

# Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in Peru (LAC Region)

(UNDP PIMS ID 5497    GEF ID 9044)



**Mid-Term Review March-April, 2019**

**April, 12 2019**

**Elena Laura Ferretti**  
**Independent Consultant**

## **Acknowledgements**

The Mid-Term Review of the GEF Small Grant Programme Operational Phase 06 in Peru was carried out in March-April 2019 with the field visit taking place from March 23<sup>rd</sup> to April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2019. The Draft Final Report was delivered on April, 12, 2019.

The Project is implemented in Peru, in the Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) Region, under the GEF Biodiversity (BD) Operational Phase 6, Objective 4, Program 9.

The GEF Project Implementing Partner is UNDP while UNOPS is the executing agency; other Project Partners are organizations receiving the small grants, national and local governments, NGOs, the academic and civil society as well as the private sector.

The Evaluation was carried out by the Consultant Elena Laura Ferretti who would like to express her appreciation and gratitude to all those who gave their time and provided invaluable information during the review; their thoughts and opinions have informed the evaluation and contributed to its successful conclusion.

Special thanks go to the Country Programme Team of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Peru and members of the NGO Centro Bartolomé de las Casas who are conducting technical assistance and monitoring in the field. All of them professionally supported the organization of meetings and contributed highly to the success of the missions in the four countries. Finally, yet importantly, the hospitality of community members in the different landscapes has been invaluable and highly appreciated.

---

Acronyms .....	4
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	5
I Project Description.....	5
II Project Progress Summary.....	5
II Concise Summary of Conclusions .....	7
IV Recommendations Summary.....	8
2. INTRODUCTION .....	10
2.1 Purpose of the Mid-Term Review and objectives.....	10
2.2 Scope and methodology .....	10
2.2.1 Limitations and elements of attention .....	11
3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND CONTEXT .....	12
3.1 Development context: Environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope.....	12
3.2 Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted .....	14
3.3 Description of the Project and Strategy.....	15
3.4 Project Implementation Arrangements .....	16
2.5 Project timing and milestones .....	18
3.6 Main stakeholders: summary list .....	18
4. FINDINGS.....	20
4.1 Project Strategy.....	20
4.1.1 Project design.....	20
4.1.2 Results Framework Analysis.....	22
4.2 Progress towards Results .....	22
4.2.1 Progress towards outcome analysis.....	22
4.2.1.1 Global Environmental benefits and the GEF Tracking Tools.....	33
4.2.2 Remaining barriers to achieving the project objectives .....	34
4.3 Project Implementation & Adaptive Management .....	35
4.3.1 Management Arrangements.....	35
4.3.2 Work Planning.....	37
4.3.3 Finance and co-finance .....	37
4.3.4 Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems .....	39
4.3.5 Stakeholder Engagement .....	40
4.3.6 Reporting.....	40
4.3.7 Communications .....	41
4.4 Sustainability .....	42
4.4.1 Financial risks to sustainability .....	42
4.4.2 Socio-economic risks to sustainability .....	43
4.4.3 Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability.....	43
4.4.4 Environmental risks to sustainability .....	44
5.1 Conclusions .....	45
5.2 Recommendations .....	46
<b>Annex A – Terms of Reference,</b> .....	<b>47</b>
<b>Annex B – Document consulted/available for consultation .....</b>	<b>48</b>

Annex C – Evaluation Questions .....	49
Annex D - Schedule, Itinerary and Institutions/People met: March-April 2019 .....	54
Annex E – Landscapes Grants Summaries of Achievements: Arequipa, Cusco, Puno, Tacna.....	56
Annex F – Status of Grants Received/Implemented per Landscape, Summary Table as of March 2019 .....	66

---

**Annex G Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

**Table N. 1 Project Summary Table**

**Table N.2 MTR Ratings & Achievements Table**

**Table N.3 Summary of Recommendations**

**Table N.4 SGP Stakeholders and Partners**

**Table N.5 Results Framework Matrix, with achievements and rating**

**Table N.6 Grants allocations by thematic area in US\$**

**Table N. 7 Budget allocations and expenditures per Outcome (US\$)**

**Table N.8 Grants allocations by landscape in US\$**

**Table N.9 Co-financing allocations in US\$**

**Table N.10 Recommendations**

---

## Acronyms

AEDES	Asociacion Especializada para el Desarrollo Sostenible
BD	Biodiversity
CBC	Centro Bartolomé de Las Casas
CBD	Convention of Biological Diversity
CBOs	Community-based Organizations
CCCP	Centro de Capacitacion Campesina de Puno
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CO	Country Office
CPM	Country Program Manager
CPMU	Country Programme Management Unit
CPT	Country Programme Team
FSP	Full Size Project
GEB	Global Environmental Benefits
GEF	Global Environment Facility
HA	Hectare
KM	Knowledge Management
LD	Land Degradation
LEAP	Local Environmental Action Plan
SL	Strategic Landscape
SLP	Strategic Landscape Platforms
NC	National Coordinator
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
NSC	National Steering Committee
MASL (masl)	Meters Above Sea Level
MoMs	Minutes of Meetings
MINAGRI	Ministry of Agriculture
MINAM	Ministry of Environment
MINCETUR	Ministry of External Trade and Tourism
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
OP	Operational Program/Operational Phase
PA	Program Assistant
PES	Payment for Environmental Services
PIF	Project Identification Form
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PMU	Programme Management Unit
QPR	Quarterly Project Review
RR	Resident Representative
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SGP	Small Grants Programme
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Time-bound
ToR	Terms of Reference
TT	Tracking Tools
UCP	Upgraded Country Programme
UNDAF	UN Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Service
UNV	United Nations Volunteer

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The present Report constitutes the Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the Sixth Operational Phase (OP) of the GEF Small Grants Program (SGP) Project in Peru, an initiative financed by GEF, implemented by the United Nations Office for Project Service (UNOPS) with guidance and oversight by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The evaluation took place in March-April 2019. The purpose of the review is to assess progress towards the achievement of project objectives and outcomes, identify risks for sustainability and provide recommendations.

**Table N.1 Project Summary**

Project Title:	"Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF SGP in Peru (LAC Region)				
UNDP Project ID:	PIMS 5497	PIF Approval Date:	April 28, 2015	Atlas Award ID:	00096493
GEF Project ID:	9044	CEO Endorsement Date:	29 November, 2016	Project Starting Date:	1 February, 2017
				Expected End Date:	31 January, 2020
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective:	BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4	Actual End Date:	31 January, 2020
Project Financing		At endorsement (US\$)		At MTR (US\$)	
Financing:	GEF	3,196,672		3,196,672	
Co-financing:	Government-regional and local	2,802,984		116,000	
	Beneficiary CBOs	1,500,000		1,700,000	
	UNDP In kind/grants	750,000		300,000 + 80,000	
	Private Sector	700,000		50,000	
	<b>Total parallel financing</b>	<b>5,752,984</b>		<b>2,246,000</b>	
Project duration	3 years: 2017- 2020	<b>Total Project Cost: 8,949,656</b>			

## I Project Description

The GEF SGP in Peru is implemented since 1998. It was upgraded as a Full-Sized Project (FSP) for the first time with this OP-6, in 2016; as such, it takes an integrated landscape approach to development and conservation. The Project is designed to empower community organizations to take collective action for socio-ecological resilience of their production landscapes in the Regions of Arequipa, Cuzco, Puno and Tacna in the Southern Cordillera, through design and implementation of grant projects for global environmental benefits and sustainable development. During implementation, the landscape strategies were designed taking as reference the administrative boundaries of each area. The objective is to overcome organizational and individual capacity barriers to conserving biodiversity and mitigating climate change in the production landscape. Community-based initiatives are implemented by legally established CBOs, in partnership with other stakeholders in each landscape and in coordinated pursuit of mutually agreed landscape management objectives. The Project document was signed on February 2017 but field operations started only in July, following the late recruitment of the Country Programme Manager (CPM). Envisaged to be implemented over a period of four years from 2017 to 2020, it only has at its disposal three years, from February 2017 to end of January 2020. The Project budget totals US\$ 8,949,656 out of which US\$ 3,196,672 from GEF and US\$ 5,752,984 from different co-financing resources. It is executed by UNDP and implemented by UNOPS, through the Country Program Management Unit (CPMU).

## II Project Progress Summary

The Project is a **highly relevant** project both for GEF and national policies and strategies. A **delayed start** slightly affects Project efficiency. Notwithstanding initial difficulties, the Project has been implemented in a **highly cost-effective** way. An accurate use of funds was instrumental to finance the largest number of

grants possible, respecting the original proportion of the budget allocating 70% of funds to grant making and 30% to the operational budget.

**Table N.2 MTR Ratings & Achievements**

Project Strategy	Rating <sup>1</sup>	Achievement Description
	N/A	Project design is relevant, appropriate and innovative: as a newly established Full-Sized Project (FSP), it takes an integrated, landscape approach. The drivers of environmental degradation are adequately exposed. It focuses on the weaknesses of organizations/civil society for collective action, to build and maintain resilience of socio-ecological landscapes. Design is based on lessons learnt; although not a requirement, an in-depth evaluation of past GEF SGP activities could have better informed design. At higher policy level, relevance with GEF, UNDP and national policies/strategies is undeniable. Yet, UNDP and the Ministry of Environment (MINAM) call for a geographical coincidence of objectives between the GEF SGP and the bigger GEF investments. The Results Framework is well connected through logical linkages; small-grants indicators are mostly coherently linked to those of the GEF project; the Landscapes Strategies provide the baseline data. Indicators are sufficiently SMART. Originally, but not coherently some Objective indicators were repeated in Outcome N.1; the error was amended and two targets revised to align with CEO's and Tracking Tools data. However, a few indicators are subject to interpretation, as fully explained in chapter 4.2.1.1.
Progress Towards Results	Rating	Comments
	S	<a href="#">Progress is registered in the Results Framework, with achievements and ratings in Table 5.</a> Projects visited manifest good technical and organizational results; mostly they are a second phase of already provided support. Most targets are on track, a few of them achieved and a couple of them off track. GEF grants budget is totally committed with 39 instead of 60 small grants under implementation; this results from a higher than planned absorptive capacity of organizations.
	HS	<b>Outcome N.1</b> Stakeholders are mapped and dialogue initiated; socio-ecological baseline conducted; four Strategic Landscape Platform (SLP) in place; Landscape strategies drafted and priorities defined; three Calls for Proposals conducted; 39 small grants selected, within 6 thematic areas; 16 projects led by women.
	S	<b>Outcome N.2</b> Shortcomings do not change the overall rating as they are mainly due to the way some targets are interpreted: the area to be covered with sustainable grazing/livestock management is within reach and beyond given the large spaces at disposal of camelid herders. Instead, the number of producers is lower as only camelid herders are considered for introduced livestock outside of GEF scope. The area to be covered with sustainable agricultural practices is off track but the reason relates with incorrect planning: plots in the area are small. Instead, there is intense activity to recuperate/conservate native varieties of different crops. The installation of efficient stoves and solar panels is achieved, beyond target.
	MS	<b>Outcome N.3</b> SLP are active but only recently starting to be involved in discussions on lessons learnt/analysis of experiences. Strategic projects are selected but three of them only recently started, being too early to be assessed. An additional strategic project on water management could be considered.
	S	<b>Outcome N.4</b> Lessons learnt exchanges for policy development are incipient and communication material is under development. A Communication strategy is developed and under implementation, compatible with the Project's stage of development. An effort to ensure visibility of MINAM on documents, web and audiovisual material is necessary.
Implementation & Adaptive Management	Rating	Comments
	S	Notwithstanding some delays, activities are efficiently and effectively implemented. The budget delivery rate climbed during 2018, in line with this type of projects. New working modalities are adopted, with an extensive use of information technology, reducing paper waste and facilitating the tasks of the National Steering Committee (NSC). The CPM and the PA make a solid team, where collaboration, trust and respect prevail. The NSC needs to be renovated, observing the rotation rule and improving reporting. Overall monitoring is satisfactory, takes place at different levels and utilizes a variety of tools. Reporting needs improvement at different levels, to ensure outstanding work is documented and decision-making tools in

<sup>1</sup> *Progress Towards Results, Implementation and Adaptive Management:* HS: Highly Satisfactory; S: Satisfactory; MS: Moderately Satisfactory; MU: Moderately Unsatisfactory; U: Unsatisfactory; HU: Highly Unsatisfactory.  
*Rating for Sustainability:* L: Likely; ML: Moderately likely; MU: Moderately Unlikely; U: Unlikely.

		addition to nicely produced knowledge management material are available.
<b>Sustainability</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Financial resources</b>	<b>ML</b>	The SGP co-financing system is effective in stimulating ownership and commitment; CBOs honor commitments and often their co-financing exceeds original intentions. Strengthening CBOs' capacities translates into empowerment, opportunities to access additional government and non-government funding through competitive calls for proposals and the ability to advocate with regional and provincial governments to finance activities strategically linked within the landscape; investments can result from the participatory budget process which is about to start. Some examples are promising, i.e. in <i>Puno</i> Landscape, <i>Melgar</i> Province water management is identified as a priority and organized women's groups already have water management project ideas, ready for financing. Co-financing did not materialize from local governments as expected; a new dialogue is necessary with newly installed authorities; among those visited, positive intensions were manifested ( <i>Melgar</i> Province, <i>Sibayo</i> district).
<b>Socio-economic</b>	<b>L</b>	SGP supports small associations living in very remote areas, often reaching places characterized by the absence of the state and/or of development cooperation; there are frequent cases of CBOs receiving funding for the first time. This translates in communities highly valuing the support received. It is noted that most of them are a second phase of an SGP action initiated under OP-5 or had previous funding and assistance from another organization. Some projects are reaching replication and scaling up stage; yet, they certainly need more time to be successful.
<b>Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>ML</b>	Landscape Platforms should ensure ownership by involved actors. A current challenge is the need to reinstate dialogue with newly installed local authorities. Although not unforeseen, it takes time to establish relations, gain the trust of people, obtain co-financing commitments and pursue the objective of converting strategic landscape approaches into local public policies. SGP works with shortly-implemented projects to achieve long-term processes. In this regard, the approach is sound to support both new activities to benefit some of the most vulnerable communities as well as already promising initiatives financed by either the SGP or other donors in the past. Achieving technical goals is the least challenge, while developing organizational, managing and monitoring capacities takes time.
<b>Environmental</b>	<b>ML</b>	Measures are taken to manage the environment to better reply to natural catastrophes. Adaptive management is widespread in projects hit by the 2018 harsh winter conditions.

## II Concise Summary of Conclusions

The Project is **relevant** in relation to GEF SGP strategies, aligned with UNDP and national policies and plans and instrumental for CBOs and NGOs living in the area. UNDP and MINAM claim alignment of the SGP with their geographical actions in areas where the bigger GEF investments are implemented. SGP small-grant projects are designed to produce: i) global environmental and local sustainable development benefits; ii) organizational capacities; and iii) knowledge from evaluation of the unique experience of recuperating ancestral knowledge and experimenting innovation. **Progress towards results** is satisfactory, with a few shortcomings and the need for key players to agree on the interpretation of a few indicators, given financial and time limits as well as the geographical characteristics of the area.

In terms of **efficiency**, the Project was initially delayed in hiring the CPM at Project start; however, once the CPM took office, and thanks to the long-term stability of the PA, who has the institutional memory of the SGP in Peru, management has been efficient and effective in implementing envisaged actions. A competent use of funds is instrumental to finance communities, which show the greater potential for reaching the most vulnerable ones. The absorptive capacity of the CBOs/NGOs is greater than originally expected, and the number of grants will probably in the end be less than the 60 originally planned. At small-grants project level, some functional delays may be present, mainly due to the organizational capacity of the specific association or the harsh 2018 winter conditions that in some cases affected implementation. At landscape level, platforms are effective forums for discussions although they still need further strengthening both because they are dynamic as more people join in and others eventually leave and because results were not yet mature for discussions on lessons learnt and local experiences. Without minimizing obstacles, which still limit the participation of civil society in environmental governance and the fact that capacity-building processes notoriously takes years to consolidate, some small grants projects are producing outstanding



results. CBOs are strengthening their internal organizational capacities and gain credibility to claim support from local authorities.

The recognition of the importance of the processes initiated is prevalent in the opinion of relevant actors. The **sustainability** of activities is likely in socio-economic terms, considering small grants are key, instrumental funds for these remote communities, some of which have received assistance for the first time; consequently, support received is highly valued. Institutional, environmental and financial, sustainability is moderately likely to happen, as different elements are not within their control, such as natural catastrophes – for which, however, communities organized with adaptive management; or the alternation of local authorities, challenging commitments. Communities are effectively empowered to speak for themselves, to be able to organize, plan and manage projects so that their capacity to take part in participatory budgeting or to access additional government and non-government funding opportunities are increased, especially when NGOs play a key supporting role. Strategic projects still have to manifest the capacity to link different experiences at thematic level to increase chances for successful outcomes and sustainability. Some grants are reaching the point of replication and scaling up. Promising initiatives should be given the opportunity for further strengthening. Management intends to cover the gap to reach targets in terms of land management, mobilizing co-financing resources for replication and scaling up. The Terminal Evaluation will be able to assess results in this sense.

#### IV Recommendations Summary

Recommendations are tailored to the sustainability and especially the replication of the Project and not to specific grants. The analysis of the sustainability of each project financed under a country programme is suggested to be done under a country specific assessment, and it is in fact the first recommendation below.

**Table N. 3 Recommendations**

N.	Recommendation	Responsible entity
<b>A</b>	<b>Outcomes level</b>	
<b>A.1</b>	<b>Outcome N.2 Reporting on targets should always clarify the interpretation taken.</b> A few indicators are subject to interpretation (see chapter 4.2.1.1): as this may change what is within reach, given resources, time and geographical characteristics of the area, it is necessary to explain which is the interpretation taken when reporting on achievements.	CPM, CPT
<b>A.2</b>	<b>Outcome N.3 Ensure more drive and stricter monitoring of Strategic Projects.</b> Three of them only recently started. The ecotourism strategic activity is split between two NGOs which have quite different approaches and require careful alignment of objectives and methodologies; this represents a unique opportunity but also a risk. To recuperate delays, ensure drive, monitoring and consider an additional strategic project in water management, depending on funds availability.	CPT
<b>A.3</b>	<b>Outcome N.3 Ensure a focus on the marketing side of the production chain.</b> All community agrobiodiversity projects should include a component to strategically link production to the market, within a landscape approach and ensuring an equitable price (added value for recuperated ancestral products/services). The agrobiodiversity project is instrumental in this way but only for native products, which are the SGP focus; beneficiaries seek marketing linkages also for other non-native products. GEF will not support non-native products but could consider them at policy level: this could influence district, province and regional strategic policies changes.	CPT, CBS, AEDES, SLP
<b>A.4</b>	<b>All outcomes. Ensure the sound gender approach taken by the project is extended to involve the youth.</b> This is a key activity to impact on the lessening of migration from the area and extend benefits across generations; a policy to systematically involve the youth is recommended.	CPT, CBC
<b>B</b>	<b>Project Implementation and Adaptive Management</b>	
<b>B.1</b>	<b>Consider a no-cost extension of the Project.</b> Aside from delays, the Project effectively has only three and not four years of implementation, from February 2017 to end of January 2020. Considering the nature of the small-grants and the fact that this is the first SGP FSP of the country, an extension is advisable up to 17 months, according to funds availability.	NSC, CPM, GEF Technical Advisor
<b>B.2</b>	<b>Reform the Peru NSC to ensure:</b> i) respect for the rotation rule, ii) replacement of members that have been sitting on the Committee for a long-time, especially when sick, old or are leaving (i.e. probably the gender focal point); iii) willingness and capacity to participate in pre-selection and M&E project site visits; iv) reporting on meetings is standardized and more informative of the decision-making process.	CPM, UNDP CO, NSC, GEF Technical Advisor, New York
<b>B.3</b>	<b>Document lessons learnt from previous and current OPs and prepare decision-making tools.</b>	CPT, CPMT

	Lessons learnt from previous SGP OPs are available but they are neither structured nor systematized. SGP Peru is only now being evaluated as a stand-alone Country Program, though in the past it was part of the UNDP/GEF Joint Evaluation of the SGP. Recent requests for information from MINAM could not be provided to the satisfaction of the claimant. The preparation of decision-making tools/documents/reports are recommended, in addition to nicely prepared knowledge management material, which are tailored for other, although important, processes and actors. The CPMT, SGP Global may be involved to provide inputs while documenting lessons learnt from previous OPs.	
<b>B.4</b>	<b>Ensure MINAM visibility in communication material and during meetings with stakeholders.</b> MINAM's requests for visibility have not been answered in the modalities required by the claimant.	CPT
<b>B5</b>	<b>Replace the Tracking Tools with the new GEF "Updated Results Architecture for GEF-7".</b> This new policy, approved in June 2018 by the GEF Council meeting, includes a set of 11 "core indicators" and 29 sub-indicators and requires projects to replace the TT with these core indicators. It is suggested to proceed to this adjustment as soon as feasible, possibly during the preparation of the next PIR or ultimately before the Terminal Evaluation.	
<b>C</b>	<b>Sustainability</b>	
<b>C.1</b>	<b>Assess results achieved at small-grant project level and design an exit-strategy.</b> Identify promising, yet not mature, initiatives to ensure they are not abandoned, even if the decision is taken to move the geographical focus of SGP for OP-7. It takes time and practice to ensure projects are not "islands" but instead fully coordinated and integrated activities which may translate into possible local development policies. In addition, working in the <i>sierra</i> is a key activity to decrease migration towards the <i>selva</i> .	CPT; CBC

## **2. INTRODUCTION**

### **2.1 Purpose of the Mid-Term Review and objectives**

---

This document is the Mid-Term Review (MTR) report of the Sixth Operational Phase (OP) of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Small Grants Program (SGP) in Peru; the Project is financed by the GEF and co-financed by a number of partners, including local and regional governments, beneficiary Community-Based Organizations (CBOs), the local private sector and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Implemented by the United Nations Office for Project Service (UNOPS), with guidance and oversight by UNDP, the Project started operations in February 2017 and is expected to end in January 2020. It is part of the long-term strategy of support to community organizations implementing grant projects to produce global environmental and sustainable development benefits. It is a Full-Size Project (FSP), subject to an MTR under the GEF Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) policies and procedures.

The independent consultant, Elena Laura Ferretti, conducted the review during the period March-April 2019 and elaborated the MTR report in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance, rules and procedures, in particular the Guidance for Conducting Mid-Terms Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-financed Projects and the TORs (Annex A).

According to the ToRs, the purposes of the MTR are to:

- Assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document
- Assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results
- Assess the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

### **2.2 Scope and methodology**

---

The MTR aimed at collecting and analyzing data in, as much as possible, a systematic manner so as to ensure that findings, conclusions and recommendations are substantiated by evidence. The rationale of the Consultant's approach included:

- i) A qualitative evaluation based on the analysis of primarily secondary data, documents and information collected, including the Results Framework, the M&E system, and interviews with stakeholders;
- ii) An analysis based on the evaluation criteria described in the ToRs, in accordance with UNDP-GEF guidance, policies and procedures, namely: Project Strategy, Progress Towards Results, Project Implementation and Adaptive Management, and Sustainability;
- iii) Evaluation findings assessed at landscape level, including the four landscapes addressed by the Project (Arequipa, Cuzco, Puno and Tacna) but with stronger emphasis on those visited during the site visit (Arequipa and Puno), mainly considering the stakeholders' perspectives of the project's adequacy and the perceptions of its long-term possibility for impact;
- iv) An evaluation based on both face-to-face and long-distance interviews with stakeholders;
- v) Field visits to two of the four landscapes but with insight on the four landscapes through interviews to relevant stakeholders. The selection of the landscapes to be visited considered: a) the number of small grants under implementation and their stage of development; b) availability of stakeholders for both individual and focus group interviews; c) geographical coverage; d) challenges experienced in adhering to the programme; and e) the geographical dispersion, distance, timing and security situation;
- vi) A well-prepared desk phase, key to the success of the mission;
- vii) An evaluation based on the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System.

The approach developed in four phases:

- a) Preparation Phase: a home-based desk review of basic documentation and literature (Annex B) provided by the Project and complemented through web research; first identification of gaps of information; preparation of the evaluation design: evaluation questions, proposed methods, sources of information and data collection procedures (Annex C); elaboration of the Inception Report, submitted to UNDP on March 13<sup>th</sup>, 2019. It included the tentative schedule of the field mission and the identification of relevant stakeholders to be interviewed (UNDP-GEF staff, local GEF SGP staff, grantees, beneficiaries, authorities, National Steering Committee (NSC) members, key informants) (Annex D: final mission schedule and people/institutions interviewed). Long-distance interviews initiated in this phase as well as a first analysis of the Results Framework and study of documents available (Table 5 Results Framework with achievements and ratings);
- b) Field Phase: interviews with the SGP Country Programme Manager (CPM) and other SGP staff, grantees, members of the NSC, UNDP Country Office (CO) staff, Government counterparts and other relevant stakeholders. The methodology of interviews included both focus groups and individual sessions. The process has been participatory to ensure the contribution of stakeholders to the analysis of the context, confirm data and information collected and discuss outcomes achieved. Open sessions served also as capacity development opportunities, allowing government and non-government organizations as well as SGP and monitoring staff to interact and share experiences;
- c) Draft reporting phase: the draft report was submitted at the end of the field mission, on April 12, 2019, in accordance with the TORs;
- d) Final reporting phase: following comments received, the final report has been completed. It included the provision of ratings to assess the relative importance of project's achievements towards outcomes as per GEF requirements (Guidance for Conducting Mid-Terms Reviews).

## 2.2.1 Limitations and elements of attention

The organization of the interviews and of the field visits involved a representative number of stakeholders within the four landscapes. It did not present major difficulties; project staff and stakeholders have been highly collaborative and facilitated meetings and interviews. Some critical elements should be considered in reading this report for the way in which they may have affected the evaluation process:

- Beneficiaries of small grants are often found over a large geographical zone and often in quite remote, not easy to reach areas; most projects are at an average altitude of 4,000 masl or even more; the rainy season discouraged visits to certain areas;
- Early 2019 changes of local governments and relatively new authorities within the Ministry of Environment (MINAM) challenged the collection of more informed data;
- The analysis of achievements and sustainability is not tailored to specific projects considering that there are 39 small grants projects under implementation plus 5 strategic projects; therefore, the focus is on processes although some more specific data has also been collected;
- The manifestation of results poses a question of “attribution” and it is not limited to the SGP OP-6 actions as often the Project supports activities already initiated under either previous SGP phases or other donors; yet, synergetic activities are considered an excellent approach.

### 3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND CONTEXT

#### 3.1 Development context: Environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope

---

##### *Environmental background*

Peru is one of only seventeen [megadiverse countries](#) on the planet (Conservation International, 1998). Its rainforests, cloud forests, tropical deciduous forests, and coastal and marine areas are widely recognized as being [of global significance](#). Lesser known to the general public but also of great biodiversity significance is the [puna ecosystem](#) of the high Andes. The *puna* is a high elevation (3,200 to 6,600 masl) montane grassland extending from southern Peru through northwestern Bolivia into northern Argentina and occupying an area of 14,960 km<sup>2</sup>. The *puna* of the Southern Cordillera of the Peruvian Andes stretches across the Regions of Cusco, Arequipa, Puno, Moquegua and Tacna and is characterized by snow-capped peaks, mountain pastures, high lakes, extensive plateaus, and poorly developed soils. The harsh climatic conditions of the *puna* both limit the types of lifeforms that exist there and favor development of endemic species. [The puna represents an important area for the conservation of endemic species of both flora](#) (i.e. *supu-tola* (*Diplostephium tovari*); the mullu-mullu (*Ribes brachybotrys*); *Puya raimondii*, the largest species of [bromeliad](#) in the world and a globally endangered species) [and fauna](#) (the most representative are the camelids: llama, alpaca, vicuña, guanaco and then chinchilla, vizcacha, puma, Andean fox, and pampas cat. Rodents like the Rhea (*Pterocnemia pennata*) and *Punomys lemmius*. The bird population, which is surprisingly diverse for such a harsh and extreme environment, includes the Andean Condor, a national symbol of Peru, which is listed as Near Threatened by IUCN).

[The puna encompasses a variety of fragile ecosystems, including bofedales](#) (diverse wetland plant communities), [Polylepis forests](#), and areas with significant populations of the giant bromeliad, *Puya raimondii*. *Bofedales* are an important ecosystem within the *puna* both for wild and domesticated species of flora and fauna and for Andean livelihoods and culture. [These areas are a key resource for traditional land management at high altitude](#), being a preferred grazing and watering ground for alpacas, llamas and sheep. Like agro-ecosystems in the Andes, *bofedales* have been intensively managed by people for millennia and are sometimes referred to as "cultural landscapes", i.e., ecosystems that are maintained by the ceaseless activity of humans and whose biota consists of highly adaptable species. [Bofedales also serve as important water storage](#) and thus have a climate change adaptation function: as runoff from *bofedales* is slow, they help to regulate the downhill flux of water and to ensure soil stability. They are also [important biodiversity hotspots](#) serving as critical habitat for many species of wildlife. [Polylepis forests](#), which occur between 4000 to 5000 masl and are the highest woody plant formations on Earth, represent an important natural resource for local people (for natural medicines, food, and/or construction and ritual purposes). Most of these forests, though now protected by law, degrade due to unsustainable (and illegal) practices, mostly overgrazing and fire. Since *Polylepis* resprouts readily after being cut, moderate timber extraction will not lead to forest destruction unless conducted on a commercial basis or in forests that are already severely degraded. In the regions of Puno, Cusco and Huancavelica the deforested area has increased from 328,440 hectares (ha.) in 1985 to 735,621 in 2000.

[The Andean region is home to a variety of native Camelids](#). The *vicuña* is the wild ancestor of the domestic alpaca. Conservation efforts over some 25 years have succeeded in bringing vicuña populations back from the brink of extinction. The global vicuña population is limited to five Andean countries, with Peru having the largest population. The [guanaco](#), the wild ancestor of the domestic llama, is struggling for survival as a viable wild population in Peru due primarily to uncontrolled illegal sport hunting. Peruvian law now prohibits use of the guanaco in any form; its fiber is second in fineness only to that of the vicuña.

The [global significance of the agro-biodiversity of the Andes](#) is well-documented. This area forms an essential part of the Andean Vavilov center of origin for a large number of cultivated plants (roots, tubers,

grains, legumes, vegetables such as kiwicha, yacón, arracacha, aguaymanto, sauco, with ocas, ollucos, quinuas and potatoes occurring at higher altitudes.

### **Livelihoods and Socio-economic factors**

Approximately 50% of Peru's indigenous population, mostly Quechua and Aymara, live in the Southern Cordillera and are among the poorest groups in the country. Elevation and harsh climatic conditions limit the types of production activities in the puna. Livelihood activities are centered around livestock raising - mostly native camelids (alpaca, llama, and vicuña), with fewer numbers of sheep and some cows at lower elevations and small-scale traditional agriculture. Most families depend on both livestock raising and small-scale agriculture for their livelihoods.

Alpacas are raised primarily for their fiber which is used for making yarn, handicrafts and garments. Alpaca meat is a secondary product which is both consumed by the producer and sold at market. 74% of the national stock of alpacas is found in the Southern Cordillera. There are two breeds of alpaca, the Huancaya, and the less common long-haired Suri Alpaca. Previous SGP projects in Peru have promoted the sustainable use of colored Suri Alpaca (most alpacas are white). Both breeds are well conserved; there is, however, some concern that genetic improvement efforts directed at improving alpaca fiber quality through selective breeding in Peru may be limiting genetic diversity of these populations. Instead, llamas are raised mostly as pack animals. Llama meat is a secondary product, which like that of alpaca is consumed by the families that raise them and is also sold at market. The fiber of the Vicuñas, the wild ancestors of the domestic alpaca is considered one of the finest and most expensive in the world.

Most livestock herders also practice agriculture, mostly for subsistence, for sale in local markets, and/or for barter (trueque), a traditional practice in the Andes that includes seed exchange among farmers and communities. Farmers typically grow a variety of native crops (e.g., potatoes, oca, olluco, quinoa, tarwi) and introduced crops (e.g., barley, oats, lima beans) in small plots distributed across different altitudinal zones, a strategy that reduces risk and contributes to adaptation and resiliency. Andean peasant farmers talk about "raising" their crops, not about "growing" them as they tend to know their crops so intimately that they prefer to refer to them in this familiar way. The vast majority of the peasant population of the Southern Cordillera is *not connected to the electric grid and does not have access to renewable energy* even though the potential for both wind and solar energy is great. Most people depend on wood, dung and/or peat for heating and cooking.

### **Environmental and Social Challenges**

Challenges to the social and ecological resilience of the production landscapes of the Southern Cordillera stem primarily from the deterioration of biodiversity and ecosystem services driven by current smallholder systems and practices. Smallholders continuously adapt and innovate their traditional systems/practices in response to socioeconomic and ecological signals. The current trend is towards growing fewer kinds of crops, fewer varieties of these crops, and in fewer plots with fewer seed exchanges between farmers while the use of chemical fertilizers, pesticides and commercial seed is increasingly common. While conventional systems and practices may provide short term gains in income, it is now increasingly clear that these often come at the expense of *longer-term degradation in the sustainability and productivity of ecosystems, including agro-ecosystems, wetlands, forests and pasturelands*. Cultivation of monocultures has led to increasing erosion and mineralization of soil carbon (organic matter), leading to decreases in soil fertility and water holding capacity. Attempts to offset the decline in soil fertility with the application of chemical fertilizers leads to nitrate and phosphate pollution of watercourses. Application of pesticides to counteract insect and other pests is unsafe with the lack of proper equipment, training and storage facilities; haphazard or ad hoc application of pesticides also results in increasing resistance by insect pests and weeds, as well as pollution of watercourses, wetlands and soils. At the same time, to cover the costs of conventional inputs, smallholders may require credit; under current marketing constraints (intermediaries, insufficient demand, lack of new, more profitable markets, etc.) they may find themselves unable to pay off accumulated debt. Those few Andean crops that have become widely popular, such as quinoa, are now



grown not only by traditional small-scale farmers but also by large companies operating in geographic zones that are not areas where the crop originated or diversified. Although this secures the conservation of the few varieties of quinoa grown for large-scale commercial purposes, it does not secure either the conservation of the huge number of quinoa varieties and landraces that exist or the continual in-situ evolution of these varieties that allows for adaptation and resilience.

*Overgrazing by livestock (mostly alpaca and sheep) threatens the puna, including the wet bofedales on which alpaca depend.* Stocking rates are unsustainably high, degrading vegetative cover and progressively reducing the carrying capacity for domestic and wild species alike. Although occasionally a relatively large number of alpacas and/or llamas may be removed at one time (a practice called *saca*), animals are not culled to maintain numbers within ecological carrying capacities but rather to sell to pay for extraordinary family costs. Overgrazing negatively affects smallholders as their livestock become *less* healthy and productive while degrading the habitat on which they ultimately depend. Approximately 39% of vicuña in Peru are now confined to fenced areas within the *puna* with the remainder existing as non-captive populations. These enclosures tend to be overgrazed, leading to habitat degradation and sometimes poor health of vicuña, resulting in lower productivity (less fiber and of a lower quality). As well, confinement of a large percentage of the wild vicuña population restricts genetic exchange and natural in-situ evolution.

*Relict patches of Polylepis-dominated Andean forests are threatened by a variety of factors including unsustainable harvest of trees for charcoal making, although Polylepis exploitation is prohibited by law.* In general, rural inhabitants are dependent on wood, peat and/or dung for fuel for cooking and heating. These forests are also threatened by *runaway fires* from land clearing for agriculture. *Illegal hunting* is a threat to specific species in the *puna* such as the *guanaco*, the *vicuña* the *Lesser Rhea* and the *Andean goose*.

*Climate change affects the puna and its human and other inhabitants.* Rising temperatures, decreasing precipitation and the decline of glaciers has led to concerns about the effects of water availability and salinization on local and downstream communities dependent on water from rivers originating in the higher elevations. According to the UNDP Human Development Report Occasional Paper on deglaciation in the Andean Region, Peru is widely considered as the South American country most vulnerable to water shortages. From the early 1970s to 2006, the surface area of glaciers in Peru has decreased by 30 per cent.

### **3.2 Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted**

---

Over the years, the Peru SGP Country Program funded more than 270 community organizations nationwide to support their capacity development through a learning-by-doing process. Communities are supported individually but also organized in networks for broader sharing and exchange of information and knowledge. The establishment of long-lasting multi-stakeholder partnerships (local governments, national agencies and Ministries, NGOs, the private sector, academics) in specific regions and around specific themes has been an enabling factor; lessons learnt are instrumentally used to consolidate the Peru SGP's more successful community approaches, with a focus on upscaling to achieve economic, social and ecological sustainability. Nevertheless, community organizations still operate under significant technical, organizational and financial weaknesses to be able to effectively act strategically and collectively in building and maintaining social and ecological resilience.

***The solution to the problem*** is for community organizations in the production landscapes of **the Southern Cordillera of Arequipa, Cusco, Puno and Tacna** to develop and implement adaptive landscape management strategies that build social, economic and ecological resilience maintained through the production of global environmental and local sustainable development benefits. **Five barriers are identified to achieve the solution:**

**Barrier 1:** *Community organizations lack the means and/or knowledge to plan, manage and coordinate their rural production landscapes with a long-term vision for the conservation of biodiversity and increased productivity and sustainability of ecosystem goods and services.*

**Barrier 2:** *Community organizations have insufficient capacities to plan their initiatives, implement and evaluate them effectively, and systematically derive practical lessons from the experience.*

**Barrier 3:** *Community organizations do not coordinate with others in taking collective action in favor of landscape resilience outcomes built on global environmental benefits and the strengthening of social capital.*

**Barrier 4:** *Community organizations have limited ability to systematize and disseminate their experience with innovations and experimentation of new practices, methods and systems.*

**Barrier 5:** *Community organizations lack the financial resources to motivate and support land and resource management practices and sustain or scale up successful experiences.*

### 3.3 Description of the Project and Strategy

---

The GEF SGP is implemented by UNDP since 1992. Community-based innovation, capacity development, and empowerment through sustainable development projects is promoted through grant-making supporting local civil society organizations with special consideration for indigenous peoples, women, and the youth. In Peru, the GEF SGP started operations in 1998; since then, it has supported over 270 projects implemented by community-based organizations and/or NGOs to conserve biodiversity, mitigate climate change, prevent land degradation and progressively reduce the use of chemicals in agriculture, while generating sustainable livelihoods. During the various operational phases, the Peru SGP addressed different regions and ecosystems of the country.

At the beginning of OP-6, the Peru SGP has been upgraded according to the SGP Upgrading Policy, becoming the first SGP FSP for the country<sup>2</sup>. Upgraded Country Programmes (UCPs) follow the same programmatic approach as other SGP country programmes to achieve global benefits through local community and civil society action, but place an emphasis on integrated solutions at the landscape level that can address the combination of income, food security, environmental and social issues that confront rural communities. This evolution, which builds progressively greater levels of coherence, consolidation, and strategic focus to the country program, culminated in the adoption of the current *community-based landscape and seascape approach*, which forms a central feature of OP-6.

The [long-term objective](#) of the Peru SGP OP6 project is to empower community organizations in Peru to take collective action for socio-ecological resilience of their production landscapes in the Regions of Arequipa, Cuzco, Puno and Tacna in the Southern Cordillera – through design and implementation of grant projects for global environmental benefits and sustainable development. Four [Outcomes](#) are formulated:

**Outcome N.1** Multi-stakeholder partnerships in the four Strategic Landscapes (SL) in the Southern Cordillera develop and execute participatory adaptive management plans to enhance socio-ecological landscape resilience and global environmental benefits

---

<sup>2</sup> Countries fulfilling a certain number of criteria (among others, number of years of SGP implementation, amount of funds delivered) are “upgraded” in the sense that they no longer receive GEF Core funds and are instead managed as GEF Full-Size Projects through the UNDP GEF UCP Global Coordinator.



**Outcome N.2** Community organizations in landscape level networks in the four SL within the Southern Cordillera build their adaptive management capacities by implementing and evaluating community level projects and collaborating in managing landscape resources and processes to achieve landscape resiliency.

**Outcome N. 3** Multi-stakeholder partnerships in the Southern Cordillera develop and implement strategic projects to bring adoption of specific successful SGP-supported technologies, practices or systems to a tipping point in each landscape through engagement of potential financial partners, policy maker and their national/subnational advisors and institutions, as well as the private sector.

**Outcome N.4** Multi-stakeholder landscape management group, local policy makers and their subnational/national advisors organized in landscape policy platforms in the Southern Cordillera discuss potential policy innovations based on analysis of project experience and lessons learned.

The Projects originally intended to achieve global environmental benefits by providing financial and technical assistance to approximately [60 community-based initiatives](#) and up to [four Strategic Projects](#) in [four](#) selected [Strategic Landscapes](#) in the high Andes of the Southern Cordillera. [Annex F](#) includes a summarized description of the main elements of the area. It is noted that the Project implemented an administrative instead than a geographical approach to landscape: the four original landscapes were *cross-regionally* defined, following the importance and extension of the natural resources. However, while drafting the Landscape Strategy, a political, administrative approach resulted more feasible; even so, this does not affect the substance of the action. [The strategic approach](#) to the solution is articulated by:

i) a community-based landscape planning and management adapted to the social and ecological contexts of the Southern Cordillera; ii) establishment of multi-stakeholder groups in each landscape; iii) development of landscape management strategies; iv) design, funding and implementation of grant projects by community organizations or networks of organizations in pursuit of or contributing to landscape level objectives; v) development of the analytical, operational, planning and management capacities of community organizations; vi) assessment of grant project impacts and experience and knowledge generation and codification; and vii) presentation of lessons learned and proposals for policy and programmatic change at landscape, district, regional and national levels. Alternative livelihoods will be supported in the SL through the identification and development of innovative products and services with special attention to the needs of women and youth groups. Some of these initiatives will be selected from previous SGP project grantees that require additional market commercialization or production capacities to enhance their entrepreneurial skills for scaling up.

The objective is to overcome organizational and individual capacity barriers to conserving biodiversity and mitigating climate change in the production landscape. These community-based initiatives will be implemented by legally established CBOs in partnership with other stakeholders in each landscape and in coordinated pursuit of mutually agreed landscape management objectives. The SGP Project collaborates closely with Regional, Provincial and District-level governments in the Regions of Arequipa, Cusco, Puno and Tacna, as well as with the private sector, universities, and NGOs.

The Project Document is contradictory on the overall period of implementation: although it refers to a period of 4-years, it is effectively signed for three years, from February 16, 2017 to end of January 2020. The Project budget totals US\$ 8,949,656 out of which US\$ 3,196,672 from GEF and US\$ 5,752,984 as co-financing from diverse partners, UNDP, including local and regional governments, CBOs, and private sector.

### **3.4 Project Implementation Arrangements**

---

The Project is delivered through the GEF SGP Peru UCP as part of its long-term strategy of support to community organizations implementing grant projects to produce global environmental and sustainable development benefits. It is executed by UNDP and implemented by UNOPS, through the [Country Program](#)

**Management Unit (CPMU)**. It observes the SGP Strategic Operational Guidelines and practice where the **National Steering Committee (NSC)** is responsible for strategic guidance and for making funding decisions on CBOs and NGOs grants while daily management is the responsibility of the **Country Program Team (CPT)**.

The Peru **NSC** is an independent entity composed of government and non-government members, with a majority of civil society members and including recognized experts on global environment and sustainable development issues together with a representative from the government through the GEF Focal Point who sits in the Ministry for Environment (MINAM) and from UNDP. NSC members serve without remuneration, rotate periodically and are appointed formally by the UNDP Resident Representative (RR), after clearance by the Global Technical Advisor. The NSC contributes to bridging community-level experiences with national policy-making.

The CPT comprises a **Country Program Manager (CPM)** (formerly **National Coordinator - NC**) and a **Program Assistant (PA)**, hired through competitive processes; a **United Nations Volunteer (UNV)** supports the programme for logistical arrangements/communication. The CPT supports the NSC strategic work and grant selection by developing technical papers; undertaking ex-ante technical reviews of project proposals; monitoring the grant portfolio and providing technical assistance to grantees during project design and implementation; mobilizing cash and in-kind resources; preparing reports for UNDP, GEF and other donors; implementing a capacity development program for communities, CBOs and NGOs, as well as a communications and knowledge management strategy to ensure adequate visibility of GEF investments, and disseminating good practices and lessons learnt. The performance of the CPM is assessed by the NSC with input from the UNDP RR, and UNOPS.

**UNDP** monitors and supports the project as GEF Agency as well as acts as permanent member of the SGP NSC. It provides overall program oversight and take responsibility for standard GEF project cycle management services beyond assistance and oversight of project design and negotiation, including project monitoring, periodic evaluations, troubleshooting, and reporting to the GEF. UNDP also provide high-level technical and managerial support through the Low Emissions Climate Resilient Development Strategies cluster, and from the UNDP Global Coordinator for Upgrading Country Program, who is responsible for project oversight for all upgraded country program projects worldwide. SGP's Central Program Management Team (CPMT) monitor for compliance of upgraded country program with the core policies and procedures of the SGP as a GEF Corporate Program. The **Country Office (CO)** is the business unit in UNDP for the SGP project and is responsible to ensure the project meets its objective and delivers on its targets. The RR signs the grant agreements with beneficiary organizations on behalf of UNOPS.

**CBOs** and **NGOs** respond to calls for proposals submitting their proposals for approval by the NSC, according to the agreed country and landscapes geographical and thematic strategies. Although government organizations cannot receive SGP grants, there is an important effort to coordinate grant implementation with relevant line ministries, decentralized institutions, universities and local government authorities to ensure their support, create opportunities for co-financing, and provide feedback on policy implementation on the ground. Contributions from and cooperation with the private sector is also sought.

**UNOPS** provides country program implementation services, including human resources management, budgeting, accounting, grant disbursement, auditing, and procurement. It is responsible for SGP's financial management and provides periodic financial reports to UNDP. It operates in accordance with UNOPS' Financial Rules and Regulations (provided these do not contravene the principles established in UNDP's Financial Regulations and Rules) as well as UNOPS SGP Standard Operating Procedures. UNOPS as the Implementing Partner shall comply with the policies, procedures and practices of the United Nations security management system.

## 2.5 Project timing and milestones

The Project Identification Form (PIF) was approved on June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2015; the document went through the GEF OP-6 Secretariat Review (as required for full and medium size projects), received the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Endorsement on November 29, 2016 and was signed on February 16, 2017. Envisaged to be implemented over a period of four years from 2017 to 2020, it only has at its disposal three years, from February 2017 to end of January 2020.

The timing of key implementation milestones registers some delays, mainly due to the time it took to recruit the CPM following retirement of the previous National Coordinator. Planned for May 2017, the inception workshop took place in July 2017, aiming at sharing among relevant actors the strategy, approach and work plan for the SGP OP-6, receive contributions, and identify opportunities for synergistic actions. Over 60 people from different public and private institutions participated.

To date, the Project has implemented **three Calls for Proposals**: i) the first one in September 2017: 120 proposals received and 19 projects selected, for a GEF contribution of US\$ 876,775. The first induction training workshop was conducted in Lima, in January 2018 for these first projects selected with 76 participants; ii) the second one in early 2018: 74 proposals received and 11 projects approved for a GEF contribution of US\$ 508,233; iii) the third one in late-2018 with 27 projects received and 9 approved for a GEF contribution of 384,462. In addition, five Strategic Projects have been approved: the Technical Assistance and Monitoring project in April 2018; the Agrobiodiversity project in June 2018 and two Ecotourism projects plus one project for the Management of Camelids in early 2019.

## 3.6 Main stakeholders: summary list

The Project's stakeholders are summarized in the table below:

**Table N.4 SGP Stakeholders and Partners**

Type of Stakeholder	Role/Type of Collaboration
Legally established <b>Community-Based Organizations</b> , including women's groups	Primary stakeholders: those forming multi-stakeholder partnerships, signing partnerships agreements, receiving grants among others. Women, ethnic minorities and youth are encouraged to participate. Many associations of artisans are women's groups. Associations of artisans, associations of alpaca breeders such as the Sociedad Peruana de Criadores de Alpacas Registradas (SPAR) or Peruvian Society of Registered Alpaca Breeders, associations of farmers, women's organizations.
Second level organizations and <b>NGOs</b> with active presence in the area and relevant focus	Participants of the partnerships agreements, implementing agents; participants of landscape level policy platforms; providers of technical assistance and training. Among others: Centro Bartolomé de Las Casas (CBC) ; Asociación Especializada para el Desarrollo Sostenible (AEDES); Progettomondo Movimento Laici America Latina; Suma Marka.
<b>Regional Governments of Tacna, Cusco, Arequipa, and Puno and Provincial and District Governments.</b>	Regional, Provincial and District governments are partners and representatives sit on the Landscapes Platforms organized in each landscape. Many of the in-kind and/or cash commitments did not materialize as originally planned; nonetheless, at project level, local authorities often commit and effectively deliver their co-financing.
<b>National Government</b> entities with programs that possibly contribute to achieving the SGP project objective	MINAGRI (AGRO IDEAS, AGRO RURAL, AGRO BANCO, Sierra Exportadora) MINAM (PROAMBIENTE, PAES) MINCETUR (PROMPERU)
<b>International NGOs</b> with relevant interests and objectives	The Suri Alpaca Network (Colorado, USA)
<b>Private Sector</b> companies whose business relates to alpaca/vicuña products, ecotourism, traditional Andean crops and products made from these	Participants of multi-stakeholders' partnerships agreements and signatories; potential participants of landscape level policy platforms (Chambers of Commerce, COOPECAN (Cooperativa de Producción y Servicios Especiales de Productores de Camélidos, LTDA); Peruvian Handicraft; Threads of Peru; Peru Art; AWANACANCHA ; Chío Lecca Fashion School

Interested <b>development partners/donors</b> with relevant ongoing projects	Helvetas; UNDP/GEF; EU; IFAD/GEF;
<b>Universities</b> with relevant academic departments	Universidad Nacional San Antonio Abad (UNSAAC) in Cusco; Universidad Nacional del Altiplano (UNA) in Puno; Universidad Nacional San Agustín (UNSA) in Arequipa; Universidad Nacional Jorge Basadre in Tacna; Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos (UNMSM); Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina (UNALM).

## 4. FINDINGS

### 4.1 Project Strategy

---

#### 4.1.1 Project design

Project design is relevant and appropriate; this is confirmed by the analysis of documents and policies as well as by interviews with most stakeholders, although with a few remarks that are explained below.

**Relevance under GEF SGP global strategies.** GEF strategies are articulated for each GEF focal area and draw closely on the guidance of the relative conventions. The SGP supports the generation of global environmental benefits in line with the strategic priorities of the GEF as well as national sustainable development objectives. The Project is aligned with the results framework of the GEF's Biodiversity Focal Area (Outcome 9.1) and the Climate Change Focal Area (CC2 Outcome 4A deployment of low GHG technologies and practices); with strategies for Community Landscapes and Seascape Conservation and Climate Smart Innovative Agro-ecology (Outcome 9.1); with the policy for upgrading of SGP Country Programs (GEF/C.46/13 GEF Small Grants Program: Implementation Arrangements for GEF-6); with GEF policy and strategies approved for SGP OP-6 which supports innovative piloting activities and demonstration of new methods and models at local level for eventual scaling up, replication and mainstreaming of successes and lessons learned with other partners (GEF/R.6/20/Rev.04, GEF Programming Directions, approved by GEF Council in March 2014). Actions taken by the civil society and local communities are considered a vital component of the 20/20 Strategy of GEF (i.e. partnerships formed of various stakeholders to achieve overall benefits for the environment and contributing to UNDP strategic plan, focusing on sustainable development). Capacity development of CSOs, with priority for CBOs and indigenous people's organizations, is a cross-cutting objective of the SGP.

**Relevance under UNDP policies and strategies** The Project's objective is in line with the UNDAF Country Program Outcome as defined in the CPAP: *Promote sustainable development through policies, programs and plans that contribute to environmental sustainability, climate change resilience and disaster risk management*. It is also in line with UNDP Strategic Plan Environment and Sustainable Development Primary Outcome: *Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor* and UNDP Strategic Plan Secondary Outcome: *Mainstreaming environment and energy*. In terms of CP Outcome(s): *Promote sustainable development through policies, programs and plans that contribute to environmental sustainability, climate change resilience and disaster risk management* and in terms of expected CPAP Output (s): *Management instruments designed and in the process of implementation that contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity at local, national and regional levels*.

**Relevance under national policies and strategies.** The project is consistent with national priorities and plans, specifically the General Law for the Environment (MINAM), art. 20 for the protection, recuperation and rehabilitation of degraded systems; the Environmental National Action Plan 2011-2021 for the sustainable conservation and use of biodiversity and ecosystems (Result N.5); with the National Policy and Strategy of Water Resources (ANA-MINAGRI) for the sustainable management of water resources within an adaptive policy to climate change; with the National Biodiversity Strategy (MINAM - 2021) and the Regional Strategies for Biological Diversity and its Action Plans (2014-2018) by valuing biodiversity and ensuring ecosystem functions while benefitting local populations; with the National Strategies for Wetlands (MINAM); with the National Program for the Restoration of Ecosystems and Degraded Areas (SERFOR-MINAGRI) as the project aims at restoring the high Andes *puna* montane grassland, bofedales, forests and agricultural areas, therefore contributing to the objective of restoring 3,2 millions ha. of land as part of the 20+20 Initiative; with the National Bio-trade Strategy and its 2025 Action Plan (MINCETUR); with the National Strategy for Rural Community Tourism (MINCETUR) by addressing ecotourism objectives focusing

on the youth; with the National Climate Change Strategy and the National Forest and Climate Change Strategy to mitigate climate change by reducing deforestation, promoting reforestation and revegetation activities and promoting sustainable agricultural and animals management practices. It is also aligned with the National Livestock Plan (2017-2021 MINAGRI) and the National Camelids Program (INIA-MINAGRI) to ensure sustainable productive systems and reducing vulnerability as well as improving the value of production, in particular of camelids: the SGP takes actions to improve the genetic of llamas and alpacas and to recuperate varieties of color alpacas (*suri*) generating alternative technologies and promoting sustainable production and genetic conservation. GEF SGP OP-6 activities are linked with the National Rural Agrarian Productive Development Program (AGRORURAL), given the emphasis on conserving, restoring and/or improving the productivity and sustainability of the high Andean landscapes with the aim of increasing social and ecological resilience of the most vulnerable inhabitants.

The Peru SGP contributes to three strategic objectives of the Biodiversity Convention that is biodiversity conservation, its sustainable use and fair and equitable participation to the benefits of its use. The nature of the participatory planning process and the holistic integrated approach to pursuing socio-ecological resilience across these landscapes also support a number of AICHI biodiversity targets, including:

- Target 1: By 2020, People are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably*
- Target 2: By 2020, biodiversity values are integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and national accounts.*
- Target 3: By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced*
- Target 4: By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity.*
- Target 5: By 2020, the genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives is maintained.*
- Target 6: By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services are restored and safeguarded.*
- Target 7: By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems.*
- Target 8: By 2020, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities and their customary use, are respected.*

Notwithstanding coincidence of objective at the higher policy level, UNDP points to a lack of coincidence with the geographical objectives of UNDP, in Peru; reportedly, the decisions of the NSC did not consider a UNDP CO proposal to work in areas other than the Southern Cordillera where UNDP was already implementing other GEF projects. The initial design intentions focused on two critical ecoregions of the country, the northwest and the Southern Cordillera. However, the challenge of covering two important and large geographical regions at the same time plus concerns related to the El Niño phenomenon, which was expected to affect the north, led to the decision to target the Southern Cordillera. Effectively, El Niño could have jeopardized activities proposed, reduced the capacity of local government for co-financing and therefore reduced chances for impact. Given the breadth of the area and funds availability, the decision appears correct. Without denying the strength of SGP's ability to reach the most vulnerable population, UNDP considers that geographical alignment would increase chances to translate results into regional and possibly national policies. This vision coincides with the current view of MINAM, which manifests its intention to continue allocating funds from the country's STAR allocation to the SGP, provided the upcoming SGP OP-7 complement the bigger GEF investments, which are mostly located in the Amazonia.

Project design adequately lays out the drivers of environmental degradation but points mainly to a capacity problem, which is the organizational weakness of collective action by civil society to build and maintain the

resilience of socioecological landscapes. The approach aims at enhancing social and ecological resilience through community-based, community-driven projects to conserve biodiversity, optimize ecosystem services, manage land – particularly agro-ecosystems – and water sustainably, and mitigate climate change. The approach is based on lessons learnt and experience gained from global (i.e. COMPACT<sup>3</sup> and COMDEKS<sup>4</sup> initiatives), national (e.g. the BioCorredores para el Buen Vivir in the Ecuador Cordillera) and, local previous SGP OPs in Peru, among others: i) taking thematic approaches; ii) strengthening women's organizations and further empowering women in areas where they already show a certain strength (i.e. Puno); iii) reaching very remote communities, often with a zero presence from the state and/or other cooperation initiatives; iv) a multi-faceted approach directed at conserving resources but also generating income for very poor communities.

Project design presents a few **elements of innovation**. Compared to past SGP Country Programs in Peru, this is a FSP taking an integrated landscape approach which mainly means: i) a focused territorial approach, ii) allocations of grants to communities gathered in strategic partnerships among them and including a number of different actors instead of individual grants to communities scattered all over the country; iii) a coordination and monitoring system based on hiring a national experienced organization for the overall coordination but utilizing landscape-based promoters; this is a way to maintain close local contact and reduce the workload on the CPT; iv) an assessment of past successful initiatives and the design of an upscaling program to be implemented and further evaluated for impact and lessons learned for adaptive management, policy discussion and potential extension of the model to other country's areas. In this way, project design directly addresses elements of sustainability.

#### 4.1.2 Results Framework Analysis

The Project Results Framework is a well-designed, articulated matrix, which comprises four outcomes, each one expecting different outputs well connected through logical linkages. The Project objective and the four outcomes are well formulated. Indicators are sufficiently SMART; yet, originally but not coherently some indicators at the objective level were repeated at the level of Outcome N.1. During the Inception phase, the error was amended; in addition, two targets at the objective level were modified: one increasing the area under sustainable activities and the other decreasing the area under reforestation or farmer managed natural regeneration. These modifications, which reflect correct figures as per CEO and the Tracking Tools data, are reported in the Result Framework matrix, with achievement and rating in [Table 5](#).

However, as discussed below in the section related to the GEF Tracking Tools, some of these targets are subject to interpretation. A clear and common understanding of what is within reach is necessary, given the resources, time and geographical characteristics of the area. Indicators at small grant project level are mostly coherently linked to those of the GEF project, with the baseline indicated in the Landscapes Strategies.

## 4.2 Progress towards Results

---

#### 4.2.1 Progress towards outcome analysis

Analysis of the June 2018 PIR and information collected through interviews with relevant stakeholders, (SGP Project Team, the technical assistance and monitoring team led by the NGO CBC, representatives of the Landscape Platforms, CBOs and NGOs) indicate good progress to date, although with some delays mostly due to: i) delayed hiring of the CPM; ii) harsh winter conditions which affected field activities in some projects; iii) the early 2019 change of local authorities and iv) a contradictory interpretation in the

---

<sup>3</sup> COMPACT (Community Management of Protected Areas Conservation) is an initiative designed to complement and add value to existing conservation programmes, by supporting community-based initiatives that increase effectiveness of biodiversity conservation and improve livelihoods of local people.

<sup>4</sup> <https://comdeksproject.files.wordpress.com/2014/10/communities-in-action-comdeks-web-v2.pdf>



numbers of years available for project implementation, which is reported as four years in the project document but which effectively amount to three years.

CBO and NGO projects have been selected through Calls for Proposals and according to the Landscape Strategy, designed in accordance with the COMDEKS methodology. This provides the occasion for a truly participatory analysis of each area's challenges and opportunities, definition of a baseline, selection of outcomes and indicators and identification of the typology of projects to be selected and implemented within each SL. The Landscape Strategy documents are simply and consistently drafted across the four landscapes, with full involvement of beneficiaries under the guidance of the Peru SGP Country Team and the Strategic Landscape Platforms (SLP), organized at Project start.

The Calls for Proposals process has been well implemented with the CPT having accurately prepared the terms of reference according to the previously defined Landscape Strategies, and guided beneficiaries in preparing proposals as well as the NSC in its process of projects selection. New working modalities compared to past OPs in Peru are implemented, with an instrumental use of information technology with minimum paper waste as information is exchanged through internet and fully saved in the Cloud.

Financial resources were not planned to be uniformly distributed across the landscapes. Notwithstanding, to date there are 39 CBOs/NGOs projects under implementation, evenly distributed within the four landscapes and designed in accordance with the Landscape Strategy and the six Thematic Areas, that is: i) Agrobiodiversity; ii) Management of Camelids; iii) Community Ecotourism; iv) Bio-trade; v) Climate Change and vi) Water and Ecosystem Management. Committed GEF resources amount to US\$ 1,666,643, a little bit over the original budget, which is possible because of availability of leftover resources from previous OPs. Consequently, the GEF budget is already spent. A few more small-grants may be funded before Project end, partly using additional GEF leftover resources and partly through co-financed scaling up and replication. Yet, it is unlikely to reach the 60 small-grants originally planned, a number probably based on an average calculation of US\$ 25,000, which is quite below the overall aggregate absorptive capacity of current organizations. Even so, projects remain within the maximum limits of US\$ 50,000 for CBOs and US\$ 150,000 for NGOs, which generally lead strategic projects.

In addition, and as planned, there are five Strategic Projects under implementation, led by NGOs: the Technical Assistance and Monitoring project (started in April 2018), covering all landscapes; the Sustainable Agrobiodiversity project (started in June 2018) and the Camelids Sustainable Management project (started in early 2019) both of which cover all landscapes; and two Ecotourism projects, both covering the Puno-Cusco area, which started in early 2019. The five projects absorb a total GEF budget of US\$ 620,000.

Progress towards outcomes is registered in the Results Framework matrix, with achievements here below in [Table 5](#), based on the Project's four outcomes and indicators, with provision of ratings as required by the ToRs with coloring follows the GEF MTR Guidelines:

Green: Completed, indicator shows successful achievements	Yellow: Indicator shows expected completion by the EOP	Red: Indicator shows poor achievement – unlikely to be completed by project closure
---	--	---

In addition, information on the small-grant projects is provided in [Annex E](#), with a short comment based on the appreciation of management for the projects not visited and a description of main activities with a MTR comment for those visited or for which a stronger analysis has been possible. The reconstruction is not meant to be fully informative but to provide an easy-to-read, summarized picture to the reader in assessing performance. The following comments complement or highlight elements of Table 5 and of Annex E.



**Table N.5 Results Framework Matrix, with achievements, comments and rating**

<b>Long-Term Project Objective:</b> To empower community organizations in four landscapes of the Southern Cordillera of southern Peru to take collective action for socio-ecological resilience of their production landscapes - through design and implementation of coordinated grant projects for global environmental benefits and sustainable development <b>Component 1:</b> Resilient landscapes for sustainable development and global environmental protection				
Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	End of project target level	Progress as of March 2019	Rating & Comment: On Track
A. Increased area of sustainably managed production landscapes that integrate biodiversity conservation in four Strategic Landscapes of the Southern Cordillera	50,000 ha sustainably managed in the four Strategic Landscapes	145,762 ha with sustainable activities under implementation in the Strategic Landscapes	-39 committed grant community projects complemented by the thematic strategic projects cover 113,485 ha within 34 of the 56 districts, included in the 4 SLS. 16 projects led by women. Target was late in June 2018 due to: i) time constraints (it takes time to liaise with local population and see progress); ii) need to gain support from local authorities with advocacy before and after 2018 with arrival of new authorities.	-Target was increased from the original 124,000 ha to 145,762 ha. to reflect correct figures as per CEO and TT data. -Coverage may refer to the entire project area or the area effectively managed. To note that in the Southern Cordillera, agricultural parcels are small; while herders dispose of large spaces for animal (camelids) management. -Actual coverage corresponds to about 78% of the target. -The Project intends to close the gap with co-financed scaling up and replication projects.
B. Increased number of producers participating in community-based landscape planning and management	0 producers participating in community-based landscape planning and management processes	3,000 producers participating in community-based landscape planning and management	- 2,741 producers/participants (1,097 women or 40%) within the 4 LS in different workshops, including Inception; Setting up Landscape Platforms (LP); Participatory baseline assessments and strategic planning; Orientation for participating in calls for proposals; Single grants inception workshops (for groups of projects). Since then, more workshops, including the CBC M&E and training activities summed up.	-On track. -Interviews indicate a sound women participation and a correct gender approach.
C. Reduced degraded areas in the four Strategic Landscapes through increased vegetative cover	50,000 ha planted with trees/bushes in reforestation campaigns in the four Strategic Landscapes. 200 hectares under farmer managed natural regeneration	80,121 ha. under reforestation or farmer managed natural regeneration	-50,127 ha under reforestation or farmer managed natural regeneration (mainly grasses) covered by 18 Projects (that is 62% of target).	-Target was decreased from the original 150,000 ha to 80,121ha. to reflect correct figures as per CEO and TT data. -Similarly, to target A, the prodoc does not provide clear indications for its interpretation. Most of the Project areas lies over 4,000 masl with the main natural vegetation being grassland and shrubs. -Coverage is good and target almost on track (62%) if reforestation and revegetation are taken together (it includes actions under target C and

				targets 1.2.1 and 1.2.2) and considering that reforestation in a GEF project is encouraged only with native species (and not commercial species like pine or eucalyptus, which are used in the highlands between 2,500–3,500 masl.) -The Project intends to close the gap with co-financed scaling up and replications projects.
D. Increased number of communities, within the Strategic Landscapes, participating in capacity development activities, to improve the social and financial sustainability of their organizations.	500 livestock producers trained in sylvopastoral systems	2,400 producers trained in agro-ecological practices and systems  1,800 livestock producers trained in sylvopastoral systems  2,400 CSO representatives participating in trainings to improve the financial and administrative sustainability of their community organizations	<b>Target D1:</b> 1,135 producers trained in agro-ecological practices and systems (50% ladies) with topics covering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Camelids raising and habitat improvement</li> <li>• Water management</li> <li>• Sustainable agriculture</li> <li>• Conservation of biodiversity.</li> </ul> <b>Target D2:</b> 329 livestock producers trained in sylvo-pastoral systems with topics covering camelids raising and habitat improvement. <b>Target D3</b> 1,464 CSO (682 ladies or 47%) participants in trainings led by SGP team and/or CBC monitoring team to improve organization, planning, M&E and financial and administrative sustainability, gender development; Marketing among others	- <b>Target D1</b> almost on track with a 47% coverage. - <b>Target D2</b> off track but this is an error in planning as in the area there is limited demand of sylvopastoral systems: tree growing is limited at high altitudes where camelids are raised. SGP does not work with other cattle, which are usually at lower altitudes where more trees may grow. - <b>Target D3</b> is on track with a 60% coverage
E. Increased number of knowledge-sharing events and instances with other SGP partners with similar projects and broader experience at national and regional levels	400 CSO representatives participating in trainings to improve the financial and administrative sustainability their community organizations	24 workshops for knowledge sharing, exchange of experiences and fora in which project participants have participated	-7 workshops or forums conducted to exchange information with representatives of the different projects and of the 4 SLS (187 participants, with 128 men and 59 women); 4 more events are planned for may June	-Target is not on track but the greatest number of meetings to exchange experiences are planned for the next phases. The number of participants to the forums already held is not available.
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Multi-stakeholder partnerships in the four Strategic Landscapes in the Southern Cordillera develop and execute participatory adaptive management plans to enhance socio-ecological landscape resilience and global environmental benefits. GEF budget: US\$ 120,000				
<b>Output 1.1</b> Formal multi-stakeholder groups organized for each of the four SL <b>Output 1.2</b> Formal multi-stakeholder agreements agreed and signed regarding long-term outcomes for each landscape <b>Output 1.3</b> Participatory research and planning processes instituted leading to comprehensive socio-ecological baseline assessments <b>Output 1.4</b> Landscape strategies developed by multi-stakeholder groups <b>Output 1.5</b> Typology of community level projects developed and agreed my multi-stakeholder groups together with eligibility criteria				
Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	End of project target level	Progress as of March 2019	Comment & Rating: On Track
1.1.1 Increased number of multi-stakeholder governance	0 multi-stakeholder governance platforms	At least four multi-stakeholder landscape	-Main stakeholders mapped - Dialogue to define vision and strategy initiated	-Target achieved with LP effectively working; leaders active in disseminating

platforms established and strengthened to support participatory landscape planning and adaptive management in the four Strategic Landscapes.	established in the four Strategic Landscapes	governance platforms in place (one in each Strategic Landscape) and functioning	and on-going -Socio-ecological baseline assessments conducted (5 workshops, 257 participants out of which 32% women in August 2017) and validated -4 multi-stakeholder Landscape Platforms in place (6 to 9 members, with communities, farmers, civil society, local authorities and private sector, 40% women) -3 Calls for proposals events organized with representatives from each platform participation	info for calls for proposals and in encouraging participation -Calls for proposals are also events to share experiences -No evidence of formal agreements being signed but the strategy reports names of participants and is signed - LP are dynamic space for concertation where new members can join at any time -Early 2019 change of local authorities require to initiate a new dialogue and strengthen agreements -Platforms appreciated by actors with intention of possibly internalize them
1.1.2 Four participatory landscape strategies and adaptive management plans for the four Strategic Landscapes	0 strategies to enhance social and ecological resilience of the four Strategic Landscapes	One landscape management strategy and plan per Strategic Landscape delineating landscape level outcomes and other elements	- A Strategy with long-term outcomes and typology of community-based projects defined in each LS (Arequipa; Cusco; Puno and Tacna-Capaso) and approved by the SGP NSC (using SGP/COMDEKS methodologies) -Priorities defined incorporated into the requisites of the calls for proposals for community projects	-Strategies are simple and uniform documents across the landscapes, easy to understand for actors and clearly defining priorities -The participatory process appears effective -No evidence that adaptive management plans have been defined as such but the strategy is in itself an adaptive plan -Need to ensure that new local authorities share priorities defined
1.1.3 Typology of community level projects developed and agreed by multi-stakeholder groups (together with eligibility criteria) as outputs to achieve landscape level outcomes	<i>(not set or not applicable)</i>	60 or more community-based projects identified and aligned with landscape strategies, identified and agreed by multi-stakeholder landscape-level groups during the FSP lifetime and implemented by CBOs and NGOs in partnership with others in the four SLs.	-39 community-based projects selected by NSC during 3 calls for proposals: large majority led by CBOs and only a few by NGOs. 16 projects led by women. -Projects evenly distributed across the four SL with Tacna-Capaso having the largest number and the largest investment and Puno the lowest -Projects covering 6 Thematic areas: • Sustainable Agriculture: 7 • Bio-trade: 6 • Climate Change: 3 • Community Ecotourism: 2 • Sust Manag. of Camelids: 7 • Sust. Water & Ecosystem Manag: 12  - Projects contribute to: • Conservation and sustainable use of native biodiversity;	-CBOs absorption capacity proved higher than expected mostly reaching the maximum ceiling of US\$ 50,000; GEF planned budget is almost entirely used with 39 micro-grants instead than the 60 planned -Left over funds from OP 4 and OP5 may allow more projects to be funded matching them by leveraging additional funds -No project yet fully completed but a few of them already reaching replication and upscaling capacity -Although classified within a thematic area, most projects have cross-sectoral, cross-thematic objective with a focus on one target more than another

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recuperation of native species</li> <li>• Recuperation of ancestral practices</li> <li>• Maintenance or recovery of ecosystems and environmental services (i.e. water)</li> <li>• Sustainable local production systems and food security</li> <li>• Diversification of livelihoods and generation of income</li> <li>• Community ecotourism income alternatives</li> <li>• Governance, capacity development/ strengthening, exchange of experiences and good practices</li> </ul>	
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Community organizations in landscape level networks in the four Strategic Landscapes within the Southern Cordillera build their adaptive management capacities by implementing and evaluating community level projects and collaborating in managing landscape resources and processes to achieve landscape resiliency.				
GEF budget: US\$ 2,091,343				
<b>Output N.2.1</b> Community level small grants projects in the selected landscapes that conserve biodiversity and enhance ecosystem services <b>Output 2.2</b> Community level small grants projects in the selected landscapes that enhance productivity and sustainability of small-holder agro-ecosystems <b>Output. 2.3</b> Community level small grants projects in the selected landscapes that innovate alternative livelihood options and improve market access <b>Output 2.4</b> Community level small grants projects in the SL contribute to mitigating climate change by reducing deforestation through application of renewable energies and efficient cookstoves.				
Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	End of project target level	Progress as of March 2019	Comment and Rating
1.2.1 Increased area under improved grazing regimes	1,000 hectares under improved grazing regimes and livestock management 500 livestock producers implementing improved grazing regimes and livestock management systems	9,000 hectares under improved grazing regimes and livestock management 1,800 livestock producers implementing improved grazing regimes and livestock management systems	- 20,756 ha within 11 projects set to directly contribute to improved grazing regimes and camelids management, including alpaca, lama and vicuña.	-Coherently with what stated above, considering small agricultural parcels and extensive pastures, here achievements are beyond target. -On the other hand, the number of producers is consistently below the target as there are not enough camelids producers in the area and GEF does not work with introduced livestock (cows, sheep, and goats). Yet, SGP facilitates training /replication to spread these systems to a broader number of participants.
1.2.2 Increased area of agricultural land under agro-ecological practices and systems that increase sustainability and productivity and/or conserve crop genetic resources	10,000 hectares of agricultural land under agro-ecological practices and systems that increase sustainability and productivity and/or conserve crop genetic resources 1,000 trees planted in	50,000 hectares of agricultural land under agro-ecological practices and systems that increase sustainability and productivity and/or conserve crop genetic resources 5,000 trees planted in agroforestry systems	-14 projects related to agro-ecological practices covering an area of 5,230 ha (about 11%) -5 projects to plant at least 9,000 trees in agroforestry systems	-Target appears off track but the explanation given on target 1.2.1 and Target C, at objective level explains the reason. -Second part of target on track

	agroforestry systems			
1.2.3 Increased numbers of fuel efficient stoves in use	100 fuel efficient stoves in use	540 fuel efficient stoves in use	- 4 Projects are installing 550 fuel-efficient stoves, replacing open-fire cookstoves and benefitting an equivalent number of families. 300 already installed and the rest under installation.	-Target completed with satisfaction of beneficiaries and with opportunities to scale up and replicate already occurring
1.2.4 Increased number of solar panels	9 solar panels	59 solar panels installed and in use	- 4 projects installed 66 solar panels and an additional 10 already planned, benefitting an equivalent number of families.	-Target completed although 10 solar panels are still under installation. Some projects with outstanding results, i.e.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Puno Landscape: installation of solar panel to bomb water to a number of small reservoir for animal management attracting interest of nearby communities for replication;</li> <li>• Arequipa landscape: 24 solar panel mobile kits for spinning alpaca fiber used by a women organization, with more efficient performance and possibility to increase ecotourism opportunities within the established eco-museum.</li> </ul>
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Multi-stakeholder partnerships in the Southern Cordillera develop and implement strategic projects to bring adoption of specific successful SGP-supported technologies, practices or systems to a tipping point in each landscape through engagement of potential financial partners, policy makers and their national/subnational advisors and institutions, as well as the private sector.				
GEF Budget: US\$ 705,449				
<b>Output N. 3.1</b> Detailed analysis of successful grant project portfolio and lines of work from earlier GEF OP (e.g. crop genetic resource conservation) to identify lessons learned/best practices <b>Output N.3.2</b> Potential financial partners and public sector institutions engaged in analysis and planning <b>Output N.3.3</b> A strategy to enable and facilitate upscaling based on the foregoing detailed analysis and identification of upscaling requirements and opportunities <b>Output 3.4</b> Potential strategic projects (up to USD 150,000 each) to implement enabling and facilitating strategies for upscaling of the identified portfolios and lines of work				
Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	End of project target level	Progress as of March 2019	Comment and Rating
1.3.1 Number of multi-stakeholder groups active in the four landscapes with strategies/plans for sustainable native camelid use, community-based ecotourism, and/or improved marketing of a variety of Andean crops and other natural Andean products by end of Project.	No multi-stakeholder groups with a focus on landscape resilience engaged in analysis and planning of strategic approaches to upscaling successful experiences with camelids, ecotourism or commercial production of key agricultural products	4 landscape level multi-stakeholder groups involved in analysis of experience, lessons learned and development of strategies for sustainable native camelid use, community-based ecotourism, and improved marketing of a variety of Andean crops and other natural Andean products	-4 landscape multi-stakeholder platform active in each landscape (see above).	-SLP active; dynamic platform where additional members can always join; challenging dialogue with new authorities which are alternating since Jan. 2019 and need to be integrated in the coming discussions on analysis of experiences, lessons learnt and thematic strategies for agrobiodiversity, camelids management, ecotourism.

1.3.2 Number of second level organizations established in the Strategic Landscapes grouping individual community producer organizations in sustainable native camelid use, community-based ecotourism, and/or improved marketing of a variety of Andean crops and other natural Andean products by end of Project.	(not set or not applicable)	At least XX second level organizations established or strengthened.	-6 second-tier organizations are being strengthened through implementation of the strategic projects: the agrobiodiversity project already active and involving different producers of native products while the camelids and ecotourism projects have recently started	-Strategic projects started implementation quite late; three of them started in early 2019. The target is off track but with possibility for recuperating the delay.
1.3.3 Number of strategic projects that support one or more of these three economic activities	No strategy currently exists to enable and facilitate upscaling by community organizations of these three economic activities based on the detailed analysis of successful SGP supported community experiences and identification of upscaling requirements and opportunities	3 Strategic projects to enable and facilitate upscaling of successful SGP-supported initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic Upscaling Project on Camelid Cooperatives</li> <li>• Strategic Upscaling Project on Community-Based Ecotourism with a Strong Youth Focus</li> <li>• Strategic Project on Value Addition and Marketing of Andean Crops and Products.</li> </ul>	-5 Strategic Projects have been approved: <b>-Technical Assistance &amp; Monitoring:</b> led by well-known CBC, based in Cusco. Started in April 2018; it supports projects in the four landscapes with a well-organized M&E system and provision of TA <b>-Agrobiodiversity Project:</b> led by NGO AEDES, based in Arequipa. Started in June 2018, it is active in strengthening associations and enlacing producers of native agrobiodiversity species (tuna, potatoes, airampo, sancayo...) to the market chain. Partnering up with a private company with experience in marketing Andean agrobiodiversity products as well as with a public-sector initiative (PROMPERU).	Target only partially on track as three of the five strategic projects only recently started, namely the <b>Camelids Management Project</b> and <b>two Ecotourism projects</b> -This is due to the fact that although Call for Proposals were implemented, SGP did not receive quality proposals and decided to relaunch the calls.

**Outcome 4:** Multi-stakeholder landscape management groups, local policy makers and their subnational/national advisors organized in landscape policy platforms in the Southern Cordillera discuss potential policy innovations based on analysis of project experience and lessons learned.

GEF Budget: 127,656

**Output N.1** Multi-sectoral policy dialogue platform organized for each landscape and one dialogue platform organized at the Country Program Level

**Output N.2** Relevant project and portfolio experiences systematized and codified for dissemination to policy platform participants as well as community organizations and networks, as well as second level organizations

Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Midterm target level End of project target level	Progress as of March 2019	Comment and Rating
1.4.1 Number of multi-stakeholder platforms organized in the Strategic Landscapes and at the Country Program level in which at least two in-depth discussions on lessons learned and potential policy applications occur during project	No such platforms currently exist	A multi-stakeholder platform is established and functional in each Strategic Landscape and at the Country Program level At least two discussions on lessons learned and potential policy applications occur	-One discussion on lessons learned and potential policy applications took place in each LS platform in September 2018, involving the multi-stakeholder platforms, project implementers and other stakeholders	-Activity on-going all along project development



implementation		during project implementation for each platform		
1.4.2 Increased number of publications documenting lessons learned from SGP-supported projects	4 publications prepared and disseminated in previous Operational Phases Communication strategy outdated	60 publications documenting lessons learned from SGP-supported projects	-Printed publications of systematization of experiences and lessons are planned and budgeted, according to the number of projects (currently 39); lessons learned are gathered by each project and included in progress reports	-Ongoing
1.4.3 Communication strategy in place and operational with effective dissemination	Communication strategy outdated	Communication strategy under implementation	-Communication Strategy designed, validated by NSC, and under implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A UNV Communication Specialist incorporated in the team;</li> <li>• Digital/social media disseminating SGP news: revamped SGP Peru Website; Facebook, Twitter &amp; YouTube accounts created/ updated;</li> <li>• 2017 call for proposals flyer;</li> <li>• SGP Peru brochure;</li> <li>• SGP Peru Projects Catalogue;</li> <li>• Six project histories published;</li> <li>• Call for proposals dissemination via SGP-hosted local workshops; radio, Website; newspapers;</li> <li>• Audiovisual material developed jointly with UNDP CO</li> <li>• Articles disseminated;</li> <li>• Professional photos and online professional photo stories</li> <li>• 3 Digital Information Bulletin "InfoPPD" disseminated</li> </ul>	-On track -MINAM has detected and reported a lack of representation of the Ministry in communication material, which is the cause of a tense relationship with the Ministry.
1.4.4 Traditional knowledge of native crop/livestock genetic resources documented and disseminated	Traditional knowledge of genetic resources relatively poorly documented and difficult to access for non-academics	4 publications and other forms of communication regarding traditional knowledge of native crop/livestock genetic resources	- Videos and articles about ancestral knowledge (i.e. Andean terraces for sustainably cultivating local crops) developed in collaboration with the UNDP CO and disseminated through the Web (i.e. UNDP exposure).	-On track
1.4.5 Farmers Rights under the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture discussed and materials disseminated	Farmers Rights poorly understood	4 knowledge fairs or workshops regarding genetic resources and farmers' rights One regional/national workshop on Farmers' Rights under the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture	-A knowledge workshop/fair organized in Nov. 2018 in Cusco, integrating the 4 SL, based on a discussion on lessons learned and potential policy applications event held in Sept. 2018 for each SL. -A new round of knowledge fairs /workshops planned for May 2019. -The regional/national workshop on Farmers'	-On track

			Rights under the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture is planned in 2019, with all projects and SLPs meeting for exchange.	
--	--	--	--	--



Notwithstanding some delays, since the CPM took office, activities are being efficiently and effectively implemented. A revolutionary transformation is not expected within the limited time and resources available; yet, some grants are reaching outstanding results and/or the point of replication and scaling up. Following the Inception Workshop in July 2017, SLP were promptly formed; soon after, a number of workshops took place to design the Landscape Strategy, identifying the baseline and the typology of projects to be financed. Three calls for proposals were implemented to date, delivering 39 community projects and five strategic projects. All community grants start activities following an initial training workshop designed to support CBOs/NGOs in understanding implementation objectives, monitoring, reporting, and communication/visibility tools.

The SGP supports small associations living in very remote areas, often reaching places characterized by the absence of the state and/or of development cooperation; there are frequent cases of CBOs receiving funding for the first time. This translates in communities highly valuing the support received. Projects visited or discussed more in-depth manifest good technical and organizational results.

The analysis of data indicates that most projects are judged by management as progressing fairly well, with only a few of them experiencing some internal problems. A few projects already have the three envisaged installments, but none of them is yet completed. Among the most appreciated results, there is the recuperation of ancestral knowledge for production and resource conservation; the management of water resources for human and/or animal use; the sustainable management of camelids through genetic improvement and management of pasture; bio-crafts textiles and the strengthening of women's organizations. Most successful initiatives are a second phase of an SGP action initiated under OP-5 (i.e. AASUPASI and ASCADI projects in Arequipa) or had previous funding and assistance by another organization (i.e. Suma Marka project in Puno). This is part of SGP OP-6 strategy to partly reach new vulnerable communities and partly support CBOs which already have reached a certain level of organization to make them sustainable, further empower their ability to articulate action with local authorities and eventually access further public funding and/or translate actions into local policies.

Activities are closely monitored by CBC, which acquired the contract for technical assistance and monitoring. All trainings and meeting are learning opportunities. CBC promotes and encourages an interesting exchange between producers to share information and prepare for replication and scaling up (i.e. in Puno, Fish Association Real Chullpita which implements an interesting system to feed water to various reservoirs powered by solar panels, and which is attracting the interest of nearby communities).

**Table N.6 Grants allocations by thematic area in US\$**

Thematic Area	Sustainable Agriculture	Bio-trade	Climate Change	Community Ecotourism	Sustainable Camelids Manag.	Sustainable Water & Ecosystem Manag.	Total
N. of CBOs/NGOs projects	7	6	5	2	7	12	39
GEF funding	329,656	287,023	208,129	88,174	300,885	452,776	1,666,643
In-kind co-financing	109,063	130,108	163,157	8,800	86,823	211,100	709,051
Cash co-financing	85,449	25,247	91,890	30,449	149,743	145,251	528,029

Strategic projects support thematic activities. Most projects started recently and at present, it is possible to appreciate only the action developed by AEDES with the agrobiodiversity project. AEDES articulates the activities of different organizations involved in the production of native products (i.e. CBOs producing native fruits such as the *tuna*, the *airampo* among others) and the recuperation of different varieties of the same product (i.e. Suma Marka, which is recovering a large number of native potato varieties).

Actors interviewed appreciate the SLP, which provide the opportunity to government, non-government and civil society actors to interact, identify and agree on landscape priorities, and therefore play a key role in guiding projects but also for the possible translation of activities into local public policies. Landscape Platforms do not meet regularly but are dynamic instruments where new members can join at any time and

where discussions can happen through a formal meeting or via e-mail exchanges. In Puno, this interaction is clearly defining water management as a main priority; civil society, supported by local authorities, manifest intention to stand up against the contamination of water sources by irresponsible mining activities.

In terms of achievement of targets, the Project is progressing well, being almost always on track except in terms of implementation of Strategic Projects and for some indicators, which however depend on the way they are interpreted (see below section on GEF Tracking Tools and Table 5).

#### **4.2.1.1 Global Environmental benefits and the GEF Tracking Tools.**

Global environmental benefits (GEB) generated by the Peru SGP were estimated simplistically over the short term because of potential aggregated impacts from the hypothetical future individual grant projects. Over the longer term, GEB are a function of the synergies created between projects through the landscape management approach, which targets biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services, sustainable land management, climate change mitigation, and water resource management through a decision-making process led by multi-stakeholder platforms. The approach closely considers local priorities for food security, income generation and the development of social capital for global environment and socio-ecological resilience.

As indicated in the CEO's comments to the Project Document, the GEF Tracking Tools as configured are not easy to be used in situations where the nature of the programme is multifocal and where projects are located over a large area and there's uncertainty apriori about the total number or the total hectares to be covered. The Peru SGP Country Program proposed to remedy these deficiencies by applying the Toolkit for the Indicators of Resilience in Socio-Ecological Landscapes and Seascapes developed under the Satoyama Initiative and extensively tested and utilized in different countries under the COMDEKS program. These indicators are specifically oriented towards the type of mosaic landscape as included in the Peru Country Program for OP-6. Reportedly, the Project utilized them while defining the Landscape Strategies.

The GEF Tracking Tools (TT) were completed initially on November 3, 2016, at project start and then during this MTR in March 2019 (see [Annex H and I](#)). The tools refer to the Climate Change area and to the Biodiversity area, Objective 04 Program 09 "Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation in Production Landscapes /Seascapes. As per the GEF "[Updated Results Architecture for GEF-7](#)", approved at the June 2018 GEF Council meeting, the GEF TT are being replaced with a set of 11 "core indicators" and 29 sub-indicators. This should be done as soon as feasible, possibly at the time of the next PIR or ultimately before the Terminal Evaluation.

During the Inception phase, two targets of indicators at objective level were modified to align with the TT: i) Target A requiring to cover 145,762 ha. (from the previous 124,000 ha.) with sustainable activities in the four Landscapes and ii) Target C requiring to cover 80,121 ha. (from the previous 150,000 ha.) with reforestation or farmer management natural regeneration. However, as mentioned, the way some of these targets are interpreted may change the picture and the following elements should be considered:

- Although Target C is not completely included in Target A, part of it surely is;
- An estimated 75% of the area to be brought under sustainable management of Target A is *puna*;
- Reforestation in a GEF project can only happen with native species and not commercial species, i.e. pine, which is widely used in the area;
- Currently about 600 ha. of relict *Polylepis* forests is under management;
- Most of the area is above 4,000 masl, which means that a large part of it can be regenerated with vegetation more than reforested;
- If Target C refers to the effective area under management within each single small grant project, it appears overambitious; if it includes the total area of the small grant project, it is within reach;

- In terms of sustainable agriculture, consideration should be given to the effective managed area and to the fact that farmers' plots in the Southern Cordillera tend to be very small; in this sense the target is probably overambitious;
- In terms of animal management, as herders tend to have wide areas at the disposal of their camelids, the target is within and even beyond reach;
- Recuperation and conservation of agro-biodiversity on-farm is significant, considering in addition to different varieties of *machua*, *tuna* and other endemic fruits and crops, the recuperation of a large number of potato varieties;
- There are two projects targeting the protection of the *Rhea pennata* (which is under threat of extinction), three projects targeting the protection of the *vicuña* and one project targeting the *guanaco*.

In Table 5, Results Framework, along with achievements, indicators are signaled as off track when not fulfilling the target; yet, given the above indications, the Project is on track regarding most indicators with only two of them falling short, namely 1.3.2 and 1.3.3 due to the delays in approving some strategic projects.

Overall, as most of the GEF funds have been committed, Project Management intends to close the gap from the current situation to achievement of the target through the upscaling and replication of activities using different co-financing sources. The Terminal Evaluation will assess this approach and the final situation.

#### 4.2.2 Remaining barriers to achieving the project objectives

Greater food security and/or generation of employment and income for resource-dependent communities from sustainable management of ecosystem processes and marketing of biodiversity and other resources should provide the primary economic incentive to these communities, individually and collectively, to conserve biodiversity and optimize ecosystem services. Community organizations are building capacities to plan and manage resources adaptively; the strategic projects should play a key role in making the action of the different communities and project synergetic, thus contributing to the sustainability of biodiversity conservation, land management and climate mitigation at landscape scales.

The Project seems to be well positioned to achieve planned targets as various indicators have already been fulfilled. Even so, as mentioned, a common understanding of the interpretation of some of the indicators/targets is necessary as, depending on the interpretation, some of them may be overambitious. Based on the findings of this MTR, the upcoming June 2019 PIR is the moment to make this situation clear.

The management of risk is based on a thoughtful analysis, which is included as an annex to the Project Document, together with identified measures for mitigation. One of the main risks was related with the low capacity and low knowledge of CBOs/NGOs in facing environmental problems through the correct identification and management of projects. This is a risk but also an opportunity as the focus of the Project lies exactly in empowering communities by developing and strengthening their capacities. All activities are fully participatory in such a way that needs as well as solutions are locally identified.

There is a widespread view among UNDP local staff, supported by Government officials, that the SGP should be better integrated with other GEF-funded activities. There is no doubt about the relevance of the SGP under national priorities, as evidenced in the section about project design, above; yet, it was also an initial recommendation of STAP to ensure that the SGP is better institutionally integrated in-country so that its outputs support multiple objectives and possibly influence other long-term activities. UNDP and MINAM call for a geographical coincidence in the next phase of the SGP with other GEF funded activities. If this approach is taken, well designed end-of-project strategies for the small grants should be elaborated to ensure promising but not yet mature projects do not loose opportunities.

The SGP makes use of the experiences of the past, lessons learnt and knowledge management in order to replicate or upscale successful experiences. Peru was part of a UNDP-GEF joint global evaluation in 2015 during which several countries were visited (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/thematic/sgp.shtml>); yet, Peru SGP has never been evaluated as a country program during 17 years of implementation; lessons learnt are available in some scattered although nicely produced knowledge management documents but not systematized. Although not a requirement, the design of the first Peru SGP FSP would have benefitted from a previous evaluation of the overall Country Programme to ensure the dissemination and adaptation of the most successful and innovative experiences throughout the different landscapes and with a clear understanding of the causality between actions and outcomes. This is a weakness that could affect translating actions into evidence-based local policies for ecosystem function and management.

Measures are taken to manage the environment in order to better reply to natural catastrophes. Adaptive management is widespread in projects hit by the 2018 harsh winter conditions (i.e. organizing protection for their animals and produce; delaying field activities; and/or looking for external help (i.e. the Suma Marka project which obtained donations of small plants for reforestation and the support of university students and of the army's soldiers for reforestation activities)).

Strategic projects are designed to be instrumental in linking projects within or across landscapes to strengthen CBOs production (sustainable management of Camelids) and marketing capacities (agrobiodiversity project) as well as to generate alternative income (ecotourism projects). Most strategic projects have recently started; therefore, it is too early to assess how successful and synergistic their actions will be. Bringing production towards the market remains a major barrier in the area. The Project focuses on the recuperation of native products; some of them require the elaboration of a product-specific management plan, i.e. the *sancayo* for which the management plan is ready or the *airampo* for which the management plan is delayed due to production weaknesses for lack of available extension of land.

The multi-actor platforms should ensure full ownership of involved actors at all levels, which could in the end lead to proposals to modify local, regional and/or national policies and strategies. A major challenge is represented by the need to reinitiate dialogue with newly installed local authorities, following the early 2019 administrative elections. Although this is not unforeseen, it takes time to establish relations, gain the trust of key people to get their buy-in to project activities, possible co-financing and pursue the objective of converting landscapes approaches into local public policies. It is never highlighted enough that the SGP works with short-time implemented projects to achieve long-term processes; as mentioned, some projects visited under this evaluation, which are showing results, benefitted from previous support. Achieving technical goals is the least of the challenges; on the other hand, developing organizational, managing and monitoring capacities takes time, and it is the only approach to allow communities to be able to pursue technical objectives as well as to apply for other government or non-government funds and have a say in local participatory budgets. Some projects are reaching the replication and scaling up stage; however, there is certainly the need for more time to be successful.

## 4.3 Project Implementation & Adaptive Management

---

### 4.3.1 Management Arrangements

The Peru SGP has been upgraded to a FSP for OP-6; the CPM was hired in June 2017 replacing the NC who retired in February 2017. Although an overlap between the two officers would have been ideal, the long-time presence of the PA with the Peru SGP ensured continuity and has not affected operations. The Country Programme Team (CPT) includes the CPM and the PA, supported by a UNV officer who recently changed, the previous one has been retained as communication expert. They are responsible for all aspects of project operations, including implementation, management, partnership development, knowledge management (KM) and M&E of the programme.

The CPM and the PA make a solid team both in the office and in the field, where collaboration, trust and respect prevail. The CPM is new to the SGP but has quickly gained the trust of superiors in New York to whom he directly reports and within the UNDP CO. All interviews confirm that he has brought new working modalities, with a systematic and instrumental use of information technology in small-grants assessment and selection, filing of documents and reporting procedures; this has required some adjustments from actors but finally made their work easier, quicker and contributed to an improved filing system, minimizing paper waste. The CPT accurately prepared the information to assess for the NSC members, utilizing a ranking system, which made the task easier and more substantial. For objectivity, it should be said that a more structured management is also the result of the programme now qualifying as an FSP with different requirements and more structured operational modalities. In addition, this process seems to have led to a decrease in the conflicts between communities to access funding because of the participatory workshops conducted and the appropriate conveying of information. This should be regarded as a success, considering that the Project works over a large area with over 3 million ha, which necessarily means that some districts or provinces have not been included.

In adherence to the country-driven nature of the programme, the CPT seeks guidance and support from, and in a sense also reports on progress in programme implementation to the NSC, which is composed, of an average of eight voluntary members. The majority non-governmental membership reflects the mandated focus of the programme for CBO capacity building and “country-drivenness”. The NSC meets 3-4 times a year, especially following calls for proposals, when there is the need to analyze, request improvements and select winning proposals. Members are invited to visit projects and should also play a supporting role in monitoring. Consensus is reached during meetings and/or e-mail exchanges and seems to pose no particular challenges. The NSC includes recognized Peruvian experts who provided valuable expertise over the years. However, some of them have been sitting on the committee since its start and are today quite old and in some cases even sick. The rotation rule should apply and a renovation in the composition of the committee could bring new insight with younger experts perhaps more able to visit the area and provide a sustained input, including in monitoring. The UNDP Resident Representative-delegated staff member is a permanent member of the NSC; this function has been covered for many years by the same person who is the UNDP Technical Advisor in Ecosystem and Climate change.

NSC’s Minutes of the Meetings (MoMs) are generally very short documents, summarizing the decisions but not giving insight regarding different opinions and approaches. Yet, behind these summaries, there is intense work and e-mail exchanges, which include the CPT. The elaboration of standard formats to report on the NSC meetings could add value and be more informative on the process.

The SGP is implemented by **UNDP** and executed by UNOPS. UNDP provides quality assurance and oversight services for the SGP at global and country levels. UNDP provides value-added benefits as programme implementation proceeds in synergy with overall UNDP and UNDP Country Office (CO) programming. The multi-stakeholder NSC assures impartiality and neutrality of decisions for often highly competitive situations. UNDP’s representation on the NSC supports synergy with other projects in the country and plays a role in resource mobilization. In this sense, UNDP claims a more relevant weight within the NSC as its line of action has been confronted during the geographical investment decisions for OP-6 by the collegial outcome of the NSC.

**UNOPS** has been the executing agency of the SGP since its inception. UNOPS provides human resources and legal support, and provides financial and procurement management guidance and supervision to SGP staff. Under the SGP, UNOPS is responsible for grants management, following the signature of a grant agreement between the NGO and the UNDP Resident Representative (on behalf of UNOPS). No major challenges have been identified.

Overall, the level of commitment and dedication of staff is without question and management is rated satisfactory with an appropriate and professional coaching of CBOs and NGOs, project monitoring and stimulating of the production of outputs.



### 4.3.2 Work Planning

The SGP develops and follows an Annual Workplan, which is basically a financial instrument with a detail of activities to be carried out during the year. Within the Results Framework, activities are strategically and logically linked. Small grants projects are approved according to the overall SGP strategy and the Landscape Strategy defined at Project start.

### 4.3.3 Finance and co-finance

The total Project budget amounts to US\$ 8,949,656 out of which US\$ 3,196,672 from the GEF and the rest as co-financing from a number of different partners. US\$ 1,543,939 are allocated to fund small grants to CBOs and NGOs in the four selected landscapes plus US\$ 561,996 for Strategic Projects. The remaining funding covers programme management costs, travel for M&E, and equipment and supplies.

The budget is managed by outcome. Budget flexibility within budget lines is possible, within a 10% variance. Outcome N.5 is a management outcome where expenditures are not allowed to go over the amount planned. UNOPS fees amount to 6% for each transaction plus a fixed amount of US\$ 12,000 per year. At the end of 2018, Project expenditures amounted to US\$ 1,586,121 corresponding to about 50% of the total budget; in addition, US\$ 824,360 were committed for small-grants disbursement; this is a little bit below requirements but in line with this kind of projects where the delivery rates significantly climb towards the mid-implementation period when grant-making is almost fully approved.

**Table N.7 Budget allocations and expenditures per Outcome (US\$)**

Budget Allocation per Outcome as of March 2019			
Budget line/Amounts	GEF	GEF Expenditures to date	SGP Co-financing allocation
Outcome N.1	120,000	108,831.12	231,900
Outcome N.2	2,091,343	1,101,428,85	3,463,732
Outcome N.3	705,449	332,707,92	1,263,550
Outcome N.4	127,656	26,967,29	519,900
Outcome N.5 (Management)	152,222	114,798,75	
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,196,672</b>	<b>1,684,733,93</b>	

The Project is executed by UNOPS, which takes responsibility for financial management. A UNOPS monitoring mission occurred just before this MTR and highlighted no major challenges. As an FSP has a more structured financial structure, the UNOPS mission intended to ensure alignment to procedures in view of the upcoming financial audit, scheduled in 2019. UNOPS submits a cumulative financial report to UNDP each quarter, utilizing the One UNOPS system. The budget is translated into the UN ATLAS system used by UNDP and quarterly reconciled. A Project Annual Report is produced.

The well-established and efficient mechanism of the GEF SGP and the utilization of already effectively proven methodologies such as the COMDEKS landscape planning approach ensure a competent use of funds and cost-efficiency. The size of the grant allocation remains fixed with a maximum ceiling of US\$ 50,000 for CBOs and of US\$ 150,000 for NGOs. The CBOs' absorptive capacity in the four landscapes resulted higher than originally envisaged as the available budget has been almost spent with the 39 CBO projects for a current GEF allocation of US\$ 1,666,643; although leftover funds from preceding OPs are available (US\$ 380,000 from OP-4 and possibly, although not confirmed a similar amount from OP-5), it is unlikely that the SGP will be able to finance the originally projected 60 small grants projects. Total GEF committed funding including both small grants and strategic projects amount to US\$ 2,286,643.

Grant-making budget allocations to the four landscapes did not follow established criteria but almost naturally resulted in an average equal number of projects selected for each landscape with Tacna having the largest number of CBO/NGO projects and also of funds allocated and Puno the least number of CBO/NGO projects and funding, as shown in the Table below.

**Table N.8 Grants allocations by landscape in US\$**

Southern Cordillera	Arequipa	Cuzco	Puno	Tacna	Strategic Projects: All landscapes	Strategic Projects: Cusco y Tacna	Strategic Projects: Arequipa y Puno
N. of CBOs/NGOs projects	10	10	8	11	2	2	1
GEF funding	417,680	436,444	336,273	476,246	300,000	200,000	120,000
In-kind co-financing	94,950	264,546	190,553	159,002	118,750	35,000	97,860
Cash co-financing	208,415	142,751	82,056	94,807	15,800	195,037	-

Budget allocations to organizations is made in three tranches, according to the absorptive capacity of the organization and not with a pre-fixed percentage. There are five strategic projects in implementation for a total GEF budget of US\$ 620,000 with a total cash co-financing of US\$ 210,837 and in-kind co-financing of US\$ 251,610. CBO co-financing contributions are estimated as the exact amount could only be determined once grants projects have been approved. During Calls for Proposals, the co-financing ratio was established in incremental terms, that is 30% during the first Call, 50% during the second Call and 1:1 during the third Call. Reportedly, CBOs fulfill commitments, often exceeding planned contributions.

An interesting example is represented by projects installing improved cooking stoves, which were able to increase their co-financing quotas. In addition, nearby communities interested in replicating and upscaling the activity made requests to the corresponding district/provincial governments, which appear willing to finance part of the cost. To date, the total co-financing from CBOs/NGOs, without considering the strategic projects, amounts to US\$ 528,029 in cash co-financing and US\$ 709,051 in in-kind co-financing.

Unfortunately, because of the change of local authorities and competing interests, regional and provincial municipalities not always fulfill their commitments; departing authorities no longer feel committed, and an entire new dialogue has to be established with new authorities. During the MTR visits, newly installed authorities in the provincial municipality of Melgar (Puno) and the district municipality of Sibayo (Arequipa) declared their willingness to contribute with co-financing. The Peru SGP will not leverage the significant cash and in-kind co-financing expected at project start, amounting to US\$ 5,752,984. This is mainly due to the substantial contribution of the Regional Government of Tacna that will not materialize. The delay in the recruitment of the CPM and consequently in starting Project activities may also have decreased the negotiation capacity of the SGP to immediately leverage those commitments. The co-financing allocations already leveraged are reported below.

**Table N.9 Co-financing allocations in US\$**

Co-financing	Committed Cash	Committed in-kind	Disbursed/Expected	Comment
Regional Government of Tacna	2,000,000		-	The departing government has been accused of corruption.
District Government of Suykutambo (Cusco)	463,000		35.000	Financed small ad hoc activities such as purchase of goods and services or participation to events.
District Government of Tisco (Arequipa)	185,000		20.000	Financed small ad hoc activities such as purchase of goods and services or participation to events.
District Government of Tuti (Arequipa)	23,000		2.000	Small financing for participation to events.
District Government of Capaso (Puno)	131,984		4.000	Financed purchase of a car and TA for the Suri Project
CBOs		1,500,000*	1.700.000	
UNDP	650,000	100,000	300.000+80.000	Staff participation; logistical and administrative support. Support for communication, videos filming.
Universidad Nacional del Altiplano (UNA), Puno		700,000	50.000	Financed activities to participate in events and discussion forums
District Government of Sibayo (Arequipa)		-	20.000 cash	Purchase of goods
District Government of Callalli (Arequipa)		-	15.000 cash	Purchase of goods

Calquipa – Private Sector	-	20.000 cash	Construction of a structure to protect the bio-garden and technical support in Callalli.
<b>Total</b>	<b>5.752.984</b>	<b>2.246.000</b>	

\*Estimate. Exact amount could only be determined once individual grant projects are approved

The University co-financing was planned to be used also to encourage graduate students to conduct relevant, practical research on defined priority community needs related to sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity and to better adapt to climate change. Reportedly, only one such case is occurring in the Arequipa Landscape.

#### 4.3.4 Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

Monitoring is carefully conducted and takes place at different levels. The Results Framework is well articulated and provides for a sound monitoring tool. Nevertheless, M&E of a large number of projects that, even if within the limits of a landscape, are located over a wide area, with a multi-actor and multi-disciplinary approach remains complex. Aggregating results from the different projects is not easy when updating the GEF Tracking Tools. The PIR is drafted annually, in June.

At small-grants project level, technical assistance and monitoring have been delivered in all landscapes through a strategic project of the well-known NGO Centro Bartolomé de Las Casas, based in Cusco; their contract started in April 2018. CBC technically and financially accompanies CBOs, through a well-organized system, which includes two Landscapes Coordinators, one for the Cuzco and Puno areas and one for the Arequipa and Tacna areas; a Landscape Promoter for each area; and finally, a Project Coordinator for each small grant project. In this way, each Landscape Coordinator oversees an average of 20 projects and systematically visits them, privileging those manifesting weaknesses. Each promoter oversees an average of 10 projects; although there is no fixed schedule, each project is visited at least once per month (some projects being located in quite remote areas, taking time to be reached) or more if the situation requires it. Each visit produces a short and standardized monitoring report, with recommendations for actions, which is shared with beneficiaries. Promoters alternated in three of the four landscapes, with only one person being stable since the beginning; a few project coordinators were also replaced either because not effective or when there was the perception of an excessive concentration of functions and power (i.e. being the coordinator but also the president of the association). Staff turnover is within acceptable limits and always the result of adaptive management. Overall, CBC monitoring system ensures a solid presence in the field.

In June 2018, the Manual for the Management of Community Projects was prepared, a handbook specifying how projects should be managed and providing indications to grantees for financial and operational management. CBOs/NGOs are required to technically and financially report quarterly; evidently, planning, managing a Logical Framework, following a workplan and reporting is not easy for small organizations, especially those receiving grants for the first time. The project Coordinator plays an invaluable role in this sense (some of them have been retained from previous SGP OPs), closely coaching organizations and helping them filling the monitoring forms, which are then reviewed by the Landscape Promoter, then by the Landscape Coordinator and finally sent to the CPT in Lima. CBC implements this task in a way to effectively teach and empower organizations to be able to plan and monitor their own activities. Inception workshops are systematically conducted to well explain the monitoring system; other specific training activities are also planned during implementation. Reportedly, technical assistance, with a person accompanying the association over a period, proves more effective than specific short training activities. Adaptive management takes place as needed, according to the difficulties that may arise and sometimes creating further opportunities for work (i.e. Suma Marka project, which faced difficulties during the 2018 winter; through adaptive management, it obtained a donation of plants and the support of university students and soldiers to complete reforestation activities, thus liberating funds to be used for additional activities).

Strategic projects report bi-annually and directly to the SGP CPT. All strategic projects strictly coordinate with CBC, which monitors the small grants. The decision was taken to split the Ecotourism Project between



two NGOs, one to cover the social side, which is assigned to CBC, and one to cover the commercial side, which is assigned to the NGO wing of the Condor Travel enterprise. The two organizations closely coordinate and are currently in the process of identifying and describing the baseline. Harmonizing the methodology of work may be challenging for the two NGOs given their different approaches; however, if successful, the opportunity for sustainable and innovative results is at hand.

#### **4.3.5 Stakeholder Engagement**

The Capacity for Engagement indicator here signals the ability of an organization to engage in local policy analysis and dialogue processes to interact with local authorities and pressure them to adopt sustainable environmental policies. The Peru SGP OP-6 has established multi-stakeholder platforms at Project start to support consultative processes on different aspects of environmental management, engaging authorities, local communities, and NGOs. Platforms are composed of public-private stakeholders, including beneficiary communities, leaders, NGOs, regional and local government representatives, academia and, where available, recognized and influential intellectuals or experts. Landscape Platforms guided the elaboration of the Landscape Strategies and served as forums for discussion of possible translation of actions into public policies. Other tools to engage stakeholders and promote exchange are the “Forums” which are periodically organized across landscapes to discuss specific themes either in conjunction or separated from “Ferias” which are particularly useful for interaction and markets’ access.

#### **4.3.6 The Gender Dimension**

The Project has an integral and effective gender approach, which was already well designed within the project document. This guided the elaboration of the terms of reference for both the elaboration of the Landscapes Strategies and of the small-grants, both including a gender analysis. The gender approach and the introduction of gender-disaggregated data are qualification criteria, allowing higher-ranking points in project evaluation and selection. The NSC includes a gender focal point who however needs to be replaced as the person will soon leave the post.

Women’s role is valued: there are 16 dedicated women-led projects and always careful attention to ensure women participate and have a voice. Gender-disaggregated indicators are included in the PIR as well as in the small grants reports. The number of women rarely prevails over the number of men in training sessions and events. The presence of ladies in the SLP is always in the hands of a man, except in Cusco. Reportedly, women’s presence in project activities reaches at least 40% and interestingly, there is often a woman at the forefront of the CBOs’ Technical Committees/Purchase Committees. In the Puno Landscape, women are organized in a sort of pyramidal structure with representation at i) community, ii) provincial, and iii) regional level. An Ordinary Congress of Organized Women regularly takes place and the NGO CCCP has greatly contributed before and with the current SGP project to open for them spaces to express their ideas and opinions as well as agree on the needs of their areas of living.

This is not to say that everything is ideal but years of experience in the area started to make the difference for the participation of women in activities. Overall, women have been well represented in meetings with the evaluator; interviews show empowerment, the ability to make their voice heard as well as to organize for planning, implementing and monitoring the project (i.e. AASUPASI in Arequipa); to engage in technical monitoring of water quality (i.e. CCCP project in Puno, Melgar Province); to lead requests for additional funding (i.e. Suma Marka project in Lampa). Capacities developed increase women’s self-esteem and the ability to stand up for their rights and present project proposals for financing under the municipality’s participatory budget. Interviews indicate that the participation of women in events and activities significantly contributes to achieving good results. Specific actions to involve youth are included, but there is not yet an effort comparable to that made for giving visibility and empowerment to women.

#### **4.3.6 Reporting**

Reporting is rated as average and could be improved. There is one PIR (June 2018) available for evaluation.

Existing information is not packed into decision-making tools. The alternation of three different ministries and vice-ministries during the last three years has required a continuous dialogue, even if some officers have changed roles though not ministry. Requests for information by the GEF Focal Point have not been fulfilled as required by MINAM, somehow creating a tense relationship. Although it is a difficult critique to make to the current management, which has performed significant work in a short period and it does not represent an unsurmountable issue, an effort to compile documents in the form of decision-making tools, summarizing the main successes and lessons learnt from past OPs as well as the current situation would have possibly eased the relation with MINAM.

The NSC MoMs are not particularly useful to understand grant selection; although mail exchanges support the decision-making process, the elaboration of a standard format for reporting on NSC meetings is advisable. There is no evidence that the CPM and the PA make reports when visiting communities/projects. Reporting from CBOs is supported by the system described in the monitoring chapter. Promotors and Landscape Coordinators prepare a monitoring visit fiche at each visit; yet, although a continuous dialogue is evident, an additional reporting weakness is the lack of short decision-making reports to inform the CPM at a strategic level. Overall, interviews and observation in the field testify to an excellent working relationship between the various actors; yet, strategic information and conclusions should be packed in short decision-making tools and filed for any possible use at different management levels.

#### 4.3.7 Communications

The GEF SGP attaches great importance to knowledge management and communication. SGP staff ensure that information is widely distributed and accessible. A Communication Strategy has been drafted together with a communication plan; it aims at contributing to attain Project objectives, supporting advocacy processes and it is oriented towards a strategic public. It is implemented in strict coordination with the UNDP communication department, which ensures quality products and a coordinated communication line. It utilizes a web page, social networks, an electronic newsletter, fairs and exchange spaces, communication material and contacts with the Media. The SLP provide a venue for discussing results of community projects and landscape strategies. An individual grant project case study is envisaged, directly included in project design and based on a participatory methodology, so that its production strengthens the community organization's capacities for reflection and action through learning-by doing. This knowledge will be systematized and codified for dissemination at both landscape and national levels, and also at global SGP level. Projects are uniquely placed to improve learning and knowledge management at the national level, and can greatly contribute to the overall GEF knowledge management strategies for the delivery of global environmental benefits and environmentally sustainable development objectives.

A new web site has been implemented since OP-6; although still under improvement, it is already more user friendly, attractive and informative. Since its implementation, MINAM has detected and reported a lack of representation of the Ministry in communication material; this is the cause of a tense relationship with the Ministry; at the time of the MTR, the issue was being addressed.

Brochures and communication material related to specific projects or telling “stories” from the community are well produced, according to the SGP Visual Guidelines, dated 2017 that seeks to produce a SGP brand identity. The production of material follows these guidelines. In addition, each project receives guidelines to systematize the knowledge process, with the Coordinator responsible for following them. This process aims at producing standardized information with a homogenous style while producing material, which can be used to share experiences, inspire other communities to continue or replicate the experience and ultimately be kept as internal memory. To date, some of the communication products released include a Projects’ Catalogue, a SGP brochure, three project videos with a few more to be soon released, interviews to experts, and a quarterly SGP newsletter published on the website.

## 4.4 Sustainability

---

The SGP landscape approach is based on the principle that global environmental benefits can be produced and maintained through community-based sustainable development projects. Key elements of sustainability are contained in the Project's design and approach, which counts on the long-term experience of the GEF SGP and on the commitment to continue supporting results. Activities are country-driven, fully participatory and comprehensive; the sustainability of results is not under discussion. Previous SGP experience in Peru is used to inform small grant project design by adopting, strengthening and replicating win-win opportunities with community initiatives and clusters of initiatives in areas such as sustainable use of biodiversity and genetic resources, agro-ecological production practices and systems, sustainable land and water management, renewable energy (primarily solar), sustainable forest management and value addition to non-timber forest products.

The approach includes a number of actions to ensure sustainability which includes: i) promoting exchanges of experience; ii) working with a group of already trained project coordinators; iii) identifying and implementing a number of potential upscaling opportunities derived from previous experience; iv) forming landscapes multi-stakeholder partnerships, involving local governments, national agencies and institutions, NGOs, the private sector and the academia at the landscape level and adopting multi-stakeholder partnership agreements; v) support market transformation by upscaling proven technologies and promoting innovations.

### 4.4.1 Financial risks to sustainability

Strengthening CBOs' capacities translates into empowerment and the ability to advocate on regional and provincial governments to finance activities strategically linked within the landscape; investments can result from the participatory budget process which is about to start. It is early to assess this capacity; however, a few examples are promising: in the *Puno* Landscape, the *Melgar* Province is clearly defining water management as the main priority; civil society, supported by local authorities, stands up against the contamination of water sources by irresponsible mining activities. Organized women's groups propose water management project ideas, ready for financing; this is a novelty as there have often been requests, which were not supported by clear ideas and budgets. During this MTR visit, provincial and district governments declared that any SGP support in this sense would be rewarded by local co-financing. In the *Arequipa* Landscape, the *Sibayo* local government also confirmed intention to support SGP projects in the area with co-financing. Overall, there is a tendency to stop financing infrastructural projects in favor of productive activities; yet, local governments demand support to write good projects to ensure further access to other government and non-government funding opportunities.

The SGP co-financing system is effective in stimulating ownership and commitment; CBOs honor commitments and often their co-financing exceeds original intentions. The developing and strengthening of capacities create opportunities to access additional government and non-government funding through competitive calls for proposals. Nevertheless, government funding often presents quite more stringent requirements than the SGP, even in terms of cash contributions which organizations not necessarily are still able to provide; therefore, these opportunities are discriminatory and do not have the SGP strength to reach the most vulnerable communities, often forgotten by the state and even other cooperation entities. SGP support is often offered across phases with many organizations and activities supported by a second phase; as these are short-term implemented projects seeking long-term processes, when this happens results are visible as was appreciated in some projects during this MTR visit. Some associations are incipient and for them it is particularly difficult to access other funds as they still have not the organizational strength to manage a project and a budget. In this sense, the request from UNDP and Government to geographically align the GEF SGP for OP-7 with the bigger GEF projects, probably in the Amazonia area,

could result in some key but not yet strong enough activities/organizations to remain at a non-advocacy level.

#### **4.4.2 Socio-economic risks to sustainability**

Grants administered through the GEF SGP decentralized grant-making facility have increased the feeling of national ownership by civil society and therefore for sustainability. Communication has been well used so far to convey the right message to the largest number of stakeholders. Systematization of lessons learnt and knowledge management is a key element to reduce socio-economic risks for sustainability. Innovative and successful activities may materialize and often community members do not have the capacity to visualize the causality between action and results. Sharing knowledge through brochures, printed material, and the organization of exchange events, fairs and forums is key to allowing people to learn from experiences and decide to scale up and/or replicate successful activities.

As mentioned, these are short-term projects aiming at institutionalizing processes, which takes time to be solid and often requires support across GEF phases, certainly for a longer period than the three years allowed in this Project. Successes observed during the MTR visit are often a second phase either of the SGP or of another donor. It is key to continue strengthening capacities especially from an organizational point of view to empower communities to speak for themselves, claim their rights and have a say in participatory budgets. The successful functioning of an organization does not mean that all associates participate with the same level of commitment; continuity of action is important also to buy in those weaker associates to ensure more equitable performances and better results. At the same time, scaling up activities is instrumental to extend areas under protection and to provide benefits to producers, which were not yet involved; conflicts have not emerged during discussions but the possibility that some people are unsatisfied can always manifest. Capturing capacity development results is always challenging; one of the principles of the SGP is the involvement of beneficiaries in assessment and self-monitoring; this promotes mutual understanding on the approach and allows capacity building and transfer of lessons learned. All CBOs/NGOs are increasing their capacities for leadership, networking and managing projects as well as for engaging in policy dialogue and strategic analysis.

#### **4.4.3 Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability**

The need to reinstitute dialogue with newly installed local authorities, following the early 2019 administrative elections is a current but certainly not an unforeseen challenge; the participatory nature of projects facilitates sustainability; yet, the presence of new actors always requires an additional effort to ensure institutional strengthening and new co-financing commitments. It takes time to establish relations, gain the trust of key players, define possible co-financing and pursue the objective of converting SL approaches into public local policies.

Political instability reflects on communities; hence, working with CBOs is certainly more challenging than working with NGOs as it is never granted that the expressed leadership really represents the community. The Landscape Platform and the forums are important occasions to strengthen participation and dialogue; effectively, platforms are dynamic tools where new actors may always join, according to needs. Although reportedly, they are functioning fairly well in all landscapes, these platforms are made of people who may be more or less committed. A good approach is to invite local authorities to visit projects to provide a firsthand appreciation of the results it is possible to obtain with SGP's small, yet effective activities.

There is a widespread opinion that the experience of the SLP will not conclude with the Project, as local authorities are increasingly more aware of biodiversity and climate change challenges; environmental consciousness starts to settle in beneficiaries and local actors' minds. Capacities built are unlikely to be totally lost even when turnover of actors may occur. The visit to the *Sibayo* district confirmed the capacity of this small town of about 300 families to work coordinately to provide a touristic brand for their village; interviews indicate awareness of the potentialities as well as the challenges of tourism development in the area; a participatory development plan and a tourism development plan are under elaboration. The SGP

correctly privileges support to CBOs rather than NGOs, which however play an important facilitation role: they support CBOs technically in the field and/or organizationally, helping them to formulate projects and to access other cooperation or public funding. SGP aims at strengthening CBOs' capacities so that they may be able to access additional funding opportunities, manage projects and advocate for translating actions into policies. SLP support the management of ancestral knowledge together with innovation; if actions are coordinated, the possibility to impact landscape policies is at hand.

The mentioned institutional instability at MINAM level could have jeopardized the design of OP-7; at present, there seems to be willingness to confirm another SGP phase, provided geographical alignment with the bigger GEF investments is ensured. Although there might be good reasons for this approach, leaving unsupported some key initiatives, which manifest potentialities in the Southern Cordillera, should be carefully evaluated. Intended and unintended positive effects should not minimize the limitations that still exist in the landscapes for an effective partnership between civil society and local authorities; building capacities and awareness raising require continued support and practice at different levels. Participating CBOs and NGOs as well as local authorities confirm positive appreciation for the experience of strengthening capacities in the six thematic areas and in the four landscapes. An end-of-Project strategy should be developed for each single small-grant to analyze results achieved, strengths and weaknesses and identify need for further support to those initiatives that present potentialities but are not yet mature to play an advocacy role within the landscape.

#### **4.4.4 Environmental risks to sustainability**

The Southern Cordillera is extremely climate sensitive with harsh winters (rains and ice) which may cause death of animals and loss of produce. The Landscape approach is an answer to environmental risks, and communities understand the concept as they live it in their skin. Measures have been taken during the 2018 winter to protect animals and produce, but some communities have been strongly hit.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1 Conclusions

The Project is **relevant** in relation to GEF SGP strategies, aligned with UNDP and national policies and plans and instrumental for CBOs and NGOs living in the area. UNDP and MINAM claim alignment of the SGP with their geographical action, in areas where the bigger GEF investments are implemented. SGP small-grant projects are designed to produce: i) global environmental and local sustainable development benefits; ii) organizational capacities; and iii) knowledge from evaluation of the unique experience of recuperating ancestral knowledge and experimenting innovation. **Progress towards results** is satisfactory, with a few shortcomings and the need for key players to agree on the interpretation of a few indicators, given financial and time limits as well as the geographical characteristics of the area.

In terms of **efficiency**, the Project suffers from an effective shorter period of implementation than the four years originally sought and a few actions are beyond targets (partly also due to delays in hiring the CPM at Project start); however, once the CPM took office, and thanks to the long-term stability of the PA, who has the institutional memory of the SGP in Peru, management has been efficient and effective in implementing envisaged actions. A competent use of funds is instrumental to finance communities, which show the greater potential or reaching the most vulnerable ones. The absorptive capacity of CBOs/NGOs proved greater than originally expected and the number of grants will probably in the end be less than the 60 originally envisaged. At small-grants project level, some functional delays may be present, mainly due to the organizational capacity of the specific association or the harsh 2018 winter conditions that in some cases affected implementation.

At landscape level, platforms are effective forums for discussions although they still need further strengthening both because they are dynamic, as more people join in and others eventually leave, and because results are recently starting to mature for discussions on lessons learnt and local experiences. Without minimizing obstacles, which still limit the participation of civil society in environmental governance and the fact that capacity-building processes notoriously takes years to consolidate, some small grants are producing outstanding results. CBOs are strengthening their internal organizational capacities and gain credibility to claim support from local authorities.

The recognition of the importance of the processes initiated is prevalent in the opinion of relevant actors. The **sustainability** of activities is likely in socio-economic terms, considering small grants are key, instrumental funds for these remote communities, some of which received assistance for the first time; consequently, given support is highly valued. Institutionally, environmentally and financially, sustainability is moderately likely to happen as different elements are not within control, such as natural catastrophes – for which however communities organize with adaptive management; or the alternation of local authorities, which challenges commitments. Communities are effectively empowered to speak for themselves, organize, plan and manage projects so that their capacity to take part in local participatory budgets or to access additional government and non-government funding opportunities are increased, especially when NGOs play a key supporting role. Strategic projects still have to manifest the capacity to link different experiences at thematic level to increase chances for successful outcomes and sustainability.



## 5.2 Recommendations

The following recommendations are tailored to improve the implementation and sustainability of the SGP as a whole and not to specific grants.

**Table N.10 Summary of Recommendations**

N.	Recommendation	Responsible entity
<b>A</b>	<b>Outcomes level</b>	
<b>A.1</b>	<b>Outcome N.2 Reporting on targets should always clarify the interpretation taken.</b> A few indicators are subject to interpretation (see chapter 4.2.1.1): as this may change what is within reach, given resources, time and geographical characteristics of the area, it is necessary to explain which is the interpretation taken when reporting on achievements.	CPM, CPT
<b>A.2</b>	<b>Outcome N.3 Ensure more drive and stricter monitoring of Strategic Projects.</b> Three of them only recently started. The ecotourism strategic activity is split between two NGOs which have quite different approaches and require careful alignment of objectives and methodologies; this represents a unique opportunity but also a risk. To recuperate delays, ensure drive, monitoring and consider an additional strategic project in water management, depending on funds availability.	CPT
<b>A.3</b>	<b>Outcome N.3 Ensure a focus on the marketing side of the production chain.</b> All community agrobiodiversity projects should include a component to strategically link production to the market, within a landscape approach and ensuring an equitable price (added value for recuperated ancestral products/services). The agrobiodiversity project is instrumental in this way but only for native products, which are the SGP focus; beneficiaries seek marketing linkages also for other non-native products. GEF will not support non-native products but could consider them at policy level: this could influence district, province and regional strategic policies changes.	CPT, CBS, AEDES, SLP
<b>A.4</b>	<b>All outcomes. Ensure the sound gender approach taken by the project is extended to involve the youth.</b> This is a key activity to impact on the lessening of migration from the area and extend benefits across generations; a policy to systematically involve the youth is recommended.	CPT, CBC
<b>B</b>	<b>Project Implementation and Adaptive Management</b>	
<b>B.1</b>	<b>Consider a no-cost extension of the Project.</b> Aside from delays, the Project effectively has only three and not four years of implementation, from February 2017 to end of January 2020. Considering the nature of the small-grants and the fact that this is the first SGP FSP of the country, an extension is advisable up to 17 months, according to funds availability.	NSC, CPM, GEF Technical Advisor
<b>B.2</b>	<b>Reform the Peru NSC to ensure:</b> i) respect for the rotation rule, ii) replacement of members that have been sitting on the Committee for a long-time, especially when sick, old or are leaving (i.e. probably the gender focal point); iii) willingness and capacity to participate in pre-selection and M&E project site visits; iv) reporting on meetings is standardized and more informative of the decision-making process.	CPM, UNDP CO, NSC, GEF Technical Advisor, New York
<b>B.3</b>	<b>Document lessons learnt from previous and current OPs and prepare decision-making tools.</b> Lessons learnt from previous SGP OPs are available but they are neither structured nor systematized. SGP Peru is only now being evaluated as a stand-alone Country Program, though in the past it was part of the UNDP/GEF Joint Evaluation of the SGP. Recent requests for information from MINAM could not be provided to the satisfaction of the claimant. The preparation of decision-making tools/documents/reports are recommended, in addition to nicely prepared knowledge management material, which are tailored for other, although important, processes and actors. The CPMT, SGP Global may be involved to provide inputs while documenting lessons learnt from previous OPs.	CPT, CPMT
<b>B.4</b>	<b>Ensure MINAM visibility in communication material and during meetings with stakeholders.</b> MINAM's requests for visibility have not been answered in the modalities required by the claimant.	CPT
<b>B5</b>	<b>Replace the Tracking Tools with the new GEF "Updated Results Architecture for GEF-7".</b> This new policy, approved in June 2018 by the GEF Council meeting, includes a set of 11 "core indicators" and 29 sub-indicators and requires projects to replace the TT with these core indicators. It is suggested to proceed to this adjustment as soon as feasible, possibly during the preparation of the next PIR or ultimately before the Terminal Evaluation.	CPM
<b>C</b>	<b>Sustainability</b>	
<b>C.1</b>	<b>Assess results achieved at small-grant project level and design an exit-strategy.</b> Identify promising, yet not mature, initiatives to ensure they are not abandoned, even if the decision is taken to move the geographical focus of SGP for OP-7. It takes time and practice to ensure projects are not "islands" but instead fully coordinated and integrated activities which may translate into possible local development policies. In addition, working in the <i>sierra</i> is a key activity to decrease migration towards the <i>selva</i> .	CPT; CBC



## **Annex A – Terms of Reference,**

## **Annex B – Document consulted/available for consultation**

### **General documents**

- TORs for the Mid-Term Review
- UNDP Guidance for Conducting Mit-Term Review of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects
- Marco de Cooperación de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo en el Perú (UNDAF), 2017-2021
- UNDP Country Programme Document for Peru 2017-2021

### **Project documents**

- Project Document: Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in Peru, with annexes
- Updated GEF Tracking Tool
- PPD Peru Manual de Procedimientos para la Implementación de Proyectos Comunitarios – Fase Operativa 6, Version 1.1 Junio 2018
- PPD Peru - Bases de la convocatoria de proyectos comunitarios de la sexta fase operativa (primera, segunda y tercera convocatoria)
- Formulario PPD 2017, 2018, 2019
- PPD 2018 Convocatoria Para un proyecto estratégico de promoción del valor agregado y la comercialización de cultivos y productos andinos
- PPD 2018 Convocatoria Para un proyecto estratégico de promoción de la producción sostenible y el valor agregado a partir de Camélidos en los Andes
- PPD 2018 Convocatoria Para un proyecto estratégico de promoción del ecoturismo de base comunitaria con enfoque en los jóvenes
- PPD 2018 Convocatoria para Proyecto de Asistencia y Monitoreo de Campo
- Power Point Presentación PPD a las autoridades
- PPD Índice de Contenido y Pautas para la Sistematización de cada Proyecto Comunitario
- Construyendo Resiliencia Social y Ecológica en el Sur Andino – Estrategia Participativas: Paisaje Arequipa/Paisaje Cuzco/Paisaje Puno/Paisaje Tacna
- Project Implementation Review (PIR) -2018, with annexes
- National Steering Committee Minutes of the Meetings
- Monitoring Project Centro de Estudios Regionales Andino Bartolomé de las Casas with all annexes prepared to monitor projects financially and technically
- Proyecto de Asistencia y Monitoreo en Campo: i) Informe Semestral: Abril-Septiembre 2018; ii) Financial Report and iii) Landscape Table (summary of projects under implementation)
- Database Community Projects OP6
- Catálogo proyectos PPD 2018
- Project documents and monitoring technical and financial reports of projects:
  - Sibayo: Alpacas by ASCADIS
  - Sibayo, Artesanía by ASUPASI
  - Tisco, Praderas by ASDIPROCAT
  - Puno, Incidencia Política by CCampesina
  - Lampa, Agua y Territorio by SUMA MARKA
  - All landscapes Strategic Project, Agrobiodiversity by AEDES
  - All landscapes Strategic Project, Technical Assistance and Monitoring by CBC
- Peru SGP Financial reports 2018 and 2019
- Peru SGP Annual Workplans

### **Knowledge Management Material**

- Brochure PPD Junio 2018
- Catálogo de Proyectos 18-Dic-1
- Exposure – Energía de Mujer/Women's Energy
- Exposure – La fuerza de Ancocalla/The force of Andean terraces
- Stories – Diamonds of the Andes
- Videos, website, Newsletters

## Annex C – Evaluation Questions

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>PROJECT STRATEGY (Relevance): Project Design: How appropriate is the strategy and project design?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.</li> <li>• Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?</li> <li>• Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?</li> <li>• Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?</li> <li>• Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.</li> <li>• If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existence of a clear relationship between project objectives and GEF/SGP policies and strategies</li> <li>• Degree of coherence between the project proposals and the strategic framework of the GEF SGP</li> <li>• Degree of coherence between the problems addressed and underlying assumptions</li> <li>• Degree of coherence between project strategy and most effective route to achieving results</li> <li>• Degree of coherence of the project proposals with national environmental and development priorities</li> <li>• Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities: evidence of incorporation of their perspective</li> <li>• Degree of involvement of stakeholders in project design and implementation</li> <li>• Evidence of lessons learnt incorporated in project design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• UNDP/GEF/SGP policies and strategies</li> <li>• National policies and strategies</li> <li>• Key project partners and stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents analyses</li> <li>• UNDP website</li> <li>• GEF SGP website</li> <li>• Interviews with UNDP, GEF/SGP, project staff and participating national stakeholders</li> <li>• Annex 9 of Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for further guidelines</li> <li>• Interviews with relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>
<b>PROJECT STRATEGY: Results Framework/Logframe</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic</li> <li>• Level of coherence between project expected results and individual CBOs/NGOs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• CBOs/NGOs proposals</li> <li>• Results Framework</li> <li>• Key project stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Key interviews</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?</li> <li>• Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.</li> <li>• Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>proposals</li> <li>• Adequacy of Indicators (SMART)</li> <li>• Evidence of gender monitoring</li> </ul>		
<b>PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS: Progress towards outcome analysis</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).</li> <li>• Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.</li> <li>• Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.</li> <li>• By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicators in Project Document/Results Framework</li> <li>• GEF Tracking Tool information</li> <li>• Examples of supported partnerships</li> <li>• Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained</li> <li>• Appreciation by stakeholders</li> <li>• Identification of risks and assumptions</li> <li>• Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• PIR</li> <li>• Project team and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents analysis</li> <li>• Interviews with project team</li> <li>• Interviews with relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>
<b>PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT: Management Arrangements</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.</li> <li>• Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.</li> <li>• Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management Arrangements</li> <li>• Evidence of efficiency of management procedures</li> <li>• Analysis of delays and respect of timeline</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• UNDP/GEF-SGP</li> <li>• Project team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Review of files</li> <li>• Key interviews</li> </ul>

(UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.			
<b>PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT: Work Planning</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.</li> <li>• Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?</li> <li>• Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timeliness and adequacy of work planning</li> <li>• Evidence of efficiency of management tools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• UNDP and Project team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
<b>PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT: Finance and Co-finance</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.</li> <li>• Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.</li> <li>• Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?</li> <li>• Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on cofinancing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Availability and quality of financial and progress reports</li> <li>• Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures</li> <li>• Cost in view of results achieved</li> <li>• Cash or in-kind co-financing funds committed and effectively delivered and level of its strategic use</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• UNDP/GEF-SGP</li> <li>• Project team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Review of files</li> <li>• Key interviews</li> </ul>
<b>PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT: Project-level M&amp;E Systems</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?</li> <li>• Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality of results-based management</li> <li>• Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency</li> <li>• Participatory monitoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• UNDP/GEF-SGP</li> <li>• Project team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Review of files</li> <li>• Key interviews</li> </ul>
<b>PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT: Stakeholders Engagement</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appreciation from national stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> </ul>

<p>necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?</li> <li>• Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?</li> </ul>	<p>with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Degree of involvement of stakeholders in project design and implementation</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP/GEF-SGP</li> <li>• Project team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of files</li> <li>• Key interviews</li> </ul>
<b>PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT: Reporting</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.</li> <li>• Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)</li> <li>• Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, M&amp;E)</li> <li>• Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• UNDP/GEF-SGP</li> <li>• Project team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Review of files</li> <li>• Key interviews</li> </ul>
<b>PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT: Communication</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?</li> <li>• Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)</li> <li>• For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of Project's communication efforts</li> <li>• Quantity and Quality of knowledge management material</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• UNDP/GEF-SGP</li> <li>• Project team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Review of files</li> <li>• Key interviews</li> </ul>
<b>SUSTAINABILITY:</b>			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.</li> </ul> <p>Financial risks to sustainability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?</li> </ul> <p>Socio-economic risks to sustainability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?</li> </ul> <p>Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.</li> </ul> <p>Environmental risks to sustainability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of risks and assumptions</li> <li>• Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed</li> <li>• Evidence / quality of sustainability strategy</li> <li>• Evidence / quality of steps taken to ensure sustainability</li> <li>• Level and source of future financial support and commitments following project ends</li> <li>• Level of recurrent costs after completion of project and funding sources for those recurrent costs if any</li> <li>• Degree to which project activities and results have been taken over by local counterparts or institutions/organizations</li> <li>• Level of financial support available to continue activities</li> <li>• Degree of relevance for future projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents and reporting</li> <li>• Project Case Studies</li> <li>• UNDP/GEF-SGP, project staff and partners</li> <li>• Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Beneficiaries</li> </ul>



## Annex D - Schedule, Itinerary and Institutions/People met: March-April 2019

(Rome timing is expressed when home-based)

Task/Interview	Date – Time	Location	Contact
Preparation	10-22 March	Home based	
Presentation of Inception Report	Delivered on 13 March	Home-based	
<b>Interviews with UNDP/GEF/SGP before departure</b>			
Nick Remple, Technical Advisor, UNDP-GEF	Tue 5, March 15:00	Skype	<a href="mailto:Nick.rempel@gmail.com">Nick.rempel@gmail.com</a>
Rosanna De Luca, Associate Portfolio Manager	Tue 5, March 15:00	Skype	<a href="mailto:rosannadl@unops.org">rosannadl@unops.org</a>
Manuel Mavila, Project Manager, National Coordinator	Thur 7, March	Skype	<a href="mailto:manuel.mavila@undp.org">manuel.mavila@undp.org</a> Tel +511 625-9068
Emilia Bustamante Guerra, Ex National Coordinator, SGP Peru		Whatsup	<a href="mailto:emilia.bustamante.g@gmail.com">emilia.bustamante.g@gmail.com</a> Tel +51 950137274
<b>Travel to Peru, Lima 23<sup>rd</sup> March, 2019</b>			
Manuel Mavila, SGP NC	Mon, 25, March	UNDP, CO	<a href="mailto:manuel.mavila@undp.org">manuel.mavila@undp.org</a> Tel +511 625-9068
Jhulino Sotomayor, SGP PA	Mon, 25, March	UNDP, CO	<a href="mailto:jhulino.sotomayor@undp.org">jhulino.sotomayor@undp.org</a> Tel. +511 625-9069
Alicia Chang, M&E Coordinator, International Cooperation Office (OCAI), Ministry of Environment (MINAM)	Mon 25, March	MoE	<a href="mailto:achang@minam.gob.pe">achang@minam.gob.pe</a> Tel. 511 996343306
Juan Torres, UNALM, Member of NSC	Mon 25, March Morning	UNDP CO	<a href="mailto:amotape@yahoo.com">amotape@yahoo.com</a>
Teresa Gianella, Leisa, Member of NSC	Mon 25, March Morning	UNDP CO	<a href="mailto:leisa-al@etcandes.com.pe">leisa-al@etcandes.com.pe</a>
Fernando Hilbck, private sector, Member of NSC	Mon 25, March Morning	UNDP CO	<a href="mailto:fernando.hilbck@gmail.com">fernando.hilbck@gmail.com</a>
Ana Loayza, CBO, Member of NSC	Mon 25, March Morning	UNDP CO	<a href="mailto:Analoayza26@hotmail.com">Analoayza26@hotmail.com</a>
James Leslie, UNDP, Member of NSC	Mon 25, March Morning	UNDP CO	<a href="mailto:james.leslie@undp.org">james.leslie@undp.org</a>
Edo Stork, Deputy RR	Mon, 25, March		<a href="mailto:edo.stork@undp.org">edo.stork@undp.org</a>
<b>Travel to Arequipa March 26, 2019 (Valle del Colca, Chivay, Sibayo) Flight LATAM 09.59-11:33</b>			
Betty Chatata, Coordinator of Strategic Agrobiodiversity Project	Tue, 26 March	Arequipa airport	<a href="mailto:betty@aedes.org.pe">betty@aedes.org.pe</a>
Leny Delgado, Coordinator, Landscapes Arequipa and Tacna-Capaso, CBC	Tue, 26 March	Arequipa-Chivay	<a href="mailto:lenyde2001@yahoo.com">lenyde2001@yahoo.com</a> 958585010
Pedro Lauraceo, Coordinator, Project Bioartesanía, AASUPASI	Wed, 27 March	Sibayo	<a href="mailto:pedrolaura34@yahoo.es">pedrolaura34@yahoo.es</a>
Women of Project Bioartesanía, AASUPASI	Wed, 27 March	Sibayo	Focus group discussion and visit to eco-museum and project premises
Pedro Lauraceo and Julian Samayani, Projects Manejo de praderas, alpacas de colores/suri y bioartesanía ASDIPROCAT; ASCADIS; AASUPASI	Wed, 27 March	Sibayo	<a href="mailto:Asdiprocat-tisco@hotmail.com">Asdiprocat-tisco@hotmail.com</a> <a href="mailto:pedrolaura34@yahoo.es">pedrolaura34@yahoo.es</a> <a href="mailto:ascadis-alpacas-sibayo@hotmail.com">ascadis-alpacas-sibayo@hotmail.com</a>
Teofilo Condori and Vanessa Cutipa, representatives of Arequipa Landscape Platform for NGOs and for the private sector	Wed, 27 March	Sibayo	Focus group discussion <a href="mailto:Tito@aedes.org.pe">Tito@aedes.org.pe</a>
Mayor of Sibayo, local authorities and other private actors sitting on the Arequipa Landscape Platform	Wed, 27 March	Sibayo	Focus group discussion

Travel Arequipa-Lima March 27, 2019 Flight LATAM 18:10			
Antonio Gonzalez Norris (APCI), Agencia Peruana Cooperacion Internacional	Thur, March, 28	APCI Office	<a href="mailto:agonzalezn@apci.gob.pe">agonzalezn@apci.gob.pe</a>
Valerio Paucarmayta, CBC Director and Norma Garcia, Ecotourism Project Coordinator	Thur, March 28	Skype	Skype: valerio.paucarmayta1 <a href="mailto:valerio.paucarmayta@apu.cbc.org.pe">valerio.paucarmayta@apu.cbc.org.pe</a>
Travel Lima-Juliaca March 28, 2019 (Ayaviri, Melgar Municipality and Lampa) Flight 17:40			
Luis Palma, Cusco and Puno Landscape Coordinator	Fri, March 29	Ayaviri, Melgar Province	<a href="mailto:palmaluisalberto0@gmail.com">palmaluisalberto0@gmail.com</a> 931558418
Bartolomé Challos, Promotor Puno	Fri, March 29	Ayaviri, Melgar Province	<a href="mailto:barchallos@hotmail.com">barchallos@hotmail.com</a>
Focus group discussion representatives of the Puno Landscape Platform including the Mayor of Melgar Province and various members of Melgar municipality, of Santa Rosa district and representatives of women's organizations; Elisban Ccorimanya representing NGOs	Fri, March 29	Ayaviri, Melgar Province municipality	<a href="mailto:elisbankori@gmail.com">elisbankori@gmail.com</a>
Focus group discussion with a group of ladies coordinated by Jeo Laureano, Project CCCP - Centro Capacitacion Campesina de Puno	Fri, March 29	Ayaviri, Melgar Province municipality	<a href="mailto:jeo61@hotmail.com">jeo61@hotmail.com</a>
Visit and focus group discussion with Rocio Palomino Coordinator, Project Suma Marka in Lampa and members of the community	Fri, March 29	Lampa	<a href="mailto:rpalomino@sumamarka.org">rpalomino@sumamarka.org</a>
Travel Juliaca-Lima March 29, 2019 Flight 19:50			
Focus group discussion with actors from the Cusco Landscape: Samuel Ganastaga, NGO ARARIWA and the Tacna-Capaso Landscape: Silvio Cacallica, lider Proyecto Andenes and Elisbero Villegas, President Landscape Platform	Mon, April, 1	UNDP CO	
Milagros Leon, SGP Communication consultant	Mon, April, 1	UNDP CO	<a href="mailto:milagros.leon@undp.org">milagros.leon@undp.org</a>
Marta Cuba, GEF Focal Point, MINAM	Mon April, 1	MINAM	<a href="mailto:mcuba@minam.gob.pe">mcuba@minam.gob.pe</a>
Carmen Mejia and Yveth Villeneuve, Experts, OACI, MINAM	Mon, April 1	MINAM	
Manuel Mavila, SGP CPM and Jhulino Sotomayor, SGP PA	Tues, April, 2	UNDP, CO	<a href="mailto:manuel.mavila@undp.org">manuel.mavila@undp.org</a> Tel +511 625-9068 jhulino.sotomayor@undp.org Tel. +511 625-9069
Travel Lima-Florencia, April 2-3 Flight Iberia 19:45			

## Annex E – Landscapes Grants Summaries of Achievements: Arequipa, Cusco, Puno, Tacna

### Annex F-A

LANDSCAPE: AREQUIPA PROJECTS BY THEMATIC AREAS: as of March 2019: N. 10		
Thematic area: Biotrade (1)		
<b>CBO: Artesanos Asociados Sumac Pallay Sibayo (AASUPASI)</b> <b>Title:</b> Promoción de la producción de bio-artesanía textil a base de fibra de alpaca, en el paisaje de Sibayo (3800 masl) <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 49,567; Co-financing cash US\$ 14,647; in-kind US\$ 1,079 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 60% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation:</b> A well-implemented project, which can be considered a second phase as the association received funds in OP5. A group of ladies entirely manage the project with enthusiasm and dedication, and support by the coordinator in planning and monitoring. Ancestral use are recuperated to produce alpaca Suri textile to be sold in the touristic Sibayo village; an eco-museum has been created within the premises of the project where it is also possible for tourist to purchase textiles and use a cafeteria. Alpaca suri material is provided by another SGP supported project for the management of alpaca led by the association ASCADI	<b>MTR comment:</b> A well-implemented project, which nicely interlaces with the ASCADIS project. Both projects show good progress as a result of being a second phase of a previous project financed for both organizations during OP5.
Thematic area: Water and ecosystems management (4)		
<b>CBO: Cooperativa de Servicios Especiales Yurac Qori Tisco</b> <b>Title:</b> Conservación de la diversidad biológica y valores cultural - paisajística <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 39,892; Co-financing cash US\$ 10,606; in-kind US\$ 10,260 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2019		
<b>Financial Delivery: 40% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Just started	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>CBO: Asociación de Mujeres Nuevo Amanecer del Centro Poblado Lago del Colca de la parcialidad de Janansaya de Callali</b> <b>Title:</b> Implementación y operación de un bio-huerto comunal para la comercialización de tubérculos y hortalizas en el poblado de Chichas distrito de Callalli en Arequipa (4500 masl) <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 24,221; Co-financing cash US\$ 4,922; in-kind US\$ 3,265 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 70% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Average; overcame climatic and technical challenges	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>NGO: Cáritas del Perú</b> <b>Title:</b> Recuperación de áreas degradadas con especies nativas para la protección para la protección del paisaje, en el anexo de Taltahuarahuarcco en el paisaje de Caylloma en Arequipa (4380 masl) <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 50,000; Co-financing cash US\$ 28,906; in-kind US\$ 15,422 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 60% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Good; recuperated initial delays	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>CBO: Asociación distrital de productores de camélidos domésticos y artesanos del distrito de Tisco (ASDIPROCAT) en alianza con la Municipalidad Distrital de Tisco</b> <b>Title:</b> Restauración del ecosistema de praderas nativas alto andinas en el paisaje de Tisco (4200-5600 masl) <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 50,000; Co-financing cash US\$ 30,962; in-kind US\$ 2,503 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2018		
Thematic area: Sustainable management of Camelids (4)		

<b>Financial Delivery: 60% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation:</b> A good project for the genetic improvement and management of camelids with a focus to restore the ecosystem through protection of water and “bofedales”, improved pastos. This is also a second phase of a previous project financed under OP5.	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b> Another second phase project now focusing to reinforce activities and capacities and also articulate with authorities to possibly translate activities into landscape policies and to access additional funds made available by the state. Interesting exchange between producers to share information and prepare for scaling up
<b>CBO: Asociación zonal de Criadores de Camelidos Andinos Chalhuanca</b> <b>Title:</b> Gestión sostenible del Área de Conservación Local Microcuenca Chalhuanca-Accomayo, Distrito de Yanque <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 22,000; Co-financing cash US\$ 32,473; in-kind US\$ 6,480 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2019		
<b>Financial Delivery: 45% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Just started	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>CBO: Cooperativa Alpaqueros Los Watayponchos de Caylloma, en alianza con la ONG AEDES</b> <b>Title:</b> Recuperación de la Diversidad de Colores de Alpacas y Manejo de Praderas Naturales en el paisaje de Caylloma en Arequipa (4300 masl) <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 50,000; Co-financing cash US\$ 5,800; in-kind US\$ 25.209) <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 60% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Good	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>CBO: Asociación de Criadores de Alpacas del Distrito de Sibayo en alianza con la Municipalidad Distrital de Sibayo (ASCADI)</b> <b>Title:</b> Recuperación del germoplasma de alpacas suri color en el paisaje de Sibayo (4300 masl) <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 50,000; Co-financing cash US\$ 24,923; in-kind US\$ 459) <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 60% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation:</b> This is a second phase a previous project financed by SGP OP5 which strengthen the capacity of alpaca farmers to recuperate the alpaca suri. Progress is already showing both in the organizational and managerial capacity of the organization and in their production, notwithstanding harsh climatic conditions of the past winter which challenged the capacity of animals to survive in connection with “the alpaca calendar” that is the reproduction period...Production is the final goal of the association but in total respect of nature by protecting water and “bofedales”. Adapting strategies are implemented for protecting nature and for protecting animals from climatic conditions.	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b> The idea has already been experimented in other areas of Peru within OP5 but the innovation here is the strong linkage with production through the association AASUPASI (see above). The production capacity of ASCADI is potentially higher the capacity of absorption of AASUPASI and new market possibilities are to be found.
<b>CBO: Comunidad Campesina de Cuchocapilla, en alianza con la ONG AEDES</b> <b>Title:</b> Recuperación, conservación y manejo sustentable de praderas alto-andinas y Vicuñas en la Comunidad Campesina de Cuchocapilla – Caylloma. Arequipa (4500 masl) <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 50,000; Co-financing cash US\$ 48,918; in-kind US\$ 10,584) <b>Starting Date:</b> June 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 70% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Very good	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>Thematic area: Climate change mitigation (1)</b>		
<b>CBO: Asociación ALLPA KALLPA Callalli Caylloma</b> <b>Title:</b> Uso sostenible de agua, mediante sistemas de bombeo con energía solar fotovoltaica <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 32,000; Co-financing cash US\$ 6,258; in-kind US\$ 19,689) <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2019		
<b>Financial Delivery: 38% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Just started	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>

## Annex E-B

LANDSCAPE: CUSCO PROJECTS BY THEMATIC AREAS as of March 2019: N.9		
Thematic area: Sustainable Agriculture (3)		
<b>CBO: Asociación Vial Ccapac Ñan en alianza con la Municipalidad Distrital de Chillihuani, Cusipata, Cusco</b> <b>Title:</b> Mejoramiento y sostenibilidad de la soberanía y seguridad alimentaria de las familias, a través de la recuperación de cinco variedades de Mashua nativa en el centro poblado de Chillihuani, Cusipata, Cusco <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 50,000; Co-financing cash US\$ 120; in-kind US\$ 16,340 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery:</b> 60% disbursed	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Very Good	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>CBO: Asociación Sol Naciente de Productores y Agropecuarios Ccapacmarca (APA) en alianza con la municipalidad distrital de Ccapacmarca</b> <b>Title:</b> Recuperación, cultivo y procesamiento orgánico de variedades nativas de Tuna, para mejorar ecosistemas y medios de vida en el paisaje de Ccapacmarca, Chumbivilcas, Cusco <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 48,959; Co-financing cash US\$ 8,052; in-kind US\$ 13,164 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery:</b> 60% disbursed	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Good	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>CBO: Asociación Wiñay Choqqchampi en alianza con la Municipalidad Distrital de Suykutambo</b> <b>Title:</b> Conservación y revaloración de la propiedades alimenticias y medicinales de plantas nativas y silvestres, en articulación con el ecoturismo en la comunidad campesina de Ecchocollo, Suykutambo, Cusco (3500 and above masl) <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 32,800; Co-financing cash US\$ 22,259; in-kind US\$ 9,540 <b>Starting Date:</b> June 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery:</b> 30% disbursed	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Good. Initial delays overcome.	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
Thematic area: Biotrade (1)		
<b>CBO: Asociación Civil Pachamama Raymi, en acompañamiento a las comunidades de Oscollopata y Huillque</b> <b>Title:</b> Recuperación del cedro andino (Cedrela lilloi) y ampliación de bosques de tayanca, inoculados con hongo morchella nativo con fines comerciales, en las comunidades de Oscollopata y Huillque, distrito de Omacha, Paruro, Cusco <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 42,880; Co-financing cash US\$ 7,600; in-kind US\$ 18,476 <b>Starting Date:</b> June 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery:</b> 70% disbursed	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Very good	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
Thematic area: Community Ecotourism (1)		
<b>NGO: Asociación de Turismo Vivencial Qoñi Wasi (ATV QOÑI WASI) en alianza con la municipalidad distrital de Suykutambo</b> <b>Title:</b> Conservación de recursos naturales y belleza escénica, desarrollo del... <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 38,251; Co-financing cash US\$ 11,449; in-kind US\$ 5,000 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery:</b> 60% disbursed	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Average: problems of expectations and internal management	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
Thematic area: Water and Ecosystems Management (2)		
<b>NGO: ASOCIACION ARARIWA PARA LA PROMOCION TECNICO CULTURAL ANDINA</b> <b>Title:</b> "Gestión participativa para la conservación de áreas de reserva forestal del Distrito de Pomacanchi <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 36,500; Co-financing cash US\$ -; in-kind US\$ 42,475		

<b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2019		
<b>Financial Delivery:</b> 44% disbursed	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Just started	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>NGO: Asociación Arariwa para la Promoción Técnico Cultural Andina</b> <b>Title:</b> Comunidades campesinas fortalecidas gestionan sus recursos hídricos y ejercen ciudadanía para la conservación de sus recursos naturales en las Comunidades del Distrito de Paccaritambo, Paruro, Cusco <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 45,172; Co-financing cash US\$ 20,917; in-kind US\$ 22,136 <b>Starting Date:</b> June 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery:</b> 77% disbursed	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Very good: reaching replication and upscaling level	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>Thematic area: Sustainable Management of Camelids (1)</b>		
<b>CBO: Asociación de Productores de Llamas y Alpacas Apu Ccona</b> <b>Title:</b> Recuperación y conservación de ecotipos de Llamas Kara y Chacu en el paisaje productivo de Velille, Cuzco <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 46,885; Co-financing cash US\$ 1,529; in-kind US\$ 12,741 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery:</b> 65% disbursed	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Average: initial problems of coordination and remoteness of the area	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>Thematic area: Climate Change Mitigation (2)</b>		
<b>CBO: Comunidad Campesina de Quiñota, en alianza con la Asociación Arariwa</b> <b>Title:</b> Acceso de los hogares con economía de subsistencia a cocinas mejoradas como contribución al mejoramiento ambiental de la comunidad de Quiñota, Cusco (3700 masl) <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 50,000; Co-financing cash US\$ 70,825; in-kind US\$ 79,154 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery:</b> 100% disbursed	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Very good during all implementation. Closed.	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>NGO: Centro de Desarrollo de los Pueblos AYLLU - CEDEP AYLLU</b> <b>Title:</b> Implementacion de Cocinas Mejoradas en 2 Comunidades Campesinas del Distrito de Omacha como estrategia de mitigación de cambio climático <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 44,997; Co-financing cash US\$ -; in-kind US\$ 45,520 <b>Starting Date:</b> Febr. 2019		
<b>Financial Delivery:</b> 50% disbursed	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Just started	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>

## Annex E-C

LANDSCAPE: PUNO PROJECTS BY THEMATIC AREAS as of March 2019: N. 8		
Thematic area: Sustainable Agriculture (3)		
<b>CBO: Asociación de Productores Agropecuarios Horticultores y Animales Menores Nueva Esperanza Aconsaya (APAHAMME) en alianza con la Municipalidad de Corani</b> <b>Title:</b> Conservación de la biodiversidad de papa nativa de colores mediante el fortalecimiento de capacidades y la revaloración de los conocimientos ancestrales para mejorar los medios de vida de los agricultores de Corani, Puno <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 41,970; Co-financing cash US\$ -; in-kind US\$ 34,650 <b>Starting Date:</b> June 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 70% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Good	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>CBO: Comunidad Campesina de Pacaje</b> <b>Title:</b> Conservación in situ de la agrobiodiversidad de variedades de: papas nativas, ocas e izaños con prácticas agroecológicas sostenibles en la comunidad campesina de Pacaje del paisaje de Macusani en Puno <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 39,459; Co-financing cash US\$ 100; in-kind US\$ 11,634 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 70% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Good; yet 3 months delays to renovate the Directory	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>NGO: Wildlife Conservation Society - WCS</b> <b>Title:</b> Creación de dos nuevas áreas de conservación local en el distrito de Cuyocuyo <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 49,999; Co-financing cash US\$ 49,996; in-kind US\$ - <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2019		
<b>Financial Delivery: 40% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Just started	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
Thematic area: Biotrade (1)		
<b>CBO: Asociación de Artesanos Textiles Corani, en alianza con la Comunidad Campesina de Quelcaya</b> <b>Title:</b> Promover la conservación de las alpacas suri y huacaya, mediante el fortalecimiento de capacidades e incremento del valor agregado de la fibra de alpaca de colores naturales para mejorar las condiciones de vida de las mujeres artesanas del paisaje de Cora (4900 masl) <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 44,576; Co-financing cash US\$ -; in-kind US\$ 39,301 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 65% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Good	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
Thematic area: Water and Ecosystems Management (3)		
<b>NGO: Centro de Capacitación Campesina de Puno (CCCP)</b> <b>Title:</b> Conservación de la agrobiodiversidad y los servicios ecosistémicos mediante la incidencia de mujeres organizadas para generar políticas públicas que garantizan medios de vida sostenibles en los distritos de Nuñoa, Santa Rosa, Orurillo, Cupi, Llalli, Asill <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 30,000; Co-financing cash US\$ -; in-kind US\$ 16,418 <b>Starting Date:</b> June 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 50% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation:</b> The project is coordinated by an NGO and implemented by a group of already empowered women, protecting and directly monitoring the quality of their water sources. Project supported the leadership of women, some of whom are now part of the directive board of the municipality	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b> A well-implemented project, highly appreciated by management, reaching replication/upscaling level.



<b>NGO: Asociación para la investigación y desarrollo sostenible Suma Marka y por la Comunidad Campesina de Moquegache Japo</b> <b>Title:</b> Conservación y manejo comunitario del agua y territorio en la Comunidad Campesina Moquegache Japo, del distrito de Lampa, Puno <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 46,780; Co-financing cash US\$ 27,960; in-kind US\$ 65,055 <b>Starting Date:</b> June 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 65% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation:</b> Advanced state of implementation with the communities having selected an extensive area for protection of water sources and potatoes production with native recuperated species ... good adaptive management when climatic conditions delayed reforestation activities and finally got the donation of the small plants and help of university students and even the army soldiers to reforest as it would have been very challenging for community members to do all the work alone. This allowed the availability of more money to be used for other activities. Very good coordination by the leading Suma Marka NGOs.	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b> A sound well-coordinated and well implemented project having its strength also in previous activities initiated with the support of other organizations. Community is already able to leverage other funds...
<b>CBO: Asociación de Mujeres Artesanas de Fibra de Alpacas - Lagunillas</b> <b>Title:</b> Conservación y protección de la diversidad biológica, terrestre y acuática <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 35,432; Co-financing cash US\$ -; in-kind US\$ 8,121 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2019		
<b>Financial Delivery: 40% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Just started	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>Thematic area: Climate Change Mitigation (1)</b>		
<b>CBO: Asociación Pesquera Real Chullpía, con el apoyo de la Municipalidad</b> <b>Title:</b> Mitigar el cambio climático mediante la instalación de sistemas de riego presurizado con paneles solares para regar los pastos naturales y mejorar la calidad de vida de los socios de Chullpía, en el paisaje de Ocuvi, Puno (4400 masl) <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 48,057; Co-financing cash US\$4,000; in-kind US\$ 15,374 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 100% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation:</b> Project developed without problems installing a system to ensure the availability of water for irrigation of pasture at different points utilizing a system alimented by solar panels. The area presents availability of water but pasture for their camelids is almost unavailable, thus affecting the health of the animals. The system to feed water to small reservoir is being visited by other communities interested in replicating the activity. The leadership of the organization is sound and all associated beneficiaries actively participate.	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b> Project produced very good results, highly appreciated by beneficiaries; it attracts the interest of neighboring communities for replication. Mostly completed

## Annex E-D

LANDSCAPE TACNA-CAPASO PROJECTS BY THEMATIC AREAS as of March 2019: N. 11		
<b>Thematic area: Sustainable Agriculture (1)</b>		
<b>CBO: Asociación de Mujeres Agropecuarias Artesanal y Turístico Tierra Rica de Camilaca</b> <b>Title:</b> Mejoramiento de la producción sostenible, procesamiento y comercialización del cultivo de Lacayote (Cucurbita ficifolia) en Camilaca, Candarave, <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 42,248; Co-financing cash US\$ -; in-kind US\$ 20,470 <b>Starting Date:</b> June 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 70% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Very good	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>Thematic area: Biotrade (3)</b>		
<b>CBO: Asociación Agroturismo Industrial Yabroco (AINYA), en alianza con la Comunidad Campesina de Yabroco</b> <b>Title:</b> Propagación, manejo, procesamiento y comercialización del Sancayo, en la comunidad de Yabroco, Tarata <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 50,000; Co-financing cash US\$ -; in-kind US\$ 20,052 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 60% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Good.	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>CBO: Asociación de Ovinos Nuevo Progreso de Candarave en alianza con el Instituto de Investigación y Desarrollo de zonas áridas del Sur</b> <b>Title:</b> Recuperación del Ayrampo (Opuntia soehrensii) para su manejo sostenible, valor agregado y comercialización en las comunidades de Candarave (3400 masl) <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 50,000; Co-financing cash US\$ 3,000; in-kind US\$ 34,060 <b>Starting Date:</b> June 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 30% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Average; coordination challenges with partner and regional assistance	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>NGO: Asociación de Productores San Pedro Candarave (APROTSANPEDRO)</b> <b>Title:</b> Recuperación y Manejo Sustentable de Suche y Carachi en Laguna Aricota, Candarave <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 50,000; Co-financing cash US\$ -; in-kind US\$ 17,140 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 100% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> It was proceeding very well but affected by extraordinary rains	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>Thematic area: Community Ecotourism (1)</b>		
<b>CBO: Asociación de Mujeres Artesanas, Turístico y Agropecuario de la Comunidad de Calientes del Sur</b> <b>Title:</b> Revalorización de los ecosistemas del volcán Yucamani y del valle los géiseres, para la conservación del bosque, la biodiversidad y el desarrollo ecoturístico en beneficio de las comunidades locales <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 49,923; Co-financing cash US\$ 19,000; in-kind US\$ 3,800 <b>Starting Date:</b> June 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 30% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Good	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>Thematic area: Water and Ecosystems Management (3)</b>		
<b>NGO: INSTITUTO MALLKU</b> <b>Title:</b> CONSERVACIÓN DE LA MICROCUENCA ANCOMARCA PARA LA PROVISIÓN DE SERVICIOS ECOSISTEMICOS Y RECUPERACION DEL SURI, CAPASO <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 19,000; Co-financing cash US\$ 5,600; in-kind US\$ 5,210 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2019		

<b>Financial Delivery: 47% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Just started	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>CBO: Instituto Mallku para el Desarrollo Sostenible</b> <b>Title:</b> Manejo del hábitat alto-andino para la recuperación poblacional del Suri "Rhea pennata" en Capaso <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 50,000; Co-financing cash US\$ 5,300; in-kind US\$ 8,500 <b>Starting Date:</b> June 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 35% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Good	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>CBO: Asociación de Productores Agropecuarios 10 de Agosto Ancocala, en alianza con Sothern Peru Copper Corporation</b> <b>Title:</b> Recuperación de canales y andenes ancestrales mediante la producción tecnificada y la comercialización de papas nativas y maíz tostado, incrementa los ingresos económicos de productores, Cairani (3700 masl) <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 50,000; Co-financing cash US\$ 15,000; in-kind US\$ 15,000 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan. 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 60% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Very good. Reaching replication and upscaling level	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>Thematic area: Sustainable Management of Camelids (2)</b>		
<b>CBO: Comunidad Campesina de Susapaya</b> <b>Title:</b> Conservación del Guanaco mediante el ecoturismo en la Comunidad de Susapaya <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 32,000; Co-financing cash US\$ -; in-kind US\$ 11,350 <b>Starting Date:</b> Febr. 2019		
<b>Financial Delivery: 38% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Just started	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>CBO: Comunidad Campesina Alto Perú</b> <b>Title:</b> Mejoramiento del manejo y distribución rural de agua superficial y de las capacidades de captura y esquila en las áreas de manejo de Vicuña de la Comunidad Campesina Alto Perú, Palca, Tacna ... (4400 masl) <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 50,000; Co-financing cash US\$ 36,100; in-kind US\$ 20,000 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 70% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Average. Significant delays for internal organizational problems	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>Thematic area: Climate change mitigation (1)</b>		
<b>CBO: Comunidad Campesina de Quilahuani, en alianza con la ONG Soluciones Prácticas</b> <b>Title:</b> Adopción de las cocinas mejoradas para el uso eficiente de energía en la comunidad de Quilahuani <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 33,075; Co-financing cash US\$ 10,807; in-kind US\$ 3,420 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 100% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Very good during all implementation. Closed.	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>

## Annex E-E

STRATEGIC PROJECTS ACROSS THE LANDSCAPES		
<b>Landscape: AREQUIPA-PUNO Thematic area: Sustainable Management of Camelids</b>		
<b>NGO: Progettomondo Movimento Laici America Latina</b> <b>Title:</b> De los camélidos a sus productos: una cadena de valor sostenible (Arequipa y Puno) <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 120,000; Co-financing cash US\$ -; in-kind US\$ 97,860 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2019		
<b>Financial Delivery:</b> 50% disbursed	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Just started	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>
<b>Landscape: Cusco-Tacna-Capaso Thematic area: Community Ecotourism</b>		
<b>NGO: Centro de Estudios Regionales Andinos "Bartolomé de Las Casas" - CBC</b> <b>Title:</b> Proyecto estratégico de promoción del ecoturismo de base comunitaria con enfoque en los jóvenes (Cusco y Tacna – Capaso) <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 100,000; Co-financing cash US\$ 95,000; in-kind US\$ 35,000 <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2019  <b>NGO: Asociación Civil sin Fines de Lucro Condor Travel - Wings</b> <b>Title:</b> Ecoturismo de base comunitaria como aliado para la conservación y resiliencia de los paisajes en zonas altoandinas de Cusco y Tacna <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 100,000; Co-financing cash US\$ 100,037; in-kind US\$ - <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan 2019		
<b>Financial Delivery:</b> 50% disbursed	<b>State of implementation:</b> The strategic ecotourism project has been divided into two with a side given to a recognized NGO with more than 45 years of experience in the area working with communities in the rural areas of the Andes and another side to the NGO wing of a private touristic enterprise - Condor Travel. The project just started and the two organizations have undertaken joint visits to the areas to design the initial baseline and coordinate working modalities. CBC has an approach to ecotourism based on three key elements: i) Development of tourism must benefit local communities which on the other hand needs to be strengthened to ensure they provide quality services; ii) a cultural approach to tourism development where a dialogue is promoted between tourists and communities in reciprocal respect while knowing their different cultures; iii) Tourism which respect the environment and nature, including a sound management of waste. A Tourism Platform with local governments is promoted. Even if there are only in the third months of implementation, they are already envisaging that time for implementation is probably insufficient.	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b> An innovative approach of financing two organizations, one from the private sector and an NGO with an history of working at community level to collaborate for an ecotourism approach involving an already tourist developed area (Cusco) showing governance problems, with conflicts both between communities and between local governments and a touristic undeveloped area (Tacna-Capaso) with different challenges. It is a challenging approach, apparently never experimented in the country, with a lot of potentiality but requiring careful monitoring to ensure coordination of working modalities for two NGOs with quite different initial objectives.
<b>Landscape: All landscapes Thematic area: Sustainable Agriculture</b>		
<b>NGO: Asociación Especializada para el Desarrollo Sostenible - AEDES</b> <b>Title:</b> Promoción del valor agregado y la comercialización de cultivos y productos andinos (4 landscapes) <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 150,000; Co-financing cash US\$ 15,800; in-kind US\$ 58,750 <b>Starting Date:</b> June 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery:</b> 50% disbursed	<b>State of implementation:</b>	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b>

	Advanced state of implementation: initial study of the area undertaken from a political, environmental and market access point of view, including mapping and visits to relevant stakeholders and actors. Support is provided to 16 CBOs projects within the landscapes of Puno, Tacna and Cusco (not yet in Arequipa) recuperating and producing native agrobiodiversity products. Producers are trained both technically and organizationally with exchange of experiences and strategic alliances between actors being at the core of the approach; among other, this is intended to possibly lead to actors being able to access government funds to sustain their projects. Management plans are under preparation for the first time in Peru for some key native products such as the <i>sancayo</i> .	The strategic approach is fully confirmed from interviews conducted with actors, all pointing to the need to work and have further support at the end of the production scale to improve access to markets and therefore revenues for beneficiaries. -Dialogue with new local authorities just installed is reinitiated. -A limiting factor during 2018 has been the harsh climatic conditions of the winter season. -The NGO is professionally recognized in the area and has previous experience with the SGP.
<b>Landscape: All landscapes    Thematic area: Integrated</b>		
<b>NGO: Centro de Estudios Regionales Andinos "Bartolomé de Las Casas" - CBC</b> <b>Title:</b> Asistencia técnica y monitoreo en campo de iniciativas comunitarias en paisajes estratégicos – Fase Operativa 6 del PPD (4 landscapes) <b>Budget:</b> GEF: US\$ 150,000; Co-financing cash US\$ -; in-kind US\$ 60,000 <b>Starting Date:</b> June 2018		
<b>Financial Delivery: 75% disbursed</b>	<b>State of implementation and management appreciation:</b> Very good.	<b>Issues or MTR comment:</b> Quality approach and quality deliver of TA and M&E. See further comments within the MTR main text.

## Annex F – Status of Grants Received/Implemented per Landscape, Summary Table as of March 2019

Subject/Landscape	Arequipa	Cusco	Puno	Tacna
<b>Provinces and districts</b>	Caylloma (8 districts) 545,256 ha	Paruro, Acomayo, Espinar; Chumbivilcas; Canchis; Quispicanchis (15 districts) 643,027 ha	Melgar, Carabaya, Azangaro, Lampa (15 districts) 1,035,994 ha	Candarave, Tarata, Tacna, El Collao (14 districts) 707,717 ha
<b>Inhabitants</b>	18,367 inhabitants	142,163 inhabitants	128,271 inhabitants	18,951 inhabitants
<b>DHI</b>	0.27-0.5	0.14-0.46	0.16-0.43	0.25-0.47
<b>Importance of resources</b>	Agrobiodiversity; Camelids (guanaco, vicuna) in the Salt National Reserve Aguada Blanca; Ecotourism potential and water resources in Valle del Colca	Agrobiodiversity; Fauna (guanaco, vicuna, taruca); <i>Polylepis</i> forests; <i>Puya raimondii</i> ; Hub for artisans; Alpaca and llama populations; Ecotourism potential. Regional Conservation area “Tres Canones”.	Agrobiodiversity; Fauna (guanaco, taruca); <i>Polylepis</i> forests and areas of <i>Puya raimondii</i> ; Alpaca and llama populations: Hub for artisans.	Agrobiodiversity; <i>Polylepis</i> forests; Ecotourism potential; Conservation of globally and nationally important wildlife species (Rhea, guanacos, vicuñas and taruca). Regional Conservation area Vilacota-Maure
<b>Landscape Strategy</b>	OK	OK	OK	OK
<b>N. of CBOs/NGOs grants</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>by Thematic Area:</b>				
-Sustainable agriculture	-	3	3	1
-CCM	1	2	1	1
-Biotrade	1	1	1	3
-Water/Ecosystems Manag.	4	2	3	3
-Sustain. Manag. Camelids	4	1	-	2
-Community Ecotourism	-	1	-	1
<b>GEF Funding (US\$)</b>	417,680	436,444	336,273	476,246
<b>In-kind co-financing</b>	94,950	264,546	190,553	159,002
<b>Cash co-financing</b>	208,415	142,751	82,056	94,807
<b>N. of projects completed</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>Strategic Project</b>	<b>Thematic Area:</b> Sustainable management of camelids. <b>Landscape:</b> Arequipa-Puno. <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan. 2019 <b>GEF Funding:</b> 120,000; Cash Co-financing: -; In-kind Co-financing 97,860			
<b>Strategic Project</b>	<b>Thematic Area:</b> Community Ecotourism. <b>Landscape:</b> Cusco-Tacna. <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan. 2019 <b>GEF Funding:</b> 100,000; Cash Co-financing: 100,000-; In-kind Co-financing -			
<b>Strategic Project</b>	<b>Thematic Area:</b> Community Ecotourism. <b>Landscape:</b> Cusco-Tacna. <b>Starting Date:</b> Jan. 2019 <b>GEF Funding:</b> 100,000; Cash Co-financing: 95,000; In-kind Co-financing 35,000			
<b>Strategic Project</b>	<b>Thematic Area:</b> Sustainable agriculture. <b>Landscape:</b> All landscapes. <b>Starting Date:</b> June 2018 <b>GEF Funding:</b> 150,000; Cash Co-financing: 15,800; In-kind Co-financing 58,750			
<b>Strategic Project</b>	<b>Thematic Area:</b> Technical assistance and monitoring. <b>Landscape:</b> All landscapes. <b>Starting Date:</b> June 2018 <b>GEF Funding:</b> 150,000; Cash Co-financing: -; In-kind Co-financing 60,000			

## ANNEX G - EVALUATION CONSULTANT AGREEMENT FORM

### Evaluator 1:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>5</sup>

#### Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: Elena Laura Ferretti

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.



Signed in Florence, Italy on 12 April 2019

<sup>5</sup> [www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)