

Management Response and Tracking Format
Final Evaluation of Project 00071603 "Biodiversity in Production Forests and Certified Markets"
Review Completion Date: March 31st, 2017

Key Findings and Recommendations	Management Response*				Tracking**	
	Response	Main Actions to be taken	On-call period	Entity in charge	Status***	Comments
We suggest returning to a practice introduced in other GEF-UNDP projects in Mexico, consisting of an initial review of the Logical Framework (LF) by an international expert in indicators, to ensure that the LF complies with standards such as clearly established final goals, SMART indicators that measure achievement (and not only performance) and a clear and uniform understanding of the final goal.	Partially Accepted	<p>This analysis is to be considered when designing new projects.</p> <p>In particular, work has been carried to develop a new project (A Landscape Approach to Strengthening Sustainable Forest Management), which includes several elements of the Biodiversity in Production Forests and Certified Markets Project. A specialist in construction and evaluation of development projects was recruited for its design. Said specialist coordinated a participatory workshop, receiving feedback from the stakeholders on the proposed assignment, and presented a proposal for a metric's framework that encompassed the inputs received from CONAFOR's technical areas and from the Monitoring and Evaluation specialists at UNDP.</p>	Permanent	UNDP	Partially completed	The observation is partially accepted, as an initial workshop was conducted as part of the project. However, it was more focused on establishing operating mechanisms and results, the indicators not being reviewed by international experts. Nonetheless, the results framework is considered to be robust; it includes SMART achievement indicators (as is indicated by the Mid term Review – MTR)
We recommended that the MTRs be executed with the timeliness established in the M&E Plan, since any delay in the MTR may result in missed opportunities to correct subsisting errors and/or reinforce certain strengths. While there may be different causes for this, we suggest that the Terms of Reference (ToR) should be evaluated in order to fix any weakness and ensure they are not	Rejected for this project, but a review will be assessed for upcoming UNDP projects	UNDP will evaluate the pertinence of a review of the ToRs that are published when conducting project evaluations, and determine if their simplification is relevant.	April-May 2017	UNDP	Lessons learned applied to other projects	Contracting was delayed for both the Mid Term Review and the Final Evaluation, not in order to achieve better results, but because either the received proposals did not comply with the TORS or no competitive bids were received in time.

seen as barriers that would discourage evaluators.						
It is imperative that the documentation generated by the project (e.g. best practices or systematizations guides), which would enable actions/strategies to be replicated in other countries, clearly highlight the national context (political, legal, and ecological) given that processes that can be very successful in Mexico may lead to the degradation of ecosystems elsewhere.	Partially accepted. While information management and South-South cooperation promotion are important, contextualization for other countries is not one of goals for the project.	The relevance of South-South cooperation schemes could be considered for upcoming projects. In any case, the driven processes, success stories and experience gained from the project are documented throughout the different knowledge tools developed to that end. The material is available through the institution and has been shared, when requested.	Does not apply	UNDP/CONAFOR	Does not apply	The project promoted the replicability of lessons learned and best practices at the federal level, even including States not considered in the original coverage. The project is considered to have achieved high local replicability and high potential for transferring its results to other contexts. As in any cooperative effort, what is shared must be contextualized and well-measured, and not necessarily considered to be applicable without adaptations to different realities. Nevertheless, contrary to the evaluator indications, suggesting that forest management in Mexico is easier than in tropical forests in other Latin American countries, and that replicability is a risk for other countries, we consider this assertion to be baseless and, in any case, to be a matter of analysis by the countries concerned.
Equity in the selection of Community-Based Forest Enterprises (CFE), taking into consideration that, as reported by some authorities and implementers, more mature CFEs were selected for the implementation of the program, given that replicating actions outside of the project would result in a slow process,	Partially Accepted	The recommendation will be taken into account in the design of new programs and projects	Permanent	UNDP and CONAFOR	Does not apply	For some of the issues, such as those related to competitiveness, work obviously began with the more mature CFEs, as required by the driven aspects (cost determination and sawing coefficients, etc.), and was then extended to other CFEs as the project progressed. On the other

<p>especially for the less mature CFEs which would require greater efforts from the authorities</p>						<p>hand, with regards to capacity building, biodiversity and certification issues, no distinctions were made. Work was carried on with CFEs having different levels of development.</p>
<p>A suggestion for future projects, regarding equity concerns, is the protection of ejido members benefits. During the project, some ejido members reported purchase and sale operations of ejido rights and individuals interested in buying them. In such circumstances, it is advisable that the authorities providing advice to the CFEs include topics on the benefits of revaluation and on the long-term benefits of their rights as an ejido member, in order to prevent disadvantageous sales transactions.</p>	<p>Rejected</p>	<p>Does not apply</p>	<p>Does not apply</p>	<p>Does not apply</p>	<p>Does not apply</p>	<p>The view expressed by the evaluator is contrary to growth principles and suggests maintaining the conditions of poverty and marginalization in favor of conservation. Such conditions have been proven to exert a greater stress on natural resources. Experience shows that ejido members know the value of the resources they possess. They do not sell these because they have greater growth expectations and are aware of the benefits they can obtain from being ejido members (and therefore CFE members). Unless the evaluator has evidence that the project encouraged the sale of ejido rights (which is not the case), what the evaluator does confirm with these assessments is that the project had a positive effect in the improvement of the socio-economic conditions of the target population and, therefore, confirms the attainment of one of the main goals established by the project.</p>
<p>Responsibility for possible replication of project practices in Protected Areas.- Prior to replication, it is necessary to</p>	<p>Partially Accepted</p>	<p>Continue to work with CONANP to consolidate the Sustainable Forest Development Strategy in Protected Natural Areas.</p>	<p>November 2016- December</p>	<p>CONAFOR</p>	<p>Partially completed</p>	<p>CONAFOR collaborated with the project in developing the Sustainable Forest Development Strategy in</p>

gather sufficient information to prove that certain types of management or environmental practices ensure the integrity of the ecosystems and the conservation of the biodiversity therein.		<p>Monitor management activities results and good practices applied in Protected Natural Areas (PNA).</p> <p>Collaborate with CONANP in the development of handbooks and manuals on Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) in PNAs</p>	2017			<p>Protected Natural Areas, which considers management actions for PNAs.</p> <p>CONANP has made progress in adapting the knowledge products from the project for PNAs. For instance, a section was added to the Manual of Best Practices to be implemented in these areas.</p>
Systematizing the information collected during the project. This recommendation refers to the information on conservation elements, identified within the CFEs thru monitoring activities, and which, when systematized, could enrich the knowledge repertory, ensuring its conservation and giving access to integrating contributions at the regional or country level.	Accepted	<p>Create databases of species identified in the High Conservation Value research and the actions undertaken for their conservation.</p> <p>Process and systematize the information on the species obtained from the Community Monitoring Programs, developed by the project and the monitoring programs of certified companies.</p> <p>Process and systematize information on the results of biodiversity conservation practices established in the Management Programs (biodiversity section) and their impact on species</p>	Permanent	CONAFOR	Pending	The project supported studies to identify High Conservation Values (HCV), biological monitoring training and the development of community monitoring programs, as well as the preparation of manuals to incorporate a biodiversity section in the Management Programs. However, the operational capacities were insufficient, as was the time required to process and systematize the information generated by said instruments.
Exchange of biodiversity records, between CONAFOR - CONANP and CONABIO, of information collected from Biological Monitoring.	Accepted	The actions mentioned in the previous point will be carried out and the exchange of information will be negotiated with CONANP and CONABIO	May-December 2017	CONAFOR	Pending	As was expressed in the previous point
Development of the Theory of Change Scheme.- While the Theory of Change (ToC) analysis, carried out as part of the project, is interesting, it has certain weaknesses. Therefore we suggest that the ToC scheme of the	Rejected for this project but will be considered for new ones	The PRODOC template for new UNDP projects calls for the development of a ToC (although not based on the RotI methodology). This analysis was not requested In the design of the project under consideration.	Does not apply	UNDP	Completed	The original design of the project did not include a request for a theory of change analysis. Near the end of the timeframe of project, an analysis exercise was carried out only to develop the corresponding scheme,

<p>ROtlmethodology, generated to this end for GEF projects, be used in other projects (as it is no longer possible to do so at present). While the Theory of Change (ToC) analysis, carried out as part of the project, is interesting, it has certain weaknesses. Therefore we suggest that the ToC scheme of the ROtlmethodology, as generated to this end for GEF projects, be used in other projects (as it is no longer possible to so so at present).</p>					<p>based on the documentation that was available.</p> <p>The evaluator insisted on criticizing the project for not including a ToC analysis based on the ROtl methodology, which is a new methodology and UNDP did not requested it.</p>
---	--	--	--	--	--

* Unit(s) responsible for the management response will fill the columns under the management response heading.

** Unit(s) responsible for management response will update the implementation status. Assigned to an oversight function – monitors and verifies the implementation status.

** * Implementation Status: Completed, Partially Completed, Pending