NATIONAL FEDERATION OF PALM OIL CULTIVATORS (FEDEPALMA)
INTER AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK (IDB)
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL FUND (GEF)

TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

PROJECT "CONSERVATION OF BIODIVERSITY IN ZONES OF PALM OIL CULTIVATION IN COLOMBIA"

GEFSEC ID: 4113
BID ID: CO-X1011 and ATN/FM-13216-CO

GEF Focal Area: Biodiversity
GEF-5 Strategic program(s): BD-SP5

Partners: **Instituto Alexander von Humboldt (IAvH)**
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)
Research Center in Palm Oil (CENIPALMA)

Evaluator:
Julio Guzmán

Coordinators:
Juan Carlos Espinosa, FEDEPALMA
Rosario Gómez, FEDEPALMA
Fernando Balcázar, BID
Josué Ávila Murillo, BID

Terminal Evaluation Report Period: 12-06-2018 to 12-11-2018

Evaluator contact

JULIO GUZMÁN
☎ (+506) 8379-2116
julioantonioguzman@gmail.com

COLOMBIA

PROJECT "CONSERVATION OF BIODIVERSITY IN ZONES OF PALM OIL CULTIVATION IN COLOMBIA"

TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ANNEXES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AOP	Annual Operation Plan
AWP	Annual Work Plan
BPL	Biodiverse Palm Landscape
C	Component
CAR	Regional Autonomous Corporation
CC	Climate Change
CCG	Global Climate Change
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CENIPALMA	Corporation Research Center in Palm Oil
CO_2	Carbon (dioxide)
CONPES	National Council for Economic and Social Policy
COP	Conference of the Parties
CP	Carbon Print
CORPOCESAR	Regional Autonomous Corporation of Cesar
CORPAMAG	Regional Autonomous Corporation of Magdalena
CORPORINOQUIA	Autonomous Regional Corporation of the Orinoquia
CORMACARENA	Corporation for the Sustainable Development of the Special Management Area La Macarena
DNA	Does not apply
EA	Executive Agency
EC	Executive Committee
ECDBC	Colombian Strategy for Low Carbon Development
EEV	economic and ecological valuation
FEDEPALMA	National Federation of Oil Palm Growers
FN	Natura Foundation
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GHG	Green House Gases
GIZ	German Agency for International Cooperation
GoCO	Government of Colombia
HCV	High Conservation Value
HCVA	High Conservation Value Areas
IA	Implementing Agency
IAvH	Research Institute of Biological Resources "Alexander von Humboldt"
IDB/Bank	Inter-American Development Bank
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LL	Lesson learned or finding
LMT	Landscape Management Tools
LULUCF	Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry
MADR	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
MADS	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (before MAVDT)
MAVDT	Ministry of the Environment, Housing and Territorial Development
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MoA	Memorandum of Agreement
MtCO2e	Millions of tons of carbon dioxide equivalent
MTE	Mid Term Evaluation
NDP	National Development Plan
NFP	Non-Reimbursable Financing Proposal
NSPOP	National Sustainable Palm Oil Program
OM	Operation Manual
OMP	Operation Manual of the Project
ONG	Non-Governmental Organization
PA	Plans of Acquisitions and Contracting
PCU	Project coordination unit

PDD	Project Design Document
PEA	Project Executing Agency
PIF	Project Identification Form
PIR	Project Implementation Form
PMR	Project Monitoring Report
PNN	Natural National Parks of Colombia
PO	Plan of Operations
Project	Project “Conservation of Biodiversity in Zones of Palm Oil Cultivation in Colombia”
RE	Renewable Energy
REDD	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
RSPO	Round Table on Sustainable Palm Oil
STAP	Scientific Advisory Panel
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
TC	Technical Cooperation
TCA	Technical Cooperation Agreement
TCD	Technical Cooperation Document
TER	Terminal Evaluation Report
tCO_{2e}	Tons of equivalent carbon
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
ToR	Terms of reference
UAATAS	Environmental and Social Technical Assistance and Audit Units
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UPRA	Rural Agricultural Planning Unit
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Key aspects of the evaluation approach and methodology

The objective of the Project was "to contribute to the conservation of biodiversity and to a sustainable management of the palm oil systems, through a better planning and adoption of agro-ecological practices in zones of expansion of the palm oil activity".

The methodology was designed to be as inclusive as possible and the evaluation followed a focus that prioritized the participation of different actors that have been part of the project. For the evaluation, the following data collection and analysis methods were used: i) review of the documentation; ii) semi-structured interviews (face-to-face and virtual), (iii) questionnaires and; (iv) presentation of the preliminary results.

The evaluation consists of five dimensions: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. The description of each of the scores analyzed is found in Table 4.

1.2 Project description

The Project was composed of four components:

***Component 1**: Planning and environmentally sound management of palm systems (US$8,80 millions).*

***Component 2** Conservation and valuation of Environmental services in palm oil systems (US$4,56 millions).*

***Component 3**: Uses and differentiated markets for products that contribute to biodiversity (US$2,76 millions).*

***Component 4**: Monitoring, communication and evaluation of impacts (US$0,57 millions).*

The estimated costs of the Project per component are shown below:

Table 1: Estimated cost of the Project per component (millions US$)

CATEGORY	BID GEF	LOCAL	TOTAL
1. Environmentally Appropriate Planning and Management of Palm Systems	1,170	7,644	8,814
2. Conservation and Valuation of Environmental Services in Palm Systems	1,413	3,151	4,564
3. Differentiated uses and markets for products that contribute to agrobiodiversity	693	2,069	2,762
4. Monitoring, communication and evaluation of impacts	549	28	577
Coordination, Project Management	385	1,438	1,823
Audit	40	-	40
TOTAL COST	***4,250***	***14,330***	***18,580***

Fuente: *BID 2012.*

1.3 Summary of evaluation ratings

The Terminal Evaluation Report (TER) aims to provide an independent and in-depth review of the achievements made in the implementation of the project. The TER is made according to the guidelines, standards and procedures established by the IDB and GEF, as established in the GEF Agencies Guide to carry out Final Evaluations. *("Guidellines for GEF Agencies conducting Terminal Evaluations", "GEF Evaluation Office Ethical Guidelines")*.

Next, the rating of the different dimensions analyzed is presented, according to what is established in the table of the evaluation keys presented in Table 4.

Table 2 Summary of ratings for the evaluation of the project

EVALUATION OF RESULTS	RATINGS
Relevance	Moderately satisfactory (MS)
Effectiveness	Satisfactory (S)
Efficiency	Moderately satisfactory (MS)
Impact	Moderately unsatisfactory (MU)
Sustainability	Moderately improbable (MI)

Source: Format GEF 2008, with the results from the evaluation 2018.

1.4 Main findings

1.4.1 Analysis of the design and execution

The framework (matrix) of results presented a vertical logic: the indicators responded to the results and products, the results and products to the components and the components to the objective. The objectives, components, results, products and indicators to be met were ambitious, but ultimately feasible; however, to some extent unclear and in some cases exclusive. In addition, both the components and the results responded and were connected to the development problems identified in the Non-Reimbursable Financing Proposal (NFP), which was confirmed through the interviews conducted during the fieldwork.

However, the objectives were very ambitious and presented some inconsistencies, which are explained below:

- *The "support in the definition of suitable areas for the cultivation of palm within the territorial order, taking into account criteria for crop sustainability" of the C1 was described in a very general terms, without specifying a clear approach of how do it out, with project partners and government entities.*
- *The detailed impact analysis in C4 is not compatible with the establishment of conservation corridors for C1 ecosystem connectivity. Additionally, the random selection of participating palm producing farms did not ensure their interest and commitment to implement the activities proposed by the Project.*
- *The assumptions were used:*
    - *That the palm growers should or could receive incentives or compensations for the ecosystem services of the palm farms; when in reality, palm growers are net users of these services*

- *That they could generate value chains of biodiversity products, when in reality, these activities are not within their "core business" or show a financial attraction for producers.*

1.4.2 Relevance, Impact, Effectiveness and efficiency

The design of this project complied with the legal regulations and policies of the beneficiary country, the Implementing Agency (IA) and GEF, namely, the following

- *The National Development Plan (PND) 2010-2014 defined five engines for growth and employment generation; that included agriculture, prioritizing the palm sector to increase productivity and competitiveness.*
- *In compliance with article 6 of the Convention on Biological Diversity, this project contributed to the incorporation of biodiversity considerations into the plans and programs of the sector.*
- *With the IDB, the operation was included in the Document Country Program 2012, the expected results of the project contributed to the indicator "number of products certified by environmental programs".*
- *The project contributed to objective 2 of the GEF-4 Focal Biodiversity Strategy, which sought to incorporate biodiversity considerations into productive landscapes.*

The impact/outcome indicators were not necessarily SMART[1]: specific, measurable (targets were set), not all affordable, relevant as they responded to development problems (and in the vertical logic to components and products) and limited to the time of technical cooperation (TC). The project had very positive impacts, because it managed to penetrate into a guild for which biodiversity and sustainability were not part of its "core business", but rather an increase in productivity; however, a mentality towards RSPO certification was already developing, which ended up being strengthened with the collaboration of the project and the effects of activities related to the use of ecosystem services. But, the project had some deficiencies in the achievement of the indicators, without adequately adjusting the results matrix.

In terms of efficiency, the project used all the financial resources of the GEF in its entirety, despite not achieving all the expected outputs and not contemplating the possibility of replacing them (those that could not be achieved) with others more in line with the changes in the context.

1.4.3 Sustainability

FEDEPALMA and CENIPALMA, as a result of this project, were convinced to act as assertive change promoters, in terms of developing sustainable palm crops in balance with biodiversity, due to their influence on the palm clusters and their suppliers, so much so that during the last Palm Congress in Colombia, the sustainable palm production strategy was launched.

The main tool for sustainability is extension, for example, CENIPALMA has contracted three environmental extension agents (one for each of the main palm areas of the country), who will work jointly in the Environmental Department of FEDEPALMA, which is a first step to that these themes and lessons learned reach palm producers. Additionally, the National Sustainable Palm Oil Program, which will seek to have partners and allies, as well as national and international

[1] SMART: specific, measurable, accesible, relevant and time limited.

financing to promote the adoption of sustainability practices including what is promoted by the BPL.

The project designed a series of products, including a pedagogical tool (game) that the UAATAS of beneficiary clusters can use in training sessions for palm producers. In addition, the information generated by the project has been included in different pieces of communication (presentations, documents) to socialize the results to different audiences (regional and national producers' forums, Competitiveness Committees, Institutions, Donors and Banking).

Also, with counterpart resources from FEDEPALMA, progress is made in the generation of the systematization of what has been generated in the planning component, for delivery to beneficiary clusters and therefore to their associates/producers.

An Integral Vision of Conservation in Biodiverse Palm Landscapes was generated with the territorial entities of CORPAMAG, CORPOCESAR, National Natural Parks in its northern region and the Secretariats of Agriculture and Environment, CORMACARENA, CORPORINOQUIA, National Natural Parks and SIRAP (Regional Systems of Protected Areas) Orinoquia eastern region, which are expected to generate a general awareness in the local palm sector.

The ecological sustainability of this project is given by the increase of the forest patches and the greater vegetation cover that is being promoted in the vicinity and within the palm plantations.

Within the framework of the RSPO certification program, the conservation of these areas will be verified in the monitoring process. In addition, FEDEPALMA will make alliances with the universities of palm-growing regions, to conduct a biodiversity monitoring where HCVA have been identified, in order to establish strategies for their conservation.

According to the interviews carried out during the final evaluation, some of the activities carried out by the project may continue with financing once its activities are completed, namely:

1. *In Component1 1, la UPRA, with governmental resources, has been generating information to determine areas of agricultural and palm expansion.*
2. *In Component 2, the project raised awareness in the palm sector about the economic, social and environmental benefits of HCVA and ecosystem services.*
3. *In Component 3, the beneficiary palm growers have developed capacities to develop a sustainable palm crop*
4. *In Component 4, FEDEPALMA and CENIPALMA are developing communication and dissemination processes that seek to achieve sustainable palmiculture.*

The Finca Plan was articulated in a strategy of CENIPALMA extension program, with which type farms will be established, to be a model of best environmental, social and productive practices and, including many of the best practices promoted by the BPL.

FEDEPALMA and CENIPALMA will continue working on the topic of cost-benefit analysis of the implementation of sustainability practices and their benefits, in order to complement the promotion of these activities within the framework of the National Sustainable Palm Oil Program.

1.5 Summary of lessons learned, and recommendations

Below is a summary of the most relevant lessons learned and recommendations:

Table 3: Lessons learned and most relevant recommendations

LESSON LEARNED	RECOMMENDATION
*The project BPL, of b*iodiversity conservation in productive activities, had a very high incidence in the awareness of the population, producers, the palm guild and involved institutions (CAR and UAATAS, among others), especially about the benefits of sustainability at a local, regional and global levels, through a participatory strategy. This awareness was evidenced with the launch of the National Sustainable Palm Oil Program	The realization of this type of projects in palm and other productive activities should be encouraged, especially the most questioned in environmental terms, in order to promote the integral sustainability of agricultural territory
The linking of public institutions, UPRA and Cooperating Entities identified (Section 5.3) in the support for the definition of areas suitable for agriculture and specifically palm, within the territorial order, taking into account sustainability criteria, not only aligns this type of initiatives with others of the Government and the country, but gives legitimacy to the process	It is important that the entities identified in the PPB design documents are properly included in the implementation of the project in order to make an assertive achievement of the products. Compliance with the program of co-financing resources committed in the Project Agreement is important (Section 5.7).
The BPL partners should had been clear about their role, duties and limitations, before signing the cooperation agreement	The Implementing Agency (IA) must ensure that project partners, in this case the BPL, clearly understand their duties and obligations before signing the cooperation agreement, which would promote their adequate appropriation and achievement of the proposed products and results
The IE is a useful tool to measure the real impact of a project and its causality. However, the compatibility or non-compatibility between the objectives and technical goals of the project and the proposed IE should be carefully analyzed; in the case of the PPB, the non-compatibility between the establishment of biological corridors and an experimental design of (double) randomization	The IE is a useful tool for decision-making. On excluding issues, such as the establishment of biological corridors and an impact evaluation with an experimental design with (double) randomization, it is necessary to decide between one of the two. If the objective of the establishment of the biological corridors prevails, then a compatible impact assessment methodology (probably non-random) should be sought
Formal changes with the approval of the IA in the BLP results matrix were essential to changes in the context of the country, especially due to the time that elapsed between design and implementation	Changes in the results matrix, although must be analyzed in depth by the actors, should have been proposed in an assertive and formally approved manner, in order to carry out an adaptive management of the BPL and maintain or increase its relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency
The promotion of nectariferous and legumes in the beneficiary palm plantations of the BLP results in a decrease in the use of agrochemicals	The result of the BPL experiences, identified the need to carry out experimental studies and benefit-cost analysis on the promotion of nectariferous and legumes and the consequent decrease in the use of agrochemicals in palm plantations
Plantations of forest patches in the adjoining BPL beneficiary plantations increased biodiversity in the agricultural region	The Finca Plan applied in the BPL proved to be an ideal instrument to promote the reforestation of unused areas in the lands of the palm plantations, to increase biodiversity and produce both tangible and intangible benefits to the producers and the population in general, which should be replicated in other productive projects

LESSON LEARNED	RECOMMENDATION
Freatimeters are a necessary instrument for the efficient use of water or drainages in palm plantations	Taking into account that the implementation of freatimeters in palm farms (and in other agricultural activities) has a relatively low cost and provides very valuable information for decision making regarding the use of irrigation or drainage, it is recommended to extend its use in the agricultural geography
Staff turnover should have been reduced to a minimum in the BPL, especially with an adequate remuneration policy adjusted to the project budget; but decisions should have been made on time when the professionals were not adequate to fulfill the assigned positions	It is essential that both the Implementing Agency (IA) and the Executing Agency (AE) have the appropriate policies to encourage good professionals and make changes at an appropriate time when they do not adapt to the requirements. The IA must ensure that the EA is supporting the project in this regard
The processes of acquisitions, purchases and financial reports of this type of projects – in this case the BPL - are complex (Section 5.1) and must had benn streamlined to reduce the risks in obtaining the products and expected results	The IA should include more strongly in its operations plan, the training and accompaniment of the administrative officers in charge of the project's financial processes
The co-financing contributions negotiated for the implementation of the BPL project should have been monitored and also served as a means to generate synergies with the different institutions involved	The EA must keep a careful control not only of GEF contributions, but also of co-financing and link it to a strategy for achieving synergies with the institutions involved
It is essential that the products produced in projects with GEF resources, in this case the BPL, are public and, therefore, available to society in general	All products achieved in this type of project should be published on the WEB, in order to promote the public use of the information generated
More synergies could have been achieved and a more efficient use made of the "scarce resources" of the BPL project, by means of the identification of initiatives - in accordance with the goals that it was designed to achieve - that were already in process and could have been finalized and/or scaled with key institutions at the local, regional and national levels	A strategy of generating synergies with other institutional actors, projects and initiatives must be developed, for which it is necessary to map and design a coordination structure, in order to provide continuity in the objectives
Ecological sustainability does not only depend on the identification of HCVA. What was important in the BPL was to create possibilities for dialogue to promote the conservation of natural resources at the local level	It is very important to continue with the participation processes developed by the BPL and FEDEPALMA and that the identified HCVA serve as an input for the generation of policies and regulations for the promotion of sustainability
The strategy of biodiversity conservation must take into account the participation of and the effect on women and young people of the relevant actors, as in the case of the BPL	It is necessary to improve the communication issue to reach more efficiently women and youth in the communities, for which it is relevant to take the case of the PPB

2 BASIC INFORMATION

In US$

IDB Project number: ***CO-X1011.*** *GEFSEC ID:* ***4113***
Title: Project **"Conservation of Biodiversity in Zones of Palm Oil Cultivation in Colombia"**
Contract number of non-refundable financing: ATN/FM-13216-CO
Country: Colombia
Beneficiary: National Federation of Palm Oil Growers (FEDEPALMA)
Sector/Subsector: Environmental Programs
Board Approval Date: 19/04/2012
Eligibility date first disbursement: 22/04/2013
Amount of Non-Reimbursable Financing of Investment Agreement
Original amount: 4.250.000 (GEF donation)
Current amount 4.250.000
Co-financing: 14.330.000
Total cost of the project: 18.580.000
Months of execution
From approval: 60
From the effectiveness of the Agreement of Non-Reimbursable Investment Financing: 56
Disbursement periods
Original date of final disbursement: 19/07/2017
Current final disbursement date: 19/10/2018
Cumulative extension (months): 15 months
Special extension (months): N/A
Disbursements
Total amount of disbursements to date: 4.250.000
Amount of co-financing disbursed and registered to date: US$11.109.559

3 INTRODUCTION

3.1 Purpose of the evaluation

The final evaluations (FE) provide an independent, comprehensive and systematic explanation of the performance at the end of the project cycle. These consider the total effort, from the design of the project to its application and conclusion; They also take into account the likelihood of sustainability and the possible impacts. It is designed to identify problems in the design of the project, evaluate the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned, as well as provide recommendations on specific actions that must be carried out to improve the execution of other projects. With this evaluation there is the opportunity to know and have indications about the success or failure of the Project.

3.2 Scope and methodology

The FE is carried out according to the guidelines, standards and procedures established in the GEF Agencies Guide to carry out Final Evaluations *("Guidelines for GEF Agencies conducting Terminal Evaluations", "GEF Evaluation Office Ethical Guidelines")*.

The evaluation uses the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. The general questions of the evaluation are presented below. With these, a series of questions was drafted that cover in depth each of these criteria included in these ToR (Annex 1).

- *Relevance*: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF area of interest and to environmental and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?
- *Effectiveness*: To what extent have the results and expected objectives of the project been achieved?
- *Efficiency*: Was the project implemented efficiently, in accordance with national and international standards and standards?
- *Sustainability*: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic or environmental risks to sustain the long-term results of the project?
- *Impact*: Are there indications that the project has contributed to improving biodiversity, or that it has allowed progress towards these results?

The evaluation must provide information based on credible, reliable and useful evidence. The evaluation follows a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close involvement with government officials, in particular the operational focal point of the GEF, the IDB Country Office, the project team, the GEF/IDB Regional Technical Adviser and interested parties. key (Annex 2). A mission was carried out, in which he visited the project office and other key actors in Bogotá, Villavicencio and Santa Marta.

The dimensions described above were assessed, according to the evaluator's criterion, using the rating keys of the "GEF Agencies Guide to carry out final evaluations", which is presented in Table 4.

Table 4: **Evaluation rating key table**

CALIFICACIONES DE RELEVANCIA, EFECTIVIDAD, EFICIENCIA, E IMPACTO	CALIFICACIONES DE SOSTENIBILIDAD (Y RIESGO[2])
6: Highly Satisfactory (H**S**): it did not present deficiencies	4. Probable (**P**): Insignificant risks for sustainability.
5: Satisfactory (**S**): it presents minor deficiencies	
4: Moderately satisfactory (**MS**): moderate deficiencies	3. Moderately probable (**MP**): moderate risks
3. Moderately unsatisfactory (**MI**): important deficiencies	
2. Unsatisfactory (**I**): more important deficiencies	2. Moderately unlikely (**MU**): Significant risks
1. Highly unsatisfactory (**HI**): serious deficiencies	1. Unlikely (**U**): Serious risks

Source: Adapted from GEF 2008.

[2] The risk reads contrary to sustainability; thus, an unlikely risk is that of least risk.

4 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The objective of the Project was to "contribute to the conservation of biodiversity and to a sustainable management of the palm systems, through better planning and adoption of agro-ecological practices in zones of expansion of the palm tree activity", through the actions that could deploy based on the following components (BID 2012):

"Component 1: Planning and environmentally sound management of palm systems (***US$8,80 millions).*** This component seeks to address the problem of the lack of knowledge among palm growers about the importance of conservation and environmentally sound management of palm systems. For this, the component seeks to generate information and tools that facilitate the planning of crop expansion considering the values of biodiversity and environmental services. It will also support the dissemination and adoption of low environmental impact agricultural practices. The component includes: (i) support in the definition of areas suitable for palm cultivation within the territorial order, taking into account criteria for crop sustainability; (ii) creation of an extension and socialization program on ecological characteristics of expansion areas, zoning and planning tools; (iii) design and implementation of conversion plans for environmentally sound agricultural practices for the management of land, soil, pests and biological control; and (iv) support in the adoption of specific interventions that generate biological connectivity of the palm landscapes, such as the implementation of river barriers, living fences, and the definition of conservation corridors to generate ecological connectivity of the landscape. These actions will be implemented through the strengthening of the extension services of the palm sector, in coordination with the UAATAS.

"Component 2 Conservation and valuation of environmental services in palm systems (US$4,56 millions). This component seeks to contribute to the economic valuation of the services provided by ecosystems in areas of palm cultivation and expansion. For this, it will support the analysis for the conceptualization and definition of economic incentives for the conservation of HCVA. The component will finance: (i) identification of HCVA and development of management plans for their protection and restoration; (ii) cost-benefit studies associated with the provision of environmental services associated with palm systems and HCVAs in cultivation and expansion areas; and (iii) development of compensation schemes for conservation through payment for environmental services. Activities to strengthen the palm extension services (training and experimental learning) will be financed to accompany the activities of this component. "

"Component 3: Differentiated uses and markets for products that contribute to biodiversity (US$2,76 millions). This component seeks to develop capacity to facilitate the access of palm growers to differentiated markets through the implementation of environmental sustainability criteria in crop management and expansion practices (e.g., RSPO or Rainforest Alliance certification standards). In addition, the promotion and marketing of agrobiodiversity products will be supported as a strategy to contribute to the integrated management of palm farming systems, local food security and the increase in income of small producers. These actions will generate capacity in the palm guild to promote the adoption of practices conducive to compliance with international certification schemes. The component will finance: (i) analysis of opportunities on biodiversity and access to differentiated markets; (ii) diagnostics and action plans to access environmental sustainability certifications, especially the RSPO due to its international relevance; and (iii) extension program on agrobiodiversity and access to differentiated markets, through the strengthening of extension services, UAATAS and other sectoral actors (e.g. Regional Autonomous Corporations, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development). "

"Component 4: Monitoring, communication and evaluation of impacts (US$0,57 millions). This component seeks to reduce the existing knowledge gap on the effectiveness in the development of this type of intervention, through an impact evaluation that identifies the effect of the project on several indicators of interest. It also includes the creation and implementation of an outreach and introductory training strategy for palm clusters interested in the lessons learned at the end of the project. This strategy will strengthen the transversal actions of extension and capacity building, as well as the replicability of lessons learned. This component will finance: (i) evaluation of impact and results; (ii) the analysis of project performance; and (iii) the strategy of dissemination and introductory training to new palm nuclei mentioned. "

Execution Model

"The Executing Agency of the Project is the National Federation of Oil Palm Growers (FEDEPALMA), through the Project Coordination Unit (PCU), in its capacity as technical and administrative coordination entity. FEDEPALMA will be responsible for the administration of the project, including management of planning instruments, financial and accounting management, procurement and contracting processes and preparation of project progress reports. His specific responsibilities include: (i) opening separate accounts to manage project funds; (ii) prepare and send the disbursement requests to the Bank, with supporting documentation of the eligible expenses; (iii) ensure the quality of the procurement and contracting processes; (iv) verify the quality of the goods and services provided by the contractors and make the payments; (v) prepare progress reports; (vi) ensure compliance with the conditions of the agreement to be signed with the Bank, to achieve the expected results and (vii) ensure the local counterpart."

Its "main function will be the implementation of the actions planned and included within the Project Results Framework (PRF). FEDEPALMA must also establish partnerships with the Project Partner Entities, which are: Alexander von Humboldt Institute (IAvH), WWF Amazon North Regional Office and Choco-Darién and CENIPALMA, for the co-execution of the technical components of the project and secure its co-financing. These institutions will be part of the Project Steering Committee. In turn, cooperation agreements between FEDEPALMA and the Partner Entities will be signed, in accordance with the provisions of the Cooperation Agreement signed between FEDEPALMA and the IDB.

Additionally, the following will be held as Cooperating Entities and strategically linked in the achievement of specific products of the Project: Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MADR), Institute of Hydrology, Meteorology and Environmental Studies (IDEAM), National Natural Parks of Colombia (PNN), four regional environmental authorities (CORMACARENA, CORPORINOQUIA, CORPOCESAR, and CORPAMAG), and six beneficiary palm clusters. "

5 FINDINGS

5.1 Results´ framework and identified risks

In the design

The framework (matrix) of results presented a vertical logic: the indicators responded to the results and products, the results and products to the components and the components to the objective. The objectives, components, results, products and indicators to be met were ambitious, but ultimately feasible; however, some were unclear and in some cases exclusive (randomization and biological corridors, components 1 and 4). In addition, both the components and the results responded and were connected to the development problems identified in the Grant Proposal (PFNR), which was confirmed through the interviews conducted during the fieldwork.

The project sought to contribute to the identification, protection and restoration of areas of high conservation value (HCVA) and sustainable management of the palm agroecosystems, through better planning and the adoption of agro-ecological practices in areas of expansion of the activity Palm tree. The idea of Component 1 was to plan for the expansion of the crop with agro-ecological criteria; while Component 2 sought the assessment and conservation of environmental services in palm systems. Component 3 sought to facilitate the access of palm growers to differentiated markets, through the RSPO (or Rainforest Alliance) certification and the marketing of agrobiodiversity products, as a strategy to contribute to the integrated management of palm systems, local food security, and the increase in income of small producers. Finally, Component 4 sought to reduce the existing knowledge gap on the effectiveness in the development of this type of intervention, through an impact evaluation that identified the effect of the project on several indicators of interest (Results Matrix). It also included the creation and implementation of an outreach and introductory training strategy for palm clusters interested in the lessons learned at the end of the project.

The risks identified in the TCD were logical and coherent with the development problems and an important input to determine the activities to be developed by the project. (Table 16).

In the execution

The objectives of the project were very ambitious and during the execution there were some inconsistencies, which are explained below:

- *The "support in the definition of suitable areas for the cultivation of the palm within the territorial order, taking into account criteria for the sustainability of the crop" of the C1 was described in a very general way, without specifying a clear approach of how to carry it out with project partners and government entities, so much that, according to the opinions of the majority of the interviewees with knowledge on the subject, the changes of project coordinators prompted changes in the criteria to achieve the proposed objectives. However, according to the Environmental Leader of FEDEPALMA, many of these changes were due to the adaptation of the project to standard changes in matters of sectoral planning until mid-2018, which delayed the final products of this component and the publication of the guidelines for the planning of new palm projects, which will be carried out with FEDEPALMA's own resources.*
- *The detailed impact analysis in C4 was not compatible with the establishment of conservation corridors for the ecosystem connectivity of C1: the first was designed in such a way that the beneficiaries were chosen at random and the establishment of conservation*

corridors responds to present reality in the field (cartographic multivariate analysis), which includes a variety of productive activities in a given space and not only palm. Additionally, the random selection of the participating farms did not assure the interest and commitment of the selected ones to implement the activities proposed by the project.

- *The detailed impact analysis in C4 was not compatible with the establishment of conservation corridors for the ecosystem connectivity of C1: the first was designed in such a way that the beneficiaries were chosen at random3 and the establishment of conservation corridors responds to the present reality in the field (multivariate cartographic analysis), which includes a variety of productive activities in a given territory and not only palm. Additionally, the random selection of the participating farms did not assure the interest and commitment of the selected ones to implement the activities proposed by the project.*
- *The following was proposed, that the diagnosis proved unviable and the necessary corrections were not formally made in the results matrix, changing the products that could not be achieved, by others that contributed to the sustainability of palm production:*
    - *That the palm growers should or could receive incentives or compensations for the ecosystem services of the palm farms; when in reality, palm growers are net users of these services. In addition, no incentive scheme or payment for environmental services at a public level in Colombia is in operation at this time; although there are some examples at the private level, especially for the provision of water.*
    - *That value chains of biodiversity products could be generates, when in reality, these activities are not within their "core business" or were not interesting from the point of generating financial benefits.*
- *Most interviewees with knowledge in this topic agreed that there were changes in criteria regarding the definition of the products and the methodology to be used to obtain them (possibly due to the high turnover of personnel that occurred in the project and the lack of capacity of some coordinators in some cases). This, added to the inconsistencies described above, partly caused the project to present the following deficiencies in its implementation.*
    - *No relevant product was generated as support for decision making on the definition of suitable areas for palm cultivation within the territorial order, taking into account criteria for the sustainability of the crop.*
    - *No Conservation corridors could be implemented for ecosystem connectivity.*
    - *No incentive schemes or compensation for ecosystem services were implemented.*
    - *No value chains of green/agrobiodiversity markets could be established.*
    - *Aceites Manuelita, one of the randomly selected clusters, which in the first instance accepted to participate and signed an agreement with FEDEPALMA, decided not to participate in some project activities, for example, in the cost-benefit quantification studies associated with the provision of ecosystem services.*

The risk matrix of the project was handled appropriately. The risk matrix was updated every year and adjusted according to the socioeconomic and environmental needs and changes in the development context of the country (Table 17 in Annex 4).

However, there were aspects that affected the execution of the project, namely the following:

- *Partners had the expectation of being hired to execute some of the products of the consultancies and signed the agreements without having clear the limitations of their roles, according to the interviews carried out with people with knowledge of this subject.*

[3] Especially in relation to the random selection of the selected farms in every cluster.

- *The "support in defining suitable areas for palm cultivation within the territorial order, taking into account criteria for the sustainability of the crop" is an activity that requires a strong participation of the related public institutions, especially of the Cooperating Entities identified in the OM (see Section 5.2).*

Adaptive management in Project design

Project design provided a way to adapt the project according to the needs of the context; thus, FEDEPALMA, on its own initiative, was authorized to suggest modifications to the Technical Cooperation Agreement (TCA) (IDB 2012), after conducting internal consultations with project partners, in order to adapt it to the new conditions or circumstances. which could arise during the execution stage. The suggested changes should be consulted with the Bank staff in charge of supervising the Project, for which a no objection was required; specifically, the following annotations endorse it, namely:

> *"Este Manual es un instrumento flexible que debe ser revisado y validado en forma permanente para garantizar su vigencia y aplicabilidad durante la ejecución del Proyecto. De conformidad con lo dispuesto en el Convenio de Cooperación, cualquier modificación, adición o cambio que se efectúe al mismo, a solicitud de los entes involucrados en la ejecución del Proyecto, requerirá de la aprobación por parte de FEDEPALMA y la No Objeción por escrito del BID." (FEDEPALMA-BID 2012).*
>
> *"Las modificaciones, adiciones o cambios mencionados anteriormente podrán darse particularmente cuando en el proceso de ejecución del Proyecto se observe que no se está cumpliendo con su objetivo de favorecer a la población meta definida en el mismo, por limitaciones de este instrumento o por circunstancias particulares que se identifiquen en las áreas geográficas de influencia." (FEDEPALMA-BID 2012).*
>
> *"Se hará una evaluación externa de medio término cuando el 40% de los recursos BID/GEF se desembolsen. La evaluación determinará el progreso hacia las metas establecidas, el nivel de participación de los interesados, cambios positivos en los beneficiarios que resulten de la intervención y los cambios que deban realizarse a la estratega de ejecución." (BID 2012).*
>
> *"Si como resultado de la gestión del proyecto o como parte de un ejercicio de seguimiento se hace necesario modificar el Plan Operativo Anual (POA), la Coordinación del Proyecto informará tanto al Comité Directivo como al BID, sin que se requiera no objeción adicional." (PPB 2011).*
>
> *"El prestatario debe actualizar el Plan de Adquisiciones anualmente o cuando se presenten cambios sustanciales. Cualquier propuesta de revisión del Plan debe ser acordada con el Banco. La supervisión del Banco de las adquisiciones y contrataciones del proyecto se llevarán a cabo en forma ex post, excepto cuando el Plan de Adquisiciones indique lo contrario." (BID 2012).*

Adaptive management in Project execution

In order to adjust the results matrix to changes in the perspectives of the project, some changes were made that are summarized below:

- *It was not allowed to make farm investments, but it was changed to carry out investments in infrastructure and good agricultural practices, among others (FN 2018 and interviews 2018).*

- *The scope of some indicators was changed (Table 5), which will be described in more detail in the sections 5.5 and 5.6 (Table 6).*
- *Changes were made in the budget between the different components (Annex 5).*

Table 5 Changes made in the indicators of the results matrix during the execution of the project

ORIGINAL INDICATOR	MODIFIED INDICATOR	COMMENTS
Impact/result´s indicators		
Indicator 0.1.2 GHG direct emissions reduction (millions tCO_{2e})	N/A	The indicator was eliminated. From the beginning of the project this indicator was not approved as a project indicator (2011-2012).
Indicator 0.2.1 Number of ha of HCVA formally declared and managed for conservation by beneficiary producers	# hectares of HCV identified, with management plans and articulated to private conservation initiatives by beneficiary producers	This indicator was modified to (Informe semestral 2014-2015), taking into account that there are no faculties to formally declare HCVA
Indicator 0.2.2 Difference between the% of HCVA formally declared and managed for conservation, with respect to the total number of HCVA identified, in the beneficiary palm clusters and control clusters of the project	Difference in the % of areas with HCV that have management plans between beneficiary and non-beneficiary clusters	The project requested at different times to adjust the scope of the indicator because it was not feasible to guarantee that private conservation initiatives were legally protected due to their voluntary nature (according to semiannual report FEDEPALMA 2018)
Indicator 2.2.1 Difference in the number of beneficiary and control clusters involved in the design and adoption of environmental incentives or compensations	N/A	These indicators were not measured, because there was no feasibility to implement the incentive or compensation proposal
Indicator 2.2.2 Difference in the percentage of producers of beneficiary and control palm clusters that access existing incentives or environmental compensation	N/A	
Indicator 3.1.1 Percentage of small producers of fruit from selected farms in beneficiary palm clusters, who insert their agro-biodiversity products sustainably managed in new markets	N/A	Taking into account the findings of the baseline exercise, this component was not addressed by the project due to its low feasibility (FEDEPALMA 2018).
Indicator 4.3.1 Number of palm clusters presenting a letter of	N/A	Regarding the six letters of commitment from non-

ORIGINAL INDICATOR	MODIFIED INDICATOR	COMMENTS
commitment confirming their participation in the replication program		beneficiary clusters of the BPL, the Coordinator reported that the IDB and the Environmental Leader of FEDEPALMA met on October 19 and agreed to support this point with the minutes of two FEDEPALMA boards of directors held this year, in which the mandate was given to formulate the National Sustainable Palm Oil Program, which collects the results of the BPL
Product indicators		
Indicator 1.1.1 Number of studies of ecological structures at the sub-regional scale built participatively with the environmental authorities, territorial entities and the palm clusters	N/A	The scope of the indicator was varied from three to two reports, one for each region
Indicator 1.1.2 Number palm aptitude zoning studies at the sub-regional scale completed	Proposals for palm aptitude zoning at the sub-regional scale completed for three sub-regions to two (northern and eastern areas)	Idem above, the indicator was modified from three to two
Indicator 1.7.1 Number of conservation corridors established at the palm sub-region scale	Number of conservation corridors identified at the scale of the palm sub-region	The project modified the PMR, noting that it did not have the faculties to formally declare a corridor, but rather to influence various stakeholders for its implementation
Indicator 2.1.1 Beneficiary palm clusters (BPC) with declared HVCA	Beneficiary palm clusters with HVCA identified	The project modified the PMR, noting that it did not have the faculties to formally declare a corridor, but rather to influence various stakeholders for its implementation (FEDEPALMA 2018).
Indicator 2.3.1 Number of beneficiary palm clusters and their UAATAS trained for the identification, management, protection and restoration of HCVA and the valuation of their ecosystem services	This indicator was divided into two: ○ *1. Beneficiary palm clusters (and their UAATAS) trained in the identification, management, protection and restoration of HCVA* ○ *2. Beneficiary palm clusters (and their UAATAS) trained in*	1. Goal 6 2. Goal 6

ORIGINAL INDICATOR	MODIFIED INDICATOR	COMMENTS
	valuation of their ecosystem services	
Indicator 2.4.1 Number of incentive or compensation schemes for the conservation of HCVA and ecosystem services, designed and arranged among providers and users of ecosystem services	N/A	The initial study to identify possible incentives for conservation for the palm sector resulted in the lack of viability in the short term to implement incentive or compensation systems. Therefore, the project focused on identifying ecosystem services to demonstrate their economic, environmental and social value and did not advance in the design and adoption of environmental incentives or compensations
Indicator 2.5.1 Number of beneficiary palm-tree clusters and their UAATAS trained for the definition and access to incentives and environmental compensations	N/A	
Indicator 3.2.1 Number of palm clusters with diagnoses and Action Plans made to access sustainability certifications (RSPO or similar)	o *1. Palm clusters with diagnoses made to access sustainability certifications (RSPO or similar)* o *2. Palm clusters with Action Plans made to access sustainability certifications (RSPO or similar)*	○ *Goal 6.* ○ *Goal* 6.
Indicator 3.3.1 % producers of beneficiary groups that participate in the support program for the adoption tools and practices of agrobiodiversity and green markets	○ *1. Beneficiary palm clusters (and their UAATAS) trained in the identification, management, protection and restoration of HCVA* ○ *2. Beneficiary palm clusters (and their UAATAS) trained in the valuation of their ecosystem services*	*o 1. Goal 6.* *o 2. Goal 6.*

Source: *Semiannual reports, POA and interviews 2018.*

Some of the changes to the results matrix were not formally carried out[4], despite the fact that FEDEPALMA requested it, according to the Environmental Leader of FEDEPALMA, both in some semi-annual reports from 2014 onwards, as well as in the mid-term evaluation, for example, those related to the payment of incentives to palm growers, agrobiodiversity markets and the implementation of conservation corridors for ecosystem connectivity.

[4] In the sense of doing an adaptive management of the results matrix, identifying other products that replace those that could not be achieved, according to what had been identified in the initial baseline diagnoses.

5.2 Monitoring and evaluation

In the design

The operational manual of the project correctly stated the use of monitoring and evaluation tools (AOP, risk matrix, PMR, procurement plan and technical reports, among others), as well as the responsibilities of FEDEPALMA (as EA) and the project coordinator. The manual clearly describes the use of the AOP follow-up systems, budgetary and financial execution, external evaluations, audits and recording of the information required to establish the degree of progress of the project (semi-annual, accounting, and financial reports, among others) (FEDEPALMA-BID 2012).

During the execution

The project effectively used the following instruments for the monitoring and evaluation of the activities; despite its complexity, which entailed a process of extensive learning:

- *Semi-annual and Annual Operating Plan (AOP): with which the planning and monitoring of the activities were carried out.*
- *Results and risk matrix that was updated annually.*
- *Project Monitoring Report (PMR): which collected information on progress in the products and results of the project.*
- *Multi-year execution plan and follow-up reports (start-up, semi-annual, annual and final and at some point monthly reports on compliance with the work plan).*
- *Annual budget and partial (annual) financial statements of the project: internal FEDEPALMAs instrument and contractual requirement, audited by an external firm.*
- *Procurement Plan (PP): updated at least every 12 months, which provided administrative monitoring of the project's goods and services.*
- *Consulting reports: the contracts had the terms of reference with the Bank's no objection in accordance with the provisions of the MOP.*
- *Project Implementation Report (PIR) and Tracking tools.*
- *Technical Committees and Steering Committees: they were managed by the coordinators of each component, with quarterly meetings.*

The instruments described above were used in the project, which allowed keeping track of all activities, financial execution, and acquisitions, among others.

The AOP achieved the purpose of planning the activities to be carried out during the following year. The logic was followed that activities that could not justifiably be carried out as planned, were updated in the PMR and planned for later years of the project. This procedure was carried out as appropriate according to the bank's procedures.

However, there was a deficiency in the use of these instruments in making decisions regarding the staff of the PCU, according to most of the interviewees with knowledge in this topic, since there was evidence of a high turnover of personnel and in some cases delays in the replacement of personnel who were not fulfilling the assigned responsibilities.

5.3 Relevant actors and coordination of the application by FEDEPALMA, IDB and partners

In Project design

The OMP and the TCA also presented a detailed and adequate design to facilitate the fulfillment of the objectives, results and products of the project internally in the administrative and technical matters, as well as in regard to the partner entities. Both the MOP (2012) and the PFNR (2012) specified in detail the responsibilities of the project partners and the Steering Committee:

- *"Las Entidades Socias del proyecto serán el Instituto Alexander von Humboldt (IAvH), la Oficina Programa Regional Amazonas Norte y Chocó Darién de WWF y CENIPALMA. Estas entidades serán parte del Comité Directivo del Proyecto y como tal darán las orientaciones estratégicas para su desarrollo."*
- *"En seguimiento a lo establecido en las Estipulaciones Especiales, inciso Tercero, del Convenio de Cooperación, FEDEPALMA realizará las gestiones necesarias para asegurar la disponibilidad de estos recursos de cofinanciamiento del Proyecto, de acuerdo a la planificación de los recursos necesaria para su adecuada ejecución."*

Cooperating entities were defined, strategically linked in the achievement of specific products of the Project, namely the following: the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MADR), the Institute of Hydrology, Meteorology and Environmental Studies (IDEAM), National Natural Parks of Colombia (PNN), four regional environmental authorities (CORMACARENA, CORPORINOQUIA, CORPOCESAR, and CORPAMAG), and the six beneficiary palm clusters.

Inside FEDEPALMA, for the management of the funds, a Project Coordination Unit composed of the National Coordinator, Administrative and Financial Assistant was conveniently designed. Additionally, there was a technical coordinator for each component and field support for each region. The National Project Coordinator reported to the Leader of the Sectorial Planning and Environmental Development Area of FEDEPALMA, who supervised the technical development of the project. The consultants hired for the project reported to the National Project Coordinator. The supervision of the consultancies was carried out in conjunction with the technical units involved of FEDEPALMA and the project partners.

During Project execution

The key actors of the project are presented in Table 18 of Annex 6. FEDEPALMA is composed of and represents most of the Colombian palm growers. It is made up of small, medium and large palm oil growers, who operate on a corporate, associative or individual scale, as well as palm oil extractors. FEDEPALMA promotes environmental and social responsibility among its members. In general, FEDEPALMA has both technical and administrative capacity to be chosen as the executing agency for the project; however, the response timing, due to the difficulty of the procedures - surely because it is an entity that manages public funds - were slow and cumbersome. According to the interviews conducted, the entity fully appropriated the project during 2018, but did not show the same interest since the beginning.

With respect to the partners of the project, IAvH, WWF and CENIPALMA, according to the opinion of the majority of the interviewees with knowledge in the subject, because at the beginning of the execution of the project they expected to be hired as consultants or receive funds from the project - to execute some of the studies described in the results matrix, they lost a bit of interest, which despite having participated in the project, did not provide the added value as expected in its design.

MADR was not adequately involved during the first years of the project - like IDEAM -; however, during the last year their involvement was greater, especially in relation to C1. PNN had a relatively adequate participation in the project, especially regarding the definition of biological corridors.

The four regional environmental authorities participated very closely with the project in all the components and the six palm clusters, except “Aceites Manuelita”, especially in relation to training, knowledge transfer and technical assistance.

To coordinate the execution and operational issues, the following work meetings were carried out effectively, namely the following:

- *Semi-annual meetings of the Steering Committee: approximately every semester, in which the results of the project were reported, the AOP was approved and policy decisions and follow-up of the project were made. Extraordinarily other meetings were held depending on the needs, for example, when project extensions were requested.*
- *Technical coordination meetings for every component at least every two weeks, in which participated the representative of FEDEPALMA.*
- *Meetings with IDB, virtual or in person, approximately every 15 days, or whenever it was requested: in which updates were provided about the achievement of objectives, goals and products and operational problems that were presented were solved.*
- *Technical Committees, several meetings depending on the needs during each semester, in which feedback was given to the work of the PCU and the consultants, by the partner entities.*
- *• Follow-up meetings with the consultants of each component.*

The project and FEDEPALMA signed cooperation agreements in the framework of the execution of the BPL in order to achieve the objectives more effectively, creating synergies. The list of the main agreements signed is presented in Annex 7.

5.4 Relevance

In summary, this project is rated as highly satisfactory (HS), since it harmonizes the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries and stakeholders and, the results are clearly linked to development problems and national and international regulations.

5.4.1 Alignment of the project with the development problems

Design analysis: context

The TCD and the OP clearly identified the development problems that were intended to be solved and with which the initial design of the project was aligned, namely the following (for more details see Table 20 Annex 8):

- *The cultivation of oil palm (Elaeis guineensis Jacq.) In Colombia is growing significantly.*
- *The expected growth for the Colombian palm sector can lead to environmental impacts.*
- *From the diagnoses made by the Ministry of Environment, Housing and Territorial Development, MAVDT (2008), and UNDP (2010), it is concluded that in Colombia there are factors causing the loss of biodiversity, associated with palm expansion and cultivation method.*

During its design, this project was widely discussed with the Alexander von Humboldt Institute of Biological Resources Research (IAvH), Institute of Hydrology, Meteorology and Environmental Studies (IDEAM), National Parks Unit, World Wildlife Fund (WWF - Amazon North and

Choco Darién), Regional Environmental Authorities, CENIPALMA and FEDEPALMA, among others.

Analysis of the execution: change in context

During the execution, although the initial objectives of the project were not altered, according to most of the interviewees with knowledge on the subject, socioeconomic and environmental changes occurred in the country that had repercussions on the project, namely:

- *The initial goal of expansion of the palm areas was changed to increase in productivity.*
- *When the present project was formulated (2007-2011), there was no planning unit (for new extensions of palm) that exists today in the agricultural sector (Agricultural Rural Planning Unit, UPRA), so that an attempt was made to cover this need with the project. The idea was that the activities described in Component 1 (C1) would provide location guidelines in accordance with environmental issues and biodiversity, information[5] that finally served the UPRA to define the official guidelines for the palm sector.*
- *There were environmental emergencies that affected the restoration tasks.*
- *The Colombian peso was devalued[6], which implied a greater amount of financial resources in local currency, which allowed that it could be invested in the purchase of inputs and goods (water pumps, wire, trees and, freatimeters, among others) in the type farms of the six beneficiary clusters.*

5.4.2 Connection of the project with national and international legal regulations

The National Development Plan (NDP) 2010-2014[7] defined five engines for growth and employment generation; that included agriculture, prioritizing the palm sector to increase productivity and competitiveness. The need to include environmental considerations to guarantee agricultural sustainability and focus innovation processes on the farm to increase productivity was highlighted. Emphasis was placed on the importance of implementing an integral management of water resources in private participation schemes, as well as instruments for the preparation of land within the farms. Finally, the expansion and diversification of the internal and external market with high quality agricultural products was contemplated, as well as the adoption of certifications that differentiate sustainable practices in production, transformation and commercialization, which is in accordance with the RSPO.

The NDP 2010-2014 also proposed expanding and diversifying domestic and foreign markets with quality products, ensuring the availability of basic food products for food security and the adoption of certifications aimed at differentiating products in the markets associated with the incorporation of sustainable practices in production, processing. and marketing.

The document of the National Council of Social and Economic Policy CONPES 3510 of 2008 "Policy Guidelines to Promote the Sustainable Production of Biofuels in Colombia" highlighted the importance for the agricultural sector of differentiating the biofuels produced in the country (among which is the palm biodiesel) for its social and environmental responsibility. This project aimed to identify alternative palm oil markets known for their social and environmental considerations, for which efforts were made to adopt the principles and criteria of the RSPO or other

---

5 The information generated consisted basically in cartographic information with five variables: legal exclusion, edapho-climatic aptitude, supply and environmental risk, legal conditions, and other areas of environmental importance.

6 The Exchange rate changed from $1.871,49 per dollar in 1-11-2011 to $3.056,37 in 18-10-2018 (BCC 2018, http://www.banrep.gov.co/es/trm).

7 http://www.dnp.gov.co/PND/PND20102014.aspx

socio-environmental schemes. FEDEPALMA is not only a member of the RSPO, but also led, with the support of the Alexander von Humboldt Institute (IAvH) and WWF, the process for the National Interpretation of the Principles and Criteria of the RSPO for Colombia, which has already been supported by the RSPO Board. In addition, Colombian legislation (Law 99/9310, Law 1151/0711) aimed to generate mechanisms for the creation of payment schemes for environmental services in areas of importance for the conservation of water resources, linked to HCVA in palm-growing areas. The regulations were complemented with the intention of implementing the National Strategy for Payment for Environmental Services and the National Production and Sustainable Consumption Policy of the MAVDT (2010), which sought to change unsustainable patterns of production and consumption[8].

The attempt to define and adopt strategies based on the ecosystem for the planning of oil palm production, in the design of the project, was consistent with the PND, the CONPES document 3477, 2007, Strategy for Competitive Development of the Colombian sector of the oil palm, and with the Law 388 of 1977 and the Decree 3600 of 2007. The project promoted the efficient use of the land in accordance with the production potential of the regions and the reconversion in balance with the environment, since it carried out an analysis of the HCVA and provided inputs to the UPRA for zoning proposals for oil palm; information that could be key to identify the new areas of aptitude for the expansion and renewal of oil palm[9].

The project supported the advances in the strategies of the Cleaner Production National Policy, aimed at the productive sectors. The project sought coherence with the policies of land use change and forestry included in the policy "Bicentennial Vision of Colombia 2019", the "Development Plan", and the policy of "Stimulus for Commercial Reforestation". The alignment of the project also directly coincided with the IDB Country Strategy with Colombia 2012-2014, specifically in the following areas of dialogue[10]: ii) environmental management and adaptation to the consequences of climate change and vi) energy efficiency and renewable energy (IDB 2015).

In compliance with Article 6 of the Convention on Biological Diversity, this project contributed to the incorporation of biodiversity considerations into the plans and programs of the sector, for example, landscape management tools (LMT) and economic and ecological valuation (EEV). In the same line, it contributed to the National Biodiversity Policy (1996[11]) and the Technical

---

[8] The project was also consistent with the provisions of document 3680 of 2010 of the CONPES, which defined the Guidelines for the Strengthening of the National System of Protected Areas (SINAP), and with Decree 2372 of 2010, which regulated the SINAP. These documents established the regulatory framework for all protected areas of public or private, national or regional government.

[9] Through the diversification of production landscapes within the oil palm regions (component 3), the project in its design sought to be aligned with the PND strategy to increase income and reduce the vulnerability of the population to the external shocks. The NDP proposed adapting the institutional framework for rural development and competitiveness. As one of the strategies to achieve this, the NDP proposed strengthening the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development for the sustainable use of biodiversity through the promotion of bio-trade activities. In particular, create a specific institutional framework in coordination with the Ministry of the Environment, Housing and Territorial Development, which promotes bio-trade as an alternative for sustainable development.

The operation was also included in the Document Country Program 2012, the expected results of the project contributed to the indicator "number of products certified by environmental programs", so the project contributed to reach the regional goal of development of the GCI-9, associated to the sectoral priority of "protection of the environment, response to climate change, promotion of renewable energy and increase of food security", terrestrial and marine protected areas as a proportion of the territorial surface and its product number of projects with components that contribute to improving the management of terrestrial and marine protected areas. In addition, it was consistent with the last approved Country Strategy (GN-2648-1), which identified the agricultural and environmental management sector and adaptation to the consequences of climate change as areas for dialogue, which, in turn, was in accordance with the National Development Plan 2010-2014, which reiterated the importance of environmental protection, risk management, territorial planning and institutional strengthening for the socioeconomic development of the country. In this way, the project supported the implementation of national priorities related to climate change and the agricultural sector, through energy efficiency, established by the Colombian Government through the National Energy Plan known as "Comprehensive energy strategy, 2003 vision -2020".

[10] The project was indirectly aligned with the following strategic sectors: (ii) science, technology and innovation, (iii) trade and (v) social protection and; with the following areas of dialogue: i) agriculture and, iii) business promotion policies.

[11] http://www.minambiente.gov.co/documentos/politica_nacional-biodiversidad.pdf

Proposal of the National Action Plan "Biodiversity of the XXI Century[12]". The project also helped to prevent the deterioration of habitats and to raise awareness about conflicts of use, through the analysis of HCVA, ecological structures and the zoning of the aptitude of oil palm. This operation generated a crucial progress in the increase of knowledge of biodiversity in oil palm areas and in the mapping of suitability based on the ecosystem, which can be replicated in other productive activities within the agricultural sector.

Colombia formulated a National Policy on Sustainable Production and Consumption of the Ministry of the Environment, Housing and Territorial Development (2010), which aimed to change the unsustainable patterns of production and consumption of different sectors of society. This implied the availability of regulatory and financial instruments for their implementation in productive sub-sectors. This project contributed to the implementation of this policy: greater adoption of agro-ecological practices in oil palm plantations (component 1).

Finally, the project contributed to objective 2 of the GEF-4 Biodiversity Focal Strategy, which sought to incorporate biodiversity considerations into productive landscapes, through: (i) the development of specific tools for planning oil palm activities with ecosystem criteria, emphasizing the reduction of threats from the productive sector to natural ecosystems; and (ii) strengthen the national capacity to adopt certification standards that promote better environmental and social practices. Specifically, the project included actions aimed at the identification, evaluation, conservation and management of HCVAs, as well as LMT and EEV referred to above, in oil palm clusters to support the strengthening of local and regional networks of protected areas.

5.5 Impact

In summary, this project is rated as moderately satisfactory (MS), since although it has some deficiencies, awareness and concrete advances have been developed in terms of biodiversity and sustainability, in a sector that has been much questioned worldwide.

The impact/outcome indicators were not necessarily specific SMART[13], specific, measurable (targets were set), not all affordable, relevant as they responded to the development problems (and in the vertical logic to the components and products) and limited at the time of technical cooperation (TC). A more detailed analysis of these indicators is presented below.

In the compliance tables presented below, the original comments that appeared in the results matrix are presented - *in italics and with a small size*. And, with normal lyrics, the comments of the evaluator, according to the interviews conducted and the information provided.

5.5.1 Impact/result Project indicators

Three indicators exceeded the goal, one did not reach it and one does not have the data at the moment. One indicator was eliminated.

- *Project indicator 0.1.1:* Coverage analysis with satellite images. At the end of the project it was concluded that the beneficiary and control clusters affected a maximum of 2% of natural areas for expansion. The impact analysis differentiating the beneficiary and

[12] According to Juan Carlos Espinosa, Environmental Leader of FEDEPALMA, "the project contributed a lot to this strategy, while in this policy it is established that the conservation of biodiversity in a mega-diverse country like Colombia does not only happen in protected areas but also in the productive systems. That is why the Humboldt Institute had developed the concept of Landscape Management Tools (LMT), which was landed for the palm sector in the framework of the project. In addition, a first exercise of Ecological and Economic Valuation of ecosystem services provided by the HCVs and LMTs to the palm production systems was carried out ".

[13] SMART: specific, measurable, affordable, relevant and limited in time.

control clusters carried out by the corresponding consultancy, was carried out with a proxy variable "natural coverage", since the HVCA could not be analyzed in the control clusters, so the data is approximate (FEDEPALMA 2018).

- *Project indicator 0.1.2:* From the beginning of the project this indicator was not approved as Project Indicator (2011-2012).
- *Project indicator 0.2.1:* This Indicator was modified to (Semiannual Report 2014-2015), taking into account that there is no capacity to formally declare the HVCA.

  The project complied with the identification of HVCA and the definition of management plans for 16,761 hectares compared to the goal of 1,000 hectares
- *Project indicator 0.2.2:* The project requested at different times the adjustment of the scope of the indicator, because it was not feasible to guarantee that the private conservation initiatives were legally protected due to their voluntary nature (according to the semi-annual report FEDEPALMA 2018). According to the final report of the project (FEDEPALMA 2018) the result of the measurement of the indicator is not yet available.
- *Project indicator 0.3.1*: The net income of the producers for sale of palm is presented in **Table 7**

  The proposed goal was 5% higher than the baseline income. The initial diagnosis showed that the average income of the beneficiaries was US$894.44/ha/year, so the goal should have been US$939.16, which means that the Indicator is met.
- *Project indicator 0.3.2*: The goal was exceeded, since the difference in the income change between the control and beneficiary farms exceeded the goal of 5% and reached 29%; that is, the project has a positive impact - greater than expected - on the income of the beneficiary palm growers.

Table 6 Compliance of the impact/result Project indicators

IMPACT/RESULT INDICATORS	BASE LINE	GOAL	CURRENT ACCOMPLISHMENT	%	COMMENTS
Project objective: Contribute to the conservation of biodiversity and sustainable management of palm systems, through better planning and adoption of agro-ecological practices in areas of expansion of the palm tree activity					
0.1: Reduction in the percentage of new areas under palm cultivation that have displaced areas of high conservation value (HCVA)					
Indicator 0.1.1 % areas of HCVA that have been transformed to palm cultivation in a period of 5 years	17,5% National natural areas [14] y 24,8% natural areas Meta Dept.[15]	0% of HCVA transformed in the intervention areas of the project	2%	89%	*Documented at the beginning and end of the project (2005-2010 for baseline, 2010-2015 for final goal).* *During the first year, the baseline will be established to identify HCVAs. See indicator component 4.*
Indicator 0.1.2 Direct reduction of GHG emissions (million tCO_{2e})	0%	10%	N/A	N/A	*There are no substantial changes in economic, social or environmental conditions that affect the measurement of the indicator.* This indicator was not measured and was not included in the documents finally approved for the project.
0.2: Increase in the extension of HCVA in the palm cluster that are legally protected and under conservation management (protection and restoration)					
Indicator 0.2.1 ***Current***: # hectares of HCV identified, with management plans and articulated to private conservation initiatives by beneficiary producers ***Original***: # of HVCA formally declared and managed for preservation by beneficiary producers	0	1.000	16.761	1.600%	*There are no substantial changes in economic, social or environmental conditions that affect the measurement of the indicator.*
Indicator 0.2.2	0	15			*The following assumptions were taken into account: i) the HCVA estimate in the beneficiary nuclei is 10% of its extension (approximately 7,000 ha); ii) 1,000 ha of HCVA are formally*

[14] Según Rodríguez & Van Hoof, 2004, "sobre la utilización anterior de las áreas de las fincas plantadas en palma de aceite, las empresas respondieron que 82,5% estaban dedicadas precedentemente a la ganadería o a la agricultura y 17,5% eran ecosistemas naturales".

[15] "De acuerdo con WWF (2007), en el departamento del Meta se plantaron a la fecha del estudio 14.608 ha. de palma de aceite. El análisis de las coberturas vegetales correspondientes a las 14.600 ha nuevas de palma de aceite en el 2005 respecto al mapa de Ecosistemas de la Cuenca del Orinoco colombiano del 2001 (IAvH, 2004) indica que aproximadamente el 24,8% (3.626 ha) de las ha nuevas correspondían a ecosistemas de bosques naturales, cuerpos de agua y sabanas de piedemonte y el 75,2% restante (10.982,5 ha) eran cultivos transitorios, pastos y áreas intervenidas en el año 2001". (Evaluación Ambiental Estratégica de Biocombustibles en Colombia (MAVDT, Palacios. et al., 2007).

IMPACT/RESULT INDICATORS	BASE LINE	GOAL	CURRENT ACCOMPLISHMENT	%	COMMENTS
Current: Difference in the % of areas with HCV that have management plans between beneficiary and non-beneficiary palm clusters ***Original***: Difference between % of HCVA formally declared and managed for their conservation, with respect to the total number of HCVA identified, in the beneficiary palm and control clusters					*protected in the beneficiary nuclei (approximately 15% of the HCVA); in the control clusters, 0% of the existing HCVA areas are formally protected. Therefore, the difference is 15% - 0% = 15%.* **The consolidated information is not available at the time of the final evaluation report.**
0.3: Increase in the average net income of small fruit producers associated with the project because of their participation in it					
Indicator 0.3.1 Average net income of small producers of fruit beneficiaries (US$/ha/year)	966,73 (1.811,5)	1.015,07 (1.902,1)	1.674,9	173%	*The preliminary base line figure is estimated from average prices (2005-2009) of fruit and average yields (2005-2009) in the intervention zones. These figures will be corroborated or corrected in the first semester, with field data. Production: 16,879 tons/ha/year; Price fruit: 107,3251625 USD/ton (233.508 COP/ton to 2.175,71. COP/USD)=1.811,54 USD/ha/yrar.* Between parentheses appear the estimated amounts in the results matrix and above these the amounts resulting from the initial diagnosis. The problem was that the values in the results matrix were not updated.
Indicator 0.3.2 Difference in percentage change in average net income between small fruit producers' beneficiary and control	0	5%	45%	900%	*The goals assume that the program does not benefit the control group; however, these goals will be re-evaluated during implementation when it is identified whether or not there are benefits to the control clusters. Randomization implies that the difference between control group and beneficiaries for baseline is equal to zero, which will be raised during the first semester of the project on a representative sample.* *The increase in income is assumed by:* *- Decrease in expenses (self-consumption family production).* *- Possible additional markets for agrobiodiversity.* *- Opportunities recognitions of differentiated markets.*

Note: *The color indicates an alert in compliance, according to the information provided.*
The comments in italics in the last column correspond to the results matrix of the project (BID 2012).

Source: BID __, Informe Semestral 2018, Informe Final 2018, interviews 2018.

Table 7 **Income of treatment and control producers**

VARIABLE	MONITORING		BASE	
	Control	Treaties	Control	Treaties
Net income from palm sales (US$/ha)	1.395,08	1.674,88	968,73	966,73
Percentage change	120		-0,51	

Source: Preliminary results impact evaluation 2018.

5.5.2 Impact/result Component 1 indicators

Two indicators exceeded the goal, two did not reach it, and for one data is not available at the moment

- *Result indicator 1.1.1*: Although the goal was not met, it is evident that there is a lot of awareness among palm producers and clusters about the importance of implementing agro-ecological management in their farms. FEDEPALMA expects that the goal will be reached soon.
- *Result indicator 1.1.2*: the producers who at least apply 50% of good practices are the following: control 21.34% and treaties 53.24%.
- *Result indicator 1.2.1*: According to the final report of the project (FEDEPALMA 2018), the project generated cartographic information with different variables that allows the identification of expansion areas for palm cultivation at a sub-regional scale for the six beneficiary clusters; However, it clarifies that the focus of the guild and the project focused on increasing productivity of the current plantations and not on the expansion of the crops.

Table 8 **Compliance with the result indicator of Component 1 (C1): Environmentally sound planning and management of palm systems *(US$8,80 millions)***

RESULT INDICATOR	BASE LINE	GOAL	CURRENT ACHIEVEMENT	%	COMMENTS
1.1 Increase in the palm cultivation area under agroecological management (without certification)					
Indicator 1.1.1 Area of palm cultivation under agro-ecological management (without certification) by the beneficiaries (ha)	4.000	25.000	22.269	89%	*There are no substantial changes in economic, social or environmental conditions that affect the measurement of the indicator.* The goal was not met.
Indicator 1.1.2 Difference in the percentage of palm cultivation under agro-ecological management between beneficiary and control palm plantations	0%	30%	31.9%	106%	*Randomization implies that the difference between control group and beneficiaries for the baseline is equal to zero* The goal was exceeded. There was greater agro-ecological management of the beneficiary farms.
1.2 Núcleos palmeros tienen identificadas áreas de expansión para el cultivo de palma con criterios ecosistémicos a escala subregional					

RESULT INDICATOR	BASE LINE	GOAL	CURRENT ACHIEVEMENT	%	COMMENTS
Indicator 1.2.1 Difference in the percentage of areas of expansion identified with ecosystem criteria between beneficiary and control palm-tree clusters	0	100			*Randomization implies that the difference between control group and beneficiaries for the baseline is equal to zero.* **The consolidated information is not available at the time of the final evaluation report.**
1.3 Decrease in expenses associated with the use of agrochemicals by beneficiary palm growers					
Indicator 1.3.1 Annual cost of agrochemicals per hectare of beneficiaries (US$)	590*	472	461,10	109%	**Source: Duarte y Guterman (2010).*
Indicator 1.3.2 Difference in the percentage of cost reduction of agrochemicals between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries	0	20%	3,85%	19%	*Randomization implies that the difference between control group and beneficiaries for the baseline is equal to zero.* The cost of agrochemicals increased more than expected mainly in the beneficiaries of the project, due to its location and the incidence of diseases.

***Note**: The color indicates an alert in compliance, according to the information provided.*
The comments in italics in the last column correspond to the results matrix of the project (BID 2012).

Source: BID __, Informe Semestral 2018, Informe Final 2018, interviews 2018.

- *Result indicator 1.3.1*: The costs of fertilizers, pesticides and total are shown in Table 9.

Table 9 **Diferencia en el porcentaje de cambio de costos de agroquímicos entre beneficiarios y no beneficiarios (US$/ha/año)**

VARIABLE	CONTROL			TREATIES		
	Base	Monitoring	Change (%)	Base	Monitoring	Change (%)
Cost of fertilizers + pesticides per ha (%)	590	483,47	-18%	590	461,10	-21,85%

Source: Preliminary results of the impact evaluation 2018, with hard data from the survey.

- *Result indicator 1*.3.2: The idea of the indicator was that the beneficiary producers devote a lower percentage of costs to the use of agrochemicals. The results are shown in Table 9. However, according to Juan Carlos Espinosa, Environmental Leader of FEDEPALMA, the incidence of the diseases "pudrición del cogollo" and "marchitez letal" was higher than expected in the design of the project, which directly affected the use of agrochemicals as diseases with a strong impact on the palm population. The three beneficiary clusters, in the Northern Zone, are very close to each other, where the "pudrición del cogoyo" has greatly affected; on the other hand, the control clusters, one is closer to Cartagena and the other closer to Valledupar, where the incidence of the disease is lower. This data is still under analysis in the impact evaluation.

5.5.3 Indicadores de resultado del Componente 2

An indicator exceeded the goal, for one there is no the information at the time of the FE and for two do not apply due to its infeasibility.

- *Result indicator 2.1.1*: the goal was exceeded by much. Detailed information is found in the HCV reports of each palm cluster.
- *Result indicator 2*.1.2: there is no information at this moment.

Table 10 **Compliance with the result indicators of Component 2 (C2): Conservation and valuation of environmental services in palm systems (US$4,56 millions)**

RESULT INDICATOR	BASE LINE	GOAL	CURRENT ACHIEVEMENT	%	COMMENTS
2.1 Increase in the area under management plans for the protection and restoration of HCVA and its ecosystem services					
Indicator 2.1.1 Total extension under Management Plans for the protection and restoration of HVCA in Palm clusters (ha)	0	4.000	16.760	419%	*The existence of 10% of HCVA is assumed in the beneficiary palm clusters (7,000 ha), of which 4,000 (57%) are expected to be protected. For the calculation of indicator 2, it is assumed that around 12% of HCVA will be protected by year 5.*
Indicator 2.1.2 Difference in the percentage of the HVCA in the beneficiary and non-beneficiary palm clusters under Management Plans for protection and restoration	0	45			*Randomization implies that the difference between control group and beneficiaries for the baseline is equal to zero* **The consolidated information is not available at the time of the final evaluation report.**
2.2 Schemes of incentives or environmental compensation in the areas of intervention of the project for the conservation of the HCVA and ecosystem services provided applied					
Indicator 2.2.1 Difference in the number of beneficiary and control clusters involved in the design and adoption of environmental incentives or compensations	0	3	N/A	N/A	These indicators were not measured, because there was no feasibility to implement the incentive or compensation proposal in productive activities
Indicator 2.2.2 Difference in the percentage of producers of beneficiary and control palm clusters that access existing environmental incentives or compensations	0	66	N/A	N/A	

Note: *The color indicates an alert in compliance, according to the information provided. The comments in italics in the last column correspond to the results matrix (BID 2012).*

Source: BID __, Informe Semestral 2018, Informe Final 2018, interviews 2018.

- *Result indicator 2*.2.1 y 2.2.2: The initial study to identify possible incentives for conservation for the palm sector resulted in the lack of viability in the short term. The project focused on identifying ecosystem services to demonstrate their economic, environmental and social value and did not advance in the design and adoption of environmental incentives or compensations.

5.5.4 Result indicators of Component 3

Two indicators exceeded the goal, one did not reach it and another one did not apply due to its infeasibility.

- *Result indicator 3.1.1: Taking into account the findings of the baseline exercise, this indicator was not addressed by the project due to its low feasibility, contrary to what was planned in the design* (FEDEPALMA 2018).
- *Result indicator 3.1.2*: The study of the apicultural chain was carried out in the northern zone in the Cluster C.I. Tequendama.
- *Result indicator 3.2.1*: The goal was exceeded, as there is a lot of awareness among producers and the Colombian palm sector about the need to differentiate the Colombian product with the certification. Not everything is attributable to the project, but capitalized on this change to advance on this issue. As of today, four of the six palm clusters are RSPO certified and nationally 11 of 67; therefore, the percentage of certification in the beneficiary clusters is greater than in the control ones.
- *Result indicator 3.2.2: Although there is a generalized awareness of the need for RSPO certification, the activities carried out by the project facilitated its obtaining by the beneficiaries*.

Table 11 **Compliance with the result indicators of Component 3 (C3): Differentiated uses and markets for products that contribute to biodiversity (US$2,76 millions**

RESULT INDICATOR	BASE LINE	GOAL	CURRENT ACHIEVEMENT	%	COMMENTS
3.1 Products of agrobiodiversity promoted in local or regional markets					
Indicator 3.1.1 Percentage of small producers of fruit from selected farms in beneficiary palm clusters, who insert their agrobiodiversity products managed sustainably in new markets	0%	10%	N/A	N/A	*The farms of the small producers will be selected during the first semester of the project. At least one value chain will be worked on in each priority sub-region. The indicators are associated with products of local biodiversity. Agrobiodiversity is constituted in the variety and variability of plants, animals and microorganisms important in food and agriculture and that are derived from the relationships and interactions between the environment, genetic resources and systems and management practices used by human societies*
Indicator 3.1.2	0	3	1	33%	The goal will not be met

RESULT INDICATOR	BASE LINE	GOAL	CURRENT ACHIEVEMENT	%	COMMENTS
# Value chains of agro-biodiversity products managed sustainably by small producers in beneficiary palm clusters in each palm sub-region, which are inserted in new markets					
3.2 Palm cultivation area with socio-environmental certification (RSPO or others) increased					
Indicator 3.2.1 % extension of beneficiary palm clusters that have socio-environmental certification (RSPO or others)	6	26	45	173%	*Refers to organic, environmental, RSPO, Rain-forest Alliance certifications, or other schemes that recognize socio-environmental differences..*
Indicator 3.2.2 Percentage difference in the extension of beneficiary and control palms clusters that have socio-environmental certification (RSPO or others)	6	22	38	173%	The goal was exceeded.

***Note**: The color indicates an alert in compliance, according to the information provided.*
The comments in italics in the last column correspond to the results matrix of the project (BID 2012).

Source: BID __, Informe Semestral 2018, Informe Final 2018, interviews 2018.

5.5.5 Result indicators of Component 4

The three indicators of the component reached the goal.

- *Result indicator 4.1.1*: The report is being prepared directly by the IDB
- *Result indicator 4.3.1: On the six letters of commitment of non-beneficiary clusters of the PPB, the Coordinator reported that the IDB and the Environmental Leader of FEDEPALMA met on October 19 and agreed to support this point with the minutes of two FEDEPALMA boards of directors of this year, in which the mandate was given to formulate the National Sustainable Palm Oil Program, which includes the results of the PPB. This program was officially launched in Cali at the Palm Congress, evidencing the sector's commitment to continue advancing in environmental sustainability, for which the contribution of the PPB has clearly been a fundamental part. It was considered to be a real and tangible commitment of the sector led by FEDEPALMA to replicate the lessons learned from the PPB.*

Table 12 **Compliance with the result indicators of Component 4 (C4): monitoring, communication and evaluation of impacts**

RESULT INDICATOR	BASE LINE	GOAL	CURRENT ACHIEVEMENT	%	COMMENTS
4.1 Analysis of the impact of the program carried out					
Indicator 4.1.1 Final impact evaluation report of the program	0	1	1	100%	The goal was achieved
4.2 Analysis of the impact of the communication strategy for the dissemination of the progress of the project carried out					
Indicator 4.2.1 Final evaluation report of FEDEPALMA impact of the communication strategy of the project's progress	0	1	1	100%	The goal was achieved
4.3 Non-beneficiary palm clusters committed to FEDEPALMA in replicating the lessons learned from the program					
Indicator 4.3.1 Number of palm clusters presenting a letter of commitment confirming their participation in the replication program	0	6	6	100%	The goal was fulfilled through the launch of the National Sustainable Palm Oil Program (NSPOP) [16] and not with the 6 letters of commitment.

***Note**: The color indicates an alert in compliance, according to the information provided.*
The comments in italics in the last column correspond to the results matrix of the project (BID 2012).

Source: BID __, Informe Semestral 2018, Informe Final 2018, interviews 2018.

5.6 Effectiveness

In summary, this project is rated as moderately satisfactory (MS), since there were deficiencies in the achievement of the products, which were partly due to deficiencies in the design, and partly due to deficiencies in the execution and, no formal exercise of adaptation of the results matrix was carried out with the proposal of new product indicators in substitution of those that were unviable.

In this section compliance is analyzed in the product indicators, in accordance with the provisions of the technical cooperation agreement and the MOP. Additional details on compliance with the product indicators can be found in the tables in Annex 9.

[16] According to an interview on 13-02-2019 with Juan Carlos Espinosa, Environmental Leader of FEDEPALMA, the NSPOP was launched in June 2018 and currently they have hired a Manager and a consultant who are working on its structuring, under the three pillars of sustainability (environmental, social and economic). The definition of objectives, strategies and search for financing is underway (with Europe - Germany, Norway and Holland - and USAID); but the fundamental idea is to scale the BPL to other palm clusters, which will depend on the availability of resources.

5.6.1 Effectiveness of Component 1 products

All goals of this component were met, except 1.2.1 by 50%.

Although it is true that the goals of this component were met, with the exception of one, according to most of the interviewees with knowledge on this issue, the products were not worked forcefully in an articulated manner with the government institutions, so the Information has not been used completely for the purpose for which it was designed. According to the Environmental Leader of FEDPALMA, the component was designed to develop planning tools for the palm trees, with which it was only necessary to include planning norms and references of the governmental entities, which were framed in the territorial zoning policies and water resources, biodiversity and risks policies.

Table 21 in Annex 9 shows the results for each of the product indicators of Component 1.

- *Product indicator 1.1.1:* In the eastern zone, two sub-regions were presented, in this sense there were three studies in total (one in the north and two in the east). The coverage of the studies carried out covered the entire area of initial influence, but was unified in two reports, one for each region, which did not vary the scope.

  The ecological structures were worked within the framework of the integral vision of conservation in palm landscapes, which sought to integrate various types of criteria and productive and environmental variables for crop planning.

- *Product indicator 1.1.2:* Same as previous justification. The wording of the indicator "Proposals for the zoning of palm fitness at the sub-regional scale completed" was changed from three sub-regions to two (north and east). Each zoning study covers the territorial environment of the set of palm cluster at sub-regional level

- *Product indicator 1.2.1:* In the month of April 2018, a very preliminary training was carried out in the eastern area where the UAATAS of the three beneficiary clusters participated and the methodology designed by the project was presented to them. In the North Zone the workshop had not been carried out.

  Subsequently, a pedagogical tool (game) was designed for the realization of a day of training to UAATAS of beneficiary clusters, including the identification of the entities that can apply for permits and access to information.

  The information generated by the project has been included in different pieces of communication (presentations, documents) as support for the socialization of the component's results to different audiences (two regional forums, National Forum, Competitiveness Committees, Institutions, Donors and Banking).

  Also, with counterpart resources from FEDEPALMA, progress is made in generating the systematization of what was generated in the planning component, for delivery to beneficiary clusters.

  The other workshops were not carried out due to problems with the hiring of the planning coordinator. FEDEPALMA included in its own budget the realization of these workshops during the next year.

- *Product indicator 1.2.2:* This product met the socializations of the proposed methodologies for the generation of the Integral Vision of Conservation in Palm Biodiversity Landscapes with the territorial entities of CORPAMAG, CORPOCESAR, National Natural Parks in the northern sub-region and the Secretariats of Agriculture and Environment,

CORMACARENA, CORPORINOQUIA, National Natural Parks and SIRAP (Regional Systems of Protected Areas) Orinoquia eastern region.

- *Product indicator 1.3.1:* The Diagnoses and Agro-ecological Conversion Plans are developed by farm in the beneficiary palm clusters. The indicator was divided in two and in both the goal was exceeded.

    - *Beneficiary farms with diagnoses carried out. Goal 80%. Achievement: 85%.*

    In the framework of the baseline surveys of the project, the diagnosis was made in the adoption of BAP and a report was generated for each palm cluster on the state of adoption. From 192 beneficiary providers chosen in the random process participated in the diagnosis (survey) 163, exceeding the defined goal

- *Beneficiary farms with agro-ecological conversion plans made. Goal 80%. Achievement 82%.*

    159 farm plans were prepared out of the 192 initially proposed. The total coverage in hectares of the farm plans was 29,037 ha. It was not possible to cover all the beneficiary providers since some stopped having commercial agreements with the anchor companies and others were not interested in participating.

- *Product indicator 1.4.1*: Trainings within the framework of the Finca Plan. Beneficiaries chosen in the random process, 163 participated in the diagnosis (survey) exceeding the defined goal.

- *Product indicator 1.5.1*: The Diagnostics and Implementation Plans of Complementary Landscape Management Tools were developed by farm in the beneficiary palm clusters. Complementary refers to nectariferous and coverages that facilitate connectivity. Additionally, in the implementation of LMT, nurseries were established.

- *Product indicator 1.6.1*: The extension was made in the framework of Finca Plan and establishment of nurseries.

- *Product indicator 1.7.1*: The project modified the PMR stating that it did not have the faculties to formally declare a corridor, but to influence several stakeholders for its implementation.

    The impact of the project on the establishment of corridors consisted of the following activities:

    - *(i) present a proposal with cartographic information associated with potential corridors in each area of the project,*
    - *(ii) implement landscape management tools in the palm farms that are located in the identified corridors and,*
    - *(iii) generate a connectivity pilot proposal for the Aracataca river window.*

    Two corridors were identified at the North and East Zone sub-regions.

5.6.2 Effectiveness of Component 2 products

Four product goals were met, four were not met, of which two showed no feasibility in the initial diagnosis.

Table 21 Annex 9 shows compliance with the output indicators of Component 2, namely the following:

- *Product indicator 2.1.1*: The six beneficiary clusters have the HVCA identification studies. The incidence of the project in the establishment of corridors consisted in implementing landscape management tools in the palm plantations found in the identified co-corridors.

  The project modified the PMR stating that it did not have the faculties to formally declare a corridor, but rather to influence different groups of interest for its implementation (FEDEPALMA 2018). Additionally, the following communication pieces were published: HCV Guide, HCV Cards and, HCV experimental fields.

- *Product indicator 2.1.2*: The six HCVA identification studies include management plans and monitoring thereof.

- *Product indicator 2.2.1*: The ecosystem services of soil formation, pest control and pollination were evaluated in relation to good practices in the two project regions, results that showed feasibility of the activities.

  The issue was not carried out with Aceites Manuelita and it was not clear the reason why they did not allow to advance in this subject.

- *Product indicator 2.3.1*: This indicator was divided into two:

  - *1. Beneficiary palm clusters (and their UAATAS) trained in the identification, management, protection, and restoration of HCVA.*

    Goal 6, achievement 6 (100%). Trainings carried out in the framework of Finca Plan.

  - *2. Beneficiary palm clusters (and their UAATAS) trained in the valuation of their ecosystem services.*

    Goal 6, achievement 5 (83%) Workshops were held on ecosystem services with producers during the course of the consultancy, the final results were delivered to these products, and a formal journey was held with UAATAS. The socialization of final results is not done. Manuelita cluster decided not to participate in the activities.

- *Product indicator 2.3.2*: Socialization seminars were conducted on the HVCA studies with different environmental authorities and interest groups in the two project areas (North Zone and East Zone).

- *Product indicator 2.4.1 and 2.5.1*: The initial study to identify possible incentives for conservation for the palm sector resulted in the lack of viability in the short term to implement incentive or compensation systems. Therefore, the project focused on identifying ecosystem services to demonstrate their economic, environmental and social value and did not advance in the design and adoption of environmental incentives or compensations.

5.6.3 Effectiveness of Component 3 products

Two product goals were met and two others were not met.

Table 23 Annex 9 shows the summary of compliance with the product goals of Component 3, which are detailed below:

- *Product indicator 3.1.1*: The baseline study, which included 403 surveys at the farm level, showed as a result that there was no potential to advance in the establishment of chains associated with green markets or agrobiodiversity.

However, an effort was subsequently made to comply with this indicator and the possibility of conducting research on the potential of the apiculture chain was identified with the CI Tequendama cluster in the northern zone.

- *Product indicator 3.2.1*: This indicator was divided into two, namely, the following:
    - 1. Palm clusters with diagnoses made to access sustainability certifications (RSPO or similar).

      Goal 6. Achievement 6 (100%).
    - 2. Palm clusters with Action Plans made to Access sustainability certifications (RSPO or similar).

      Goal 6. Achievement 6 (100%).
- *Product indicator 3.3.1:* Ten suppliers of CI Tequendama received beehives in the framework of the apiculture chain. However, there was no feasibility to advance in green markets.
- *Product indicator 3.3.2:* The clusters that achieved the RSPO certification during the validity of the project were Aceites S.A, Palmaceite S.A., and Aceites Manuelita.

  Hacienda La Cabaña and UNIPALMA are in audit processes. They have not yet been certified.

5.6.4 Effectiveness of Component 4 products

The goals were met and one went beyond what was planned.

Table 24 in Annex 9 shows the summary in compliance with the product goals of Component 3, which are detailed below:

- *Product indicator 4.1.1*: 403 surveys were carried out on the properties of beneficiary and control clusters. There are reports of analysis of the results at the cluster level.
- *Product indicator 4.2.1*: In 2014 the baseline was carried out and in 2018 its update
- *Product indicator 4.3.1: The project has delivered and received the non-objection of 10 semi-annual performance reports to date.*
- *Product indicator 4.4.1*: This indicator was completed with the tours made shortly before the end of the project.

5.7 Efficiency: comparison of physical achievements and budget/execution

In summary, this project is rated as moderately unsatisfactory (MI) as it has significant deficiencies in the execution of the budget for the achievement of the planned products and counterpart resources.

Table 13 shows the budget and budget execution of the project, which was executed following a plan, which included some variations that are described in Table 18 Annex 5, without varying the amount of US$4,250,000 granted. by GEF to the beneficiary. However, it is worth highlighting some aspects, namely the following:

- *The IDB/GEF budget was executed practically in its entirety, but without achieving all the proposed goals, although some exceeded what was planned. No new products were managed to replace those that would not be achieved as unviable.*
- *The counterpart budget was not fully executed (78% in total) (see Table 25 Annex 10 with the sources of co-financing). There was no counterpart from the National Government (IDEAM and National Parks), it was very low by the CARs (only 24%), and it did not reach 83% by the IAvH, Anchor Companies and FEDEPALMA; although WWF and CENIPALMA exceeded their contribution by more than 40%.*
- *The lack of adequate coordination with the government institutions described in Section 5.1 is also evidenced by the lack of co-financing committed in the Project Agreement.*

Table 13 **Comparison between the budget planned in the OP and executed by the BPL Colombia project (to October 19, 2018)**

PRODUCT	PLANNED BUDGET 2013-2018			EXECUTED TO OCTUBER 19TH 2018*					
	BID/GEF	CO-FINANCING	TOTAL	BID/GEF	%	CO-FINANCING	%	TOTAL	%
1.0. *Operability of the component**+	438.918	123	439.041	421.096	96%	196	159%	421.292	96%
1.1: Studies of palm fitness zoning and ecological structures developed at subregional scale	94.902	1.519.521	1.614.423	97.900	103%	663.175	44%	761.075	47%
1.2: Extension and socialization program on ecological structures, zoning and planning tools	4.423	577.913	582.336	4.423	100%	128.155	22%	132.578	23%
1.3: Diagnostics and Agroecological Conversion Plans formulated for beneficiary clusters	11.931	80.000	91.931	11.931	100%	621.142	776%	633.073	689%
1.4: Extension program for the adoption of the Agroecological Conversion Plans	1.029.704	2.770.012	3.799.716	1.012.934	98%	4.328.883	156%	5.341.817	141%
1.5: Diagnostics and implementation plans for complementary landscape management tools formulated for the beneficiary clusters	0	138.889	138.889	0		0		0	0%
1.6. Extension program for the adoption of Complementary Landscape Management Tools	9.247	1.111.229	1.120.476	14.935	162%	0	0%	14.935	1%
1.7 Conservation corridors for ecosystem connectivity established in the palm sub-regions	85.073	1.446.597	1.531.670	89.977	106%	0	0%	89.977	6%
TOTAL Component 1 Planning and integrated management of palm systems	***1.674.198***	***7.644.284***	***9.318.482***	***1.653.196***	***99%***	***5.741.551***	**75%**	***7.394.747***	**79%**
2.0. *Operability of the component**+	330.128	373	330.501	324.813	98%	420	113%	325.233	98%
2.1: Palm clusters with identified HVCA and management plans for their protection and restoration formulated	195.406	1.255.384	1.450.790	195.349	100%	522.823	42%	718.172	50%
2.2 Cost-benefit quantification studies associated with the provision of ecosystem services developed for prioritized palm clusters	90.686	194.444	285.130	90.686	100%	129.088	66%	219.774	77%

PRODUCT	PLANNED BUDGET 2013-2018			EXECUTED TO OCTUBER 19TH 2018*					
	BID/GEF	CO-FINANCING	TOTAL	BID/GEF	%	CO-FINANCING	%	TOTAL	%
2.3: Extension program for the identification, management, protection and restoration of HCVA and the valuation of its ecosystem services	55.874	1.700.799	1.756.673	55.874	100%	0	0%	55.874	3%
2.4: Schemes of incentives or compensations for environmental conservation in palm clusters designed	287.557	0	287.557	288.210	100%	0	0%	288.210	100%
2.5: Extension program to beneficiary palm clusters and their UAATAS for the definition and access to incentives and environmental compensations	13.816	0	13.816	13.816	100%	0	0%	13.816	100%
Total Component 2 Conservation and provision of environmental services	***973.467***	***3.151.000***	***4.124.467***	**968.748**	***100%***	**652.331**	**21%**	**1.621.079**	**39%**
*3.0. Operability of the component**+**	250.726	8.032	258.758	246.625	98%	8.059	100%	254.684	98%
3.1: Analysis of opportunities on agrobiodiversity and access to differentiated markets for palm beneficiary clusters	53.738	348.352	402.090	53.738	100%	0	0%	53.738	13%
3.2 Diagnostics and Action Plans to access sustainability certifications (RSPO or similar) designed for palm clusters	35.612	126.379	161.991	35.612	100%	126.379	100%	161.991	100%
3.3: Extension program on agrobiodiversity, access to differentiated markets and RSPO	53.088	1.586.237	1.639.325	51.534	97%	3.130.121	197%	3.181.655	194%
Total Component 3 Uses and alternative markets of agro-biodiversity	**393.164**	**2.069.000**	**2.462.164**	**387.509**	***99%***	***3.264.559***	**158%**	**3.652.068**	**148%**
*4.0. Operability of the component**+**	71.440	104	71.544	76.318	107%	104	100%	76.422	107%
4.1: Study to finalize the baseline carried out with a representative group of project beneficiaries and control group	140.652	0	140.652	140.652	100%	0	0%	140.652	100%

PRODUCT	PLANNED BUDGET 2013-2018			EXECUTED TO OCTUBER 19TH 2018*					
	BID/GEF	CO-FINANCING	TOTAL	BID/GEF	%	CO-FINANCING	%	TOTAL	%
4.2: Follow-up study of the producers with whom the baseline was built	66.452	0	66.452	67.188	101%	0	0%	67.188	101%
4.3: Analysis of program performance	149.932	27.820	177.752	149.755	100%	0	0%	149.755	84%
4.4: Outreach strategy and introductory training to new palm clusters that show interest in the lessons learned from the program	320.140	76	320.216	332.968	104%	76	100%	333.044	104%
Total Component 4 Monitoring, Communication and Impact Evaluation	**748.616**	**28.000**	**776.616**	**766.881**	***102%***	***180***	**1%**	**767.061**	**99%**
Total Component 5 Project Management Coordination	**392.098**	**1.428.034**	**1.820.132**	**404.979**	***103%***	**1.441.256**	**101%**	**1.846.235**	**101%**
6.0. Financial Audit	**68.457**	**9.682**	**78.139**	**68.687**	***100%***	**9.682**	**100%**	**78.369**	**100%**
PROJECT TOTAL	**4.250.000**	**14.330.000**	**18.580.000**	**4.250.000**	**100%**	**11.109.559**	**78%**	**15.359.559**	**83%**

Note: *The color indicates an alert in compliance, according to the information provided.*
** These figures correspond to the execution until October 19, 2018, which is why they are preliminary, since payments will be made until October 31, 2018 and the financial statements will be prepared in November 2018.*

***+** This item did not appear in the original PMR budget table.*

Source: MOP 2012, DCT 2012.

5.8 Sustainability

In summary, this project rates as moderately probable (MP), since it presents moderate risks for sustainability in terms of the possibility that the main actors continue to develop the activities initiated with the Project

Contributing to the conservation of biodiversity and to the sustainable management of palm systems, through a better planning and adoption of agro-ecological practices in zones of expansion of the palm cultivation, was one of the central objectives of the project. In order to achieve the sustainability of the results beyond the time of the Project, the TC used the strategies described in the sections below.

5.8.1 Social and institutional sustainability

In order to achieve social and institutional sustainability, this TC effectively used the following strategies (BID 2012):

- *It sought palm producers to appropriate and associate the concepts of HVCA and the integral valuation of ecosystem services and their social benefits in a participatory strategy focused on a landscape scale.*
- *It had a focus on the involvement of responsible regional entities in the Territories (CAR) and UAATAS and included activities to strengthen the institutional capacity of the Project components through technical assistance, training workshops, and materials development. among others.*
- *It included promotion and dissemination activities of the Project and of the proposed activities that allowed to effectively communicate its objectives and attracted the attention of new allies/actors.*
- *Many dissemination, systematization and training materials were generated that can be used autonomously by all the actors linked to this theme, to replicate many of the activities and results of the project*[17]*.*
- *Agreements were signed with different institutions / organizations (Section 5.3) to support the conservation of biodiversity and carry out sustainable palm farming*

FEDEPALMA and CENIPALMA, as a result of this project, were convinced to act as assertive change promoters, in terms of developing sustainable palm crops in balance with biodiversity, due to their influence on the palm clusters and their suppliers, so much so that during the last Palm Congress in Colombia, the sustainable palm production strategy was launched.

The main tool for sustainability is extension, for example, CENIPALMA has contracted three environmental extension agents (one for each of the main palm areas of the country), who will work jointly in the Environmental Department of FEDEPALMA, which is a first step to that these themes and lessons learned reach palm producers. Additionally, the National Sustainable Palm Oil Program will seek to have partners and allies, as well as national and international financing, to promote the adoption of sustainability practices including what is promoted by the PPB.

The project designed a series of products, including a pedagogical tool (game) that the UAATAS of beneficiary clusters can use in training sessions for palm producers. In addition, the information generated by the project has been included in different pieces of communication

[17] According to FEDEPALMA Environmental Leader, these materials will be available in the web www.paisajepalmerobiodiverso.org

(presentations, documents) to socialize the results to different audiences (regional and national producers' forums, Competitiveness Committees, Institutions, Donors and Banking).[18]

Also, with counterpart resources from FEDEPALMA, progress is made in the generation of the systematization of what has been generated in the planning component, for delivery to beneficiary clusters and therefore to their associates/producers.

An Integral Vision of Conservation in Biodiversity Palm Landscapes was generated with the territorial entities of CORPAMAG, CORPOCESAR, National Natural Parks in its northern region and the Secretariats of Agriculture and Environment, CORMACARENA, CORPORINOQUIA, National Natural Parks and SIRAP (Regional Systems of Areas Protected) Orinoquia eastern region, which are expected to generate a general awareness in the local palm sector.

5.8.2 Ecological sustainability

The ecological sustainability of this project is given by the increase in forest patches and the greater vegetation cover that is being promoted in the vicinity and within the palm plantations, which is resulting in a greater presence of biodiversity. Additionally, the project identified HVCA which may be subject to conservation through the promotion of policies of both regional and national institutions and private enterprises.

Within the framework of the RSPO certification program, the conservation of these areas will be verified in the monitoring process. In addition, FEDEPALMA will make alliances with the universities of palm-growing regions, to conduct a biodiversity monitoring where HVCA have been identified, in order to establish strategies for their conservation.

5.8.3 Financial sustainability

Some of the activities carried out by the project may continue with funding, due to the fact that these could be assumed by the following actors:

1. *In Component 1, planning and environmentally sound management of palm systems, UPRA has been generating information with its own resources to determine areas of agricultural and palm expansion, with criteria of agro-ecological sustainability, which - according to the Environmental Leader of FEFEPALMA - complements what has been achieved by the project.*
2. *In Component 2, conservation and valuation of environmental services in palm systems, the project generated awareness in the palm sector about the economic, social and environmental benefits of HCVAs, LMT and ecosystem services, so much so that FEDEPALMA and CENIPALMA already have environmental and social extension agents, financed with their own resources.*
3. *In Component 3, differentiated uses and markets for products that contribute to biodiversity, the beneficiary palm growers have developed capacities to develop a sustainable palm crop, which is a first step towards RSPO certification - which some already have and finance with own resources and cluster support - and they are transmitting to non-beneficiary palm producers.*
4. *In Component 4, monitoring, communication and evaluation of impacts, FEDEPALMA and CENIPALMA, with their own resources, are developing communication and dissemination processes that seek to achieve a sustainable palm farming.*

[18] According to an interview with Juan Carlos Espinosa, Environmental Leader of FEDEPALMA, the pedagogical and communication tools will be published soon on the website www.paisajepalmerobiodiverso.org

The Finca Plan was articulated in a strategy of the extension program of CENIPALMA, with which type farms will be established, to be a model of best productive, environmental and social practices and, including many of the best practices promoted by the BPL.

FEDEPALMA and CENIPALMA will continue working on the topic of cost-benefit analysis of the implementation of sustainability practices and their benefits, in order to complement the promotion of these activities within the framework of the National Sustainable Palm Oil Program.

6 LESSONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is structured by identifying the lessons learned from the project and with this evidence developing conclusions and suggesting recommendations. Thus, lessons learned, conclusions and recommendations for the dimensions of design and relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability are obtained.

6.1 With respect to the design and relevance

1 Contribution to the conservation of biodiversity:

- *LL: The project Biodiverse Palm Landscape (BPL), of b*iodiversity conservation in productive activities, had a very high incidence in the awareness of the population, producers, the palm guild and involved institutions (CAR and UAATAS, among others), especially about the benefits of sustainability at a local, regional and global levels, through a participatory strategy. This awareness was evidenced with the launch of the National Sustainable Palm Oil Program[19].
- *Conclusion*: This project had a very important effect on the change of paradigm in the palm sector and related institutions, which assumed as excluding the increase of productivity and the conservation of biodiversity, towards a complementary vision with a number of environmental, social and economic benefits, still to be measured.
- *Recommendation*: The realization of this type of projects in palm and other productive activities should be encouraged, especially the most questioned in environmental terms, in order to promote the integral sustainability of agricultural territory.

2 Areas of expansion of sustainable palm farming:

- *LL:* The linking of public institutions, UPRA and Cooperating Entities identified (Section 5.3) in the support for the definition of areas suitable for agriculture and specifically palm, within the territorial order, taking into account sustainability criteria, not only aligns this type of initiatives with others of the Government and the country, but gives legitimacy to the process.
- *Conclusion*: Public institutions, Cooperating Entities (Section 5.3) UPRA, and other relevant institutions must participate appropriately to appropriate the definition of areas suitable for palm farming (Section 5.1).
- *Recommendation*: It is important that the entities identified in the PPB design documents are properly included in the implementation of the project in order to make an assertive achievement of the products. Compliance with the program of co-financing resources committed in the Project Agreement is important (Section 5.7).

3 Role of partners:

[19] According to an interview on 13-02-2019 with Juan Carlos Espinosa, Environmental Leader of FEDEPALMA, the NSPOP was launched in June 2018 and currently they have hired a Manager and a consultant who are working on its structuring, under the three pillars of sustainability (environmental, social and economic). The definition of objectives, strategies and search for financing is underway (with Europe - Germany, Norway and Holland - and USAID); but the fundamental idea is to scale the BPL to other palm clusters, which will depend on the availability of resources.

- *LL*: The BPL partners should had been clear about their role, duties and limitations, before signing the cooperation agreement.
- *Conclusion*: The project partners (Section 5.3), signed the agreements, with the expectation of being hired to achieve some of the most important products and were not clear about their role and limitations, so there was no an adequate appropriation of the project from their part and therefore, it affected the achievement of the objectives.
- *Recommendation*: The Implementing Agency (IA) must ensure that project partners, in this case the BPL, clearly understand their duties and obligations before signing the cooperation agreement, which would promote their adequate appropriation and achievement of the proposed products and results.

4 Compatibility between the impact evaluation and the project objectives:

- *LL*: The impact evaluation (IE) is a useful tool to measure the real impact of a project and its causality. However, the compatibility or non-compatibility between the objectives and technical goals of the project and the proposed IE should be carefully analyzed; in the case of the PPB, the non-compatibility between the establishment of biological corridors and an experimental design of (double) randomization (Section 5.1, in the execution, second bullet point).
- *Conclusion*: The experimental design and the random selection of beneficiaries in this project, were a limitation to comply with the products and indicators proposed in the development of biological corridors, since they were exclusive objectives, also in terms of extending the project to other producers interested (spillover effect) and have producers really interested in participating (Section 5.1, in the execution, second bullet point).
- *Recommendation*: The IE is a useful tool for decision-making. On excluding issues, such as the establishment of biological corridors and an impact evaluation with an experimental design with (double) randomization, it is necessary to decide between one of the two. If the objective of the establishment of the biological corridors prevails, then a compatible impact assessment methodology (probably non-random) should be sought.

6.2 With respect to effectiveness and efficiency

5 Changes in the result matrix:

- *LL*: Formal changes with the approval of the IA in the BLP results matrix were essential to changes in the context of the country, especially due to the time that elapsed between design and implementation.
- *Conclusion*: There were changes in the context of the country and sector (due to the time elapsed between design and implementation) that decreased the relevance and effectiveness of some of the proposed products in the project design (Section 5.1 in the execution and 5.4.1 analysis of the execution: change in context). However, formally changes in the results matrix were not carried out; as a result, the original GEF budget was used to meet a smaller number of products - and no additional product was included.

- *Recommendation*: Changes in the results matrix, although must be analyzed in depth by the actors, should have been proposed in an assertive and formally approved manner, in order to carry out an adaptive management of the BPL and maintain or increase its relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency.

6 Decrease in the use of agrochemicals:

- *LL*: The promotion of nectariferous and legumes in the beneficiary palm plantations of the BLP results in a decrease in the use of agrochemicals.
- *Conclusion*: Although no scientific experiments and benefit-cost studies were carried out within the framework of the project to promote nectariferous within the palm plantations, according to the interviews conducted, the producers assure that there was a significant decrease in the use of agrochemicals to combat pests. and diseases.
- *Recommendation*: The result of the BPL experiences, identified the need to carry out experimental studies and benefit-cost analysis on the promotion of nectariferous and legumes and the consequent decrease in the use of agrochemicals in palm plantations.

7 Increase in biodiversity:

- *LL*: Plantations of forest patches in the adjoining BPL beneficiary plantations increased biodiversity in the agricultural region.
- *Conclusion*: According to the interviews carried out, the producers claim that wildlife sightings inside and outside the palm plantations have grown significantly, due to forest plantations or spontaneous forest growth in the vicinity of the palm plantations, especially animals. as palm bear, deer, otters, snakes, iguanas, birds, and sloths, among others.
- *Recommendation*: The Finca Plan applied in the BPL proved to be an ideal instrument to promote the reforestation of unused areas in the lands of the palm plantations, to increase biodiversity and produce both tangible and intangible benefits to the producers and the population in general, which should be replicated in other productive projects.

8 Efficient use of irrigation and drainage:

- *LL*: Freatimeters are a necessary instrument for the efficient use of water or drainages in palm plantations.
- *Conclusion*: The use of freatimeters among the beneficiaries of the PPB proved to be a low cost and an indispensable tool to measure the level of water in the land and therefore, plan the irrigation or drainage in palm plantations efficiently.
- *Recommendation*: Taking into account that the implementation of freatimeters in palm farms (and in other agricultural activities) has a relatively low cost and provides very valuable information for decision making regarding the use of irrigation or drainage, it is recommended to extend its use in the agricultural geography.

9 Staff rotation:

- *LL*: Staff turnover should have been reduced to a minimum in the BPL, especially with an adequate remuneration policy adjusted to the project budget; but decisions

should have been made on time when the professionals were not adequate to fulfill the assigned positions.

- *Conclusion*: The BPL project suffered from a large turnover of staff, especially general coordinators and other key personnel; but also, the decisions were not made on time to separate the personnel that was not adequate to fulfill the assigned responsibilities (sections 5.1 and 5.3).
- *Recommendation*: It is essential that both the Implementing Agency (IA) and the Executing Agency (AE) have the appropriate policies to encourage good professionals and make changes at an appropriate time when they do not adapt to the requirements. The IA must ensure that the EA is supporting the project in this regard.

10 Project management:

- *LL*: The processes of acquisitions, purchases and financial reports of this type of projects – in this case the BPL - are complex (Section 5.1) and must had benn streamlined to reduce the risks in obtaining the products and expected results.
- *Conclusion*: Financial processes of the BPL, in general, should have had agile procedures and experienced staff or trained by the Implementing Agency, in order to meet their administrative requirements at the time required.
- *Recommendation*: The IA should include more strongly in its operations plan, the training and accompaniment of the administrative officers in charge of the project's financial processes.

11 Co-financing resources:

- *LL*: The co-financing contributions negotiated for the implementation of the BPL project should have been monitored and also served as a means to generate synergies with the different institutions involved.
- *Conclusion*: The co-financing resources were used partially, so they were not managed properly, taking control of the contributions and a strategy to promote synergies between the different actors identified in the TCD of the BPL.
- *Recommendation*: The EA must keep a careful control not only of GEF contributions, but also of co-financing and link it to a strategy for achieving synergies with the institutions involved.

12 Public nature of the project's products:

- *LL*: It is essential that the products produced in projects with GEF resources, in this case the BPL, are public and, therefore, available to society in general.
- *Conclusion*: The products achieved with this type of technical cooperation must serve to provide information and be an input so that other organizations/institutions can advance in the achievement of national objectives. In this case, the results and products of the BPL project will be published on the web, according to the Environmental Leader of FEDEPALMA.

- *Recommendation*: All products achieved in this type of project should be published on the WEB, in order to promote the public use of the information generated[20].

13 Synergies with other key players:

- *LL*: More synergies could have been achieved and a more efficient use made of the "scarce resources" of the BPL project, by means of the identification of initiatives - in accordance with the goals that it was designed to achieve - that were already in process and could have been finalized and/or scaled with key institutions at the local, regional and national levels.
- *Conclusion*: Some synergies achieved by the BPL with local, regional actors, CENIPALMA, national institutions and other projects and initiatives generate greater ownership of key actors, such as savings in human and financial resources (Section 5.8).
- *Recommendation*: A strategy of generating synergies with other institutional actors, projects and initiatives must be developed, for which it is necessary to map and design a coordination structure, in order to provide continuity in the objectives.

6.3 With respect to impact and sustainability

14 ***Sustainability and Environmental impact:***

- *LL*: Ecological sustainability does not only depend on the identification of HCVA. What was important in the BPL was to create possibilities for dialogue to promote the conservation of natural resources at the local level.
- *Conclusion*: The ecological sustainability depends to a great extent on knowing the resource and the appropriation of the community and interested groups, to carry out more integral processes of territorial planning, ecological restoration, conservation of basins and improvement of quality of life (Section 5.8.2).
- *Recommendation*: It is very important to continue with the participation and certification (such as RSPO) processes developed by the BPL and FEDEPALMA and that the identified HCVA serve as an input for the generation of policies and regulations for the promotion of sustainability.

15 ***Consideration of gender and youth***:

- *LL*: The strategy of biodiversity conservation must take into account the participation of and the effect on women and young people of the relevant actors, as in the case of the BPL.
- *Conclusion*: In many development projects the communities carry out work in which the beneficiaries of the programs/projects (training, generation of work, awareness, among others) are directed - sometimes by the nature of the project - to adult men and do not encourage participation of women and young people in the process. In the specific case of this project, according to the Environmental Leader of FEDEPALMA, many of the workshops, trainings and other socialization strategies

[20] According to an interview with Juan Carlos Espinosa, Environmental Leader of FEDEPALMA, the pedagogical and communication tools will be published soon on the website www.paisajepalmerobiodiverso.org

of the project involved women-owners of palm farms, responsible for environmental issues and extensionists, among others.

- *Recommendation*: It is necessary to improve the communication issue to reach more efficiently women and youth in the communities, for which it is relevant to take the case of the PPB.

7 BIBLIOGRAPHY

BID. 2012. *Convenio de Cooperación Técnica ATN FM-13216-CO*. Proyecto Conservación de la Biodiversidad en las Zonas de Cultivos de Palma ATN/FM-13216-CO. Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo, Fondo para el Medio Ambiente Mundial (FMAM).

BID. 2015. *Manual operativo*. Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo. Conservación de la Biodiversidad en las Zonas de Cultivos de Palma ATN/FM-13216-CO. Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo.

BID. 2012. *Plan de operaciones*. Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo. Conservación de la Biodiversidad en las Zonas de Cultivos de Palma ATN/FM-13216-CO. Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo.

BID. 2012. *Conservación de la biodiversidad en zonas de cultivo de palma* (PPB, CO-X1011). Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo.

GEF. 2011. *Request for CEO Endorsement/Approval Project Type: Full-Sized Project*. The GEF Trust Fund.

FEDEPALMA-BID. 2012. *Manual operativo*. Federación Nacional de Cultivadores de Palma de Aceite-Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo.

FEDEPALMA. 2018. *Informe final*. Paisaje Palmero Biodiverso. Conservación de la Biodiversidad en las Zonas de Cultivos de Palma Conservación de la Biodiversidad en las Zonas de Cultivos de Palma.

FEDEPALMA. 2018. *Informe semestral*. Paisaje Palmero Biodiverso. Conservación de la Biodiversidad en las Zonas de Cultivos de Palma Conservación de la Biodiversidad en las Zonas de Cultivos de Palma.

FN (Fundación Natura). 2018. *Informe Final Proyecto Plan Finca*. Bogotá. Proyecto Conservación de la Biodiversidad en las Zonas de Cultivos de Palma ATN/FM-13216-CO. Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo, Fondo para el Medio Ambiente Mundial (FMAM).

GEF. 2008. *Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations*. Global Environmental Facility, Evaluation Office, Evaluation Document Nº 3.

Hofstede, Robert. 2016. *Mid-term evaluation. Project ATN/FM-13216-CO: Biodiversity Conservation in Palm-growing Areas*. Global Environmental Facility (GEF)-InterAmerican Development Bank (IDB).

IDB. 2015. *IDB Country Strategy 2015-2018: Colombia*. Document of the Inter-American Development Bank, http://idbdocs.iadb.org/wsdocs/getdocument.aspx?docnum=40089584

PNUD. 2012. *Guía para realizar evaluaciones finales de los proyectos respaldados por el PNUD y financiados por el FMAM*. Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo. Oficina de evaluación.

PPB. 2011. *Sistema de seguimiento y evaluación del proyecto*. Fortalecimiento de la biodiversidad en agroecosistemas palmeros en Colombia. Federación Nacional de Cultivadores de Palma de Aceite (FEDEPALMA).

Proyectos Semana S.A. 2018. *Informe de Ejecución De Compromisos*. Foro Nacional: “Paisaje Palmero Biodiverso, Un Compromiso Nacional y Sectorial” y Mesa “La Palmicultura Sostenible Un Buen Negocio”.

Proyectos Semana S.A. 2018. *Informe de Ejecución De Compromisos*. Ciclo De Foros y Mesas de Trabajo: Proyecto Paisaje Palmero Biodiverso (PPB).

8 ANNEXES

Annex 1

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

FE Project Biodiversity Conservation in Zones of Palm Oil Cultivation in Colombia

Interviewed person (Name, contact): _____

Date: _____. Interview method (telephone, etc.): _____

INTRODUCTION
The IDB is conducting the FE of the Project Biodiversity Conservation in Zones of Palm Oil Cultivation in Colombia. The idea of the evaluation is to make a critical assessment of the performance of the project, providing a complete and systematic analysis from the design of the Project, the implementation process, and process toward the accomplishment of products, results and possible impacts.
¿ What was your role in the development of the project??
I. RELEVANCE
1. How does the project relate to the main objectives of the area of interest of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and to environmental and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?
2. Were the problems well identified at the beginning? Has the design and implementation of the project been adapted to the national reality and existing capacities? Explain
3. Did the problems the project aimed to target improved or deteriorated?
4. Was there a coherence between the needs of stakeholders vs. IDB-GEF? Between the internal logic and the expected outputs/results? Between the design and its implementation approach?
5. In the execution of the project, what changes have been necessary to make in relation to what has been proposed (technical, financial, economic and institutional) and what were the reasons for these changes to guarantee the achievement of the objectives? or was it necessary to make any important adjustments to maintain the relevance of the project?
6. ¿Lessons learned?
II. EFFECTIVENESS
7. What components/products of the project have been achieved? What was the baseline? Planned? Which products were completely achieved? Which ones were partially achieved? Which ones have not been achieved?

8. Do the established indicators describe well the progress in the expected and planed products in Costa Rica? Learned lessons
9. What have been the main risks (and assumptions) that affected the effective development of the project? Were they well identified? Were they mitigated? How? ¿LL?
10. Have links been fostered with institutions or organizations?
11. What other unplanned achievements did the project have? Strengths and weaknesses (opportunities, threats, and aspirations)?
12. Now that the project has finished its execution period and in retrospect, what would you have done differently? What went well and did not go well?
13. To take into account in future agreements, what learning was obtained after this execution of the project?
III. EFFICIENCY
14. Did the expenses of each component/activity/product correspond to those estimated in the budget and have they been sufficient? Was it necessary to make adjustments (in terms, resources, etc.)?
15. How appropriate was the time allotted for the execution of each of the project's outputs/components?
16. What key problems have arisen? Strengths and weaknesses of financial execution (opportunities, threats, and aspirations)?
17. If at this time you had more financial resources for the project, what would you do?
18. How could the project have been executed more efficiently? Learned lessons?
IV. SUSTAINABILITY
19. Is there a sustainability strategy? What are the key activities? How will they be financed?
20. Have the investments made been sustainable?
21. Have the products results or scope/benefits of the project been sustainable so far?
22. Do you think the project will be sustainable? If yes, what factors do you think have contributed to its sustainability? From the technical and institutional point of view? Why?
23. What are the weaknesses of the project?

24. Who are the beneficiaries, partners and local actors of the project? How many? Have they appropriated it? What commitments have they acquired? Have they collaborated? How have they complemented each other? What activities have been assumed by the counterpart or other actors?
25. Collaboration and complementarity with other projects or initiatives in Costa Rica or internationally? What commitments have you acquired? Have they collaborated? How have they complemented each other? Products with added value?
26. What are the key actors to guarantee the continuity and/or sustainability of the results/benefits of the project? What are the key activities to strengthen the EA?
27. What are the main challenges for the sustainability of the project? Have they been addressed? What potential measures could be taken? Learned lessons?
V. MONITORING AND EVALUATION
28. What instruments have been used to monitor and evaluate the project? (Partial reports, endings, Inspection Visits, PMR/PCR, Evaluation Reports, etc.). What indicators have been used?
29. How has the supervision been? What could be improved?
30. Has a results-based management approach been used? Explain
31. How often were they applied (periodicity)? Learned lessons?
VI. IMPACT
32. What experiences, processes, methodologies or innovative services have emerged or were adopted? Have they been successful? What activities have fostered innovation?
33. What are the impacts or possible impacts of the Project (environment, income level, socio-economic issues)?
34. Has the project contributed to an unexpected impact?
35. How can the project develop on its successes and learn from its weaknesses? Learned lessons?

Annex 2

FIELDWORK AGENDA AND, LIST OF PEOPLE AND ORGANIZATIONS INTERVIEWED

Table 14 **Fieldwork agenda and people/organizations interviewed, from July 23rd de August 2nd,2018**

DAY	TIME	ACTIVITY	COMMENTS
Monday 23		Arrival to Bogotá.	
Tuesday 24	8 am – 12 pm.	Interviews Fedepalma and Cenipalma: 8 am. Andrés F. García. Director de planeación y desarrollo sectorial. 9 am. Juan Carlos Espinosa. Líder ambiental. 10 am. Elzbieta Bochno. Secretaría general. 11 am. Jens Mesa. Presidente Fedepalma.	Meetings in Fedepalma. Calle 98 N° 70 - 91 piso 14, Bogotá.
	2 – 6 pm	Travel to Villavicencio.	It is suggested to travel by land. At Villavicencio there is only one flight in the afternoon and the risk of cancellation is high. If you agree, we can contact the company that FEDEPALMA hires for overland travel, to see how it would proceed for booking and direct payment with the consultant, and define the time and place of collection (may be in FEDEPALMA).
Wednesday 25	6 am – 12 pm	Visit to La Lorena y Palmas de La Roca. Núcleo La Cabaña.	
	2 pm - 5 pm	Interviews with Sandra Salamanca y Sonia González, Hacienda La Cabaña and visit to the nursery.	
Thursday 26	6 am – 12 pm	Visit to fincas Agricol y Villa Carola.	
	2.30 pm	Interviews with Iván Camilo Mahecha y Julio Martínez, UAATA Unipalma. Visit to the nursery	
Friday 27	8 – 9 am	Interview Leonardo Millán. Núcleo Manuelita.	
	9 – 3 pm	Visit to plantación el Oasis (San Carlos de Guaroa)	
Saturday 28/Sunday 29		Return to Bogotá Travel to Santa Marta	Se sugiere tomar vuelo a Santa Marta en horas de la mañana.
Monday 30	6 am – 2 pm	Visit to sector de Bellaena – Dos fincas de CI Tequendama Lunch	
	3.30 pm	Interview with Carolina Torrado. CI Tequendama	
	4.30 pm	Interview with Chinchilla (Aceites) y Ana Lucía Ávila (Palmaceite)	
Tuesday 31	6 am – 2 pm	Visit to two farms in El Retén y Aracataca (Aceites y Palmaceite) Lunch	

	2 pm	Visit to Campo Experimental Palmar de la Sierra and interview with José Julián Monroy.	
Miércoles 1	6 am – 5pm	Visit to a farm (CI Tequendama). Visit to the nursery of native species de CI Tequendama. Interviews with Jairo Vargas y Roberto Díaz. UAATA CI Tequendama.	
	8 pm	Return to Bogotá	
Jueves 2		Return to CR	

Table 15 **People/organizations interviewed**

NAME	DATE	ORGANIZATION	POSITION
Josué Ávila	28-06-18	BID	Coordinador proyecto
Juan Carlos Espinosa	24-7-18	FEDEPALMA	Líder ambiental
Elbieta Bocho Hernández	24-7-18	CENIPALMA	Directora
Jens Mesa	24-7-18	FEDEPALMA	Director Ejecutivo
Andrés García	24-7-18	FEDEPALMA	Director de planeación y desarrollo sectorial
Sandra Salamanca Sonia González	25-7-18	UAATA	Coordinadora Ambiental Coordinadora UAATA
Luis Antonio Pastrana	25-7-18	La Lorena Cumaral	Propietario
Héctor Rivera José Luis Peipa	25-7-18	Agricol Internacional S.A.S Plantación El Achiote	Administrador
Daniel Rodríguez	25-7-18	Palma La Roca	Propietario
Julio Martínez José Tovar Iván Carrillo Mecha	25-7-18	UNIPALMA	Jefe agronómico Supervisor de Campo Ingeniero Ambiental
Norberto López	26-07-18	Villa Carola	Propietario
Willington González	26-7-18	PPB	Encargado de Campo
Nubia Rairán	26-7-18	Estación Experimental Las Cocoras	Superintendente de Campo
Álvaro García	26-07-18	Finca El Oasis	Propietario
Juan Carlos Espinosa	27-07-18	Aceites Manuelita	Gerente productividad y medio ambiente
Carlos Chinchilla	30-7-18	Aceites S.A.	Director de Sostenibilidad
Ana Lucía Ávila	30-7-18	Palmaceite	Directora de Sostenibilidad
Héctor Marín Valdés	30-07-18	Finca Bella Sandrith	Propietario

NAME	DATE	ORGANIZATION	POSITION
Edulfo Deaguas	30-07-18	Finca El Perrenque	Propietario
Álvaro Redondo Aramis Avendaño	31-07-18	Finca Campo Alegre	Propietario
Evangelina Durán Tatiana Bolaños Jean Carlos Scorzia Pedro Sarmiento	31-07-18	Finca San Quintín	Administradora RSPO Encargado sanidad vegetal Supervisor de campo
José Julián Monroy	31-07-18	Campo Experimental Palmar de la Sierra	Superintendente
Carolina Torrado Patricia Apreza Guillermo Barrios	31-07-18	Grupo Da'Abon CI Tequendama	Jefe Ing. Ambiental Jefe Gestión Social Director Alianzas
José Luis Martínez	1-08-18	Finca Clara Inés	Propietario
Rogelio Charris	1-08-18	Finca Costa Rica	Propietario
Eduardo San Juan	1-08-18	Vivero Aabon	Encargado
Hernando Barliza de la Rosa	1-08-18	PPB	Encargado de Campo
Fernando Balcázar	17-08-18	BID	Especialista Senior en Recursos Naturales
Mónica Lozano	27-08-18	PPB	Coordinadora C3
Camila Paula Cammaert Gutiérrez	28-08-18	WWF Colombia	Especialista
Clara Bustamante Samudio	28-08-18	Instituto Humboldt Colombia	Líder en sostenibilidad y economía verde del Programa Ciencias Sociales
Javier Ortiz 3ahamón	31-08-18	PPB	Excoordinador
Rosario Gómez	27-09-18	PPB	Coordinadora
Antonio Wills	15-10-2018	PPB	Monitoreo y evaluación
Lina Salazar	3-03-2019	BID	Impact Evaluation

Annex 3

ANTICIPATED RISKS IN THE PROJECT OPERATIONS MANUAL

The risks identified and the mitigation measures specified in the OM are presented below.

Table 16 **General risks of the project and mitigation strategies in the Operational Manual (OM).**

RISKS	GRADE	MITIGATION STRATEGY
1. Emergence or recurrence of diseases and pests in the areas of intervention	M	Within the actions of regional consultation has been identified that the recovery of biodiversity in the palm clusters is a strategy for the prevention and management of the appearance of pests and diseases. In this sense, the project will strengthen the issues associated with the provision of ecosystem services related to the control of pests and diseases and integrated pest management, contributing to the reduction of the alteration of the biological activity of species by the use of chemical. Likewise, the practices will contribute to the offer of habitats for beneficial animals for cultivation and therefore to the increase of biodiversity in the palm systems.
2. Lack of cooperation willingness among various public institutions at the national and regional levels, organization, partners and cooperators, which implies a reduction in the contribution of counterparts.	M	The project has taken into account relevant institutional stakeholders, from the beginning of the PPG phase, including the regional environmental authorities - CAR, the municipalities, the producer associations, to ensure their support and participation in the project. From the beginning, cooperation agreements will be defined that assure the participation of a set of entities identified as the minimum cooperating. The generation of knowledge and of the conceptual and methodological tools that the project will bring is an important hook to achieve the interest of the local and regional authorities and the CARs. Additionally, the project coordination will maintain a co-financing strategy with other stakeholders that may be interested in local and regional development, as well as international in order to multiply the resources needed for implementation and additional or complementary actions.
3. Lack of consolidation of UAATAS	L	The project seeks to strengthen the environmental component of the UAATAS, which will contribute to its administrative and technical consolidation within the clusters
4. Security problems	M	Once the intervention areas of the project and the palm clusters in which the project's action has been focused within the palm sub-regions have been selected, it has been verified that the risk level of these is low. In case the security risk increases in the intervention areas of the project, the timetables and priorities for the implementation of the activities in the field will be reviewed and adjusted in order to guarantee the integrity of the technical personnel of the project. and of the beneficiary clusters.
5. Recurrence of the winter wave	M	The winter wave situation that Colombia has experienced in recent months has in many cases exceeded the prevention and contingency schemes for this type of climatic phenomena, generating serious damage to productive areas in different regions of the country. More than 40,000 hectares of palm have been affected by this phenomenon, and it is possible that this situation will worsen in the coming months/years. As a result of this project, there will be concrete tools to determine an adequate use of the soil in areas of influence of bodies of water, which will serve to plan new palm projects in areas of expansion or restore sensitive areas in areas affected by floods.

RISKS	GRADE	MITIGATION STRATEGY
6. Low will and decision to establish corridors of conservation by other subsectors	M	The project will encourage active participation and agreement with other agricultural subsectors, environmental authorities and territorial entities in the design and implementation of conservation corridors. Specifically, it will seek to work closely with these last two for the adoption of proposals for conservation corridors in their EOTs and Local or Regional Systems of Protected Areas.
Total risk of the project	**Medium low**	

***Note**: High risk B: Low risk. M: Medium risk.*

Source: BID 2012.

Annex 4

UPDATED MATRIX OF RISKS OF THE PROJECT AND COMMENTS OF THE FINAL EVALUATION

The matrix below presents the update carried out by the project in January 2018, based on the update made in the 2017 annual report, of the risks identified in the initial stage of the project and for which mitigation actions were implemented during its development. A final evaluation of each one was also made (FEDEPALMA 2017).

Table 17 **Project risk matrix updated to 2017 and mitigation actions implemented**

RISK	PROBABILITY	IMPACT	RISK CLASIFICATION	MITIGATION ACTIONS	FINAL EVALUATION AND RANKING[21]
1. Delays in execution due to the low willingness to agree on conservation actions by the various actors who share a cluster geographically	2	2	MEDIUM	There will be constant monitoring of the implementation of the investment plans within the framework of the Farm Plans. A schedule with planned activities will be sent to partners, clusters and other interested parties to prevent workshops or training sessions from being canceled at the last moment. **Responsible: UCP and facilitators of the zone.**	*The risk decreased.* Due to the mitigation measures implemented, an awareness of the different actors could be generated. ***IMPROBABLE (Ip)***
2. Failure to meet the result goals and execution of Project resources within the established timing	3	3	HIGH	Monthly meetings will be held with FEDEPALMA to review progress on the project's work plan and make decisions that facilitate agility and progress in technical and administrative matters. From the PCU, a work schedule with weekly milestones was defined for each process to which permanent monitoring will be carried out. **Responsible: General coordination, PCU and FEDEPALMA.**	*The risk remained.* C1 could not be used in decision-making, although product indicators were met. Although it was expected not to comply with many of the products of the different components, it was not requested to modify the results matrix. ***PROBABLE (P)***
3. Non-compliance in the execution of counterparts between the partners, beneficiary and allied palm-tree clusters	2	2	MEDIUM	A counterpart plan was defined with each of the partners in order to avoid delays and difficulties when registering them. **Responsible: National Project coordination, zone facilitators, administrative and financial analyst.**	The risk remained. The corresponding counterparts were not met (total execution 78%). There were no counterparts from the Government and those of the anchor companies was very low (Table 25 Annex 10). **PROBABLE (P)**
4. Difficulty in guaranteeing an Impact Evaluation of the experimental type project, due to difficulties in registering and keeping the beneficiaries and the control group in the years of project execution	2	2	MEDIUM	It is possible that in the second phase of the farm plan, some suppliers will not continue with their implementation, which could affect the impact evaluation of the project. Maintain updated databases with contact information of palm producers. Socialize the project implementation processes with the beneficiaries (Farm Plan, RSPO Gap Closure, Ecosystem Services Assessment) and implement the communication strategy with them.	The risk remained. There were problems with the experimental and control groups. **PROBABLE (P)**

[21] The classification keys are presented in Table 4, page 15.

RISK	PROBABILITY	IMPACT	RISK CLASIFICATION	MITIGATION ACTIONS	FINAL EVALUATION AND RANKING[21]
				Responsible: Zone facilitators, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, Communication Consultant.	

***Note**:* *Probability/impact 1 low, 2 medium, 3 high.*
Sum/classification:

5-6= **High Risk (H):** There is a probability greater than 75% that the assumptions will not be valid or will not materialize or the project could face high risks.
4= **Substantial Risk (S):** There is a probability between 51% and 75% that the assumptions will not be valid or will not materialize or the project could face substantial risks.
3= **Modest risk (M):** There is a probability between 26% and 50% that the assumptions will not be valid or will not materialize or the project could face only modest risks.
2= **Low Risk (L):** There is a probability of up to 25% that the assumptions will not be valid or will not materialize or the project could face only modest risks.

The color indicates an alert in the described risk. N.a.= does not apply

Source: *Risk matrix and interviews 2014 and 2016.*

Annex 5

BUDGETARY EXCHANGE BETWEEN THE COMPONENTS OF THE PROJECT

Table **18** **Budget exchange between project components**

INVESTMENT CATEGORY		CURRENT BUDGET US$	AVAILABLE BUDGET US$	TRANSFER US$	MODIFIED BUDGET US$
No.	Descriptiion	1	2	3	4
1	Planning and integrated management of palm systems	1.170.000	66.093	504.197	1.674.197
2	Conservation and Valuation of Environmental Services in Palm Systems	1.413.000	663.625	-439.533	973.467
3	Differentiated uses and markets for products that contribute to biodiversity	669.496	407.265	-276.331	393.165
4	Monitoring, Communication and Impact Evaluation	549.000	177.261	199.616	748.616
5	Project management	385.000	69.138	7.098	392.098
6	Financial audit	63.504	22.732	4.953	68.457
TOTAL		***4.250.000***	***1.406.114***	***0***	***4.250.000***

Annex 6

KEY ACTORS OF THE PROJECT

Table **19** **Key actors of the project**

KEY ACTOR	ROL	ABILITY TO EXECUTE THE ROLE	EXPLANATION
National Federation of Oil Palm Growers (FEDEPALMA)	Manager, beneficiary and executing agency of the project	G	The executing agency and beneficiary of the project was FEDEPALMA, who executed the design operation (CO-T1226). Founded in 1962, FEDEPALMA groups and represents most of the Colombian palm growers. It is made up of small, medium and large palm oil growers, who operate on a corporate, associative or individual scale, as well as palm oil extractors. FEDEPALMA promotes environmental and social responsibility among its members. Among other initiatives, it worked in coordination with the MAVDT[22] in a cleaner production agreement and an environmental guide for the palm sector. It is a member of RSPO and led the National Interpretation for Colombia of the Principles and Criteria of the RSPO, an initiative approved by the RSPO Board of Directors in November 2010. FEDEPALMA was responsible for the administration of the project, including management of planning instruments, financial and accounting management, procurement and contracting processes and preparation of project progress reports. In addition, FEDEPALMA will coordinate with all the institutions that will make contributions to this operation.
Research Institute of Biological Resources "Alexander von Humboldt" (IAvH)	Member of the Project Steering Committee	R	It was foreseen that the IAvH would provide technical support on biodiversity, conceptual and methodological frameworks on agro-ecological practices and landscape management tools, information on the Biodiversity Information System and results of pilot exercises on incentives and environmental compensation and payment schemes for Environmental Services.
World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	Member of the Project Steering Committee	R	WWF Amazonas Norte and Chocó-Darién was expected to provide technical personnel and experience in the conceptual and methodological framework of the HCV analysis scheme, areas of palm fitness and international benchmarks in the adoption of the principles and criteria of the RSPO.
Corporation Research Center in Oil Palm (CENIPALMA)	Member of the Project Steering Committee	G	It was foreseen that it would provide the advances in research of edapho-climatic requirements of the crop, cartographic information, water management, soil, pests and pollination and the technology transfer platform of the palm guild that would support the four components of the project.
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MADR)	Cooperating Entity	G	Strategically linked in the achievement of specific products of the Project.

[22] Ministry of Environment, Housing and Territorial Development.

KEY ACTOR	ROL	ABILITY TO EXECUTE THE ROLE	EXPLANATION
Institute of Hydrology, Meteorology and Environmental Studies (IDEAM)	Cooperating Entity	R	Strategically linked in the achievement of specific products of the Project.
Natural National Parks of Colombia (PNN)	Cooperating Entity	G	Strategically linked in the achievement of specific products of the Project.
Four regional environmental authorities (CORMACARENA, CORPORINOQUIA, CORPOCESAR AND CORPAMAG)	Cooperating Entities	E	Strategically linked in the achievement of specific products of the Project, especially activities related to training, knowledge transfer and technical assistance.
Six beneficiary palm clusters	Cooperating Entity	G	Strategically linked in the achievement of specific products of the Project, especially activities related to training, transfer of knowledge and technical assistance. All participated except Aceites Manuelita, who did not participate in some project activities.

***Note**: E= excellent G= good R= regular B= bad.*
The color indicates an alert in compliance, according to the information provided.

Source: Progress reports and interviews 2018, CCT 2018.

Annex 7

COOPERATION AGREEMENTS SIGNED BY FEDEPALMA WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BPL

- *Strategic Cooperation Agreement No. PE.GDE.1.4.8.1.16.021 between the Corporation for the Sustainable Development of the Special Management Area La Macarena (CORMACARENA), Aceites Manuelita S.A. and the National Federation of Oil Palm Growers (FEDEPALMA), September 2018.*
- *Special research agreement between the Universidad del Magdalena, FEDEPALMA, C.I. Tequendama S.A.S. and the Association of Beekeepers Conservationists of the Sierra Nevada (APISIERRA), June 2016.*
- *Cooperation agreement signed between the National Federation of Oil Palm Growers (FEDEPALMA) and Aceites SA, for the execution of the GEF project "Conservation of Biodiversity in Crops Areas of Palma", financed by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB).*
- *Cooperation agreement between the National Federation of Oil Palm Growers (FEDEPALMA) and C.I. Tequendama S.A.S., for the execution of the GEF project "Conservation of Biodiversity in Crops Areas of Palma", financed by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB).*
- *Cooperation agreement between National Federation of Oil Palm Growers (FEDEPALMA) and the Research Center Corporation in Oil Palm (CENIPALMA), for the execution of the GEF project "Conservation of Bio-diversity in Crop Areas de Palma", financed by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB).*
- *Cooperation agreement between the National Federation of Oil Palm Growers (FEDEPALMA) and the Regional Autonomous Corporation of Magdalena, for the implementation of the GEF project "Conservation of Biodiversity in Palm Crops Areas", financed by the Bank Inter-American Development Bank (IDB).*
- *Cooperation agreement signed between the National Federation of Oil Palm Growers (FEDEPALMA) and Hacienda La Cabaña SA, for the execution of the GEF project "Conservation of Biodiversity in Palm Crops Areas", financed by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB).*
- *Specific cooperation agreement between the National Federation of Oil Palm Growers (FEDEPALMA) and the Alexander von Humboldt Research Institute for Biological Resources.*
- *Cooperation agreement signed between the National Federation of Oil Palm Growers (FEDEPALMA) and National Natural Parks, for the execution of the GEF project "Conservation of Biodiversity in the Crops Areas of Palma", financed by the Inter-American Development Bank (BID).*
- *Cooperation agreement between the National Federation of Oil Palm Growers (FEDEPALMA) and UNIPALMA Plantations of Los Llanos S.A. (UNIPALMA S.A.), for the execution of the GEF project "Conservation of Biodiversity in the Palm Cropping Zones", financed by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB).*
- *Cooperation agreement between the National Federation of Oil Palm Growers (FEDEPALMA) and WWF Colombia, for the implementation of the project "Conservation of Biodiversity in Palm Crops Areas", financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and administered by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB).*
- *Cooperation agreement signed between the National Federation of Oil Palm Growers (FEDEPALMA) and Aceites Manuelita SA, for the execution of the GEF project "Conservation of Biodiversity in the Crops Areas of Palma", financed by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB).*

Annex 8

IDENTIFICATION OF DEVELOPMENT PROBLEMS THAT GAVE ORIGIN TO THE DESIGN OF THE PROJECT

Table **20** **Identification of the development problems that gave origen to the design of the project**

PROBLEM	CLARITY IN DIAGNOSIS	OBJECTIVE OF THE TC?	EXPLANATION
The cultivation of oil palm (Elaeis guineensis Jacq.) In Colombia is growing significantly.	VC	Yes	The sector has already experienced an accelerated growth in the last two decades, going from 111,380 hectares sown in 1990 to 403,684 hectares sown in 2010.
Currently, palm cultivation is the third largest in Colombia, and the government has prioritized it as one of the productive sectors with the greatest potential for global competitiveness.	VC	Yes	The crop is supported by the Productive Transformation Program of the Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Tourism, in which a goal of growth of the area sown in oil palm in the country of about 1,600,000 hectares for the year 2032 had been proposed at the time of project design. With this, it was intended that the crop could become the largest area sown in the country.
The growth expected for the Colombian palm sector can lead to two types of environmental impacts.	VC	Yes	• Degradation of ecosystems: The expansion of crops puts more pressure particularly on natural areas. A study commissioned by FEDEPALMA in 2004 showed that 17.5% of the area devoted to palm was previously under natural ecosystems (eg humid forests, savannas, wetlands, etc.) (Rodríguez & van Hoof, 20044). In the case of the eastern part of the country, another study indicates that 24.8% of the new area planted in the Meta Department (85,635 km2) in 2005 corresponded to areas with native forests and bodies of water (MAVDT 2008). It is to be expected that these figures will increase if the capacity to implement a palm expansion plan with low environmental impact on natural ecosystems is not created, either by palm growers or by local authorities. • Inadequate agricultural practices: degradation of agroecosystems by farming practices that affect the biotic (flora and fauna), water and soil conditions in areas of palm influence. The UNDP (2010), points out the reduction of pesticides and fertilizers, integrated pest management and biological control among the

PROBLEM	CLARITY IN DIAGNOSIS	OBJECTIVE OF THE TC?	EXPLANATION
			most important practices to reduce the effects of palm cultivation on biodiversity. The main effects of traditional farming practices include erosion and soil compaction; water and land contamination due to the use of chemical inputs and solid waste; alteration and decrease of water sources by deviation and drying them; alteration of the biological activity of species; and contamination by liquid effluents. These impacts lead to the degradation of the natural productive base in these zones, as well as to the fractioning of the ecological integrity and functionality of natural ecosystems..
From the diagnoses carried out by the Ministry of Environment, Housing and Territorial Development, MAVDT (2008), and UNDP (2010), it is concluded that in Colombia there are four factors causing the loss of biodiversity, associated with palm expansion. and crop management:	VC	Yes	(i) Lack of knowledge about conservation instruments and environmentally sound management in palm systems.[23] (ii) Limited institutional capacity to incorporate biodiversity into sectoral agendas and planning and territorial ordering processes.[24] (iii) Access to differentiated markets.[25] (iv) Undervaluation of the economic benefits of environmental services for the palm tree activity.[26]

[23] Palm growers and regional actors are not familiar with comprehensive methods to identify, manage and monitor important conservation areas inside and outside the crops, such as the protocols for the identification of HCVA and the use of landscape management tools to recover the connectivity of ecosystems. Therefore, between 10% and 15% of the areas in natural state remaining within the palm systems have not yet been managed according to their ecological attributes or environmental services. These areas have not been articulated within the network of protected areas at the regional or national level, which threatens the connectivity and viability of ecosystems in the long term.

[24] In Colombia, there is no adequate zoning of areas suitable for the development of palm farming, which considers criteria of soil, climatic and/or ecological aptitudes. The incorporation of the environmental dimension in the Municipal Land Management Plans and the application of specific tools for managing biodiversity at the landscape level are incipient. In addition, the environmental agendas of local actors tend to focus on the control of pollution and clean production, leaving the aspects of valuation of biodiversity and their related environmental services in the background.

[25] Although Colombia has 10% of the world's biodiversity, the country captures less than 0.05% of the world market for bio-trade products, estimated at US$141.3 billion by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD 2010). The adoption of environmental certification schemes in the palm sector is taking place in response to a collective effort of producers, suppliers and users to minimize the negative environmental impact of the crop and minimize the risks associated with it, mainly reputational. Although Colombia has a specific standard based on the Principles and Criteria of the Round Table on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO), its implementation is still incipient as a result of the technical weakness of palm growers and environmental authorities. to give the necessary accompaniment to the producers to comply with said requirements. Certification can be a factor of competitiveness and product differentiation at an international level.

[26] The environmental benefits (e.g. phytosanitary barriers, pollination, erosion control) associated with conservation areas within the production and expansion areas have not been valued within the palm sector. None of these environmental services is reflected in market values or explicitly recognized in the economic analysis that underlies the decisions of expansion and management of the crop by producers. Compensation schemes for environmental services have not been developed that could weigh the opportunity costs of producers to maintain conservation areas with natural palm potential.

***Note**: VC= Very clear C= Clear NC= Not clear NM= Not mentioned*

Fuente: Plan de operaciones, informes de avance y entrevistas 2018.

Annex 9

TABLES OF COMPLIANCE WITH PRODUCT INDICATORS

Table 21 **Cumplimiento de los indicadores de producto del componente 1 (C1): Planificación y manejo ambientalmente adecuado de los sistemas palmeros**

PRODUCT INDICATOR	BASE LINE	GOAL	ACCOMPLISHMENT	%	COMMENTS
1.1: Studies of palm aptitude zoning and ecological structures developed at sub-regional scale					
1.1.1 Number of studies of ecological structures at sub-regional scale constructed participatively with the environmental authorities, territorial entities, and the palm clusters	0	2	2	100	The initial goal of 3 was modified to 2, fulfilling 100%.
1.1.2 Number of palm aptitude zoning studies at the sub-regional completed	0	2	2	100	The initial goal of 3 was modified to 2 fulfilling 100%.
1.2: Extension and socialization program on ecological structures, zoning and planning tools					
1.2.1 Number of palm beneficiary clusters and their UAATAS trained in the adoption of ecological structures, zoning and planning tools	0	6	3	50	*It will be considered that a beneficiary palm cluster is trained, to the extent that at least 80% of its members of the selected farms (supplier producers) and the personnel of their UAATAS have received training throughout the project.*
1.2.2 Number of socialization and feedback events of studies of ecological structures and zoning developed with environmental authorities and territorial entities at a sub-regional level	0	12	12	100	The attendance lists can be found in the semi-annual reports 2014-2016.
1.3: Diagnostics and Agro-ecological Conversion Plans formulated for the beneficiary clusters					
1.3.1 Percentage of selected farms in the beneficiary centers with diagnoses and agro-ecological conversion plans made	0	80	82	102	The goal was exceeded. The indicator was divided into two.
1.4: Extension program for the adoption of the Agro-ecological Conversion Plans					
1.4.1 Number of beneficiary palm clusters and their UAATAS trained for the implementation of Agro-ecological Conversion Plans	0	6	6	100	*A beneficiary palm cluster will be considered trained, to the extent that at least 80% of the members of the selected farms (supplying producers) and the personnel of their UAATAS have received training throughout the project.*
1.5: Diagnostics and implementation plans for complementary landscape management tools formulated for the beneficiary clusters					
1.5.1 Number of beneficiary clusters with diagnoses and implementation plans of landscape management tools formulated	0	6	6	100	It was carried out within the context of Finca Plan and establishment of nurseries.
1.6: Extension program for the adoption of Complementary Landscape Management Tools					
1.6.1 Number of palm beneficiary clusters and their UAATAS trained for the implementation of	0	6	6	100	It was carried out within the context of Finca Plan and establishment of nurseries.

PRODUCT INDICATOR	BASE LINE	GOAL	ACCOMPLISHMENT	%	COMMENTS
Complementary Landscape Management Tools					
1.7: Conservation corridors for ecosystem connectivity established in the palm sub-regions					
1.7.1 ***Current***: Number of conservation corridors identified at the scale of the palm sub-region ***Original***: Number of conservation corridors established at the palm-sub-regional level	0	2	2	100	The indicator was modified to: "Number of conservation corridors identified at the palm sub-region scale"

Note: *The color indicates an alert in compliance, according to the information provided.*
The comments in italics in the last column correspond to the results matrix of the project (BID 2012).

Source: BID __, Informe Semestral 2018, Informe Final 2018, interviews 2018.

Table 22 **Compliance with the product indicators of component 2 (C2): conservation and valuation of environmental services in palm systems (US$4.56 million)**

PRODUCT INDICATOR	BASE LINE	GOAL	ACCOMPLISHMENT	%	COMMENTS
2.1: Palm clusters with identified HVCA and management plans for their protection and restoration formulated					
2.1.1 ***Current***: Beneficiary palm clusters (BPC) with identified HVCA ***Original***: Beneficiary palm clusters (BPC) with HVCA declared	0	6	**6**	100	It was carried out in the beneficiary clusters.
2.1.2 BPC with management plans for the protection and restoration of HVCA formulated	0	6	**6**	100	It was carried out in the beneficiary clusters.
2.2: Cost-benefit quantification studies associated with the provision of ecosystem services developed for prioritized palm clusters					
2.2.1 Number of clusters that have cost-benefit quantification studies associated with the provision of ecosystem services	0	6	5	83	Aceites Manuelita cluster was not interested in participating in the studies carried out by ECOTRÓPICO firm.
2.3: Extension program for the identification, management, protection and restoration of HCVA and the valuation of its ecosystem services					
2.3.1 ***Current***: ○ *1. Beneficiary palm clusters (and their UAATAS) trained in the identification, management, protection and restoration of HCVA.* ○ *2. Beneficiary palm clusters (and their UAATAS) trained in*	0	6	1. 6 2. 5	1. 100 2. 83	*A beneficiary palm cluster will be considered qualified, as at least 80% of its Allies of the selected farms (producing suppliers) and the personnel of their UAATAS have received training throughout the project.*

PRODUCT INDICATOR	BASE LINE	GOAL	ACCOMPLISHMENT	%	COMMENTS
the valuation of their ecosystem services. ***Original***: Number of beneficiary palm clusters and their UAATAS trained for identification, management, protection and restoration of HCVA and the valuation of their ecosystem services					Partial accomplishment. The Manuelita cluster did not participate in the second phase.
2.3.2 Number of socialization events of HCV analysis with environmental authorities and territorial entities developed at the sub-regional level	0	6	6	100	They were carried out in the North and the East Zone.
2.4: Schemes of incentives or compensations for environmental conservation in palm clusters designed					
2.4.1 Number of incentive or compensation schemes for the conservation of HCVAs and ecosystem services, designed and arranged among providers and users of ecosystem services	0	3	0	0%	There was no feasibility to develop this product.
2.5: Extension program to beneficiary palm clusters and their UAATAS for the definition and access to incentives and environmental compensation					
2.5.1 Number of beneficiary palm clusters and their UAATAS trained for the definition and access to environmental incentives and compensations	0	6	0	0%	*A beneficiary palm cluster will be considered qualified, as at least 80% of its Allies of the selected farms and the personnel of its UAATAS have received training throughout the project.* Idem 2.4.1.

Note: *The color indicates an alert in compliance, according to the information provided.*
C= component.
The comments in italics in the last column correspond to the results matrix of the project (BID 2012).

Source: BID __, Informe Semestral 2018, Informe Final 2018, interviews 2018.

Table 23 **Compliance with the product indicators of component 3 (C3): uses and differentiated markets for products that contribute to biodiversity (US$2,76 million)**

PRODUCT INDICATOR	BASE LINE	GOAL	ACCOMPLISHMENT	%	COMMENTS
3.1: Analysis of opportunities on agrobiodiversity and access to differentiated markets made for beneficiary palm clusters					
3.1.1 Number of palm clusters with studies analyzing opportunities on agrobiodiversity and access to green markets	0	6	1	17%	Only one study was carried out on the apicultural chain in C.I. Tequendama

PRODUCT INDICATOR	BASE LINE	GOAL	ACCOMPLISHMENT	%	COMMENTS
3.2: Diagnostics and Action Plans to access sustainability certifications (RSPO or similar) for palm clusters designed					
3.2.1 Number of palm clusters with diagnoses and Action Plans to access sustainability certifications (RSPO or similar) made	0	6	6	100	The indicator was met.
3.3: Extension program on agrobiodiversity, access to differentiated markets and RSPO					
3.3.1 % producers of beneficiary clusters participating in the support program for the adoption of agrobiodiversity tools and practices and green markets	0	60	0	0	The test conducted with the apicultural chain was not feasible to access green markets.
3.3.2 Extension of farms with advances in compliance plans to achieve a socio-environmental certification (RSPO or similar) (ha)	4.000	19.000	27.715	146%	*The socio-environmental certification refers to organic, environmental, RSPO, Rainforest Alliance, or other certifications that recognize socio-environmental differences.*

***Note**: The color indicates an alert in compliance, according to the information provided.*
The comments in italics in the last column correspond to the results matrix of the project (BID 2012).

Source: BID __, Informe Semestral 2018, Informe Final 2018, interviews 2018.

Table 24 **Compliance with product indicators of component 4 (C4): monitoring, communication and evaluation of impacts (US$0,57 million)**

PRODUCT INDICATOR	BASE LINE	GOAL	ACCOMPLISHMENT	%	COMMENTS
4.1: Study to finalize the baseline with a representative group of project beneficiaries and control group carried out					
4.1.1 Baseline report delivered and reviewed	0	1	1	100	The goal was met.
4.2: Follow-up study of the producers with whom the baseline was built					
4.2.1 Reports of follow-up surveys that show the main differences of the main indicators between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries	0	2	2	100	The report analyzing the differences between the indicators is being prepared directly by the IDB.
4.3: Analysis of program performance					
4.3.1 Periodic reports of program performance delivered and reviewed	0	3	10	100	The goal was met.
4.4: Outreach strategy and introductory training to new palm clusters that show interest in the lessons learned from the program					
4.4.1 Number palm producers of non-beneficiary clusters participating in dissemination and training workshops	0	100	142	142	The goal was exceeded.

***Note**:* *The color indicates an alert in compliance, according to the information provided. The comments in italics in the last column correspond to the results matrix of the project (BID 2012).*

Source: BID __, Informe Semestral 2018, Informe Final 2018, interviews 2018.

Annex 10

SOURCES AND AMOUNTS OF CO-FINANCING (TO OCTOBER 19, 2018)

Table 25 **Sources and amounts of co-financing (to October 19, 2018)**

COFINANCING SOURCES [1]	NAME OF CO-FINANCIER	TYPE OF CO-FINANCING [2]	CONFIRMED/ APPROVED	DISBURSED AT THE MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE PROJECT		DISBURSED AT THE PROJECT CLOSURE [3]	
			(US$)	(US$)	(%)	(US$)	(%)
Autonomous Institution	IAvH	In kind	1.110.000	860.585	78%	860.585	78%
National Government	IDEAM	In kind	470.000	0	0%	0	0%
National Government	National Parks	In kind	400.000	0	0%	0	0%
ONG	WWF	In kind	310.000	211.210	68%	436.884	141%
Government	CAR[27]	In kind	1.420.000	0	0%	344.508	24%
Autonomous Institution	CENIPALMA	In kind	1.660.000	1.717.057	103%	2.339.952	141%
Autonomous Institution	FEDEPALMA	In kind	1.910.000	913.583	48%	1.573.788	82%
Private Enterprises	Anchor Companies	In kind/Cash	7.050.000	3.287.556	47%	5.553.842	79%
		TOTAL	**14.330.000**	**6.989.991**	**49%**	**11.109.559**	**78%**

***Note**: The color indicates an alert in compliance, according to the information provided.*
[1] Sources of co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agencies, Foundations, GEF Agency, Local Governments, National Government, Civil Society Organizations, other multilateral agencies and, Private Sector, among others.

[2] Type of co-financing may include: donation, soft loan, hard loan, guarantee and in kind, among others.

(3) Figures correspond to execution until October 19, 2018. These figures are preliminary since payments will be made until October 31, 2018 and the financial statements will be prepared in November 2018.

Source: CEO endorsement request 2012; EMT 2016, BID 2018.

[27] Regional Autonomous Corporation.