF-MSMEs, including information on specific bankable projects	Same
Output 1.2	A risk guarantee facility established by the project is being used by banks to reduce the risks of lending to BF-MSMEs	Same
Output 1.3	Revenue-based lending approaches have been accepted, and are being used by banks to lend to BF-MSMEs	Eliminated
Output 1.4	A biodiversity reward facility is helping to expand lending by non-banking institutions to BF-MSMEs at interest rates that are sufficiently profitable to lenders and affordable to borrowers	Same
Output 1.5	Tailored financing products developed for standardized loan situations	Same
Output 1.6	Strengthened personnel and organizational resources at CABEI and involved FIs for improved management of biodiversity financing	Same
Output 1.7	"Bio-score" loan approval tool including biodiversity criteria being used in FIs loan approval procedures	Same
Outcome 2: MSMEs working in a broad range of economic sectors are able to develop biodiversity-friendly business ventures and access new markets for their products and services		
Output 2.1	Potential BF-MSMEs who could be in need of BF financing are identified and listed in a database being used by FIs.	Eliminated
Output 2.2	Awareness created with identified, potential UnBF-MSMEs regarding green markets and other biodiversity-friendly business opportunities, and of the newly available lending opportunities for related investment.	Eliminated
Output 2.3	Technical capacity of MSMEs with viable ideas for biodiversity-friendly business development is enhanced through an operational PACT (Technical Capacities Assistance Programme) technical skills support programme	Technical capacities and management abilities of SME improved and developed though the implementation of a technical assistance programme.
Output 2.4	SME's business planning and management skills developed through an operational PACE (Business Capacities Assistance Programme) business skills support programme	
Output 2.5	Market linkages improved across the supply chain	Eliminated
Output 2.6	Market information about biodiversity friendly products and services is disseminated to MSMEs through a Biodiversity Market Information Clearing House Mechanism (BF-CHM)	Same
Output 2.7	Increased market demand for select BF-products and services	Eliminated
Output 2.8	Partnerships established between potential BF-MSMEs and research community for development and marketing of new BF products	Eliminated
Outcome 3: Enabling environments have been modified to create greater incentives for developing biodiversity-friendly sub-sectors of national economies. <i>Reformulated as: Policy and sector initiatives are facilitated and supported to foster the development of BF MSME within national economies</i>		
Output 3.1	Policy, legislative and regulatory review and reform recommendations formulated	Support given for the facilitation and follow-up of sectorial and policy initiatives to strengthen MSME sector
Output 3.2	Recommendations formulated and support provided for introduction of fiscal incentives	Eliminated
Output 3.3	Support provided for national adoption and implementation of recommended policy, legislative, regulatory and incentive reforms	Eliminated
Outcome 4: Learning, feedback and adaptive management, particularly relating to interactions amongst outcomes 1-3, are ensured. <i>Reformulated as: Lessons learned from the implementation process are collected and evaluated to generate an adaptive management model</i>		

Output 4.1	Advanced monitoring system established for a) measurement of biodiversity impact, b) continuous measurement of project indicators, and c) refinement of lessons learned, including BF-MSME development and BF banking	A comprehensive monitoring model established for following up biodiversity impacts, project management indicators and lessons learned, to induce opportune decision-making.
Output 4.2	Adaptive management systems established to continuously incorporate adjustments based on lessons learned from the monitoring system	
Output 4.3	Regional dissemination of project lessons, including best practices for BF-MSME development	Same

2.5.KEY REFERENCE INDICATORS

The impact of the project's objective will be measured by the degree to which banks and financial institutions provide lending for investments in biodiversity-friendly business practices within MSMEs, as well as the biodiversity impact these investments have. The project monitoring system provided semiannual reports on specific contributions to the indicators in the GEF's business plan.

Outcome 1:	Indicators will measure the amounts of co-financing generated for biodiversity-friendly business investments in a) formal bank loans to small and medium-sized businesses, and b) non-banking credits to micro-producers.
Outcome 2:	Indicators will measure MSMEs ability to document a biodiversity benefit from their investments, while being able to generate increased earnings.
Outcome 3:	Indicators will measure the degree to which participating countries are implementing measures to increase incentives for biodiversity-friendly MSME investment.
Outcome 4:	Indicators will measure project management efficiency.

1. Please refer to the Logical Framework (Annex 2) of this Document for a complete list of output indicators.

2.6.KEY STAKEHOLDERS

The nature of the project is such that its success is entirely reliant on close relationships and networking with the various relevant stakeholders and players at regional and national levels. Key stakeholders are described in the PD as follows:

1. **CABEI** is the key organization involved in increasing biodiversity impact through its commercial financing to eligible projects and eligible MSME users. It will be both the executing agency for the GEF contribution and the main co-financier, and as such has been integral to the design and development of this project.
2. **The financial intermediaries (FIs)** are the direct contact to potential BF clients, and therefore the role of FIs in this project is crucial. They will be the vital link in making the investment financing happen. The FIs will be represented in the PSC.
3. **Central American Commission on Environment and Development (CCAD)** will be among the project's core strategic alliances, as it is in a strong position to provide the project with networks and liaisons for environmental legislation and policy related issues, due to the fact that it already plays a pivotal role in the regional efforts to harmonize the promotion of BF approaches by regional governments. As the key player in activities around the Mesoamerican Corridor, CCAD will be spearheading its efforts in the BF arena for the benefit of the project.
4. **National Ministries of Environment, Finance and Productive Sectors:** The project will work closely with the national government in each of the five countries.
5. **Sector Associations, Chambers of Industry and Commerce:** The sector and industry associations and chambers are the key channels to their members, which are potential BF clients. They will be motivated and mobilized by the project through national seminars and other forms of generating awareness to become strong proponents of a BF approach in business whenever applicable.
6. **MSMEs:** The MSMEs are the agents for change in behavior in favor of BF businesses. Therefore, they are key beneficiaries of the project. Ultimately, they will either lead the project to success, or in the worst case scenario, they will continue to make business decisions without any regard to the

positive incentives that favor BF approaches. The FIs in the CABI network can provide loans in the US\$ 25 – 1 million range. Thus, the project will also be able to reach out to grass roots level businesses, creating an opportunity to introduce BF activities at all levels of the private sector.

7. Technical Assistance Service Providers: The project will be dealing with three types of TA providers: (i) banking and revenue-based financing specialist organizations; (ii) BF specialist organizations, and (iii) Institutions and consultants providing business planning and management support.

8. Related International and National Biodiversity and Environmental Financing Facilities: A number of initiatives and programs are being implemented or launched in BF and closely related fields. The most relevant ones are part of the IFC Environmental Business Finance Program, EcoLogic Finance NGO program, EcoEnterprise Fund, and PROARCA/SIGMA Clean Production Program.

3. FINDINGS

3.1.PROJECT DESIGN AND FORMULATION

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

The project document identifies the challenges and the opportunities facing small and medium enterprise development, and how financing sustainable practices can be an effective tool for improving natural resource use and biodiversity enhancement. Conceptually, the project is very coherent, and the documentation reflects a careful preparation process. The novelty of its strategy consists in linking environmental goals with financing targets, and the possibility of using traditional financial institutions and mechanisms to develop new financial products that could generate substantial increases in lending operations to BF enterprises reaching the project objectives.

The central aspect of the challenge is very clearly indicated in the project objective: *to remove barriers in banking and business, and create enabling environments to catalyze BF investments*. The project correctly proposes a two-tier strategy.

To strengthen the demand side, the strategy for Outcome 2 proposes alliances with a broad set of partners (market organizations, certification providers, other development projects, research and training institutions like CATIE and INCAE, etc.) to provide assistance and services to emerging businesses, and prepare them to become bankable. To stimulate changes on the supply side, the logic for Outcome 1 is to create and to a certain degree institutionalize “smart subsidies,” namely partial risk guarantees and biodiversity reward instruments to reach credit-needy (emerging) clients. These are intended to provide an initial boost for CABI, the participating FIs and the enterprises themselves to structure viable businesses and actually get financing for sustainable BF economic activities.

These aspects of the design were highly relevant. Logically, MSME require the accompaniment of public and private services, and the provision of technical assistance and other incentives as an essential component of project success. Furthermore, as the goal of the project is not only to provide access to loans, but also to ensure that those loans are provided to potential biodiversity-friendly businesses to enhance their productive practices, so they can become sustainable borrowers, with long-term biodiversity benefits of a regional scope. Thus, the main challenge to the project is linking loans with technical assistance and other incentives, to thereby produce desired project outputs and impact.

Given the complexity of this project, it makes sense that to fine-tune the level of planning and logic of change required for implementation an inception phase was needed. Usually, more grounded strategies that are better suited to the needs of target groups and the project's available financial resources can be designed once execution has begun. Thus, it is understandable that this process was postponed until the initial implementation, so that the demand (for loans, TA and incentives) could be determined once the project was underway, in consensus with the participating institutions.

According to the evaluator, one of the most noticeable challenges facing the project during implementation is to operationalize strategies for reaching project clientele within defined commodities and sectors⁴. For financial intermediaries, the universe of MSMEs is ample⁵, encompassing different production conditions and financial needs. It is therefore worth noting that project clientele have different capacities to introduce biodiversity friendly practices in their production schemes. There are also substantial differences in terms of how these MSMEs access financial institutions.

The strategy for reaching Outcome 3: to create an enabling environment for biodiversity friendly practices in the productive sectors is centered on the improvement of public policies affecting biodiversity-friendly behavior. The means to achieving the goal is built upon the political leverage of the CCAD, and the links between its respective national environmental authorities and sectorial ministries. According to the MTE, this objective has been difficult to implement, a finding that has been confirmed during this evaluation process. The insufficient participation of national institutions in a regional project can be considered a more common peculiarity, rather than a shortcoming of the project design itself. The component that seemed most ambitious from the start is the goal of achieving policy reforms, which has proven to be very complex and time-consuming, and the project wisely scaled this goal down. Nevertheless, small and medium producers and enterprises face many structural barriers limiting their development, and capital availability is only one of them. A project with CAMBio's complexity needs to be embedded in a favourable policy and institutional environment; therefore, it is understandable that it maintained a policy expert on payroll.

The fourth outcome in the project strategy ensures that all elements of this ambitious project will be closely monitored, including the achievement of the project's indicators, in order to facilitate management decisions, including adjustments when necessary. Therefore, understanding the theory of change behind the project is crucial for monitoring project success. As it is explained in the following sections, one shortcoming is that the monitoring modality was constructed around project deliverables, with little attention given to project results and expected impacts.

- **Project Indicators, Assumptions and Risks**

The project logical framework matrix identifies performance indicators, as well as the risks and assumptions associated with each outcome. Nevertheless, as stated before, due to the project's complexity and the unpredictability of credit demand, it would not have been appropriate to define quantifiable indicators in the design phase, so the logical framework contains broad definitions of outcomes, outputs and indicators. This clarification is necessary to avoid an inadequate rating of project design. In relation to Outcome 1, although the situation analysis provides good information, as expected, the project lacks an FI baseline to more firmly ground decisions. Participating FIs were integrated at a latter phase, during implementation. Regrettably, no data was collected during FI selection, especially about their previous operations with target clients, to have reference data available.

⁴ Agroforestry, Organic Agriculture, Sustainable Forest Management, Certified Aquaculture, Sustainable Tourism, Silvopastoral Systems, Sustainable Fishing.

⁵ In Central America the definition of micro, small and medium enterprise is a production unit with 1 to 100 employees.

- For the overall objective, the project baseline asserts that at project start, virtually no financing was being channelled by CABEI and its *FIs* to BF investments. This assertion has not proven accurate, according to the findings of this final evaluation (most of the interviewed clients already had credit with *FIs*), especially if we consider that the great majority of loans went to the coffee sector. The assumption that the BF financial product will be able to work long after the project ends cannot be fully tested either, as *FIs* are promoting the BF-MSME credit line cautiously, although they continue to make loans to their good clients through this or other available funding channels.
- The other baseline assumption that proved difficult to test was that few loans were awarded to micro-enterprises for BF activities. This assumption might be true for private banks, but not for microfinance institutions that specialize in rural clients. Project findings show that the great majority of micro financing was already targeting BF micro enterprises, as proven by the case of Nicaragua and Guatemala. In the case of El Salvador, the findings demonstrate that *FIs* were already lending to BF-enterprises, but were classified differently, according to other bank lending categories.
- The use of a bio-scorecard (or eligibility matrix) seems to be a key aspect of the project strategy, to enable tracking of impacts on biodiversity. It is questionable whether this tool was appropriate for assessing project impacts. Moreover, the online tool contained a large number of variables, and the majority of *FIs* were not able to follow-up loan progress in the field. The lack of complete data (and the poor quality of it) limits the impact assessment, as the BIA⁶ demonstrated.
- The BF reward facility (bio-award) indicator has no baseline for testing the 30% increase in lending rates to micro-enterprises, in comparison to previous lending operations. In addition, targets for this project component and procedures to provide the prize were drafted during implementation.
- None of the targets for indicators in Outcome 2 were measurable. According to the mentioned impact evaluation, the project only documented BF variables' performance among lenders that received the BF reward, representing less than 25% of the total CAMBio portfolio. No data was collected regarding the earnings of clients.
- No database for identifying potential lenders or emerging BF businesses was ever used by *FIs* as a tool to provide credit, and therefore this indicator was not useful, and was eliminated.
- Neither indicator for assessing technical assistance was used, as the strategy for this component changed during project implementation.
- One very relevant indicator that is missing from the project design is the quantification of new BF clients in *FIs*.

The project log frame was extensively reviewed during the MTE, but this opportunity was not taken advantage of by the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) to produce a more comprehensive understanding of the project theory of change, orienting the reformulation of suitable indicators for measuring project intended results and impacts, especially in regard to Outcome 1 and 2. Practically, all the relevant output indicators for Outcome 2 were eliminated, and instead of producing a new outcome with suitable indicators, they were rewritten, downsizing the relevance and strategy of the technical assistance component and the biodiversity outcomes.

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

The project is a result of the preparation of environmental plans in Central America. During the process of constructing PARCA, the MBC was the backbone for forest and biodiversity conservation. In this approach, traditional conservation activities in protected areas are complemented with sustainable productive activities in areas of interconnection, considered vital for biodiversity and the livelihood of rural populations. According to the CBM rationale, these areas of interconnection

⁶ CAMBio Project Biodiversity Impact Evaluation, March 2016.

are private lands (individual or collective) that support the economy of millions of people and agroforestry practices and forest plantations play a key role in their sustainability⁷.

CAMBio benefits from the experience of three major development programs implemented at the time of its design within the framework of SICA organizations. The first two, PROARCA⁸ and ARECA, had CCAD and CABEL as a partner in one or more of their components, with the intention of promoting green economies in these vital areas of conservation. At the time of project design, CABEL was eager to integrate the environment into their working areas with regional integration projects. For them, the distinctive aspect of CAMBio was the alliance with environmental institutions. The other project in CABEL that provided operative experience to CAMBio was ZONAF, financed by the EU.

From PROARCA/CAPAS, the project strategy inherits the continuation of tourism and agro-forestry efforts in the peripheries of Protected Areas, and the promotion of green markets for organic coffee. SIGMA implemented a model that introduced financing and technical assistance to small and medium enterprises to reduce pollution. Working with FIs, this initiative provided risk guarantees for banks to catalyze investments on a commercial basis.

From the GEF side, the *Degraded Pastures* project was another important experience influencing the CAMBio design. The project, implemented in 2004 in Nicaragua and other Central American countries, provided a farm model to increase CO₂ capture in animal husbandry farms. Continuing the experience with a second small GEF project, NITLAPAN and FDL developed a financial product known as *Paquete Verde*, targeting the introduction of sustainable practices on farms receiving microcredits. One lesson was that impacts in biodiversity were observed when the participating farms were medium size.

Equally important was the transfer of experience that CATIE gained while implementing the Mesoamerican Agro-Environmental Program (MAP) funded by Scandinavian donors. In alliance with many regional partners, this initiative has been providing training and innovation in sustainable productive practices to Central American farmers, in coffee, cacao and other agroforestry commodities.

The main lessons from previous projects is the importance of integrating the private sector into conservation efforts, with public-private partnerships, and the need for adapting to each country's conditions, offering a financial product that can be tailored to the priorities of partner institutions. Therefore a reflexive/adaptive practice is needed to guide management. The flexibility to offer credit lines to institutions working with different sectors and client groups provides a more diverse universe for operations, but also presents the risk of dispersion and dilution of impacts.

At present, CABEL offers more than 14 financial products to MSMEs, and the competitive advantage of CAMBio was the favorable interest rate, allowing a favorable spread for FI. Together with non-reimbursable complements (TA and the BIO-AWARD), the package to FIs and clients was very attractive. CAMBio provided a means to upscale and consolidate previous lending experiences in pilot schemes, using the strong leadership and the extensive network of financial institutions that are partners with CABEL. The big milestone was the full integration of FIs into the implementation scheme, with the associated consequence, however, of also having to adapt to the FIs' own lending policies and clientele segment.

- **Repeat approach**

The project strategy explicitly contains a replication approach, since the BF credit line within FIs can be sustained permanently as long as demand exists. Moreover, the creation of an enabling

⁷ CBM Project Document 2006.

⁸ PROARCA I ran from 1996 to 2001. PRARCA II 2001 – 2006.

environment for MSME development sought to strengthen the norms and procedures to make lending operations more attractive to BF clients, thus enhancing the demand side for BF credit.

The part of the strategy that was not replicable and sustainable is the provision of incentives and technical assistance to improve BF practices and environmental outcomes. According to FIs, other specialized organizations should complement this type of service to MSMEs, although it is possible to negotiate integrating the cost of the TA in the loans, if services are demanded and effective for clients. The scaling up phase designed in the project was somewhat ineffective. It was meant as a learning process, with pilot trials to sustain the tailoring of the project deliverables (programmes) with feedback from the field experience. In practice, the project manuals and procedures were consultant driven, and drafted in a very orthodox way, with no reference to the insights of the acquired practice during lending operations in the years 2008-2009 with regard to targets and needs, and the effectiveness of the monitoring tool. The project entered into full operation at its third year. The project developed a business model, but according to this evaluation, the model is not sustainable, and more field experience is needed to validate results, especially in regard to the social and environmental impacts of financial loans in agricultural landscapes. A cautionary tale is that the strength of the model--*high* participation of the private financial sector--could be at the same time a caveat, as private banks segment clients and target areas according to business strategies, not always in convergence with development needs. Besides risk assessments, careful social and environmental assessments are also needed, to assert performance of financed projects. The CAMBio model, in terms of biodiversity, was centered on the promotion of an assembly of best management practices voluntarily chosen by project participants. Understanding the environmental assets of enterprises and difference between sector best practices and biodiversity-friendly practices is fundamental to project success and replication of the model.

- **Comparative advantage of UNDP**

The Project fits very well into UNDP priorities set in the new Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) aiming for responsible production and the regional expertise of the UNDP-GEF focal point was crucial for the project development. For GEF, UNDP comparative advantage lies in its global network of country offices, its experience in integrated policy development, and human and institutional capacity development. The UNDP assisted the Central American countries in designing the project, consistent with both, GEF mandate and national and regional sustainable development plans.

- **Project links with other sector interventions**

Linkages in the field with other sector interventions are observed, especially in the process of coffee certification. Rainforest Alliance, Fair Trade and export companies have pioneered the provision of services to improve farmers' incomes through the adoption of sustainable practices and international quality standards in coffee. Many of the FIs' coffee clients have received services and are certified, and trade their commodities within the market premium niche that these organizations offer.

The project concept complements other regional GEF initiatives in Central America very well, especially the conservation projects addressing the MBC goals and IFC support to agribusiness. The GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) support has been instrumental in leading to benefits and impacts for local populations residing in environmentally sensitive geographical areas. However, no evidence of linkages or alliances was collected during this evaluation process.

Unfortunately, synergies with other CABI green initiatives were not achieved either. Especially in relation to the sustainable energy sector, several CAMBio clients visited during this evaluation would have benefitted from the introduction of renewable energy sources in their production schemes. One example is CAPUCAS, a CAMBio showcase that is eagerly searching for renewable energy sources to operate the coffee processing plant.

- **Administrative Provisions**

The UNDP Regional Office for Latin America in Panama and the Honduras UNDP Country Office served as the GEF implementing base for this Project, and provided the necessary support for project implementation activities, including monitoring and evaluation, budget revisions and GEF disbursements.

CABEI provided day-to-day operations, the accountability of project funds, the management of the Project Implementation Unit (PIU), and led the Project Steering Committee (PSC).


The staff of the PIU, hired in 2007, consisted of the Regional Coordinator, administrative support, three specialists (MSME, Finance and Biodiversity) and five country facilitators. The main changes in relation to the original design were the reduction in the number of regional experts, and the incorporation of country facilitators. The monitoring was sub-contracted to a consulting firm, delegating one consultant. Other international and national experts have been hired on a short-term basis for specific tasks.

Project administration costs, according to audit reports, total US\$ 6 million (see the section on efficiency for details of this expense).

3.2.PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

- **Adaptive management (changes in project design and project results during implementation)**

Figure 1: Project Implementation Unit chart



The Project has been implemented according to the PD, with no adjustments during the inception phase, and no major changes were introduced during the implementation plan until the MTE in 2010, when major changes in the project strategy were adopted, country facilitators were all in place, and a new project coordinator was hired. Project delays in the first years due to lack of approved procedures for disbursement affected deliveries of project outcomes in 2007, 2008 and 2009, especially in the technical assistance component, and the provision of partial guarantees.

The MTE report identifies the strengths and weaknesses of the project design based on the assessment of performance through 2010, and provides recommendations for amendments to the logical framework⁹. It is important to mention that when the MTE was conducted, CABEI had disbursed 67% of the US\$17 million committed¹⁰, and had delivered bio-awards totalling US\$310,000 (out of the total US\$735,000 available). It is also worth noting that the MTE drew attention to the fact that the predominant users of CAMBio loans (two-thirds of users at the time) and recipients of bio-awards were the consolidated coffee industry and coffee growers,

⁹ Major recommendations were accepted by the Project Committee in September 2011.

¹⁰ US\$ 4.11 million with 7 microfinance institutions, and US\$ 6.46 million with 4 banks.

participating in the organic and/or certified coffee markets. An observation that was missed by the evaluators is that the project was functioning, but without any synergy between the different financial facilities. TA was not operational until the end of 2010.

The main changes in the project logical framework after the MTE were as follows: elimination of output 1.3 targeting revenue-based lending approaches; scaling down of the partial guarantee fund; elimination of all outputs of Outcome 2, with the exception of dissemination of information; and reformulation of outputs 2.3 and 2.4 into one new output; elimination of outputs 3.1 and 3.2 from Outcome 3, and reformulation of output 3.3 to facilitate and support follow-up policy initiatives for strengthening the SME sector. In relation to Outcome 4, only outputs 4.4 and 4.5 were maintained. These changes meant, in practice, a significant decrease in the project's overall ambitiousness, and also its anticipated impacts.

The facility fund to provide partial credit guarantees was scaled down, and the conception of the facility providing Technical Assistance changed from a facility targeting the progressive provision of assistance with long-term partners, based on a modality of cost recovery principles (as foreseen in the project design), to a fund operated as small short-term grants for consultancies and subcontracts.

Another policy change that influenced project outcomes is the inclusion of banks in the provision of bio-awards. Originally, this incentive was designed to motivate the lending by non-banking institutions to BF microenterprises. It can be argued that with this modification, a part of this facility also went to more robust enterprises, compromising the incentive to smallholdings that in relative terms were making greater efforts in biodiversity conservation.

A positive element introduced during project implementation was the hiring of country facilitators. These operational liaisons between CABEI, FIs and MSME in each country were crucial for the placement of incentives and the use of the technical assistance fund.

The response of the PSC to the MTE recommendations in regard to monitoring biodiversity enhancement is disappointing. The evaluators correctly identified the limitations of the monitoring tool at the time of the evaluation, but no changes were introduced to the bio-score card or eligibility tool. CABEI and UNDP held the main responsibility for producing and implementing these indicators. However, despite all of the changes in the LFA, and the productive observations and recommendations provided in the MTE report, no major adjustments were made in the strategic course of the project.

The big gaps in the performance of *FI* organizations with respect to monitoring now limit the integrity of data needed to perform impact assessments. During this final evaluation, as with the MTE, many discrepancies were found in the field related to procedures used for application of the biodiversity indicator-monitoring tool. A detailed assessment of project outputs and impacts is provided in the section on results.

• **Partnership Agreements**

In general, the Project succeeded in developing cooperative relations between main implementing agencies, especially *FIs*. However, the project had shortcomings in regard to long-term partners providing political backstopping and technical assistance. The main discrepancies in relation to project design were the following:

- CCAD, Ministries of Environment and other sectorial institutions only marginally participated in project implementation and follow-up.
- The project did not create the expected working alliances with academic or research institutions.

- The project did not create lasting synergies with other programs supporting MSME capacity development, especially other GEF, IFC and other like-minded donor programs working in the same commodities, agribusiness, ecotourism and biodiversity conservation, in CAMBio's geographic zones or in complementary target areas.

It is important to remember that CABEL is a second-tier bank, and CAMBio entered the niches and market segments where there was opportunity and interest for participating *FIs*. Only institutions with credit line in operation were eligible. Among the very extensive network of *FIs* associated with CABEL, CAMBio reached agreements with 27¹¹, but the great majority (89.03%) of lending resources were channeled through 7 bank institutions, 2 microfinance groups and 1 cooperative.

Most collaboration with other partner organizations was through subcontract agreements, under the TA facility.

• **Feedback from M & E activities used for adaptive management**

As already stated, the main feedback from monitoring activities was obtained during the MTE process, when a major review of progress and implementation arrangements took place. The PIR framework was modified according to new formulated outcomes.

The annual planning sessions before the PSC meetings, assisted by an external monitoring specialist, also provided feedback to analyze project progress and make budgetary decisions. Yearly goals were defined in a POA. During the annual PSC meetings, the emphasis of discussions was on the disbursements of the project's four components. Quantitative data was provided in relation to loan placement, and MSME beneficiaries of technical assistance and bio-awards. Equally important was the approval of the following year's budget, including credit placement targets and the distribution of non-reimbursable funds, with goals per country and *FIs*. During these meetings, CAMBio experts presented reports about the progress toward project goals, according to reports from the eligibility tool. It is the opinion of the evaluator that PCS members failed to appreciate that the way data was consolidated and classified did not provide insight or knowledge related to project's main objectives, specially in regard to financial inclusion, synergy of project benefits, additions related to biodiversity enhancement, and changes in the MSME productive processes.

There was a tendency to rely on future consultancy studies to provide a better assessment of project results and impacts, especially in relation to biodiversity, exerting a result-driven management style. There was little demand for a more process-oriented learning practice, using internal resources such as project experts, the regional coordinator, CABEL, and *IFs* counterparts, to delve further into data findings and provide recommendations for improvement.

The GEF/UNDP expert was a committed partner providing recommendations to better align the project outcomes with environmental indicators, while also considering the limitations found in the project data system created for verifying impacts. In 2013, a project exit strategy, to be implemented during 2014, was presented to the PSC. It is expected that project closure activities will include a systematization of project results, and an independent biodiversity impact assessment to assist this final external evaluation.

• **Project Funding**

The project GEF disbursements were made according to plan, with a substantial increase in the leverage of CABEL contributions classified as biodiversity friendly. Loans totaled US\$56.4 million, signifying a threefold increase in committed resources. Profits from fund administration amounted

¹¹ CAMBio started with more financial partners, especially microfinance institutions and cooperatives. However, many of these institutions lost the CABEL credit line in 2008 and 2009. A complete list, including initial partners, is unfortunately not available.

to US\$2.26 million. Almost 40% of the GEF contribution went to incentives, and the remaining 60% to operational costs¹². UNDP administration fees were 5%. The estimated US\$320,000 in government contributions was never reported in the project accounts.

Table 3: Project Financing / Co - Financing

Co-financing (type/source)	GEF/UNDP Financing (millions USD)		Government (millions USD)		Partner Agency (millions USD)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants	10,225,000	10,200,200				
Loans/Concession					17,000,000	56,400,000
In – kind support			320,000			
Other						
Totals		10,200,000				56,400.000

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

Project monitoring and evaluation was conducted in accordance with CABI, GEF and UNDP procedures. For the project implementation review (PIR) the logical framework matrix formed the basis of the monitoring system. In general, rankings from the internal project evaluation were very positive in regard to management and project achievement of planned objectives. As stated before, one aspect missing in the monitoring process was a more comprehensive discussion analyzing project progress towards the technical assistance and biodiversity impacts. This finding is surprising, as the project staff included a biodiversity and monitoring expert, and several case studies and consultancies were dedicated to this goal. The 2015 PIR report acknowledges the need to better assess and demonstrate the impacts that the loans and the technical assistance to MSME have had on biodiversity conservation prior to this final evaluation. This major consideration is particularly relevant, due to the potential negative environmental impacts that loans to agribusiness and animal husbandry can have.

Besides the Logical Framework Matrix and the PIRs, monitoring tools include the yearly operation plans (“POA” in Spanish), a follow-up workshop, and the financial reports from external audits. CABI employs the F1 format (internal tool) to track loan disbursements, and the CAMBio eligibility databases to track fulfillment of requirements.

The project hired Global Business Advisors (GBA) to produce semiannual progress reports and to assist the *preparation* of POAs. Reported data comes from F1 and the project online eligibility tool records. A weakness of this reporting system is the lack of analytical content, and the failure to use project information coming from other sources to expand and explain findings. During this evaluation, *FI* staff who were interviewed reported difficulties during follow-up of the eligibility tool, and in entering data into the centralized information system. They could not follow-up all loans, and they reported that data was introduced into the platform only about candidates chosen for the bio-award, to the best of their abilities. As mentioned, CAMBio clients were very diverse. This hinders the quality of the quantitative data, and complementary assessments are required to weigh information in relation to the effect that financial investments had on ecosystems and farm practices. The analysis of credit has only been reported in terms of project disbursements. Higher-level analysis was required to assess impacts and understand synergies between loans and incentives. This topic is further covered in the section on results and impacts.

¹² Operational costs include the technical assistance expenses during the Project’s first years, which included designing and defining operational procedures for the project financial facilities, and information and monitoring systems.

The project produced an overwhelming number of reports from project experts, hired consultants and specialized studies and reports coming from the technical assistance fund. Part of the inventory is a cartographic database. It is the opinion of the evaluator that the information generated by the project has been underused, especially in regard to the analysis of results that the CAMBio model produces, and recommendations for decision makers. Case studies and assessments demonstrate *FI* and *MSME* performance, but without attributions to CAMBio's contributions to achieving results.

Financial supervision and audits have been performed according to plan. The CABI accounting office has main responsibility for these activities. This office, with the support of the CABI internal audit, and the project external audits procured by UNDP, produced the required follow-up and reports for the PSC. A project of this financial size requires anchoring in an institutionalized financial system, as indeed happened.

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

Effective coordination took place between the project Regional Coordinators (2 coordinators during the period), the GEF regional expert in Panama and the Tegucigalpa UNDP office. In fact, project governance depended to a high degree on this communication. As stated, UNDP supervision was focused on results and responsive to approval requests from the PIU. Although the PIU was located within the CABI premises in Tegucigalpa, the integration within CABI headquarters and lines of authority were not as anticipated in the PD. Not all UNDP the UNDP country offices experience and knowledge were fully integrated in the monitoring and follow-up of activities.

Table 4: Rating of Assessment and Monitoring and Implementation

Monitoring and Evaluation	
General Quality of M&E	MS
M&E design at entry	MS
M&E Plan Implementation	MU
IA& EA Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	MS
Quality of Implementation Agency	MS
Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	MS


3.3.PROJECT RESULTS

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

Removing barriers in banking and business, and creating an enabling environment to catalyze biodiversity-friendly investments in micro-, small and medium sized enterprises.

The project was highly successful in the intermediation of funds to *FIs*. In a period of severe financial crisis and a rise in payment resisters in Central America, CABI increased the loan portfolio to agricultural commodities, tourism and other agroforestry productive activities. A crucial factor in reaching target beneficiaries was the involvement of microfinance institutions and credit cooperatives. According to the available database, CABI disbursed US\$ 55.5 million through 27 *FIs* in geographic areas rich in biodiversity (see Table 5 below), a threefold increase in the initial project

Figure 2. Source: Final Project Report, CAMBio
Tendency in lending operations SMSM
Cumulative 2008-2015



financial pledge. Ten *FIs* have lending portfolios over US\$ 1 million (7 banks, 2 microfinance institutions and 1 credit cooperative). This group altogether intermediated 89% of CAMBio resources.

In spite of the project's slow start, US\$ 7.5 million in loans was placed in the first 3 years of lending operations (2008-2010). A substantial increase in lending took place in 2011 with a peak of US\$ 20 million in 2012. According to the MTE, the decrease in the interest rate from 5.6 to 4.5%¹³ allowed for a better spread of *FIs*, and might have been one of the reasons for the surge in lending from 2011 onward.

Figure 3: FIs providing loans to MSME




Table 5: Amount disbursed by CABEI through FIs

Country/Financial institution	Loans	Weight	Amount in USD	Weight
EL SALVADOR	517.00	4.3%	21160,052	38.1%
BANCO HIPOTECARIO DE EL SALVADOR S.A.	231.00	1.9%	18546,529	33.4%
BANCO DE FOMENTO AGROPECUARIO	13.00	0.1%	954,054	1.7%
CAJA DE CREDITO RURAL DE SONSONATE	87.00	0.7%	734,100	1.3%
BANCO IZALQUEÑO DE LOS TRABAJADORES	2.00	0.0%	351,200	0.6%
CAJA DE CRÉDITO SANTIAGO NONUALCO	155.00	1.3%	318,104	0.6%
CAJA DE CRÉDITO DE NUEVA CONCEPCIÓN	6.00	0.0%	155,500	0.3%
CAJA DE CRÉDITO RURAL DE ZACATECOLUCA, SOCIEDAD CO	23.00	0.2%	100,564	0.2%
GUATEMALA	10,290.00	85.0%	14350,409	25.8%
FUNDACION TECNOLOGICA-GENESIS EMPRESARIAL	9,352.00	77.3%	4630,553	8.3%
BANCO DE DESARROLLO RURAL S.A.	113.00	0.9%	3986,853	7.2%
BANCO G & T CONTINENTAL	106.00	0.9%	3875,686	7.0%
ASOCIACION CHITO. IWIB. XUKUJE. RI UJ QUIXKAT O.	127.00	1.0%	730,895	1.3%
Fondo para el Desarrollo Solidario	130.00	1.1%	729,772	1.3%
ASOCIACIÓN DE DESARROLLO INTEGRAL CUENCA DEL LAGO DE ATITLÁN	431.00	3.6%	286,382	0.5%
Agencia de Desarrollo Económico Local	20.00	0.2%	61,480	0.1%
ASOCIACION DE DESARROLLO INTEGRAL RURAL (ASDIR)	11.00	0.1%	48,788	0.1%
HONDURAS	46.00	0.4%	10613,804	19.1%
BANCO DE OCCIDENTE,S.A.	14.00	0.1%	5570,068	10.0%
BANCO DEL PAIS S.A.	24.00	0.2%	2248,084	4.0%
Banco LAFISE (Honduras)	2.00	0.0%	1999,810	3.6%
COOPERATIVA DE AHORRO Y CREDITO INTIBUCANA LIMITADA	2.00	0.0%	599,000	1.1%
BANCO HONDUREÑO DEL CAFÉ,S.A.	2.00	0.0%	129,762	0.2%
COOPERATIVA DE AHORRO Y CREDITO CEIBEÑA LIMITADA	2.00	0.0%	67,079	0.1%
NICARAGUA	1,214.00	10.0%	8173,389	14.7%
BANCO DE CREDITO CENTROAMERICANO,S.A.	28.00	0.2%	5116,850	9.2%
FONDO DE DESARROLLO LOCAL	1,140.00	9.4%	2348,932	4.2%

¹³ The BCEI Assets and Liabilities Committee agreed to set the MSME-AB line in dollar prices, which for some countries reduced the normal cost of LGC funds from 5.6% to 4.5%. The rate remained at 4.5% for the rest of the project period. It is currently 4.75%.

BANCO DE LA PRODUCCION,S.A.	2.00	0.0%	660,000	1.2%
COOPERATIVA DE SERVICIOS MULTIPLES 20 DE ABRIL	44.00	0.4%	47,607	0.1%
COSTA RICA	33.00	0.3%	1219,118	2.2%
COOPEALIANZA RL	31.00	0.3%	1009,751	1.8%
COOCIQUE RL	2.00	0.0%	209,367	0.4%
TOTAL GENERAL	12,100.00	100.0%	55516,771	100.0%

Who were the credit lenders?


The recipients of loans can be grouped in three major categories (see Figure below). A small group of 52 clients, all in the coffee sector with the exception of one in fisheries, received 52% of the loan funds. Borrowers in this group were individuals, trading-export-wholesale companies, second level and export cooperatives, and limited societies in Honduras, El Salvador and Nicaragua. It is worth noting that 7 clients with loans over US\$ 1 million (with several credit operations) received 20% of the CAMBio portfolio. Clearly, this group already had good financial credentials and credits with *FIs*.

The second group is comprised of 412 clients, receiving 33% of the funds, with credit amounts ranging from US\$ 10,000 to US\$200,000. This segment includes very diverse MSMEs, and was possibly, together with the microfinance clients, the major recipient of technical assistance and bio-awards.

The third group is by far the largest in regard to loan placement: 10,823 clients, receiving 16% of the credit funds, mainly through 2 microfinance institutions. It is worth noting that a Guatemalan microfinance institution, *Genesis Empresarial* (GE) that targets rural clients using innovative strategies, provided loans to 9,529¹⁴ CAMBio clients. The main portfolio is subsistence agriculture, including production of coffee, cardamom and cacao. *FDL*, the other microfinance institution in Nicaragua, reached 1,140¹⁵ clients.

One shortcoming which this evaluation discovered during field visits is the lack of *FI* records, to assess whether CAMBio BF-MSME borrowers continue receiving credit after the conclusion of project activities, or the % of loans that continue in operation. During interviews, it was indicated that clients returned to previous financing conditions and in cases where the deadlines have not expired, the loans continue in effect. However, none continue to offer the BF package.

Figure 4: Loans distribution



Analysis of credit placement by Country and by Financial Institution

El Salvador

The *Banco Hipotecario del Salvador* allocated US\$ 18.5 million through 231 loan operations, accounting, by a large margin, for 33.4% of the total project financial resources, and 85% of the loan placements in El Salvador. The main shareholder of this bank is the government, and they have a strong lending history in agriculture. The bank has a credit line allocated specifically to coffee, using a rotating fund/working capital modality. The main types of loan guarantees were collateral and

¹⁴ This represents around 10% of the institution's active clients.

¹⁵ This represents around 1.7% of the institution's active clients.

mortgages. In addition to CABEL funds, the bank used special funding lines from BANADES¹⁶ to support the coffee sector. Clients with certified coffee or specialized niche market coffee were selected from among the bank's coffee-sector portfolio, to offer the CAMBio BF package. This practice insured that all CAMBio clients came from the bank's existing client portfolio in the coffee sector¹⁷. The main selection criterion was belonging to a certification-based model. Clients were mostly consolidated, medium-size enterprises selling coffee in specialized certified markets. In general, 30% of the bank's coffee portfolio is certified, and according to interviewed bank officials, the incentives that the CAMBio program provided to these producers was extremely fortuitous, since the Technical Assistance funds reimbursed the cost of certification over a number of years. Some clients were cooperatives, which acted as second tier lenders, providing credit and services to their members.

The rest of the loans in El Salvador (286 operations) with other banks or *cajas de crédito* went to more diverse sectors (coffee, animal husbandry, organic agriculture, and tourism) targeting smaller businesses. As expected, among this more risky portfolio, the repayment of loans and *FI* performance were more erratic, to the point that some institutions lost the global credit line with CABEL due to a lack of solvency. Clients of the *Cajas de Crédito* of Sonsonate and Nonualco went into default. In the case of Sonsonate, their traditional clients are the municipalities and the informal sector. With CAMBio, as more of a pilot scheme in partnership with CLUSA, they targeted small horticulture producers in the highlands along the border with Honduras. Unfortunately, in this geographic area there is no well-established credit culture, and most of the producers became payment resisters. Nonualco is at present involved with judicial processes. The *Banco de Fomento Agropecuario* obtained more successful results in lending to small farmers with the intermediation of cooperatives, but their involvement in CAMBio came late, when the project was in its final phase.

Guatemala

With the placement of 25% of the credit funds, Guatemala spearheaded the expansion in the number of credit recipients in CAMBio (85% of credits operations) by a large margin. The main CABEL partner, as mentioned, was *Genesis Empresarial (GE)*, a consolidated microfinance institution that provided micro-loans to 9,529 clients (US\$4.8 million).

According to GE executives, the CAMBio approach was not necessarily the most suitable for a microfinance institution, given all of the requirements that had to be met. Nonetheless, the procedures for registering clients and monitoring program indicators were substantially modified, and the program goals were achieved. CAMBio was really designed for small and medium businesses, while all of Genesis's clients live at the poverty level and are subsistence farmers. Their main crops are coffee, cardamom, basic grains and cacao. The CABEL resources primarily targeted coffee, cardamom and cacao producers. The main types of guarantees were fiduciary or surety, and all of the loans were used as working capital. Given the small size of loans (an average of US\$600.00), CAMBio applied more flexible incentive requirements, and borrowers only had to promise to conserve the environment and plant trees (monitored and supported by the organization's "promoters") in order to obtain bio-awards.

Two banks, the *Banco Continental* and the *Banco de Desarrollo Rural*, placed the next largest amounts, US\$ 3.5 and 3.8 million respectively. The first has a diversified portfolio in ranching and agriculture, while the second focuses solely on small and medium coffee producers.

¹⁶ The loan awarded with BCEI funds had a 9% interest rate, and it was possible to obtain a further rediscount with a rate of 6% with funds awarded by the government. The coffee sector's debt is over US\$ 220 million. The sector has received backing from the Government through a Guarantee Fund, so that the banks continue providing Working Capital Loans.

¹⁷ CAMBio absorbed around 60% of the bank's coffee portfolio.

Honduras

Honduras was the third largest fund allocator, with 49 credit operations all in the coffee sector with the exception of 3 in tourism. Most of the clients were cooperatives, coffee processing plants or coffee exporters, which in practice meant they functioned as second tier lenders, giving credit to their members to use for working capital or services. The largest credit placement was US\$2 million, in the form of two credit allocations by *Banco La FISE* to the same client, to improve a coffee processing plant.

The *Banco de Occidente* placed the largest amount of funds through 17 credit operations to 6 cooperatives, all coffee exporters. A good number of these cooperatives commercialize their coffee in special and/or fair trade markets. The largest amount of financing allocated was US\$ 1.6 million, in 4 credit awards to one cooperative. However, the *Banco del País* made the largest credit placement to one individual client, through 12 credit operations totaling US\$ 1.4 million.

According to officials from the *Banco de Occidente*, it was the bank's clients who requested participation in the CAMBio project, since they were all certified coffee producers and this would give them an advantage for receiving non-reimbursable funds, even though the bank's funds had better payment conditions. According to an interview with the bank official, given the CABEL requirement of monthly payments, many coffee producers ended up in debt, since they obtain their income only during specific seasons. The credit was poorly structured for the coffee sector. Despite attempts to make changes to the CAMBio project, it was not possible.

Nicaragua

The organization with the second largest number of microfinance clients, after the *GE* of Guatemala, was the *Fondo de Desarrollo Local* (FDL) of Nicaragua, with 1,140 operations. This financial organization uses a green business development model with small producers working in silvopastoral, agroforestry, and sustainable agriculture systems. Their clients are small farmers with diversified portfolios. They selected producers to receive the BF financing from their portfolio on the basis of their geographic location near protected areas, and also those most consistent with the CAMBio objectives. In contrast to *GE*, the FDL's clients are more consolidated producers, and they received an average amount of US\$1,500 in credit. Credit guarantees were mostly surety and fiduciary. In terms of financial resources, this microfinance institution placed 4.2% (US\$ 2.4 million) of total resources, but carried out 1,140 credit operations.

The BANCENTRO bank of Nicaragua placed US\$ 5.6 million through 31 credit operations, mostly to the coffee and tourism sectors. This bank worked with large and medium business owners. The largest amount of individual credit awarded was US\$ 2 million, in three credit operations, for coffee renovation. The only credit awarded by the CAMBio project to the fishing sector was in the amount of US\$ 500,000, in the northern coastal zone of Nicaragua. The remaining loans from this bank were given to cooperatives and coffee producers, and tourism companies. In the entire project, this bank, together with the FDL, provided the most credit operations to the tourism industry.

In Costa Rica, a savings and credit cooperative, COOPEALIANZA, was responsible for almost all the financial intermediation, placing US\$ 1 million with small banana producers and small coffee and tourism companies, through 29 credit operations. The guarantees for these loans were mainly mortgages. In a singular case, the COOCIQUE Cooperative awarded two long-term loans to two Rural Aqueduct Associations (ASADAS). They were each for US\$200,000, one with a 15-year term (180 months), and the second a 20-year term. In one case, the investment plan consisted of obtaining the property where the natural springs that supply water to the communities are located, and the guarantee was the mortgage. The payments by water users provide the resources for repayment of the loan. In the other case, a tree-adoption program was implemented, thereby generating the revenues to pay back the credit. The bio-award provided the incentive and logic for these loans, and was used to help purchase equipment and plant trees.

Risk Guarantee Facility to help remove lending barriers

This guarantee mechanism, designed by the project to remove barriers to credit, was difficult to implement. According to the final project report, 12 guarantees (a total of US\$ 223,000) were issued. Financial reports indicate that CABEL had received US\$ 2,940,000 in December 2007 for creating a Guarantee Fund, however, the operational manual was drafted in April 2012.

The MTE recommended modifying this incentive, given the likelihood that the funds would not be used during the rest of the project period. Financial records indicate that CABEL returned the unused funds to the UNDP in 2011, so they could be reassigned to other project components. The corresponding goals were eliminated from the POA as of 2012. According to the monitoring report, it did not constitute a relevant aspect of promoting and placing credit in the MSMEs. In the evaluator's opinion, the fact that the instrument was operationally closed, but an operational manual was drafted afterwards, reflects contradictions within the executing agency with respect to promotion of the instrument.

When they had previous experience with this kind of financial instrument, *FIs* were more open to benefiting from it. However, for some *FIs*, this type of incentive is not a good financial practice, since it could encourage an increase in arrears, which would then affect their performance indicators. Excessive paperwork and the fact that the product provided only partial coverage made it costly. This, and the additional fact that funds would need to eventually be returned by the financial institution, could have also affected the lack of demand on the part of *FIs*.

Technical Assistance

In regard to technical assistance, accessible records indicate that the project executed 155 disbursements, for a total amount of US\$ 2,110,621.51, classified in three categories of subcontracts: technical assistance associated with the loan (62); sectorial (80); and TA for *FIs* (35). The evaluator finds this classification system unusable, since in addition to several overlaps, these broad classifications include different modalities associated with the use of funds. A better way of representing the fund utilization would be according to technical assistance providers, or by recipient/stakeholder organizations.

One aspect that makes evaluating this project component more difficult is the fact that the rules for use meant that funds could be awarded in an extremely dispersed fashion. According to the rules, all eligible MSMEs could receive TA in the amount of 10% of the credit award, up to a maximum of US\$ 10,000. Similarly, the *FIs* could receive 2% of the amount of credit issued, up to a maximum of US\$ 20,000. In addition, institutions or sectors that promote an enabling environment to the development of MSMEs can receive up to a maximum of US\$ 10,000.

Nonetheless, an important percentage of the TA funds were allocated to improving productive processes of SMEs, and to promoting and/or monitoring the credit placed by *FIs*. As expected, the majority of funds (US\$ 1,488,915.18, or 67% of the total) were channeled through *FIs*, and within this group, the *Banco Hipotecario* from El Salvador received the biggest share, followed by *FDL*, *GE*, and the *Banco de Occidente*.

Table 6: TA funds allocation

Banco Hipotecario de El Salvador	569,292.01	Banco Fomento Agropecuario	33,520.00
Fondo de Desarrollo Local (FDL)	234,576.43	AYNLA	25,022.09
Génesis Empresarial	172,837.46	LAFISE HONDURAS	14,005.00
Banco de Occidente S.A	122,442.92	BANHCAFE	12,390.00
LAFISE BANCENTRO	85,522.25	BANPAIS	10,000.00
BANRURAL	84,400.00	BANPRO/CORCASAN R.L	10,000.00
FONDESOL	78,346.13	Banco Fomento Agropecuario	5,942.50
COOPEALIANZA	55,040.48	GYT CONTINENTAL	600.00
Caja de Crédito de Sonsonate	44,209.11		

- **Improving Technical Skills needed to improve productive practices**

The following three organizations, dedicated to the provision of microfinance, used their own institutional models to provide technical assistance.

FDL-Nitlapan Model

FDL is the only *FI* participating in CAMBio that has a very comprehensive and developed business model to enhance the competitiveness of small producers, and improve the flow of micro-credit to small-scale enterprises. They do that with the support of *Nitlapan*, its partner organization for TA. In general, every FDL branch office includes a financial officer, in charge of commercial loan operations, and technical staff from *Nitlapan*, responsible for providing agricultural assistance to clients. FDL will not issue loans unless the client agrees to accept and follow *Nitlapan's* recommendations for crop and animal production. Several of their emblematic programs include monitoring environmental indicators.

CAMBio loan recipients were cattle ranchers and coffee producers. With the additional 10% of loans for TA (US\$234,576), they provided TA services to 1,140 farmers, including 5 field visits during the agricultural cycle. The strength of their methodology is the construction of a management plan for the farm that considers the farm ecosystem more comprehensively, and also serves as a baseline. It was simple for them to incorporate CAMBio indicators and monitoring requirements into this system. Targets chosen with CAMBio included improving vegetation cover, incorporating natural fences into silvopastoral systems and managing shade trees on coffee plantations.

Genesis Empresarial

The Genesis business concept integrates training and technical assistance as a complement to its credit model, at an approximate cost of US\$ 0.62/month. Since its target group includes the indigenous population, specialized educational methodologies are needed for illiterate adults, along with a comprehensive development philosophy. They received US\$ 172,837.46 from the CAMBio program as a complement to productive credit, so that the organization's promoters could support improvements to cardamom, coffee and cacao farm plots. They utilize a group methodology, and the promoters support campaigns to plant trees in patios and crop areas.

AYNLA

Since 1992, they have been involved with microfinance in the departments of Sololá and Totonicapán providing subsistence microcredit to indigenous populations. With CAMBio, they began lending credit in the *Zona Reyna* of El Quiché, directly supporting two producer organizations—APZOR XOY ACTE and ASODIL—involved with cardamom production, and one organization—ACDREA—that groups together coffee farmers. With US\$ 25,000 received as TA, the organization provided one technician to assist crop cultivation and improve the shade cover through planting native trees. Due to this area's difficult access, the presence of AYNLA and the bio-award received from CAMBio are very significant for these producer organizations. Unfortunately, both organizations grouping together 64 cardamom farmers went bankrupt due to the collapse in prices, and at the time of the field visit, leaders were looking for ways to resolve the crisis.

In addition, FONDESOL and ADICLA, both in Guatemala, hired external consultants to provide specialized technical assistance to manage coffee and cardamom pest control, and MAXAM agronomic and post harvest practices, to their credit beneficiaries.

- **Improving production process using certification schemes**

Banks with the largest coffee portfolio opted to assist clients through certification refunds. *Banco Hipotecario*, with the greatest allocation of funds, was also the main recipient of TA funds. Less

than half of the funds (US\$267,949.18)¹⁸ were used to pay certification fees for SMEs. The other half was used to train bank officials, to sponsor the participation of SMEs in three *Let's talk Coffee* events in the region, and to sponsor a national Coffee Forum in El Salvador.

According to the logic of the banks, certification signified fulfillment of two of the project requirements: eligibility for access to credit funds, and eligibility for the bio-award, since certification means fulfillment of biodiversity-friendly practices. While this way of thinking is usually compatible with the project rationale for small farmers, the aspect that most limits certification is not payment of the certification fee per se, but rather ensuring the funds needed to implement the changes in the production system required by the certification program. For the banks, it was much easier to refund the certification costs with more consolidated farmers, and in practice, this became an important instrument that, together with the bio-award, made the CAMBio financial package very attractive to bank coffee clients.

• Human capital development and Outreach

TA funds provided to *FIs* were also used to finance many other activities, such as English courses, participation in international events and fairs, consultancies to assist MSMEs in preparing management plans, organization of outreach events, participation in fairs, and other promotional and training activities that were sponsored for MSME and bank clients. Beneficiaries emphasize the importance of these events and activities for strengthening liaisons with markets and generating new commercial opportunities.

• Enabling processes and Sectorial approaches

The project has supported a considerable number of activities led by collaborating public and private organizations through a small grant modality. The modality for approval was receiving a memo from a CAMBio committee, headed by the director of CABEI/ FINAM.

A core group of these public sectorial institutions were meant to support the competitiveness of MSMEs by developing and promoting policies to increase access to financing and markets. In the case of Costa Rica, the Piña Platform did so by bringing together private enterprises for a constructive dialogue with government institutions.

Table 7: Allocated amounts per organization

CCAD SICA	30,000.00	Instituto Hondureño Turismo	9,500.00
CONAP	30,000.00	Mesa de Com de San Rafael Pie de la Cuesta	9,902.50
ADICLA	29,879.06	PRONAGRO Asoc Nac Prod de Cacao	9,230.00
Plataforma Piña CR	20,000.00	SEFAS	8,000.00
PNUD	20,000.00	CORSATUR	6,500.00
SAG Honduras	19,067.82	Cooperativa Santiago	6,000.00
INAB	15,000.00	FUNICA	5,100.00
MIFIC Nicaragua	15,000.00	Alc Mun San Nicolás Santa Bárbara	5,000.00
ASOPROGAL	14,393.54	CEI Nicaragua	6,000.00
Proyecto CAMBio	13,080.34	FAST (Alianza Fin para el Com Sostenible)	5,000.00
AMITIGRA	12,410.71	PYMES DE COSTA RICA S.A	5,000.00
ANAPIH (Apic Honduras)	10,000.00	Sustable Harvest	5,000.00
APROSACAO	10,000.00	UCOSEMUN	5,000.00
ASHERCA	10,000.00	Proyecto CAMBio (INBIO)	4,850.00
ARNPG Guatemala	10,000.00	Cámara Nacional de Cacao	4,360.00
Cámara de Comercio de El Salvador	10,000.00	CATIE	4,000.00
Comité Nac AgricOrganic Honduras	10,000.00	MINTUR (Ministerio Turismo)	3,500.00
Fundación Café Forestal	10,000.00	RAMACAFE	3,500.00
INTUR (Instituto de Turismo)	10,000.00	APPTA	2,500.00
LUTHERAN WORLD RELIEF	10,000.00	FEDENMURG	2,175.64
MARN Salvador	10,000.00	AED (Aca para el desarrollo educacional)	1,900.00
Agencia de Desarrollo Zona Norte	9,950.00	APEN Solic por la Sede Nicaragua del BCIE	1,675.52

¹⁸ US\$ 77,205 in 2011; US\$80,982.62 in 2012; US\$ 86,387.83 in 2013; and US\$ 23,373.73 in 2014.

However, most of the 45 recipient organizations opted to sponsor training courses, regional workshops, MSE exchanges, fairs, and other institutional activities. As detailed in the table above, allocated amounts indicate that the funds had no programmatic orientation, but rather, were meant to support single events or other services provided in relation to specific training. It can be assumed that CAMBio involvement was limited to the provision of funds.

To conclude, when the TA was not provided directly to a farmer or MSME, the TA facility financed a considerable number of widely diverse activities, and without a more in-depth analysis of the outcomes of these events, it is difficult to assess the particular benefit to the MSME targeted with credits or to other project-supported intended outcomes.

Table 8: Bio-awards received by MSMEs and FIs

	Total Amount	MSME	FI
2010	133,807.19	99,665.05	34,142.14
2011	250,924.41	175,647.61	175,647.61
2012	543,266.63	402,183.11	141,083.52
2013	529,175.46	370,030.52	159,144.94
2014	(1,557.46)		
Total	1,455,617.23	947,861.24	510,018.21

One aspect missing from the TA facility was devoting more field efforts and resources to research and technology innovations, and to investigating the demand for credit in the project target areas more carefully. The PD identified the existence of a more diverse clientele and range of businesses as potential CAMBio beneficiaries. Technical assistance providers should have offered more insight about the reasons why there was no demand from other sectors.

Bio-Award

The project used an online tool known as the “eligibility guideline” to track loan investments and impacts on biodiversity via the adoption of best practices. This tool was also used to verify the selection of clients receiving the bio-award, a “smart subsidy” at the core of the project strategy. According to project procedures, the cash award is to be shared between the MSME and the financial institution¹⁹ that provided funding. So this incentive is also intended to stimulate follow-up of biodiversity indicators by FIs. Previous technical assistance was not a requirement for the award.

The financial records show that the project disbursed US\$ 947,861.24 in bio-awards to MSMEs. According to rules, target clients were the micro- and small enterprises. The amount of the prize was set at 20% of the total loan, up to a maximum of US\$10,000. During the first two years, only microfinance clients were eligible for the prize. In 2012, this policy expanded to include banks. Altogether, cash awards given to 22 FIs totaled US\$510,018.21, which is slightly more than the stipulated 30%.


In terms of the number of prizes awarded, the records indicate 3,831 payments (checks), given mainly to beneficiaries of microfinance institutions.

As illustrated in the diagram below, the rules for issuing the bio-award produce a certain bias and tend to concentrate large resources. Some 83% of the awards delivered were given to clients from microfinance institutions, but these clients only received 21% of the available financial resources. This large number of awards (3,184) consisted of extremely small amounts, averaging US\$78. At the other extreme, 96 SMEs received 45% of the financial resources, with awards greater than US\$2,500. Among this group, 41 clients received the maximum amount permitted (US\$7,000). This concentration of resources results from including banks in the intermediation of bio-awards. As expected, after the microfinance institution *FDL*, the bank that placed the largest number of awards among its clients was the *Banco Hipotecario*.

¹⁹ 70% of the awards went to SMEs and 30% to FIs.

Table 9: Bio-award amount per institution

Financial institutions	Total
ADICLA	26732.52
Asoc. Ayúdense y Nosotros les Ayudaremos (AYNLA)	145216.43
Asociación de Desarrollo Integral Rural (ASDIR)	1279.87
Banco de Desarrollo Rural	63773.39
Banco de Fomento Agropecuario	16000.00
Banco de la Producción S.A.	10000.00
Banco de Occidente	70000.00
Banco del País	10000.00
Banco Hipotecario	234466.80
Banco Hondureño del Café	4783.03
Banco Lafise BANCENTRO	30000.00
Caja de Crédito de Zacatecoluca	17382.80
Caja de Crédito Nueva Concepción	11700.00
Caja de Crédito Rural de Sonsonate	66140.00
Cooperativa de Ahorro y Crédito Alianza de Pérez Zeledón R.L.	114020.30
Cooperativa de Ahorro y Crédito de Ciudad Quesada R.L.	20000.00
Cooperativa de Ahorro y Crédito Intibucana Limitada (CACIL)	20000.00
Cooperativa de Ahorro y Crédito La Ceibena de RL	13415.93
Cooperativa de Servicios Múltiples 20 de Abril de RL	2242.20
Fondo de Desarrollo Local (FDL)	357715.11
Fondo de Desarrollo Solidario (FONDESOL)	50648.98
Fundación Tecnológica Génesis Empresarial	173191.88
Sub Total	1458709.24

Figure 5: Bio-award distribution

However, this outcome is unsettling for several other reasons as well. One is the inappropriateness of the rules.²⁰ The intention of this incentive is to reward improvements in environmental performance on farms, along with the modernization of productive systems. For this reason, the differences in the amounts of prizes should reflect the level of effort made and the changes achieved. In other words, they should recognize the productive unit's impact on the environment, generated by CAMBio. In practice, the rules contained in the manual for bio-awards reward the size of the credit. The larger the loan, the larger the prize. If there is going to be a difference in the amount of awards, it should recognize the additions achieved through different practices. Unfortunately, no indicator was designed to quantify achievements of this type.

In addition, the great majority of CAMBio loan recipients were microcredits, and the maximum possible prize for this sector was US\$140.²¹ Therefore, this is the sector that benefits least given the structure of the rules. However, as mentioned, these differences are not because the microfinance sector has made less effort or has had less success in achieving environmental results through introducing new practices. The case studies demonstrate that the greatest achievements have, in fact, been made by this sector, as illustrated by Zona Reyna in Guatemala and Nitlapan in Nicaragua.

Another reason for concern about the rules is that microfinance institutions also handled the majority of CAMBio clients. This means that to meet the high demand for awards expected from microfinance institutions, a disproportionate amount of time and effort was required from participating institutions.

The procedure for approval and emission of a check to the beneficiary includes 34 administrative steps, involving all levels of FI and CABEI management, from the field technical supervisor in the institution proposing the candidate, to the BCEI executive president who finally approves the proposal. After approval, the process includes 7 more steps to finally have the check ready and plan the award ceremony. Prize recipients also have to invest time and money to take part in the event. One criterion for getting clearance from the system was complying with a set of indicators agreed upon when the loan was approved. This step required field verification.

For GE--the microfinance institution in Guatemala that disbursed 1,885 awards, out of a pool of 9,529 potential beneficiaries--the process was cumbersome. It is noteworthy that a large

²⁰ Operations Manual for the Biodiversity Award Benefits (BIO-AWARD). Version 3.

²¹ The limit for loans by microfinance institutions is set at US\$10,000.

percentage of their borrowers did not receive the prize. The lowest check on record for this organization is US\$8.17. It is also worth remembering that prior to this convoluted process of being awarded the prize, there was a previous loan eligibility and approval process in which GE staff had to acquire and register a large amount of information about each client on CAMBio's online platform. The information required by CAMBio for microcredit of US\$60 was almost identical to the information required for a US\$ 0.5-1 million loan (only minor adjustments in measuring units). All in all, the demands for information and administrative processes for loan preparation and follow-up were very complex and time consuming for microfinance institutions.

Hence, for *GE* and for other similar institutions, the situation was unmanageable. Aside from the very high cost implications, it was impossible for them and the CAMBio facilitator to fulfill the required field verification in very remote and dispersed locations. In addition to providing online documentation to the CABEL platform, they had to prepare and send an enormous amount of physical paperwork to CABEL. They managed to simplify the process, and finally the organization assigned a full-time technician to introduce data into the platform at the organization headquarters. AYNLA and COOPEALIANZA had similar experiences, but with fewer clients to handle, it was much easier for them to cope with the requirements and to distribute the benefits more evenly among the loan recipients within their organization.

In the case of *FDL* in Nicaragua (the second largest microfinance institution), despite also having very small awards, the situation was much more manageable. With technical support from NITLAPAN, as part of their own procedures, farmers develop a management plan setting biodiversity goals. This put them in a very privileged position with respect to the paperwork required for the bio-award at a very early stage of the process. As a consequence, *FDL* requests were timely and able to obtain available funds. The rules made clear to all *FIs* that funds were limited, and that requests would be met according to demand. This is the reason why most of *FDL* clients received the cash incentive. However, regardless of this very positive outcome, the learning curve for *FDL* was very high, and they indicated that the CAMBio online tool needs to be simplified.

Banks participating in CAMBio could award the full prize up to a maximum of US\$7,000, as indeed happened. According to interviewed commercial banks, all of their CAMBio-BF clients were eligible to apply for the project's non-reimbursable incentives, as they already fulfilled the eligibility criteria when they entered the BF portfolio.²² For them, the main criteria for selecting beneficiaries of the prize were a good debt standing, along with the size of the MSME. In addition, once chosen, beneficiaries had to pass the electronic eligibility review. To do this, the bank officer--sometimes assisted by CAMBio facilitators--entered the required data at the headquarters office. Field verification was also required to prepare all the corroboration documents, before the CABEL financial department could issue a check. As the process involved fewer clients, it was easier for the CAMBio facilitator and the *FI* official to arrange field visits or to sub-contract inspection services.

Field narratives with farmers during interviews were very predictable. Farmers who received the prize, regardless of the amount, were extremely satisfied, and those who didn't receive the incentives were extremely disappointed. Curiously, the award was not expected by some of the interviewed beneficiaries. In general terms, farmers were aware of the environmental and biodiversity-friendly practices being promoted by the project. Most farmers and households report having made improvements to their own crop plots, forested areas or patio gardens. Some of the most common management practices included planting trees, producing shade with native trees, constructing live fences, and producing organic pesticides.

Unfortunately, no workable database containing a complete report from the web platform is available, nor are there written records for each loan indicating the practices or indicators each

²² The great majority of bank clients were in the coffee portfolio, and for most of them, the selected indicator was certification.

MSME adopted to receive the award. The eligibility screening and system approval were online, and the evaluation determined that the only interviewed *FI* with records on file is *FDL*.

3.4.EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY

Effectiveness

As discussed above, the project indicators and outcomes as defined in the PD have limited operational detail in relation to all project intentions and expected goals. On the other hand, the modified project log frame is overly focused on delivery targets; therefore, indicators are not useful for assessing project results and impacts. Despite this consideration, the project was very successful in achieving approved targets, and has, according to the POAs and the internal monitoring system, significantly exceeded expected output indicators:

Outcome 1	US\$ 56 million in lending operations vs. 17million (a threefold increase).
Output 1.1; 1.6	26 participating FIs and 80 training workshops for FI staff.
Output 1.1; 1.5	Elaboration of project manuals, eligibility guidelines, case studies and a comprehensive list of project documents (see annex 3).
Output 1.2	Partial risk guarantee. Project reports 40.57 % achievement based on reformulated target.
Output 1.4	Bio-award allocation, 97.25% target.
Output 1.5	Standardized models for lending. The project reports 100% achievement based on guidelines for eligibility.
Output 1.7	Use of the bio-scorecard. The project reports 100% achievement.
Output 2.9; 3.4	TA allocation, 99.74% target (see complete list in annex 4)
Output 4.3	Outreach and dissemination of lessons, 100% target.

However, there is still a significant distance between these accomplishments and the project expected outcomes and immediate objective. Certainly, key barriers preventing MSME access to banking and business development still remain. Additionally, the way that the project information system was constructed does not support a more comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of the three strategic tools developed with the assistance from GEF funding: the partial guarantee, technical assistance and the bio-award facilities.

One of the main shortcomings of the project information system is the lack of variables to analyze the degree of financial inclusion achieved through increasing resources intermediated through the BF-MSME credit line. It is the evaluator's opinion that only around 15% of microfinance clients were first time borrowers. This percentage might drop when also considering banks. In addition, if we consider that just one bank with a consolidated coffee portfolio utilized an important share of CAMBio resources overall (loans, TA and bio-awards), the project achieved very little expansion to new MSMEs.

Additionally, in spite of the quite complex procedural setups for biodiversity monitoring, the system has proven to be poor in producing measured results. The relationships and effects on biodiversity attributed to project deliverables are not demonstrated, nor are the expected synergies foreseen in the implementation model.

Efficiency

The project procedures and BCEI accountability requirements demanded an overwhelming amount of paperwork, paper use, and administrative support.

As discussed in previous sections, contractual tender procedures for technical assistance and mechanisms for providing bio-awards required writing more than 3,000 checks, following loan approval processes. As part of this evaluation, it was not possible to screen activities for cost-effectiveness, but considering the very small sums of the checks and the limitations farmers faced in

cashing them, the costs associated with delivery of this cash incentive was awkwardly disproportionate.

Administration costs represent around 63% of the non-refundable funds. These expenses correspond to the executing unit's costs, which include coordination with FIs and other stakeholders, preparation of regional events, preparation of studies and publications, investment in a technological platform, equipment and salaries. In general terms, from the perspective of the investments in TA, awards, guarantees, and costs represent a very high ratio. It is assumed that the management of CABI credit lines with *FI* partners has a separate institutional cost structure.

3.5.RELEVANCE

The project concept is highly relevant. Central America's rural livelihoods depend on agricultural commodities. Clearly, there is a very close relationship between biodiversity and these rural communities. The CAMBio business model couples FIs with MSMEs, to produce goods and commodities in a sustainable manner.

Many of the loan recipients were from the agroforestry sector. In the coffee agro-ecosystem, it is widely accepted that the more traditional type of production, with diverse shade trees and minimal use of agro-chemicals, encourages the maintenance of rich biodiversity communities. Enhancing the scale of these practices means impacts can be achieved at the landscape level. Coffee cooperatives in Honduras, in the northern part of Nicaragua, and in El Salvador belong to specialty markets with different models of certification. Promoting and strengthening these value chains is of utmost importance for small-scale farmers.

According to CEPAL, an estimated 85% of the 250,000 coffee farmers in Central America are micro- and small-scale producers. In these households and farms, the family is the primary source of labor. Moreover, they usually produce half of the food they need by intercropping, making an integrated farm approach necessary. In contrast, medium, large and agro-industrial plantations maintain a permanent labor force and they usually produce only one crop.

In El Salvador, after two severe coffee crises, the sector has an outstanding debt of US\$220 million. The government is now providing loan guarantees and special credit lines to banks to maintain capital flow to coffee activities. In this context, CAMBio resources were highly relevant, allowing the segment that made use of the certification benefits to continue receiving premium prices.

For MSMEs in other sectors like ecotourism/agro-tourism, access to the loans was highly relevant. For this sector, most of the CAMBio portfolio was first-time borrowers. These types of initiatives face more barriers in terms of access to *FIs*, due to the high cost of the loans. The few cases included in the CAMBio portfolio were very relevant.

Agriculture financing empowers poor farmers to increase their household's capital. The microfinance model, which couples loans with technical assistance, has proven to be highly relevant for this sector.

It is important to remember that CABI focuses mainly on public funding, with only 30% of funds reaching the private sector. The financial intermediation through private *FIs* depends very much on the enthusiasm of these institutions, which usually target clients with lending operations over a US\$ 1 million. As described in the loan section, the CAMBio lending portfolio also has borrowers with significant investments. In fact, this group captured most of the lending. For this segment, CAMBio evaluation tools are not suitable, because investments of this size require a more comprehensive environmental assessment. In addition, public-private environmental initiatives should aim to distribute benefits more widely.

According to CAMBio, an important goal has been changing the paradigm of *FI* lending practices, achieved by enhancing their understanding of green and biodiversity businesses. This pilot experience is certainly opening the path toward exploring and consolidating this new way of thinking.

3.6. INTEGRATION AND NATIONAL IMPLICATION

CABEI has a consolidated mechanism for the intermediation of financial resources with *FIs*. Through the global credit lines, it offers 14 financial products to MSMEs. Now the BF-MSME is part of the institutional lending program. Other institutional experiences are available that offer lending models integrating non-reimbursable funds with loans. Commonly, technical assistance is available for pre-investment studies, as part of loan preparation processes.

CAMBio, however, was considered a pilot scheme. Within CABEI, it was not fully integrated into the institutional setup, and was managed as a project, with authority given to the project implementation unit. However, in the management of the project finances, the administrative divisions of CABEI provided full supervision and accountability.

CABEI “Green MSMES” funded by KFW is an ongoing program supporting renewable energy, coupling loan financing in the energy sector with non-reimbursable funds for studies and technical assistance to *FIs*. It used several aspects of the CAMBio model, but with a much leaner and institutionalized implementation structure. With the project’s conclusion, FINAM is in the process of evaluating whether the biodiversity-friendly complements can continue as part of the institutional BF MSME credit lines within the organization’s present institutional set up.

For *FIs*, the project leaves an important legacy, stipulating sector best practices as part of lending procedures. However, the information system for monitoring indicators was not fully assimilated, and will likely require substantial modifications in order to gain broader institutional acceptance.

In terms of national replication of the business model, the closest experience is found in El Salvador. BANDESAL, a second tier bank, also has a credit line similar to MSME-BF, sponsored by KFW. They indicate that there is great demand for these types of funds, combined with technical assistance and in partnership with other institutions. The view, in this case, merges profitability with socio-economic development.

In Costa Rica, as part of the technical assistance component, the project facilitated a dialogue within FUNCAFOR to include coffee trees as part of PES incentives in FONAFIFO. Additionally, the government established a platform for discussing pineapple cultivation practices and sustainability. Other sectorial initiatives were also strengthened in Guatemala, El Salvador and Nicaragua.

The remarkable example of Nitlapan-FDL as a model that integrates TA as part of loans with a cost recovery scheme, and with very positive results monitoring environmental impacts at the farm level, should be replicated in other parts of the region.

Mainstreaming the project with other UNDP or national priorities was not considered in the project annual plan of operations. No specific goals were considered for gender equality, poverty, recovery from natural disasters, or improved governance. However, the project did reach many women producers and women head of families with loans and non reimbursable incentives.

3.7. SUSTAINABILITY

With the conclusion of project activities, the non-reimbursable grants are no longer available. No revolving facility is functioning for the partial guarantee facility, and the technical assistance was

not absorbed into the cost of loans as a consequence of project activities. Microfinance institutions do provide TA as part of their lending models, and their clients continue receiving these institutionalized services.

What has remained from the CAMBio experience is the institutional financing mechanism for the BF MSME product, as part of the overall credit lines between CABI and FIs. It will now be possible for any other donor or funder to provide financing through this mechanism. The credit line that was opened with the CAMBio project continues operating as a revolving credit line, and remains operational to the extent that there is demand from the FIs. The TA component could be activated at any moment, depending upon the availability of such funds. In addition, CABI now has the institutional capacity to direct such a program with a leaner project unit, since it has created an area for intermediation programs within its own structure.

3.8.IMPACT

Mainstreaming Biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within MSME

CAMBio lacks a conceptual framework for understanding how the project outcomes will produce desired impacts. It is hoped that these will take place in two specific areas: i) improving the profitability of MSME businesses, and ii) at the level of biodiversity benefits. It is expected that credit will improve capital assets to strengthen and develop businesses and farms, thereby increasing household income. Moreover, incorporating productive best practices will eventually bring improvements to natural ecosystems, reducing forest fragmentation, improving the ecological structure of farms, reducing soil erosion and the use of pesticides, and improving aquifer recharge, which will support wildlife and biodiversity.

The project has produced some direct effects that have been analyzed in previous sections. What hasn't been clarified is how the path toward desired impacts will be strengthened. The following table uses the *Review of Outcomes to Impacts*, or RoTI, evaluation methodology to outline these relationships. The sustainable livelihood framework can also be used to systematize project impacts, as illustrated in the figure.


It is assumed that credit and the delivery of cash incentives (bio-awards) have generated positive economic impacts in the MSMEs and rural households receiving microcredit (no project data available). Nonetheless, these benefits reach them in differentiated forms, due to the huge differences in types of businesses, and therefore, in the amounts of credit and awards they receive. One assumption for achieving desired impacts is that CAMBio provided credit at reasonable rates, so that it is a viable option within the cost structure of different businesses.²³ Generally, making working capital available to farms generates employment, allows producers to purchase agricultural inputs, increases physical capital through improvements to productive infrastructure, and insures that all necessary agricultural tasks can be carried out for developing and harvesting crops.

The empirical evidence collected during this evaluation confirms that the delivery of cash incentives provided an additional cash flow that producers used to repay interest on credit, or invested in education, health care, sales, or the purchase of land or food. Some cooperatives used the award to invest in infrastructure, pay for certification or permits, or to pay employees. The microfinance institutions reaching the majority of CAMBio beneficiaries clearly help families in their livelihood strategies, providing cash flow to meet immediate needs. For these small-scale

²³ The microfinance institutions that attend to the poorest sector provide the most "expensive" money, with interest rates as much as 17% higher (9% in the banks and 26% offered by some microfinance institutions).

farmers, cash crops are the primary source of cash income. The case of cardamom and cacao in Northern Guatemala is an excellent example of how available small cash flows are crucial for rural livelihoods. The case of coffee cooperatives in the northern part of Nicaragua provides another equally relevant example of the importance that cash flows play in the livelihoods of poor farmers. In addition, microfinance institutions also provide funding to small commercial activities, diversifying the cash income of households even more.

Table 100: RoTI, evaluation methodology using The sustainable livelihood framework

	MEANS		OUTCOMES			IMPACTS Sustainable Livelihood Framework
Project Strategy	Activities	Output	Direct Effects	Drivers and Assumptions	Intermediate States	
	□	□	CABEI and FI are providing loans to BF-MSME	- Low cost credit -New BF-MSME clients -Cash awards	-Increased profits in MSME	Financial capital Increased income and cash flow Human capital Improvement of capacities
	□		MSME working in a broad range of sectors, which are able to develop BF-business and thereby access new markets for products	-Diversity of products -Value chains -Technical capacity -Increased productivity	-Use of sustainable production technologies -Measurable effects at farm level -Knowledge	Physical capital Productive infrastructure Coffee processing plants Improved pastures Renewed coffee Natural capital Ecosystem Services Habitat connectivity Conservation value Biodiversity enhancement
	□		Political-sector initiatives	□	□	
	□	□	Lessons Learned	Adaptation	Validation	

Source: prepared by the evaluator

It is important to ask whether the credit is a direct contribution of the CAMBio project, and therefore if the impacts generated from credit can be attributed to the project. The evidence collected in this evaluation indicates that most *FI* clients already had access to credit. What CAMBio added was a cash incentive and technical assistance. This is confirmed by the impact evaluation conducted by the SEM firm in Honduras. *"The producers do not see credit in and of itself as something novel, since the interest rates and repayment terms are the same as those offered by commercial banks. Traditionally, producers do not value technical assistance, making the most original component of the CAMBio project and its credit plan this element that has already been presented. We believe, along with banks and beneficiaries, that this is necessary."*²⁴

Similarly, according to this evaluation, the components that can be attributed to CAMBio are the bio-award and technical assistance. A strict evaluation of project impact would have to separate those clients who received the CAMBio package from the larger universe of clients who only received credit. The failure to do so is a key limitation identified in all of the case studies conducted. The causality between project actions and results is not analyzed in any form. Although it is true

²⁴ Sistemas Empresariales de Mesoamerica (SEM) Page 7. Evaluacion de los impactos en biodiversidad como resultado de las intervenciones del proyecto CAMBio en las MIPYMES de Agroforesteria de Café y Cacao en Honduras. 11/2013.

that there are no suitable baselines for use in this analysis, ex-post methodologies exist that could be used to overcome such constraints.

In general, the impacts produced from these contributions should be seen as improvements in human capital, the use of more sustainable practices, better farm productivity, greater diversification of products, insertion into markets, and improvements in the natural capital of farms and the productive environment.

An evaluation of the CAMBio project's benefits to biodiversity was conducted by the firm Ecoagriculturepartners, and its conclusions are included in Annex 5. It is beyond the scope of this evaluation to assess this report. However, coupling capital provision with other project incentives to produce biodiversity benefits²⁵ in agricultural ecosystems demands a high level of knowledge about the environmental externalities associated with the productive practices of commodities. The challenge of promoting biological diversity within agricultural systems is not as obvious as it might first appear, and the causalities associated with practices must be carefully assessed.

As already mentioned in this evaluation, coffee was the main agricultural commodity receiving support from CAMBio. Project records indicate that a key strategy was paying for the certification of cooperatives and farms, to insure the continuation of environmentally friendly practices. It is assumed that the defining agro-ecological feature of coffee producers is using shade trees as an integral part of their ecosystem management. A diverse and abundant shade tree canopy with native species is widely recognized as a strong foundation for agro-ecology, demonstrating the potential for conservation.

According to CAMBio's own final reports, the project paid for the certification (or renewal of certification) of 996 landholdings, covering a total area of 21,799 hectares and the production of 6,183,068.1 quintals of harvested coffee. By promoting best practices, they have successfully protected over 200 species of trees both on and off of coffee plantations, and have supported comprehensive approaches to outbreak management, positive changes in the use of soil and water, and increases in the production yields and competitiveness of MSMEs. *FIs* provided loans for 134,062.08 hectares of agroforestry used for coffee, cocoa and cardamom production; 6,999 hectares of sustainable fishing; 2,269.38 hectares of organic farming and plantations; 200.95 hectares of sustainably managed forest; and 447.94 hectares used for ecotourism.

In terms of negative impacts, no data exists in regard to land reconversion within MSMEs. However, it is well known that lending in agriculture can also trigger more land use changes, converting primary forest to land used for agriculture production (coffee) and cattle ranching. It is, therefore, very relevant to comprehensively assess the productive environments of these enterprises, and not only promote the use of one or two best practices, particularly given the large portfolio of coffee growers and businesses that captured a significant portion of financial services.

Table 11: Rating ²⁶

IA& EA Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	MS
Quality of Implementation Agency	MS

²⁵ Biodiversity refers to variety and variability among living organisms and the ecological compliances in which they occur. Major components in biodiversity are ecosystem diversity, species diversity and genetic diversity (thegef.org).

²⁶ The scale that rates overall quality of implementation and execution is the following: 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; and 1: Highly unsatisfactory (HU), serious deficiencies. For relevance, the rates are Relevant (R) or Not Relevant (NR). Sustainability is rated Likely (L), Moderately Likely (ML), Moderately Unlikely (MU), and Unlikely UL.

Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	MS
Products/results	
Overall quality of project results	MS
Relevance	
Qualification of relevance	R
Products/results	
Effectiveness	MS
Efficiency	MU
Sustainability	
Overall likelihood of sustainability	L
Financial resources	L
Socio-political	NA
Institutional framework and governance	NA
Environmental	NA

NA means not applicable, because no data was available to evaluate.

4. CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS

Financing BF-MSME

In spite of the crisis in the financial market, CABEL was very successful in providing US\$ 55 million (a threefold increase in pledged funds) to financial institutions lending to BF-MSMEs, through existing credit lines. With the promotion of a more attractive financial product with non-reimbursable incentives, the ties between *FIs* and MSMEs were also strengthened. The lending process also reinforced the importance of environmentally friendly practices in production schemes; the fund's marketing strategy explicitly advocated rewarding the implementation of biodiversity-friendly indicators.

CAMbio involved more than 27 *FIs* and a group of four banks specializing in agricultural commodities, which allocated more than half of the credit funds. *HIPOTECARIO* bank, which by far disbursed most of the financial resources (33.4% of the total funds) was also the intermediary for other public funds provided by *BANDESAL*, targeting the coffee sector. Thus, coffee borrowers using the CAMbio credit line were able to obtain an additional discount through use of this other special credit line. Agroforestry systems (coffee, cardamom and cacao) represent nearly 75% of all loans. The majority of loans were used as working capital.

The eligibility tool utilized to select clients compelled *FIs* to offer the CAMbio credit line to their best ongoing clients, in cases where it was possible to overlap with one or more of the biodiversity eligibility criteria (there was a certain level of specialization among participating *FIs*). As explained in the interviews, their goal was finding the sector with higher credit demand and less risk, in a biodiversity rich environment.

Accordingly, this evaluation confirms that most CAMbio beneficiaries were already clients of *FIs*. Some 52 borrowers, with loans over US\$200,000 and up to US\$1 million, received 52% of CAMbio's credit funds. On the other hand, microfinance institutions that reached micro and small enterprises, with more than 10,823 clients, disbursed 16% of the project resources. Even within this segment of borrowers, more than 80% were already in good standing in terms of their credit records. These findings indicate that the CAMbio project's strategy of using collaterals and incentives to promote greater financial inclusion was not effective. It is noteworthy that the overall project objective was to remove barriers in the banking industry, and during this evaluation, no evidence was found of any major changes in the banking environment with respect to policies or lending practices and procedures. The micro-finance environment is equally stringent with respect to risk taking. Additionally, reaching remote rural populations implies very high transaction costs, and this continues to be a big limitation for reducing microfinance interest rates and expanding private bank lending to this sector.

Given that the main source of funds for loans was CABEL, and that banks were taking their own financial risks in lending processes, requests for targeting clientele and using social indicators were not part of CAMbio's considerations. However, this is an important discrepancy with respect to the environment created by the project, since much of its rationale and design are focused on reaching and developing emerging MSMEs with limited access to credit and poor production practices.

Project Incentives – The non-refundable components

At the core of the project strategy is removing barriers related to business organization, development and financing, through the provision of technical cooperation. CAMbio employed three non-reimbursable financial facilities: technical assistance, bio-awards and partial risk guarantees. According to written procedures, all the MSMEs eligible for a BF loan were also eligible to receive project incentives.

During project implementation, the facility to provide partial credit guarantees was scaled down, and practically became non operational in 2012, The fund only disbursed 7.5%, in 12 contracts, of the initial US\$2.9 million. There is no report indicating how many of these guarantees were executed by *FIs*.

Technical Assistance

The technical assistance strategy also changed during project implementation, from a facility targeting the provision of assistance with long-term partners based on a modality of cost recovery principles, to a fund operated as small short-term grants used for consultancies and subcontracts. According to the rules, *FIs* could provide TA to MSMEs in the amount of 10% of the credit award, up to a maximum of US\$ 10,000. Similarly, the *FIs* could receive 2% of the amount of credit issued, up to a maximum of US\$ 20,000. In addition, institutions or sectors promoting a more enabling environment for the development of MSMEs could receive up to a maximum of US\$ 10,000.

Around 20% of the US\$10 million provided by GEF was disbursed in 155 payments to *FIs* or sectorial recipient organizations. Microfinance institutions used the funds to improve skills on productive farms, using their own technical or promoter networks. Banks, on the other hand, paid for coffee certification processes, training events and outreach activities. Sectorial organizations sponsored training courses, regional workshops, and other activities aimed at building institutional capacities.

A showcase in the technical assistance component is the FDL-Nitlapan model, which had very successful field results, and is partially sustainable because utilizes a cost recovery mechanism. For coffee growers, refunds for certification costs was very well received, since it meant fulfillment of biodiversity-friendly practices.

The use of the TA facility as a fund for small grants caused a big dispersion of resources and questionable results in terms of project goals. As commonly recognized in other evaluations, this somewhat scatter-shot approach to TA (with generic workshops, forums, regional and international events, etc.) provides little synergy between the different activities that are carried out, and in many cases provides minimal information about the final outcomes and the substantive benefits received by participants (except in the few but notable cases where participants provided market and sales information about trips made to international trade fairs).

Bio-Award

The use of the bio-award, a cash incentive to reward the enhancement of biodiversity friendly practices, reached 26% of loan recipients and 22 financial intermediaries, using 14.5% of the GEF allocation. According to the rules, the amount of the award was set at 20% of the total loan, up to a maximum of US\$10,000 (70% of the award resources went to MSMEs and 30% to *FIs*).

Findings from this evaluation demonstrate that the operationalization of this cash award was overwhelmingly complicated, expensive, and required specialized personnel and a field technical structure seldom found in financial institutions. Eighty-three percent of the awards were given to clients from microfinance institutions. This large number of prizes (more than 3,000) were cash awards (checks) averaging US\$78. The procedure for approval and emission of checks included 34 administrative steps, an extended process that involved field promoters as well as the highest level of CBEI's loan approval committee. The process ended with an award ceremony, organized by the project.

Project Management, Evaluation and Monitoring

The project was very successful in achieving approved targets, and according to POAs and the internal monitoring system, has significantly exceeded expected output indicators. However, as demonstrated in this evaluation, there is still a significant distance between these accomplishments and the project's expected outcomes and immediate objective. One shortcoming is that the

monitoring modality was constructed on the basis of project deliverables, with little direct attention given to expected project results and impacts.

With the exception of only a few cases, the quality and integrity of the field data collected on farms is a major project limitation. This finding is also corroborated in the Biodiversity Impact Evaluation report, where consultants reported on the constraints they faced producing an impact evaluation, given the limited available information. This is an unexpected finding, considering the high cost of the PIU, the number of project staff, and the numerous contracts outsourced to analyze project results and impacts. This is where a more adaptive management model and the active participation of the UNDP, CABI and other stakeholders could have provided more suitable orientation for taking better strategic advantage of these consultancies.

Overall conclusion

CAMBIO provided a means to upscale and consolidate previous green lending experiences, using the extensive network of financial institutions that are partners with CABI. In general, there is a very strong commitment among CABI, *FIs* and clients to improve the environmental performance of their operations. The potential to achieve positive impacts in agricultural landscapes is enormous, as farmers are eager to enter green markets and to produce and take advantage of environmental services.

CAMBIO was implemented as a pilot scheme. However, it was not fully integrated into CABI's institutional setup, and was managed as a project. The weak anchoring and ownership limited the internalization and adjustment of developed instruments, which would have better grounded processes. Nonetheless, the experience produced tools and a workable model, which with suitable guidance, can be useful for introducing practices and routines within *FI* and among clients, to mainstream and monitor biodiversity in a cost effective and sustainable way.

4.1.RECOMMENDATIONS

This evaluation confirms that CAMBIO has been a highly relevant and innovative project, but requires adjustments in its implementation procedures and validation of field practices to consolidate its results in biodiversity.

The proposed public-private partnership has great potential for expanding environmental and social benefits generated through lending to agricultural activities. The alliance between UNDP/GEF and CABI makes use of an already established financial intermediation network, using the global credit mechanism, and presently offers 14 financial products to MSMEs. The evaluator strongly recommends that CABI continue strengthening the environmental screening and requirements for loans within *FIs*. Hopefully, with GEF technical cooperation, CABI can expand credit schemes to produce ecosystem services in productive landscapes with development goals.

The following recommendations to UNDP/GEF for a post-CAMBIO initiative build on the findings of this evaluation.

FI target groups:

- Financial institutions have very well-defined strategies for financial markets and credit infiltration. Lending to agriculture continues to be seen as a very risky business. With the exception of microfinance institutions, *FIs* do not target small farmers, and this sector continues to face severe barriers to financial inclusion. A new UNDP/CABI initiative must openly address these limitations, to define potential project beneficiaries.
- This evaluation shows that microfinance institutions and agricultural lending cooperatives are better prepared to provide financial services to the smaller production sectors and achieve greater financial inclusion in their networks.

- Ideally, the bracket of potential profitable farmers would be identified that--with the assistance of loans, technical assistance and chain markets--would be able to overcome barriers and become competitive, and exit the productive stagnation that keeps them in poverty.
- The CAMbio lending portfolio concentrated on two very extreme groups of farmers. A new initiative must stay away from such polarized clientele to be effective and to produce impact. In Guatemala, the microfinance organization invested considerable effort trying to reach subsistence agriculture clients. In the case of very small credits, the CAMbio loan approval and follow-up processes posed a severe limitation to the scalability and effectiveness of its model. On the other hand, the environmental requirements for the large loans made by private banks were too lenient.

Productive Sectors:

- Agricultural commodities play a major role in the livelihood strategies of farmers in Central America. However, there are major differences in the degree of modernization and market integration within the CABI defined MSME sector. A new initiative must clearly define a typology of farmers and productive systems as target groups. A clear target group will allow lending to be effectively integrated with technical assistance and anchor market chains.
- CAMbio demand was in the coffee sector. But within this sector, there are substantial differences in production technologies, and in levels of vulnerability faced by farmers for sustaining livelihoods. To insure consistency with UNDP development strategies, a new initiative must be firmly anchored among small-scale farmers. As many researchers have demonstrated, small-scale family farms produce over 70% of the world's coffee, giving this sector tremendous potential for a vertical and horizontal integration in value chains.
- However, before embarking on a new initiative, a more profound assessment is required to better understand sector niches and opportunities.

Value Chain Approach:

- Commercial sectors and sustainable food chains are increasingly adopting inclusive models, pulling small farmers into the value chain approach. The FDL-Nitlapan institutional model is a very effective approach for providing financing to small producers. In the CAMbio model, they provided support to farmers in the form of credit and technical assistance. However, they also have an excellent record bringing the extension model one step further: integrating markets. Using anchor firms in dairy processing, they have linked farmers receiving credit and technical assistance with these businesses, demonstrating a very successful development model.
- A new initiative must avoid the small grant model of technical assistance, and should fine-tune a more strategic methodology.

Definition of sustainable practices:

- To obtain positive biodiversity externalities, a much more comprehensive ecosystem approach is needed. The CAMbio model is based on sector good practices. This approach is reasonable for improving production practices, and for mitigating bad practices. But to reduce deforestation, land degradation, climate change adaptation and biodiversity losses, additions at the farm and landscape levels must be carefully assessed with an agro-ecology perspective. Conservation management strategies must also be part of the picture.
- As a cautionary note, not all certification seals for coffee require ecological considerations. It is possible that a coffee farmer in the specialty market, with several certifications, might be deforesting very important biodiversity spots to increase the coffee production area.
- In any case, the causalities and additions achieved with the introduction of best management practices in regard to biodiversity require careful assessment.

Use of Incentives and cash awards:

- If requirements are not clearly defined and if the selection processes are not competitive and transparent, a new initiative should steer clear of this type of award. Better loan rates might, in fact, be an easier alternative to providing incentives.

4.2.LESSONS LEARNED

- Agricultural commodity production plays a very important role in the economy of rural populations in Central America. CAMBio defines coffee, cacao and cardamom as biodiversity-friendly crops. However, depending on management practices and technologies, these crops can also be the source of losses in biodiversity and ecosystem services. The tradeoffs that may occur must be acknowledged and integrated into the project intervention models.
- CAMBio promoted the afforestation of farming systems in many respects through improved agroforestry, but was not found to provide sufficient mechanisms to enhance the protection of existing forests on farms.
- A project of the scale and complexity of CAMbio requires better institutional anchoring and active stakeholders very embedded in project implementation, such as farmer organizations and commercial anchor firms.
- It is not reasonable to employ bank loan procedures for the delivery of incentives, if these are intended to reach an ample clientele. A good lesson is provided in the section on bio-awards.
- The cost effectiveness and the roles of a PIU, including technical experts, must be carefully determined.
- Future programs following similar purposes should invest more time in acquiring baseline information and developing more robust databases for impact assessments.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE

TÉRMINOS DE REFERENCIA

CI/00051185/01787/2015CONSULTORÍA EVALUACIÓN FINAL DEL PROYECTO CAMBIO

INTRODUCCIÓN

De acuerdo con las políticas y los procedimientos de SyE del PNUD y del FMAM, todos los proyectos de tamaño mediano y regular respaldados por el PNUD y financiados por el FMAM deben someterse a una evaluación final una vez finalizada la ejecución. Estos términos de referencia (TdR) establecen las expectativas de una Evaluación Final (EF) del proyecto Mercados Centroamericanos para la Biodiversidad (CAMBio): Priorización de la conservación y el uso sostenible de la biodiversidad en el desarrollo y financiamiento de las micro, pequeñas y medianas empresas, PIMS ID 3368.

A continuación, se presentan los aspectos esenciales del proyecto que se deben evaluar:

CUADRO SINÓPTICO DEL PROYECTO

Título del proyecto:	Mercados Centroamericanos para la Biodiversidad (CAMBio): Priorización de la conservación y el uso sostenible de la biodiversidad en el desarrollo y financiamiento de las micro, pequeñas y medianas empresas.			
Identificación del proyecto del FMAM:	3368		<i>al momento de aprobación (millones de USD)</i>	<i>al momento de finalización (millones de USD)</i>
Identificación del proyecto del PNUD:	43770	Financiación del FMAM:	10.225	0
País:	Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa	IA y EA poseen:		
Región:	Centroamérica	Gobierno:	0	0
Área de interés:	MIPYMEs	Otro:	0	
Programa operativo:	CAMBio	Cofinanciación total:	0	0.78 (0.23 MIPYMEs, 0.55 IFIs).
Organismo de Ejecución:	Banco Centroamericano de Integración Económica (BCIE)	Gasto total del proyecto:	17	58
IFIs				
Otros socios involucrados:	Comisión Centroamericana para el Ambiente y el Desarrollo (CCAD)	Firma del documento del proyecto (fecha de comienzo del proyecto):		18-Julio-2006
		Fecha de cierre (Operativo):	Propuesto: Junio 2012	Real: Diciembre 2015

OBJETIVO Y ALCANCE

El Proyecto se diseñó para priorizar los temas de conservación y uso sostenible de la Biodiversidad, en el desarrollo y financiación de las micro, pequeñas y medianas empresas (MIPYMEs) de cinco países centroamericanos (Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras y Nicaragua). Al hacerlo, se generarán beneficios a la Biodiversidad, mediante la motivación hacia la transformación de las prácticas productivas y de servicios, así como de las inversiones relacionadas con éstas, de tal manera que se logre impactar positivamente en la Biodiversidad.

El proyecto trabajó de forma muy cercana con tres importantes redes proveedoras de servicios, cada una de ellas asociada a un componente específico del proyecto, y apoyando el acercamiento entre ellas. En primer lugar, con la Red del sector financiero del Banco Centroamericano de Integración Económica (BCIE), seleccionando a miembros de su extensa red de intermediarios financieros (IFs), para desarrollar y extender nuevos productos financieros capaces de generar incrementos sustanciales de los préstamos a MIPYMEs Amigables con la Biodiversidad (MIPYMEs-AB), para inversiones que generen beneficios para la Biodiversidad. En segundo lugar, con MIPYMEs-AB en potencia y en alianza con una gama de proveedores de servicios técnicos y comerciales, nacionales e internacionales, a fin de asegurar que las inversiones de las MIPYMEs sean realizadas de forma eficiente y que maximicen los beneficios económicos, sociales y de la Biodiversidad/Ambiente. Finalmente, con las Instituciones gubernamentales e intergubernamentales, incluidos los Ministerios del Ambiente, Ministerios sectoriales relevantes (Agricultura, Industria, Turismo, Finanzas y Comercio), así como con la Comisión Centroamericana de Ambiente y Desarrollo (CCAD), estructura regional de coordinación orientada a promover un ambiente habilitador que alentará el crecimiento de las MIPYMEs-AB en el mediano y largo plazos.

El financiamiento del Fondo para el Ambiente Global (GEF), brindó cooperación técnica orientada a remover una variedad de barreras, incluidas aquellas relacionadas con la organización y desarrollo de las empresas, los sistemas bancarios y el ambiente habilitador, con el fin de priorizar las áreas arriba mencionadas. Igualmente, apoyo financiero directo en forma de garantías parciales y de otros créditos mejorados. El Fondo GEF ha logrado apalancar recursos por un monto de US\$. 48,655,674.76 en co-financiamiento, en forma de fondos de crédito directo disponibles en las líneas de crédito BCIE-MIPYMEs existentes, las cuales apoyan actualmente préstamos para las Micro, Pequeñas y Medianas Empresas Amigables con la Biodiversidad MIPYME-AB. Adicionalmente, trabajando en alianza con otras fuentes de financiamiento en formas que benefician a la Biodiversidad.

Al 30 de Junio del 2013 el Proyecto CAMBio ha logrado colocar en los 5 países de la Región Centroamericana, 7,478 créditos que benefician al mismo número de MIPYME's, por un monto total de US\$48,651,036.94. De igual manera, ha logrado brindar asistencia técnica a 21,970 MIPYME's (9,729 a través de asistencia asociada al crédito y 12,241 mediante asistencias sectoriales), 793 Ejecutivos de IFIs (asistencia a la IFI) y 41 Instituciones que apoyan el marco habilitador/iniciativas sectoriales para el financiamiento a las MIPYME's, por un monto total de US\$1,770,261.22.

Asimismo, mediante el Programa de Premio por Beneficios a la Biodiversidad (Biopremio), ha logrado otorgar un monto total de US\$1,039,419.77, beneficiando a 2,836 Micro y Pequeñas Empresas que han cumplido al 100% los Indicadores de Biodiversidad propuestos al inicio de los créditos, y así beneficiar a 33 IFI's que han otorgado y supervisado dichos indicadores.

La EF se realizará según las pautas, normas y procedimientos establecidos por el PNUD y el FMAM, según se establece en la Guía de Evaluación del PNUD para Proyectos Financiados por el FMAM.

Los objetivos de la evaluación analizarán el logro de los resultados del proyecto y extraerán lecciones que puedan mejorar la sostenibilidad de beneficios de este proyecto y ayudar a mejorar de manera general la programación del PNUD.

ENFOQUE Y MÉTODO DE EVALUACIÓN

Se ha desarrollado con el tiempo un enfoque y un método general¹ para realizar evaluaciones finales de proyectos respaldados por el PNUD y financiados por el FMAM. Se espera que el evaluador enmarque el trabajo de evaluación utilizando los criterios de **relevancia, efectividad, eficiencia, sostenibilidad e impacto**, según se define y explica en la Guía para realizar evaluaciones finales de los proyectos respaldados por el PNUD y financiados por el FMAM. Se redactó una serie de preguntas que cubre cada uno de estos criterios incluidos en estos TdR ([Ver Anexo C de los TdR](#)). Se espera que el evaluador modifique, complete y presente esta matriz como parte de un informe inicial de la evaluación, y la incluya como anexo en el informe final.

La evaluación debe proporcionar información basada en evidencia que sea creíble, confiable y útil. Se espera que el evaluador siga un enfoque participativo y consultivo que asegure participación estrecha con homólogos de gobierno, en particular el Centro de Coordinación de las Operaciones del FMAM, la Oficina en el País del PNUD, el equipo del proyecto, el Asesor Técnico Regional del FMAM/PNUD e interesados clave. Se espera que el evaluador realice una misión de campo en *(Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua y Costa Rica)*, incluidas las siguientes visitas de campo:

Guatemala:

- Zona Reina del Quiché (tomar en cuenta que por la lejanía son 4 días de viaje)
- Huehuetenango
- Baja y Alta Verapaz

El Salvador

- Ruta de las flores y Cordillera Apaneca-Ilamatepec

Honduras

- Santa Rosa de Copan
- San Pedro de Copán
- La Ceiba
- Marcala

Nicaragua

- Matagalpa, Jinotega y Nueva Segovia en la zona de amortiguamiento de la Reserva de Bosawas,
- Isla Ometepe, Rivas.

¹ Para obtener más información sobre los métodos de evaluación, consulte [el Manual de planificación, seguimiento y evaluación de los resultados de desarrollo](#), Capítulo 7, pág. 163

Costa Rica

- Comunidades Ciudad Quesada
- Perez Zeledon

Las entrevistas se llevarán a cabo con las siguientes organizaciones e individuos, como mínimo:

Guatemala:

Gerente de país BCIE y Ejecutivos de BCIE

Consejo Nacional de Áreas Protegidas (CONAP)

Ministerio de Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (Unidad del CBM)

Programa de Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo

Fundación Génesis Empresarial

Fondo de Desarrollo Solidario

Asociación de Desarrollo Integral de la Cuenca del Lago de Atitlán (ADICLA)

Banco de Desarrollo Rural (BANRURAL)

AYNLA

Asociación de productores ASODIL y APSOR de la zona Reina

El Salvador:

Gerente de país BCIE y Ejecutivos de BCIE

Comisión Centroamericana de Ambiente y Desarrollo (CCAD)

Banco Hipotecario

Banco de Fomento Agropecuario

Caja de Crédito Rural de Zacatecoluca

Banco Izalqueño de los Trabajadores

Caja de Crédito de Nueva Concepción

Caja de Crédito Rural de Sonsonate

Cooperativa Siglo XXI

CORSATUR (Corporación Salvadoreña de Turismo)

Honduras:

Gerente de país BCIE y Ejecutivos de BCIE

Gerente GERSYP Y PREA

Programa de Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo

Banco de Occidente (Tegucigalpa)

Banco Hondureño del Café (San Pedro Sula)

Banco del País (San Pedro Sula)

Banco LAFISE Honduras

Cooperativa La Ceibeña

Cooperativa CAPUCAS

Cooperativa COAGRICSA

Cooperativa Caruchil **Nicaragua:**

Gerente de país BCIE y Ejecutivos de BCIE

Programa de Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo

Fondo de Desarrollo Local-FDL

Banco Lafise-Bancentro

Banco de la Producción (BANPRO)

Cooperativa de Servicios Múltiples 20 de Abril

Nitlapan.

MIFIC (Ministerio de Fomento y comercio de Nicaragua)

INTUR (Instituto de Turismo)

Lutheran World Relief

Costa Rica:

Gerente de país BCIE y Ejecutivos de BCIE

Cooperativa de Ahorro y Crédito de Ciudad Quesada-COOPEALIANZA

Cooperativa de Ahorro y Crédito Alianza de Pérez Zeledón-COOCIQUE

El evaluador revisará todas las fuentes de información relevantes, tales como el documento del proyecto, los informes del proyecto, incluidos el IAP/IEP anual y otros informes, revisiones de presupuesto del proyecto, evaluación de medio término, informes de progreso, herramientas de seguimiento del área de interés del FMAM, archivos del proyecto, documentos nacionales estratégicos y legales, y cualquier otro material que el evaluador considere útil para esta evaluación con base empírica. En el [Anexo B](#) de estos Términos de Referencia se incluye una lista de documentos que el equipo del proyecto proporcionará al evaluador para el examen.

CRITERIOS Y CALIFICACIONES DE LA EVALUACIÓN

Se llevará a cabo una evaluación del rendimiento del proyecto, en comparación con las expectativas que se establecen en el Marco lógico del proyecto y el Marco de resultados (consulte el [Anexo A](#)), que proporciona indicadores de rendimiento e impacto para la ejecución del proyecto, junto con los medios de verificación correspondientes. La evaluación cubrirá mínimamente los criterios de: **relevancia, efectividad, eficiencia, sostenibilidad e impacto**. Las calificaciones deben proporcionarse de acuerdo con los siguientes criterios de rendimiento. Se debe incluir la tabla completa en el resumen ejecutivo de evaluación. Las escalas de calificación obligatorias se incluyen en el [Anexo D](#) de los TdR.

Calificación del rendimiento del proyecto			
1. Seguimiento y Evaluación	calificación	2. Ejecución de los IA y EA:	calificación
Diseño de entrada de SyE		Calidad de aplicación del PNUD	
Ejecución del plan de SyE		Calidad de ejecución: organismo de ejecución	
Calidad general de SyE		Calidad general de aplicación y ejecución	
3. Evaluación de los resultados	calificación	4. Sostenibilidad	calificación
Relevancia		Recursos financieros:	
Efectividad		Socio-políticos:	
Eficiencia		Marco institucional y gobernanza:	
Calificación general de los resultados del proyecto		Ambiental:	
		Probabilidad general de sostenibilidad:	

FINANCIACIÓN/COFINANCIACIÓN DEL PROYECTO

La evaluación valorará los aspectos financieros clave del proyecto, incluido el alcance de cofinanciación planificada y realizada. Se requerirán los datos de los costos y la financiación del proyecto, incluidos los gastos anuales. Se deberán evaluar y explicar las diferencias entre los gastos planificados y reales. Deben considerarse los resultados de las auditorías financieras recientes, si están disponibles. Los evaluadores recibirán asistencia de la Oficina en el País (OP) y del Equipo del Proyecto para obtener datos financieros a fin de completar la siguiente tabla de cofinanciación, que se incluirá en el informe final de evaluación.

Cofinanciación (tipo/fuente)	Financiación propia del PNUD (millones de USD)		Gobierno (millones de USD)		Organismo asociado (millones de USD)		Total (millones de USD)	
	Planificado	Real	Planificado	Real	Planificado	Real	Planificado	Real
Subvenciones	0		0					
Préstamos/concesiones	0		0					
• Ayuda en especie	0		0					0.78
• BCIE	0		0		17	58.08	17	58.08
Totales	0		0					

INTEGRACIÓN

Los proyectos respaldados por el PNUD y financiados por el FMAM son componentes clave en la programación nacional del PNUD, así como también en los programas regionales y mundiales. La evaluación valorará el grado en que el proyecto se integró con otras prioridades del PNUD, entre ellos la reducción de la pobreza, mejor gobernanza, la prevención y recuperación de desastres naturales y el género.

IMPACTO

Los evaluadores valorarán el grado en que el proyecto está logrando impactos o está progresando hacia el logro de impactos. Los resultados clave a los que se debería llegar en las evaluaciones incluyen si el proyecto demostró: a) mejoras verificables en el estado ecológico, b) reducciones verificables en la tensión de los sistemas ecológicos, y/o c) un progreso demostrado hacia el logro de estos impactos.²

Alternativamente a esta evaluación, el programa está llevando a cabo una evaluación de impactos a la biodiversidad, de la cual a solicitud de los responsables del programa, se podrá solicitar revisión de los resultados preliminares por parte del evaluador.

CONCLUSIONES, RECOMENDACIONES Y LECCIONES

El informe de evaluación debe incluir un capítulo que proporcione un conjunto de **conclusiones, recomendaciones y lecciones**.

ARREGLOS DE APLICACIÓN

La responsabilidad principal para gestionar esta evaluación radica en la OP del PNUD en Honduras. La OP del PNUD contratará a los evaluadores y asegurará el suministro oportuno de viáticos y arreglos de viaje dentro del país para el equipo de evaluación. El Equipo del Proyecto será responsable de mantenerse en contacto con el equipo de Evaluadores para establecer entrevistas con los interesados, organizar visitas de campo, coordinar con el Gobierno, etc.

PLAZO DE LA EVALUACIÓN

La duración total de la evaluación será de 67 días de acuerdo con el siguiente plan:

Actividad	Período	Fecha de finalización
Preparación	7 días	Las fechas de finalización de las actividades estarán en función de la fecha de la firma del contrato de los evaluadores. Sin embargo, en principio se prevé que la evaluación inicie en el
Misión de evaluación	35 días	
Borrador del informe de evaluación	20 días	
Informe final	5 días	mes de agosto, de manera que se pueda contar con un documento final en el mes noviembre.

² Una medida útil para medir el impacto del avance realizado es el método del Manual para la Revisión de Efectos Directos a Impactos (RoTI, por sus siglas en inglés) elaborado por la Oficina de Evaluación del FMAM: [ROTI Handbook 2009](#)

RESULTADOS FINALES DE LA EVALUACIÓN

Se espera que el equipo de evaluación logre lo siguiente:

Resultado final	Contenido	Período	Responsabilidades
Informe inicial	El evaluador proporciona aclaraciones sobre los períodos y métodos	A los 7 días de la entrega de la documentación al consultor	El evaluador lo presenta a la OP del PNUD
Presentación	Resultados iniciales	Al finalizar la misión de evaluación	A la gestión del proyecto, OP del PNUD
Borrador del informe final	Informe completo, (por plantilla anexada) con anexos	A los 20 días de la presentación de los resultados iniciales	Enviado a la OP, revisado por los ATR, las PCU, los CCO del FMAM.
Informe final*	Informe revisado	Dentro del plazo de 7 días después haber recibido los comentarios del PNUD sobre el borrador	Enviado a la OP para cargarlo al ERC del PNUD

*Cuando se presente el informe final de evaluación, también se requiere que el evaluador proporcione un 'itinerario de la auditoría', donde se detalle cómo se han abordado (o no) todos los comentarios recibidos en el informe final de evaluación.

COMPOSICIÓN DEL EQUIPO

El equipo de evaluación estará compuesto por (2 *evaluadores internacionales*). Los consultores deberán tener experiencia previa en evaluación de proyectos similares. Es una ventaja contar con experiencia en proyectos financiados por el FMAM. Los evaluadores seleccionados no deben haber participado en la preparación o ejecución del proyecto ni deben tener ningún conflicto de intereses con las actividades relacionadas al proyecto.

Consultor(es) independientes internacionales

- Papel y responsabilidades:
 - Líder del equipo y responsable de finalizar y presentar el reporte de evaluación
 - Define y coordina con el otro consultor del equipo el cronograma de trabajo y los insumos de cada uno para la evaluación y los reportes
- Perfil requerido:
 - Grado académico en ciencias ambientales, gestión de recursos naturales y biodiversidad o equivalentes.
 - Con amplia experiencia en evaluaciones de proyectos (demostrables 3 evaluaciones en la temática)
 - Se valorará experiencia en evaluación de proyectos financiados por el FMAM
 - Se valorará dominio del contexto del sector de la conservación de la biodiversidad en Honduras y Centroamérica.
 - Experiencia demostrable de trabajo con el Sistema de las Naciones Unidas.
 - Dominio de la metodología del marco lógico, gestión basada en resultados y enfoque de gestión del conocimiento.
 - Conocimiento sobre la transversalización del enfoque de género, derechos humanos e interculturalidad (pueblos indígenas).
 - Capacidad –habilidades de redacción, análisis, síntesis y sistematización

- Capacidad de trabajo en equipos multidisciplinarios y multiculturales, buenas relaciones interpersonales
- Disponibilidad para viajar a zonas rurales
- Dominio del idioma inglés y español

Además, el equipo evaluador deberá reunir las siguientes habilidades:

- Excelentes capacidades analíticas y de redacción
- Habilidad para trabajar bajo presión
- Habilidad para trabajar en equipo

PRESENTACIÓN Y CALIDAD DE LA EVALUACIÓN

El informe de la evaluación final deberá ser presentado en idioma inglés y deberá cumplir con las normas y estándares necesarios para la aceptación de la evaluación conforme al Grupo de Evaluación de las Naciones Unidas (UNEG).

ÉTICA DEL EVALUADOR

Los consultores de la evaluación asumirán los más altos niveles éticos y deberán firmar un Código de conducta (Anexo al aceptar la asignación. Las evaluaciones del PNUD se realizan de conformidad con los principios que se describen en las ['Directrices éticas para evaluaciones'](#) del Grupo de Evaluación de las Naciones Unidas (UNEG).

MODALIDADES Y ESPECIFICACIONES DE PAGO

%	Hito
25%	Al firmar el contrato.
35%	Después de la presentación y aprobación del primer borrador del informe final de evaluación.
40%	Después de la presentación y aprobación (OP del PNUD y ATR del PNUD) del informe final definitivo de evaluación.

PROCESO DE SOLICITUD DE PROPUESTAS

Los consultores individuales interesados, deben remitir los siguientes documentos que conformarán su propuesta de consultoría:

- Carta confirmando interés y disponibilidad para ejecutar la consultoría.
- Hoja de vida en la forma P11 actualizada debidamente firmada.
- Metodología y cronograma de trabajo.
- Oferta económica que deberá especificar un monto en suma alzada que indique el costo total de la asignación (incluidos gastos diarios, viáticos y costos de viaje).
- Copia de un documento de identificación.

Para la presentación de su propuesta, se deben emplear los formatos que se encuentran en el siguiente vínculo de la Página Web del PNUD Honduras:

<http://www.hn.undp.org/content/honduras/es/home/operations/procurement/>

Los consultores interesados deberán remitir su solicitud a más tardar el **8 de septiembre de 2015**, ya sea de manera impresa o electrónica en cualquiera de las direcciones que se indican a continuación: Casa de las Naciones Unidas, Colonia Palmira, Avenida República de Panamá, Tegucigalpa o al correo electrónico adquisicionespnudhn@undp.org

Consideraciones para la presentación de oferta económica

La oferta económica deberá especificar un monto suma alzada y establecer un plan de pagos basado en productos entregables específicos y medibles (cualitativa y cuantitativamente), según se especifica en los Términos de Referencia. A manera de facilitar la comparación de ofertas económicas, esta debe incluir un desglose de costos empleando para ello el formato incluido en el vínculo indicado anteriormente.

La oferta económica que presente el contratista deberá considerar lo siguiente:

- Honorarios del contratista;
- Gastos de permanencia (viáticos);
- Costo de desplazamiento (viajes);
- Equipos y papelería.

Todos los costos relacionados con los viajes deben ser incluidos en la oferta económica. En el caso de los viajes imprevistos, el pago de los gastos de viaje que incluye boletos aéreos, alojamiento y gastos terminales debe ser acordado entre PNUD y el Contratista Individual, antes del viaje y se calculará el reembolso. En apego a la normativa para contratación de contratistas individuales del PNUD, antes de empezar su trabajo todo contratista mayor de 62 años que requiera viajar en cumplimiento de los servicios solicitados deberá contar con un Medical Clearance. Una vez seleccionado el contratista, la oficina del PNUD Honduras proveerá los datos de contacto de los médicos aprobados por el Sistema de las Naciones Unidas en su País de origen. El costo de los exámenes médicos necesarios para el medical clearance deberá ser cubierto por el contratista.

Adjudicación

La adjudicación del contrato se realizará utilizando el criterio de puntaje más alto tras el análisis acumulativo. Bajo esta metodología, la adjudicación del contrato se recomendará al contratista individual cuya oferta ha sido evaluada y se ha determinado que:

- ha cumplido con los requisitos establecidos para este proceso, su oferta responde a los requerimientos incluidos en los TDR, la oferta se ha determinado aceptable, y;
- ha obtenido el más alto puntaje asignados a criterios técnicos y económicos predeterminados específicamente para esta solicitud.

A fin de determinar el puntaje acumulado final, se empleará la siguiente fórmula:

$$P=y(u/z)$$

Donde

P= puntaje obtenido por la oferta económica en evaluación.

y= puntaje máximo asignado a la oferta económica.

u= precio de la oferta económica más baja

z= precio de la oferta económica en evaluación

El PNUD utiliza un proceso de selección justo y transparente que considera las competencias/capacidades de los candidatos, así como sus propuestas financieras. Se alienta a las mujeres y a los miembros calificados de las minorías sociales para que presenten su solicitud. Todas las aplicaciones serán tratadas con la más estricta confidencialidad.

ANEXO B: LISTA DE DOCUMENTOS QUE REVISARÁN LOS EVALUADORES

- Planes de gobierno: Visión de País 2010-2038, Plan de Nación 2010-2022, y Plan Estratégico de Gobierno 2014-2018.
- MANUD y Plan de Acción 2012-2016
- Programa País PNUD 2012-2016
- [Plan Estratégico PNUD 2014-2017](#)
- [Plan Estratégico BCIE 2015-2019](#)
- Documento de Proyecto (PRODOC)
- Informes Trimestrales Directorio BCIE
- Informes Anuales PNUD-BCIE
- Evaluación de Medio Término
- Scorecard de monitoreo del Proyecto
- Informes de monitoreo del Proyecto (empresa consultora GBA)
- PIR (Project Implementation Report)
- Modelo de Negocios del Proyecto CAMBio para los 5 países
- Lecciones Aprendidas del Proyecto CAMBio (publicación)
- Experiencias Exitosas Producto de la Incidencia de la Asistencia Técnica otorgada por el Proyecto CAMBio
- Informes financieros mensuales
- Informe financiero anual
- Informe de auditorías anuales
- Estudios de línea base
- Modificaciones al PRODOC según recomendaciones de la Evaluación de Medio Término
- Management Response (MTE-PNUD-GEF)
- 5 Estudios de caso que muestran impactos en Biodiversidad (Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua y Costa Rica).
- [Manual de Planificación, Seguimiento y Evaluación de Resultados de Desarrollo del PNUD](#)
- [UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports](#)
- [Guía para Realizar Evaluaciones Finales de los Proyectos Respaldados por el PNUD y Financiados por FMAM](#)
- Legislación nacional relevante al proyecto y cualquier otro material que pueda considerarse de utilidad.

ANEXO D: ESCALAS DE CALIFICACIONES

Calificaciones de resultados, efectividad, eficiencia, SyE y ejecución de AyE 6: Muy satisfactorio (MS): no presentó deficiencias 5: Satisfactorio (S): deficiencias menores 4: Algo satisfactorio (AS) 3. Algo insatisfactorio (AI): deficiencias importantes 2. Insatisfactorio (I): deficiencias importantes 1. Muy insatisfactorio (MI): deficiencias graves	Calificaciones de sostenibilidad: 4. Probable (P): Riesgos insignificantes para la sostenibilidad. 3. Algo probable (AP): riesgos moderados. 2. Algo improbable (AI): Riesgos significativos. 1. Improbable (I): Riesgos graves.	Calificaciones de relevancia 2. Relevante (R) 1.. No Relevante (NR) Calificaciones de impacto: 3. Significativo (S) 2. Mínimo (M) 1. Insignificante (I)
Calificaciones adicionales donde sea pertinente: No corresponde (N/C) No se puede valorar (N/V)		

ANEXO F: ESBOZO DEL INFORME DE EVALUACIÓN⁴

- i. Primera página:
 - Título del proyecto respaldado por el PNUD y financiado por el FMAM
 - Números de identificación del proyecto del PNUD y FMAM
 - Plazo de evaluación y fecha del informe de evaluación
 - Región y países incluidos en el proyecto
 - Programa Operativo/Programa Estratégico del FMAM
 - Socio para la ejecución y otros asociados del proyecto
 - Miembros del equipo de evaluación
 - Reconocimientos
- ii. Resumen ejecutivo
 - Cuadro sinóptico del proyecto
 - Descripción del proyecto (breve)
 - Tabla de calificación de la evaluación
 - Resumen de conclusiones, recomendaciones y lecciones
- iii. Abreviaturas y siglas
(Consulte: Manual editorial del PNUD⁵)
1. Introducción
 - Propósito de la evaluación
 - Alcance y metodología
 - Estructura del informe de evaluación
2. Descripción del proyecto y contexto de desarrollo
 - Comienzo y duración del proyecto
 - Problemas que el proyecto buscó abordar
 - Objetivos inmediatos y de desarrollo del proyecto
 - Indicadores de referencia establecidos
 - Principales interesados
 - Resultados previstos
3. Hallazgos
(Además de una evaluación descriptiva, se deben considerar todos los criterios marcados con (*))⁶
- 3.1 Diseño y formulación del proyecto
 - Análisis del marco lógico (AML) y del Marco de resultados (lógica y estrategia del proyecto; indicadores)
 - Suposiciones y riesgos
 - Lecciones de otros proyectos relevantes (p.ej., misma área de interés) incorporados en el diseño del proyecto
 - Participación planificada de los interesados
 - Enfoque de repetición
 - Ventaja comparativa del PNUD
 - Vínculos entre el proyecto y otras intervenciones dentro del sector
 - Disposiciones de Administración

³ La longitud del informe no debe exceder las 40 páginas en total (sin incluir los anexos)

⁴ Manual de estilo del PNUD, Oficina de Comunicaciones, Oficina de Alianzas, actualizado en noviembre de 2008

⁵ Con una escala de calificación de seis puntos: 6: Muy satisfactorio, 5: Satisfactorio, 4: Algo satisfactorio, 3: Algo insatisfactorio, 2: Insatisfactorio y 1: Muy insatisfactorio. Consulte la sección 3.5, página 37 para conocer las explicaciones sobre las calificaciones.

- 3.2** Ejecución del proyecto
- Gestión de adaptación (cambios en el diseño del proyecto y resultados del proyecto durante la ejecución)
 - Acuerdos de asociaciones (con los interesados relevantes involucrados en el país o la región)
 - Retroalimentación de actividades de SyE utilizadas para gestión de adaptación
 - Financiación del proyecto:
 - Seguimiento y Evaluación: diseño de entrada y ejecución (*)
 - Coordinación de la aplicación y ejecución (*) del PNUD y del socio para la ejecución y cuestiones operativas
- 3.3** Resultados del proyecto
- Resultados generales (logro de los objetivos) (*)
 - Relevancia (*)
 - Efectividad y eficiencia (*)
 - Implicación nacional
 - Integración
 - Sostenibilidad (*)
 - Impacto
- 4.** Conclusiones, recomendaciones y lecciones
- Medidas correctivas para el diseño, la ejecución, seguimiento y evaluación del proyecto
 - Acciones para seguir o reforzar los beneficios iniciales del proyecto
 - Propuestas para direcciones futuras que acentúen los objetivos principales
 - Las mejores y peores prácticas para abordar cuestiones relacionadas con la relevancia, el rendimiento y el éxito
- 5.** Anexos
- TdR
 - Itinerario
 - Lista de personas entrevistadas
 - Resumen de visitas de campo
 - Lista de documentos revisados
 - Matriz de preguntas de evaluación
 - Cuestionario utilizado y resumen de los resultados
 - Formulario de acuerdo del consultor de la evaluación
-

ANNEX 2. ITINERARY

[illegible]

Agenda de Visita de Campo
Guatemala
Del 10 al 19 de Enero 2016

Hora	Domingo 10 de enero	Lunes 11 de enero	Martes 12 de enero	Miércoles 13 de enero	Jueves 14 de enero	Viernes 15 de enero	Sábado 16 de enero	Domingo 17 de enero	Lunes 18 de enero
AM (09-12md)	8.30 am	Genesis Empresarial - Vilma Garcia, Adela De Rizzo, Luis Vicente, Gerente General	Genesis Empresaria I Visita de Campo: Verapaz Gerente de Region: Estuardo Caen, Promotore s Lidia Pana,	Genesis Empresaria I - Reunion con grupos solidarios en Coban y San Leonel, San Manzano y Aldea Choval	Visita de Campo: Alta Verapaz - Santa Cruz del Quiche	AYNLA Visita de Campo: Zona Reina del Quiche - Atitlán IgnacioXamirezAlvarez, Gerente General. Victor Chay, Ing. Ambiental encargado de la Asistencia Tecnica. Productores de Cardamomo de Zona Reina: ASODIL y AGDREA			Asociación de Desarrollo Integral de la Cuenca del Lago de Atitlán (ADICLA) - Reunión con Daniel Soto y productores de Maxan
		BCIE - Fanny Ramos. Rodrigo M. El Sr. Carlos Boj estaba de vacaciones.							
		CONAP-CBM MARN - Mario Diaz. Jorge Cabrera, EX Secretario General CCAD							
PM (2- 6pm)		Banrural, Carlos Orantes							
	Llegada	Fondesol *							salida a Salvador

**Agenda de Visita de Campo
El Salvador**

Hora	Martes 19 de Enero	Miércoles 20 de Enero	Jueves 21 de Enero	Viernes 22 de Enero	Sábado 23 de Enero
AM (09-12md)	BCIE: Guillermo Enrique Funesn(Director), Raul Castañeda Trabanino (Gerente de Pais) y Daniel Murcia, ex cordinador de CAMbio	CCAD - Crista Castro (reunion Cancelada)	Visita de Campo: Ruta Las Flores y Cordillera Apaneca-Illamatepec Victor Eduardo Mencía Alfaro - Director Presidente de Sociedad Cooperativa Siglo XXI. Sigfredo Benitez, presidente de la Asociación Cooperativa de Producción Agropecuaria Los Pinos de R.L. Productores de Café.		Rina Yolanda Flamenco de Romin. Productora de Añil
PM (2- 6pm)	Banco Hipotecario: Ssilvia Vega de Diaz (Directora de Banca Comercial), Julio Ernesto Bran Rodas (Subgerente AGROPYME), Victor Salvador Hernández Sermeño (ejecutivo Agropyme)	Caja de Crédito de Sonsonate: Lic. Ismael García Pérez (gerente General), Oscar Adolfo Pérez (encargado de Riesgos)			
	Banco de Fomento Agropecuario, José Antonio Peñate (Gerente General y equipo de créditos agropecuario)	PNUD: Carolina Dreikorn, ResilienceArea			

**Agenda de Visita de Campo
Honduras**

	2015			2016		
Hora	14 de Diciembre	15 de Diciembre	16 de diciembre	10 Marzo	7 Marzo	8 Marzo
AM (09-12md)	Preparación de Sesiones de Trabajo BCIE	Sesion de Trabajo BCIE . Otto Gutierrez, Jefe de Project Finance, Sergio Aviles, Lynda García, Project Mananager. Yuri Zenteno (coordinador regional CAMbio), Carlos Canales, (Facilitador Regional), Leda Margarita Lopez (asistente proyecto CAMbio).	Sesion de Trabajo BCIE : Otto Gutierrez, Jefe de Project Finance, Sergio Aviles, Lynda García, Project Mananager	Visita de Campo: Marcala - CARUCHIL José Leopoldo Mejía, Presidente Junta Directiva. Marcos Pineda, Técnico de Proyectos	La Entrada COAGRICSAL Gerente General, Oscar Serrano	Santa Rosa de Copán - CAPUCAS . Gerente de Café, Omar Rodriguez.
PM (2- 6pm)			Sesion de Trabajo PNUD : Dennis Funes.	San Pedro Sula	Santa Rosa de Copán:	
				Bancafé . Gerente Regional, Ramón Edgardo Mendoza. José Juventino Murillo, Gerente de Agencia	Banco de Occidente . Sub Gerente Departamento Agropecuario, Juan Miguel Alvarenga.	
				BanPaís . Ana Calix, Sub Gerente Metropolitana de Negocios. René Fuentes, Gerente Regional		

**Agenda de Visita de Campo
Nicaragua**

	2015		2016					
Hora	02 de Diciembre	18 de Diciembre	Lunes 01 febrero		Martes 02 febrero	Miércoles 03 febrero	Jueves 04 febrero	Viernes 05 febrero
AM (09-12md)		Gerente de País BCIE.	MIFIC. Maria Amanda del Carmen, Directora Ambiente y Calidad Ambiental. Experta Legal, Maribel	Nitlapan. Director, Elias Ramirez. Omar Dávila, extension	Visita de Campo: Rivas - Isla de Ometepe. Cientes de FDL: Carlos Alberto Aviles, Arimel Antonio Gutierrez Ampie. Javier del Socorro Ponce, Bornan Francisco García González, leonel Manuel Martínez Cruz		Visita de Campo: Matagalpa -Jinotega. UCA San Juan, Carolina Aguilar Duarte, Gerencia Creditos. Vista a productores de café miembros de la cooperativa. Centro de Entendimiento de la Naturaleza CEN. Edgar Castillo, Alan Bolt, productores de café Tuma la Dalia. Alcaldia de Tuma La Dalia. Jaime Arauz Centeno, Alcalde, Unidad de Medio Ambiente.	
	Maria Engracia de Trinidad, Facilitadora de CAMBio	PNUD. Leoni Arguello, oficial Ambiente	Intur. Raquel Quezada, ambiente					
PM (2- 6pm)		FDL. Julio Flores, Gerente General FDL	LWF					
			Lafise. Scarl et Espinoza, Ejecutiva de Crédito					
			Banpro. Ivania Zelaya. MIPYMES					

**Agenda de Visita de Campo
Costa Rica**

Hora	Lunes 08 febrero	Martes 09 febrero	Miércoles 10 febrero	Jueves 11 febrero
AM (09-12md)	Visita de Campo - Ciudad Quesada (Alajuela). COOCIQUE. Rosilbel Castillo Jiménez, Control y Seguimiento de Crédito. Visita de Campo a los dos proyectos financiados por CAMbio.	Reunión BCIE. Jeffrey Carmona Zuñiga, Ejecutivo de Proyectos.	Visita de Campo - Pérez Zeledón. Kimberly Campos Bermúdez, Gestora de Financiamiento. Equipo de Crédito. Vista de Campo a beneficio de café, productores de piña y granos básicos.	

ANNEX 3. LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Guatemala	
Génesis Empresarial	-Luis Vicente, Gerente General -Vilma García, -Adela De Rizzo, -Estuardo Caen, Gerente de Región -Lidia Pana, Promotora Grupos solidarios en Coban y San Leonel, San Manzano y Aldea Choval
BCIE	-Fanny Ramos. Rodrigo M. (El Sr. Carlos Boj estaba de vacaciones).
CONAP-CBM MARN	-Mario Díaz. Jorge Cabrera, EX Secretario General CCAD
AYNLA	-Ignacio Xamirez Álvarez, Gerente General. -Víctor Chay, Ing. Ambiental encargado de la Asistencia Técnica. -Productores de Cardamomo de Zona Reina: ASODIL y AGDREA
Banrural	-Carlos Orantes
ADICLA	-Daniel Soto -Productores de Maxan
El Salvador	
BCIE	-Guillermo Enrique Funes, Director -Raúl Castañeda Trabanino, Gerente de País -Daniel Murcia, ex coordinador de CAMbio
Banco Hipotecario	-Silvia Vega de Díaz, Directora de Banca Comercial -Julio Ernesto Bran Rodas, Subgerente AGROPYME -Víctor Salvador Hernández Sermeño, Ejecutivo Agropyme
Caja de Crédito de Sonsonate	-Lic. Ismael García Pérez, Gerente General -Oscar Adolfo Pérez, Encargado de Riesgos
PNUD	-Carolina Dreikorn, Resilience Area
Banco de Fomento Agropecuario	-José Antonio Peñate (Gerente General -Equipo de crédito agropecuario
Ruta Las Flores y Cordillera Apaneca-Illamatepec	-Victor Eduardo Mencía Alfaro - Director Presidente de Sociedad Cooperativa Siglo XXI. -Sigfredo Benítez, Presidente de la Asociación Cooperativa de Producción Agropecuaria Los Pinos de R.L. -Rina Yolanda Flamenco de Romín, Productora de Añil -Productores de Café.
Honduras	
BCIE	-Otto Gutierrez, Jefe de Project Finance, -Sergio Aviles, -Lynda García, Project Manager. -Yuri Zenteno, Coordinador regional CAMbio -Carlos Canales, Facilitador Regional -Leda Margarita López, asistente proyecto CAMbio
PNUD	-Dennis Funes
Marcala – CARUCHIL:	-José Leopoldo Mejía, Presidente Junta Directiva -Marcos Pineda, Técnico de Proyectos

Bancafé:	-Ramón Edgardo Mendoza, Gerente Regional -José Juventino Murillo, Gerente de Agencia
BanPaís	-Ana Calix, Sub Gerente Metropolitana de Negocios -René Fuentes, Gerente Regional
COAGRICSAL	-Oscar Serrano, Gerente General
Banco de Occidente	-Juan Miguel Alvarenga, Sub Gerente Departamento Agropecuario
CAPUCAS	-Omar Rodríguez, Gerente de Café

Nicaragua	
BCIE	-Gerente de País -Maria Engracia de Trinidad, Facilitadora de CAMBio
PNUD	-Leoni Arguello, oficial Ambiente
MIFIC	-Maria Amanda del Carmen, Directora Ambiente y Calidad Ambiental. Experta Legal, Maribel
INTUR	-Raquel Quezada, ambiente
Lafise	-Scarlet Espinoza, Ejecutiva de Crédito
Banpro	-Ivania Zelaya. MIPYMES
Nitlapan.	-Elías Ramírez, Director -Omar Dávila, extensión
Cientes de FDL, Ometepe – Rivas.	-Carlos Alberto Aviles, Arimel Antonio Gutiérrez Ampie. Javier del Socorro Ponce, Bornan Francisco García González, Leonel Manuel Martínez Cruz
UCA San Juan, Matagalpa-Jinotega	-Carolina Aguilar Duarte, Gerencia Créditos. -Productores de café miembros de la cooperativa.
Centro de Entendimiento de la Naturaleza CEN.	-Edgar Castillo -Alan Bolt, -Productores de café de Tuma la Dalia.
Alcaldía de Tuma La Dalia.	-Jaime Arauz Centeno, Alcalde -Unidad de Medio Ambiente.

Costa Rica	
COOIQUE.	-Rosilbel Castillo Jiménez, Control y Seguimiento de Crédito.
BCIE.	-Jeffrey Carmona Zúñiga, Ejecutivo de Proyectos.
Cantón Pérez-Zeledón	-Kimberly Campos Bermúdez, Gestora de Financiamiento -Equipo de Crédito

ANNEXE 4. SUMMARY OF FIELD VISITS

Guatemala. (Del 12 al 17 de enero)

- Alta Verapaz - Santa Cruz del Quiche: Génesis Empresarial
- Zona Reina del Quiche – Atitlán: AYNLA, ASODIL y AGDREA

El Salvador (Del 21 al 22 de enero)

- Ruta Las Flores y Cordillera Apaneca- Ilamatepec: Sociedad Cooperativa Siglo XXI, Asociación Cooperativa de Producción Agropecuaria Los Pinos de R.L. y productores de Café.

Honduras (10 de marzo)

- Marcala: Cooperativa CARUCHIL

Nicaragua (del 2 al 5 de febrero)

- Rivas - Isla de Ometepe: Clientes de FDL
- Matagalpa – Jinotega: UCA San Juan, Centro de Entendimiento de la Naturaleza CEN y productores de café del Tuma - la Dalia.

Costa Rica (del 8 al 11 de febrero)

- Ciudad Quesada (Alajuela): Cooperativa COOCIQUE y dos proyectos financiados por CAMBio.
- Pérez Zeledón: visita a beneficio de café, productores de piña y granos básicos.

ANNEX 5. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

- Plan Estratégico PNUD 2014-2017
- Plan Estratégico BCIE 2015-2019
- Documento de Proyecto (PRODOC)
- Informes Trimestrales Directorio BCIE
- Informes Anuales PNUD-BCIE
- Evaluación de Medio Término
- Scorecard de monitoreo del Proyecto
- Informes de monitoreo del Proyecto (empresa consultora GBA)
- PIR (Project Implementation Report)
- Modelo de Negocios del Proyecto CAMBio para los 5 países
- Lecciones Aprendidas del Proyecto CAMBio (publicación)
- Experiencias Exitosas Producto de la Incidencia de la Asistencia Técnica otorgada por el Proyecto CAMBio
- Informes financieros mensuales
- Informe financiero anual
- Informe de auditorías anuales
- Estudios de línea base
- Modificaciones al PRODOC según recomendaciones de la Evaluación de Medio Término
- Management Response (MTE-PNUD-GEF)
- Estudios de caso que muestran impactos en Biodiversidad (Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua y Costa Rica).
- Manual de Planificación, Seguimiento y Evaluación de Resultados de Desarrollo del PNUD
- UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports
- Guía para Realizar Evaluaciones Finales de los Proyectos Respaldados por el PNUD y Financiados por FMAM
- Legislación nacional relevante al proyecto y cualquier otro material que pueda considerarse de utilidad.
- CAMBio Project Biodiversity Impact Evaluation. Ecoagriculture partners. March, 2016

ANNEX 6. EVALUATION QUESTION MATRIX

Criterios de evaluación – Preguntas	Indicadores	Fuentes	Metodología
Relevancia: ¿Cómo se relaciona el proyecto con los objetivos principales del área de interés del FMAM y con las prioridades ambientales y de desarrollo a nivel local, regional y nacional?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¿Cómo apoya el proyecto el área focal correspondiente y las prioridades estratégicas del GEF? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existencia de una clara relación entre los objetivos del proyecto y el área focal del GEF. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentos del proyecto. Estrategias y documentos del área focal del GEF. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Análisis de documentos. Entrevistas con personal del PNUD y del proyecto.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¿Cómo el proyecto apoya las prioridades ambientales y de desarrollo a nivel nacional? ¿Cuál ha sido el nivel de participación de los interesados en el diseño del proyecto? ¿El proyecto toma en consideración las realidades nacionales (marco de políticas e institucional) tanto en su diseño como en su implementación? ¿Cuál ha sido el nivel de apropiación de los interesados en la implementación del proyecto? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grado en el que el proyecto apoya el objetivo de manejo sostenible del medio ambiente de la END. Apreciación de interesados clave con respecto al nivel de adecuación del diseño e implementación del proyecto a las realidades nacionales y capacidades existentes. Coherencia entre las necesidades expresadas por los interesados nacionales y el criterio PNUD-GEF. Nivel de involucramiento de funcionarios gubernamentales y otros socios en el proceso de diseño del proyecto. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> END. Documentos del proyecto. Socios e interesados clave del proyecto. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Análisis de documentos. Entrevistas con personal del PNUD y del proyecto.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¿Existen vínculos lógicos entre resultados esperados del proyecto y el diseño del proyecto (en términos componentes del proyecto, elección de socios, estructura, mecanismos de implementación, alcance, presupuesto, uso de recursos, etc.)? ¿Es la duración del proyecto suficiente para alcanzar los resultados propuestos? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nivel de coherencia entre los resultados esperados y el diseño de la lógica interna del proyecto. Nivel de coherencia entre el diseño del proyecto y su enfoque de implementación. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentos del proyecto. Interesados clave del proyecto. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Análisis de documentos. Entrevistas con interesados clave.

Efectividad: ¿Hasta qué punto se han logrado los resultados y objetivos esperados del proyecto?			
Criterios de evaluación – Preguntas	Indicadores	Fuentes	Metodología
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ¿Ha sido el proyecto efectivo en alcanzar los resultados esperados? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ver indicadores en el marco de resultados estratégicos/marco lógico del proyecto. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentos del proyecto. • Reportes de avance trimestral y anual. • Equipo del proyecto e interesados clave. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Análisis de documentos. • Entrevistas con interesados clave. • Entrevistas con el equipo del proyecto.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ¿Cómo se manejaron los riesgos y supuestos del proyecto? • ¿Cuál ha sido la calidad de las estrategias de mitigación desarrolladas? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integridad de la identificación de riesgos y supuestos durante la planeación y el diseño del proyecto. • Calidad de los sistemas de información establecidos para identificar riesgos emergentes y otros “issues”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentos del proyecto. • Reportes de avance trimestral y anual. • Equipo del proyecto, PNUD e interesados clave. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Análisis de documentos. • Entrevistas.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ¿Qué cambios pudieron haberse hecho (de haberlos) al diseño del proyecto para mejorar el logro de los resultados esperados? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Datos colectados durante la evaluación. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Análisis de datos.

Eficiencia: ¿El proyecto se implementó de manera eficiente en conformidad con las normas y los estándares internacionales y nacionales?			
Criterios de evaluación – Preguntas	Indicadores	Fuentes	Metodología
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ¿Se utilizó o necesitó el manejo adaptativo para asegurar un uso eficiente de los recursos? • ¿Han sido utilizados como herramientas de gestión durante la implementación del proyecto el marco lógico, los planes de trabajo o cualquier cambio realizado a estos? • ¿Han sido los sistemas financieros y contables adecuados para la gestión del proyecto y para producir información financiera precisa y a tiempo? • ¿Han sido los reportes de progresos precisos y puntuales? • ¿Responden a los requerimientos de reporte? ¿Incluyen los cambios por manejo adaptativo? • ¿Ha sido la ejecución del proyecto tan eficiente como fue propuesta originalmente (planeado vs. actual)? • ¿El cofinanciamiento ha sido según lo planeado? • ¿Los recursos financieros han sido usados eficientemente? • ¿Han podido haberse usado más eficientemente? • ¿Han sido las adquisiciones realizadas de manera que se haga un uso eficiente de los recursos del proyecto? • ¿Cómo ha sido usado el enfoque de gestión basada en resultados durante la implementación del proyecto? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disponibilidad y calidad de los reportes financieros y de progreso. • Puntualidad y adecuación de los reportes entregados. • Nivel de discrepancia entre el gasto planeado y el ejecutado. • Cofinanciamiento planeado vs. actual. • Costo en función de los resultados alcanzados en comparación con los costos de proyectos similares de otras organizaciones. • Cuán adecuadas han sido las opciones seleccionadas por el proyecto en función del contexto, la infraestructura y el costo. • Calidad del reporte de gestión basada en resultados (reportes de progresos, monitoreo y evaluación). • Ocurrencia de cambios en el diseño del proyecto o en el enfoque de implementación cuando ha sido necesario para mejorar la eficiencia del proyecto. • Costo asociado al mecanismo de delivery y estructura de gestión, en comparación con otras alternativas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentos del proyecto. • Equipo del proyecto. • PNUD. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Análisis de documentos. • Entrevistas claves.
Sostenibilidad: ¿Hasta qué punto hay financiero, institucional y / o riesgos ambientales socio-económico, para el sostenimiento de los resultados del proyecto a largo plazo?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ¿Han sido integrados issues de sostenibilidad en el diseño e implementación del proyecto? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidencia/ calidad de la estrategia de sostenibilidad. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentos del proyecto. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Análisis de documentos.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidencia/ calidad de las acciones llevadas a cabo para asegurar la sostenibilidad. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equipo del proyecto. • PNUD. • Socios. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entrevistas.

Criterios de evaluación - Preguntas	Indicadores	Fuentes	Metodología
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¿El proyecto aborda adecuadamente los issues de sostenibilidad financiera y económica? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nivel y fuente de soporte financiero a ser provisto en el futuro a sectores y actividades relevantes después del término del proyecto. Evidencia de compromiso de socios internacionales, gobiernos y otros interesados para apoyar financieramente sectores/actividades relevantes luego de la finalización del proyecto. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentos del proyecto. Equipo del proyecto. PNUD. Socios. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Análisis de documentos. Entrevistas.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¿Existe evidencia de que los socios del proyecto darán continuidad a las actividades más allá de la finalización del proyecto? ¿Cuál es el grado de compromiso político para continuar trabajando sobre los resultados del proyecto? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grado en que las actividades del proyecto y los resultados han sido asumidos por las contrapartes. Nivel de soporte financiero a ser provisto por el gobierno, una vez termine el proyecto. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentos del proyecto. Equipo del proyecto. PNUD. Socios. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Análisis de documentos. Entrevistas.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¿Cuáles son los principales desafíos que pueden dificultar la sostenibilidad de los esfuerzos? ¿Se han abordado durante la gestión del proyecto? ¿Qué potenciales medidas podrían contribuir a la sostenibilidad de los esfuerzos logrados por el proyecto? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cambios que podrían significar desafíos al proyecto. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentos del proyecto. Equipo del proyecto. PNUD. Socios. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Análisis de documentos. Entrevistas.
Impacto: ¿Hay indicios de que el proyecto, a través de su lógica, ha contribuido a/o habilitado progreso hacia la reducción del estrés ambiental y / o mejora del estado ecológico?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¿Se prevé que el proyecto alcance su objetivo de consolidar la sostenibilidad financiera del Sistema 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financiamiento disponible. Efectividad de gestión de las APs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentos del proyecto. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Análisis de documentos.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nacional de Áreas Protegidas del Corredor Biológico Mesoamericano y a las áreas de intervención del proyecto? ¿Cuál ha sido el impacto por países o zonas de intervención? ¿Han existido diferencias entre ellos/as?, ¿A qué factores se han debido las diferencias? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equipo del proyecto. PNUD. Socios. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Entrevistas.

Criterios de evaluación – Preguntas	Indicadores	Fuentes	Metodología
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ¿Cuál ha sido el impacto sobre la generación y/o sostenibilidad de medios de vida de los beneficiarios/as? • ¿Cuál ha sido el impacto según los sectores particulares apoyados? ¿Se pueden identificar otros sectores con potencial para implementar el modelo de CAMBIO? • ¿Cuál ha sido el impacto sobre la dimensión del paisaje productivo? ¿Cómo se podría mejorar este impacto? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Número de medios de vida generados. • Número de personas beneficiadas por • la generación de medios de vida • Número y tipología de sectores a los cuales se les ha brindado el crédito 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentos del proyecto. • Equipo del proyecto. • PNUD. • Socios. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Análisis de documentos. • Entrevistas.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ¿Cuál ha sido el valor agregado de la asistencia técnica brindada a las MPYMEs como acompañamiento a los créditos? ¿Se pudieron haber brindado los créditos sin el acompañamiento de la asistencia técnica? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Número y tipos de asistencias técnicas brindadas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentos del proyecto. • Equipo del proyecto. • PNUD. • Socios. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Análisis de documentos. • Entrevistas.

ANNEX 7. QUESTIONNAIRE USED AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Modelo de Entrevista: Instituciones financieras

Datos Generales

- Nombre y cargo
 - Institución y Área
 - Función
1. ¿Cómo se enteró su Institución Financiera del Proyecto CAMBio?.
 2. ¿Qué ventajas en relación a otros productos financieros que ya ofrecen tiene la línea de créditos de CAMBio?.
 3. ¿Cómo dio a conocer entre sus clientes la línea de crédito del proyecto CAMBio?.
 4. ¿Qué tipo de MIPYMES están participando de CAMBio?.
 5. ¿Qué sectores productivos fueron financiados por medio de CAMBio?
 6. ¿Cuáles fueron los sectores productivos más interesados en el crédito?
 7. ¿Qué sectores productivos podrían incluirse en los fondos de CAMBio en un futuro?.
 8. ¿A qué tasa recibió el dinero? ¿A qué tasa se colocaron? ¿Qué otros costos existen, como seguros, gastos legales y demás?.
 9. ¿Cuál es su opinión sobre el Bio-Premio? ¿Ha contribuido a mover el crédito?.
 10. Como fue el proceso para seleccionar a los clientes MIPYME que recibieron el BIOPREMIO?.
 11. ¿Ha utilizado las garantías parciales de crédito? ¿Qué problemas o limitaciones tiene este componente?
 12. ¿Ofrecieron la asistencia técnica a las MIPYME? ¿La ha recibido su institución? EXPLICAR SI SE QUEDO SATIFECHO CON LA AT QUE SE RECIBIO Y COMO FUE EL PROCESO PARA LAS MIPYMES PUDIERAN TENER AT
 13. ¿Cómo describiría la situación del sector financiero para MIPYMES general por país?.
 14. ¿Ahora que ya no hay Biopremio o AT, se siguen moviendo los fondos de CAMBio? ¿Usan esos fondos o prefieren utilizar los propios?
 15. ¿Continuarán financiando productos financieros para MIPYMES-AB?
 16. ¿Qué le pareció el instrumento de criterios de elegibilidad y de monitoreo de impactos sobre la biodiversidad? ¿Fue fácil de utilizar, o la aplicación la hicieron los facilitadores del BCIE? ¿La usa su IF ahora que se ha finalizado el proyecto CAMBio?.
 17. Como valora la relación con los facilitadores de CAMBio y/o el Coordinador Regional?.

Modelo de Entrevistas a MIPYMES-AB

1. ¿Cómo se enteró de CAMBio?.
2. ¿Qué ventajas tuvo este financiamiento comparado con otros que ha tenido de la IF?.
3. ¿A qué actividades se dedica usted como productor?
4. ¿Qué le parecen las condiciones del crédito, tasa de interés, plazo, otros?
5. ¿Son los procedimientos para aplicar para el préstamo fáciles o burocráticos?

6. ¿Qué inversión ambiental está implementando como parte de su participación de este crédito?
7. ¿Recibió seguimiento en la utilización del crédito?. En el cumplimiento de Indicadores Ambientales?. Se comprometió usted a algunos?
8. ¿Recibió usted algún incentivo adicional o el Bio-Premio? ¿En qué invirtió el fondo ganado?.
9. Le tomó de sorpresa la entrega de este incentivo o ya le habían informado que se lo darían?. Porque se lo dieron?.
10. ¿Recibió asistencia técnica? O participó de alguna actividad de intercambio?
11. ¿Qué beneficios ve en este ProyectoCAMbio a largo plazo para usted, su empresa o a la región dónde se ubica?.

ANNEX 8. EVALUATION CONSULTANT AGREEMENT FORM

Formulario de acuerdo del consultor de la evaluación³

Acuerdo para acatar el Código de conducta para la evaluación en el Sistema de las Naciones Unidas

Nombre del consultor: Desirée Elizondo Cabrera

Nombre de la organización consultiva (donde corresponda):

Confirmando que he recibido y entendido y que acataré el Código de Conducta para la Evaluación de las Naciones Unidas.

Firmado en MGA, Nicaragua el No. 2015

Firma: D. Elizondo

ANNEX 9. EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

Informe de evaluación revisado y autorizado por

Oficina en el país del PNUD

Nombre: _____

Firma: _____ **Fecha:** _____

ATR del FMAM/PNUD

Nombre: _____

Firma: _____ **Fecha:** _____

ANNEX 10. PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Project Overall Goal					
Micro- Small- and Medium-sized enterprises in Central America increasingly contribute to Sustainable Development and Environmental Protection by incorporating biodiversity concerns in their products and services					
	Indicator (quantified and time-bound)	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Objective of the project : Removing barriers in banking, business, and enabling environment to catalyze biodiversity-friendly investments in micro-, small-, and medium-sized enterprises in Central America	By the end of the project, SMMEs are accessing financing through CABEL's financial intermediaries for investments with proven environmental benefit	At project start, virtually no financing is channeled by CABEL and its FIs to BD-friendly investments	By the end of the project, CABEL's FIs will have disbursed a total of 22 million dollars for BD-friendly investments. After the project, installed capacity and remaining loan enhancement instruments are going to catalyze significant amounts in leveraged financing	FIs will report on increase in value of BD loan portfolios	There is some uncertainty related to how quickly the project can provoke a deal flow of sufficient magnitude to reach the stated target. The loan enhancement instruments are designed to be able to work long after the project is finished.
	Indicators will be developed and refined depending on the composition of business activities in the loan portfolio, but will include number of hectares of agricultural production with improved BD management (including number of hectares RA or ecological certified), reduction in contamination sources, implementation of clean production technology etc.	Currently no measurable, positive impact on biodiversity derived from CABEL or FI lending activities	As the project generates a more accurate overview of potential borrowers, targets will be formulated per industry area, e.g. thousands of hectares managed according to BD-friendly principles (including certification), reduction in specific contamination sources (including POPs), etc.	Portfolio-wide monitoring of investments and business activities will document impact	The project will provide assistance to SMME for transformation to BD-friendly products and services, but will not have full control over private sector activities. It can show more difficult than anticipated to generate clear BD benefits in SMMEs
Outcome 1: CABEL and its Financial Intermediaries are providing loan financing to SMMEs for development of biodiversity-friendly business activities	Number of loans to SMEs for BD-friendly business development – based on revenue-based lending principles – being processed by participating banks	No BF loans processed; very few with risk guarantee	By the end of the project, the banks will have generated USD 12 million in loans. ²⁷ The risk guarantee will continue to leverage an estimated additional US\$ 59 million during lifetime of funds (write-off rate 5%)	Lending records of participating banks	Risk: loans do not materialize as quickly as anticipated, possibly because demand proves less than anticipated

²⁷This is estimated to be about 40 loans per country, for a total of 200 loans.

Project Overall Goal	Micro- Small- and Medium-sized enterprises in Central America increasingly contribute to Sustainable Development and Environmental Protection by incorporating biodiversity concerns in their products and services				
	Indicator (quantified and time-bound)	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Increasing number of loans to micro-enterprises to develop BD friendly business practices	Few loans processed to micro-enterprises for BD-friendly activities	By the end of the project, 6-8,000 BD loans have been processed by the FIs to micro-enterprises, representing USD 10 million in loan financing. The BD reward facility will continue to leverage an estimated additional 10 million by year 2020 ²⁸	Lending records of participating micro-finance institutions	Risk: micro-loans do not materialize as quickly as anticipated
Output 1.1: Increased awareness generated among financial institutions of potential market opportunities for lending to BF-SMMs, including information on specific bankable projects	Participating banks take a leading role in development of the new BF lending opportunities	Some interest, but minimal awareness detected in FIs	Participating FIs include BF-lending prominently in plans and strategies	FIs' plans and strategy papers	Awareness does not translate to action or business Other priorities override BD preferences
Output 1.2: A risk guarantee facility established by the project is being used by banks to reduce the risks of lending to BF-SMMs	Loans provided to BF investments and business.	No loans provided to BF business	Guarantee facility will leverage loans of US\$ 12 million during project (portfolio turnover rate 2)	Lending records at the banks and CABI	Guarantee does not trigger lending, due to lack of demand or conservative practices continuing by banks.
Output 1.3: Revenue-based lending approaches have been accepted, and are being used by banks to lend to BF-SMMs	Increase in number of banks willing to do loans to SMEs for BD-friendly business development based on revenue-based lending principles	Few pilot experiences in revenue-based lending, mainly in clean production financing	By the end of the project's pilot phase, one participating bank per country regularly does revenue-based BD lending, using the risk guarantee facility. This will expand to a minimum of 15 banks in the region by the end of the project	Lending records of participating banks, monitoring by CABI	It could be more difficult than anticipated to change banks' lending practices
Output 1.4: A biodiversity reward facility is helping to expand lending by non-	BD reward facility drastically increases interest in BD-friendly activities.	Few micro-finance institutions lend to BD-friendly micro-	From the end of the project's pilot phase, loan records of at least one participating micro-	Lending records of participating micro-finance institutions	Clients are not geared to include BF features in business (e.g.

²⁸Should some of the micro-loans not be able to document BD benefits, the borrower will not get access to the BD reward. The BD reward will be able to catalyze a total of USD 20 million for activities with proven BD benefits

Project Overall Goal	Micro- Small- and Medium-sized enterprises in Central America increasingly contribute to Sustainable Development and Environmental Protection by incorporating biodiversity concerns in their products and services				
	Indicator (quantified and time-bound)	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
banking institutions to BF micro-enterprises at interest rates that are sufficiently profitable for lenders and affordable to borrowers	MFIs extend micro-loans to BF business and activities.	enterprises	finance institution per country show lending to BD-friendly micro-enterprises growing at rates of 30% per year. At least US\$ 10 million of micro-loans have been granted by MFIs to BF business (based on 20% reward).		trading). MFIs find transaction costs too high on BF business.
Output 1.5: Tailored financing products developed for standardized loan situations	Credit officers have developed standard financing structures for repeat BF operations. Project financing approach is part of the banks' standard operations. New financing instruments are being utilized (e.g. quasi-equity)	No financing products others than direct loans with real collateral available.	80 % of credit officers have been exposed to revenue based lending techniques. 30% of the banks have financed BF projects with less than first-class collateral.	Financing products are adopted by banks. Loan records and CABEL monitoring	Banks not willing to cease obtaining collateral from SMMEs, as prerequisite for loans. Increased TA to credit officers in BF project structuring.
Output 1.6: Strengthened personnel and organizational resources at CABEL and involved FIs for improved management of BD financing	CABEL's and the FIs loan supply chain (term?) are fully able and willing to take the lead in developing the BD market and loan potential	Limited awareness of opportunities, lack of technical skills in promoting, appraising and monitoring BF projects.	By the project's mid-term evaluation, CABEL and FIs have earmarked and have trained key officers to be able to deliver against any new BF financing demand. BF has been internalized as one eligible line of business	Mid-term evaluation	CABEL and FIs too thinly spread to actively promote BD area.
Output 1.7: "BioScore" loan approval tool including biodiversity criteria being used in FIs loan approval procedures	FI loan officers find it easy to apply biodiversity criteria in its loan approval practices through the BioScore tool	No biodiversity criteria are being applied in loan approval procedures	By the end of the pilot phase, 80% of involved credit officers find the BioScore loan approval tool easy to use. 50% of FIs have used BioScore in BF project appraisal process.	Poll at the end of pilot phase, monitoring by CABEL.	BioScore not used due to lack of demand, or to minor role of >BF component in loans.

Project Overall Goal	Micro- Small- and Medium-sized enterprises in Central America increasingly contribute to Sustainable Development and Environmental Protection by incorporating biodiversity concerns in their products and services				
	Indicator (quantified and time-bound)	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	BioScore tool's biodiversity criteria are continually revised according to findings of project monitoring of loan portfolio, thereby guaranteeing BD impact	No biodiversity criteria are being applied in loan approval procedures	Impact evaluations show that the biodiversity criteria in the BioScore loan approval tool ensure biodiversity impact		
Outcome 2: SMMEs working in a broad range of economic sectors are able to develop biodiversity-friendly business ventures and thereby access new markets for their products and services	Number of SMMEs able to document a biodiversity benefit from its production or service as a result of project assistance	Few SMMEs are able to document BD benefits	By mid-term evaluation of the project, 60% of borrowers are able to document BD benefits from their investment, increasing to 80% of borrowers by the end of the project	Yearly BD impact evaluations performed on the portfolio	
	BD-friendly investments generate extra value-added for involved SMMEs		SMMEs involved in the project can document increased earnings of at least 15% a year	Yearly SMME economic performance surveys	
Output 2.1: Potential BF-SMMEs who could be in need of BD financing are identified and listed in a database being used by FIs.	Database listing all producers or operators registered in national industry associations with potential for a) certification (coffee, timber, cacao, bananas, eco-tourism, etc.), b) other producers with potential for enhancing BD management in their operations, and c) environmentally damaging producers with potential for cleaner production	Producers and operators are registered by their respective industry associations, but not linked to potential need for BD-financing	At least 10,000 potential BF-SMMEs identified by the end of year 1. ²⁹	Database is operational	Identification process could be more arduous than expected due to data gaps.
Output 2.2: Awareness created with identified, potential BF-SMMEs regarding green markets and other biodiversity-friendly business	Using the database of potential BF-SMMEs and regional networks, an information campaign has succeeded in disseminating the message of BD-friendly	Some knowledge exists among the more visionary SMMEs regarding BD-friendly business opportunities, but	50 % of identified SMMEs are aware of the BD-friendly business opportunities and availability of financing for related investments by the end of the pilot phase, and 75% by	Estimates based on polls with randomly selected SMMEs from the database	There are too many potential BF-SMMEs to benefit from the project activities.

²⁹Most of these will be small- or micro-producers

Project Overall Goal	Micro- Small- and Medium-sized enterprises in Central America increasingly contribute to Sustainable Development and Environmental Protection by incorporating biodiversity concerns in their products and services				
	Indicator (quantified and time-bound)	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
opportunities, and of the newly available lending opportunities for related investment	business potential and available financing to a majority of producers and operators in the region	often not enough to convince them to take action.	the end of the project		
Output 2.3: Technical capacity of SMMEs with viable ideas for BD-friendly business development is enhanced through an operational PACT (Programa de Asistencia en CapacidadesTécnicas) technical skills support programme,	PACT technical skills support programme – consisting of a select group of technical assistance providers – screens all incoming BD-friendly business ideas for technical viability, and technically viable business ideas get access to high-quality support to develop business ideas so that a large majority of them are able to access needed loan financing	Some sporadic technical assistance is available in the region, but SMMEs interested in developing BD-friendly business ideas have considerable difficulty in accessing assistance.	By the end of the pilot phase, 100% of SMMEs identified in the database will have access to an initial screening. All SMMEs with technically viable business ideas needing technical support to develop BD-friendly activities, will get help to develop them.	The project will compile statistics of the rate of viable business ideas which achieve access to financing	There are too many potential BF-SMMEs to benefit from the project activities and TASP.
Output 2.4: SMME's business planning and management skills developed through an operational PACE (Programa de Asistencia en CapacidadesEmpresariales) Support Programme	Increasing numbers of SMMEs with technically viable BD-friendly business ideas develop good business plans acceptable to FIs	A minority of SMMEs have the technical capacity to develop business plans	By the end of year 3, 70% of SMMEs who receive technical support will achieve loan financing from FIs.	Lending records of participating banks	There are too many potential BF-SMMEs to benefit from the project activities and TASP. SMME business skills is so low that each SMME beneficiary takes a long time to become capacitated.
Output 2.5: Market linkages improved across the supply chain	A number of additional key purchaser are newly engaged and directly sourcing from SMMEs involved in this project.	Established market linkages exist in some sectors, but generally remains a barrier for BF-SMME development	At least ten experiences of additional demand created through project activities by the end of the project. At least one example in each country of a supply chain improved to benefit BF-SMMEs.	Export agreements and other documentation showing successful market linkages	Supply chains can be reformed.

Project Overall Goal					
Micro- Small- and Medium-sized enterprises in Central America increasingly contribute to Sustainable Development and Environmental Protection by incorporating biodiversity concerns in their products and services					
	Indicator (quantified and time-bound)	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Output 2.6: Market information about BD-friendly products and services is disseminated to SMMEs through a BD market information clearing house mechanism (BD-CHM)	SMMEs interested in BD-friendly business opportunities will have access to market information	Very few SMMEs have sufficient access to market information for BD-friendly products and services	At the end of the pilot phase, 50 % of SMMEs in the database of potential BF-SMME borrowers have the ability (knowledge and suitable technology) to access BD market information, increasing to 75% at the end of the project	Estimates based on polls with randomly selected SMMEs from the database	Market information is available. The project can find ways for rural and remote SMMEs to access the information.
Output 2.7: Increased market demand for select BF-products and services	Increase in value of domestic market for BD-friendly products and service in each country	Current demand is scarcely met and little new demand is generated	Value of domestic market demand for at least one BD-friendly product and service in each country increases by 30% by the end of the project	Market studies	Market demand can be increased during the project with limited funds.
Output 2.8: Partnerships established between potential BF-SMMEs and research community for development and marketing of new BF products	Increase in new and innovative BD-friendly products and services developed through the partnerships	No established partnerships in place	At least one new product brought into the markets and the value and market opportunities for 3 existing BF products and services increased by the end of the project.	Market studies	There are market opportunities for new products.
Outcome 3: Enabling environments have been modified to create greater incentives for developing biodiversity-friendly sub-sectors of national economies	In each country initiatives have been put in place which will provide incentives for BF-SMME development	No particular incentives in place	By the end of the project, the countries will have revised their policies, legislation, and regulation to promote BF-SMME development		
Output 3.1: Policy, legislative and regulatory review and reform recommendations formulated	Recommendations on legislative and regulatory reform to improve economic conditions for BF-SMMEs.	A mixture of policies which generally do not provide any comparative advantages for BF-SMMEs to compete in the marketplace	Recommendations on legislative and regulatory reform to improve economic conditions for BF-SMMEs are presented to government in each country on policy and provisionally agreed upon by key stakeholders by end of year 2.	Report on reform.	

Project Overall Goal	Micro- Small- and Medium-sized enterprises in Central America increasingly contribute to Sustainable Development and Environmental Protection by incorporating biodiversity concerns in their products and services				
	Indicator (quantified and time-bound)	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Output 3.2: Recommendations formulated and support provided for introduction of fiscal incentives	Fiscal incentives identified for introduction in each participating country.	No fiscal incentives for BD-friendly behavior	Fiscal incentives recommended and provisionally agreed for introduction in each participating country.	Report on introduction of fiscal incentives	
Output 3.3: Support provided for national adoption and implementation of recommended policy, legislative, regulatory and incentive reforms	Adoption of recommended policy, legislative or incentive reform occurs in all five countries	Government ministries resistant to change with vested interests in mainstream commercial sectors.	By the end of the project the major policy, legislative or incentive reforms proposed are in place and are being implemented. Fiscal incentives implemented in at least three participating countries. CCAD actively promotes the application of fiscal incentives throughout the region	Laws, government records and assessment of government activity.	Not too much resistant and the project has sufficient time to support reform recommendations through generally lengthy negotiation and adoption procedures at the national level.
Outcome 4: Learning, evaluation and adaptive management, particularly relating to interactions amongst outcomes 1-3, are ensured	Project Technical Advisory Group members are commending the project for applying lessons learned and adapting to changing environment, thereby achieving its objectives	N/a	N/a	Technical Advisory Group meeting minutes	
Output 4.1: Advanced monitoring system established for a) biodiversity impact measurement, b) continuous project indicator measurement, and c) distillation of lessons learned, including BF-SMME development and BF banking	High-quality information available to project manager and project team for decision making	N/a	N/a	Regularly updated reports available	
Output 4.2: Adaptive management systems established to continuously	Bi-yearly revision of project log-frame and implementation strategy	N/a	N/a	Periodic project progress reports	

Project Overall Goal	Micro- Small- and Medium-sized enterprises in Central America increasingly contribute to Sustainable Development and Environmental Protection by incorporating biodiversity concerns in their products and services				
	Indicator (quantified and time-bound)	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
incorporate adjustments based on lessons learned from monitoring system	based on inputs from monitoring system				
Output 4.3: Regional dissemination of project lessons, including best practices for BF-SMME development	Opportunities for governments, NGOs, donors, FIs and trade associations to learn about project programmes and lessons.	N/a	Material available on the project's website gets accessed by interested from inside and outside the region. Two international workshops will attract key players in BF-SMME development and financing	Registry of hits on the website. Number and quality of participants in workshop	

ANNEX 11. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Intercambio de experiencias / pasantías			
Año	País	Descripción	Sector
2010	Regional	Experiencias Agricultura Orgánica ECAO	Agricultura y plantaciones orgánicas
2011	Costa Rica	Participación en BIOFACH 2011	Agricultura y plantaciones orgánicas
2011	Regional	Intercambio en AGRITRADE 2011	Agricultura y plantaciones orgánicas
2011	El Salvador	Evento Hablemos de Café	Agroforestería
2011	Costa Rica	Los Encuentros de MontBlanc 2011	Agricultura y plantaciones orgánicas
2011	El Salvador	Feria "Taiwan Tea, Coffee & Wine Expo"	Agroforestería
2012	El Salvador	Participación en BIOFACH 2012	Agricultura y plantaciones orgánicas
2012	El Salvador	III Congreso Internacional de Producción Bajo Área Protegida	Agroforestería
2013	El Salvador	Evento Hablemos de Café y Hablemos de Roya	Agroforestería
2014	Regional	Evento Hablemos de Café	Agroforestería
2015	Nicaragua	Feria Internacional de Cafés Especiales SCAA 2015	

Patrocinio de eventos			
Año	País	Descripción	Sector
2010	Guatemala	Congreso Conservación Tierras Privadas	Agroforestería
2010	Costa Rica	Lanzamiento BIOINNOVAR y Bioinnovar Challenge	Agricultura y plantaciones orgánicas
2011	El Salvador	Encuentro comercial P+L	Turismo sostenible
2011	Nicaragua	Feria Financiera FAST	Agricultura y plantaciones orgánicas

2011	Honduras	Segundo Simposio Técnico de la Pesquería de la Langosta Espinosa: Un enfoque sostenible, rentable y seguro”	Pesquería sostenible
2011	Honduras	Taller Financiando el Sector Forestal, 1ra. Feria Financiera Forestal de FAST y V Feria Financiera de FAST	Manejo forestal
2011	Honduras	Curso Valorización, Fusión, Alianza y Capitalización de Instituciones Microfinancieras	Agricultura y plantaciones orgánicas
2011	Honduras	VIII Congreso Centroamericano de Integración y Actualización Apícola 2011	Agroforestería
2011	Costa Rica	II Congreso Internacional de PYMES	Agricultura y plantaciones orgánicas
2011	Costa Rica	IV Foro “Producción diversificada y provisión de servicios ambientales en el sector cacaotero de Panamá”	Agroforestería
2011	Nicaragua	X Encuentro cafetalero Internacional Ramacafe	Agroforestería
2011	Nicaragua	III Encuentro Nacional de Productores y Exportadores	Agroforestería
2011	Honduras	I Congreso Centroamericano de Agricultura Orgánica y I Feria Centroamericana de Productos Orgánicos e Insumos para la Agricultura Orgánica	Agricultura y plantaciones orgánicas
2011	El Salvador	Evento Hablemos de Café	Agroforestería
2011	Guatemala	Encuentro Nacional de Cacao: Historia, Cultura, Incidencia Económica, Medio Ambiente.	Agroforestería
2012	Costa Rica	Feria y Rueda de Negocios el “Gustico Costarricense”	Agroforestería
2012	Guatemala	“I Congreso Nacional sobre conocimientos tradicionales indígenas: Implicaciones para el Desarrollo Sostenible” y del “I Congreso Internacional sobre acceso a Recursos Genéticos, Conocimiento Tradicional Y Propiedad Intelectual”	Agricultura y plantaciones orgánicas
2013	Regional	Encuentro Centroamericano de Negocios Amigables a la Biodiversidad	Agroforestería
2014	El Salvador	Primer Foro de Productores de Café	Agroforestería

Transferencia de conocimiento			
Año	País	Descripción	Sector
2010	El Salvador	Desarrollo de Sistema Informático Contable	Agroforestería
2010	El Salvador	Capacitación sobre certificaciones	Agroforestería
2010	El Salvador	Capacitación NIIF-PYME	Agroforestería
2010	El Salvador	Capacitación sobre Rainforest Alliance y turismo sostenible	Agroforestería
2011	El Salvador	Elaboración de planes de negocios	Turismo sostenible
2011	El Salvador	Diplomado en Ventas	Agroforestería
2011	Honduras	Curso de inglés	Agroforestería
2011	Regional	Curso Virtual de Análisis de Riesgos Ambientales y Sociales	Turismo sostenible
2011	Nicaragua	Curso Valorización, Fusión, Alianza y Capitalización de Instituciones	Agricultura y plantaciones orgánicas

		Microfinancieras	
2011	Nicaragua	Curso Intensivo “Montaje de Sistema Contable a PYMES aplicando las normas NIIF”	Agroforestería
2011	Guatemala	Capacitación de mujeres en liderazgo y equidad de género	Agricultura y plantaciones orgánicas
2011	Regional	Capacitación en Planes de Negocios	Agricultura y plantaciones orgánicas

Iniciativas sectoriales / marco habilitador			
Año	País	Descripción	Sector
2011	Nicaragua	Definición de Política y estrategia de Incentivos para sostenibilidad de MIPYME turísticas en Nicaragua	Turismo sostenible
2011	Nicaragua	Actualización de la normativa ambiental sobre los beneficios húmedos del café	Agroforestería
2011	Regional	Análisis de Factibilidad Técnica, Legal y Financiera del Programa de Garantías Crediticias del INAB”	Agricultura y plantaciones orgánicas
2011	Honduras	Plan de divulgación y socialización del Anteproyecto de la Ley de Pesca y Acuicultura	Pesquería sostenible
2011	Honduras	Difusión de la Normativa de Buceo	Turismo sostenible
2011	Honduras	Difusión de la Estrategia Estimulación de Turismo Sostenible	Turismo sostenible
2011	Nicaragua	Producción Diversificada y provisión de servicios ambientales en el sector cacaotero	Agroforestería
2011	Costa Rica	Producción Diversificada y provisión de servicios ambientales en el sector cacaotero	Agroforestería
2011	Guatemala	Actualización de la Política sobre la Actividad Turística en Áreas Protegidas	Turismo sostenible
2011	Costa Rica	Divulgación de la investigación: “Servicios Financieros Complementarios con la Producción Responsable y Sostenible de Piña en Costa Rica”	Agricultura y plantaciones orgánicas
2012	Nicaragua	Apoyar la divulgación y disseminación de la Ley No. 765 de fomento a la producción agroecológica u orgánica, su reglamento y la norma técnica obligatoria nicaragüense	Agricultura y plantaciones orgánicas
2012	Nicaragua	Validar la aplicación de la propuesta de reforma de la Norma Técnica Ambiental NTON 05 028-06 para la protección de la calidad de los cuerpos de agua afectadas por los vertidos líquidos y sólidos provenientes de los beneficios húmedos del café.	Agroforestería
2012	El Salvador	Guía del Emprendedor Turístico	Turismo sostenible
2013	Regional	Apoyar el diálogo de políticas sobre ordenamiento territorial en Centroamérica, retos y desafíos para el desarrollo sostenible en un contexto de cambio climático	Agricultura y plantaciones orgánicas
2013	Regional	Apoyar el “Proyecto de Norma General para el Eco etiquetado de los	Agricultura y plantaciones orgánicas

		productos. Requisitos”	
2013	El Salvador	Apoyar la implementación del plan de difusión de la legislación ambiental de El Salvador: Ley del Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales, Política Nacional de Medio Ambiente 2013-17, Convención de Diversidad Biológica, Ley de Áreas Naturales Protegidas y Convención de NNUU sobre Cambio Climático hacia el sector MIPYME’s.	Agricultura y plantaciones orgánicas
2013	El Salvador	Análisis y adaptación de la metodología del Programa de Desarrollo de Proveedores (PDP) de la Cámara de Comercio e Industria de El Salvador, con énfasis en encadenamientos productivos y prácticas sostenibles .	Acuicultura y pesquería sostenible

ANNEX 12. INFORMATION GENERATED BY THE PROJECT

1. Herramienta para la evaluación y seguimiento de MIPYME-AB, en el Modulo de evaluación de inversiones AB y Modulo del Bio Premio.
2. Documento con los criterios de elegibilidad simplificados para un total de 11 sectores productivos, con un mínimo de 8 criterios y máximo de 11 criterios, como sigue:
 - i. Agroforestería Cardamomo Micro Empresa Guatemala (9 criterios)
 - ii. Agroforestería de Cardamomo, Café y Cacao para Micro Empresa (9 criterios)
 - iii. Agroforestería de Cardamomo, Café y Cacao para Mediana Empresa (10 criterios)
 - iv. Agricultura sostenible Micro Empresa y Mediana Empresa (10 criterios)
 - v. Manejo Forestal Sostenible Maderable (9 criterios)
 - vi. Manejo Forestal Sostenible No Maderable (10 criterios)
 - vii. Sistemas Silvopastoriles (9 criterios)
 - viii. Artesanías y Apicultura (9 criterios)
 - ix. Turismo Ecológico (10 criterios)
 - x. Acuicultura Certificada (10 criterios)
 - xi. Pesquerías Sostenibles (10 criterios)
3. Indicadores con un promedio de 16 indicadores por sector productivo.
4. Guía Pocket, que resume el funcionamiento de la herramienta de elegibilidad de inversiones AB.
5. Diseño del módulo del Bio Premio integrado en la nueva plataforma de evaluación y seguimiento de inversiones.
6. Cuadernillos Técnicos:
 - i. Cuadernillo 1: Explicación del proceso de elegibilidad
 - ii. Cuadernillo 2: Explicación de los criterios para las inversiones que no son elegibles.
 - iii. Cuadernillo 3: Terminología y conceptos básicos de inversiones AB y buenas prácticas
 - iv. Cuadernillo 4: Conceptos básicos de biodiversidad
7. Producto verde:
 - i. Cinco publicaciones, una por país que resumen las acciones de las IFI's en su adopción del programa de MIPYMES AB y criterios de selección para la implementación de programas de crédito verde en sus productos financieros.
8. Cinco Documentos de estudio de caso en biodiversidad:
 - i. Evaluación de los impactos en biodiversidad como resultado de las intervenciones del Proyecto CAMBio en las MIPYME's en los sistemas agroforestales de café en la Ruta de Las Flores, El Salvador".
 - ii. Evaluación de los impactos en biodiversidad como resultado de las intervenciones del Proyecto CAMBio en las MIPYME's: Acueducto Rural La Tigra y Acueducto Las Delicias en Alajuela, Costa Rica.
 - iii. Evaluación de los impactos en biodiversidad como resultado de las intervenciones del proyecto CAMBio en las MIPYME's de agroforestería de café y cacao en Honduras.

- iv. Evaluación de los impactos en biodiversidad como resultado de las intervenciones del proyecto CAMBio en las MIPYME's de agroforestería de cardamomo en la Zona Reina, Guatemala. Complemento del estudio de caso con análisis de uso del suelo y análisis de conectividad del paisaje.
 - v. Evaluación de los impactos en biodiversidad como resultado de las intervenciones del proyecto CAMBio en las MIPYME's sistemas silvopastoriles en la zona norte de Nicaragua, zona de amortiguamiento de Bosawas.
9. Resúmenes de Estudio de Caso de Biodiversidad para su divulgación en la 5ta Asamblea del GEF.
10. Mapas para visualización y análisis:
- i. 30 mapas (5 por país) con los siguientes análisis: Sectores productivos CAMBio versus: 1) Ecorregiones, 2) Zonas de Vida, 3) Ecosistemas, 4) Corredores Biológicos- Áreas Protegidas, 5) Recursos Hídricos, 6) Ubicación General.
 - ii. 7 mapas para los créditos en Agroforestería de cardamomo evaluados en la Zona Reina, que incluyen: 1) Ecorregiones, 2) Zonas de Vida, 3) Ecosistemas, 4) Corredores Biológicos-Áreas Protegidas, 5) Recursos Hídricos, 6) Ubicación General, 7) Vacíos de Conservación NISP
 - iii. 6 mapas para los créditos de Maxan, que incluyen: 1) Ecorregiones, 2) Zonas de Vida, 3) Ecosistemas, 4) Corredores Biológicos-Áreas Protegidas, 5) Recursos Hídricos, 6) Ubicación General
 - iv. 5 animaciones con 3 capas por país, que incluyen Sectores productivos CAMBio versus Corredores Biológicos- Áreas Protegidas y área de intervención
 - v. 6 mapas adicionales actualizados a noviembre del 2013 con las inversiones del Proyecto CAMBio y su colindancia con el corredor.
 - vi. 2 mapas de cambio de uso del suelo en la Zona Reina Quiche.
 - vii. 2 mapas de cambio de uso del suelo en la zona norte de Nicaragua, RB de Bosawas.
 - viii. 6 mapas de intervención del Proyecto CAMBio El Salvador
 - ix. 3 mapas de intervención del Proyecto CAMBio en los acueductos de Costa Rica.
11. Bases de datos georeferencia:
- i. Base de datos de puntos de georeferencia para las inversiones del Proyecto CAMBio
 - ii. Base de datos de los puntos de georeferencia para las fincas evaluadas en El Salvador
 - iii. Base de datos de los puntos de georeferencia para las fincas evaluadas en la Zona Reina
 - iv. Base de datos de los puntos de georeferencia para las fincas evaluadas en zona norte de Nicaragua (Bosawas)
 - v. Base de datos de puntos de georeferencia de las fincas y nacientes de los acueductos La Tigra y Las Delicias
 - vi. Una base de datos de georefencia para la MIPYME's evaluadas por el Bio Premio por país.
 - vii. Base de datos catálogo de *shape*

12. Base de datos de los indicadores y porcentaje de cumplimiento.
13. Base de datos de especies:
 - i. Especies de árboles identificadas en las fincas con crédito y sin crédito en El Salvador
 - ii. Especies de plantas identificadas en las intervenciones del Proyecto CAMBio
 - iii. Especies de árboles y fauna identificadas en la Tigra y en las Delicias
14. Metodologías para la evaluación de impactos:
 - i. Metodología para la evaluación de impactos en BD, de acuerdo al estudio de El Salvador.
 - ii. Metodología para evaluar impactos en biodiversidad a nivel regional.
 - iii. Metodología para hacer análisis de conectividad y de fragmentación, y de cambios de uso del suelo.
 - iv. Metodología para medición de impactos en los acueductos y modelo de sostenibilidad de ASDAS.
 - v. Metodología para la identificación de áreas prioritarias de conservación

Manuales operativos de los programas

- Establecimiento del fondo para el programa de fortalecimiento de capacidades técnicas y empresariales (asistencia técnica) y sus procedimientos: Resolución CDP-001/2010.
- Guía operativa del Programa Apoyo MIPYME-AB: Resolución de Directorio del BCIE N° DI-53/2008
- Manual operativo del Programa de premio por beneficios a la biodiversidad (Bio premio): Resolución de Directorio del BCIE N° DI-193/2008 y posteriores modificaciones (DI-87/2011 y PRE-60/2011)
- Manual Operativo del Programa de Garantías Parciales de Crédito: resolución MO-GERPRODE-PROFOEX-CAMBio-57-2012