Document of The World Bank

Report No: ICR0000704

IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION AND RESULTS REPORT (MULT-24843)

ON A

GRANT FROM THE

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY TRUST FUND

IN THE AMOUNT OF SDR 11.8 MILLION (US\$ 15.0 MILLION EQUIVALENT)

TO THE

INSTITUTO DE INVESTIGACIÓN DE RECURSOS BIOLÓGICOS ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT

FOR AN

ANDEAN REGION CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE USE OF BIODIVERSITY PROJECT

June 30, 2008

Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Colombia & Mexico Country Management Unit Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Office

CURRENCY EQUIVALENTS

(Exchange Rate Effective June 18, 2008)

Currency Unit = Colombian Peso 1.00 = US\$ [0.00] US\$ 1.00 = [1702.73]

FISCAL YEAR 2008

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

Agroecotur	National Network of Agritourism and Ecotourism Services
AICA	Area of Importance for Bird Conservation
CARDER	Regional Autonomous Corporation of Risaralda
CAM	Regional Autonomous Corporation of Alto Magdalena
CARs	Regional Environmental Authorities (Corporación Autónoma Regional)
CAS	Country Assistance Strategy
CIEBREG	Research center on biodiversity and genetic resources (<i>Centro de investigaciones en biodiversidad y recursos genéticos</i>)
CIFOR	Center for International Forestry Research
CORANTIOQUIA	Regional Autonomous Corporation of Centro de Antioquia
CORNARE	Regional Autonomous Corporation Rionegro – Nare
CORPOCALDAS	Regional Autonomous Corporation of Caldas
CORPONOR	Regional Autonomous Corporation of Norte de Santander
CORPONARINO	Regional Autonomous Corporation of Nariño
CORTOLIMA	Regional Autonomous Corporation of Tolima
CPS	Country Partnership Strategy
CRC	Regional Autonomous Corporation of Cauca
CRQ	Regional Autonomous Corporation of Quindío
CVC	Regional Autonomous Corporation of Valle del Cauca
DMI	Integrated District Management (Distrito de Manejo Integrado)
DNP	National Planning Department (Departamento Nacional de Planeación)
EA	Executing Agency
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GoC	Government of Colombia
IAvH	Alexander von Humboldt Institute on Biological Resource Research (Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt)
IDEAM	Colombian Institute of Hydrology, Meteorology and Environmental Studies (Instituto de Hidrología, Meteorología y Estudios Ambientales de Colombia)
INVEMAR	Marine and Coastal Research Institute (Instituto de Investigaciones Marinas y Costeras "José Benito Vives de Andréis")
ISAGEN	Mixed utility company (power generation and energy solution sales)
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
MMA	Colombian Ministry of the Environment (now Ministry of Environment, Housing and Territorial Development, MAVDT)

National Development Plan
Non Governmental Organization
National Protected Areas System
National Biotrade Observatory (Observatorio Nacional de Biocomercio)
Protected Area
Project Appraisal Document
Project Coordination Unit
Annual Operating Plan
Civil Society Reserves Network
National Environmental System (Sistema Nacional Ambiental)
National Parks System (Sistema de Parques Nacionales Naturales)
National Parks Administrative Unit (Unidad Administrativa Especial del Sistema de Parques Nacionales Naturales)
World Wildlife Fund

Vice President: Pamela Cox Country Director: Axel van Trotsenburg Sector Manager: Laura E. Tlaiye Project Team Leader: Juan Pablo Ruiz ICR Team Leader Natalia Gomez

COUNTRY Colombia

Project Name ANDEAN REGION CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE USE OF BIODIVERSITY

CONTENTS

Data Sheet

- A. Basic Information
- B. Key Dates
- C. Ratings Summary
- D. Sector and Theme Codes
- E. Bank Staff
- F. Results Framework Analysis
- G. Ratings of Project Performance in ISRs
- H. Restructuring
- I. Disbursement Graph

1. Project Context, Global Environment Objectives and Design	6
2. Key Factors Affecting Implementation and Outcomes	11
3. Assessment of Outcomes	. 17
4. Assessment of Risk to Development Outcome	23
5. Assessment of Bank and Borrower Performance	24
6. Lessons Learned	
7. Comments on Issues Raised by Borrower/Implementing Agencies/Partners	27
Annex 1. Project Costs and Financing	
Annex 2. Outputs by Component	29
Annex 3. Economic and Financial Analysis	33
Annex 4. Bank Lending and Implementation Support/Supervision Processes	35
Annex 5. Beneficiary Survey Results	37
Annex 6. Stakeholder Workshop Report and Results	40
Annex 7. Summary of Borrower's ICR and/or Comments on Draft ICR	42
Annex 8. Comments of Cofinanciers and Other Partners/Stakeholders	45
Annex 9. List of Supporting Documents	48
Annex 10. Tracking Tools for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priorities 1-	
2548 MAP	

INSERT DATA SHEET HERE

AFTER APPROVAL BY COUNTRY DIRECTOR AN UPDATED DATA SHEET SHOULD BE INSERTED <u>MANUALLY</u> IN <u>HARD COPY</u> BEFORE SENDING A FINAL ICR TO THE PRINT SHOP.

NOTE: The Data Sheet is generated by the system using the information entered in the Operations Portal each time you use "Send Draft", "Print" or "Submit Final" functions.

1. Project Context, Global Environment Objectives and Design

1.1 Context at Appraisal

a. Country and sector background – At the time of appraisal, Colombia was already recognized as a megadiverse nation with one of the highest concentration of species per surface area (Mittermeier 1998) and the Andes identified as the richest biogeographical region in the country given its number of distinct ecosystem types, each of which is remarkably diverse due to great fluctuations in altitude, climate and geology. The high conservation priority assigned to the Colombian Andes was based on its biological richness¹ and on the existing pressures on its biological integrity. Threats included the impact of human interventions², ranging from agricultural activities to illicit cropping and the associated degradation and loss of natural habitats and soil erosion. Regional planning did not internalize biodiversity concerns and only 7% of the Andes was under some sort of protection regime, declared as a category of protected area. A preliminary review of incentives for biodiversity conservation indicated that there was a comprehensive set of instruments on the books but their application had been inconsistent. Full documentation of Colombia's biodiversity was lacking, with inventories and field surveys still required to overcome the pervasive deficit of good knowledge and support its dissemination and use by decision-makers.

b. Institutional and policy framework – The institutional framework for biodiversity in Colombia created through the country's 1991 Constitution and Law 99/93 included: i) the Ministry of Environment (MMA); ii) 33 Regional Autonomous Corporations (CARs) responsible for regional environmental management, 18 of which in the Andean region; iii) the National Parks Administrative Unit (UAESPNN) created within the Ministry to develop and manage Colombia's protected areas; and iv) 4 related research institutes to support scientific, technical decision and policy-making processes, including the Alexander von Humboldt Research Institute on Biological Resources (IAvH). This decentralized system for environmental management was conceived to include local and regional authorities, private and public universities, NGOs and others. By 1999 UAESPNN had supported the establishment of the National Protected Areas System, comprising different categories of protected areas, from regional to local and from public and private to collectively owned, while seeking to improve their conservation effectiveness by involving local communities and a diversity of methods such as collaborative management, as part of its policy on Social participation for conservation in place at appraisal. In this regard, indigenous groups were constitutionally recognized as key players in the management of biodiversity areas.

The National Biodiversity Policy (MMA, 1997) was developed within the context of the Biodiversity Convention ratified by Colombia through Law 165/94. At the request of MMA, the IAvH led the formulation process of the Policy's associated instruments comprising the National Biodiversity Report, Strategy and Action Plan (1998), which prioritized three lines of action: conservation, equitable and sustainable use, and improved knowledge. The National Biodiversity Report identified the Andean region as the leading regional priority in terms of biodiversity use. Subsequently, MMA established biodiversity conservation in the Andean region as a top environmental priority for the National Development Plan (NDP) 1999-2002 that included a Strategic Plan for Environment (*'Proyecto Colectivo Ambiental'*) with three main objectives: i) conservation and restoration of priority areas within strategic ecoregions; ii) promotion of environmental sustainability of economic sectors; and iii) promotion of sustainable regional and urban development. Moreover, in August 1999, the MMA published its *National Strategy for the Conservation of the Andes*, which sough to ensure strategic GEF intervention in the region to avoid irreversible loss of globally significant biodiversity. Four GEF proposals were designed to address immediate priorities, including the project in question as a national 'umbrella' project³, conceived to launch in the Andes the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan referred to above ⁴, whose formulation the IAvH had led. Consequently, given the policy-

¹ Of the five biogeographical regions in the country (the Amazon, the Caribbean, the Pacific, the *Orinoquia* and the Andean regions), the Andes has the highest number of species of mammals, birds, reptiles and amphibians.

² About 70% of Colombia's population was estimated to live in this region at the time of appraisal, which had resulted in the transformation of about two thirds of the region's natural habitats.

³ The umbrella project was to be complemented by three regionally-based interventions: in the Colombian Massif, the *Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta* and the *Serranía de la Macarena*, to implement regional systems of protected areas.

⁴ These instruments included long (25 years), mid (10 years) and short (4 years) term actions to implement the National Biodiversity Policy, agreed upon through a participatory process involving environmental and social NGOs, indigenous and afrocolombian

making nature of the MMA and IAvH's expertise and administrative autonomy⁵, the Minister of Environment delegated full responsibility for the project in the IAvH in September 2000.

c. Rationale for Bank assistance – The rationale for Bank assistance was stated in the 1997 CAS (Document number: 17107-CO). The CAS identified protection and conservation of the environment as one of the major themes of assistance, noting that the country was listed as one of the worldwide priority areas for conservation of flora and fauna. According to the CAS, "inadequate management of natural resources has led to a growing deterioration as seen by the loss of biodiversity, deforestation...endangered strategic ecosystems, soil degradation, highly polluted rivers, canals and wetlands". The project contributed to the CAS's strategic focus on sustainable development/protection and conservation of strategic ecosystems; improving the effectiveness of the recently introduced decentralized system for environmental management; and promoting employment opportunities for the poor through environmentally sustainable projects.

d. Consistency with GEF policies – The project was set to support the following key elements of the GEF 1998-2002 Operational Strategy in place at the time of appraisal: Andean Region use of biodiversity, increased awareness, policy reform, capacity building, sectoral integration, and financial sustainability. Specifically, it supported biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in forest and mountain ecosystems (ecosystems under Operational Programs 3 and 4 respectively) as well as the cross-sectoral area of land degradation. The project also sought to address issues of agrobiodiversity that were endorsed as a GEF Priority by the III Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity in Buenos Aires (1996).

1.2 Original Global Environment Objectives (GEO) and Key Indicators (as approved)

The project development objective was to increase conservation, knowledge and sustainable use of globally important biodiversity of the Colombian Andes⁶. Specifically, the project would:

- 1. Support the development of a more representative, effective, and viable Andean protected area system
- 2. Identify conservation opportunities in rural landscapes, develop and promote management tools for biodiversity conservation
- 3. Expand, organize, and disseminate the knowledge base on biodiversity in the Andes to a wide audience of stakeholders and policy makers, and implement monitoring tools, and
- 4. Promote inter-sectoral coordination to address some root causes of biodiversity loss in the Andes

Key indicators included the following:

- a. 6 regional active networks of protected areas established in project conservation zones
- b. Participatory management plans for 50% of existing national protected areas within the project conservation zones prepared and implemented
- c. 50% of remaining ecosystem types per ecoregions represented in protected areas
- d. 4 biodiversity and socioeconomic surveys of different representative rural landscapes for the identification of conservation opportunities completed
- e. 4 management tools for biodiversity conservation in rural landscapes (e.g. corridors, enrichment of productive landscape matrices and live fence rows) evaluated for biological effectiveness and economic viability
- f. 2 management plans for 2 threatened species of global importance
- g. Biodiversity baseline for the Andes region built based on information available
- h. 8 comprehensive biodiversity assessments filling major knowledge gaps in the Andes

communities, CARs, research institutes, the National Planning Department, the MMA and other ministries such as Agriculture, Mining and Energy, and Foreign Trade.

⁵ The IAvH is a non-profit, private civil corporation, attached to the Ministry of Environment, with administrative autonomy, legal personality and its own net worth, whose mission is to promote, coordinate and carry out research that contributes to biodiversity use. Pursuant to corporate by-laws, its duties include "obtaining, storing, analyzing, processing, providing and disseminating basic information on biodiversity, ecosystems, resources and processes to manage and exploit the Nation's renewable natural resources", among others.

⁶ For the purposes of the project, the Colombian Andes were defined as the areas encompassing over 500 m in the Eastern, Central and Western mountain ranges, excluding a small number of other high altitude areas such as the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta or the Sierra de Macarena, already targeted by specific GEF projects as mentioned above.

- i. A biodiversity state-pressure-response indicators system implemented, updated and in use
- j. A network of Andean biodiversity databases established with at least 15 institutional biodiversity databases systematized and linked to the network
- k. Inclusion of biodiversity considerations in the MoE, environmental licensing, TORs and on guidelines of infrastructure, mining, energy and agricultural projects

1.3 Revised GEO (*as approved by original approving authority*) and Key Indicators, and reasons/justification

The PDO/GEO was not revised. The original project's logical framework included 40 key performance indicators focusing mainly on activities and outputs. At MTR and as shown below, thirteen of these 40 indicators were adjusted and the remaining twenty three⁷ indicators left unchanged. In addition, six new outcome indicators were developed to focus M&E on project results (see Sections 1.7, 2.3, 3.2 and Annex 2):

Table 1. Adjusted key indicators				
	Original indicator as set out in PAD, Annex 1	Adjusted indicator by MTR		
1	Management plans for 50% of existing national protected areas within the conservation zones prepared and implemented	Management plans for 6 selected national protected areas within conservation zones prepared and implemented		
2	4 management tools for biodiversity conservation in rural landscapes evaluated for biological effectiveness and economic viability (e.g. corridors)	2 management tools for biodiversity conservation in rural landscapes evaluated for biological effectiveness and economic viability (e.g. corridors)		
3	10 pilot sites with selected management tools implemented and monitored	5 pilot sites with selected management tools implemented and monitored		
4	Package of incentives for Andean region use of biodiversity designed and promoted	Evaluation of property tax exemptions as an incentive for conservation and sustainable resource use and identification of incentives to be tailored to biodiversity targets		
5	Green markets promotion program initiated	6 green market offices in six project areas supporting sustainable bio-commerce initiatives		
6	3 of the project zones implemented with examples of adoption of promoted practices and management tools	Evaluation of rural biodiversity use and local practices in six zones within the Andean region, with agreement signed with local communities regarding management and sustainable use		
7	Biodiversity information kits distributed amongst 1000 schools in project zones	Publish the incorporation of biodiversity into		
8	100 schools trained for the design and implementation of schoolyard ecology projects	school curricula in written and electronic media		
9	Promotional material for practices and management tools for biodiversity conservation in rural landscapes produced (4 videos, 4 manuals, 15 booklets in accessible language)			
10	Active internet Webpages, electronic publication and newsletters addressed to decision-makers, scientists and general public	Communications strategies and exhibits		
11	30 articles published in national news media			
12	4 Andean biodiversity held guides published	Farly Warning system on biodiversity impacts of		
13	Biodiversity impact monitoring reports for selected areas in the project conservation zone	large-scale development projects designed and promoted		

New indicators set after MTR to focus M&E on outcomes

⁷ 36 indicators in total resulted after MTR adjustments, as 2 school ecology-related indicators (Ind. 7 and 8 in the table 1 above) were merged and 4 communication-related indicators (Ind. 9-12 above) were also merged into a single formulation.

1	No. of hectares under active conservation processes ⁸
2	No. of hectares with land management tools applied
3	No. of actors applying land management tools designed/promoted under project
4	No. of knowledge products generated by the project available and consulted ⁹
5	No. of actors involved in biodiversity information management ¹⁰
6	No. of policy proposals and/or instruments included in National Development Plans, policies or sectoral
0	instruments

1.4 Main Beneficiaries

The intended main beneficiaries were government agencies responsible for managing Colombia's natural resources and their non-governmental partners (peasant and sector organizations, network of private reserves, environmental and social NGOs working locally, regional universities) through new management tools. Rural and indigenous populations in prioritized conservation zones would also directly benefit through project support for more sustainable use of biological resources. In addition, the project's investment in the creation and dissemination of knowledge would be of value to decision-makers and the scientific community both globally and nationally.

1.5 Original Components (as approved)

Component 1: Project Conservation Zones and Protected Areas (US\$12.53 million, 41.8% of estimated total project cost; GEF US\$ 3.22 million corresponding to 37.1% of GEF grant)

This component would promote the consolidation of Colombia's National Protected Areas System within the Andean region (comprising National Natural Parks and protected areas of regional and local character, including private reserves), by testing some of its elements in key areas. Activities would be supported at two levels: the protected areas level (areas officially declared under a protection category) and the conservation zone level (extended geographic regions containing PAs). Existing protected areas would be strengthened through the participatory design and implementation of their management plans. New protected areas would be established as needed and their management plans designed and implemented in a participatory manner. To enhance protected areas would be addressed through the participatory design and implementation of conservation zone plans. 11 Conservation zones encompassing a representative sample of the Andean ecosystems and biodiversity were identified, of which 5 were selected for Phase 1 implementation spanning over the project's first three years¹¹. Activities would expand to the remaining 6 conservation zones during Phase 2 (the last three years)¹², subject to the achievement of targets set for the end of Phase 1 related to the completion of 15 outputs (i.e. establishment of 22 new protected areas, fulfillment of 4 rural landscape surveys, 4 biodiversity assessments, among others).

⁸ Active conservation processes referred to 3 criteria: management plans implemented; interinstitutional coordination and social participation.

⁹ This included products covered by agreements entered into by the IAvH and its partners.

¹⁰ Information management referred to i) entities linked to the Biodiversity Information System (through data provision and management).

¹¹ **First phase conservation zones** meant the following <u>geographic areas in the Andean Region</u>: (i) Northeastern *páramos* and moist forests; (ii) Alto Putumayo; (iii) Dagua-Calima-Paraguas corridor; (iv) Altiplano Cundiboyacense; and (v) Los Nevados Park and neighboring coffee-growing area, or any other conservation zone in the Andean Region that could, with the agreement of the Bank, replace those listed above. **First phase protected areas** within these zones meant the following <u>National Natural Parks</u>: (i) Cocuy; (ii) Tamá; (iii) Pisba; (iv) Los Nevados; (v) Otún-Quimbaya; and (vi) Isla de la Corota, or any other protected area in the Andean Region that could, with the agreement of the Bank, replace the protected areas listed above.

¹² Second phase conservation zones meant any of the following geographic areas in the Andean Region: (i) Cuchilla de los Cobardes and Chicamocha canyon; (ii) Rusia Páramo and the Quercus forest of Santander; (iii) Patía Valley and neighboring western Andes mountain range; (iv) Carare-Opón; (v) Tatacoa desert; and (vi) Dry forests of the Cauca canyon in Antioquia or any other conservation zone in the Andean Region that could, with the agreement of the Bank, replace those listed above. Second phase protected areas meant any existing protected area in a second phase conservation zone, or any new protected area which would be established pursuant to component 1 of the project.

Component 2: Andean Region Use of Biodiversity in Rural Landscapes (US\$8.47 million, 28.2% of estimated total project cost: GEF US\$ 4.3 million, 28.7% of GEF grant)

This component would lay the groundwork to promote long-term biodiversity conservation in transformed landscapes still providing habitats and/or corridors for biodiversity. In the same conservation zones targeted under Component 1, the project would specifically support: assessments of conservation opportunities in transformed landscapes; development of management tools for biodiversity conservation in rural landscapes (biological corridors, enrichment of grassland, complex production systems such as shade coffee and live fencerows); dissemination of management tools developed during project; development of a system of institutional and economic incentives, including the design of a funding mechanism to promote markets for biodiversity goods and services.

Component 3: Knowledge Base for Decision Making, Monitoring and Evaluation (US\$5.6 million, 18.7% of estimated total project cost; GEF \$3.1 million corresponding to 20.7% of GEF grant)

This component would support and expand existing efforts to improve knowledge and monitoring on the different aspects of the region's biodiversity, its species, ecosystem fragility and protection needs, as well as to address the lack of sufficient knowledge and deficient scientific information on Andean biodiversity to set conservation priorities and make decisions at the national and regional scale. Subcomponents included: biodiversity assessments; building a decentralized biodiversity information system; implementing a dissemination and public awareness program; and implementing an indicator system of biodiversity state-pressure-response.

Component 4: Intersectoral Coordination (US\$ 0.86 million, 2.9% of estimated total project cost; GEF US\$0.5 million corresponding to 3.3% of GEF grant)

Under this component, studies and training would be provided to relevant government agencies and the private sector to promote the inclusion of biodiversity goals in sector development plans for the Andes. This would be accomplished through coordination with Colombian Ministries, sector associations and economic conglomerates, and monitoring biodiversity trends in large-scale development projects.

Component 5: Project Management and Monitoring (US\$ 2.54 million, 8.5% of estimated total project cost; GEF US\$1.54 millions corresponding to 10.3% of GEF grant)

This component would finance project administration and coordination (staff, office costs, travel and other administrative expenses, as well as annual audits), and a system to monitor project implementation.

1.6 Revised Components

Project components were not revised.

1.7 Other significant changes

a. Project Adjustment – The midterm review recommended to focus project activities and investments taking into account i) the execution lags under component 1, ii) the nature of the IAvH as a centralized research institute, and iii) the need to strengthen results dissemination/knowledge transfer and focus M&E on achievement of outcomes (see Section 2). Consequently the project experienced the following adjustments:

- i. *Consolidation of activities in First phase conservation zones* in line with project design, whereby midterm review would assess if the expansion of activities to the remaining 6 conservation zones was warranted for (based on the achievement of pre-determined benchmarks), activities for Phase 2 were confined to first phase conservation zones. Targets for the establishment of protected areas and regional protected area networks under component 1 had not been achieved due to administrative inefficiencies (see Section 2.2e); thus, activities continued in first phase conservation zones, considered successful but requiring additional time to provide full benefits. *La Isla de la Corota* was replaced as a first phase protected area by the *Iguaque* Flora and Fauna Sanctuary as approved by project team.
- Scope of activities IAvH's ability to help implement the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan was limited considering its centralized and research-oriented nature (see Sections 1.1 and 2.1-2.2). Therefore the scope of certain activities under project components was adjusted, as reflected in the project indicators described in Section 1.3:
 - <u>Components 1 and 2</u> regarding the *development of a system of institutional and economic incentives* (Component 2), IAvH's role in providing technical input to the creation of such system was emphasized,

instead of implementing the system itself. This was also the case for the establishment of new protected areas (Component 1), where IAvH's technical input rather than PA declaration was underlined.

- <u>Components 3 and 4</u> the scope of efforts to *monitor the application of the national biodiversity policy* (Component 3) and to *monitor biodiversity trends in large-scale development projects* (Component 4) was also narrowed. The latter was adjusted to design an early warning system to identify possible threats from sectoral development projects, to be presented as an independent project to other financing sources. Both activities were considered to exceed the possibilities of a single project and therefore their financing and implementation should be shared with other ongoing and/or future initiatives.
- iii. M&E adjustments these changes in geographic coverage and scope of activities, together with MTR recommendations to strengthen knowledge transfer through education-communication strategies and steer M&E away from outputs, resulted in adjustments to key performance indicators as described in Section 1.3. In addition, as mentioned in Section F, biannual supervision after MTR focused on 15 of the 40 key performance indicators as adjusted, deemed most representative of increased biodiversity knowledge, conservation and sustainable use (reported as of 2005 in the Implementation Status Reports).

b. Implementation arrangements

- *i.* Concentration of activities in UAESPNN and IAvH a highly decentralized scheme was designed for project execution, building upon existing institutional strengths of the entities involved. Activities under components 1 and 2 were to be carried out through grants which different organizations would apply for accordingly (UAESPNN, CARs, NGOs and community groups). As such, the IAvH would coordinate and manage project funds and interventions to be implemented regionally and locally by subgrant recipients. Components 3 and 4 would be directly executed by the IAvH. In practice, implementation of activities in the six targeted protected areas under component 1 was assumed in its entirety by the UAESPNN as head of the National Protected Area System, and for reasons analyzed in Section 2, the supervision of remaining activities under components 1 and 2 was concentrated in the IAvH and their execution carried out with regional and local partners.
- *ii. Financial arrangements*
 - <u>Administration of National Parks subgrant</u> in light of the changes described above, a trust fund not provided for in project design was set up for UAESPNN to administer resources for protected area activities under Component 1.
 - <u>Change in trust fund denomination</u> in 2003, the GEF introduced the change in trust fund denomination from Special Drawing Rights to US dollars.
 - <u>Reallocation of grant proceeds</u> in October 2007, the Bank agreed to reallocate proceeds between categories of items to be financed, to strengthen environmental education/communication activities as recommended by supervision missions (implemented by means of consultants' services¹³).

2. Key Factors Affecting Implementation and Outcomes

2.1 Project Preparation, Design and Quality at Entry

The following key factors positively contributed to project preparation:

a. Consistency with overall strategies/priorities – the fact that project design and objectives were consistent with country and sector priorities, as well as CAS and GEF strategies, contributed to the ample institutional support from National Environmental System (SINA) actors obtained for its implementation.

b. Soundness of background analysis – the project design built on technical studies financed by the GEF Project Preparation Grant (previously PDF Block B) and other partners, including: i) biological analysis assessing the representation, conservation/transformation and protection status of 21 identified Andean ecosystems; ii)

¹³ This included reallocating: i) US\$1,174,586 to Category 2 (Consultants' services) and ii) US\$149,200 to Category 5 (Fund subgrants) to cover the difference between the amount allocated to this category in SDR (corresponding to US\$800,800 in Schedule 1 of the amended Grant Agreement) and that included in the PAD and resulting Agreement No.06-01-24843-0339CE entered into by the IAvH and the Biotrade Fund (totaling US\$950,000). These resources were deducted from Categories 1 (Goods), 3 (Operating Costs), 4 (Subgrants) and 6 (Unallocated).

socioeconomic diagnoses of project zones; and iii) a review of the environmental management sector. These studies contributed to an adequate selection of zones for project intervention given their importance for biodiversity conservation purposes and socioeconomic feasibility for component 1 and 2 activities. In addition, biodiversity knowledge gaps and the need to organize available information were identified and resulted in key activities designed under component 3.

c. Participatory approach – GEF preparation resources also financed a broad consultative and participatory process with local communities, central and decentralized authorities, national and international NGOs, universities and productive associations that helped verify the outcomes of the social analysis and assured the observance of stakeholders' priorities as well as their support.

The following key factors negatively affected project design:

d. Multiplicity and complexity of objectives – although consistent with current priorities for biodiversity conservation at appraisal, GEO and its 4 specific objectives each involved far-reaching goals and activities resulting from the project's conception as the tool to launch the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan for the Andes. The participatory exercise to adapt both the Strategy and its Action Plan to a six year project specifically for the Andes involved representatives from nearly 20 institutions from the academic, government and non-governmental sectors to prioritize actions and work zones, all of which helped press for ample objectives to encompass wide ranging interests. As stated in the project's external evaluation (Uribe, 2007)¹⁴ "the coincidences between the objective of the [Biodiversity] Convention and the objective of the project are evident", an indication that too broad a purpose had been attributed to the operation in its design. Among others, this resulted in project adjustment as discussed in section 1.7, and also had implications on achievement of outcomes as discussed in section 3.

e. Multiplicity and segmentation of components – 18 subcomponents under 5 components were identified to support objectives, making project execution complex given limited time and resources. More importantly, the multiplicity of components contributed to segment project implementation, reinforced by the M&E focus on products/outputs by component rather than on outcomes contributing to GEO achievement (see sections F, 1.3 and 2.3).

f. Underestimation of key risks – the project identified key risks regarding: i) political support, ii) stakeholder interest (from decision-makers, sectoral agencies, etc.), and iii) long-term financial sustainability. However, the following can be said about their assessment:

- i. *Political support* this risk was underestimated as negligible, as the GoC had actively participated in project design and was expected to continue so during implementation. For reasons explained in Section 2.2, a more defined mitigation measure such as establishing a specific role for MMA in project execution would have been key to ensure its support until closing.
- ii. *Stakeholder interest* this risk was estimated as moderate and to mitigate it, target groups would be identified and the benefits of changed practices presented to them. This proved insufficient to guarantee their interest given, among others, staff turnover. Underestimating both risks i) and ii) resulted in the lack of project marketing strategy that would have been useful from its start, including more robust budget allocations to component 4 and to dissemination activities under components 2 and 3, which accounted for 2.9 and 4.2% of total project costs, respectively.
- iii. *Long-term financial sustainability* not achieving financial sustainability was considered a moderate risk, and consequently less attention was paid to the effective design of financial mechanisms (a fundraising unit in PCU identified as a mitigation measure was not implemented). Confidence in budgetary allocations by CARs and fundraising activities in protected areas, particularly National Natural Parks, overrode institutional weaknesses in fundraising and lobbying.

¹⁴ In November 2007, the IAvH hired two external evaluators to assess the project's contributions to national commitments under the Convention on Biological Diversity and to the postulates of the National Biodiversity Policy. To do so, well qualified and acknowledged environmental specialists in Colombia, Eduardo Uribe Botero and Antoine Cleef, undertook project documentation review, interviews with PCU staff and field visits to 4 project sites in *Boyacá* and *Quindío*, publishing the resulting evaluation reports in December 2007.

2.2 Implementation

Key factors contributing to successful implementation

a. IAvH's high quality research – As one of Colombia's main research institutes on biological resources since 1995, the IAvH has set up a team of highly qualified researchers under four main programs (biodiversity inventories, conservation biology, use and valuation, and policy and legislation) and two cross-cutting programs for information and training. It has engaged in several research projects with national and international organizations resulting in quality products following recognized technical standards, all of which has been recently acknowledged by an influential regional newspaper granting the IAvH an award for its exemplary career in national biodiversity conservation. Project activities supporting the expansion and improvement of the country's biodiversity knowledge base benefited from this institutional strength.

b. Active participation and commitment by direct beneficiaries – the implementation of biodiversity conservation management tools and incentives in rural landscapes and protected area buffer zones encountered initial resistance from some local authorities, producers and communities. However, field training and visits to pilot project sites turned direct beneficiaries into active participants in conservation activities once they became aware of the local benefits that conservation could bring about. Their commitment was key to test innovative incentives implemented by the project such as a payment scheme for environmental services in one targeted watershed.

c. Dutch participation – the government of the Netherlands played a key role in project implementation as one of its main co-financiers. In keeping with the Paris Agreements and given the comprehensive nature of the project, resources from the Bank and the Netherlands were invested in a complementary manner and allowed for increased and uninterrupted flow of funds. In addition, Embassy representatives facilitated high-level dialogue between the MMA and the EA when institutional relations were tense due to political reasons outside project control. A Tripartite Committee set up to facilitate joint project planning and supervision helped maximize reporting efforts by PCU and enhance supervision given technical complementarities between project evaluators.

Key factors hindering implementation

The scope and complexity of the project proved to be a real challenge to the IAvH, as stated in section 2.1, given that achieving its objectives called for the active participation and commitment from numerous actors. Traditionally weak public inter-institutional coordination, particularly in the SINA, demanded active support from the PCU and its field staff to promote dialogue. The following key factors hindered implementation:

d. **Decentralized project implementation by a centralized implementing agency** – implementing the highly decentralized grant scheme described earlier for project execution was a challenge for the IAvH as a centralized research institute with limited competencies regarding protected area consolidation and sector policy dialogue (see Section 1.1b) It involved numerous partners with dissimilar administrative capacities, which was also demanding in terms of capacity-building and coordination efforts. Several activities designed to be led by CARs, NGOs and other partners were eventually taken up by IAvH for administrative efficiency reasons, but given its weak lobbying capacity as a research institute, decision-makers at all levels were unevenly and insufficiently engaged.

e. Slow learning curves in UAESPNN – as mentioned earlier, the UAESPNN took on the execution of activities in targeted protected areas under component 1 as head of the National Protected Area System. However, its centralized contracting scheme whereby activities in each National Park are approved at the central level, delayed contract approval and subsequent budget execution. Park Chiefs normally administering limited resources were unfamiliar with procurement requirements and associated paperwork, and lack of sufficient administrative staff in UAESPNN's legal department contributed to administrative inefficiencies. Moreover, the technical content of each contract was initially cleared and its execution audited by IAvH, considerably straining the inter-agency dialogue. Mitigation measures to streamline procedures included: transferring technical quality accountability to the UAESPNN; more actively involving its staff in project technical and steering committees; and additional training to park and IAvH personnel in the preparation of POAs, bidding documents, financial

reports and monitoring tools. Finally, given disbursement lags in UAESPNN's subgrant accumulated since 2002¹⁵, the project set up a Joint 2006-2007 POA between UAESPNN and IAvH which enabled the latter to directly execute non-disbursed resources in activities prioritized with UAESPNN, the Bank and the Dutch Embassy (e.g. project results dissemination, environmental education, biodiversity information system).

f. Staff turnover – changing personnel in government agencies, from management to technical staff particularly in the CARs, hindered project implementation in several areas as activities and targets agreed upon with previous delegates were not prioritized by subsequent decision-makers and agreements had to be rebuilt. This was the case for the declaration of a protected area in *Alto Putumayo* agreed upon during project preparation with Cofan indigenous authorities (*cabildos*) who later changed in their entirety, which, together with public order disruptions in the area, made it necessary to find alternate sites for the establishment of a new national protected area. The same was true for the planned activity discussed with Cundinamarca's CAR and the CVC to create regional reserves in a dry ecosystems, not supported by the new administrations. This implied searching for alternatives such as finding second choices for protected area declarations.

2.3 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Design, Implementation and Utilization

Project design included a monitoring and evaluation plan that would allow tracking the evolution of biodiversity in project areas as well as project performance and impact.

a. Biodiversity M&E system

- i. *Design* a system comprising simple and complex indicators was laid out to monitor biodiversity characteristics alongside socioeconomic and institutional conditions in selected areas, and to relate observed changes to project interventions.
- ii. Implementation and use – Under component 3, a system of state-pressure-response indicators was developed by the IAvH with a view to provide information on the status of Andean biodiversity, the pressure-exerting factors and the policy actions set out to achieve the desired biodiversity scenarios. The system was successfully piloted to prioritize conservation areas in the jurisdiction of Cundinamarca's CAR, in the Iquaque-La Rusia-Guantiva oak forest corridor and in the coffee-growing region (Eje *Cafetero*). These and other exercises applying biodiversity state-pressure-response indicators in selected Andean areas are available at http://www.humboldt.org.co/humboldt/mostrarpagina.php?codpage=5000312, including the methodological sheets describing each indicator. In addition, through a tool called INFORMAR 'Municipal and Regional Information related to Biodiversity in Colombia', the project collected data to build biodiversity baselines and socioeconomic indicators linked to municipal statistics and maps. Resulting information was initially compiled and published as a book, INFORMAR Andes, distributed to 14 CARs acting in the area. It is now available for authorized researchers as an online application at http://intranet.Humboldt.org.co/indicadores/informar.html. Synthetic indicators to analyze the transformation of subAndean forest fragments between 1985 and 2000 and its relation to human activity were also developed with the National Program for Human Development¹⁶. Although the biodiversity state-pressure-response M&E strategy seeks to build regional indicator systems adding up to a countrywide structure to monitor to the application of the National Biodiversity Policy, under the project its scope was limited following midterm review advice on insufficient budget.

b. Project M&E system

i. *Design* – As for project performance, the M&E plan included in the corresponding PAD Annex foresaw a system comparing planned versus executed activities and outputs using measures of effectiveness, efficiency and timing. The system would also evaluate impacts based on the project's logical framework,

¹⁵ Administrative inefficiencies outside UAESPNN's control also contributed to disbursements lags under this component, including the implementation and selection process of the subgrant trustee between 2002 and 2003, which took over a year to become fully operational and the change in trust fund denomination from SDR to US dollars, which <u>delayed Bank disbursements between March and May 2004.</u>

¹⁶ This program is a joint initiative between the National Planning Department, the Colombian Presidential Agency for Social Action and International Cooperation and the United Nations Development Program, established to strengthen regional and local authorities' social development programs. It aims to support the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals locally and assist national efforts to monitor and evaluate progress.

complemented with indicators of productivity (cost/benefit) and quality (planned vs. obtained technical standards per output).

ii. Implementation and use – Although IAvH set up a planning and M&E system administered by its planning office, project design lacked adequate arrangements to ensure that desired variables were actually measured. As stated in previous sections, the project's logical framework focused mainly on activities and outputs, with 40 product indicators that did not comprehensively measure achievement of objectives. Bank efforts as early as May 2003 to remedy a weak and unclear M&E design to measure GEO progress resulted in the adjustments referred to in Sections F and 1.3 adopted after midterm review, namely: i) focusing biannual supervision on 15 indicators deemed most representative of increased biodiversity knowledge, conservation and sustainable use, and ii) developing 6 outcome indicators to focus M&E on aggregated improvements in biodiversity knowledge, conservation and use practices and their sustainability, using the 40 product indicators were actually incorporated into M&E processes by project partners, including the IAvH as research institute normally operating on an output base. The intended impact evaluations were not undertaken, partly due to the M&E emphasis on outputs (see Annex 2 for details on achievement of outputs), and the 6 outcome indicators agreed upon were measured only on project closing.

The project used several mechanisms to monitor progress: i) software to administer management data, ii) annual operating plans with timetables and targets, and iii) meetings with regional and component coordinators to prepare progress reports presented on an annual basis at first and biannually since 2006 to the Bank, upon approval by IAvH's General Assembly and Board of Directors. Progress reports were based on information from contractors and grant recipients working under different components. A protocol for archiving documents was developed by IAvH.

2.4 Safeguard and Fiduciary Compliance

Four safeguard policies (Indigenous people, Natural Habitats, Gender Issues and NGO Involvement) applied to the project as identified in the PAD. Comprehensive studies were also carried out for Involuntary Resettlement¹⁷ and Environmental Impacts for selection of priority areas. As of 2004, PSR-ISRs reported on compliance with four safeguards: Environmental Assessment, Natural Habitats, Forestry and Indigenous Peoples.

a. Environmental safeguards – the project was rated B category as no major adverse environmental impacts were expected from a design that would increase conservation, knowledge and sustainable use of globally important biodiversity of the Colombian Andes. The technical studies referred to in Section 2.1a enabled the selection of areas representing the wide range of Andean ecosystems and established their importance for global conservation purposes. Compliance with policies on Natural Habitats and Forests was ensured through the preparation and implementation of management plans for targeted protected areas (existing and new) and their surrounding regions. Land management tools and conservation incentives applied in rural landscapes promoted the protection and rehabilitation of natural habitats and integrated forests into farming practices in a more sustainable manner. In addition, biotrade initiatives supported by the funding mechanism set up by the project were screened to guarantee their positive approach to natural resource management.

b. Social safeguards – social assessments and participatory consultations for project design and implementation sought to guarantee its participatory approach to biodiversity conservation, sustainable use and knowledge in the Andean region.

i. *Indigenous peoples* – the project complied with OP 4.20 requirements in place during preparation and later OP 4.10 provisions throughout its implementation. Free, prior, and informed consultations with the 5 Indigenous peoples present in two project conservation zones, namely the *Alto Putumayo* and the

¹⁷ The project adopted UAESPNN policy on social participation in conservation (1999) based on respect for acquired rights, among other principles, and established a strategy to ensure stakeholder involvement in the design of regional protected area systems, in the identification of new protected areas and in the promotion of sustainable productive activities and conservation incentive systems. Eligibility criteria for project activities supporting private or regional reserves and biotrade initiatives included having no impact on land tenure or land use situation of local people. Finally, the national protected area that was to be declared in *Cerro Patascoy* was uninhabited due to its difficult access and interrupted relief.

Northeastern *Páramo* and humid forests, resulted, on the one hand, in broad community support to the project by the 4 Indigenous Peoples located in the *Alto Putumayo*¹⁸, and on the other, in the exclusion of U'wa territories. As for the Cofan, Siona, Kamsa and Inga peoples in the *Alto Putumayo*, project activities were consistent with their Life Plans and supported ongoing initiatives to protect and maintain the integrity of their territories. A participatory approach, respectful of traditional knowledge and cultural conditions, prevailed during project intervention in the area.

ii. *Gender issues and NGO involvement* – an equal opportunities approach was implemented for on-theground activities particularly under components 1 and 2, where many small to medium-sized landowners in protected area buffer zones included women with children who were actively involved in environmental education efforts and the implementation of land management tools. As for the PCU itself, about 85% of the team members and researchers benefiting from IAvH grants were women. With regards to NGOs, the project identified over 400 of them working in the Andes during preparation, and engaged in consultations with a large number of them for project design. 57 NGOs directly executed activities in components 1, 2 and 3 under the project's decentralized grant scheme and most of them provided in-kind cofinancing. Their views were taken into account during self evaluation exercises and project performance monitoring, as well as during technical discussions and trainings under component 4 in the case of sectoral organizations and productive associations.

c. Fiduciary compliance – the project complied with fiduciary policies as shown by procurement and financial management reviews, as well as semiannual audit reports on project implementation. From its onset, an action plan for compliance with fiduciary regulations was drafted by IAvH with Bank assistance, whereby the project coordination unit was staffed with an appropriately qualified and experienced procurement officer and financial management specialists, who received training on Bank requirements and procedures throughout the project. The financial management software, Novasoft, was acquired and implemented by 2006. At the end of 2005, the IAvH's administrative staff undertook functions previously carried out by the PCU as they were incorporated into the Institute's Financial and Administrative Coordination and Legal Units. POAs, terms of reference and selection processes by IAvH were examined and approved by the Bank pursuant to the Grant Agreement and Operations Manual.

2.5 Post-completion Operation/Next Phase

A follow-up operation was not expected for this project and although a plan was not formally presented by IAvH upon project closing, supervision missions over the last year discussed strategies for post-completion. Consequently, certain activities and outputs have set up arrangements to ensure their continuity after project completion. These arrangements by IAvH and project partners comprise: i) 2008 budget allocations by UAESPNN to continue implementing strategic lines included in the National Natural Parks' management plans developed with project support; ii) budget and cofinancing agreements with 3 private and public sector users¹⁹ to ensure continuity of the Biodiversity Information System and its staff; and iii) guaranteed financing for the Biotrade Fund set up under component 2, totaling over US\$ 4.6 million from 3 sources (the Dutch Embassy, IFC and *Petrotesting Colombia*), to continue lending to biotrade initiatives. Subject to the signature of cooperation agreements, IAvH would provide technical assistance to CARs and other actors investing in protected Area and Biodiversity Conservation Trust Fund, which have expressed interest in such support. In addition, a national project was recently approved by the GEF Council for work program inclusion in April 2008, to mainstream biodiversity in Colombia's coffee sector. It will build on the tools and lessons learned from the landscape-based management approaches developed in coffee-growing areas by this project.

¹⁸ The Cofanes expressed their interest in project support for the process they had been leading for over two years to protect the *Cerro Patascoy* located in the *Alto Putumayo* Zone 2 to enable the protection of an area with high biodiversity of global importance and a significant source of water and medicinal plants for these indigenous peoples.

¹⁹ Agreements have been signed with the following partners: the World Bank (for US\$66,000), CIEBREG (to sponsor 1 junior researcher) and INVEMAR (to sponsor an engineer for 9 months, half-time).

3. Assessment of Outcomes

3.1 Relevance of Objectives, Design and Implementation

Increasing conservation, knowledge and sustainable use of globally important biodiversity of the Colombian Andes continues to be relevant to achieve country environmental sustainability objectives, which the Bank in turn has continued to support through its recently approved Country Partnership Strategy (2008-2012). The 2006-2010 National Development Plan establishes six central themes to guide environmental management in Colombia, three of which closely related to the GEF/WB operation: i) biodiversity knowledge, conservation and sustainable use; ii) sustainable productive processes; and iii) environmental planning in land management. In particular, the consolidation of the National Protected Area System is highlighted as an important approach to conservation. The Government's midterm policy-guiding document "Colombia Vision 2019" also includes biodiversity knowledge, conservation and use as a key strategy for the promotion of sustainable development. It establishes targets for the consolidation of the Biodiversity Information System, in situ conservation in the framework of the National Protected Area System and sustainable use of biodiversity products, among others. As for the National Biodiversity Policy (1997), the project's external evaluation concluded that its "four components...directly contributed to compliance of the country's commitments under the Biodiversity Convention and to the development of the strategies of the National Biodiversity Policy" and its associated instruments, which continue to be in force. Finally, in light of GEF focal area strategies and strategic programming for GEF-4²⁰, the project continues to have high overall relevance. The decentralized and participatory approaches for protected area management also continue to be relevant, as evidenced by their promotion in country and sector strategies for environmental sustainability and their application by other environmental authorities and projects.

3.2 Achievement of Global Environmental Objectives

The project completed the majority of its activities and there is enough evidence of its contribution to increase conservation, knowledge and sustainable use of globally important biodiversity in the Colombian Andes (see Annex 2 for details).

a. A more representative Andean protected area system was supported - as a result of the project ecosystem representation has increased in the 7 WWF/World Bank ecoregions targeted for intervention. 96.4% of remaining ecosystem types in these ecoregions is now represented in protected areas and only the semiarid open and low bush forest in the *Valle del Cauca* Dry Forest ecoregion is not. This was possible through the establishment of different categories of protected areas supported by project (see Annex 2, Table 1) totaling 85 new protected areas declared. Enhanced conservation has resulted from the expansion of the National Protected Areas System enabled by the project as follows: i) the creation of one new national park: *Selva de Florencia*, ii) the declaration of 3 regional PA: *Barbas-Bremen* and the *Distritos de Manejo Integrado Berlin* and *Alicante*, and iii) the establishment of 81 private reserves. One national park (Orito–*Ingi Ande*) was proposed but approved by GoC after project closing in June 2008, totaling 88,134 additional protected area hectares. In the framework of UAESPNN's policy for Social Participation in Conservation, a methodology to design protected area management plans was validated by the project in 6 selected National Protected Areas²¹ and later applied by the UAESPNN to the remaining national protected areas under its jurisdiction.

²⁰ The project directly contributed to Biodiversity Long-term Objectives 1 (to catalyze sustainability of protected area systems) and 2 (to mainstream biodiversity in production landscapes and sectors) by strengthening terrestrial PA networks (Strategic Program 3), strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity (SP 4), and fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services (SP 5).

²¹ The National Natural Parks *Pisba, Iguaque, Cocuy, Tama, Nevados* and *Otun-Quimbaya* applied the following three-step planning route: 1) Description – diagnose the PA (characterize existing productive systems, actors and socioeconomic factors in buffer zones and identify biodiversity threats), identify conservation objects and objectives for action, and measure management effectiveness for each area through WB/WWF adapted tracking tool; 2) Prospective territorial planning – zone the PA, regulate land uses and activities, and adjust PA limits, and 3) Strategic action – determine strategic lines for the implementation of PA management plans (knowledge generation, use agreements, institutional strengthening, strategic alliances for territorial planning, among others to reduce ecosystem degradation).

The project supported efforts to consolidate 6 regional networks of protected areas²² through: i) biological diagnoses for the selection of priority conservation objects and areas; ii) dissemination of tools and assessments developed under different project components; and iii) active participation by project experts in the workshops and technical discussions held in the framework of these networks. With project assistance, private reserves also developed and applied management plans and joined the Civil Society Reserves Network (RRSC) through 5 Andean nodes strengthened by the project to interact with regional protected area networks. Moreover, private conservation efforts were enhanced with project support for community-based initiatives to declare Areas of Importance for Bird Conservation (AICA)²³. 40 AICA were declared during project execution for the Andean region. For details on relevant outputs, see Annex 2, Table 1.

b. Conservation opportunities in rural landscapes were identified and management tools for biodiversity conservation were piloted – as a result of the project, the conservation opportunities identified in rural landscapes through biodiversity and socioeconomic assessments were translated into management tools and incentives applied in pilot sites, including a national biotrade program. Their widespread promotion and sectoral adoption, including by environmental authorities, is still pending.

Management tools designed and applied²⁴ in 10 pilot sites resulted in 332 ha. and 239.6 km of improvements in 274 farms. Complementary strategies to reinforce management tool implementation included a participatory communication and capacity-building strategy with beneficiaries, as well as nurseries specializing in native species²⁵ and agreements with communities for sustainable resource use and management based on characterizations of local practices. These management tools enhanced the ecological connectivity of over 4,000 ha. of remnant forest patches in intervened watersheds and farms. As for incentives to promote private conservation efforts, 3 were successfully piloted, including a national scale program supporting biotrade. Property tax exemptions and water payments to farmers implementing conservation activities were tested by the project. Despite their limited coverage (101 farms in one municipality benefiting from tax exemptions and 8 farms in 1 watershed receiving periodic payments from 4,500 downstream users), their operation has continued after project completion due to beneficiary commitment. Moreover, the Payment for Environmental Services pilot was recognized by the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) as an important example of applied local economic incentives. The biotrade program supported 90 companies in the 5 priority value-chains identified. A web-based observatory, OBIO, was set up to provide practical company, market and technology information related to biotrade http://www.humboldt.org.co/obio. The program's funding mechanism, the Biotrade Fund, was successfully designed and implemented, having supported 23 biotrade initiatives by December 2007 with US\$654,027 and leveraged additional resources to continue operating independently from project. Finally, 10 offices in CARs were supported to promote local green market initiatives.

The project successfully proved the economic, environmental and social feasibility of management tools and conservation incentives. However, the pilot nature of their implementation did not enable their regional and national dissemination and adoption. The consolidation of regional systems of incentives by CARs and other competent authorities was not achieved as designed in PAD, in partly due to concentration of activities in IAvH.

c. Biodiversity knowledge base was expanded, organized and disseminated to stakeholders – enhanced biodiversity knowledge and monitoring has been achieved through: i) an Andean biodiversity baseline completed with data from 9 biodiversity assessments and 2 land cover map updates; ii) fieldwork training in

²² Northeastern paramos, Alto Putumayo, Valle del Cauca, Altiplano Cundiboyacense, Eje Cafetero and Huila networks.

²³ Although not considered an official protected area category, the declaration of an AICA, normally a local initiative, can contribute to the subsequent declaration of a local or regional PA, as was the case for DMI Alicante in Antioquia and the National Park *Selva de Florencia* in Caldas. In support of these areas, the project developed population studies, inventories, and conservation and restoration strategies in 15 AICA in 9 regions. Technical appraisals complemented local initiatives for declaration as well as 2 courses on bird recording and identification, for inventory and monitoring purposes.

²⁴ Biological corridors, live and mixed hedgerows, agroforestry systems, multipurpose forests, enclosed and enriched forest remnants, plus management plans for threatened species.

²⁵ The project developed an innovative methodology to accelerate natural forest succession. A large number of diverse native species in different succession stages and varied growth patterns were planted in nurseries. When transferred to farms, they enabled growing woodlands with the structure and species composition of old forests in short timeframes. This methodology will be adopted in two climate change projects by CORNARE and IDEAM.

collection management and data processing to 89 partners institutions; iii) a biodiversity state-pressure-response indicator system piloted to prioritize conservation areas in 3 project zones; and iv) a decentralized Biodiversity Information System (BIS) bringing together 16 information networks, 50 specialized databases and 171 organizations contributing data for the Andean region at http://www.siac.net.co/Home.php, based on similar international initiatives adjusted for national operation. The system's decentralized features allow for independent data management by partner institutions, helping to increase their confidence in the system and enabling more databases to be linked.

The following examples illustrate key contributions to increasing biodiversity knowledge: the 2000 and 2005 Andean ecosystem maps²⁶ were used as input for the Colombian Ecosystem Map published in 2007; the collection of 13 Red Books on threatened species published as a collective effort between project partners, served to issue two decrees officially declaring over 390 of them threatened, with defined use prohibitions; and as for the information system, an innovative database on traditional biodiversity uses and knowledges '*Yoscua*' was established and linked to the BIS, expanding on related research carried out by the project.

These efforts towards systematic data gathering and monitoring were complemented by an environmental education/communication strategy in formal and non-formal settings that disseminated biodiversity information to the general public, children and specialized audiences through 12 communication products and strategies (see Annex 2, Table 3 for details). However, the lack of a marketing strategy for project results has weakened the widespread adoption of quality knowledge-based products by decision-makers, and more needs to be done with a view to compile a portfolio that can easily 'be sold' to different potential users. Access restrictions to certain products, like the biodiversity indicator system, still persist.

As for institutional strengthening, the project's external evaluation by Uribe (2007) concludes that IAvH increased its capacity and leadership as a main source and manager of biodiversity information in Colombia, internationally consolidating it as a reference for global biodiversity information systems.

d. A systematic approach to inter-sectoral coordination was adopted - as recognized by the project's external evaluation, "the Andes project is the first systematic and sustained effort of the SINA seeking to intervene and influence the design of policies, regulations, programs, etc., of different economic sectors". Technical input to enhance inter-sectoral coordination on a sound scientific basis include: i) a methodology for the inclusion of biodiversity considerations into Impact Evaluations for environmental licensing and Strategic Environmental Assessments, the latter applied by the MMA in its assessment of liquid fuels, ii) 43 biodiversity-oriented policy adjustments for agriculture, mining, energy and transport; iii) input for 8 national regulations, including 6 bills passed to Congress; iv) the design of an Early Warning System for biodiversity impacts from large-scale development projects, and v) training on proposed adjustments offered to Ministry representatives and productive associations. Key decision-makers, however, were not engaged in these efforts and inter-sectoral coordination culture in Colombia's public sector in general. The effective implementation of project proposals and the degree to which they helped increase sector awareness on biodiversity importance was not monitored by the project.

3.3 Efficiency

The scope of this analysis is constrained for several reasons: i) incremental costs were used instead of traditional measures of efficiency such as NVP or ERR at appraisal; ii) multiple products of varied nature obtained under project components and subcomponents make it difficult to define units of inputs or outputs for cost comparison; and iii) no adequate economic data was collectable for Components 1, 3 and 4, while biodiversity-friendly production activities under Component 2 were not accompanied by farm productivity nor cost-benefit data collection, except for the Biotrade Fund which analyzed ROE (Return on equity), ROA (Return on Assets) and profit margin of potential client companies and their business plans.

²⁶ These maps received an honorable mention under the research category awarded by the *Fundación Alejandro Angel Escobar*, a Colombian NGO supporting scientific progress in benefit of local communities since 1955.

Based on the incremental cost analysis undertaken for project preparation (see Annex 3 for details), the incremental global benefits estimated at appraisal were achieved through the GEF Alternative, with less resources invested by the project to enhance sustainable conservation of remaining natural habitats in the Andes (US\$3.15 million less were spent under component 1), given an important modification in baseline scenario estimates regarding UAESPNN investments in the National Protected Area System (between 2006 and 2007, the Unit was allocated 21.8% more resources to invest in the National Protected Areas System²⁷). Moreover, less GEF resources in the amount of US\$0.24 million were spent under components 2 and 3, mainly due to a substantial increase in counterpart financing for activities under both, contributing to achieve and even surpass targets set out under the project's logical framework leading to enhanced capacity-building and expanded knowledge base (see Annexes 2 and 3 for details). As for intersectoral coordination, although GEF resources were slightly increased to finance this component (from an estimated US\$0.50 to an actual US\$0.51 million), total spending was actually reduced by an approximate 13% (from an estimated US\$0.86 to an actual US\$0.75 million). Costs for project management increased by 50%, with US\$ 0.19 million additional GEF resources employed to finance staff, office costs and other administrative costs.

As for the project disbursement performance, an indication of reduced efficiency was the continuous lag between expected and actual disbursements throughout its implementation mainly due to administrative inefficiencies described in Section 2.2b for Component 1 execution. Mitigation measures to streamline administrative procedures enabled full grant disbursement, but several planned activities in National Natural Parks for 2007 were cut back (namely, activities included in Park management plans regarding visitor carrying capacity studies and septic pit and power plant installations that did not compromise project goals). The graph in section I above illustrates this lag.

3.4 Justification of Overall Outcome Rating

Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The project was and remains relevant to biodiversity conservation efforts in Colombia. It applied enhanced management tools for the National Protected Areas System, supporting its consolidation with key technical input. It piloted innovative approaches to reinforce public and private conservation efforts in protected areas and transformed landscapes, as well as improved the knowledge-base and its availability for public consultation. It did not achieve the promotion of inter-sectoral coordination that would address root causes of biodiversity loss, mainly due to design shortcomings described in section 2.

However, the project failed to engage key decision makers at the local, regional and national levels, including the MMA, to ensure adoption of its outputs, placing increased biodiversity conservation and sustainable use at significant risk (see section 4). Moreover, an important missed opportunity was ensuring IAvH's long term viability, as for the six years the project lasted a large part of its budget depended on GEF resources, causing important staff cut-backs upon project completion.

Therefore, the ICR team rates overall outcome as moderately satisfactory.

3.5 Overarching Themes, Other Outcomes and Impacts

a. Poverty impacts, Gender Aspects, and Social development – most project activities in rural landscapes, including protected area buffer zones, involved middle to low income level beneficiaries, including a number of women and children who benefited from environmental education and training in management tool implementation. Although on a small-scale, social capital increased in rural areas intervened as a result of the project's participatory approach to on-the-ground conservation efforts. Examples include the organization of 4,500 downstream water users in the *Chaina* watershed to pay 7 families for their continued upstream conservation activities, the creation of NATIVA – a private association assembling biodiversity goods and

²⁷ Although not directly attributable to the project, the increase in resources allocated to the UAESPNN by the central government is due to its improved institutional and administrative capacities to execute resources and the Dutch negotiations with the MAVDT to strengthen the Unit's personnel and operational budget.

services producers seeking to promote biotrade, and locally-based initiatives to promote AICA declarations. Equally important, traditional biodiversity uses and knowledge was employed as a complementary management tool seeking to recognize historical and cultural elements in private conservation efforts. A network of researchers including indigenous peoples retrieved and documented traditional biodiversity uses and knowledges, helping to create the '*Yoscua*' database. It contains over 1,400 files on biodiversity uses by 90 Colombian ethnic groups and 346 information sources, including local testimonies, favoring the exchange of traditional knowledge through modern methods. In addition, *Cofan* indigenous peoples participated in the development of an inventory on traditionally-used flora and fauna, in the design of a management plan for the use of medicinal flora, and in the publication of an intercultural botanical survey. Finally 3 agrobiodiversity surveys completed in each Andean mountain range sought is valuation as a source of food security; 4 events mainly involving women were held to promote seed and recipe exchanges encouraging the use of native, locally cultivated plants, many of which endangered.

b. Institutional Change/Strengthening – enhanced institutional capacities were brought about in particular for the UAESPNN, which gained key administrative skills through the implementation of Bank fiduciary requirements. The Civil Society Reserves Network which brings together private reserves and their owners was strengthened through the consolidation of 5 of its nodes to enable interaction with regional protected area networks. As for SINA enhancement, despite administrative difficulties described in section 2, effective cooperation was eventually achieved between key actors such as IAvH and UAESPNN, and to a lesser extent, between IAvH and CARs through the provision of quality information for regional protected area networks led by the latter. The project's systematic approach to inter-sectoral coordination sets an example for the manner in which technical data can serve to inform sector policy design. Information exchange was also strengthened in the framework of Colombia's National GEF Committee, chaired by the MMA and attended by the GEF implementing agencies in the country and its political focal point at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This exchange enabled ongoing and future biodiversity-related initiatives to learn about tools and lessons under the High Andes operation, later to be adopted by projects to mainstream biodiversity in coffee and cattle ranching sectors, as well as by the National Protected Area Conservation Trust Fund. Moreover, aligned Bank and Dutch investments strengthened the application of Paris Agreements' in Colombia. However, project unintendedly caused IAvH budget reliance on project resources that forced staff cut-backs on project completion.

3.6 Summary of Findings of Beneficiary Survey and/or Stakeholder Workshops Results of key stakeholders interviews

As of July 2007, the IAvH carried out beneficiary surveys and stakeholder workshops. Participants in focal survey groups included local landowners and governmental staff in two of the main areas of action, a group of environmental authorities at the regional level, and the technical staff of the implementing institution. Key stakeholders interviewed were six National Parks Chiefs and a representative from the UAESPNN's regional management office, as well as local inhabitants, municipal authorities and staff, NGOs, private enterprises, local teachers and artisans.

- a) **Local stakeholders** were oriented more towards the landscape management tools strategy, with which they had been closely acquainted. Although technical terms were not necessarily incorporated in their daily life, there was a general concern about advances in characterizations and especially its significance in terms of biodiversity richness, for regional pride.
- b) **Municipal officials** in charge of environmental matters had been used to reforestation programs, where small trees were planted at low densities, implying high maintenance costs over three or more years. The new technique proposed, based on the recovery of bigger seedlings for planting at high densities, allowed rapid tree growth and thus instant credibility at every level.
- c) Implementation of biological corridors and other management tools was deemed successful by **donors**, **local population**, **local or regional environmental authorities**, academic institutions and others. Still, some weakness was perceived in the strengthening of local capacity, which would enable to continue this actions as the project is finished.
- d) **Staff implementing the project at IAvH** stressed the fact that technical basis for action is important, but local and regional participation can enhance results. When supporting regional processes, there was a

substantial effort to adapt to local or regional dynamics, but some obstacles were not surmounted, due to political stances affected by some of the project's targets. This situation implied searching for alternatives which not always complied with all technical definitions and restrictions, such as finding second choices for protected area declarations. Difficulties arose because in the project design the implementing agency was the sole responsible for completion of the project's objectives and targets, thus assigning a technical role to the coordinating office.

- e) **National Parks Authority** participants reviewed aspects of implementation, concluding the following main findings:
 - 1. The GIS tools applied during the project for map updating, along with the boundary stones built, were critical for parks delimitation, giving much needed consistence with zoning proposals made by the regional autonomous corporations and municipalities and allowing for conflict resolution with them and landowners.
 - 2. A positive strategy for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in or around the Park areas was to link activities such as ecological restoration, watershed management plans and sustainable practices in productive systems to communities inhabiting the area. Relations between civil society and institutions collaborating towards these goals will be beneficial for every agent implied.
 - 3. Well-known methodologies applied to planning and monitoring, allowed for a strengthening of technical capacity, reflected in the systematic structure of management plans and yearly operation plans.
 - 4. Participation by the Park's chiefs and staff in the management plan construction granted a finetuned diagnosis and the appropriation of actions proposed.
 - 5. Effective participation processes, including both planning agreements and the financial support needed for attaining proposed actions, are significant for success.
 - 6. The quality of information on biodiversity, as well as good cartography is the basis for the advancement of decision making regarding conservation areas.
 - 7. In regional processes, the exchange of information is crucial, and this was obtained with the establishment of a regional node of the Biodiversity Information System.
 - 8. There was a slow development of national guidelines on conservation categories, giving way to myriad denominations according to the local or regional authorities promoting their creation.
 - 9. Municipalities are open to conservation efforts, despite some technical deficiency.
- f) Municipality of Filandia participants stressed that biodiversity characterization permitted identification of negative effects caused by forest fragmentation, and later in, showed the way for outlining biological corridors and other management tools adapted to the cattle ranching productive system common in this area. The native tree nursery, especially created for the purpose of obtaining good quality and a wide variety of native tree species (498), was the core of the management tools. Support from the municipality to this endeavor also allowed regional recognition for environmental protection, attracting ecotourism and developing local guide capacity.
- g) **Chambery watershed area participants** pointed that landowners learned to read the landscape configuration including and beyond their property. After the project, people talked easily about connections in the landscape, hedgerows establishing bridges for the protection of native animals. Exchange tours between the implementation areas were instrumental for comprehension of this initiative.

Stakeholder's workshops

A total of five workshops were carried out in the project zones, with 113 participants from different institutions. The participants agreed on:

- a) A high completion of the project's objectives, obtained with institutional and community participation.
- b) A high number of participants (42%) perceived the project's contribution to the knowledge, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity as high, while a further 32% considered it was medium, whereas 19% and 2% considered it was low or very low (5% did not answer). They reported that knowledge on

biodiversity increased both for scientists and the general public, but assessed this endeavor as low because this inventory is far from being completed due to this country's high biodiversity.

c) Clear methodologies for **conservation** objectives in protected areas or rural landscapes, linked to a change in local attitudes, were deemed crucial for a high grading in the project's contribution; medium grades referred to the requirement of environmental education to consolidate conservation processes; a low assessment implied that further work is needed to create more effective incentives and new areas to be declared for conservation.

The project's contribution to **sustainable use** was highly recognized in relation to participative local processes in traditional knowledge of species and in the creation of value-chains for the commercial exploitation of biodiversity. As further time is needed to consolidate value-chain processes, this was considered a medium grade, whereas a low contribution was assigned to the development of guidelines for sustainable use and management.

4. Assessment of Risk to Development Outcome

Rating: Substantial

The project faces significant uncertainties for the sustainability of its outcomes and although arrangements are in place to guarantee the short to midterm operation of certain outputs (see Section 2.5) the following risks are foreseen, with insufficient mitigation measures in place to address them:

a. Government ownership and institutional commitment – the UAESPNN as head of the National Protected Area System has not only demonstrated its financial commitment to support project outputs (resources amounting to roughly US\$300,000 have been secured in 2008 to implement six strategic lines prioritized in the management plans of intervened National Natural Parks), but has also adopted the methodology for participatory management plan design and implementation, including economic instruments and production/market-oriented strategies in buffer zones for enhanced PA management. It is not likely for UAESPNN to change a successful methodology in constant evolution since 1999 and consequently not allocate resources to its implementation after 2008. This minimizes the risk that enhanced protected area management as supported by the project will not be furthered. The same is true for the biodiversity knowledge base expanded and organized under project, as it remains an objective aligned with the IAvH's mission and functions. The biodiversity monitoring system has been partially adopted by UAESPNN and several partners of the Biodiversity Information System have pledged their support to its continued operation through financial and inkind contributions. However, the remaining project outputs contributing to enhanced biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, namely under components 2 and 4, have not been endorsed by key decision-makers to allow for their far-reaching implementation. The project provided evidence of management tools' biological effectiveness and economic feasibility, but their scaling-up requires government ownership from national, regional and municipal authorities, some of which are simply unaware or insufficiently informed of their existence. As for sectoral policy-screening tools, valid representatives to enable high-level inter-sectoral dialogue such as MMA management were not sufficiently engaged in their development. Other technical and methodological advancements as summarized in previous sections, including communication products and environmental education strategies, are at risk of falling into disuse if their promotion is not sustained.

b. Financial viability – closely related to institutional ownership of project outputs contributing to increased biodiversity knowledge, conservation and sustainable use in the Andean region, is their financial viability. Additional resources, including sufficient human resources, are required to promote their active use and the only secured source of public funding depends on UAESPNN's budget. Other government resources to consolidate decentralized protected area systems, conservation tools and incentives will depend on political commitments mainly by CARs with varying technical and financial resources to sustain and/or expand project's pilot efforts. This includes existing legal uncertainties for them to invest in private conservation incentives. Contributions from municipal and provincial authorities are feasible yet subject to active promotion of project's results, an activity which will largely depend on IAvH's shrinking budget.

Although incentives and management tools can continue to operate with support from landowners and surrounding communities, as demonstrated in the *Chaina* watershed, it involves costly technical assistance and initial set up (including dissemination efforts) as incurred in by other related GEF projects. The recently closed regional project, 'Integrated Silvopastoral Approaches for Ecosystem Management', demonstrated that considerable financial and technical support is needed for the establishment of silvopastoral systems and different biodiversity-friendly arrangements in cattle ranching farms. Solid contributions cannot be expected from NGOs working locally, whose own financial sustainability is not always assured. Therefore designed incentive measures and piloted management tools lack financial security for their application after project completion.

In turn, the Biodiversity Fund – which is financially viable – may encounter future difficulties in placing its resources given the fact that it only finances companies comparatively more developed and financially solvent. The more incipient initiatives need support from the biotrade program in order to develop business plans and strengthen entrepreneurial skills, yet the program is also depending on IAvH's much more limited resources to expand its services. In addition, due to political reasons outside project control, the Green Markets program in the MMA has closed down, weakening the biotrade program. The green market offices in CARs can offer support but their limited capacity and continuity may eventually be at risk, as was the case in the CRC, where the office was shut down by the new administration.

c. Stakeholder support – although as indicated in previous sections, stakeholder support in particular from rural communities was a key factor contributing to successful implementation, the pilot nature of on-the-ground interventions is insufficient in scale to promote national or even regional adoption beyond project completion. Resource use agreements, nurseries and other complementary management tools could also fall into disuse. On the contrary, private reserves are not likely to be sold and employed for other non-conservation purposes, as their existence is strongly supported by the RRSC and more recently by the National Network of Agritourism and Ecotourism Services, *Agroecotur*, to enhance their capacity for related services.

5. Assessment of Bank and Borrower Performance

5.1 Bank

(a) Bank Performance in Ensuring Quality at Entry

Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The Bank's performance during identification, preparation and appraisal of the project is considered moderately satisfactory. Project was highly relevant in light of existing country, CAS and GEF priorities and benefited from sound background analysis which provided a complete review of economic, financial, social and environmental issues in the Andean region, complemented by consultations with relevant stakeholders. However, shortcomings in its design referred to in Section 2, including a weak M&E system, underestimation of key risks and insufficient budget allocations to dissemination activities, contributed to place outcome sustainability at significant risk.

(b) Quality of Supervision

Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

Supervision was conducted by TTL and field team in the Colombia office and mainly biodiversity/natural resource specialists from the region joined its missions, carried out regularly twice a year with office sessions and field visits with PCU team, co-financers, partner institutions and on-the-field beneficiaries. Procurement and financial management issues were reviewed *ex ante* and *ex post* by Bank specialists, with action plans developed and tracked when adjustments were called for. A comprehensive midterm review took place in May 2005 with an external evaluation team and project partners, specifically promoting: i) the consolidation of interventions in First Phase conservation zones; ii) increased interaction between project components, including through an enhanced communication/education strategy to enable knowledge transfer; iii) M&E focus on outcome evaluation through no more than 8 formal indicators; and iv) a revision of the scope of certain activities as

described in Section 1.7. In addition, follow-up meetings held between missions as of 2006 closely monitored disbursement progress, particularly under component 1 given accumulated lags. Tripartite meetings with the Government of the Netherlands were conducted once a year or as needed and the Bank played an important role in facilitating agreements to help ensure Dutch contributions. Frequent training was held for PCU's procurement, legal and financial staff and no-objections were granted promptly. Sector manager calls for task team re-composition and timely back-to-office reports were attended with the inclusion of M&E and communications specialists and through on-time PSR/ISR submissions in keeping with standards. However, design shortcomings made it difficult to resolve threats to project sustainability and the team may have acted too slowly or ineffectively to formally adopt the necessary changes, most of which identified as early as 2005.

(c) Justification of Rating for Overall Bank Performance

Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

As stated, Bank performance was less than satisfactory in assuring quality at entry, although its specialized support and flexibility during implementation, providing assistance in technical and procedural matters as well as seeking to overcome obstacles, were important features of its performance during supervision. However, the team was unable to remedy design shortcomings that impeded a more thorough connection between project components and outcomes.

5.2 Borrower

(a) Government Performance

Rating: Satisfactory

Significant turnover in the Ministry of Environment, including its merger with the Ministry of Economic Development, negatively affected its involvement with the project, as fewer human resources were available to devote to active participation and feedback for project implementation. However, the UAESPNN as head of the National Protected Area System remained actively involved and committed throughout implementation to apply project methodologies and approaches, although not without hesitation regarding management of productive areas in National Park buffer zones. It overcame administrative inefficiencies and obstacles in its relation with IAvH that hindered project execution particularly under component 1, and thus contributed to enhance biodiversity conservation and sustainable use through improved PA management.

(b) Implementing Agency or Agencies Performance

Rating: Satisfactory

IAvH was able to carry out project until completion with committed and quality staff, despite changing national coordinator three times. As highlighted in Section 2, IAvH ensured high quality technical information to support the different project activities and undoubtedly contributed to enhance biodiversity knowledge and its availability, as a result of its research under the project and its organization in a decentralized information system. It complied with Bank procedures, maintained strong financial and procurement management, adopted suggestions for improvement and constantly supervised progress to guarantee output quality. Its failure to adequately involve key decision-makers to support project outcomes, including within the MMA, and to transfer outputs to the SINA for their broad adoption relates to its nature as a research institute and to project design shortcomings discussed in previous sections, for which the agency cannot be held accountable.

(c) Justification of Rating for Overall Borrower Performance

Rating: Satisfactory

Despite modest commitment to the project at the central level, mainly from the MMA due to wide ranging factors, a committed and quality-oriented implementing agency enabled completion of all project outputs and partial achievement of project objectives, responding with professionalism to a challenging project.

6. Lessons Learned

Several lessons have been learned from project design and implementation, particularly regarding factors discussed in section 2 related to the multiplicity and complexity of project objectives and components, as well as beneficiary and stakeholder involvement:

- **a.** Balancing participatory approaches and the need for focused objectives the open participatory approach adopted for project preparation ensured support for its subsequent execution but also pressed for ample objectives to encompass wide ranging interests. As seen earlier, focusing objectives is crucial to increase effectiveness and sustainability of project outcomes but implies ruling topics out. Balancing the two requires building stakeholder understanding of the issue, so as to adequately channel expectations into focused agreements. Seeking to adapt a national biodiversity policy framework to a six year project geographically too ambitious undermines achievement of outcomes.
- b. Trade-offs between administrative efficiency and institutional adoption of outcomes IAvH's designation by the MMA as implementing agency enhanced administrative efficiency given the Institute's legal status and its strong financial management skills. Where possible, these arrangements whereby resource execution is governed by private law but their use is decided upon with public authorities should be employed. However, in seeking efficiency, correspondence between project objectives and institutional functions should be ensured. IAvH's role within the SINA is to provide knowledge-based outputs to inform decision making, especially by the MMA as head of the SINA and responsible for defining the country's environmental policy. The research-oriented nature of the IAvH may have influenced a project design favoring outputs, segmenting implementation and overlooking political marketing of results to key institutional stakeholders to focus instead on comprehensive, quality assessments of study objects. However, Bank teams and project designs must ensure that policy makers are held accountable for interventions which seek to mainstream biodiversity considerations in productive landscapes and sectors. UAESPNN's adoption and regular use of methodologies developed under component 1, including its budget allocations to continue activities in the 6 National Natural Parks targeted by the project, illustrate how in spite of administrative inefficiencies and slow learning curves inherent to most public authorities, investing in their direct execution of project activities can result in long-term adoption of project outcomes.
- c. Results-framework and M&E schemes critically affect output-outcome and component linkages few and synthetic indicators focusing on how outputs lead up to desired outcomes help overcome segmented approaches to project implementation. As a first generation GEF project seeking to promote public and <u>private</u> conservation and sustainable use efforts in the Colombian Andes, including mainstreaming biodiversity considerations in sectoral practices and policies, the design of a useful M&E framework proved to be a challenge that was not surmounted.
- **d.** Donor coordination coordinated donor investments and actions, in particular under a programmatic approach, should be actively sought to help strengthen the impact of single interventions.
- e. Adequate risk assessment and sustainability mechanisms the risks identified during preparation should be closely screened and candidly evaluated, so as to ensure that project implementation focuses on developing adequate mitigation measures and sustainability mechanisms from the start, if deficient. This was the case for a fundraising unit in the PCU which was never developed and the self-financing mechanisms each component would attempt to put in place which were not monitored, among other risk mitigation and sustainability measures included in project design which proved insufficient. Midterm review provides an excellent opportunity to evaluate strengths and weaknesses of the project's sustainability strategy, which should include:
 - i. *Building community-based ownership* documenting processes throughout project implementation helps increase their continuity under changing institutional conditions, including staff turnover affecting partner support. However, gathered information must be disseminated in forms comprehensible to different audiences to build an understanding of the project's objectives and expected outcomes. Yet, since dissemination is not enough to warrant adoption and use, field training and visits to successful sites are key to ensure community-based ownership. This strategy proved successful in turning local actors into advocates of land management tools and conservation incentives, once their benefits were evident. Therefore, project design should allocate sufficient resources for this type of support-building strategies. It is in this manner that civil society can be empowered to press for the continuity of successful institutional actions.

- ii. *Developing institutional alliances and engagement* in addition to community-based ownership, institutional commitment to project objectives and results is critical for sustainability. Enough time should be invested in building alliances with management and technical staff in key partner institutions, through their active involvement in preparation **and** execution and the provision of sufficient training given slow learning curves. This is successfully illustrated by UAESPNN's incorporation of project results, compared to other authorities less involved in activity implementation and now less committed to their continuation.
- f. Linking biodiversity knowledge production with conservation and sustainable use practices requires a different phased approach a more effective phased approach to increase biodiversity knowledge, conservation and sustainable use implies separating stages and even operations for the implementation of activities aimed at each. In this manner, initial stages should focus on generating knowledge to design and pilot tools to enhance public and private conservation and sustainable use practices. Knowledge gained in such a first phase would provide solid M&E evidence for a second phase scaling-up. Implementing these activities in parallel, as was the case for the project under review, scatters efforts with little impact; opportunities for sustainability such as allowing more/separate time and resources for results marketing and adoption by key actors are missed.

7. Comments on Issues Raised by Borrower/Implementing Agencies/Partners

(a) Borrower/implementing agencies

The IAvH and the UAESPNN were invited to comment on the project's ICR and their views are included in Annex 7 and 8 respectively.

(b) Cofinanciers

The Embassy of the Government of Netherlands has provided its general impression on project outcomes, included in their entirety in Annex 8.

(c) Other partners and stakeholders

None

Annex 1. Project Costs and Financing

(a) Project Cost by Component (in USD Million equivalent)

Components	Appraisal Estimate	Actual/Latest Estimate (USD	Percentage of
^	(USD millions)	millions)	Appraisal
PROJECT CONSERVATION AREAS AND PROTECTED AREAS	5.56	5.60	100.7%
ANDEAN REGION USE OF BIODIVERSITY IN RURAL LANDSCAPES	4.30	4.17	97.0%
KNOWLEDGE BASE FOR DECISION MAKIN, MONITORING AND EVALUATION	3.10	2.99	96.5%
INTERSECTORAL COORDINATION	0.50	0.51	102.0%
PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND PROJECT MONITORING	1.54	1.73	112.3%
Total Baseline Cost			
Physical Contingencies	0.00		
Price Contingencies	0.00		
Total Project Costs			
Project Preparation Facility (PPF)	0.00		
Front-end fee IBRD	0.00		
Total Financing Required			

(b) Financing

Source of Funds	Type of Cofinancing	Appraisal Estimate (USD millions)	Actual/Latest Estimate (USD millions)	Percentage of Appraisal
Borrower		0.00	0.00	0.00
Global Environment Facility (GEF)		15.00	15.01	100.1%
NETHERLANDS, Govt. of THE (Except for MOFA/Min of Dev. Coop)		4.00	6.78	169.5%
CARs		8.00	12.27	153.4%
Other donors (includes UAESPNN)		2.00	2.14	107.0%
Other local (includes IAvH)		1.00	1.48	148.0%

Annex 2. Outputs by Component

Component 1: Project Conservation Zones and Protected Areas

This component addressed the need to develop an integrated National Protected Areas System (NPAS) with a variety of protection categories at regional and local levels, and tested key elements of this government strategy in targeted protected areas. It financed technical studies presented by the IAvH as input to strengthen the legal framework for the National Protected Areas System , contributed to the participatory design and implementation of management plans for 6 selected National Natural Parks and enabled active participation by the IAvH in efforts to consolidate Regional Protected Areas Systems and declare new protected areas, including private reserves and community-based initiatives. Table 1 shows relevant outputs achieved compared to those committed in the original project design or as adjusted during its implementation (see Sections 1.3 and 2.3). Additional notes complement information provided in the table.

	Table 1. Outputs achieved for Component 1			
	Original Targets (or as adjusted by MTR)	Actual Target Achieved		
4 ²⁹	6 regional active networks of protected areas established in project conservation zones, with management plans, under implementation	6 regional active network of protected areas supported in project conservation zones ³⁰ , 3 of which with action plans under implementation		
5	Management plans for 6 selected National Protected Areas prepared and under implementation	Management Plans for 6 selected National Protected Areas prepared and under implementation (Natural Parks <i>Pisba, Iguaque,</i> <i>Cocuy, Otún-Quimbaya, Tamá & Nevados</i>)		
6	1 new National Protected Area established	1 new National PA established (Selva de Florencia) ³¹		
7	40 new private reserves consolidated	81 new private reserves consolidated ³²		
8	30 annual workshops held for dissemination and stakeholders involvement in the establishment of regional networks of protected areas	30 annual workshops held for dissemination and stakeholders involvement in the establishment of regional networks of protected areas		
9	16 workshops held for dissemination and stakeholders involvement in the design and implementation of the management plans of project protected areas	16 workshops held for dissemination and stakeholders involvement in the design and implementation of the management plans of project protected areas		
10	50% of remaining ecosystem types per ecoregion represented in protected areas ³³	96.4% of remaining ecosystem types in 7 ecoregions intervened are represented in protected areas		

²⁹ Indicators 1-3 in the project's logical framework (1. 100% of the ecosystem types represented in the Protected Areas System, 2. Increased conservation, knowledge and Andes representing the APAS, and 3. Adoption of biodiversity friendly guidelines) were set to measure achievement of GEO independently from components and were monitored in the Implementation Status Reports (see Section F, Indicator 1).

³⁰ The regional networks supported include:

 <u>Northeastern páramos</u>, First Phase Conservation Zone 1 – technical support was provided to formulate the 10 year Action Plan for the Regional Protected Area System promoted by the CARs and regional governments sharing jurisdiction over the area, including the completion of a baseline for existing biophysical information. The establishment of a biological corridor between the National Parks of Tamá, Cocuy and Pisba was supported under this component.

 <u>Alto Putumayo, First Phase Conservation Zone 2</u> – geographical, ecological and socioeconomic studies helping to identify conservation objects were financed, as well as legal support for the design of a regional network with new PAs including a National Park to be declared in 2008 (see footnote below). 26 indigenous territories in *Putumayo* were supported to title and expand their land in the *Ukumari Kankhe* and *Sibundoy* Valley.

 <u>Valle del Cauca network in First Phase Conservation Zone 3</u> – technical support was provided to consolidate the Regional Protected Area System promoted by the CAR holding jurisdiction over the area, and to formulate the *Department's* Biodiversity Action Plan together with regional universities, local NGOs, WWF and UAESPNN.

^{4. &}lt;u>Altiplano cundiboyacense, First Phase Conservation Zone 4</u> – CARs and other organizations working in the area were supported to develop biophysical and socioeconomic assessment tools to prioritize conservations areas, including actions in key wetlands. A strong institutional network was not consolidated as in other areas.

^{5. &}lt;u>Eje Cafetero network in First Phase Conservation Zone 5</u> – the establishment and advertisement of the Regional Protected Area System comprising the Nevados National Park was supported through focal species population studies to define conservation priorities for the declaration of new PA, biotic assessments in 3 natural parks (Campoalegre, Tatamá and Otún-Quimbaya), legal and technical assessment regarding the creation and categorization of new PA. IAvH also participated in the formulation of its action plan.

 <u>Huila network, partially covered by Second Phase Conservation Zone 5</u> – at the request of the corresponding CAR, this component supported the design of a Regional Protected Area System and undertook biophysical assessments to assist priority site selection.

³¹ The declaration of one National Natural Park, the Orito-*Ingi Ande* in *Alto Putumayo* supported by the project and its partners in the area (WWF and municipal and indigenous authorities) was approved by GoC in June 2008. In addition, 2 Regional protected areas were established in project zones (Regional Park Barbas-Bremen and the Berlin Integrated Management District, plus 1 regional PA declaration outside project zones (DMI Alicante) supported by the project for its declaration of an AICA. ³² Biological assessments and management plans were developed for private reserves with project support, including enhancing their capacities in ecotourism-related

 ³² Biological assessments and management plans were developed for private reserves with project support, including enhancing their capacities in ecotourism-related services.
 ³³ Original target included ecosystems in the 9 WWF/WB ecoregions identified as overlapping with the Andes as defined for this project. Actual target is calculated

³³ Original target included ecosystems in the 9 WWF/WB ecoregions identified as overlapping with the Andes as defined for this project. Actual target is calculated for the 7 ecoregions targeted for intervention after midterm review, coinciding with First Phase Conservation Zones.

Component 2: Andean region use of biodiversity in rural landscapes

This component promoted biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in rural landscapes in the Colombian Andes by identifying conservation opportunities in selected sites and piloting tools and incentives to encourage private involvement in their achievement. Assessments financed by this component on the state of biodiversity in rural settings allowed for the selection of intervention areas with high conservation values and socioeconomic feasibility. A set of management tools were tested and disseminated, and legal and technical options to trigger private conservation efforts studied – some effectively implemented including a biotrade program to market biodiversity goods and services and finance eligible initiatives. Table 2 shows relevant outputs achieved compared to those committed in the original project design or as adjusted during its implementation (see Sections 1.3 and 2.3).

Table 2. Outputs achieved for Component 2				
	Original Targets (or as adjusted by MTR)	Actual Targets Achieved		
11	4 biodiversity and socioeconomic surveys of different representative rural landscapes for the identification of conservation opportunities completed	4 surveys completed in 9 sites (1 in sub-Andean cattle ranching areas; 1 in high Andean cattle ranching areas; 1 in coffee growing areas; 1 in traditional productive systems in dry enclaves)		
12	2 management tools for biodiversity conservation in rural landscapes evaluated for biological effectiveness and economic viability (e.g. corridors)	2 management tools (biological corridors & live hedgerows) evaluated for biological effectiveness and economic viability in 10 sites		
13	5 pilot sites with selected management tools implemented and monitored	10 pilot sites with selected management tools ³⁵ implemented, 5 of which actively monitored		
14	2 management plans for 2 threatened species of global importance completed	2 management plans for 2 threatened species of global importance completed – the howling monkey (<i>Alouatta seniculus</i>) and <i>Cauca</i> guan (<i>Penelope perspicax</i>)		
15	2 main productive system types evaluated for the identification of practices to increase biodiversity conservation	2 main productive system types (cattle ranching and potato cropping) evaluated for the identification of practices to increase biodiversity conservation		
16	Replication strategy for larger application of guidelines drafted	Replication strategy for land management tool in the Central mountain range applied in the Eastern range and Valle del Cauca ³⁶		
17	Evaluation of property tax exemptions and identification of incentives to be tailored to biodiversity targets	Evaluation of property tax exemptions as an incentive for conservation and sustainable resource use and identification of incentives to be tailored to biodiversity targets ³⁷		
18	6 green market offices in six project areas supporting sustainable bio- commerce initiatives	$10~{\rm green}$ market offices supporting sustainable bio-commerce initiatives 38		
19	Small grant fund established to promote biodiversity-friendly activities	Small grant fund established to promote biodiversity-friendly activities, having supported 23 bio-commerce initiatives at project closing		
20	Evaluation of rural biodiversity use and local practices in six zones within the Andean region, with agreement signed with local communities regarding management and sustainable use	Evaluation of rural biodiversity use and local practices in six zones within the Andean region, with 11 agreements signed with local communities regarding management and sustainable use ³⁹		

³⁴ 4 Andean production systems were assessed in 9 rural landscapes; biodiversity use and management practices were characterized; threatened species were identified and listed in Red Books; traditional biodiversity uses were inventoried and systematically organized for dissemination; agricultural biodiversity opportunities were assessed in each Andean mountain range, among other assessments sponsored by this component.
³⁵ Management tools applied with regional and local partners included: biological corridors, live & mixed hedgerows, agroforestry systems, multipurpose forests,

³⁵ Management tools applied with regional and local partners included: biological corridors, live & mixed hedgerows, agroforestry systems, multipurpose forests, enclosed and enriched forest remnants, and management plans for threatened species. Complementary tools included: 7 nurseries specializing in native species, protein banks and local use agreements (see below). A participatory communications strategy facilitated negotiations with private landowners and resulted in agreements and contracts signed for tool implementation. The project's main nursery in Filandia fostered 2,100,000 plants pertaining to 101 botanical families, 236 genera and 498 species, 358 of which were trees and 147 endangered species.

³⁶ The strategy included: community training in the establishment of nurseries with high Andean species; workshops on environmental education; fieldtrips with communities and authorities to sites successfully applying tools; and valuation of cultural biodiversity uses and traditional knowledge to include species of interest to landowners and communities. Mainly the people of *Carmen de Carupa*, *Chíquiza*, *Filandia* and *Villa de Leyva* benefited from training and community newsletters. Learning materials and their protocols were prepared and applied, including a scale model for landscape and watershed interpretation in *Cane-Iguaque* and *Fúquene*.

³⁷ Incentives included: silvopastoral systems for cattle ranching and organic fertilizers for potato cropping conversion; property tax exemptions – applied as of 2005 in 101 farms in the municipality of *Filandia* implementing biodiversity-friendly management tools; payments for environmental services – in place in *Chaina* watershed (buffer zone of National Park *Iguaque*) where 4,500 downstream water users pay a regular fee through their monthly water bills to upstream landowners applying conservation tools. These incentives were presented to Andean CARs and the MAVDT.

³⁸ A biotrade program was set up with 3 lines: market research, business-oriented capacity-building and a web-based service platform. Under its research line, 23 products were assessed and 5 value-chains prioritized (natural ingredients for the pharmaceutical, cosmetics and food industries; tropical ornamental plants; native fruits; fibers and seeds for crafts; and ecotourism); 90 companies were supported in their business plan formulation; and 1,256 commercial partners have registered in the program's databases by December 2007. The biotrade observatory (OBIO) has nearly 8,500 visitors per month, 43% of which entrepreneurs, 36% researchers and 21% students.

³⁹ Agreements for sustainable resource use signed with local communities include: 1. Bejuco artisans in Quindío; 2. Cofan indigenous peoples in the *Ukumare-Kankhe resguardo* (medicinal and useful flora); 3. *Fúquene* fisherfolk and artisans (fish and wetland flora); 4. Communities in *Salento* (medicinal flora); 5. Indigenous artisans in Caldas (native seeds and fibers); 6. Afrocolombian communities in *Valle del Cauca* (useful flora and fauna, wild and cultivated); 7. Peasant communities in San Fernando, Pasto, Nariño (hedgerow flora); 8. Peasant communities and potters in *Villa de Leyva* and *Ráquira, Boyacá* (useful and hedgerow flora); 10. Peasant communities in *Nima, Valle del Cauca* (useful and hedgerow flora). 11. Peasant farmers in Garagoa, Boyacá (agrobiodiversity).

Component 3: Knowledge base for decision making, monitoring and evaluation

This component strengthened institutional abilities to collect, expand, organize and disseminate information on the Andean biodiversity through: i) biodiversity assessments and related training to research partners, ii) the organization of a Biodiversity Information System, and iii) a state-pressure-response indicator system. Efforts towards systematic data gathering and monitoring were complemented by a dissemination and public awareness campaign to different audiences. Table 3 shows relevant outputs achieved compared to those committed in the original project design or as adjusted during its implementation (see Sections 1.3 and 2.3). Additional notes complement information provided in the table.

	Table 3. Outputs achieved for Component 3				
	Original Targets (or as adjusted by MTR)	Actual Targets Achieved			
21	Biodiversity baseline for the Andes region built based on available information	Biodiversity baseline for the Andes region built based on available information			
22	Replicable methodological scheme for biodiversity assessment and monitoring designed	Replicable methodological scheme for biodiversity assessment designed and applied by 10 partner institutions ⁴⁰			
23	8 comprehensive biodiversity assessments completed, filling major knowledge gaps in the Andes	9 comprehensive biodiversity assessments completed, filling major knowledge gaps in the Andes ⁴¹			
24	10 institutions and 80 people trained in taxonomy and collection management	89 institutions and 189 people trained in taxonomy and collection management			
25	10 institutions collaborating with the project biodiversity monitoring and assessments	10 institutions collaborating with the project biodiversity monitoring and assessments			
26	2 land cover map updates of the Andes region, 4 years apart, based on satellite imagery completed	2 land cover map updates of the Andes region, 4 years apart (2000 & 2005), based on satellite imagery completed 42			
27	Biodiversity state-pressure-response indicators system implemented, updated, and in use	Biodiversity state-pressure-response indicator system implemented, updated and consulted ⁴³			
28	Network of Andean biodiversity databases established	Biodiversity Information System established as a network of Andean biodiversity databases			
29	15 institutional biodiversity systematized and linked to the network	7 institutional databases, 9 institutional metadata nodes, 4 subregional and 3 thematic networks linked to the network 44			
30	15 institutions and 100 people trained in biodiversity information management	55 institutions and 153 people trained in biodiversity information management			
31	Communications strategies and exhibits ⁴⁵	Communications strategy on biodiversity implemented, with a specific participatory component for rural landscapes applying management tools ⁴⁶			
32	Publish the incorporation of biodiversity into school curricula in written and electronic media ⁴⁷	Biodiversity considerations in school curricula discussed with inter-institutional committees for environmental education, namely the Bogotá chapter; environmental education strategy published on CD and website ⁴⁸			

Component 4: Intersectoral coordination to address root causes of biodiversity loss

⁴⁰ Guidelines produced to facilitate methodology transfer include: a manual on inventory methods; audio guides for the identification of birds; field guides on flora and fauna groups; a monitoring protocol for ecosystem types in the National Natural Parks System.
⁴¹ Biological data from 9 sites was gathered to fill gaps in the Andean biodiversity baseline built with available information: *Sisavita-Santurbán, Iguaque* National

⁴¹ Biological data from 9 sites was gathered to fill gaps in the Andean biodiversity baseline built with available information: *Sisavita-Santurbán, Iguaque* National Park, *Tapias-Tareas, Tatamá* National Park, *Campoalegre* Municipal Park; *Chingaza* National Park, *Cueva Guácharos-Puracé* corridor, and *Alto Bitaco*.

⁴² Previous land cover map of the Andean region (Etter 1998) used a 1:1,500,000 scale that resulted in less ecosystems identified for country and the Andes. 2000 and 2005 updates identified 141 additional ecosystems using a 1:250,000 scale.

⁴³ Data collected and linked to municipal data and maps was initially published as a book, *INFORMAR Andes*, and sent to 14 CARs; the application is now available online for authorized researchers. Using the indicator system, priority conservation areas were identified for the area under *Cundinamarca*'s CAR jurisdiction, the *Corredor de Robles* (Eastern Andean chain) and the coffee-growing areas. Synthetic indicators were produced for the Andean region with the National Program for Human Development and a multitemporal analysis (1985-2005) was carried out to analyze changes in sub-Andean forest fragments and their relation with human activity.
⁴⁴ In total, 50 biodiversity databases were linked to the System and 171 organizations contributed information by December 2007. 7 information products are

⁴⁴ In total, 50 biodiversity databases were linked to the System and 171 organizations contributed information by December 2007. 7 information products are available: 1) Colombian Species catalogue, 2) Electronic biota, 3) Biodiversity in numbers; 4) Biodiversity knowledge indicators, 5) Simple information resource search tool, 6) Information service for species with commercial potential, and 7) *Yoscua* local biodiversity uses and knowledge.

⁴⁵ As described in Section 1.3, **four original indicators** (Promotional material for practices and management tools for biodiversity conservation in rural landscapes produced; Active internet WebPages, electronic publication and newsletters addressed to decision-makers, scientists and general public; 30 articles published in national news media; and 4 Andean biodiversity field guides published) were aggregated into this single formulation.

⁴⁶ Following midterm review recommendations, Second Phase communications strategy concentrated on disseminating project results to different audiences and implementing a specific communication-education campaign with rural participants to increase management tool appropriation (see Table 2 above). The mass communications campaign included 12 products/tools: biological group exhibits (1 on toucans; 1 on birds of prey; 1 on birds in Oxford, 1 itinerary biodiversity trailer exhibited in botanical gardens, zoos, parks and other public spaces); IAvH showings; an eco-store with promotional material operating; and 9 published communication products from the different project components, aimed at the general public, children or specialized audiences – 88 books, 5 bird song guides, 66 brochures, 10 banners, 7 posters, 2 ecotourism maps, 37 webpages & electronic newsletters, 23 thematic videos and 45 videoclips, 15 of which regularly broadcasted on national TV.

⁴⁷ **Two original indicators** (Biodiversity information kits distributed amongst 1,000 schools in project zones & 100 schools trained for the design and implementation of schoolyard ecology projects) **were aggregated** and replaced following midterm review recommendations to shift focus from school ecology to formal and non-formal environmental education in support of other components, in particular to reinforce the implementation of land management tools in rural landscapes.

⁴⁸ First phase outputs included 50 environmental school projects in Antioquia and Quindío applying biodiversity-related considerations. It involved working with existing inter-institutional committees for environmental education, namely the Bogota chapter, to promote biodiversity-oriented curricula and training teachers. 303 school and college teachers participated in 6 workshops and field visits. The environmental education strategy was published on CD and website http://andes.humboldt.org.co/mostrarpagina.php?codpage=13. The non-formal education strategy provided training and learning material to participating rural communities (see Table 2 above) and distributed promotional material to national and regional libraries, as well as 3,000 schools in the Andean region.

This component financed consultation activities with different private and public sector actors, as well as policy-screening to mitigate sector impacts on biodiversity. Table 4 shows relevant outputs achieved compared to those committed in the original project design or as adjusted during its implementation (see Sections 1.3 and 1.3). Additional notes complement information provided in the table.

	Table 4. Outputs achieved for Component 4				
	Original Targets (or as adjusted by MTR)	Actual Targets Achieved			
33	Inclusion of biodiversity considerations in the environmental licensing TORs and on the environmental guidelines of infrastructure, mining, energy and agricultural projects	Biodiversity considerations included in guidelines for environmental licensing by MMA and methodologies designed to include biodiversity criteria in the environmental guidelines of 19 agricultural and 1 infrastructural subsectors and in Territorial zoning plans ⁴⁹			
34	7 biodiversity workshops on sectoral biodiversity impacts for ministries and sector associations held	50 workshops on sectoral biodiversity impacts with ministries and sector associations $held^{50}$			
3551	Early Warning system on biodiversity impacts of large-scale development projects designed and promoted	Early Warning system on biodiversity impacts of large-scale development projects designed and promoted with Ministries of Environment, Agriculture, Transport and Mining and Energy ⁵²			

⁴⁹ 43 policy adjustments proposed for the mining & energy (8), transport (3) and agricultural (24) sectors, 20 of which were adopted mainly for agriculture; 8 proposals had a general, non-sectoral application. Policy instruments for which technical input was provided included: the 2002-2006 and 2006-2010 National Development Plans, the policy-guiding document "Colombia Visión 2019" and 6 bills passed to Congress (on páramos, forests, water resources, fuel alcohol, the Rural Development Statute, among others). A national agrobiodiversity program was designed; guidelines for the inclusion of biodiversity in municipal territorial planning were published with the National Institute on Geography. ⁵⁰ Policy adjustments and early warning system were presented in sectoral committees (mining & energy, transport & infrastructure and agricultural committees), as

well as other project results were presented in technical meetings and studies groups in corresponding entities. ⁵¹ Original indicator No. 40 (after MTR adjustments No. 36) 'Effective operation of project office' is discussed in Annex 3.

 $^{5^{22}}$ Related outputs included: commercial policies in the agricultural sector reviewed *ex ante* for their impacts on biodiversity and methodology for the inclusion of biodiversity criteria in Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) designed and applied with the MMA in the liquid fuels SEA.

Annex 3. Economic and Financial Analysis

Based on the incremental cost analysis undertaken for project preparation, the following can be said about the global benefits achieved under the GEF Alternative, as indicated in the PAD, Annex 4:

Project Conservation Zones and Protected Areas

7 indicators included in the project's logical framework for component 1 aimed at promoting the consolidation of the Colombian National Protected Areas System have been met, as adjusted by MTR when project was downsized to consolidate activities in First Phase conservation zones and adjust to IAvH's nature. Moreover, the amount of private reserves consolidated by the project doubled what was estimated at appraisal for the GEF alternative and a higher ecosystem representation rate was achieved for the ecoregions finally intervened, enhancing the sustainable conservation of remaining natural habitats in the Andes, identified as one of the project's main global incremental benefits. This was done with less GEF resources than initially estimated (US\$ 12.53 million were calculated at appraisal for this component, while at closing, actual costs amounted to US\$9.38 million), mainly due to project downsize but also to the budget increase the UAESPNN was able to negotiate with the National Planning Department and the Ministries of Finance and Environment (between 2006 and 2007, the Unit was allocated 21.8% more resources to invest in the National Protected Areas System⁵³). In this regard, the project was more efficient than expected to obtain the incremental benefits anticipated.

Andean Region Use of Biodiversity in Rural Landscapes

The 10 indicators included in the project's logical framework (as adjusted by MTR) for Component 2 have been met. Conservation opportunities in transformed landscapes were assessed and management tools as well as institutional/economic incentives for biodiversity conservation in rural landscapes were piloted, using less GEF resources than estimated at appraisal. Actual costs financed by the GEF were US\$0.13 million less than initially calculated (from an estimate of US\$4.3 to US\$4.17 million), mainly due to a nearly 224% increase in counterpart financing under this component and project downsize. In addition, the small grant fund established to promote biodiversity-friendly activities leveraged US\$4.66 million from national and international sources for its sustainable financing after project completion.

Knowledge base for decision making, monitoring and evaluation

The 12 indicators included in the project's logical framework (as adjusted by MTR) for Component 3 have been met, with those regarding training and linked databases surpassed, contributing to achieve the anticipated incremental benefits regarding capacity-building and expanded scientific knowledge base. The Biodiversity Information System registered 6,600 monthly visits by December 2007, and the state-pressure-response indicator system received 3.655 visits between March 2007 and January 2008, enhancing information dissemination and accessibility. These results were also possible with US\$0.11 million less GEF resources and a 22.8% increase in counterpart funding.

Intersectoral coordination

The 3 indicators included in the project's logical framework (as adjusted by MTR) for Component 4 have been met, although as discussed in section 3, intersectoral coordination to address the root causes of biodiversity loss was not adopted as a regular practice, and the incremental benefits assessed at appraisal regarding the replication of experience gained throughout the Andes region and increased awareness of environmental issues, were not achieved. Although GEF resources were slightly increased to finance this component (from an estimated US\$0.50 to an actual US\$0.51 million), total spending was actually reduced by an approximate 13% (from an estimated US\$0.86 to an actual US\$0.75 million).

Project management

⁵³ Although not attributable to the project, worth noting is the increase in resources allocated to the UAESPNN by the central government, due to its improved institutional and administrative capacities to execute resources and the Dutch negotiations with the MAVDT to strengthen the Unit's personnel and operational budget. In addition, worth noting is the reduction in deforestation rates in Colombia as registered in the World Development indicators 2007, which went down from 150,000-250,000 hectares per year as estimated at appraisal, to less than 101,000 hectares per year.

The indicator set out to measure progress under Component 5 (Effective operation of project office) was achieved, insofar as it enabled a satisfactory implementing agency performance, as assessed in section 5. However, actual costs for project management increased by 50%, with US\$ 0.19 million additional GEF resources employed to finance staff, office costs and other administrative costs, including annual audits. As for the project disbursement performance, an indication of reduced efficiency was the continuous lag between expected and actual disbursements throughout its implementation mainly due to administrative inefficiencies described in Section 2 for Component 1 execution. Mitigation measures to streamline administrative procedures enabled full grant disbursement, but several planned activities in National Natural Parks for 2007 were cut back (namely, activities included in Park management plans regarding visitor carrying capacity studies and septic pit and power plant installations that did not compromise project goals).

Annex 4. Bank Lending and Implementation Support/Supervision Processes

(u) Lusis Louin	memberb		
Names	Title	Unit	Responsibility/ Specialty
Lending			
Walter Vergara	Lead Chemical Engineer	LCSEN	Initial TTL
Claudia Sobrevila	Sr. Biodiversity Spec.	ENV	Co-TTL
Juan Pablo Ruiz	Sr. Natural Resources Mgmt Spec.	LCSEN	Co-TTL
Douglas J. Graham	Sr. Environmental Spec.	EASVS	Biodiversity info. systems
Philip Hazelton	Consultant	LCSRF	Protected Areas
Rafael Gomez R	Consultant	LCSES	Environmental TF expert
Carmen P. Nielsen	Procurement Analyst	LCSES	
Supervision/ICR	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Juan Pablo Ruiz	Sr. Natural Resources Mgmt Spec.	LCSEN	Task manager
Beatriz Elena Franco	Program Assistant	LCSAR	
John V. Kellenberg	Sector Manager ENV	ECSSD	
Douglas J. Graham	Sr Environmental Spec.	EASVS	Biodiversity info. systems
Ricardo Hernandez M.	Sr Environmental Spec.	LCSEN	Intersectoral coordination
Natalia Gomez	Rural development Spec.	LCSAR	Acting TTL
Philip Hazelton	Consultant	LCSEN	Protected Areas
Robert Hofstede	Consultant		Páramos specialist
Paola Agostini	Sr. Economist	AFTEN	Land management tools
Stefano P. Pagiola	Sr Environmental Economist	ENV	Biotrade economic aspects
Alejandra Torres	Consultant	LCSEN	M & E specialist
Monica Rodriguez	Consultant	LCSEN	M&E and ICR
Marco Ehrlich	Consultant		Institutional specialist
Carlos Hernando Tapia	Consultant	LCSEN	Communications strategy
Rafael Gomez R.	Consultant	LCSES	Environmental TF expert
Miguel Perez B	Lump Sum Consultant		Agrobiodiversity
Emmanuel N. Njomo	Sr. Financial Management Specialist	LCSFM	
Jeannette Estupinan	Financial Management Specialist	LCSFM	
Mylenna Cardenas	ET Consultant	LCSFM	Financial management
Otto A. Bolaños	Financial Expert Consultant	LOCA	
Luis Fernando Rios	Junior Professional Associate	LCSFM	Financial management
Jose M. Martinez	Sr Procurement Spec.	LCSPT	
Silvia Moran-Porche	Procurement Asst.	LCSPT	
Gabriel Penaloza	Procurement Analyst	LCSPT	
Mercedes Souza	Consultant	LCSPS	Procurement
Carmen Palacio N	Procurement Analyst	LCSES	
Julio Cordoba	Consultant	LCSEN	Initial ICR preparation

(a) Task Team members

(b) Staff Time and Cost

	Staff Time and Cost (Bank Budget Only)				
Stage of Project Cycle	No. of staff weeks	USD Thousands (including travel and consultant costs)			
Lending					
FY99		58.46			
FY00	2	114.91			
FY01	1	84.01			
FY02		4.44			
FY03		0.00			
FY04		0.00			
FY05		0.00			
FY06		0.00			
FY07		0.00			
FY08		0.00			
Total:	3	261.82			
Supervision/ICR					
FY99	0	0.00			
FY00	0	0.00			
FY01	0	0.00			
FY02	13.67	45.57			
FY03	11.64	45.64			
FY04	13.31	55.57			
FY05	14.53	63.07			
FY06	11.57	33.59			
FY07	9.52	31.12			
FY08	16.18	52.63			
Total:	90.42	327.19			

Annex 5. Beneficiary Survey Results

Key stakeholders and focal groups' interviews

Methodology

A qualitative and participative methodology was applied, in which an exploration of stakeholder's views about the project was made towards identifying the situation before and after the project, the lessons learned, as well as difficulties encountered and recommendations; and steps followed since its inception. Semi-structured interviews were made with key stakeholders and with focal groups. Based on these data, comparative analyses are carried on, trends are recognized and a synthesis is obtained. Participants in focal groups included local landowners and governmental staff in two of the main areas of action, a group of environmental authorities at the regional level, and the technical staff of the implementing institution. Key stakeholders interviewed were all six National Parks Chiefs and a representative from the regional management office; also, local inhabitants, municipal authorities and staff, NGOs, private enterprises, local teachers and artisans.

Stakeholders intervi	ewed	Participants
Key stakeholders		15
	Local landowners and inhabitants in Chambery watershed	7
Focal groups	CARs in the coffee growing region	5
	Local landowners and inhabitants in Filandia	4
	Staff implementing the project at Institute Humboldt	8
	Total	39

Results of key stakeholders interviews

National Parks Authority participants reviewed aspects of implementation, concluding the following:

In the institutional arrangement for the project's development, functions assigned in technical issues should have been the responsibility of the central parks authority since the inception of the project. Strengthening in administrative capacities both in each Park and in the central unit is crucial for the timely completion of paperwork so that field activities can be accomplished satisfactorily. The GIS tools applied during the project for map updating, along with the boundary stones built, were critical for parks delimitation, giving much needed consistence with zoning proposals made by the regional autonomous corporations and municipalities and allowing for conflict resolution with them and landowners. A positive strategy for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in or around the Park areas is to link activities such as ecological restoration, watershed management plans and sustainable practices in productive systems to communities inhabiting the area. Relations between civil society and institutions collaborating towards these goals will be beneficial for every agent implied. Well-known methodologies applied to planning and monitoring, allowed for a strengthening of technical capacity, reflected in the systematic structure of management plans and yearly operation plans. Participation by the Park's chiefs and staff in the management plan construction granted a fine-tuned diagnosis and the appropriation of actions proposed. After the mid-term review, procuring the effectiveness of conservation, actions were concentrated identifying four strategic lines of action: research and monitoring, restoration, GIS tools and watershed management plans.

In the participatory design of conservation areas, main issues were recognized:

Effective participation processes, including both planning agreements and the financial support needed for attaining proposed actions, are significant for success. The quality of information on biodiversity, as well as good cartography is the basis for the advancement of decision making regarding conservation areas. In regional processes, the exchange of information is crucial, and this was obtained with the establishment of a regional node of the Biodiversity Information System. There has been a slow development of national guidelines on conservation categories, giving way to myriad denominations according to the local or regional authorities promoting their creation. This situation is difficult for an organized management at the regional level, complicated by the fact that no cartography is available at this scale. In a regional coordination stance, scarce or uneven information and dynamics of conservation areas is the rule; this should not hinder conservation efforts but rather open participation to allow this development at their own pace. Municipalities are open to conservation efforts, despite some technical deficiency.

The relationship with the network of civil society protected areas was successful in attaining not only the project's targets but also additional accomplishments. Thus, 81 new reserves were created, and in this process, characterization advanced, management plans were made and began their implementation. Strengthening was also for decentralized management by

regional nodes and their participation in conservation areas design roundtables (SIRAP). Concerning landscape management tools, the network now applies concepts and practice to their own reserves; the network also helped with some technical exchange tours for landowners and institutions, designing educational materials for this purpose.

Conservation at the species level was especially encouraged by the management plans of endangered or flagship species, and by the red books collection, which assembled a substantial number of experts and academic institutions. These published materials were used by regional autonomous corporations and other authorities for controlling and promoting conservation of these endangered species.

Individual perspectives from several local stakeholders were oriented more towards the landscape management tools strategy, with which they had been closely acquainted. Although technical terms were not necessarily incorporated in their daily life, there was a general curiosity about advances in characterizations and especially its significance in terms of biodiversity richness, for regional pride. This was sometimes reflected in the local school teachers who changed their activities to include "biodiversity days" in which school children would plant trees in biological corridors, and to adopt these corridors in monthly walks with children. Municipal officials in charge of environmental matters had been used to reforestation programs, where small trees were planted at low densities, implying high maintenance costs over three or more years. The new technique proposed, based on the recovery of bigger seedlings for planting at high densities, allowed rapid tree growth and thus instant credibility at every level. Implementation of biological corridors and other management tools was deemed successful by donors, local population, local or regional environmental authorities, academic institutions and others. Still, some weakness was perceived in the strengthening of local capacity, which would enable to continue this actions as the project is finished.

Results of focal groups interviews

The municipality of Filandia, located in the central Andean chain, was important for conservation because two large forest areas with high biodiversity value were in this area. Biodiversity characterizations permitted identification of negative effects caused by forest fragmentation, and later in, showed the way for outlining biological corridors and other management tools adapted to the cattle ranching productive system common in this area. The native tree nursery, especially created for the purpose of obtaining good quality and a wide variety of native tree species (498), was the core of the management tools. Support from the municipality to this endeavor also allowed regional recognition for environmental protection, attracting ecotourism and developing local guide capacity.

Further north, the Chambery watershed area had a different landscape configuration, with smaller properties, high transformation and forest fragmentation. There, characterizations showed high biodiversity values in riverine forests, indicating the direction of management tools implementation by connecting small forest patches and riverine areas mainly with hedgerows, silvicultural and agroforestry arrangements, and forest enrichment. Landowners learned to read the landscape configuration including and beyond their property. Before, hedgerows were just property demarcations and forest patches were useless nuisance. After the project, people talked easily about connections in the landscape, hedgerows establishing bridges for the protection of native animals. The motto "making conservation productive" was thoroughly appropriated by local inhabitants owing to teamwork forged with the technical assistants. Exchange tours between the implementation areas were instrumental for comprehension of this initiative, removal of barriers and skeptical positions and their adoption by landowners as a useful tool. The communications strategy applied both at the beginning of the project and later on, for exchange tours and diffusion on a national scale had to adapt different tools for each scale, including written, graphic and audiovisual materials. Biodiversity values were made evident and sustainability assured.

Staff implementing the project at Instituto Humboldt stressed the fact that technical basis for action is important, but local and regional participation can enhance results. Some directors of regional institutions were supportive of the project's objectives, while others openly admitted not having any interest in them, weakening institutional relations regarding the appointed goals. When supporting regional processes, there was a substantial effort to adapt to local or regional dynamics, but some obstacles were not surmounted, due to political stances affected by some of the project's targets. This situation implied searching for alternatives which not always complied with all technical definitions and restrictions, such as finding second choices for protected area declarations. The National Parks Authority was in charge of implementing the management plans for the six andean parks, a target which met with substantial delays and hindrance. Difficulties arose because in the project design the implementing agency (Instituto Humboldt) was the sole responsible for completion of the project's objectives and targets, thus assigning a technical role to the coordinating office. To avoid further strain, during the second phase of the project this technical responsibility changed, giving way to a steering committee.

An ecosystem approach and adaptive management concepts should be more actively involved in project implementation. Also, some provision has to be made towards establishing a firm basis for sustainability of actions. A fundamental achievement of the project has been the methodological developments made in every component, such as in biodiversity inventories, where a manual was devised and an active capacity building program was applied while carrying out field characterizations. Standardized procedures are instrumental for diffusion of knowledge. Valuable information has been organized and disseminated by complementary actions: a decentralized information system devised for the free exchange of data on biodiversity and publishing available information on native species in the field guide collection. These goals were attained with the cooperation of academic institutions and other research groups, national and international.

Administrative rules deriving from the operation manual were applied, with some complications arising from the learning process necessary for compliance in the part of every person involved, both on the technical or administrative staff. Nevertheless, institutional strengthening was acquired and procedures are currently applied.

Annex 6. Stakeholder Workshop Report and Results

Methodology

The methodology for assessing stakeholder's perspectives about the project had a double approach, one on a regional basis, for those components directed towards the whole Andean region, and a complementary vision from local case studies, where components developed particular actions in the selected zones of the project. A participatory research strategy was applied, in which every type of stakeholder is included, without being exhaustive in terms of every possible person or institution that had an interaction with the project. This strategy involved: a) discussion and analysis of changes observed as a result of project implementation b) a complementary focus on the process necessary to achieve results, and c) lessons learned.

Pre-designed open format questions were applied for each participant in the workshops, to obtain the following information: a) general information about actions, dates, and participants b) results with a percentage of achievement, difficulties encountered and sustainability of actions c) three main lessons learned in each process d) suggestions for future projects based on the above e) stakeholder perception about the contribution of each action in three main lines: knowledge, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. A collective discussion and deliberation followed, in which conclusions were obtained.

			Methodology				
Approach Zone		Areas/Actions	Focal groups	Semi- structured interviews	Workshops		
		Barbas river watershed in Filandia, Quindío	1	4	3 workshops in		
Case Studies	Coffee growing	Risaralda	1		Caldas, Risaralda		
Case Studies	area	Chambery river watershed - Caldas	2	2	and Quindío		
		Environmental education - Quindío		3			
	Altiplano	Cane-Iguaque watershed	1	3	1		
	Cundiboyacense	Fúquene region	1	3			
	Alto Putumayo	Conservation and sustainable use	1	3			
	Valle del Cauca	Rural landscapes management tools		3	1		
Northeastern Paramos and moist forests		Participatory design of protected areas	1	3			
		Protected areas	1	3			
Components		Rural landscapes management tools	1	1			
Components	Project	Knowledge base	1	1			
	Components/ Sub-components	Intersectoral coordination	1	1			
		Biotrade		1			
		National Parks Management Plans	1	1			

Results

A total of five workshops were carried out in the project zones, with 113 participants from the following types and number of institutions:

Type of institution	Number of institutions
Environmental authorities (CAR)	4
National Parks Unit	3
Universities and research groups	5
Schools and technical education institutions	16
NGOs, networks and associations	11

Municipal authorities	3
Entrepreneurs	5

All participants agreed on a high completion of the project's objectives, obtained with institutional and community participation, which allows for a general sense of ownership of proposed goals and actions and thus, their sustainability. An explanation for actions qualified as having a medium to low completion dwells on the necessity of further time to consolidate certain processes, or on a slow diffusion of results to some groups of participants.

Workshop topics	Conclusions							
Difficulties	1. Comprehension of objectives and community participation in the first stages of the							
	project							
	2. Delays in field activities due to administrative procedures							
	3. Social and political unrest							
	4. Slow information processing resulting in delays in dissemination to stakeholders							
	5. Weak support from certain managers affecting local processes and possibly their continuation							
	6. Weather conditions constraining certain field actions							
	7. Environmental education strategy and other materials were received with considerable delay							
Lessons learned	1. Participatory processes involving both institutions and persons in a learning-by-doing and communications strategy with straightforward terms and actions resulted in high understanding and appropriation							
	2. Coordinated institutional alliances were successful because they were based on mutual respect, complementary actions and financial support, and mutual learning by technical exchange							
	3. Local stakeholders, such as landowners and students, discovered biodiversity in their richness, value and conservation possibilities							
	4. Project design should consider institutional competence to carry out project's objectives							
	5. To avoid double functions and staff, institutional strengthening can be obtained when the project's administrative, legal and financial responsibilities are in charge of the current institutional staff.							
	6. Rules and procedures established by the project were beneficial for institutional organization.							
	7. Technical advances obtained during project development were instrumental for accomplishments in the institutional mission.							
	8. Establishing alliances with local and regional partners (governmental and NGOs) is an effective strategy for success.							
	9. Social and cultural dimensions in dissemination, education and public conscience should be more relevant both for project design and during implementation							
Recommendations	1. Continue interdisciplinary actions carried out by different institutions							
	2. Consider longer periods for the monitoring and evaluation of actions in project design							
	3. Continue diffusion of results to a wider audience, implementing the communications							
	strategy							
	4. Maintain institutional relations while inviting other participants							

A high number of participants (42%) perceived the **project's contribution** to the knowledge, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity as high, while a further 32% considered it was medium, whereas 19% and 2% considered it was low or very low (5% did not answer). They reported that **knowledge** on biodiversity increased both for scientists and the general public, but assessed this endeavor as low because this inventory is far from being completed due to this country's high biodiversity. Clear methodologies for **conservation** objectives in protected areas or rural landscapes, linked to a change in local attitudes, were deemed crucial for a high grading in the project's contribution; medium grades referred to the requirement of environmental education to consolidate conservation processes; a low assessment implied that further work is needed to create more effective incentives and new areas to be declared for conservation. The project's contribution to **sustainable use** was highly recognized in relation to participative local processes in traditional knowledge of species and in the creation of value-chains for the commercial exploitation of biodiversity. As further time is needed to consolidate value-chain processes, this was considered a medium grade, whereas a low contribution was assigned to the development of guidelines for sustainable use and management.

Annex 7. Summary of Borrower's ICR and/or Comments on Draft ICR

The *Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt* was designated as executing agency for the Project "Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the Colombian Andes", being the institution assigned by the Ministry of the Environment for all matters related to biodiversity according to the Convention of Biological Diversity signed by Colombia.

The Ministry of the Environment appointed the Instituto Humboldt as project designer in 1998, in compliance with the ratification and implementation of the Convention of Biological Diversity that had begun in 1994. A group of researchers and institutions was assembled, with previous knowledge and studies in the Andean region; this allowed bringing relevant experience for structuring the project, and selecting main areas.

At the time of appraisal, the Instituto Humboldt gave its pledge to an important challenge for the environmental sector as a whole, that is, making biodiversity a household concept and highlighting its importance for a country rich in natural regions; also, stressing the special treatment for the Andes region, which required emergency measures on account of its population being concentrated in this area, causing rapid transformation of natural landscapes. Besides the environmental sector, other productive sectors were concerned: mining and energy, agriculture and transport were the main forces driving change, especially around main cities or in vulnerable mountain areas such as the "páramos". In this respect, the project was innovative by widening the range of actions taken in order to enhance protection and sustainable use of biodiversity. Many of the organizations and professionals thus summoned will no longer be able to ignore the environmental costs of production, or the advantages and benefits derived from the goods and services provided by biodiversity.

General lessons learned

The overall experience of the project regarding biodiversity issues is that scientific assessments and methodological developments can be effectively combined with social, cultural, political and economic aspects in order to achieve beneficial changes in the landscape, both in protected areas declaration and management, as well as in conservation and sustainable use in rural areas by committed organizations and people, which have to be mobilized.

Many former studies had focused on detailed scientific observations which laid the ground for this more actionoriented project. In order to achieve the expected results, it was necessary to keep the rigorous aspect of scientific data and analyses, but it was essential to include innovative methodologies adjusted to the conditions observed in rural areas, such as the relative importance of cattle ranching, coffee-growing and mixed cropping found in the Colombian Andean region. In each of these productive systems, management tools were designed and implemented with highly satisfactory results and replicas. Nonetheless, besides the outstanding documentary and actual evidence of the outputs by component, there is a still incipiently measured outcome which in the near future should bear fruit: capacity–building activities were widespread and involved a great number of persons and organizations operating in the local and regional levels. This endeavor involved the dissemination of biodiversity concepts, as well as methodologies developed over the course of the project, many of which were structured or adjusted with partners, enhancing appropriation. The technical staff realized early in the project that in order to widen the general population's acquaintance with biodiversity and the incorporation of management tools in everyday practice, there should be a dissemination of the proposed actions by multiple ways. This was reflected in the communications strategy and in workshops, seminars, field visits, congresses, tutoring and assistance with teachers and other interested parties.

The political context for the environmental sector changed from the time of appraisal and through the execution of the project, mainly reflected in the loss of political relevance by the environmental sector, at the expense of housing and regional development issues assigned to a Ministry formerly in charge only of environmental aspects. Thus, the project's initial design was more ambitious in its involvement of a strong environmental sector which would adopt many of the project's results and engage other ministries and sectors towards biodiversity conservation.

The Instituto Humboldt's performance

Effect indicators were designed for the project, in order to summarize the main accomplishments regarding general thematic areas. Thus it was established that 9,8 million hectares had conservation scenarios designed in a participative way within the protected areas component, which amounts to the 34,4% of the Andean region. 88,134 hectares were declared as new protected areas, both by official entities (80,444 ha) and by civil society organizations (7.690). Moreover, 464.539 hectares belonged to Park areas for which management plans were designed and implemented in the six National Parks selected for the project. The management tools applied in rural landscapes were established in 332 hectares and 239.6 km, enabling the connection of 4,025 hectares of forest remnants. As stated above, considerable attention was given to capacity building activities in which 17,929 persons and 1,850 organizations participated, mostly in themes related to rural landscapes, such as design and implementation of management tools, sustainable use of biodiversity, biotrade, incentive measures, biodiversity characterizations and threatened species management plans. The knowledge base was considerably expanded, which is recorded in 947 main products including books, software developments, technical documents, audio and video records, and maps. The Information System on Biodiversity has been instrumental to compile and link 171 organizations which contribute and manage information on biodiversity. Regarding the intersectoral coordination, 43 policy papers or documents were designed and 50% have been included in some plan, program, and policy paper or sector guidelines. The evaluations at the end of the project have been satisfactory in terms of the Institute Humboldt's performance to achieve the above results.

Component 1: Andean protected area system more representative, viable and effective.

The determining factors under the protected areas component were: sound ecological basis for defining and designing conservation options; a participation strategy with local populations and their willpower for conservation actions; institutional arrangements respecting competence and enhancing individual abilities for complementary performance; and full conscience by institutions or projects that process dynamics will vary according to local conditions and cannot be forced. Representation of ecosystem types per eco-region in the protected system was increased by including local, regional and national areas in different conservation schemes, private and official. Private conservation initiatives were pioneering, as an essential and complementary strategy for regional conservation initiatives. New areas were created, regional nodes strengthened, characterizations carried out, management plans designed and implemented and capacity enhanced towards ecotourism development for this network's sustainability.

Component 2: Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in rural landscapes

The high degree of transformation in the Andean region required visible tools established in the landscape, which unlocked previous skeptical positions and enabled a smoother process with stakeholders. Environmental education, biodiversity use co-management, incentive measures design and biotrade support activities were pivotal for acceptance and integration of the proposed strategy. Committed participation was contrived with the appointment of regional coordinators and an institutional roundtable for future projection of actions.

Component 3: Knowledge base of biodiversity expanded, organized for decision making, evaluation of impacts and disseminated to stakeholders

This component sought to complement base lines while strengthening capacity in the Institute and partner organizations. Capacity building was a good strategy for strong institutional alliances during project execution and for a substantial advance in the national biodiversity inventory. The knowledge base was complemented by an indicator system coupled with spatial analyses, which has shown its power for policy action proposals, with further promise for biogeographical analyses. A network of databases was also created to compile previously dispersed or unavailable information, to enhance effective decision-making.

According to regional conditions and project implementation requirements, the communications strategy involved the media, institutional or community stakeholders, focused on local and regional diffusion,

emphasizing results on webpages, newspapers, bulletins, radio, television, books and other media. Despite somewhat short budget assignments for the original dissemination goal, the Humboldt Institute effectively spread biodiversity themes in the general public, mainly through a national television campaign launched with the Ministry of the Environment.

Component 4: Intersectoral coordination.

Considerable vigor was brought into play in order to achieve proper diffusion and later on, engagement on the many propositions contrived. The flow of information, the discussions with several groups of stakeholders according to their respective sectors or interests, the study groups, seminars and courses, complemented by field visits, were instrumental to get a proper hold of themes and the respective advancement in the relevant groups. All of these contributed to design policy papers coordinated with pertinent agencies; regardless, this effort sometimes does not yield the expected fruit, as not every one of the documents produced may have been incorporated and subsequently applied. This situation, however, emphasizes that technical papers will need a stronger political support for their wide-ranging use.

Component 5: Project management and project monitoring

Constant supervision of activities and special attention given to its compliance with proposed objectives were crucial throughout the implementation period. There was continuous follow-up also taking into account the coherence between components as regards outcomes. The role played by the regional and local stakeholders, on one part, and on the other, the World Bank and the Dutch Embassy staff, was significant to improve performance while adapting to regional conditions and the project development, while still fulfilling the proposed objectives. The technical proficiency brought by the Bank's experts in the missions enriched discussions and redirected some areas without losing the projects' consistency.

The project's permanent follow-up was provided for by a system for planning, monitoring and evaluation, designed and applied with the help of the planning office in the Humboldt Institute. In general, the simpler the monitoring scheme the easier to concentrate on the project's activities development towards the desired outcomes. Training for regional partners in these aspects was also crucial to obtain targets.

The project's M&E system design attempted an impact assessment that project design had not incorporated in all its complexity and methodological aspects, including the fact that impact measurements are usually accomplished after the execution has finished. Subsequently, many efforts were directed to comply with the Bank's requirements, especially at midterm review, with the incorporation of 6 outcome indicators. The main results have been included in the previous section on the Institute's performance.

Annex 8. Comments of Cofinanciers and Other Partners/Stakeholders

The National Parks Administrative Unit

The General Director of UAESPNN has addressed the following letter to the project's TTL (original in Spanish), officially translated as follows:

Bogota, D.C.

Mr. JUAN PABLO RUIZ SOTO Natural Resource Management Specialist World Bank Bogota

Dear Mr. Ruiz:

The implementation of the subcomponent of the GEF Andes project aimed at consolidating a more representative, viable and effective National Protected Area System, which concentrated its efforts in the national parks *Iguaque* Flora and Fauna Sanctuary, *Otún-Quimbaya* Flora and Fauna Sanctuary, *Los Nevados* National Natural Park, *Tama* National Natural Park, *Pisba* National Natural Park, and *El Cocuy* National Natural Park, allowed for significant progress in the definition of methodological aspects, capacity-building and training of public officials in the formulation processes of protected area management plans, which were replicated as useful tools in the entire national system.

Equally, said management plans allowed for the definition of strategic lines on issues such as research and monitoring, ecological restoration, strengthening and structuring of a geographic information system, buffer zone definition and demarcation, watershed zoning and management, and mitigation of threats and pressures. The implementation of these strategic lines allowed the National Parks Unit to position itself institutionally and socially in favor of an improved protected area management, in line with our national policy on "Social participation in conservation".

The project's contribution to the improvement of infrastructure and the acquisition of supplies and equipment was highly significant, which substantially improved the operative and logistic capacity of the areas, resulting in enhanced management and increased institutional presence locally and regionally.

Finally, an important added-value worth mentioning is the project's impulse to learning and training processes for protected area officials, with emphasis on administrative issues for the implementation of Bank financed projects.

In summary, the contributions by the GEF Andes project meant an important administrative, technical and political enhancement aimed at improving institutional capacities for the protection of high mountain ecosystems in the country.

Sincerely,

Original signed by

JULIA MIRANDA LONDOÑO General Director

Reviewed by: Carolina Villafañe García



Parques Nacionales Naturales de Colombia Directón Generel



Bogota, D.C.

Doctor JUAN PABLO RUIZ SOTO Especialista Manejo Recursos Naturales Banco Mundial Bogota

Estimado doctor Rulz:

La Implementación del subcomponente del proyecto GEF – Andes orientado a la consolidación de un Sistema de Áreas Protegidas Andinas más representativo, viable y eficiente y que concentró sus estuerzos en los parques nacionales Santuario de Fauna y Flora de iguaque, Santuario de Fauna y Flora de Otún – Quimbaya, el Parque Nacional Natural Los Nevados, el Parque Nacional Natural Tama, el Parque Nacional Natural Flora y el Parque Nacional Natural El Cocuy, permitid avanzar significativamente en la definición de aspectos metodológicos, capacitación y formación de los funcionarios en los procesos de formulación de los planes de manejo de las áreas protegidas, los cuales fueron replicados como herramientas útiles a todo el sistema nacional.

Igualmente, dichos planes de manejo permitieron definir las líneas estratégicas en temas como investigación y Monitoreo, Restauración Ecológica, Fortalecimiento y Estructuración de un Sistema de Información Geográfico, Definición y Delimitación de Zonas Amortiguadoras, el Ordenamiento y manejo de cuencas, y Mitigación de Amenazas y Presiones. La Implementación diohas líneas estratégicas le permitió a la Unidad de Parques Nacionales posicionarse institucional y socialmente, en pro del mejoramiento de la gestión de las áreas portegidas de manera coherente con nuestra política nacional de "Participación Social en la Conservación".

La contribución del proyecto en el mejoramiento de la Infraestructura y adquisición de insumos y equipos fue altamente significativa, lo cual mejoró de manera sustancial la capacidad operativa y logistica de las areas, redundando en incremento de la gestión, con aumento de presencia institucional a nivel local y regional.

Finalmente, cabe resaltar que un valor agregado importante fue el impulso que el proyecto dio al desarrollo de procesos de aprendizaje y capacitación de los funcionarios de las áreas protegidas, con enfasis en temas administrativos para la implementación de proyectos financiados por el Banco Mundial.

En sintesis, los aportes hechos por el proyecto GEF Andes significaron un incremento importante en términos administrativos, técnicos y políticos orientados al mejoramiento de la gestión institucional para la protección de ecosistemas de alta montaña del país.

Cordialmente,

JULIA MIRANDA LONDOÑO Directora General Revist: Carolina Villafañe Garcia

The Embassy of the Government of Netherlands

The Dutch government has been co-financing the Andes project through two different activities for a 6 six year period. In accordance with the Paris Declaration, the project was an example of program financing and coordination between the World Bank and the Dutch Embassy in Bogotá.

The products of the project have been evaluated in a very positive way, identifying quality and innovation, but also with too much emphasis on simple project implementation and too little on support and demand at the political level. The development of management tools for biodiversity conservation in rural landscapes, inter-sectoral coordination, promotion of green markets and the creation of a knowledge base for decision making are good examples of products with great quality and innovation.

During 2007 the Dutch development cooperation decided to start sectoral support to the National Development Plan and its environmental chapter. Results of the Andes project are being taken into account in this support. The sectoral program is an effort to balance the political, institutional and operational levels of the Dutch development cooperation.

Annex 9. List of Supporting Documents

Chaves M.E. y Santamaría M. (eds). 2006. Informe sobre el avance en el conocimiento y la información de la biodiversidad 1998-2004. Instituto de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt. Bogotá D.C., Colombia. 2 tomos

Chaves, M.E., M. Santamaría, E. Sánchez. 2007. Documento síntesis del proyecto Conservación y uso sostenible de la biodiversidad en los Andes colombianos. Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt.

- Cleef, Antoine M. 2007. Evaluación externa final del proyecto Conservación y uso sostenible de la biodiversidad en los Andes colombianos. Ámsterdam.
- Ideam, IGAC, IAvH, Invemar, I. Sinchi e IIAP. 2007. Ecosistemas continentales, costeros y marinos de Colombia. Instituto de Hidrología, Meteorología y Estudios Ambientales, Instituto Geográfico Agustín Codazzi, Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt, Instituto de Investigaciones Marinas y Costeras "José Benito Vives De Andréis", Instituto Amazónico de Investigaciones Científicas Sinchi e Instituto de Investigaciones Ambientales del Pacífico. Bogotá, D.C. Colombia. + 36 anexos cartográficos.
- Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt. Ayudas de Memoria de las Misiones de Evaluación del Proyecto Conservación y uso sostenible de la biodiversidad en los Andes colombianos, 2002-2007.
- Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt. 2007. Catálogo de documentos y productos del Proyecto Conservación y uso sostenible de la biodiversidad en los Andes colombianos. CD-ROM. Bogotá.
- Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt. 2006a. Informe quinquenal de gestión institucional. Plan Estratégico "Biodiversidad para el desarrollo 2000 2004". Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt. Bogotá, D.C. Colombia.
- Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt. 2006b. Informe anual 2005. Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt. Bogotá D.C., Colombia.
- Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt. 2005a. Informe anual 2004. Proyecto Conservación y uso sostenible de la biodiversidad en los Andes colombianos. Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt. Bogotá, Colombia.
- Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt. 2005b. Plan Estratégico 2005–2010. Biodiversidad para el desarrollo: el manejo sostenible de ecosistemas como aporte al bienestar humano. Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt. Bogotá, Colombia.
- Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt. 2004. Informe anual 2003. Proyecto Conservación y uso sostenible de la biodiversidad de los Andes colombianos. Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt. Bogotá, Colombia.
- Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt. 2003a. Informe anual 2001-2002. Proyecto Conservación y uso sostenible de la biodiversidad en los Andes colombianos. Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt. Bogotá, Colombia.
- Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt, y Promotora de Proyectos S.A. 2003b. Fondo de apoyo de biocomercio sostenible para el Proyecto Andes. Manual Operativo. Informe final. Bogotá, Colombia.
- Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt. 2000. Colombia megadiversa: cinco años explorando la riqueza de un país biodiverso. Santafé de Bogotá. Colombia.
- Laverde G.N. 2007a. Memorias de entrevistas y grupos focales de discusión en áreas de acción del proyecto para la recopilación de lecciones aprendidas. Proyecto Conservación y uso sostenible de la biodiversidad en los Andes colombianos. Informe de consultoría. Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt. Bogotá D. C., Colombia.
- Laverde G.N. 2007b. Síntesis de aprendizajes proyecto "Conservación y uso sostenible de la biodiversidad en los Andes colombianos". Documento de trabajo. Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt. Bogotá, Colombia.

- Memorando de Entendimiento. 2006. Propuesta de Plan de Acción del Sistema Nacional de Áreas Protegidas de Colombia. PA – Sinap. Propuesta técnica. Versión diciembre 1 de 2006. Memorando de Entendimiento para la Formulación del Plan de Acción del Sistema Nacional de Áreas Protegidas de Colombia. Bogotá, D.C. Colombia..
- Ministerio del Medio Ambiente, IAvH, Instituto de Investigación en Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt, DNP, Departamento Nacional de Planeación. S.f. Política Nacional de Biodiversidad. Bogotá, Colombia.
- Ortiz, N. 2007. Estimación y Análisis de Indicadores de efecto del Proyecto Conservación y Uso Sostenible de la Biodiversidad en los Andes Colombianos. Bogotá.
- Pardo M.P. y Ochoa D. (eds.) 2003. Informe anual del proyecto Conservación y uso sostenible de la biodiversidad en los Andes colombianos. Instituto de Investigación en Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt. Bogotá, Colombia.
- Roldán, G. et al. 2005. Evaluación externa de término medio del proyecto Conservación y uso sostenible de la biodiversidad en los Andes colombianos. Medellín.
- The World Bank. 2001. Report No: 21723 CO. Project Appraisal Document (PAD) on a proposed grant from the Global Environmental Facility Trust Fund in the amount of SDR 11.8 million (US\$15.0 million equivalent) to the *Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt* for an Andean Region Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity Project. February 12, 2001. Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Colombia, Mexico & Venezuela Country Management Unit. Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Office.
- The World Bank, Aide memoirs of Supervision missions
- Unidad de Parques Nacionales Naturales de Colombia. 2005. Sistema de Parques Nacionales Naturales de Colombia a través de sus Planes de Manejo. Bogotá, D.C. Colombia.
- Uribe Botero, Eduardo. 2007. Evaluación externa final del proyecto Conservación y uso sostenible de la biodiversidad en los Andes colombianos. Bogotá.

Yepes-Guzmán A., Galindo P., Vivas-A. J., Mateus R.D. 2007. Aproximación al estado de las actividades de investigación y cooperación científica y técnica sobre medio ambiente con énfasis en biodiversidad. 2007. Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt Bogotá D.C., Colombia.

Annex 10. Tracking tools for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priorities 1 and 2

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels

Section One: Project General Information

- 1. Project Name: Andean Region Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity
- 2. Project Type (MSP or FSP): FSP
- 3. Project ID (GEF): 774
- 4. Project ID (IA): P063317
- 5. Implementing Agency: IBRD
- 6. Country(ies): Colombia

Name of reviewers completing tracking tool and completion dates:

	Name	Title	Agency
Work Program Inclusion			
Project Mid-term			
Final Evaluation/project	Mónica Rodríguez	Consultant	World Bank
completion	Inés Cavelier/Ana Patricia Toro	PCU Coordinator/ Assistant	IAvH
	Emilce Mora	International Cooperation	UAESPNN

- 7. Project duration: *Planned*____6___years *Actual*___6___years
- 8. Lead Project Executing Agency (ies): Research Institute on Biological Resources *Alexander von Humboldt*; National Administrative Parks Unit (UAESPNN) for protected area activities under component 1
- 9. GEF Operational Program:

drylands (OP 1) coastal, marine, freshwater (OP 2) X forests (OP 3) X mountains (OP 4) agro-biodiversity (OP 13) integrated ecosystem management (OP 12) sustainable land management (OP 15) Other Operational Program not listed above:____

10. Project coverage in hectares: Please complete the table below.

Targets and Timeframe	Foreseen at project start	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
Project Coverage		Project	
Extent in hectares of protected areas targeted			
by the project			
Existing protected areas strengthened (PNN)	N.A.	N.A.	464,539
New protected areas established	N.A.	N.A.	88,134
Regional protected area networks	N.A.	N.A.	9,881,084

Please complete the table below for the protected areas that are the target of the GEF intervention. Use NA for not applicable.

Name of Protected Area	Is this a new protected	Area in Hectares	Global designation or priority listsLocal Designation of Protected Area (E.g,		IUCN Category for each Protected Area ⁵⁴					
	area? Please answer yes or no.		(E.g., Biosphere Reserve, World Heritage site, Ramsar site, WWF Global 200 , etc.)	indigenous reserve, private reserve, etc.)	Ι	II	III	IV	V	VI
1. PNN Tamá	No	48,000	N.A.	National Natural Park		Х				
2. PNN Pisba	No	45,000	N.A.	National Natural Park		Х				
3. PNN Cocuy	No	306,000	N.A.	National Natural Park		Х				
4. PNN Otún-Quimbaya	No	489	N.A.	National Natural Park		Х				
5. PNN Los Nevados	No	58,300	N.A.	National Natural Park		Х				
6. PNN Iguaque	No	6,750	N.A.	National Natural Park		Х				
7. PNN Selva de Florencia	Yes	10,019	N.A.	National Natural Park		Х				
8. PNN Orito Ingi-Ande *	Yes	10,204	N.A.	National Natural Park		Х				
9. PRN Barbas-Bremen	Yes	9,651	N.A.	Regional Natural Park						
10. DMI Berlín	Yes	44,272	N.A.	Integrated management						
				district						
11. DMI Alicante	Yes	6,298	N.A.	Integrated management						
				district						
12. 81 private reserves	Yes	7,690	N.A.	Private reserves						

* Official declaration took place after project closing.

⁵⁴ I. Strict Nature Reserve/Wilderness Area: managed mainly for science or wilderness protection

II. National Park: managed mainly for ecosystem protection and recreation

III. Natural Monument: managed mainly for conservation of specific natural features

IV. Habitat/Species Management Area: managed mainly for conservation through management intervention

V. Protected Landscape/Seascape: managed mainly for landscape/seascape protection and recreation VI. Managed Resource Protected Area: managed mainly for the sustainable use of natural ecosystems

Section Two: World Bank/WWF Site-Level Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool for Protected Areas

Name of protected area			Otún Quimbaya	Flora and F	auna Sanctuary	
Location of protected area (country, ecoregion, and if possible map reference)			Middle basin of the Otún river, <i>Vereda</i> la Suiza, <i>Corregimiento</i> la Florida, Municipality Pereira, Eastern range, <i>Departamento</i> Risaralda, Colombia.			
Date of establishment (disting agreed and gazetted*)	juish betwe	en	Agreed: N.A.		Gazetted: Resolution No 916 of August 23, 1996	
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)			National N	atural Park o	of Colombia	
Management Authority				UAESPNN		
Size of protected area (ha)				489		
Number of staff			Permanent 5		Temporary 8	
Annual budget (US\$)			\$15	58,248.70		
Designations (IUCN category World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)			Flora and Fauna Sanctuary		
Reasons for designation			Flora and Fauna Sanctuary representative of the sub-Andean and Andean rainforests			
Brief details of GEF-funded project or projects in PA			N.A.			
Brief details of other relevant	projects in	PA		None	,	
	List	the two pr	imary protected area obje	ectives		
Objective 1	Guarantee of the Eas existing ec	the perpetu tern range, a cosystems	al conservation of a sample llowing for the developmen	of sub-Andea t of viable po	an rainforest in the Western slopes opulations of species related to	
Objective 2	Guarantee watershed	the conserv s	ration of the Paloblanco, la	Hacienda, Co	orozal, la Suiza and la Mula	
List the top two r	nost import	ant threats	to the PA (and indicate rea	asons why t	hese were chosen)	
Threat 1 Entry of domestic ani objects are minimum		nimal (dogs, cats and cattle), although threats and risks to conservation n in general				
Threat 2 Presence of invasive f			flora species (Urapán and Matandrea)			
List top two critical management activities						
Activity 1 Ecotourism services in			in concession to public- private joint venture			
Activity 2 Research lots for activ			ve ecological restoration			

Reporting Progress in Protected Areas: Data Sheet⁵⁵

Name/s of assessor (including people consulted): <u>Augusto Ramírez Mesa</u>

Contact details (email etc.): clioambiental@yahoo.es

Date assessment carried out (Day/Month/Year): June 2008 *Or formally established in the case of private protected areas

⁵⁵ Data sheets have been filled out by UAESPNN for the existing 6 National Natural Parks targeted for intervention under project component 1. However, due to their extension, only 1 sample sheet for PNN Otún - Quimbaya has been included in this ICR Report. The remaining 5 data sheets are available in Spanish as part of project files.

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status	The protected area is not gazetted			
Does the protected area have legal status?	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun			
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete			
Context	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3		
2. Protected area regulations	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area			
Are inappropriate	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land			
land uses and activities (e.g. poaching)	use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively			
Controlled ?	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented			
3. Law enforcement	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations			
Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough?	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)			
Context	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2		
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and Regulations			

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
4. Protected area objectives	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area			
Have objectives been agreed?	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these Objectives			
Planning	The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented			
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3		
5. Protected area design	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible			
Does the protected area need enlarging,	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent			
corridors etc to meet its objectives?	Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2		
Planning	Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area			
6. Protected area boundary demarcation	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighboring land users			
Is the boundary known and demarcated?	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighboring land Users	2		
Context	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated			
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated			

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
7. Management plan	There is no management plan for the protected area			
Is there a management	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented			
plan and is it being implemented?	An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2		
Planning	An approved management plan exists and is being implemented			
Additional points	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan			
	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+2		
Planning	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning			
8. Regular work plan	No regular work plan exists			
Is there an annual	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets			
work plan?	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed			
Planning/Outputs	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		
9. Resource inventory	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area			
Do you have enough information to manage the area?	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Context	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained			
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained			
10. Research	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area			
Is there a programme of management-	There is some ad hoc survey and research work	2		
orientated survey and research work?	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management			
Inputs	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs			
11. Resource management	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed			
Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	2		
species, poaching)?	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed			
Process	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed			

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
12. Staff numbers	There are no staff			
Are there enough people employed	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities			
protected area?	Staff numbers are below optimum level for	2		
	critical management activities			
Inputs	Staff numbers are adequate for the			
	management needs of the site			
13. Personnel	Problems with personnel management			
management	constrain the achievement of major management objectives			
	Problems with personnel management	2		
Are the staff managed well enough?	partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives			
chought	Personnel management is adequate to the			
Process	achievement of major management objectives but could be improved			
	Personnel management is excellent and aids			
	the achievement major management objectives			
14. Staff training	Staff are untrained			
Is there enough	Staff training and skills are low relative to the			
training for staff?	needs of the protected area	1		
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but			
	could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management			
Inputs/Process	Staff training and skills are in tune with the			
	management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs			
15. Current				
budget	- There is no budget for the protected area			
	The available budget is inadequate for basic			
Is the current budget sufficient?	management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage			
	The available budget is acceptable, but			
	could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Inputs	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area			
16. Security of budget	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding			
Is the budget secure?	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding			
Inputs	There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2		
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi- year cycle			
17. Management of budget	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness			
Is the budget managed to	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1		
meet critical management needs?	Budget management is adequate but could be improved			
Process	Budget management is excellent and aids Effectiveness			
18. Equipment	There are little or no equipment and facilities			
Are there adequate equipment and	There are some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate			
facilities?	There are equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	2		
Process	There are adequate equipment and facilities			

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
19. Maintenance of equipment	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities			
Is equipment adequately maintained?	There is some ad <i>hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities			
Process	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	2		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained			
20. Education and awareness programme	There is no education and awareness programme	0		
Is there a planned education programme?	There is a limited and ad <i>hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this			
Process	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps			
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area			
21. State and commercial	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users			
neighbours Is there co- operation with	There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1		
adjacent land users?	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation			
Process	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management			
22. Indigenous people	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area		N.A. – there are no indigenous or ethnic communities in the area	

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions			
the PA have input to management decisions?	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management			
Process	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management			
23. Local communities	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0		
Do local communities resident or near	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions			
the protected area have input	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management			
to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management			
Additional points	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1		
Outputs	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented			
24. Visitor facilities	There are no visitor facilities and services			
Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilorims etc) good	Visitor facilities and services are Inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction			
enough?	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved			
Outputs	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		
25. Commercial	There is little or no contact between			
tourism	managers and tourism operators using the protected area			

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Do commercial tour operators	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1	Given that only as of October 1, 2007, ecotourism services were given in concession to public-private operators	
contribute to protected area management?	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values			
Process	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve Conflicts			
26. Fees If fees (tourism,	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected			
fines) are applied, do they help protected area	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs			
management?	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area			
Outputs	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3		
27. Condition	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural			
assessment	values are being severely degraded			
Is the protected	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded			
managed consistent to its objectives?	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted			
Outcomes	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are			
	predominantly intact	3		
Additional points	There are active programmes for restoration			
Outputs	of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1	There are small lots of exotic and invasive flora and the area has begun research for active restoration	
28. Access assssment	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives			

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Is access/resource use sufficiently	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives			
controlled? Outcomes	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives			
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities			
Is the protected area providing	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy			
economic benefits to local communities?	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		
Outcomes	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)			
30. Monitoring and evaluation	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area			
Are management activities monitored	There is some ad hoc monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
against performance?	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management			
Planning/Process	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management			
TOTAL SCORE		58		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority Two: Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors

I. Project General Information

- 1. Project Name: Andean Region Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity
- 2. Project Type (MSP or FSP): FSP
- 3. Project ID (GEF): 774
- 4. Project ID (IA): P063317
- 5. Implementing Agency: IBRD
- 6. Country(ies): Colombia

Name of reviewers completing tracking tool and completion dates:

	Name	Title	Agency
Work Program Inclusion			
Project Mid-term			
Final Evaluation/project	Mónica Rodríguez	Consultant	World Bank
completion	Inés Cavelier/Ana Patricia Toro	Coordinator/PCU Assistant	IAvH
	Emilce Mora	International Cooperation	UAESPNN

- 7. <u>Project duration:</u> *Planned*___6__ years *Actual*__6__ years
- 8. <u>Lead Project Executing Agency (ies)</u>: Research Institute on Biological Resources *Alexander von Humboldt*; National Administrative Parks Unit (UAESPNN) for protected area activities under component 1
- 9. <u>GEF Operational Program:</u>

drylands (OP 1) coastal, marine, freshwater (OP 2) X forests (OP 3) X mountains (OP 4) agro-biodiversity (OP 13) integrated ecosystem management (OP 12) sustainable land management (OP 15) Other Operational Program not listed above:

10. Production sectors and/or ecosystem services directly targeted by project:

10. a. Please identify the main production sectors involved in the project. Please put "P" for sectors that are primarily and directly targeted by the project and "S for those that are secondary or incidentally affected by the project. Agriculture___P____
Fisheries__S____
Forestry___P____
Tourism___S____
Mining__P____
Oil_____N.A. ___
Transportation___S____
Other (please specify)_Biotrade_____

10. b. For projects that are targeting the conservation or sustainable use of ecosystems goods and services, please specify the goods or services that are being targeted, for example, water, genetic resources, recreational, etc

- 1. Biodiversity
- 2. Water (on a pilot case)

II. Project Landscape/Seascape Coverage

11. a. What is the extent (in hectares) of the landscape or seascape where the project will directly or indirectly contribute to biodiversity conservation or sustainable use of its components? An example is provided in the table below.

Targets and Timeframe Project Coverage	Foreseen at project start	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
Landscape area <u>directly⁵⁶</u> covered by the project (ha)	N.A:	N.A.	552,673 ha (existing and new protected areas) + 332 ha. & 239.6 km of land mgmt tools
Landscape area <u>indirectly</u> ⁵⁷ covered by the project (ha)	N.A.	N.A.	9.8 million

Explanation for indirect coverage numbers:

Includes territories within the boundaries of regional protected area networks supported by project, comprising the area directly covered by project

11 b. Are there Protected Areas within the landscape/seascape covered by the project? If so, names these PAs, their IUCN or national PA category, and their extent in hectares.

	Name of Protected Areas	IUCN and/or national	Extent in hectares of PA
		category of PA	
1.	PNN Tamá	National Natural Park	48,000
2.	PNN Pisba	National Natural Park	45,000
3.	PNN Cocuy	National Natural Park	306,000
4.	PNN Otún-Quimbaya	National Natural Park	489
5.	PNN Los Nevados	National Natural Park	58,300
6.	PNN Iguaque	National Natural Park	6,750
7.	PNN Selva de Florencia	National Natural Park	10,019
8.	PNN Orito Ingi-Ande	National Natural Park	10,204
9.	PRN Barbas-Bremen	Regional Natural Park	9,651
10.	DMI Berlín	Integrated management	44,272
		district	
11.	DMI Alicante	Integrated management	6,298
		district	
12.	81 private reserves	Private reserves	7,690

III. Management Practices Applied

12.a. Within the scope and objectives of the project, please identify in the table below the management practices employed by project beneficiaries that integrate biodiversity considerations and the area of coverage of these management practices? Note: this could range from farmers applying organic agricultural practices, forest management agencies managing forests per Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) guidelines or other forest certification schemes, artisanal fisherfolk practicing sustainable fisheries management, or industries satisfying other similar agreed international standards, etc. An example is provided in the table below.

Targets and Timeframe Specific management practices that integrate BD	Area of coverage foreseen at start of project	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
1. Biological corridors	N.A.	N.A.	146.7 ha.
2. Live & mixed hedgerows in farms	N.A.	N.A.	118 km
3. Agroforestry systems	N.A.	N.A.	23.8 ha

⁵⁶ Direct coverage refers to the area that is targeted by the project's site intervention. For example, a project may be mainstreaming biodiversity into floodplain management in a pilot area of 1,000 hectares that is part of a much larger floodplain of 10,000 hectares.

⁵⁷ Using the example in footnote 5 above, the same project may, for example, "indirectly" cover or influence the remaining 9,000 hectares of the floodplain through promoting learning exchanges and training at the project site as part of an awareness raising and capacity building strategy for the rest of the floodplain. Please explain the basis for extrapolation of indirect coverage when completing this part of the table.

4. Enclosed & enriched forest	N.A.	N.A.	121.5 km enclosed and
remnants in farms			161.5 ha enriched
5. Restored multipurpose forests	N.A.	N.A.	8 ha.
6. Local communities practicing sustainable resource management ⁵⁸	N.A.	N.A.	11 local communities sustainable management
7. Biotrade companies strengthened and financed through a small grant fund	N.A.	N.A.	90 biotrade companies

12. b. Is the project promoting the conservation and sustainable use of wild species or landraces? __X_Yes____ No

If yes, please list the wild species (WS) or landraces (L):

Species (Genus sp., and common name)	Wild Species (please check if	Landrace (please check if
	this is a wild species)	this is a landrace)
1. Agaricus cf. trinitatensis	WS	
2. Alnus acuminata	WS	
3. Amphilophium paniculatum	WS	
4. Arracacia xanthorrhiza		L
5. Arthrostema ciliatum		L
6. Artocarpus altilis		L
7. Arundo donax		L
8. Asplundia sarmentosa	WS	
9. Baccharis bogotensis	WS	
10. Baccharis buddlejoides	WS	
11. Bambusa guadua	WS	
12. Bixa orellana		L
13. Caesalpinia spinosa	WS	
14. Carludovica palmata	WS	
15. Cecropia telealba	WS	
16. Chusquea latifolia	WS	
17. Crescentia cujete		L
18. Croton magdalenensis	WS	
19. Cucurbita ficifolia		L
20. Cyclanthera pedata		L
21. Dodonea viscosa	WS	
22. Erythrina edulis		L
23. Euphorbia laurifolia	WS	
24. Ficus velutina	WS	
25. Freziera bonplantiana	WS	
26. Geonoma weberbaueri	WS	
27. Gomphrena serrata		L
28. Gustavia superba	WS	
29. Hericium erinaceum	WS	
30. Indigofera suffruticosa	WS	
31. Juncus andreanus	WS	
32. Justicia phytolaccoides	WS	
33. Justicia polygonoides	WS	
34. Lactarius indigo	WS	
35. Lentinus crinitus	WS	
36. Lippia alba		L

⁵⁸ 1. Bejuco artisans in Quindío; 2. Cofan indigenous peoples in the Ukumare-Kankhe resguardo (medicinal and useful flora); 3. Fúquene fisherfolk and artisans (fish and wetland flora); 4. People in Salento (medicinal flora); 5. Indigenous artisans in Caldas (native seeds and fibers); 6. Afrocolombian communities in Valle del Cauca (useful flora and fauna, wild and cultivated); 7. Peasant communities in San Fernando, Pasto, Nariño (hedgerow flora); 8. Peasant communities and potters in Villa de Leyva and Ráquira, Boyacá (useful and hedgerow flora); 9. Peasant communities in Chambery, Caldas (useful and hedgerow flora); 10. Peasant communities in Nima, Valle del Cauca (useful and hedgerow flora). 11. Peasant farmers in Garagoa, Boyacá (agrobiodiversity)

37. Macrolepiota colombiana	WS	
38. Mammea americana		L
39. Marcgravia brownei	WS	
40. Matisia cordata		L
41. Miconia ligustrina	WS	
42. Miconia notabilis	WS	
43. Miconia squamulosa	WS	
44. Monnina phytolaccaefolia	WS	
45. Montanoa quadrangularis	WS	
46. Myrcianthes rhopaloides	WS	
47. Myrsine coriaceae	WS	
48. Oenocarpus bataua	WS	
49. Opuntia schumanii		L
50. Oreopanax floribundum	WS	
51. Oxalis latifolia		L
52. Palicourea angustifolia	WS	
53. Passiflora mollissima		L
54. Philodendron sp. nov	WS	
55. Pithecoctenium crucigerum	WS	
56. Plantago major		L
57. Pseudolmedia rigida	WS	
58. Quercus humboldtii	WS	
59. Ramaria spp.	WS	
60. Ricinus communis		L
61. Schinus molle	WS	
62. Sechium edule	WS	
63. Smilax tomentosa	WS	
64. Thevetia peruviana		L
65. Tigridia pavonia	WS	
66. Trichanthera gigantea		L
67. Typha latifolia	WS	
68. Urtica ballotaefolia		L
69. Viburnum cornifolium	WS	
70. Viburnum tinoides	WS	
71. Viburnum triphyllum	WS	
72. Xanthosoma esculenta		L
73. Xylosma spiculiferum	WS	

12. c. For the species identified above, *or other target species of the project not included in the list above (E.g., domesticated species)*, please list the species, check the boxes as appropriate regarding the application of a certification system, and identify the certification system being used in the project, if any. An example is provided in the table below.

Certification Species	A certification system is being used	A certification system will be used	Name of certification system if being used	A certification system will not be used
N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

IV. Market Transformation and Mainstreaming Biodiversity

13. a. For those projects that have identified market transformation as a project objective, please describe the project's ability to integrate biodiversity considerations into the mainstream economy by measuring the market changes to which the project contributed.

The sectors and subsectors and measures of impact in the table below **are illustrative examples, only**. Please complete per the objectives and specifics of the project.

Name of the	Unit of measure of	Market	Market	Market
market that the	market impact	condition at	condition at	condition at
project seeks to		the start of	midterm	final evaluation

affect (sector and sub-sector)		the project	evaluation of project	of the project
N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

13. b. Please also note which (if any) market changes were directly caused by the project.

Market transformation was not a project objective, although inter-sectoral coordination was to be promoted to address root causes of biodiversity loss. This resulted in technical input provided to sector policy design and in training offered to public and private actors in the mining/energy, agriculture and transportation sectors. Regarding activities to mainstream biodiversity in rural landscapes, these were pilot experiences to test management tools and incentives, which did not pretend market impact.

V. Improved Livelihoods

14. For those projects that have identified improving the livelihoods of a beneficiary population based on sustainable use /harvesting as a project objective, please list the targets identified in the logframe and record progress at the mid-term and final evaluation. An example is provided in the table below

Improved Livelihood Measure	Number of targeted beneficiaries (if known)	Please identify local or indigenous communities project is working with	Improvement Foreseen at project start	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

VI. Project Replication Strategy

15. a. Does the project specify budget, activities, and outputs for implementing the replication strategy? Yes___ No_X__

As explained in the project's Information Completion Report No.74/2008, certain activities and outputs have set up arrangements to ensure their continuity after project completion (PA management plans; Biodiversity Information System; Biotrade fund). In addition, several methodologies have resulted from project implementation which will enable replication of activities such as PA management plan design and implementation; rapid biotrade product assessments; acceleration of natural forest succession through nurseries; biodiversity assessments and characterizations, etc.

15. b. Is the replication strategy promoting incentive measures & instruments (e.g. trust funds, payments for environmental services, certification) within and beyond project boundaries? Yes_X__No____

If yes, please list the incentive measures or instruments being promoted:

On a pilot scale, project promoted property tax exemptions in 1 municipality and payments for environmental services in 1 watershed, which continue to operate after project completion. In additional, a national biotrade program set up to provide company, market and technology information support continues to operate, including a funding mechanism.

15. c. For all projects, please complete box below. Two examples are provided.

Replication Quantification Measure (Examples:	Replication	Achievement at	Achievement at Final
hectares of certified products, number of resource	Target	Mid-term	Evaluation of Project
users participating in payment for environmental	Foreseen	Evaluation of	
services programs, businesses established, etc.)	at project start	Project	
1 No. of hectares under active conservation	NA	NA	1 037 681 ha ⁶⁰
1. No. of nectares under active conservation	1 1.2 1.	1 1.2 1.	1,007,001 114

⁵⁹ Active conservation processes refer to 3 criteria: management plans implemented; interinstitutional coordination and social participation.

⁶⁰ Includes 552,673 ha in existing and new protected areas established and 485,008 has in AICAs supported.

2. No. of hectares with land management tools	N.A.	N.A.	332 ha & 239 km
applied			
3. No. of actors applying land management tools	N.A.	N.A.	6.559
designed/promoted under project			
4. Number of knowledge products generated by the	N.A.	N.A.	947
project, available and consulted			
5. No. of actors involved in biodiversity information			171
management ⁶¹			
6. No. of policy proposals and/or instruments	N.A.	N.A.	27
included in National Development Plans, policies or			
sectoral instruments			

Data is not available for project start or at midterm because these indicators were developed after midterm review and following MTR recommendations.

II. Enabling Environment

For those projects that have identified addressing policy, legislation, regulations, and their implementation as project objectives, please complete the following series of questions: 18a, 18b, 18c.

The project sought to promote inter-sectoral coordination to address root causes of biodiversity loss in the Andes, and given the research-oriented nature of the lead Executing Agency, this would be accomplished through studies and training to relevant government agencies and private sector actors. A project component was designed to accomplish this objective and its outputs are related to technical input and training for sector policy adjustments. However, as discussed in the project's Information Completion Report No. 704/08, the use and enforcement of policy adjustment proposals was not monitored by the project. Therefore, the tables below were not completed at work program inclusion or at midterm review.

15. d. Please complete this table at **project closure for each sector** that is a primary or a secondary focus of the project. Please answer YES or NO to each statement under the sectors that are a focus of the project.

Sector	Agriculture	Mining/Energy	Transportation
Statement: Please answer YES or NO for each sector that is a focus of the project.			
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy	YES	YES	YES
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy through specific legislation	YES	NO	NO
Regulations are in place to implement the legislation	NO	NO	NO
The regulations are under implementation	NO	NO	NO
The implementation of regulations is enforced	NO	NO	NO
Enforcement of regulations is monitored	NO	NO	NO

15. e. Within the scope and objectives of the project, has the private sector undertaken voluntary measures to incorporate biodiversity considerations in production? If yes, please provide brief explanation and specifically mention the sectors involved.

N.A.

VIII. Mainstreaming biodiversity into the GEF Implementing Agencies' Programs

16. At each time juncture of the project (work program inclusion, mid-term evaluation, and final evaluation), please check the box that depicts the status of mainstreaming biodiversity through the implementation of this project with on-going GEF Implementing Agencies' development assistance, sector, lending, or other technical assistance programs.

Time Frame	Work	Mid-Term	Final	
------------	------	----------	-------	--

⁶¹ Information management refers to entities linked to the Biodiversity Information System (through data provision and management)

	Program Inclusion	Evaluation	Evaluation
Status of Mainstreaming			
The project is not linked to IA development assistance,			
sector, lending programs, or other technical assistance			
programs.			
The project is indirectly linked to IAs development			
assistance, sector, lending programs or other technical			
assistance programs.			
The project has direct links to IAs development assistance,			
sector, lending programs or other technical assistance			Х
programs.			
The project is demonstrating strong and sustained			
complementarity with on-going planned programs.			

IX. Other Impacts

17. Please briefly summarize other impacts that the project has had on mainstreaming biodiversity that have not been recorded above.

As described in the project's Implementation Completion Report, the Andes project is the first systematic and sustained effort of the country's National Environmental System seeking to intervene and influence the design of policies, regulations, programs, etc., of different economic sectors, and as such, it sets an example for the manner in which technical data can serve to inform sector policy design. In addition, subject to the signature of cooperation agreements, the Executing Agency would provide technical assistance to regional environmental authorities and other actors investing in protected area management and conservation in rural landscapes, including the GEF-financed National Protected Area and Biodiversity Conservation Trust Fund, which have expressed interest in such support to replicate tools and incentives to mainstream biodiversity in productive/transformed landscapes.

MAP

INSERT MAP HERE

AFTER APPROVAL BY COUNTRY DIRECTOR

AN ORIGINAL MAP OBTAINED FROM GSD MAP DESIGN UNIT

SHOULD BE INSERTED

MANUALLY IN HARD COPY

BEFORE SENDING A FINAL ICR TO THE PRINT SHOP.

NOTE: To obtain a map, please contact

the GSD Map Design Unit (Ext. 31482)

A minimum of a one week turnaround is required