INTEGRATED SUSTAINABILITY SOLUTIONS LLC

Final Evaluation Report

Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable management in priority Socio-ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes (SEPLS)

Keith J. Forbes
Integrated Sustainability Solutions LLC
kforbes@issolutionsllc.com

November 8, 2019

Cover images: (From left to right) Top row – Southern Mangroves Aquaculture Cooperative member in Barachois, Cité la Chaux, Mauritius; recently cleared land in Mae Um Yod community lands, Mae Chaem District, Chiang Mai Province, Thailand; residents of Mae Yod village at group interview; Middle row - girl planting mangrove seeds in Rio do Portoviejo estuary, Manabi province, Ecuador; Agricultural and NTFP produced by Mae Um Pai community, Mae La Noi District, Maehongson Province, Thailand; Artisanal salt production in Las Gilces, Manabi, Ecuador; Bottom row - Barachois showing rehabilitated path and mangroves; Isla Corazon mangrove island, Rio Chone estuary, Manabi, Ecuador; Abandoned house intended for eventual project use in Barachois. Photographs by Keith Forbes.

This Evaluation Report was authored by Keith Forbes (kforbes@issolutionsllc.com), Integrated Sustainability Solutions LLC (http://www.issolutionsllc.com/).

It should be cited as:

Forbes, Keith. 2019. Terminal Evaluation of "Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable management in priority Socio-ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes (SEPLS)" Conservation International GEF Project Agency (CI-GEF), Arlington, VA.

Acronyms

CEPF	Critical Ecosystem Protection Fund
CI	Conservation International
CI-GEF	Conservation International Global Environment Facility (GEF) Project Agency
CIJ	Conservation International Japan
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
COP	Conference of the Parties
EA	Executing agency
EPCO	Environmental Protection & Conservation Organisation
ESMF	Environmental and social management framework
FIDES	*La Fundación Para la Investigación y Desarrollo Social*
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IGES	Institute for Global Environmental Strategies
IEO	Independent Evaluation Office
IMPECT	Inter Mountain Peoples' Education and Culture in Thailand Association
IPSI	International Partnership for the Satoyama Initiative
ISS	Integrated Sustainability Solutions LLC
KI	Key Informant
KfW	German development bank
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NTFP	Non-timber forest products
OECM	Other effective area-based conservation measures
PIR	Project Implementation Report
QR	Quarterly Report (of CI-GEF)
SEPLS	Socio-ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes
SDM	Satoyama Development Mechanism
TE	Terminal Evaluation
UNU-IAS	United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability
WCS	Wildlife Conservation Society

Table of Contents

Acronyms....1
List of Tables....3
List of Figures....3
I. Executive Summary....4
II. Introduction: Purpose, Scope, and Methodology....6
II.1 Purpose and Scope of Evaluation....6
II.2 Methodology....9
II.3 Limitations of the Evaluation....17
III. Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations....21
III.1 Theory of Change....21
III.2 Assessment of Project Results....28
III.3 Progress to Impact....37
III.4 Quality of Implementation and Execution....40
III.5 Gender and Safeguards....43
III.6 Sustainability....47
III.9 Summary of Ratings....55
....55
IV. Cross-cutting Evaluation Themes and Lessons Learned....56
IV.1 Co-financing and need for follow-up....56
IV.2 Lessons Learned....56
Annex....59
Online Survey....59
Evaluation Team Composition and Expertise....61

List of Tables

Table 1. Regions, countries and executing agencies....7
Table 2. Questionnaire for CI Japan (Executing Agency) and Grantees....10
Table 3. Key Informant Questionnaire....12
Table 4. List of Key Informants in Thailand....13
Table 5. List of Key Informants in Mauritius....14
Table 6. List of Key Informants in Ecuador....16
Table 7. GEF-Satoyama Project Components, Outputs, and Outcomes....22
Table 8. Project Outcomes and Assumptions....23
Table 9. Objective Indicators....28
Table 10. GEF-Satoyama Project Results Framework....29
Table 11. Grievances reported by Sub-grantee....43
Table 12. Summary of Sustainability Ratings....54
Table 13. Summary of Ratings....55

List of Figures

Figure 1. Field visit to communities, Thailand....13
Figure 2. Field visit to Barachois, Mauritius....15
Figure 3. Field visit to Ecuador....17
Figure 4. Mangroves in the Barachois, Mauritius....38
Figure 5. Isla Corazon in the Rio Chone estuary, Ecuador, showing reforested mangroves....39

I. Executive Summary

Integrated Sustainability Solutions LLC (ISS) implemented the Terminal Evaluation (TE) of "Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable management in priority Socio-ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes (SEPLS)" for the Conservation International Global Environmental Facility (GEF) Project Agency (CI-GEF), also known as the GEF-Satoyama Project (hereafter).

The specific components of the project are: Component 1: "On-the-ground demonstration" – Enhancing livelihoods, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services through investing in demonstration projects, Component 2: "Knowledge generation" – Improving knowledge generation to increase understanding, raise awareness and promote mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes, and Component 3: "Capacity Building" – Improving inter-sectoral collaboration and capacities for maintaining, restoring and revitalizing social and ecological values in priority SEPLS.

The TE was implemented by Mr. Keith Forbes (hereafter consultant or ISS), Founder and Principal of Integrated Sustainability Solutions LLC (ISS). The research was designed to consist of three phases: 1) Desk Research, 2) Field Work, and 3) Analysis and Report Writing. The GEF-Satoyama Project was implemented in three regions – Tropical Andes, Madagascar and the Indian Ocean islands, and Indo-Burma. Due to resource constraints which precluded visiting all the countries, the consultant was asked, within the proposal, to propose field visits to a single country from each region. ISS proposed Thailand, Mauritius, and Ecuador, which were accepted by CI-GEF. The other seven countries were assessed during phase 3 through an online survey.

These countries were chosen to strike a balance between the direct and indirect numbers of beneficiaries and area improved, land vs. seascapes, different productive sectors, and ecosystems; as well as cost-effectiveness. The proposed countries for the study total 3,603 direct and 40,736 indirect beneficiaries, and the total affected area is 17,207 ha (direct) and 102,213 ha (indirect). The countries proposed also include a wide range of ecosystems (mangroves, dry forest, rain forest, and coastal wetlands) and productive sectors (agriculture, agroforestry, and fisheries).

The TE considered the following evaluation elements in rigorous compliance with the Scope of Work – Theory of Change, Assessment of Project Results, Progress to Impact, Quality of Implementation and Execution, Gender and Safeguards, and Sustainability. The Scope of Work states, "The Terminal Evaluation (TE) is designed to provide comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of a completed project by assessing its design, implementation, and achievement of objectives. The evaluation is expected to: promote accountability and transparency and facilitate the synthesis of lessons learned. Also, the TE will provide feedback to allow the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) to identify recurring issues across the GEF portfolio; and, contribute to GEF IEO databases for aggregation and analysis." In addition, ISS suggested to CI-GEF that this evaluation specifically seek to identify lessons learned regarding

the design of large global projects, which was enthusiastically received and supported by CI-GEF.

The evaluation team worked closely with the sub-grantees, IMPECT, EPCO, and FIDES; and CI Japan (CIJ) in identifying key informants (KI). However, it is important to stress that the evaluation maintained complete independence in terms of findings, recommendations, and ratings. An Inception Report (May 23, 2019) and presentation of Initial Conclusions (presented via Skype on August 1 to CI-GEF, CI Japan, UNU-IAS, IGES and representatives of the Japanese Ministry of the Environment) were provided to CI-GEF prior to the elaboration of this evaluation report.

The other evaluation elements were rated as Satisfactory or Highly Satisfactory, and Sustainability as Moderately Likely. This reflects the solid accomplishments of the GEF-Satoyama Project across 3 regions and 10 countries. While certain structural changes, greater attention to "right sizing" individual projects, and the development of value chains would benefit future such global projects, this project achieved numerous successes across multiple geographies. The specific ratings are provided below.

- Theory of Change – Highly Satisfactory
- Assessment of Project Results (Overall, Highly Satisfactory; Particular indicators – Moderately Satisfactory)
- Progress towards Impacts – Highly Satisfactory
- Quality of Implementation and Execution – Highly Satisfactory (Implementation), Highly Satisfactory (Execution)
- Gender and Safeguards – Satisfactory
- Sustainability – Likely

II. Introduction: Purpose, Scope, and Methodology

II.1 Purpose and Scope of Evaluation

Integrated Sustainability Solutions LLC (ISS) is pleased to submit to CI-GEF the Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project titled "Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable management in priority Socio-ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes (SEPLS)" (hereafter, referred to as the "GEF-Satoyama Project").

The Conservation International Foundation (CI) issued an RFP on March 6, 2019, requesting bids from consultants to implement the TE. ISS was pleased to have been selected on April 29, 2019. The contract between CI and ISS was fully executed on May 13, 2019, with a period of performance between May 10 and August 9, 2019 (subsequently extended) and a total level of effort of 42 days.

SEPLS are "dynamic mosaics of habitats and land and sea uses where the harmonious interaction between people and nature maintains biodiversity while providing humans with the goods and services needed for their livelihoods, survival and well-being in a sustainable manner." The GEF-Satoyama Project page states that the "Satoyama initiative is promoting the sustainable use of natural resources in human-influenced natural environment (socio-ecological production landscapes and seascapes: SEPLS), which are formed by the interaction of human *(sic)* and nature.[1]"

The GEF-Satoyama Project focused on SEPLS globally, aiming to make valuable contributions to the achievement of multiple Aichi Biodiversity Targets and Sustainable Development Goals. This project was funded by the GEF, implemented by CI-GEF, and executed by CI Japan (CIJ), in cooperation with the United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS) and the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES). CI Japan, UNU-IAS and IGES, together, formed the Executive Team (ET). The project had three components, which are inter-related: Component 1 for field demonstration, Component 2 for knowledge generation, and Component 3 for capacity building and outreach (the latter two constituted the amplification arm of the project).

The GEF Project ID is 5784 and the project is within the Biodiversity focal area of the GEF. The project was administered by CI-GEF and was implemented from 9/1/2015 to 8/30/2019. GEF financing was USD 1,909,000, which was supplemented with an expected level of USD 6,350,000 of co-financing. This was exceeded and USD 7,408,736 was realized. The project components were:

- Component 1, "On-the-ground demonstration." Enhancing livelihood, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services through investing in demonstration projects.

[1] GEF-Satoyama Project website http://gef-satoyama.net/about-us/. Accessed 10/7/2019.

- Component 2, “Knowledge generation.” Improving knowledge generation to increase understanding, raise awareness and promote mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes
- Component 3: “Capacity Building.” Improving inter-sectoral collaboration and capacities for maintaining, restoring and revitalizing social and ecological values in priority SEPLS.

The project was implemented in ten countries in three regions, as follows.

Table 1. Regions, countries and executing agencies

Region	**Country**	**Executing Agency**
Tropical Andes	Ecuador	*La Fundación Para la Investigación y Desarrollo Social (FIDES)*
	Colombia	*Universidad Industrial de Santander (UIS)*
	Peru	*Asociación Amazónicos por la Amazonía (AMPA)*
Madagascar and the Indian Ocean Islands	Mauritius	EPCO
	Seychelles	Green Islands Foundation
	Comoros	Dahari
	Madagascar	Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)
Indo-Burma	Thailand	Intermountain Education and Culture in Thailand Association (IMPECT)
	India	The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI)
	Myanmar	Fauna & Flora International (FFI)

The central purposes of this TE are: 1) To evaluate the GEF-Satoyama Project, through a case study approach involving Thailand, Mauritius, and Ecuador (through field visits, key informant interviews, and in-depth interviews with the sub-grantees) and supplemented with an online survey administered to the additional seven countries; 2) To draw lessons learned from step 1 of wider applicability to the program as a whole, and 3) To draw lessons learned from this TE to inform the design of future such CI-GEF global programs. The specific evaluation themes included were: Theory of Change, Assessment of Project Results, Progress to Impact, Quality of Implementation and Execution, Gender and Safeguards, and Sustainability.

The research consisted of three phases: 1) Desk Research, 2) Field Missions (Thailand, May 24 - 31; Mauritius, June 17 - 26; Ecuador, August 5 - 10), and 3) Analysis and Report Writing. The field missions were scheduled in accordance with the availability of the sub-grantee teams and local circumstances.[2] Indeed, the presentation of Initial Conclusions was actually held before the Ecuador field mission. The slide deck of the presentation was subsequently modified to add data and conclusions drawn from the Ecuador fieldwork as well as questionnaire responses from UNU-IAS and IGES. The slide deck was submitted on August 1 and then re-submitted on Aug 20. During phase 3, supplementary data from the other seven countries was requested through an online survey.

This report is structured as follows: I. Executive Summary, II. Introduction: Purpose, Scope, and Methodology, III. Findings and Recommendations, and IV. Overall Conclusions and Lessons Learned. Chapter II discusses the scope of the evaluation, the methodology, and its limitations. Chapter III presents the findings and conclusions for each of the evaluation themes, makes recommendations, and provides a rating per the GEF six-point system (from Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory) for all the themes except for Sustainability. The GEF six-point rating system is defined as follows:

- Highly satisfactory (HS): Level of outcomes achieved clearly exceeds expectations and/or there were no shortcomings
- Satisfactory (S): Level of outcomes achieved was as expected and/or there were no or minor shortcomings
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): Level of outcomes achieved more or less as expected and/or there were moderate shortcomings
- Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): Level of outcomes achieved somewhat lower than expected and/or there were significant shortcomings
- Unsatisfactory (U): Level of outcomes achieved substantially lower than expected and/or there were major shortcomings
- Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): Only a negligible level of outcomes achieved and/or there were severe shortcomings
- Unable to Assess (UA): The available information does not allow an assessment of the level of outcome achievements

Sustainability is rated differently, using a four-point scale (Likely to Unlikely) based on an assessment of the likelihood and magnitude of the risks to sustainability. These ratings are defined as follows:

- Likely (L): There is little or no risk to sustainability.
- Moderately Likely (ML): There are moderate risks to sustainability.
- Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks to sustainability.
- Unlikely (U): There are severe risks to sustainability.

[2] The Ecuador mission was conducted quite late in the process because of local elections changing the representatives of the local government partners involved in the project.

- Unable to Assess (UA): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability.

Chapter IV integrates the recommendations from Chapter III and focuses on lessons learned of relevance to future CI-GEF global programs.

II.2 Methodology

The methodology of the TE was designed to strike an appropriate balance between breadth and depth, and be representative of the different regions, ecosystems, and scales of the projects. As such, it consisted of the following steps:

I. Desk research focusing on relevance to the TE (executing agency reports – recent PIRs and quarterly reports, the Project Document (ProDoc), individual project reports, programmatic site visits, and recent grantee reports)
II. Design of evaluation methodology and development of questionnaires for CI Japan, UNU-IAS, and IGES, sub-grantees, KI interviews, and field visit observations
III. Inception Workshop (held May 22, 2019) – a virtual inception workshop was held with CI-GEF, CI Japan, IMPECT, EPCO, and FIDES[3]
IV. Detailed questionnaire applied with CI Japan (see Table II below), and follow-up emailed questionnaires conducted with Mr. Yasuo Takahashi of IGES and Mr. Yohsuke Amano of UNU-IAS to obtain supplementary information regarding components 2 and 3
V. Field visits to Thailand, Mauritius, and Ecuador
VI. Analysis[4] and preparation of the Initial Conclusions presentation (presented virtually to CI-GEF, CI Japan, UNU-IAS, IGES, and Japanese Ministry of the Environment on August 1, 2019; report was updated after Ecuador field mission and sent to CI-GEF and CI Japan on August 20, 2019[5])
VII. Preparation of Draft and Final reports

[3] The related documents, previously submitted to CI-GEF, can be obtained via these links: Inception Workshop presentation and Inception Workshop report
[4] During the analysis phase, ISS supplemented the country level data using an online survey for the other seven countries
[5] CI-GEF requested that ISS provide the presentation of Initial Conclusions before the research was completed. ISS accommodated this request, which was made due to changes in the Executive Team staffing.

Table 2. Questionnaire for CI Japan (Executing Agency) and Grantees

Terminal Evaluation - Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable management in priority Socio-ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes (SEPLS)

I. Theory of Change

By: Component 1: "On-the-ground demonstration". Enhancing livelihood, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services through investing in demonstration projects, Component 2: "Knowledge generation". Improving knowledge generation to increase understanding, raise awareness and promote mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes, and Component 3: "Capacity Building." Improving inter-sectoral collaboration and capacities for maintaining, restoring and revitalizing social and ecological values in priority SEPLS.

the project will:

Mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services

Human well-being in priority Socio-Ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes can be improved

Question 1 – In retrospect, what can you say about the theoretical link between the 3 actions mentioned above and the overarching goals of the project?

Question 2 – Based on your insights from the implementation of this project, can you identify factors that came to the fore which were not anticipated in this theory of change?

II – Review of Logical Framework and M&E systems

Review achievement/non-achievement of indicators and reasons for both

Question 3 – Can you describe how the M&E systems were used in practice, and provide any examples of corrective actions taken based upon insights from M&E?

Question 4 – With the benefit of hindsight, would you agree that the log frame best measured the project? If not, why, and are there any project achievements which you feel could have been measured in a different way?

III – Progress to Impact

Question 5 – Can you comment on how the subgrant project outcomes contributed to

environmental stress reduction?

Question 6 – Can you point to any specific environmental status change (policy/ legal/regulatory, and socioeconomic)

Question 7 – How did the environmental stress reduction and status change at subgrant project level influence areas outside the project boundaries?

IV – Sustainability

Question 8 – What can you say about the sustainability of the project at EA (executing agency) and subgrant level? (Note – sustainability of these kinds of projects helpful to CI-GEF)

Question 9 – Are there any subgrants the impact of which you would consider more or less sustainable than others? If so, why? Are there any common factors that make some subgrant projects more likely to have sustainable impacts? (*not asked of grantees)*

V – Quality of Implementation and Execution

Question 10 – Can you comment on the evolution of the project from project identification, concept preparation, appraisal, preparation of detailed proposal, approval and start-up, oversight, and supervision, to completion.

Question 11 – Please describe the day-to-day implementation of the project at EA and subgrant level? *(EA part of question not asked of grantees)*

Question 12 – Can you briefly characterize the hiring processes and how goods and services were procured? Were there any bottlenecks?

Question 13 – What would you say about the link between the internal project organization and workflow and the project outputs? Would other structures have changed the outputs?

VI – Gender and Safeguards

Question 14 – Please describe both the formal (policies and norms) and practical integration of gender into the project at EA and ET level as well as subgrant level?

Question 15 – List the safeguards and accountability and grievance mechanisms. Were any of them triggered, and, if so, please describe how the issues identified were resolved?

In addition to the questionnaire applied to CI Japan, follow up emailed surveys were used with IGES and UNU-IAS, to obtain more data on components 2 and 3. These surveys were more concise, focusing on the respective organizations, as follows:

- ➔ Which of the 3 components of GEF-Satoyama did UNU-IAS/IGES conduct and why was UNU-IAS/IGES chosen?
- ➔ How did UNU-IAS/IGES work fit into the overall project? What degree of interaction was there with the subgrantees and institutions covering the other components?
- ➔ Can you identify any specific environmental stress reduction (e.g., deforestation, climate change, ...) or environmental status change (policies, regulations, laws, ...) attributable to the work done by UNU-IAS/IGES?
- ➔ Was there any indication that UNU-IAS/IGES work made a contribution beyond the institutions and areas directly involved in the project?
- ➔ Will UNU-IAS/IGES continue this same work? How?
- ➔ How was gender integrated?
- ➔ Were any safeguards mechanisms triggered?

The next step of the research was field missions to the selected countries, which included the following components:

1. In-depth questionnaire covering all evaluation themes (same questionnaire as in Table II above) and both GEF-Satoyama Project global level as well as sub-grantee logical frameworks (log frame) applied with IMPECT (Thailand), EPCO (Mauritius), and FIDES (Ecuador)
2. Simplified key informant interviews (see Table III below) with individuals and institutions familiar with the project or with relevant sectoral knowledge, using a more focused semi-structured questionnaire
3. Field visits to project sites

Table 3. Key Informant Questionnaire

Progress to Impact
1. Can you comment on how the subgrant project outcomes contributed to environmental stress reduction? 2. Can you point to any specific environmental status change (policy/ legal/regulatory, and socioeconomic) 3. How did the environmental stress reduction and status change at subgrant project level influence areas outside the project boundaries? 4. How will productive activities continue after the project?

Sustainability

5. What will happen after the project ends?

Gender and Safeguards

6. Please describe both the formal (policies and norms) and practical integration of gender into the project?
7. Did anyone have any concerns about the project? If so, please describe how the issues identified were resolved?

The details of each field mission are provided below by country:

Thailand

- ➔ In-depth questionnaire covering all evaluation themes and results frameworks at GEF-Satoyama Project global level as well as sub-grantee project level with IMPECT (on the first day of the field mission)
- ➔ Fifteen KI interviews (see Table III)
- ➔ Project site visits to Mae Yod and Mae Um Pai communities
- ➔ Initial conclusions presentation (on the last day of the field mission)

Table 4. List of Key Informants in Thailand

(Alphabetical by first name, name of institution or community)

1. Ayu Chupah, Akha Amma Coffee Shop owner
2. Biothai foundation – Kanlaya Chermue and Ann Sasithong
3. Boochi, Sub-district Governor of Maetho
4. Boonlue Thammatharanurak, Maechaem chief district officer
5. IMPECT – Prasert Trakansuphakong, Sakda Saenmi (Director)
6. Lakpa Nuri Sherpa, AIPP
7. Mae um Pai leaders and community
8. Mae Yod leaders and community
9. Malee Sitthikriengkrai, Chiang Mai University, Center for Ethnic Studies and Development
10. Napassawan, Sum Chai, Teachers (Khunmaeyod school, Mae um Yod)
11. Nat Sakhonbut, freelance filmmaker
12. Padpaiboon Reansorn, Pa'ka Coffee
13. PASD – Udon Charoenniyomphrai, Yottopan Phiphatmongbhokun, Phimonphan Chanpathipsong, Chamiporn Loedwattanagoson, Surachai Thaweecharoenporn
14. Phongsila Commak, Chef, 186
15. Udom Tabi, Aubluang National Park Officer

Figure 1. Field visit to communities, Thailand

(Images: Cultivated and fallow fields of different numbers of years (top and middle rows) in Mae Yod community lands, Mae Yod community interview (bottom left and middle), and (bottom right) – consultant, Phuyaiban of Mae Um Pai community, and Boonlue Thammatharanurak, Maechaem chief district officer.)

Mauritius

- ➔ In-depth questionnaire covering all evaluation themes and results framework at GEF-Satoyama global level as well as sub-grantee project level applied with EPCO (on the last day of the field mission)
- ➔ Fourteen KI interviews
- ➔ Project site visit to the Barachois, Cité La Chaux, Mahebourg
- ➔ Initial conclusions presentation (on the last day of the field mission)

Table 5. List of Key Informants in Mauritius

(Alphabetical by first name, name of institution or community)

1. Estelle Deja, EPCO (Initial and two follow-ups, conducted remotely as KI was in France during the TE visit)
2. Georges Ah Yen, Citoyen Libre
3. Johan Bisseur, Mahebourg Otentik
4. Keshwar Beeharry Panray, EPCO

5. Khemraj Prasad, Persand Royal Co. Ltd.
6. Ministry of Housing and Lands - Devsingh Shibnauth, Fazlur Taoswoo, and Shivaji Gunnu
7. Nadeem Nazurally, Senior Lecturer, University of Mauritius
8. Olivier Bolton, Save our Wetlands Mauritius
9. Pierre Yves Mongelard, Compagnie de Beau Vallon
10. Residences La Chaux Mahebourg
11. Sandy Montrose, Southern Mangrove Aquaculture Cooperative Society
12. Sebastien Sauvage and Shashi Chumul, ECOSUD
13. Vikash Tatayah, Mauritian Wildlife Foundation
14. Zayd Jhumka, Assistant Conservator of Forests, Forestry Service (Ministry of Agro-industry and Food security)

Figure 2. Field visit to Barachois, Mauritius

(Images: Top row - left, entrance to Barachois; middle, community and EPCO representative; right, remains of home of former French resident intended for use as shop connected to the planned Barachois activities; Middle row – left, view of ocean from Barachois; middle – shed next to abandoned home; right – community member walking on reconstructed bridge; Bottom row – left and middle, mangroves; right – possible evidence of Barachois returning to its former use as an illegal garbage dumping site?)

Ecuador

- ➔ In-depth questionnaire covering all evaluation themes and logical frameworks (log frame) at GEF-Satoyama global level as well as sub-grantee project level applied with FIDES (conducted over two days)
- ➔ Fourteen KI interviews
- ➔ Project site visits to the estuaries of Rio Portoviejo and Rio Chone
- ➔ Initial conclusions presentation (on the last day of the field mission)

Table 6. List of Key Informants in Ecuador

(Alphabetical by first name, name of institution or community)

1. Bolivar, president of Las Gilces commune and community leader training participant
2. Canton of Portoviejo – Cecilia Cárdenas; Roberto Novillo
3. Carlos, community leader training participant and tour guide, Las Gilces
4. FIDES – Maria Dolores Vera, Executive Director and Project Manager; Jairo Dias, President
5. Governo (GAD) provincial de Manabi, Departamento de Desarrollo Humano – Yael Seni, Director; Marisol Mendoza, Technician
6. Janic Cruz, Docente Investigador, Universidad Técnica de Manabí
7. Los Arenales school, La Crucita – Bolivar, Gilces community; Teacher/administrator - Fabiola Garcia, Javier Demera
8. Maira Vera, coordinator of biocorridor; Isla Corazon, Humedal La Segua, Cordillera Balsamo
9. Manuel Ayovi – Playa d'Ouro community project coordinator
10. Neil Zambrano, Chief Cooperación de Recursos Forestales y Ambientales de Manabí, Dirección de Gestión Ambiental, Governo (GAD) Provincial de Manabi
11. Pablo Garcia, Concejal del Canton Sucre
12. Portovelo basic school – Directora Marcia Cedeno Chila; Teachers – Marta Amanda Lor Cedeno, Jaine Maribelle Mejia, Luz Abdallah
13. Ramon Cedeno, Global Student Embassy
14. Rosa Aragundo, Las Gilces community leader training participant

Figure 3. Field visit to Ecuador

(Top row – left, boardwalk at Isla Corazon; middle – Carlos, leadership training beneficiary; right – mural at Las Gilces community center; Middle row – left, artisanal salt in Las Gilces; middle – salinas *in Las Gilces; right – Las Gilces community center supported by project funds; Bottom row – left, Los Arenales, Crucita, school, showing student "environmental police," Bolivar – community coordinator, consultant, teachers Javier Demera and Fabiola Garcia; middle – Rio Chone estuary; right – view of Isla Corazon from the water showing mangroves planted with project support)*

ISS provided CI-GEF three "Google Albums" of photographs of the field visits to the three countries visited and links to Google Drive folders of all the interview notes for the countries visited and the Executive Team. Following the desk research and field visit data gathering phases, the consultant analyzed all the data along the specific evaluation themes. The data gathered from the desk research, CI Japan, IGES, UNU-IAS, the sub-grantees, beneficiary communities and other KIs were initially collated in tabular form to facilitate further analysis. Through this process, the lack of sufficient country-specific data for the other seven countries became evident, and a short online survey was used to supplement the data from the field missions.[6] The consultant then compared the information obtained from the different sources,

[6] This survey is provided in the annex.

highlighting similarities and differences. In the case of the latter, an analysis was conducted to identify the reasons behind the differences and, based upon an understanding of the KI's perspectives, their degree of project knowledge, and the consultant's expert judgment, these differences were resolved. The end result of these processes was a set of findings which served as the foundation for the determination of conclusions and recommendations. The findings can therefore be regarded as the culled raw data, the conclusions as statements of expert opinion based upon these findings, and the recommendations as specific actions put forward based upon the conclusions. ISS LLC is known for its focus on *actionable* recommendations and maintained this focus in this evaluation.

The findings, conclusions and recommendations are discussed in Chapter 3. GEF requirements stipulate that the following six-point rating system be used – Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) – to rate the evaluation findings. Each evaluation theme is therefore also rated according to this scale, and the ratings included in the next chapter. For the Progress towards Results, the traffic light model (red-yellow-green) is used to indicate the degree of progress.

II.3 Limitations of the Evaluation

The key limitations of the methodology were: 1) Timing of the field visits, 2) Operational Challenges, 3) Length of the field visits, 4) Time span of field visits, 5) Case study approach, 6) Limited access to Executive Team, and 7) Document availability.

1) Timing of the Field Visits – The contract was finalized on May 13th and the field visit in Thailand commenced on the 24th per the availability of the sub-grantee IMPECT. Given the time difference between the consultant's base and Thailand, this allowed the consultant a very limited opportunity to review and comment on the KIs suggested by the sub-grantee. This likely led to selection bias in the KIs chosen.

2) Operational Challenges – In the case of Thailand, the consultant was not provided information regarding the language abilities of the KIs and was not aware that translation would be needed for essentially all of the interviews. Since a translator had not been budgeted for, the project lead for IMPECT accompanied the consultant to all the KI interviews and translated from English to Thai and vice versa. Both the presence of the IMPECT project lead and himself and his conducting the translation could have represented sources of bias, as there was no way for the consultant to directly comprehend the statements of the KIs (or through a neutral translator).

Seven government KIs were contacted in Mauritius. Despite repeated efforts by email and phone calls by the consultant and the EPCO lead, including proposing calls after the country

visit (by Skype, WhatsApp, or phone call), only two KI interviews were possible with Mauritian government entities, and the level of responsiveness to the evaluator in these interviews was less than optimal. Thus, the absence of a broad set of candid opinions from the multiple ministries with responsibilities over different aspects of the Barachois project limited the data available to the evaluation. This was especially critical given the role of Mauritian government entities in impeding further progress, as discussed in more detail in following sections.

Due to circumstances beyond her control, the project manager of the Mauritius Barachois project was in France at the time of the field visit. While the consultant compensated for her absence to the extent possible by multiple video and audio conferences, including after the fieldwork period, her presence during the field visit to the Barachois and discussions with the community would have been very helpful. The level of familiarity of the EPCO representative with the project, who did not have "hands on" experience with the project, was insufficient to compensate for the lack of the project manager.

3) Length of the field visits – generally, ISS endeavored to compensate for this limited time period by scheduling as many as 5 KI interviews in a day, totaling approximately 15 interviews per country, in addition to community-level interviews of large groups. However, the lack of time for reflection and dynamic modification of the KI questionnaire, in response to how it was being perceived and interpreted by the KIs, limited the analytical depth possible. Additionally, it was not possible to interview all potential KIs.

The KIs were selected according to the following process. ISS provided IMPECT, EPCO and FIDES broad guidelines (categories and relative proportions) regarding the categories of KIs desirable. As mentioned above, the consultant's ability to review the choice of the KIs was negligible in the case of Thailand. In Mauritius, the level of responsiveness of the government KIs was so poor that the scheduling was literally done by the hour *on the fly* through multiple phone calls and WhatsApp messages. Obtaining interviews for approximately 15 KIs under such challenging circumstances was a testament to the dedication of ISS and EPCO.

Specifically, with respect to interviewing the operational Focal Points (OFP), the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development is the OFP in Mauritius. The project had tried to engage this ministry during implementation, but they were unresponsive. Therefore, given the limited time, ISS focused on KIs with more knowledge of the project. In Thailand, the OFP is in Bangkok, and in Ecuador, in Quito. Since the consultant visited Chiang Mai and Portoviejo, respectively, and was pressed for time with the locally available KIIs and field visits, it was not possible to schedule time for additional phone calls. Additionally, the language barrier in Thailand would have made such a call impossible.

4) Time span of field visits – Due to the availability of the sub-grantee EPCO, the field visit to Mauritius was carried out in the last weeks of June, approximately a month after the Thailand visit. Due to local elections and changes in personnel within local government offices that had participated in the project, the field visit to Ecuador only occurred in early August. Thus, the field visits spanned May 24th to August 10th, a period of 11 weeks, which led to fragmented data analysis.

5) Case study approach – The GEF-Satoyama portfolio has projects in 10 countries. It was only possible to visit one country in each of the three regions. An online survey was administered to the other seven countries. All of the other countries except Comoros responded within the specified timeframe. While ISS has made every effort to ensure that the findings, conclusions and recommendations are broadly applicable to all the countries, the lack of primary in-country research on the other countries is obviously a limitation. As such, this report should be regarded as having employed a case study approach to the three countries visited, supplemented by the survey data.

6) Limited Access to Executive Team – ISS had limited access to CI Japan, IGES and UNU-IAS, which consisted of one approximately two-hour interview with CI Japan and emailed questionnaires to the other organizations. Multiple attempts were made to schedule a Skype call with IGES, but the representative indicated by CI Japan was unavailable at the scheduled times. Ultimately, to maintain the evaluation on track, it was necessary to use an emailed questionnaire. The consultant was advised that the representative of UNU-IAS had recently retired and may not have been available. Hence, an emailed questionnaire was also used for UNU-IAS. Earlier in the process, upon CI Japan's suggestion, ISS proposed a side visit to Japan in connection with the May 2019 research trip to Thailand. Plans were made for ISS to be able to conduct in-depth, in-person interviews of all the Executive Team partners, which would have provided valuable data for components 2 and 3, and increased the chance of the integrative nature of the three components being clear, especially if a joint interview would have been possible. This was not possible due to this trip not having been budgeted.

7) Document availability – The project's documents were not all in their final versions or completed at the stage of the desk review in May 2019. ISS endeavored to update the report with final versions of documents received during the review of the draft version of this evaluation report, but it was not always feasible within the time available to repeat all aspects of the analysis of these documents. This impacted the presentation and discussion of the Theory of Change and Results Framework (updated values provided in October 2019 version of PIR); and component 2 documents, especially the Satoyama Index manuscript, which was provided only in October 2019.

III. Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

The findings, conclusions and recommendations for all the evaluation themes are presented in this chapter. The findings are based upon a rigorous analysis of the desk research; interviews with CI Japan, UNU-IAS, and IGES; sub-grantees, country specific KIs, and field observations in Thailand, Mauritius, and Ecuador. The conclusions reflect further analysis and consideration of the multiplicity of views and opinions versus project documents through triangulation. The findings and conclusions are presented together, followed by a set of *actionable* recommendations for each set of findings and conclusions. The recommendations are based upon these findings and the expert judgment of the consultant. Findings, conclusions, and recommendations that are more specifically applicable to components 2 and 3 are noted as such.

III.1 Theory of Change

The Theory of Change of a project consists of overall objective(s), and a set of components, outputs, and outcomes, which have been designed to attain the given objectives. Also included in the Theory of Change is the long-term environmental impact of the project that is implicitly or explicitly embedded in the overall objective(s), and the assumptions that underlie the strategy of using the set of components, outputs, outcomes to achieve the objective(s).

Per the Project Document available on the CI-GEF Satoyama Project website,[7] the Project Vision is "Society in harmony with nature, with sustainable primary production sector based on traditional and modern wisdom, and making significant contributions to global targets for conservation of biological diversity," and the Project Objective is "To mainstream conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services, while improving human well-being in production landscapes and seascapes."

The intended long-term environmental impact of the program includes the development of a method by which to contribute both directly and indirectly towards biodiversity conservation. This method involves promoting sustainable management of SEPLS in locations strategically important to the planet's biodiversity. As detailed in III.2.1, key expected environmental benefits from the project's activities include conservation management of at least 60,000 ha of SEPLS in areas of global biodiversity importance; and the replication and adoption of SEPLS management approaches around the world.

The components, outputs, and outcomes are shown below in tabular form.

[7] https://www.conservation.org/gef/projects/satoyama

Table 7. GEF-Satoyama Project Components, Outputs, and Outcomes

Component	Outcome	Output
1. Enhancing livelihood, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services in priority SEPLS through investing in demonstration projects	Outcome 1.1: Effective conservation management in selected priority production landscapes and seascapes achieved	Output 1.1.1: At least 10,000 ha of production landscapes and seascapes are under effective management, with positive influence on additional 50,000 ha of protected areas nearby through connectivity, buffers or enhanced ecological sustainability provided in target landscapes and seascapes
	Outcome 1.2: Site-level conservation status of globally threatened species Improved	Output 1.2.1: Known critical threats to the conservation status of IUCN threatened species are minimized or removed.
	Outcome 1.3: Traditional knowledge benefiting and being protected in conservation measures	Output 1.3.1 Traditional knowledge and practices documented to benefit conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in subgrant projects
2. Improving knowledge generation to increase understanding, raise awareness and promote mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes	Outcome 2.1: Global knowledge on SEPLS for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into primary production enhanced	Output 2.1.1: Priority SEPLS around the world identified and mapped based on criteria developed from existing studies and methods.
		Output 2.1.2: Knowledge products (including the analysis of SEPLS cases around the world, toolkits, and policy analysis related to the development, implementation and management of sustainable SEPLS) developed and disseminated through the global knowledge management platform, relevant international fora (such as CBD and IUCN), and Component 3 workshops.
3. Improving inter-sectoral collaboration and capacities for maintaining, restoring and revitalizing social and ecological values in priority SEPLS.	Outcome 3.1: Capacity of multi-sectoral stakeholders, including national and international decision-makers and practitioners and under-represented groups, to collaborate and mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable management increased	Output 3.1.1: At least 500 stakeholders with increased awareness for mainstreaming the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in landscapes and seascapes through regional and global workshops (IPSI activities) and those conducted by and with partners (Association ANDES, SCBD and COMDEKS)
		Output 3.1.2: All workshops are conducted in gender-sensitive manner and ensure that 40-50% of the participants are women.
		Output 3.1.3: At least 50 stakeholders, including 2 practitioners / representatives from each of the subgrant project implementers under Component 1 trained in promoting mainstreaming of the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services, while improving human wellbeing, including through the use of the "Indicators for Resilience in SEPLS"

For the Theory of Change to be valid, certain assumptions have to be made about the activities and outputs. These are summarized below, as elaborated in the Project Document.

Table 8. Project Outcomes and Assumptions

Outcome	Assumptions
Outcome 1.1. Effective conservation management in selected priority production landscapes and seascapes will have positive impacts for at least 60,000ha.	Selected subgrantees address losses and/or sustain biodiversity and ecosystem services in production landscapes and seascape Land tenure and access to resources are compatible with the sustainable management of production landscapes and seascapes (also applies to Outcome 1.2.) There are land management units near the subgrant project sites, such as reasonably managed protected areas, to which the activities under subgrant projects can tangibly contribute to their conservation status (also applies to Outcome 1.2.) Local and national policies are supportive of, or at least flexible enough to accommodate, SEPLS principles and approach, and there are no significant disincentives that would undermine the project (also applies to Outcomes 1.2, 1.3., and 3.1.)
Outcome 1.2: Improved site-level conservation status of at least 20 globally threatened (critical, endangered and vulnerable) species.	The conservation status of the threatened species can be improved by investing in production landscapes and seascapes.
Outcome 1.3. Traditional Knowledge related to SEPLS management is documented, shared and used.	Issues of intellectual property rights will not affect documentation efforts
Outcome 2.1. Enhanced global knowledge on SEPLS for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into primary production	Key stakeholders will find knowledge products and resources developed through the project useful and applicable to their work.
Outcome 3.1: Increased capacity of multi-sectoral stakeholders, including national and international decision-makers and practitioners, to collaborate and mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable management	Key stakeholders will be interested and engage in capacity development and collaboration opportunities enabled through the project for the purpose of mainstreaming biodiversity and ecosystem services. Intended partner activities are conducted as discussed in consultation during the PPG phase. The Satoyama Initiative will continue to provide opportunities and support for learning, networking, collaboration and global platforms and venues for the promotion of SEPLS

III.1.1 Findings and Conclusions

Consistency with Objectives – There was consensus among CI Japan, UNU-IAS, IGES, and sub-grantee KIs that the Theory of Change is consistent with the global objectives of the program. Nothing that the consultant observed or determined through subsequent data analysis contradicts this very positive portrayal of the Theory of Change. One observation was that government outreach, which is especially critical in contexts where the government is not necessarily supportive, needed to be significantly stronger. A case in point was Mauritius, which will be discussed in further detail later in this report.

Selection criteria and changed GEF emphasis – The countries and projects across the three regions were determined through open calls for proposals. The selection criteria of Component

1 of GEF-Satoyama were focused on projects with a variety of activities, organization sizes, and landscapes versus seascapes. While this was appropriate given the demonstration nature of the sub-grantee projects and in line with the priorities of GEF-5 programming, when considering future such global projects, it is important to note that selecting projects in this manner would not facilitate the new programming directions under GEF-6.

The GEF IEO (Independent Evaluation Office) has outlined some criteria for transformational change, a priority under GEF-6.[8] These criteria include:

- Clear ambition in design
- Addressing market and system reforms through policies
- Mechanisms for financial sustainability
- Quality of implementation and execution
- May be achieved by projects of different size

Based upon GEF-6 programming directions, focusing on multi-sector linked projects within each country (depth not breadth) or region, rather than single small projects in multiple countries, is more likely to lead to effective government engagement, sustained improvements, scaling up, and transformational change. While working with multiple NGOs across ten countries brings the obvious benefit of helping to support the environmental NGO community in these countries, many of which, due to their grassroots orientation, are highly capable of implementing projects of significant impact at the local level, scaling up and government "buy-in" are rendered more challenging by this approach.

Global projects such as GEF-Satoyama will always face the challenge of striking the appropriate balance between breadth (more countries or regions) and depth (more intensive projects in fewer geographies). Whereas a larger number of geographies elevates the profile of a program, the allocation of the same resources across a greater number of projects necessarily implies a lower geographic scale of activity (i.e., more local than national). From a programmatic perspective then, a more strategic approach will ensure greater scaling up, engagement with government, and, consequently, a more sustainable and transformational impact. These goals are well aligned with GEF-6 programming guidelines.

Careful selection of sub-grantees and "right sizing" of projects – At sub-grantee level, the choice of sub-grantee and sufficient investment are critical to ensuring project success. In the case of the project in Mauritius, the project appears to have been essentially implemented by a single individual, the project manager. The view of the consultant, based on multiple discussions with the project manager, EPCO leadership, the KIs, and the community, is that, while the project manager did an excellent job in implementing the project activities and mobilizing the community, additional support for other aspects of the operational environment would have been extremely helpful.

Eventually, specific Mauritian government entities imposed obstacles upon the project in terms of not issuing permits for using the land adjacent to the Barachois and (invalid) claims that the

[8] GEF's Support for Transformational Change. GEF IEO. https://www.gefieo.org/sites/default/files/ieo/documents/files/GEF-IEO-Transformational-Change-RMES-.pdf. Accessed 10/7/2019.

project had illegally removed mangrove trees.[9] It is possible that a larger NGO may have been able to anticipate and avoid such extreme actions, as they would have had greater experience with working with the government. The project having an additional individual to address engagement with the government may have also mitigated these issues. The project was seen as the project manager's creation and not identified with EPCO *per se*. When issues developed with the government, the project manager, and not EPCO, became the focus, leading to extraordinary complications and her eventually having to leave the country. The community itself has been greatly demoralized by the sudden termination of the project related to the impediments raised by government entities. This puts the future viability of the Barachois both as an intact ecosystem and any potential productive use, at great risk.

The project restored a large polluted environmentally significant mangrove and mobilized an entire community to support this effort and take ownership and pride in their Barachois. This, by itself, was a significant and laudable accomplishment given the approximate investment of $75,000. The additional activities of establishing commercially viable aquaculture and mariculture, even without the issues raised by the government, would have been extremely ambitious within the lifespan of the project.[10] While not to the same degree, the Ecuador project also had multiple activities that were disproportionate to the investment.

In order to increase their chances of receiving funding, sub-grantees will always tend to over promise in their proposed scopes of work. Even though, in a technical sense, the activities, outputs, and outcomes of the sub-grantee projects can be, for the most part, said to have been achieved, ISS believes that a focus upon a smaller set of outputs at sub-grantee level would have been preferable. It is important that, in the future, CI-GEF review such proposals for feasibility and depth of impact in accordance with the GEF-6 emphasis on transformational change, and not overly emphasize the breadth of proposed sub-grantee activities as a criterion for awarding grants.

Component 2 – IGES was responsible for component 2. Prior to the GEF-Satoyama Project, IGES had been engaged in research and publication related to the Satoyama Initiative for several years. The GEF-Satoyama Project design was based on a similar grant program led by IGES, the Satoyama Development Mechanism (SDM). Thus, IGES was an obvious partner for the second component. The Issue Brief and Working Paper produced within this component have important lessons learned in summary and in-depth form, respectively. All subgrant projects under the GEF-Satoyama Project were documented and served as the basis for the discussions in the consolidation workshop conducted in August 2018 (representatives from all subgrant projects participated). They were presented at a side event of the General Assembly of the International Partnership for the Satoyama Initiative (IPSI) and published as an issue brief distributed at the CBD-COP14 in November 2018. Assessing the benefits of this component cannot be done in the short term as the impact of dissemination, such as policy influence, etc.

[9] In reality, the project *removed* invasive alien species and *planted* mangroves.

[10] ISS interviewed the only businessman in Mauritius to operate a commercial Barachois operation producing shellfish. It took him over a decade to reach this point, and, even now, his tenure over the Barachois is unstable.

can only occur in the medium and long-term. As such, it must be evaluated based on completion of the intended deliverables and their quality.

In addition to IGES-led case studies, CI Japan conducted a global mapping of SEPLS, as a further contribution to establishing the biodiversity target for the next decade , informing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework under the Convention on Biological Diversity.[11] The manuscript describes how the Satoyama Index (a mathematical index based on the proportion of different land cover classes determined through satellite imagery) can be used to identify SEPLS, and thereby map SEPLS globally. This mapping can then inform target setting based on the conservation of biodiversity in SEPLS.

Component 3 – As the secretariat of IPSI, UNU-IAS was able to provide CI Japan with a platform to identify potential collaborators for the GEF-Satoyama Project. During project implementation, UNU-IAS or IPSI provided a means to disseminate project activities through IPSI events and publications. The dissemination of project activities through institutions such as UNU-IAS / IPSI allows the amplification of project lessons learned beyond the local level. These smaller projects of approximately $100K implemented by local scale NGOs would not otherwise have had the same potential for amplification. While the dissemination appears to have gone well, it is not certain that the fora of the CBD, which were the major avenue for outreach, were necessarily the best forum possible. The project also made contributions to the IPSI events. Through project activities in these and other fora, the project added 19 new members to IPSI, which could potentially facilitate greater exposure of these additional organizations to project activities.

III.1.2 Recommendations

The recommendations regarding the Theory of Change are as follows:

Consistency with Objectives – The components of the GEF-Satoyama Project appear to be well matched to the global objectives. As such, the only recommendation is that government engagement be more explicitly considered. One solution would be to emphasize projects that have a "built in" link to government policy, such as the Seychelles project *vis-à-vis* national fisheries policy. More generally, incorporating a government outreach and engagement component would be useful to ensure continuity and scale, and, while an extreme case, avoid the kind of obstacles faced by the Mauritius Barachois project.

Selection of countries and projects – Instead of the current approach of open calls for proposals in multiple regions (as discussed above, appropriate for a demonstration component following GEF-5 guidelines), a more strategic approach would increase the chances of national scale impact and government engagement, which is more in line with current GEF-6 guidelines. As described above, deciding upon objectives at sector, multi-sector, or geographic level, and then designing national or regional programs around these objectives, would provide for two

[11] This manuscript, "Global mapping of socio-ecological production landscapes with the Satoyama Index," submitted to PLOS One, was provided to ISS on October 4, 2019, during the revision of the draft final TE report. It was therefore not available during the desk literature review period. As such, ISS has only reviewed the document in a cursory fashion.

desirable outcomes – scale and government "buy-in." Proposals could then be sought from consortiums of organizations with sectoral and/or local expertise. Implementing a strategic programmatic approach in this manner will also enable smaller, grassroots organizations, such as FIDES in Ecuador, to make important contributions to larger efforts. This would ensure that local level expertise is not lost, by designing calls for proposals that would allow for the participation of smaller and local, as well as larger and more nationally focused organizations.

Careful selection of sub-grantees and "right sizing" of projects – Operating a global project such as GEF-Satoyama across multiple countries through open calls for proposals necessarily limits the information available to CI-GEF about the potential sub-grantees. Especially in countries where CI may have less experience, greater vetting of sub-grantees (noting that the project used CEPF and IPSI networks to obtain information on the organizations) may be needed to ensure that they have the breadth and depth of staff necessary to implement what are often complex and multi-faceted projects. Additionally, it is important to "right size" projects relative to the level of financing and capabilities of the sub-grantees. Overly ambitious projects risk spreading limited resources too thinly, with impacts upon the ability of the sub-grantees to make more meaningful and deeper contributions to each outcome.

Component 2 – There are no significant recommendations to be made other than more careful copy editing as there appear to be some typographical and grammatical errors in the draft texts provided to the consultant.[12]

Component 3 – In the future, CI-GEF should consider identifying the most useful audiences for dissemination. Forums composed more of practitioners as opposed to national political delegations as in the CBD COPs may be better alternatives. Outreach to other development donors such as USAID, DFID, etc. may offer opportunities to convince them of the Satoyama approach and obtain more resources for similar programs in the future.

III.1.3 Rating

Per the rating system of the GEF, "Theory of Change" is considered "Highly Satisfactory," because, while there is room for improvement, the project components were well designed relative to the objectives. For component 1, the additional recommended changes in terms of how countries and projects reflect a different set of strategic directions and priorities. Lastly, the recommendations regarding more careful vetting of sub-grantees are not uniform across all the sub-grantees and thus cannot fairly be used to lower the GEF rating. With respect to the other components, there are no significant shortcomings.

[12] Final versions were not available to the TE.

III.2 Assessment of Project Results

The following presents the results (or logical) framework drawing upon the FY19 PIR and the questionnaires with CI Japan and sub-grantees. Comments and suggestions are provided regarding the validity of the indicators and the choice of targets. These comments are based upon the consultant's firsthand knowledge of the activities implemented in the three countries visited during this evaluation. The table is color coded using the "traffic light" system of green (achieved), yellow (on target) and red (not on target).

III.2.1 Findings and Conclusions

Tables IX and X present the objective and outcome results frameworks.[13]

Table 9. Objective Indicators

Objective Indicators	Target at end of project	Status at TE	Comments
Indicator a: Number of policies, regulations, or plans governing sectoral and land-use activities that integrate biodiversity conservation & sustainable use in production landscapes and seascapes as a result of participation in project activities.	3 policies, regulations, or plans	17 policies, regulations, or plans are completed (2 in Peru, 4 in Comoros, 2 in Mauritius, 2 in Myanmar, 3 in Ecuador, 1 in Seychelles, 1 in India, 2 in Colombia); and 2 under development (1 in India and 1 in Thailand).	Policies, levels, and plans greatly exceeded targets (17 versus 3). However, a significant variety of activities have been counted, such as a gender mainstreaming strategy, local level agreements, establishment of a cooperative, etc. It is recommended that terms such as "policies, regulations, or plans" be defined more robustly within the indicator to allow for clearer evaluation.

[13] The data in these tables has been updated from the original May 2019 version with the October 4, 2019 version of the FY19 PIR, provided to ISS on October 8, 2019.

Objective Indicators	Target at end of project	Status at TE	Comments
Indicator b: Status of livelihoods and scenarios facing local communities, including indigenous peoples, women and other vulnerable groups in the project, as a result of more sustainable flows of ecosystem goods and services.	An upward trend will be seen in the status of livelihoods	Per assessments by the "Indicators of Resilience in SEPLS": 3 projects reported improvements in livelihoods. 4 projects reported decline in livelihoods. 3 projects reported no change.	While, on initial analysis, it appears that the declines exceed the improvements, the PIR notes that the former were attributable to factors extrinsic to the project. Again, the indicator being an "upward trend," without a definition and metrics for its assessment complicates tracking. While the Indicators of Resilience may have been a good tool in theory, it appears that there was some lack of uniformity in how it was applied, as evidenced by the 4 declines that were not actually attributable to the project activities per the PIR.

Table 10. GEF-Satoyama Project Results Framework

COMPONENT 1 – Enhancing livelihood, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services in priority SEPLS through investing in demonstration projects						
Outcome	**Output**	**Indicator**	**Baseline**	**Target at end of project**	**Status at TE**	**Comments**
Outcome 1.1.: Effective conservation management in selected priority production landscapes and seascapes achieved	Output 1.1.1: At least 10,000 ha of production landscapes and seascapes are under effective management, with positive influence on additional 50,000 ha of protected areas nearby through connectivity, buffers or enhanced ecological sustainability provided in target landscapes and seascapes	Indicator 1.1.1: Number of hectares of land/sea benefiting from conservation management with project support.	Area supported by SDM (Satoyama Development Mechanism). Ha not available.	10,000 additional hectares	4,120,359 ha. (landscape: 216,682 ha/ seascape: 3,903,677 ha) This is the sum of the areas directly covered by ten subgrant projects.	Targets for indicators 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 greatly exceeded by orders of magnitude. The target may have been set too low, but it is difficult to set targets when using open calls for RFPs, since there is no way to assess *prima facie* the size of the projects' impact areas. At the sub-grantee level, the metric used varied. In Ecuador, it involved agreements with 3 private reserves. FIDES also supported the Rio Portoviejo and the Rio Chone estuary protected areas. In Thailand, the mapping of the different land uses was counted as conservation management. In Mauritius, effective management was considered to have occurred because the Barachois would have eventually been sustainably managed by EPCO and
		Indicator 1.1.2: Number of hectares to which activities of subgrant projects bring positive influence		50,000 additional ha	Additional 1,790,530 ha (landscape: 1,786,818 ha/seascape: 3,712 ha) is expected to receive positive influence from the interventions of the ten subgrant projects.	

						later by the local community (cooperative). A tighter definition of the indicator and training of the sub-grantees would have led to more consistent and comparable metrics.
Outcome 1.2.: Site-level conservation status of globally threatened species Improved	Output 1.2.1: Known critical threats to the conservation status of IUCN threatened species are minimized or removed.	Indicator 1.2.1: Number of IUCN threatened species (CR, EN and VU) occurring in project sites of which the habitat has been improved	0	20 species	A total of 120 species listed on the IUCN Red List as threatened (CR, EN and VU as well as EW) occur in the project sites of ten subgrant projects.	Exceeded target by 6 times. The assumption was that improved habitats and diminished threats would benefit the endangered species known to be in the area. Peru (camera traps) and Comoros (focused on particular species) were more scientifically assessed. In Colombia, UIS published catalogues for birds, mammals and ants. In Myanmar, scientific fish surveys were regularly conducted during the life of the project and several scientific papers were published. In Mauritius, baseline species assessments were done for plants, birds, fish and crustaceans. Subsequent assessments were not carried out due to project impediments related to government permits. Endemic tree species planting was quantified for 20 species. In Ecuador, while no direct assessment of impact on the species of concern was carried out, indirect evidence regarding the consumption of the fruits from the planted fruit tree species by the capuchin mono indicated a potential impact. The use of camera traps in the dry forest areas provided anecdotal evidence of the impact on species. There was clear evidence of the re-establishment of mangroves in Isla Corazon (Rio Chone estuary); overall 8,000 red mangroves planted, and 45,400 black conchs seeded. While the projects' activities *could* have benefited threatened species, there is no rigorous and consistent (across projects) way to tell that they actually did. That said, such impacts would also have been difficult to observe in the relatively short timeframe of the projects, as well as being costly.
Outcome 1.3.: Traditional knowledge benefiting and being protected in conservation measures	Output 1.3.1 Traditional knowledge practices documented to benefit conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in subgrant	Indicator 1.3.1: Number of measures (policies and projects) by all stakeholders that are newly	2 as existing IPSI Collaborative Activities	3 additional collaborative activities that are funded (future	2 case studies produced and 4 in progress 3 collaborative activities endorsed (2 completed and 1 ongoing)	Targets met

	projects	established or improved with information on traditional knowledge/practices, as demonstrated in IPSI (International Partnership for the Satoyama Initiative) Collaborative Activities and case studies.		opportunities) and 5 additional case studies (achievement report)		
COMPONENT 2 – Improving knowledge generation to increase understanding, raise awareness and promote mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes						
Outcome	**Output**	**Indicator**	**Baseline**	**Target at end of project**	**Status at TE**	**Comments**
Outcome 2.1.: Global knowledge on SEPLS for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into primary production enhanced	Output 2.1.1: Priority SEPLS around the world identified and mapped based on criteria developed from existing studies and methods.	Indicator 2.1.1a (Policy uptake): Number of policies, regulations or plans of governmental and non-governmental stakeholders at various levels that refer to or adopt the knowledge products from this project	a. 0 policies, regulations or plans that reference the product of this project	5 policies, regulations, plans or guidance documents	6: 1 in Peru; 2 in Myanmar; 2 in Comoros and 1 in Seychelles	Target met. Most actions counted are consistent and comparable.
		Indicator 2.1.1b (Referencing): Number of citations of knowledge products, e.g., peer-reviewed journal articles, other forms of publication and supporting tools	b. Citations: 0	50 citations within 3 years of publication	56	Target met
	Output 2.1.2: Knowledge	Indicator 2.1.2a.	0	No target	• GEF-Satoyama Project	UA

	products (including the analysis of SEPLS cases around the world, toolkits, and policy analysis related to the development, implementation and management of sustainable SEPLS) developed and disseminated through the global knowledge management platform, relevant international fora (such as CBD and IUCN), and Component 3 workshops.[14]	Number of times the knowledge products are shared with relevant stakeholders at local, national and international fora		provided	Issue Brief: CBD COP14 (November 2018); IPSI-8 (Sept 2019); IPSI Case Study WS (May 2019); India Satoyama Workshop (Apr 2019) • GEF-Satoyama Project Fact Sheets: At all international conferences we attended (CBD COP 13 (Dec. 2016), 14 (Nov. 2018); CBD SBSTTA19 (Nov. 2015), 20 (Apr. 2016), 21 (Dec. 2017); CBD SBI2 (Jul 2018); IPSI-6 (Jan. 2016), 7 (Oct. 2018), 8 (Sept 2019); IPSI regional workshops (Apr 2017; Sabah), IPSI Case Study Workshops* (2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019); GEF-Satoyama Project Consolidation Workshop (Aug 2018); CBD Regional Consultation Workshop on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (Jan 2019); IUCN China-S. Korea-Japan Tripartite Meeting (Sept 2018); Eastern Himalayan Naturenomics Forum (Nov. 2018); ISAP 2016, 2017, 2018; COMDEKS Mainstreaming Workshop in Costa Rica (Jan 2017); IUCN World Conservation Congress (Sept 2016); UNDP SGP Workshop on Landscape	

[14] Data for this output were received October 9, 2019. ISS cannot confirm conference attendance. ISS can also not review the 82 publications provided as a list at this stage in the evaluation process.

					Approaches (Mar 2018); India Satoyama Workshop (Apr 2019); Satoyama Workshop in Taiwan (Oct 2017) •GEF-Satoyama Project Impact Report: IPSI-8 (Sept 2019) •Indicators of Resilience instruction videos: online since 2017 •Preliminary results of the global mapping of SEPLS: American Association of Geographers Conference (Apr. 2019); ESRI Japan Community Forum (May 2019) •Training sessions/workshops on Indicators of Resilience in SEPLS were offered once in each of three target geographies (Indo-Burma, Tropical Andes and Madagascar and the Indian Ocean Islands Biodiversity Hotspots) and at IUCN WCC.	
		Indicator 2.1.2b. Number of knowledge products, including peer-reviewed journal articles, and policy recommendations in other forms of publications and supporting tools	0	No target provided	List of 82 publications provided to evaluation	UA
		Indicator 2.1.2c. Knowledge products on the approaches for	0	No target provided	•GEF-Satoyama Project Issue Brief (2018), aka the “Issue Brief”	UA

		the identification and/ or documentation of values of SEPLS, indigenous and local knowledge and elements of good governance developed and presented to stakeholders			•GEF-Satoyama Project Impact Report (2019), aka the "Impact Report" •GEF-Satoyama Project Working Paper: Values, Knowledge and Governance of Socio-ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes (2019), aka the "IGES Report"	
COMPONENT 3 – **Improving inter-sectoral collaboration and capacities for maintaining, restoring and revitalizing social and ecological values in priority SEPLS**						
Outcome	**Output**	**Indicator**	**Baseline**	**Target at end of project**	**Status at TE**	**Comments**
Outcome 3.1.: Capacity of multi-sectoral stakeholders, including national and international decision-makers and practitioners and under-represented groups, to collaborate and mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable management increased	Output 3.1.1: At least 500 stakeholders with increased awareness for mainstreaming the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in landscapes and seascapes through regional and global workshops (IPSI activities) and those conducted by and with partners (Association ANDES, SCBD and COMDEKS) Output 3.1.2: All workshops are conducted in gender-sensitive manner and ensure that 40-50% of the participants are women.	Indicator 3.1.1: a. Number of organizations/agencies that have expressed interest and demonstrated actions in SEPLS.	a. current membership of IPSI (167)	a. additional 20 IPSI members from workshop participants	a. 19 of the 68 new members of IPSI became members as a result of interactions with the GEF-Satoyama Project (1 application pending)	Target almost met
		b. Number of policies of various levels and stakeholders established or improved by incorporating the materials from the workshop and trainings under this project	b. 0	b. 5 policies established or improved	b. 11 project management policies established or improved by incorporating the materials from the workshop and trainings under this project.	Target met

	Output 3.1.3: At least 50 stakeholders, including 2 practitioners / representatives from each of the subgrant project implementers under Component 1 trained in promoting mainstreaming of the					

Overall, the project was highly successful in meeting the targets for the various indicators. However, as noted above, the definition of the indicators and metrics to be used for their measurement are not uniformly rigorous (Objective indicators "a" and "b;" Outcome indicators 1.1.1, 1.1.2 and 1.2.1). The projects visited and surveyed reported frequently on the M&E indicators, and in most cases, used the progress on the indicators as a management tool, modifying implementation accordingly, in coordination with the project beneficiaries. No sub-grantees reported difficulties in using the M&E system.

The Results Framework was highly quantitative in nature, and, as such, did not capture qualitative outcomes. For example, in Ecuador, the capacity building activities for youth (at sub-grantee level) looked at the numbers of youth involved. However, the youth involved were also introduced to municipal governments and now some of them are in leadership positions in local government and one is a mayor. This was not measured. In Thailand, due to the project, IMPECT now has more influence outside the project area including among other ethnic groups such as the Akha. IMPECT also developed important relationships with the media and chefs, which will be of use in future projects. In Peru, the impact of the productive activities was seen to go beyond merely the number of producers involved in the project. This is because the quinoa and honey activities had an amplification effect through attracting the interest of other families.

III.2.2 Recommendations

A high-level recommendation is the need to diversify the indicators to capture both qualitative and quantitative outcomes. Often, the qualitative achievements can actually be more impactful in the long term serving as the foundation for future projects and accomplishments. Recommendations for specific indicators are provided below:

Objective Indicator a: Number of policies, regulations, or plans governing sectoral and land-use activities that integrate biodiversity conservation & sustainable use in production landscapes and seascapes as a result of participation in project activities – Consider defining the metrics such that they can be consistently measured and compared across a variety of projects. One way would be to define the jurisdictional level of a policy or regulation. "Plans" is an open-ended term that can conceivably apply to a number of different actions. Another way would be to assess the degree to which these activities are having an impact, as it is not uncommon to find policies, regulations, and plans that only exist on paper and have no real significance for conservation.

Objective Indicator b: Status of livelihoods and scenarios facing local communities, including indigenous peoples, women and other vulnerable groups in the project, as a result of more sustainable flows of ecosystem goods and services – This indicator was apparently defined without a metric to measure an "upward trend." Also, an "upward trend" itself requires some fleshing out, for example, as to the number of data points that constitute a trend, the degree of increase, and so on.

Outcome Indicator 1.1.1: Number of hectares of land/sea benefiting from conservation management with project support – Having been greatly exceeded, it appears that the target

was established overly conservatively. Also, "benefiting" can represent a wide spectrum of impacts, not all corresponding to real conservation benefits as commonly understood. The differences in how this indicator was measured across the projects visited indicates that, in the absence of clear definitions, it is challenging to compare the achievements of the different projects. Thus, adding them together may not always be valid as they could represent different variables.

Outcome Indicator 1.2.1: Number of IUCN threatened species (CR, EN and VU) occurring in project sites of which the habitat has been improved – With respect to the design of this indicator, and not its implementation (which is discussed in the table above), there is an issue in the language which CI-GEF should take into account in the design of indicators for future such projects. The phrasing of the indicator makes it challenging to understand what is being measured. The project sought to make habitat improvements in areas where threatened species were known to occur. Therefore, the variable controlled by the project was the improvements to the habitats and not the number of species. By being phrased as the "number of … species occurring in project sites," the indicator can be interpreted as counting the number of species or number of individuals of a species, and not the number/quality of habitat improvements made of benefit to the species. ISS recommends that alternative language such as "Number of habitat improvements made of benefit to IUCN threatened species," be used in future such projects, to ensure specificity in the measurement of the indicator.

III.2.3 Rating

Due to the issues mentioned above, two ratings are being provided for this evaluation theme. For the Results Framework itself, as originally defined and used within the project, the rating is "Highly Satisfactory." However, with respect to the M&E system, and specifically objective indicators "a" and "b," and the outcome indicators 1.1.1 and 1.2.1, the rating is "Moderately Satisfactory."

III.3 Progress to Impact

While the previous section addressed the projects' achievements at the more specific level of detail of the objectives and outcomes defined in the Results Framework, this section takes a higher-level view. It assesses the product of these achievements in terms of environmental stress (e.g., lower emissions of greenhouse gases, lower rates of deforestation, improved water quality, etc.) and environmental status change (policy/ legal/regulatory, and socioeconomic changes). The Progress to Impact is described globally and illustrated by more specific examples from the countries visited.

III.3.1 Findings and Conclusions

III.3.1.a. Component 1

Environmental Status Change – The portfolio of projects across the different countries addressed threats such as overfishing (e.g., Seychelles), mangrove reforestation (e.g., Ecuador), hunting (e.g., India), and freshwater fisheries (e.g., Myanmar), *inter alia*. Multiple instances of environmental status change across the 10 countries were achieved – e.g., Fauna and Flora International in Myanmar establishing municipal legislation for Fisheries Conservation Zones in Indawgyi and Putao; the Green Islands Foundation in Seychelles facilitating an agreement by fishers regarding 13, which was presented to the Seychelles Fishing Authority to be promulgated into law; and, in Peru, Amazónicos por la Amazonía (AMPA) creating a gender mainstreaming strategy to be used with the provincial authorities of Bolivar to enhance sustainability efforts in the Alto Huayabamba Conservation Concession (APCC). The legal protection of the area was ensured through this concession. In India, the success and approach of the project has led KfW, the German development bank, to scale up the approach to fund a similar project for the entire State of Nagaland. The forest department of the State has noted this and is trying to formally register the areas as community reserves under the Wildlife (protection) Act.

In Seychelles, the co-management plan created recommended conservation measures for thirteen IUCN Threatened species in artisanal catch. This policy document is now awaiting to be incorporated as regulations under the Fisheries Act. When the measures enter into force, they will be enforceable across the whole country. This will contribute to reducing fishing pressure on these species. In Madagascar, the project further strengthened the commitment of the Malagasy State towards the protection of the environment. Madagascar is currently aiming at a reforestation of 40,000 ha per year.

In addition to these examples of direct impacts, there were additional policy and plan impacts as well as ad-hoc "word of mouth" instances of other communities wishing to join the project.

Figure 4. Mangroves in the Barachois, Mauritius

Environmental Stress Reduction – With respect to environmental stress in the countries visited, in **Mauritius**, a neglected natural area used as an illegal dumping ground was converted into a healthy mangrove ecosystem, as demonstrated by measured improvements in water quality and the removal of 65 lorry loads of garbage. As one key informant stated, "… ***project did more than the government could have done in 20 years*** …" Another added that " (the) project, if allowed to continue, could have ***revolutionized the management of Barachois***, from private

to public, from French to Creole (emphasis added)" In **Thailand**, there was a reduction in illegal hunting and logging, due to the increased formalization and regularization of land use, and greater community supervision.

Figure 5. Isla Corazon in the Rio Chone estuary, Ecuador, showing reforested mangroves

In Ecuador, large areas of mangroves destroyed during the 2016 earthquake were reforested in places such as Isla Corazon in the Rio Chone estuary. 45,400 black conchs were also seeded.

In the Playa de Oro community, KIs indicated that technical assistance for cacao production created more livelihood opportunities for community members, leading to lower dependence upon timber harvesting, and consequently less deforestation. The communities also have greater environmental awareness and have internalized the economic and environmental benefits of conserving mangroves. KIs also indicated that 70,000 trees were planted in the Cordillera de Balsamo using endemic species grown from seeds in the forest.

In India, hunting has ceased in the project area, and species' populations seem to be rebounding. In Colombia, farmers' perception of the molinillo (*Magnolia resupinatifolia*) have been improved as they found a way to make profit out of its non-timber products. People are now not only interested in conserving the trees that exist but have started to plant new ones. In Myanmar, FFI utilized co-financing to reduce pollution at fish conservation sites through the introduction of organic rice farming in areas surrounding the wetlands. Here, the removal of barriers to fish (river-blocking fish traps) contributed to the improvement of fish migration, allowing fish to reach their upstream spawning grounds (beyond the project area) to reproduce. In Madagascar, reforestation in the park is to be supported by the central government. The increase in rice production has reduced the pressure of slash-and-burn crops. The local population has become aware of the profitability of the Improved Rice Farming System.

The progress to impact for components 2 and 3 is described below. Due to the nature of these components, environmental stress reduction is inapplicable.

III.3.1.b. Component 2

Environmental Status Change – Six policies, regulations, plans or guidance documents were completed via project activities, as detailed above in the Results Framework (Table X). This is clear and direct evidence of environmental status change. Additionally, knowledge products such as fact sheets and issue briefs were shared numerous times. This is indirect evidence of environmental status change, as one has to assume that the products were read and had some influence, which cannot be determined within the scope of this TE.

III.3.1.c. Component 3

Environmental Status Change – Nineteen new and one pending IPSI member were generated through project activities. Also, as detailed in Table X, 11 project management policies were positively influenced by the project. The IPSI members represent indirect status change and the policies influenced represent direct status change.

III.3.2 Recommendations

The consultant was greatly impressed by the consistent ability of the sub-grantee projects visited to deliver concrete achievements regarding environmental status change and environmental stress reduction. This is especially notable given the relatively modest investments of approximately $100K. There are two high level recommendations that could improve the projects in terms of broadening their impact – one is Increasing Project Size and the other is Marketing. The former, as described in the section on Theory of Change, refers to developing larger projects with multiple sectors, which would attract greater government engagement. Naturally, this would require that the implementing organizations possess the needed capacity. The latter recommendation is Marketing. Recognizing the limited resources and small staffing of many of the implementing organizations, adding a Marketing dimension that takes full advantage of social media could facilitate investments from national public and private sources, as well as international donors active in the countries. In the Thailand project, for example, outreach for income generating activities for the communities, such as marketing, events, booths, etc. in Bangkok were not in the original plan. A key informant involved with the project implementation commented that such activities should be included from the start in future such projects.

III.3.3. Rating

The rating for “Progress to Impact” is Highly Satisfactory due to the high level of achievement in terms of reduction of environmental stress and improvements in environmental status across the project portfolio.

III.4 Quality of Implementation and Execution

This section covers the day-to-day running of the project at the CI-GEF, CI Japan, UNU-IAS, and IGES level, as well as for the sub-grantees in the countries visited and surveyed. Issues such as contracting, procurement, internal organization, workflow, communications and relationships between the various entities involved at global and national level are considered.

III.4.1 Findings and Conclusions

III.4.1.a. Quality of Implementation

CI-GEF was the implementing agency. On a day-to-day basis, CI-GEF interacted with the Executing Team through CI Japan. Information obtained through the detailed KII with CI Japan indicated that the working relationship between CI-GEF (specifically the Project Manager and Finance Manager) and CI Japan was good. UNU-IAS and IGES interacted with CI Japan, and not directly with CI-GEF. While the overall relationship between the ET and CI-GEF was characterized as good and productive, complications arose when CI international policies came into play and raised the transaction costs; e.g., regarding procurement, CI rules were difficult to interpret and obtain guidance on (e.g., the Madagascar storage facility took months to get approved, which was frustrating to the Wildlife Conservation Society, WCS). This was perhaps to be expected given the wide range of project types and different countries involved.

III.4.1.b. Quality of Execution

Due to the layered nature of this project, with an Executive Team consisting of three institutions, and multiple country sub-grantee organizations, the evaluation of execution is accordingly divided into Executive Team and the visited and surveyed country sub-grantees.

Executive Team (CI Japan, UNU-IAS, and IGES) – The day-to-day implementation proceeded smoothly according to all the members of the Executive Team – CI Japan, UNU-IAS and IGES. Interactions between the three organizations were collaborative and constructive. IGES had close interactions with CIJ and UNU-IAS, particularly in the regular Working Unit meetings. IGES worked with CI Japan to prepare the program and discussion paper for the consolidation workshop and the issue brief for CBD-COP14; and with UNU-IAS in preparing the capacity building events, e.g., a side event at the IPSI General Assembly and CBD-COP14.

UNU-IAS/IPSI helped CI Japan determine potential collaborators to design the GEF-Satoyama Project. During project implementation, GEF-Satoyama disseminated information on project activities through IPSI events and publications. The sub-grantees conducted their work according to their own institutional rules. All the subgrantees indicated that their interactions with CI Japan went smoothly and they found CI Japan to be responsive. There were no issues raised in this respect. Specific observations about the countries visited follow below.

Thailand – The work was organized through monthly meetings to review and plan for the next 2-3 months. The beneficiary communities were visited several times a month for mapping, monitoring progress, training and implementing exchange trips. Hiring was done internally with no involvement of the Executive Team. Very little equipment was bought and there were no challenges with procurement.

Mauritius – The project manager conducted the project very impressively with diligent and successful efforts to mobilize the community and create a sense of ownership and pride around the Barachois. More support from EPCO would have been useful in addressing the impediments from the government entities. The project needed more staff to address government engagement and the commercial development of the Barachois for aqua- and mariculture. The

latter, in particular, required considerably more effort to develop than possible within the timeframe and resources of the project. The project was extremely successful at obtaining donations of equipment and services from local companies, the processing of which was straightforward as was the purchasing of the hand tools needed for the project.

Ecuador – The Satoyama concept was a good fit with FIDES' approach, so it was easy to follow. The impact of the 2016 earthquake in the project area was catastrophic in many ways and required modifications to the original project plan. CI Japan's flexibility was noted in this regard. Communication with CI Japan went smoothly, and the level of responsiveness was good. FIDES' internal hiring policies are well defined and in accordance with national law. The project had complete autonomy regarding the procurement of staff, goods and services. The internal project organization was good and facilitated the achievement of the outcomes. The inclusion of local project promoters was important in working with the communities. Monthly coordination meetings and a clear internal division of labor helped greatly.

Key data obtained from some of the surveyed countries regarding project execution is provided below:

- Colombia – The experience of working with CI Japan was seen as very positive, because the sub-grantee found the project report formats easy to complete. They were able to resolve any doubts easily with the GEF-Satoyama Project coordinator.
- India – Working with CI Japan was seen to be a very productive and congenial experience, and research collaborations were established with likeminded colleagues. Especially notable, the respondent indicated that the CI Japan staff are now friends, and that they learned that a sponsor-grantee relationship can be both productive and very congenial.
- Myanmar – "We received excellent and timely guidance and support from CI." This quote is indicative of the appreciation for CI Japan's efforts.
- Seychelles – The sub-grantee indicated that CIJ provided substantial support.

III.4.2 Recommendations

There are no issues requiring recommendations except to consider streamlining CI rules regarding international procurement.

III.4.3 Rating

The rating for both the Quality of Implementation and Quality of Execution is "Highly Satisfactory."

III.5 Gender and Safeguards

III.5.1 Findings and Conclusions

As described in the Project Document, in compliance with CI-GEF's Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), CI-GEF screened the project at the PIF stage and determined that the following safeguards were triggered – Gender Mainstreaming and Stakeholder Engagement. In addition to these safeguards identified at the GEF-Satoyama Project level, other safeguards that were determined to be potentially triggered at the level of the country projects were the Involuntary Resettlement Policy, Indigenous Peoples Policy, Pest Management Policy, and the Physical Cultural Resources Policy. These four safeguards were to be screened at the individual project level. The Accountability and Grievance Mechanism, Gender Mainstreaming and Stakeholder Engagement are described below.

Accountability and Grievance Mechanism – Obviously, the policies were different for Component 1, which involved communities, versus components 2 and 3, which primarily involved knowledge management and outreach activities within international fora. Sub-grantees were required to establish and monitor a grievance mechanism to allow for community and other stakeholder grievances to be addressed and resolved. The affected local communities were informed of the relevant processes, and the contact information of the sub-grantee, the Executive Team, and CI-GEF were made available. The process was stepwise, starting with the sub-grantee, and then progressively being elevated as needed to the Executive Team, CI Japan, and CI-GEF. With respect to components 2 and 3, the process only had one reporting step, which was to CI Japan. The grievance mechanism counted 80 instances at the sub-grantee level. However, 68 of these were from WCS (Madagascar) and were requests for assistance made to WCS by village residents. WCS inappropriately used a single channel to report all communications. As such, 68 of the 80 instances were not complaints at all. In the work done by IGES, there was one female member in the 3-person team. IGES made significant efforts to represent women in the research, such as by holding specific women-only focus groups. The grievances are listed in the following table

Table 11. Grievances reported by Sub-grantee

Sub-grantee	Number of Triggering Events	Level of Escalation
AMPA	3	Local level
Dahari	Number not known	
FFI	3	
IMPECT	2	
TERI	1	

Sub-grantee	Number of Triggering Events	Level of Escalation
UIS	1	
WCS	**68**	

There were 80 instances of grievances at the sub-grantee level that were all resolved at the local level.

Importantly though, the issues in Mauritius, discussed above in the section on Theory of Change, and also below, remain unresolved. While the FY19 PIR mentions that it is expected that this will be resolved at the grassroots level by the community cooperative, ISS did not see any signs that the cooperative was making progress, or even knew what steps to take. The cooperative and the community in general are too marginalized to be able to resolve this.

Stakeholder Engagement Plan – The major stakeholders identified were the ET, communities occurring in the project sites funded under Component 1, the IPSI Steering Committee, Component 1 subgrantees, the CEPF Secretariat, as well as ongoing projects/programs such as the UNDP COMDEKS Program and CI programs in the target geographies. For Component 1, the subgrantees were given the responsibility and the leeway to engage with their stakeholders as best they saw fit. With respect to Component 2, the project used relevant gatherings of experts and stakeholders to help ensure that content and products were of relevance to them. These included the IPSI global and regional fora, side events at CBD meetings, and sessions at IUCN World Conservation Congresses. The Executive Team also used the IPSI Steering Committee; direct contacts to individuals, groups and organizations; as well as broader requests through websites, listservs, as resources. Lastly, for Component 3, the project engaged with a broad range of stakeholders through activities described in the Assessment of Results section.

ISS has determined that the plan comprehensively identified the stakeholders relevant to each of the three components. The engagement activities (e.g., participation in international environmental for a, dissemination of knowledge products, local media, brochures, participatory appraisals, capacity building and awareness raising, and co-management for communities; and sharing project progress summaries and invitations to key meetings of the Executive Team for the Japanese Ministry of the Environment) appear to have been well thought out. Having allowed the sub-grantees the latitude to choose the most appropriate methods for community engagement appears to have been an appropriate choice due to their superior local contextual knowledge.

Gender Mainstreaming

The project developed a plan to ensure that both men and women had the opportunity to equally participate in, and benefit from, the project. Key elements of the mainstreaming plan

included:

Component 1. Expressions of Interest required project proponents' commitment to gender mainstreaming and social inclusion issues, and this was taken into consideration at the evaluation stage as well.

Component 2. Knowledge products highlighted gender issues where relevant as well as their relationships to conservation outcomes, and gender dimensions were integrated within the toolkit for Indicators of Resilience.

Component 3. The trainings and workshops used content that integrated gender and adopted methods to enhance women's participation. Assessments were conducted to identify the most appropriate methods of sharing information.

With respect to project execution, indicators to assess gender mainstreaming were integrated into the project Results Framework, as described above. Gender mainstreaming during implementation was assessed both at the Executive Team level (CI Japan, UNU-IAS, and IGES) as well as for the projects that were visited during the evaluation. Data from the surveyed countries was mostly limited to basic information on reporting.

Executive Team – Gender was addressed primarily through gender balance, as opposed to the use of a consistent gender lens. Given the wide variety of projects, this is perhaps defensible, as it would have been impossible to predict their focus. Also, the capacity of the prospective sub-grantees to implement more in-depth gender programming would likewise not have been known to CI Japan. The sub-grantees were required to and reported on project beneficiaries in a gender disaggregated manner.

Thailand – The women in the communities producing income from NTFP sales was welcomed by men as a new source of income, and this did not cause any challenges at the community level. Income from the sale of spices went to the women's committees and that from coffee to the youth groups. Land use decisions are made in group discussions as the land is communally managed and tenure is not based upon gender. The relationship between the project team and the communities was smooth, as past and continuous engagement had engendered a sense of trust. IMPECT mentioned that the ethnic composition of the project team being the same as that of the communities (Karen) was also helpful in terms of trust, language and cultural knowledge. Two grievance mechanisms were triggered related to differences between villagers and leaders on land demarcation, and these were resolved at the local level.

Mauritius – Women were well represented among the community members who participated in the project and in the eventual cooperative that was created (itself headed by a woman). During the community interview, it was very evident that the women were assertive and forthcoming, and actually dominated the conversation. This project suffered a unique setback through actions by certain government entities regarding permitting and (invalid) accusations

about deforestation, as mentioned above, which brought the project to a halt, and necessitated the project manager having to ultimately leave the country.

While this is not a Safeguard issue in the technical sense, as it did not involve project beneficiaries or stakeholders *per se*, but project staff, the treatment of the project manager in Mauritius warrants concern. Numerous narratives were communicated to the consultant regarding the justification for the government's action. It was not possible to determine definitely which of these, ultimately speculative, justifications was accurate. The narratives included: 1) Envy of the project manager's success in mobilizing the community, 2) The project manager's ethnicity and nationality, 3) Local partisan politics, 4) Reserving the land to compensate landowners who lost their rights to develop their property around the Le Morne UNESCO heritage site, 5) Plans to use land for other commercial purposes, and 6) Marginalization of this Creole community.

Ecuador – FIDES has an institutional policy regarding the number of women staff and are careful to ensure that project beneficiaries are gender balanced. Within the project staff itself, 4 of the 6 staff were women. FIDES carried out a gender analysis for ASPROSAL (salt producers' association in Las Gilces) to determine the kind of work done by men and women. In 60% of the families involved in salt production, the women manage the money. With respect to the tourism activities also involved in the project, the work is done at the family level (beachside restaurants and tour guides). The women manage the cabana restaurants (cooking and managing the income), while the men fish and carry out agriculture. Regarding Safeguards, FIDES developed a clear guide delineating the various steps to reporting conflicts. By meeting monthly with the communities, no issues ever became serious enough to require reporting.

With respect to the surveyed countries, the most in-depth response regarding gender was provided by Peru, with the other subgrantees only generally confirming that they reported to CIJ in a gender disaggregated manner. AMPA indicated that they carried out a gender analysis to better understand the gender situation, and the relationships between men and women within the scope of the project. This analysis allowed them to develop more effective tools for future interventions. The project focused on involving the entire family as much as possible. However, due to the remoteness and complications of the local geography, in many cases family members prioritized the participation of a single family member, predominantly men.

III.5.2 Recommendations

There are no specific recommendations at the Executive Team level. With respect to the numerous cases reported by WCS, it would appear that a clearer understanding regarding the use of different channels for transmitting communications from the villagers could be in order; still, it is preferable to have sub-grantees over-report than under-report.

With respect to the issues around the project manager in Mauritius, this kind of issue is very challenging to address because it is extremely rare. Such issues cannot therefore be

anticipated, but it is perhaps worthwhile to consider how the situation could have been ameliorated. First, as mentioned above, having a dedicated project staff member, with long standing knowledge of the political context, to address government engagement would have been helpful. The project manager, as a foreigner with limited country experience, could not have been expected to understand the local political context, and this was clearly not part of her scope of work. Second, when government actions became more intensive, as when the project manager had to go to court to respond to (invalid) accusations that she had caused deforestation in the Barachois, it may have been helpful if she had more institutional support. Lastly, CI-GEF and CI Japan making a formal inquiry or *démarche* with the GEF operational focal point in Mauritius, as well as the government entities concerned in support of the project manager may have led to a less drastic end to the project's activities.

III.5.3 Rating

Gender and Safeguards is assessed as "Satisfactory."

III.6 Sustainability

Sustainability was assessed both at the Executive Team level (CI Japan, UNU-IAS, and IGES) as well as for the projects that were visited during the evaluation. Sustainability is not rated using the six-point HS to HU scale, but a four-point scale (Likely to Unlikely) based on an assessment of the likelihood and magnitude of the risks to sustainability.

Sustainability is the ultimate goal of all conservation and development interventions. Financing institutions seek the assurance that the positive impacts of their investments will continue after the life of the project, and not merely represent a temporary upwards trend. The degree of sustainability is inversely proportional to the magnitude of the risks, which include socio-political, institutional, financial, and environmental risks.

III.6.1 Findings and Conclusions

III.6.1.a. Institutional

Executive Team – UNU-IAS and IGES are well established institutions. UNU-IAS was inaugurated in 2014, from the joining of the UNU Institute of Advanced Studies (established in 1996) and the UNU Institute for Sustainability and Peace (UNU-ISP, established in 2009). UNU-IAS therefore has a 40-year history of existence and is supported by the UN system. IGES was established in 1998 under an initiative of the Japanese government with the support of Kanagawa Prefecture. It has been in existence for 21 years and is supported by the Japanese government. IGES and UNU-IAS/IPSI as partners for components 2 and 3 ensured built-in institutional memory and

continuity. Thus, neither UNU-IAS nor IGES face any institutional risks of relevance to the continuation of the GEF-Satoyama Project outcomes.

Sub-grantees – With respect to the sub-grantees in the visited countries, the organizations have been in existence for a considerable period of time – FIDES (10 years), EPCO (32 years), and IMPECT (27 years). With respect to the other sub-grantees, their age in years is as follows: TERI (45), FFI (116), Dahari (6), WCS (124, and 26 in Madagascar), Green Islands Foundation (13), Universidad Industrial de Santander (75), and AMPA (15). The executing agencies therefore bring an average existence of 36 years, which indicates low to no institutional risk. Complemented by the important fact that the work done within this project represents a continuation of existing efforts and represent key focus areas for most of the organizations, there is negligible institutional risk.

With respect to the other institutions involved in the projects:

- Thailand – the project was essentially implemented by IMPECT and was independent of other institutions.
- Mauritius – the limitations were more socio-political than Institutional, however while EPCO has been in existence for a long time, its staffing appears to be project dependent, with a small core staff.
- Ecuador – FIDES itself, as well as its local government partners evidenced no institutional risk.
- Colombia – Local level institutions have greater awareness, a sense of pride, and are better connected, indicating little to no risk.
- India – The institutional Tizu Valley Network created as part of the project is cohesive and participatory, showing zero institutional risk.
- Madagascar – There is good cooperation between the park manager, forest agents, and local authorities, with no risk.
- Myanmar – Increased awareness and participation of local communities have resulted in the development of 13 fisherman committees voluntarily managing fish conservation zones.
- Peru – While there are organizations and support bases that ensure the legal aspects of conservation concessions, they need to be strengthened; thus, there is some risk.
- Seychelles – The project provided the Seychelles Fishing Authority staff and fisheries related NGOs training in a monitoring protocol and the identification of species, thus strengthening these institutions. There is thus no institutional risk.

The institutional sustainability ratings follow:

- Executive Team – Likely
- Visited Countries
    - Thailand – Likely
    - Mauritius – Moderately Likely
    - Ecuador – Likely
- Surveyed Countries (adjusted by ISS as needed based on narrative information provided by the survey respondents[15])
    - Colombia – Moderately Likely
    - India – Likely
    - Madagascar – Moderately Likely
    - Myanmar – Likely
    - Peru – Moderately Likely
    - Seychelles – Likely

III.6.1.b Socio-political

Executive Team – GEF-Satoyama was implemented in partnership between CI Japan and the other members of the Executive Team. CI Japan is part of CI, a well-established international environmental organization. The UNU-IAS activities are being used to design the post 2020 activities for IPSI. The IPSI steering committee has welcomed CI Japan's suggestions, indicating high level institutional continuity for the approach. IGES contributed to a series of outreach events through knowledge products, particularly those delivered to the IPSI General Assembly and CBD-COP14 in 2018. The outcomes, while not immediately evident, will be further consolidated towards inputs to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. The project's efforts will help substantiate the new targets relating to mainstreaming biodiversity into primary production sectors, as well as for the "other effective area-based conservation measures" or OECM. Both IGES and UNU-IAS indicated that they would continue activities associated with the GEF-Satoyama Project.

At sub-grantee level, the absence of sociopolitical risk is clear in Ecuador with FIDES working with JICA and moving to obtain protected area status for an area involving four communities; the Seychelles sub-grantee becoming part of the government committee on fisheries; and the India project site becoming a community reserve under the national law. Further country-specific data for the visited countries is provided below:

Thailand – With respect to political risk, there is interest at the local government (district officer) level, but the situation is more challenging at national level. The revived National Park Act has punitive measures for villagers collecting NTFP. Additionally, many KIs felt that while there could be gradual recognition of the mapping efforts at the local level, there would be no governmental support (Ministry of Forestry) for updating the maps. It was reported that the government had little interest in communities understanding zoning and their land use rights,

[15] This same approach was used for all the dimensions of sustainability.

which are facilitated by updated and official maps. Thus, there is significant political risk to the mapping dimension.

As for the social dimension, the village leaders (*phuyaiban*) are stronger and have a longer-term vision for the communities. They now have superior negotiating skills with government and can strategically communicate with different audiences. More youth have returned to their villages and are interested in following traditional livelihoods. The rotational agriculture land use pattern itself will continue as it did before but perpetuating it per se was not the intent of the project. Rather, having it recognized as a legitimate and sustainable land use (as it is currently practiced) was. In this respect, the mapping and outreach efforts, linking community leaders with local government officials, can be a valid contribution. There is thus no social risk of the communities abandoning the sustainable rotational agriculture system they have been practicing. The interest in the youth of continuing agriculture and NTFP activities also points to social continuity. Surrounding communities have also showed interest in the project activities further bolstering the social continuity of the project activities and thereby outcomes.

Mauritius – The unusually abrupt end to the project due to the non-issuance of a key permit makes assessing sustainability difficult. In the absence of this permit, the planned aquaculture and mariculture activities were impossible to implement (noting that, as discussed above, these activities were likely overly ambitious for a 3-year project). The December 2019 election could change the government and open up space for a permit to be issued. Ecosud, a local NGO, is willing to support the community cooperative going forward, but their capacity to do so is unclear. The social risk at community level is a function of the political and financial risk, in the sense that the community would despair of the apparent futility of their efforts and lose interest in the Barachois.

Ecuador – No sociopolitical risk is involved as communities are motivated to conserve mangroves and forests and understand the link between their livelihoods and the health of intact ecosystems around them. This is especially the case after the tragedy of the 2016 earthquake which destroyed many environmentally dependent livelihoods. Thus, there is no social risk to the continuity of the project outcomes within the beneficiary communities. Political risk is also not an issue; to the contrary, the project partners included local governments.

With respect to the surveyed countries, the information obtained on sociopolitical risk is summarized below:

- Colombia – Two participants who participated in the project meetings are now running for the village council, ensuring some degree of sociopolitical impact.
- India – Increasing State interest in community conservation, as well communities themselves creating community conservation areas, together indicate low risk.

- Madagascar – The presidential election of 2018 led to a lack of continuity in the implementation of the activities, thus implying some sociopolitical risk.
- Myanmar – The project led to the first designation of community-managed fish conservation area by legal decree, showing a complete absence of sociopolitical risk.
- Peru – There are local governance organizations, such as peasant communities or productive organizations that are taking the lead in the management of their territories and their resources. In addition, AMPA, as the administrator of a conservation concession, also encourages local governance. Thus, sociopolitical risk is essentially inexistent.
- Seychelles – The political climate has changed in the last two years with the general public requesting a more concerted approach by government. This has led to the creation of more civil society groups being formed (including fisher associations) that wish to participate. Sociopolitical continuity is therefore ensured.

The sociopolitical sustainability ratings follow:

- Executive Team – Likely
- Visited Countries
    - Thailand – Likely
    - Mauritius – Likely
    - Ecuador – Likely
- Surveyed Countries
    - Colombia – Moderately Likely
    - India – Likely
    - Madagascar – Moderately Unlikely
    - Myanmar – Likely
    - Peru – Likely
    - Seychelles – Likely

III.6.1.c. Financial

With respect to financial risk, there is no risk at Executive Team level. The outcomes in Thailand and Ecuador do not require continuing inputs of financial support to continue, however there may be specific financial pressures that will tend to diminish project outcomes. These are discussed below for the countries visited:

Thailand – The new NTFP economic activities allow for a continuing stream of new income from sustainable activities. The links established with national chefs and the media could lead to new markets for sustainable NTFPs. There is though potential risk related to the financial incentives for coffee and NTFPs related to the insufficient attention paid to the value chains around the commercialization of these commodities. There is also some financial pressure on farmers who

have opted to grow corn, with the associated debt related to seed and input purchases, but these farmers were not part of the project's activities.

Mauritius – In the absence of productive activities to generate income, the Barachois will have no economic value to the community, noting that the mariculture and aquaculture efforts were not likely to have been successful at least in the short to medium term, anyway. This represents significant financial risk.

Ecuador – The project worked very closely with the communities on concrete livelihood activities (San Jacinto and Las Gilces – cabanas, gastronomy, and the sale of fisheries products to restaurants). There is no associated financial risk, as the economic viability of the tourism related businesses improved under the project rely on existing patterns of internal tourism and are expected to grow with the province of Manabi and canton level efforts to increase tourism.

With respect to the surveyed countries, the information obtained on financial risk is summarized below:

- Colombia – There are new distribution pathways for tourism and the commercialization of sustainable agricultural products, implying minimal financial risk.
- India – Ecotourism requires substantially more work to reach the point where it can generate revenue, such as for marketing. The communities do not have funds for doing so. There is therefore significant financial risk.
- Madagascar – The GEF Satoyama Fund was unable to fund community ecotourism activities, which could have been a source of local funding for the Park. The resulting increase in the income of the local population in the medium term would have enabled the community to more efficiently manage their natural resources. This shows considerable financial risk as there are no related incentives for the communities.
- Myanmar – The commitments by local fishing communities are voluntary and therefore not dependent on financial inputs. Thus, financial risk is irrelevant.
- Peru – Access to financing is a limiting factor. At the state level, support services for sustainable production activities are generally poor or simply do not exist. This implies a good deal of financial risk.
- Seychelles – The activities do not currently have financial implications. However, recommendations for compensating fishers upon the release of highly commercial species have been discussed and may be pursued in the future. While there is therefore no risk, the obtaining of future financial rewards is not definite.

The financial sustainability ratings follow:

- Executive Team – Likely
- Visited Countries

    - Thailand – Moderately Likely
    - Mauritius – Unlikely
    - Ecuador – Likely
- Surveyed Countries
    - Colombia – Moderately Likely
    - India – Moderately Unlikely
    - Madagascar – Moderately Unlikely
    - Myanmar – Likely
    - Peru – Moderately Unlikely
    - Seychelles – Moderately Likely

III.6.1.d. Environmental

At the Executive Team level, the nature of the activities conducted under components 2 and 3 precludes any environmental risk. The discussion for the countries visited follows.

Thailand – There are no environmental risks from the continued practice of sustainable rotational agriculture. However, financial pressure on surrounding farmers in debt involved with corn cultivation, may cause an environmental risk, should they increase the area under corn to pay their debts and corn becomes a dominant land use. The opinions of KIs was mixed on this issue with some feeling that farmers understood that corn production was a prison and others that felt that farmers would prefer an easily marketable commodity like corn.

Mauritius – Environmental risk is considerable because many KIs felt that the Barachois will return to its former state of being neglected, abandoned and used as an illegal garbage dump.

Ecuador – An inter-community committee (4 communities – San Jacinto, Las Gilces, San Roque, and Santa Teresa) is vigorously advocating with the Ministry of the Environment for protected status area, which will improve the management of the estuaries. The community maps made during the project could then serve as a management instrument of this new protected area.

With respect to the surveyed countries, the information obtained regarding environmental risk is summarized below:

- Colombia – Greater interest in conservation ensures lower environmental risk.
- India – The communities now host their own annual conservation festival, the Chengu festival, and also have an active WhatsApp conservation group. The forest department is also taking an interest in their activities. These two phenomena contribute to low environmental risk.
- Madagascar – The GEF funds were invested in the conservation of the Makira Natural Park ensuring low environmental risk.

- Myanmar – The fish spawning and aggregation sites are actively protected by local fishing communities. There are also improved conditions for fish migration and the removal of barriers to fish movements. Thus, environmental risk is null.
- Peru – The Alto Huayabamba Conservation Concession has legal status and ensures the protection of approximately 144,000 hectares of important ecosystems that provide multiple ecosystem services.
- Seychelles – There is a significant push by the population, government and civil society groups to ensure that fishing is sustainable in Seychelles. This is supported by the blue economy concept advocated by the government to ensure that the marine environment contributes socioeconomic benefits in a sustainable manner. Thus, there is no environmental risk.

The environmental sustainability ratings follow:

- Executive Team – Likely
- Visited Countries
    - Thailand – Moderately Likely
    - Mauritius – Unlikely
    - Ecuador – Likely
- Surveyed Countries
    - Colombia – Moderately Likely
    - India – Likely
    - Madagascar – Likely
    - Myanmar – Likely
    - Peru – Likely
    - Seychelles – Likely

Table 12. Summary of Sustainability Ratings

Level/Dimension of Sustainability	**Institutional**	**Sociopolitical**	**Financial**	**Environmental**
Executive Team	Likely	Likely	Likely	N/A
Thailand	Likely	Moderately Likely	Moderately Likely	Moderately Likely
Mauritius	Likely	Unlikely	Unlikely	Unlikely
Ecuador	Likely	Likely	Likely	Likely
Colombia	Moderately Likely	Moderately Likely	Moderately Likely	Moderately Likely
India	Likely	Likely	Moderately Unlikely	Likely
Madagascar	Moderately Likely	Moderately Unlikely	Moderately Unlikely	Likely
Myanmar	Likely	Likely	Likely	Likely
Peru	Moderately Likely	Likely	Moderately Unlikely	Likely
Seychelles	Likely	Likely	Moderately Likely	Likely
Overall	**Likely**	**Likely**	**Likely**	**Likely**

Given the complexity of the project with three institutions composing the ET and multiple country sub-grantees, the overall sustainability rating was determined using the dominant rating for each dimension (in all cases, this was Likely). Therefore, the overall rating is also Likely

III.9 Summary of Ratings

The following table summarizes the ratings for the evaluation elements.

Table 13. Summary of Ratings

Evaluation Theme	**Rating**
Theory of Change	Highly Satisfactory
Results Framework and M&E System	Overall, Highly Satisfactory (particular indicators – Moderately Satisfactory)
Progress towards Impacts	Highly Satisfactory
Quality of Implementation and Execution	Highly Satisfactory (Implementation), Highly Satisfactory (Execution)
Gender and Safeguards	Satisfactory
Sustainability	Likely

IV. Cross-cutting Evaluation Themes and Lessons Learned

This chapter focuses on the key recommendations described in greater detail above, overall impressions of the GEF-Satoyama Project, and cross-cutting issues. The essence of this section is to support CI-GEF with a base of "ground rules" upon which to design future such programs for greater and more permanent conservation impact.

IV.1 Co-financing and need for follow-up

Per the October 4, 2019 version of the FY19 PIR, the level of co-financing as of June 30, 2019 was USD 7,408,736, compared to an expected level of USD 6,350,000. This includes additional co-financing received by the Executing Agency through sponsorship to participate in several amplification activities. With respect to follow-up, none is required for the activities implemented directly by the Executive Team. However, urgent follow-up is advisable for the Mauritius project. ISS strongly suggests that CI-GEF consider the planning of a follow-up project to serve, for all intents and purposes, as a phase 2 of a very promising project. The inclusion of the original project manager, who developed an extremely strong relationship with the community, and the leader of the Southern Mangroves Aquaculture Cooperative, who is an influential individual in Cité La Chaux, would be critical. It is advised, however, that any follow up be preceded by high level outreach with the Mauritian government in general, possibly through the GEF OFP; as well as with the particular ministries involved in the project's halt. Should permitting continue to be an issue, ISS advises that an alternative project design be developed, working with the Southern Mangroves Aquaculture Cooperative.

IV.2 Lessons Learned

Breadth vs. Depth – In designing global programs across multiple regions and countries, a key strategic decision that must be made from the start if whether the program is to optimize breadth or depth. Each approach has its pros and cons. The former is similar to what was done in GEF-Satoyama, with 10 countries, 3 regions, multiple sectors and many beneficiary communities. The pros of the "breadth" approach include the opportunity to create conservation impacts in multiple sectors; support numerous, mainly grassroots level organizations; and benefit multiple communities. The cons, as described above in III.1, are a more diminished possibility of creating national or larger level impacts, and the lack of an integrated multi-sectoral impact. The approach taken by the project was compatible with the existing GEF-5 guidelines and the fact that Component 1 was geared towards demonstration.

The "depth" approach would encompass working in multiple sectors in a given country through national scale organizations. The design of the RFP would need to specify a strong preference for organizations with the capacity to implement multi-sectoral projects at national or larger scale. The pros of this approach include the ability to have a national or larger scale impact, secure government engagement, attract investment from other non-GEF sources such as

bilateral donors, and establish partnerships with other national level projects sponsored by other donors. The "depth" approach appears to be more compatible with current GEF-6 guidelines and is an important to consider in future such global projects involving multiple sub-grantee projects.

Results Framework and M&E Systems – Objective and output level indicators must be clearly defined with respect to the metrics to be used as well as be realistic relative to the scale of impacts. Unclear metrics make evaluation more challenging as determining what "counts" is difficult to do using objective criteria. Indicators must also be "right sized," such that the targets are not under or over-ambitious. The Results Framework should be defined in close collaboration with the sub-grantee organizations, and larger organizations with dedicated M&E staff, will have greater capacity to work with the EA to define appropriate indicators. While this was done at the sub-grantee project level, it was not done at the GEF-Satoyama project level. In addition to mostly qualitative indicators that can more easily sum up across a wide project portfolio at CI-GEF and GEF levels of aggregation, qualitative indicators that measure "soft" progress such as the creation of networks and the building of relationships between organizations/communities and state agencies should also be included. This kind of "soft" progress often underpins the chances of success of current and future projects, while further ensuring the sustainability of the conservation impacts.

Right sizing projects – Many of the projects in the GEF-Satoyama Project portfolio appeared to have too many components relative to their approximately $100K of financing. While many of the organizations involved made great progress across the components, this may have only been possible due to the restricted number of communities or project sites. It would be preferable to work on fewer components more intensively among a small number of beneficiaries, or to work on multiple components with a larger group of beneficiaries (with proportionally higher funding levels). Getting the relationship between project financing and the number of components correct is important to ensuring that the implementing organizations and not stretched too thinly.

Value chains – Many of the projects in the GEF-Satoyama Project portfolio involved stimulating the development of alternative livelihoods, switching from unsustainable to sustainable livelihoods activities. The products of these livelihoods such as medicinal herbs, forest gathered vegetables, honey, crabs, fish, etc. require markets in order to create demand and the generation of continuous economic activity. It is important that projects (at GEF-Satoyama level or sub-grantee level) which include such alternative livelihoods carefully consider the value chain and the commercial viability of the products *before* engaging with the beneficiary communities. A market feasibility study would be a minimal necessary step. Otherwise, projects run the great risk of mobilizing communities around the production of new commodities, which do not generate sufficient sales to ensure continued community interest, and these alternative livelihoods will not outlast the lifetime of the projects.

Synergistic and Complementary Nature of Components – One high level comment during the review of the draft report by the IA and CIJ was that, while the entire set of outputs and outcomes has been discussed in great detail in the report, the integrative nature of the three components was not evident. ISS conducted a two-hour, in-depth remote KI questionnaire with

CIJ, and, as noted in the Limitations section above, attempted to interview UNU-IAS and IGES, but was only able to obtain brief responses to an emailed questionnaire. At the data collection stage, how the three components complemented each other was not apparent to the consultant neither from the interviews nor from the desk research. IGES and UNU-IAS mainly focused on their own specific tasks. The synergies between the components was only clear to the IA and CIJ, who had a more overarching perspective, and not the country teams, who operated at project level. In order to bring such effects to the fore, ISS recommends that future such projects include a specific outcome that captures integration within the results framework. The outputs could then be case studies or other knowledge products that demonstrate how the components complement each other. The respective indicator could be the number of documents or the number of presentations made of relevance to such synergistic effects.

GEF-Satoyama establishied and managing a diverse portfolio of projects in 10 countries and 3 regions. An Executive Team of 3 entities with demonstrated competence in their respective functional areas was able to administer a complex portfolio of projects. While, as discussed in this report, there is room for improvement in the development of future such CI-GEF programs, the GEF-Satoyama Project performed well on multiple fronts and contributed to on-the-ground conservation impacts in multiple ecosystems, productive activities and geographies. Numerous communities were also supported, and livelihoods improved.

Annex

Online Survey

An online survey was sent to the other seven countries. It is reproduced below.

* 1. Please provide your contact information

Name	
Company	
Country	
Email Address	
Phone Number	

* 2. Please refer to the Results Framework of the GEF Satoyama Project (see link below). From your experience of implementing the sub-grantee project, can you provide any insights into whether the Results Framework made sense in your case? (Or, more specifically, comment on the logic of the Objectives, Outcomes, Outputs and Indicators)
Results Framework (original)

* 3. Part I. Can you describe how the M&E systems were used in practice, and provide any examples of corrective actions taken based upon insights from M&E? Part II. With the benefit of hindsight, would you agree that the Results Framework best measured the project? If not, why, and are there any project achievements which you feel could have been measured in a different way?

Part I	
Part II	

* 4. Part I. Can you comment on how your project outcomes contributed to any specific environmental stress reduction (e.g., reduced greenhouse gases, increased water quality, etc.)? Please provide examples if applicable.
Part II. Can you comment on how your project outcomes contributed to any specific environmental status change (policy/ legal/regulatory, and socioeconomic)? Please provide examples if applicable.
Part III. Did any environmental stress reduction or status change have any influence on areas outside the project boundaries? Please be specific and give examples, if applicable.

Part I	
Part II	
Part III	

* 5. Please rate the sustainability of your project according to the following criteria

	Likely	Moderately Likely	Moderately Unlikely	Unlikely
Sociopolitical	○	○	○	○
Institutional	○	○	○	○
Environmental	○	○	○	○
Financial	○	○	○	○

* 6. Please provide comments about your responses for question 5 above.

Institutional	
Sociopolitical	
Financial	
Environmental	

* 7. Can you comment on the evolution of the project from project identification, concept preparation, appraisal, preparation of detailed proposal, approval and start-up, oversight, and supervision, to completion?

* 8. Part I. Please describe the day-to-day implementation of the project for your organization. What was your experience of working with CI Japan? Part II. Can you briefly characterize the hiring processes and how goods and services were procured? Were there any problems?

Part I

Part II

* 9. What would you say about the link between the internal project organization and the project outputs? Can you think of other ways of internal organization?

* 10. Part I. Did you carry out a gender analysis? Do you have any way of determining if project benefits were obtained equally by men and women? Did you report to CI Japan in a gender dis-aggregated way? Part II. Were any Safeguards triggered? If so, which? How were the issues resolved and at what level?

Part I

Part II

Evaluation Team Composition and Expertise

The evaluation was conducted by Integrated Sustainability Solutions LLC (http://www.issolutionsllc.com/) and implemented by Keith Forbes (kforbes@issolutionsllc.com). Mr. Forbes brings 24 years of international development, monitoring and evaluation, climate change and LULUCF experience. He has extensive evaluation experience of approximately 15 global and national projects, including CI-GEF CEPF, CI-GEF AMBIO TE and MTE in Mexico, EU GCCA in Mozambique, USAID PERFORM in Malawi, U.S. Department of State SLCP, USAID EC-LEDS Colombia, USAID EC-LEDS Mexico, and five USAID/NASA SERVIR evaluations (Brazil, Nepal, Bhutan, Ghana, Nigeria).

Mr. Forbes has 24 years of experience working internationally on project evaluation, international development, LULUCF, and climate change in the U.S., Africa, Europe, S. America,

and Asia. He has lived and/or worked in Zambia, Kuwait, Sri Lanka, the U.S., Canada, and Portugal, and, on work assignments in the context of international development programs and projects, in Mexico, Brazil, Colombia, Peru, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, Ghana, South Africa, Nepal, Bhutan, and Vietnam. He brings extensive evaluation and assessment experience in the include the interface between climate change and land use, conservation, biodiversity, climate change adaptation, resilience, greenhouse gas inventories. He is widely published with a Master of Science in Environmental Science, with a focus on tropical forest ecology and international development from Indiana University's (Bloomington, IN) School of Public and Environmental Affairs. He is a native English speaker, fluent in Portuguese, and professionally fluent in Spanish. Mr. Forbes has worked for international development contractors (for USAID, DFID, EU/EC), not-for-profit and for-profit private sector consulting, NGOs, foundations, and within academia. Mr. Forbes is the founder and principal consultant of ISS LLC, an international development and climate change professional services firm, based in Saratoga Springs, NY. He has taught at Skidmore College, is on the UNFCCC roster of experts for land use and other climate change areas and has been an expert reviewer for the IPCC guidance on land use GHG inventories, and the U.N. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment.